GENDER
OPEN
REPOSITORIUM

Roman Charity : Queer Lactations in Early Modern Visual Culture

Sperling, Jutta Gisela

2016

https://doi.org/10.25595/213

Veröffentlichungsversion / published version
Buch / book

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Sperling, Jutta Gisela: *Roman Charity : Queer Lactations in Early Modern Visual Culture*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2016. DOI: https://doi.org/10.25595/213.

GenderOpen – Repositorium für die Geschlechterforschung: www.genderopen.de

FREIE
UNIVERSITÄT
BERLIN

HUMBOLDT-UNIVERSITÄT ZU BERLIN

Jutta Gisela Sperling

Roman Charity

Queer Lactations in Early Modern Visual Culture



[transcript] Image

Jutta Gisela Sperling
Roman Charity

Jutta Gisela Sperling (PhD) teaches early modern history at Hampshire College, MA. Her research interests include convent studies, comparative legal studies in the Mediterranean, and early modern lactation imagery.

Jutta Gisela Sperling

Roman Charity

Queer Lactations in Early Modern Visual Culture

[transcript]

I would like to thank Christian Heße for his diligent work in creating the layout and index and for his valuable editorial comments.

Supported by Hampshire College, Massachusetts.



This work is licensed under the
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 (BY-NC-ND).
which means that the text may be used for non-commercial purposes, provided credit is given to the author.
For details go to http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de

© 2016 transcript Verlag, Bielefeld
Cover layout: Kordula Röckenhaus, Bielefeld
Cover illustration: Guercino, *The Daughter Who Breastfeeds her Mother*, before 1661, drawing, London, Collection of Her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle, Royal Collection Trust, RCIN 902573 / © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2015.
Typeset by Christian Heße
Printed in Germany
Print-ISBN 978-3-8376-3284-2
PDF-ISBN 978-3-8394-3284-6

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements | 7

Introduction | 9

Part I: Images

Chapter 1
Breastfeeding Pero:
Sign of Desire, Transgression,
and Dionysian Excess (1525–50) | 37

Chapter 2
The Caravaggesque Moment:
Roman Charity as Figure of Dissent | 103

Chapter 3
Poussin's and Rubens's Long Shadows:
Roman Charity, French History Painting,
and the Hybridization of Genres | 175

Part II: Texts and Contexts

Chapter 4
The Literary Tradition:
Erotic Insinuations, Irony, and Ekphrasis | 231

Chapter 5
Adult Breastfeeding as Cure:
Queer Lactations in Medical Discourse | 269

Chapter 6
Charity, Mother of Allegory:
Breastfeeding as "Other Speech" | 307

Chapter 7
Patriarchy and Its Discontents:
Father-Daughter Relations and the Emergence of Absolutism | 351

Appendix

List of Figures | 375

Table: Caravaggisti, Caravaggeschi, and Their Iconographical Choices | 387

Works Cited | 393

Index of Artists | 427

Acknowledgements

This book has been a long time in the making. I received many suggestions and feedback from friends and colleagues over the course of the thirteen years it took me to write it – too many, I am afraid, to thank everybody individually – but I would like to mention a few persons and institutions that have been especially helpful. First of all, I thank the Villa I Tatti for awarding me the best fellowship ever. Françoise and Joe Connors were extraordinarily kind and generous and never complained about the new and unexpected directions of my research. Giovanni Pagliarulo, curator of the Fototeca Berenson, was especially helpful – lo ringrazio tanto. Jan Simane introduced me to the photo archive of the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence where I began to collect my images – auch ihm meinen besonderen Dank. Hampshire College indulged my forays into interdisciplinary research and contributed financially to this project. My friend Monika Schmitter shared important archival references with me and told me about a ceiling fresco in Cremona that I would never have found on my own. Patricia Simons provided me with beautiful photos of artworks, as did Helen Hills. Matteo Casini mentioned an early Madonna Lactans to me, which he discovered in a little church in Matera. Brigitte Buettner pointed me to illuminations of Boccaccio's *Famous Women* that proved immensely important to my work. Kenneth Gouwens sent me a most delightful satire about milk relics by Erasmus. Diana Bullen Presciutti, Barbara Orland, Aaron Berman, and Moshe Sluhovsky read earlier drafts of the manuscript and made many useful comments. I am very grateful to them and hope they don't mind that I couldn't implement all of the changes they suggested. Rachel Beckwith helped me identify a mysterious *Roman Charity* I found on a Russian website, as did Gülru Çakmak. Okihito Utamura and Heinrich Kuhn were of invaluable help in translating particularly obscure passages from my Latin sources. Yasmina Foehr-Janssens at the University of Geneva and Vera Cekic at the University of Applied Arts in Vienna gave me the opportunity to present some of my work, as

did the organizers of the Fifth Annual Art History Conference at the American University in Washington. Koenraad Jonckheere and Helmut Puff provided welcome feedback to my presentation at the RSA in Berlin. Juleen Eichinger and Christian Heße assisted me with the copy-editing and layout of this book. Lisa DeCarolis at Hillyer Art Library was always helpful, as was the staff at the Kunsthistorische Bibliothek in Berlin. The many soy lattes I consumed while writing this book at Sip, Northampton Coffee, the Woodstar, the Roost, the Hay Market, and the Esselon Cafe also helped tremendously. Jim shared my enthusiasm and always listened patiently to my latest news about Renaissance lactation imagery. Olivia and Lucia grew up over the course of my obsession with Pero and the nursing Madonna without ever complaining about the bizarre turns our dinner conversations sometimes took. I would like to dedicate this book to them, as well as to the memory of my father.

Northampton, August 2015
Jutta Gisela Sperling

Introduction

More than three hundred artistic representations of Pero and Cimon, the breastfeeding father-daughter couple, are currently extant in museums and collections world wide – in the form of medals, book illuminations, drawings, prints, oil paintings, maiolica dishes, frescoes, chessboard decorations, marble statues, watches, and pharmaceutical bottles. Another few dozen images show the topic in its mother-daughter variety, attesting to the preoccupation of early modern audiences with Valerius Maximus's twin anecdotes on "filial piety" in his *Memorable Sayings and Doings* (written 31 CE).[1] In this collection of anecdotes meant to illustrate the values and virtues of Roman patriarchy, two stories recount how a mother and father, respectively, are breastfed by their own daughters after being sentenced to death by starvation for a capital crime. Since the early seventeenth century, the motif became known as Roman Charity, an indication that the anecdotes of Pero and Cimon and of the anonymous Roman daughter and her mother were understood to rival, complement, or parody the embodiment of Catholicism's prime virtue, Charity, in her personification as a breastfeeding woman.

But so far, no monograph has been devoted to the motif's analysis. There are a few isolated articles, and two Italian essay collections on the motif of Roman Charity, but the ubiquity of the theme in the visual arts, oral culture, and literary discourse of early modern Europe has in no way found the academic attention it deserves.[2] Such relative lack of interest is mirrored by curators' reluctance to display even the more masterful renderings of the topic. One of Rubens's renderings of *Roman Charity* languishes in the depository of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam. Bartolomeo Manfredi's painting was removed from display in the Uffizi during construction projects. Alessandro Turchi's version hangs in the gift shop of the Galleria Doria Pamphili in Rome, unmarked; and Gerrit van Honthorst's piece went missing for a few years in the Landesmuseum in Münster. More such stories could be added.

This almost programmatic neglect is all the more disappointing because the imagery of the daughter-who-breastfed-her-father connects with a variety of current and vibrant debates among social, art, and gender historians of the early modern period. The iconography contributes to historical narratives of sexuality and the body, as it eroticizes maternity and queers our understanding of practices of lactation. In illustrating "filial piety," it embodies core values of patriarchal family relations, but as an incestuous boundary violation, it develops into a quintessential figure of perversion and dissent. Its stylistic developments encompass the classicizing eroticism of Italian Renaissance art, the pornographic aesthetic of German miniature prints, the intensity of address in Baroque gallery paintings, and the hybridization of genres in eighteenth-century France. Under Caravaggio and Poussin, the motif underwent a revolutionary semantic change by association with religious subject matters. Despite the many backstories Pero and Cimon can tell about Giulio Romano's portrayals of Dionysian excess, Sebald Beham's representations of the "naked truth" of sexual desire, Poussin's conciliatory approach to Judaism, and Greuze's fall from grace with the Académie Royale, their images have rarely been studied or displayed. It is perhaps the subversive, strangely erotic, dangerously incestuous, and potentially perverse connotations of the iconography that make curators wary of exhibiting it. In Soviet-era Leningrad, for example, workers at a steel factory allegedly requested that a copy of Rubens's Hermitage version of *Roman Charity* be removed from their dormitory because of indecency – an episode picked up by a British tabloid in an article entitled "Shocking pin-up was by Rubens" (1963) (Figure 2.27).[3]

My very first exposure to the iconography of Pero and Cimon produced arousals and resistances as well. It occurred ca. 30 years ago during my junior year abroad in Italy. Strolling through a Neapolitan exhibition of Baroque art, I was surprised, taken in, and then deeply unsettled by Caravaggio's altarpiece *The Seven Works of Mercy* (1606) (Figure 2.1). The adult breastfeeding couple at the center – which I only later understood to be a father and his daughter – held an uncanny power over me, producing complex feelings of attraction and repulsion, curiosity and fear. Decades later, after having investigated Renaissance patriarchal family structures in a variety of modes and locations, and after having gathered my own experiences with (maternal infant-) breastfeeding, I came upon the painting a second time, during an extended stay in Italy. This time, I picked up the challenge. Despite the fact that I was supposed to work on a somewhat pedantic project on comparative legal history, I found myself increasingly obsessed not only with Caravaggio's altarpiece but also with the entire visual and literary tradition of Pero and Cimon. Leafing through the photo collection of the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence, studying Andor Pigler's iconographical entries in his invaluable *Barockthemen* (1974), and perusing the internet to gather additional images, I collected a data base of more than 1,000 images of

representations of the motif of Roman Charity and related lactation imagery. The sheer volume of this visual tradition convinced me that breastfeeding pictures, and, among those, the iconography of Pero and Cimon, deserve an in-depth study. Having read David Freedberg's great book in the meantime, I wholeheartedly agree with his suggestion that representations of Roman Charity count among those images that might arouse and stir their beholders, an image that people might either break and mutilate or kiss and worship.[4]

Methodologically, I intend to approach the topic from a multi-layered perspective, one that aims at reconstructing different horizons of expectation and engages the peculiar "power" of the imagery itself. Both are complex tasks, the former because every attempt at historical contextualization needs to be regarded as tentative and incomplete, the latter because of the many contemporary and current debates about the respective limits of textuality and visuality as interlocking modes of representation.[5] In an attempt to launch the pictorial turn among historians of the early modern period, I show how high art as well as B-level artifacts can serve as sources for the investigation of instances of resistance and subversion that were rarely verbalized. Concretely, I employ queer theory to emphasize the embattled nature of early modern patriarchy, taking the visual tradition of Roman Charity as a measure of parody and discontent.

On the level of content, I want to show how the eroticized maternal body came to rival phallic imagery at a time when modern notions about the self emerged. I argue that the displacement of mothering and the exploitative nature of father-daughter relations that the iconography depicts were fundamental to patrilineal kinship formation. In addition to symbolizing the reversals, contradictions, hierarchies, and exclusions of patriarchy, post-Tridentine Catholic artists and their audiences appropriated and politicized the ancient legend of Pero and Cimon as an expression of dissent. In this context, the semantic ambiguities in representing Roman Charity became the allegory's very theme. Furthermore, I trace how medical practitioners recommended adult lactations on occasion, providing for a "real" backdrop in understanding the iconography.

Current debates about the iconic turn, the power of images, and theories of visuality are helpful in providing a point of entry into my project; evoking them might justify this trans-disciplinary study of an iconographic tradition by a social and cultural historian. Part of my ambition is to add "history" to the long list of disciplines that according to W.J.T. Mitchell have been participating in the so-called "pictorial turn," the latest paradigm-shifting event in the humanities since the "linguistic turn" of the late 1960s.[6] Observing how, since the time of Moses, iconoclasts have felt threatened by visual representations because of the obstinacy of the images they arouse, wishing them dead or mutilating them by attacking their material manifestations, Mitchell views images as parasitical life-forms that exist in the minds of their beholders as

their hosts. Going beyond Freedberg's and Belting's analyses of how certain images become inhabited by divine presence – thus acquiring power – Mitchell anthropomorphizes pictures by endowing them with agency and desire, and he likens them to idols, fetishes, or totems.[7] Successful images are scary, as they, Medusa-like, attempt to acquire mastery of their beholders.[8] Asserting the peculiar, non-verbal expressiveness of images, Mitchell paradoxically wishes "to make pictures less scrutable, less transparent," and to "reckon with ... their silence, their reticence, their wildness and nonsensical obduracy."[9] Ultimately, he wants "to make the relationality of image and beholder the field of investigation," and it is at this intersection that a historical reconstruction of horizons of expectation becomes important.[10]

Whitney Davis's recent discussion of what is visual about culture and cultural about vision foregrounds a historical approach as well when approaching images and meaning production in the arts. He insists on the need to investigate the many "relays and recursions" of cognition that occur during the apprehension of forms, motifs, and abstract significations of any given work of art. In Erwin Panofsky's vocabulary, every pre-iconographic understanding is or should be followed by iconographic recognition and iconological analysis – when, for example, a beholder distinguishes colors and shapes to signify thirteen men around a table, then proceeds to identify the motif as the last supper, and finally grasps the particular symbolic relevance of the motif for the artist and his audience. Davis, by contrast, refuses such a neat hierarchical division of levels of understanding and posits a more immediate interworking of all types of cognition, such that knowledge about the last supper is credited with helping to see thirteen men around a table.[11] This is relevant for my project because what we see on a painting of Roman Charity – a half-naked young woman offering her breast to an emaciated old man – is not necessarily succeeded smoothly by our recognition of the literary "motif" thus illustrated (filial piety), even less by any agreement about the wider significance of the motif in its pictorial form. On the contrary, if we did not know the story about Pero's heroic sacrifice from reading Valerius Maximus's *Memorable Doings and Sayings* (ca. 31 CE), seeing a pictorial representation of Cimon in the act of suckling might result in sexual arousal, disgust, or incomprehension, certainly not in any discrete "understanding" that Pero is rescuing her father from death by starvation.[12]

Davis posits that "resistance is an internal aspective conundrum in the iconographic succession," and such resistance to seeing an eroticized adult breastfeeding couple as an allegory of filial piety is one of my main preoccupations in this book.[13] Instead of viewing formal, iconographic, and iconological meanings as neatly succeeding one another, my intent is to show how signifier and signified were often at odds with each other in representing Roman Charity. In my view, such assertion of form over content and the tension

between visual representation and allegorical meaning have accompanied contemporary discussions on iconoclasm and the purpose of visual representations since the early sixteenth century. The eroticization of a "virtuous" or religiously enhanced motif thus connects with central questions of how to visually represent the sacred in both Protestant and Catholic camps. In the case of Pero and Cimon, such tensions on the signifying scene derive in part from the ekphrastic challenge that Maximus posits in telling his anecdote:

"Men's eyes are riveted in amazement when they see the painting of this act and renew the features of the long bygone incident in astonishment at the spectacle now before them, believing that in those silent outlines of limbs they see living and breathing bodies. This must needs happen to the mind also, admonished to remember things long past as though they were recent by painting, which is considerably more effective than literary memorials."[14]

Paradoxically calling into question the power of his own "literary memorial" to conjure up vivid mental images of Pero, "who put him [Myko/Cimon] like a baby to her breast and fed him," Maximus seems to recommend painting as the proper mode and medium for the commemoration of this act.[15] Wall paintings and terracotta statues excavated in Pompeii suggest that, indeed, visual representations of Pero were ubiquitous in the first century – whether as a result or precondition of Maximus's anecdote is hard to tell. In the Middle Ages, the story survived largely in its literary form – and differently gendered twin version, as we will see shortly – but since the early sixteenth century, narrative renderings of the ancient emblem of filial piety were increasingly replaced by visual representations. Investigating the peculiar (metaphorical) condensations and (metonymic) displacements of meaning that happen in the process of visual allegorization, I ultimately strive for the de-allegorization of images of lactation such as Pero's milk-offer to her father. I maintain that milk-relations as depicted in European art show traces of – historically contingent – ambiguities, tensions, and struggles between caregivers and recipients. Why was the eroticization and incestuous employment of breastfeeding imagery codified as an emblem of filial piety? How did women nursing more than one infant simultaneously come to be associated with "charity" and "humility" in the European visual tradition? And how did the picture status of such representations contribute to the fixation of their allegorical content and simultaneously call for a narrative solution of their inherent semantic contradictions?

The iconography of the Madonna Lactans has been acknowledged to be provocative because of the unstable semantics of the "Virgin's one bare breast," but the many representations of hybrid, incestuous, species-crossing, and gender-bending milk relationships in Renaissance and Baroque art still await commentary and analysis.[16] A common feature of all those Charities, wet-nurses, goddesses, daughters, men, and she-animals shown to share their milk in early modern art with a bewildering variety of suckling creatures is




Figure 0.1: Sir Godfrey Kneller, Workshop, Portrait of Lady Mary Boyle and her Son Charles, ca. 1720

that none of them nurses her own children. Even the nursing Madonna is a very special mother nursing a very special son, one endowed with a corporate persona consisting of all believers in Christ. Sir Godfrey Kneller's portrait of Lady Mary Boyle in the act of nursing her son (ca. 1730) remains an absolute – British – oddity (Figure 0.1). It acquires intelligibility in the context of the

occasional portrayal of high-ranking ladies in the guise of Charity, such as Paulus Moreelse's painting of Duchess Sophie Hedwig of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1592–1642) and Sir Reynolds's painting of Lady Cockburn (1773).[17] While these three paintings prefigure "modern" and enlightened family relationships with breastfeeding mothers at their core, the very promiscuity of milk sharing in the early modern Continental tradition belongs to another semantic universe, one that posits the lactating breast as a wandering signifier of desire whose very aim and purpose consists of boundary crossings and transgressions.

In this study, I stress the semantic density and instability of breastfeeding pictures by historicizing the process of allegorization on the one hand and politicizing the discourse of charity on the other. In particular, I propose to view representations of Roman Charity as contributions to a kind of counterculture in which the Catholic enhancement of breastfeeding as care of the needy gets ironically twisted and parodied. The conspicuous absence of maternal milk-relationships in early modern art can be viewed as the very precondition for conceiving of Charity as the love of one's neighbor, configured as the nursing of strangers. In addition, it gives us a clue to understanding the inner workings of patriarchal family relationships. Medico-legal fictions of paternal blood as constitutive of kinship coexisted uneasily with the practice of wet-nursing, even though both shared a commitment to minimizing maternal input to the process of generation in their accounts of reproduction since antiquity.[18] The iconography of Pero and Cimon is perhaps the most indicative example of the simultaneous evocation and displacement of the mother in the visual arts, highlighting that what ought to be consumed by Pero's child, gets – unduly – appropriated by her father.

Employing a broadly defined notion of "queer," I propose to view the story of Roman Charity as a riddle about kinship, in which the reversal of the generational trajectory and the substitution of mother's milk for paternal blood emphasize the fictive nature of normative patriarchal kinship. The eroticization of the maternal and the subversive image of incestuous matrilinearity that the breastfeeding daughter conjures up, but also the iconography's arousal of desire for regression and ego-threatening boundary loss, are in direct and open opposition to contemporary accounts of "straight" kinship. In a society in which female inheritance was seen as "obliquating" the straight line of patrilineal inheritance, the fetish-like obsession with Pero and Cimon among early modern art lovers expressed a "queer" desire for alternatives to patriarchy.[19] This approach is in part motivated by the motif's circulation in Renaissance oral culture as a riddle about filiation, for which early sixteenth-century printed compilations give ample evidence. Equally useful is Carla Freccero's analysis of Marguerite de Navarre's "queer" fantasies of maternal parthenogenesis and incest as subversive of patrilineal kinship.[20]

Furthermore, I regard the iconography of Pero and Cimon as evidence of an early modern view of sexuality that includes practices of adult lactation – despite all contemporary taboos prohibiting sex with a wet-nurse or breastfeeding wife.[21] In a recent review article, Sharon Marcus deplores that "there is little extant work on the queerness of those conventionally considered heterosexual," and she reminds us that "queer studies has, like feminism, expanded the definition of what counts as sexuality." Scholars who focus on family formation have found the term "queer" useful, "understood as the antithesis of the normative nuclear biological family." With Judith Butler, Marcus speculates about the existence of what she calls "pre-social kinship," which, "though marked as outside the law, bears the trace of an alternate legality."[22] My proposal to regard not only the all-female but also the cross-gendered lactation scene as indicative of queer desires that transcend the legal framework of patriarchy and oppose normative political structures follows Marcus's lead in expanding our notions of queerness, sexuality, and kinship. The incestuous quality of the iconography hints, moreover, at the need for a historicization of the Oedipal conflict as the – embattled – birthplace of Freudian subjectivity. While Oedipus slept with his birthmother and killed his father, he certainly never violated the – prior? – taboo against having sex with one's nurse or foster mom.

Mindful of Eve Sedgwick's admonition to use "queer" as a transitive verb, I argue that in representations of Pero and Cimon, patriarchy is revealed to be "relational, and strange," the product of anxiously guarded, arbitrary hierarchies and exclusions.[23] Maximus's anecdote of filial piety illustrates ancient Roman patriarchy's most cherished values by celebrating a serious boundary transgression, thus queering the notion of patrilinearity at its core. More specifically, the many ambiguities in Pero's and Cimon's relationship confirm the paradoxical outcomes of extreme paternal needs and filial submission. If in some renderings of Roman Charity, Pero is shown to be a "woman on top," relegating her father to a regressive dependency, others depict her as the abject victim of an Über-patriarch's incestuous demands.

The systematic study of this iconography thus seeks to answer Fiona Giles's call for the historical study of queer, i.e., adult breastfeeding practices, and aims at including an archive of early modern lactation imagery in Griselda Pollock's "virtual feminist museum."[24] Appropriating Aby Warburg's idea of a picture atlas that would document the workings of a non-verbal, "deeper, pictorial unconscious, a memory formation of deep emotions ... held in recurring patterns, gestures, and forms," Pollock gives renewed consideration to his concept of "Pathosformeln" in the visual arts, i.e., recurrent signifiers of strong emotions.[25] The persistence of certain images since antiquity was for Warburg indicative of the need to establish what German art historians nowadays call "picture science" [Bildwissenschaft] and to define the history of art as a discipline with the potential of transcending both history and anthropology.[26] Pollock

points to Freud's deep interest in ancient artifacts, hinting that his acquisition of a statuette of Isis breastfeeding Horus and another one of the Egyptian Uraeus, "the phallic but also eternal female emblem of everlasting pharaonic power," testify to his intuitive awareness of the importance of pre-Greek, pre-verbal, and female-centered imagery.[27] Warburg's idea of a "pictorial unconscious" might explain, perhaps, the particular resilience of Maximus's anecdote in its visual form.

Next to art, also religious discourse challenged the "law of the father" on occasion by relating milk to grace and Scripture and by allegorizing Charity as a breastfeeding woman.[28] Joel Fineman adds to this discussion by linking theories of allegorization – in language – to psychoanalytic discourse and the structure of desire, and claims: "The movement of allegory, like the [Freudian] dreamwork, enacts a wish."[29] Fineman posits that allegories become "representative of the figurality of all language" and acquire the status of "trope of tropes," an insight that challenges art historians to consider whether visual allegories express a similar meta-content.[30] Historically speaking, "allegory seems … to surface in critical or polemical atmospheres, when for political or metaphysical reasons there is something that cannot be said."[31] In my view, the motif of Roman Charity is a perfect example of such a politically relevant allegory, which silenced but embodied visually what needed to remain unsaid in early modern Europe. Its subversive content and anti-patriarchal polemic remained conspicuously confined to the realm of pictorial ambiguity.

This study's privileging of visual sources over the literary tradition, and the investigation into the distinct non-verbal qualities of artistic representations, amounts to abandoning the new historicist assumption of all culture as text.[32] Proponents of the iconic turn in Germany have been clamoring for the recognition of visual cultures' pre-and extra-linguistic features for some time now, especially followers of Heidegger.[33] While I am reluctant to celebrate the demise of language as a quasi-colonizing agent, I am committed to doing justice to pictures' dense, non-linear, and highly ambiguous mode of expression. And while there will be plenty of textual analysis in this study, the relationship between text and image is always regarded as precarious and fraught with tension. This connects with early modern viewers' interest in renderings of Roman Charity, fueled to a large extent by contemporary discussions about artists' and poets' respective capacity for mimesis and the value of paintings as memory aids and substitutes for historical discourse. Pero and Cimon continue to have shock value, and as much as the motif's imagery is based on a literary tradition, the visualization of its narrative content very often goes beyond the ekphrastic promise of its source.[34]

In a wider sense, this book seeks to establish the lactating breast as a signifier of desire at a time when early modern subjectivities are commonly believed to have emerged under the sign of the phallus.[35] The repression of the

ample visual tradition of breastfeeding imagery coincided with the attempt to abolish all non-maternal milk relationships in the eighteenth century, when reformers such as Rousseau advocated that women should avoid nursing other mothers' children.[36] The moral enhancement of exclusive maternal breastfeeding was instrumental in defining "enlightened" female domesticity and set restrictive boundaries on who counted as family. It led to the gradual abolition of the wet-nursing system, the substitution of foundling homes with welfare payments to single mothers, and the experimentation with infant formula based on animal milk.[37] It also led to the abandonment of the motif of Roman Charity as an allegory that early modern viewers found "good to think with."

Despite the fact that feminist philosophers have criticized the Lacanian account of desire since the 1970s, attempts to historicize the emergence of phallic significations in early modern Europe have neglected to search for gendered alternatives.[38] Thomas Laqueur's research on what he called the "one-sex body" in Galenic medicine provides a point of departure for the recognition of male/female analogies in Renaissance medicine, but the heavy critique against some of his more sweeping assertions led to the unfortunate underestimation of anti-Aristotelian knowledge production in the sixteenth century and what it meant for the recognition of female desire.[39] Patricia Simons's recent book *The Sex of Men in Premodern Europe: A Cultural History*, however, engages closely with Laqueur's claim regarding the ubiquity of phallic imagery in Renaissance medicine and argues that ejaculation, not erection, was the mark of virility in early modern culture. Such association of maleness with fertility, materiality, abundance, and softness seems to suggest a more androgynous – even maternal – model of phallic signification.[40] I would like to go a step further and propose to view medieval and early modern lactation imagery as itself expressive of desire and semantic power. Arguably, allegories of charity, which in medieval religious discourse denote the reciprocity of giving and receiving, and the circular view of giving as receiving came to rival prevailing notions of sexuality as penetration in Renaissance discourse.

A note on social practices: one of my aims is to establish adult breastfeeding practices as the backdrop against which Roman Charity flourished as a theme. Sources are scant, but there is some evidence that adult milk-exchange informed medical cures and religious forms of devotion. Pope Innocence VIII (1432–92), for example, was given human milk as a remedy of last resort just days before he died, a fact Giordano Bruno made fun of in his comedy *The Candle Bearer* (1582).[41] In 1518, mystic and "living saint" Elena Duglioli miraculously nursed Antonio Pucci, papal nuncio, later Bishop of Pistoia and cardinal, who longed "for the singular grace of turning into a baby again" and fantasized about being breastfed by the Madonna.[42] In 1677, Countess Elisabeth Henriette of Hessen was cured by woman's milk from a debilitating illness.[43] And in 1781, Madame Roland employed a so-called "têteuse" or "tireuse," i.e., a female

breast-sucker, to re-establish her milk flow, wishing to resume nursing her newborn daughter.[44] Interestingly, the transitive verbs "têter" and "tettare" in French and Italian, respectively, seem to refer predominantly to adult nursing practices until the eighteenth century.[45] Such "breasting" among adults could mean, as Madame Roland's correspondence and Bruno's comedy show, to have one's breast sucked as well as to offer it, in an unusual conflation of the passive and active meaning of the verb. By contrast, infant nursing was referred to as "milking" ["allaiter" and "allattare"], a distinction indicative of the need to protect infant breastfeeding from the association with adult breastfeeding and its peculiar erotic charge. The existence of the verb "to breast" in French and Italian and the references to milk cures in European-wide medical treatises indicate that adult breastfeeding was widespread until at least the late eighteenth century.

This book has the wider aim of establishing "lactation studies" as a valid area of historical research.[46] In employing a variety of perspectives on the iconography of Pero and Cimon in particular, it proposes to shed light on several broader issues: the peculiar occurrences of patriarchal exclusions in early modern Europe; the figuration of paternal power as illicit, exploitative, and in need of rehabilitation; and phantasies surrounding the eroticized maternal body. It points to art as a distinct arena for the critique of patriarchal politics at a moment when iconoclastic movements forced a debate on the particular "powers" of visual representations. It asks what the imagery of Pero and Cimon reveals about the politics of allegorization at a time when women's voices were regarded as "other speech" and relegated to the mute realm of visual embodiment. It analyzes how the iconography intervened in the debates on charity, iconoclasm, and representations of the sacred during the Reformation and post-Tridentine era. It discusses how the story of Roman Charity presents kinship as a riddle and couches the system of patriarchal filiation as an eroticized consumption of the daughter and "queer" displacement of the mother. And finally, it investigates how the lactating breast in all non-maternal milk relationships qualifies as a signifier of desire, power, and abundance.

The first section of my book, "Images," analyzes the iconography in its various contexts and genres from the early sixteenth century to the late eighteenth. Roughly, the story goes as follows: in Reformation art, the breastfeeding daughter explodes notions of pictorial intelligibility through pornographic renderings. In the Italian Renaissance, Pero performs her act of "filial piety" in the form of an emasculating Medusa-image of considerable shock value alongside Salome and Judith. In Mannerist palace decorations, Pero becomes a Dionysian emblem of Orientalizing excess but also a sign of fertility and rejuvenation. Caravaggio's altarpiece spiritualizes the motif, integrating Pero's lactation scene in order to allude to the papacy's need for "charitable" intervention and renewal. Caravaggio's followers turned *Roman Charity*

into an eroticized gallery painting but preserved the religious and political associations of the theme by drawing formal analogies between the breastfeeding father and Saint Peter, most notably in scenes of the apostle's *Denial* of Jesus Christ. Poussin's integration of the mother-daughter breastfeeding scene in his *Gathering of the Manna* became emblematic of the classicizing genre of French history painting in discussions of the Royal Academy. In the eighteenth century, Greuze and his contemporaries used the theme of Roman Charity to experiment with a hybridization of the genre by infusing it with "bourgeois" aesthetic elements. At the same time, the motif became politicized during debates on political reform, which oscillated between utopian dreams of the "good father" and fantasies of parricide.

The second section of my book, entitled "Texts and Contexts," traces the different horizons of expectation that early modern viewers brought to bear on renderings of Roman Charity. In this section, I analyze the millenarian literary tradition of the motif since Valerius Maximus, pointing to the ironic subtext of the two anecdotes on filial piety despite their didactic presentation. I examine the practice of adult breastfeeding in medical writings and explore the gendered nature of milk cures and their ailments. I trace the visual universe within which Pero and Cimon were able to flourish by examining the interlocking iconographies of Charity and the Madonna Lactans and related breastfeeding imagery. Finally, I investigate father-daughter relationships in legal discourse.

My aim is to set the parameters within which a deeper, more general, but also more concrete and "applied," understanding the theme of Roman Charity might have unfolded, by reference to textual sources, adjacent iconographies, historical practices, and institutional discourses. How and why did early modern people find Roman Charity "good to think with?" In order to answer this question, this section offers an investigation of the gendered use of breast milk for therapeutic reasons, with male patients being showcased as model consumers. It highlights the practice of commercial breast-sucking to help with engorgement – an understudied byproduct of the wet-nursing industry in early modern times – and traces the raging debates on non-maternal nursing. It discusses the deep-seated resonance of the motif with breastfeeding Charity and the Madonna Lactans, pointing to ancient rhetorical theories of allegorization and the pre-classical visual tradition of nursing deities. In addition, it raises the question of the allegory's intelligibility at a time when the proliferation of breastfeeding imagery since the fifteenth century contaminated the Catholic spiritual meaning of Charity with profane associations. The last chapter in this section gives a sketch of father-daughter relations by pointing to the dowry as an instrument of women's dispossession, and by discussing the strengthening of patriarchal family relations in the context of emerging absolutism.

Chapter 1 investigates the first blossoming of the topic in early modern visual culture. It begins by analyzing the sudden shift in focus from representations

of the mother-daughter couple in late fifteenth-century book illuminations to the depiction of Pero and Cimon in early Renaissance and Reformation art. The earliest representations of the father-daughter couple are assumed to come in the form of late fifteenth-century North Italian medals, which in one case inspired a ceiling fresco in early sixteenth-century Cremona – even though upon closer inspection, the gendering of the couple appears ambiguous.[47] During the German Reformation, Nürnberg printers Barthel and Hans Sebald Beham produced a series of heavily sexualized miniature prints of *Pero and Cimon* starting in 1525, which are the first securely dated surviving renderings of the motif. At about the same time, oil paintings of the topic seem to have emerged in Venice that are no longer extant, in addition to a wall painting by Marcello Fogolino at the Ca' d'Oro. In the 1530s, Perino del Vaga produced a fresco of the theme, Rosso Fiorentino a marble relief, and Giulio Romano a drawing. A decade later, oil paintings of *Pero and Cimon* started to appear in Germany, by Georg Pencz, Erhard Schwetzer, and the so-called Master with the Griffin's Head. Pencz was influenced by the Beham brothers, with whom he was briefly imprisoned in 1525 on charges of atheism. Perhaps he also knew of Venetian antecedents, given his presumed trip to Italy. The assumption of an Italian-German succession in the development of the iconography is hard to ascertain, however, since the motif seems to have appeared simultaneously in Nürnberg and Venice in 1525–30. Also, the early Italian oil paintings we know of are no longer extant, making a close inspection impossible. One of them, painted in the style of a Venetian sensuous half-length portrait by an anonymous artist, disappeared on the Viennese art market in 1922; the other one survives in the form of a nineteenth-century copy of a lost original by Bernardino Luini (1480/82–1532). Toward the middle of the sixteenth century, representations of the motif became more frequent – also in France and the Netherlands – in the form of prints, drawings, maiolica dishes, terracotta statues, pendants, and chessboard decorations; it is rumored that even Titian produced a copy.[48] At the end of the sixteenth century, two anonymous Italian artists rendered the motif in oil – in Rome and Bologna – and these are the first Italian paintings of the iconography to have survived.

Since its early phase of proliferation, the motif appeared in different genres and contexts, such as sensuous half-lengths, pornographic miniature prints, and Mannerist palace decorations, each medium endowing the topic with a distinct meaning and significance. Painted in oil, Pero emerges in the early sixteenth century as an eroticized woman on top, analogous to "strong women" like Judith and Salome, and sensuous Venetian half-length portrayals of what are assumed to be courtesans. The provocatively graphic, if not pornographic, prints by the Beham brothers are contributions to the raging contemporary debate among Protestants over the seductive power of images, the presumed transparency of writing, and the deceptive nature of allegories. In Italian

palace decorations, Pero is either shown to be breastfeeding through the bars of a prison window, as oral versions of the story mandated, or she appears as a Dionysian, Orientalized figure of rejuvenation. In Giulio Romano's art, she participates in a visual rhetoric of sexuality that includes breastfeeding as a figure of excess. Perhaps inspired by Francesco Colonna's *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (1499), breastfeeding mermaids, Egyptianizing fertility goddesses, and polymast figures of Nature are in this context her functional counterparts.

Chapter 2 is devoted to an analysis of Caravaggio's altarpiece and to the many genre paintings of *Pero and Cimon* it inspired among his contemporaries – friends and foes alike. It shows how Caravaggio was able to give a new meaning to the motif by Catholicizing it, i.e., by presenting Pero as successor to both the Madonna Lactans and the allegory of Charity. Retitled *Roman Charity,* the motif became the hallmark of Caravaggesque art, an observation that has eluded most art historians.[49] Starting with Bartolomeo Manfredi, famous for parsing and simplifying Caravaggio's more complex compositions, *Roman Charity* became a quintessential gallery painting, showing Pero and Cimon in a psychologically dense and intimate scene directly inspired by Valerius Maximus's ekphrastic account (1610–14). By contrast, Caravaggio tapped into oral versions of the theme, depicting Pero as breastfeeding her father through the bars of a prison window. Other early treatments of the theme are by Rubens (Hermitage version, ca. 1610–12) and Abraham Bloemaert (Kiel, 1610). Rubens and his followers painted the topic five more times, but it is his Hermitage and Amsterdam versions that became the object of several print editions, thus acquiring and retaining great popularity well into the eighteenth century.[50] A decade later, also Simon Vouet (1590–1649) and Guido Reni (1575–1642) appropriated the topic, contributing to the iconography's increasing popularity all throughout the seventeenth century.

Especially noteworthy is the afterlife of Caravaggio's altarpiece in Flanders and the Catholic Netherlands. Rubens and his school painted the story six times; Andreas Bloemaert, Dirck van Baburen, Gerrit and Willem van Honthorst, Caspar de Crayer, Paulus Moreelse, and sculptor Artus Quellinus the Elder produced multiple copies of the theme; Hans Jordaens III and Cornelis de Baellieur integrated it into their portrayals of picture galleries. This points to an intense preoccupation with the motif among Northern European Catholic audiences, including the religiously mixed clientele of Utrecht. Protestant painters such as Vermeer only obliquely referred to the iconography.[51] In my view, the popularity of *Pero and Cimon* among Catholic painters and collectors as well as recent apostates suggests a certain discontent with the post-Tridentine papacy's claims to spiritual and temporal supremacy. Indicative of such political associations is the resemblance of Cimon with Saint Peter in paintings by the same artists. Caravaggio's breastfeeding old prisoner in his altarpiece *The Seven Works of Mercy,* for example, recalls the protagonist in his *Denial of Saint*

Peter (1610), who in turn resembles Saint Peter in Battista Caracciolo's *Liberation of Saint Peter* (1615). This latter painting was paired with Caravaggio's *Seven Works of Mercy* in the church of Pio Monte della Misericordia in Naples. Both prison scenes were hung opposite each other to indicate a certain thematic connection. The early seventeenth-century flourishing of *Denial* scenes, which express Saint Peter's moral failure to acknowledge his friendship with Jesus after he was taken prisoner, also indicates a certain critical stance vis-à-vis the papacy, but the similarity of Saint Peter's facial features with those of Cimon suggests an even more subversive association. Could it be the pope himself – Saint Peter's "infallible" representative on earth – who is cast as a guilty old patriarch in need of sustenance and rehabilitation through the milk and spiritual grace of a young woman? A painting entitled *Anti-Carità Romana,* attributed to Guido Reni, openly proclaims this connection. It depicts Saint Agatha, chained, receiving a visit from Saint Peter – another Cimon-look-alike – who not only restores her breasts but also appears to liberate her from her prison cell.

The French tradition of the theme is the subject of Chapter 3. Despite earlier versions of *Pero and Cimon* since the sixteenth century – most notably, the marble relief by Jean Goujon (and workshop) and Simon Vouet's two oil paintings – the topic assumed canonical status in French art only after Poussin adopted it. Similarly to Caravaggio, Poussin integrates the breastfeeding couple into a complex scene – in his case, the *Gathering of the Manna by the Israelites* (1637–39) (Figure 3.3). In line with his historical interests centering on ancient Rome, however, Poussin depicts the first version of Maximus's anecdotes about the unnamed Roman daughter who breastfeeds her mother instead of Pero and Cimon, who appear in Maximus's "external section" and were assumed to be Greek. This surprising rendering of the all-female version would remain unmatched except for a drawing by Guercino (1591–1666) and an oil painting, now lost, by Gregorio Lazzarini (1657–1730). In the revolutionary period, three further versions of the mother-daughter version appeared, all of which went missing.[52] Poussin's unorthodox depiction of the mother-daughter scene in his *Gathering of the Manna* was the topic of a paper presented at the Académie Royale by Charles Le Brun in 1667. It inspired further experimentation with lactation imagery in general and Maximus's anecdote in particular in French art of the later seventeenth century, albeit in its cross-gendered variety.

In the late eighteenth century, Pero and Cimon experienced a late flourishing in French art at a time when paternal power and the reform of the monarchy were hotly debated. Jean-Baptiste Greuze (1725–1805) explored the topic as part of his ill-favored move toward the genre of history paintings, shortly before his painting of *Septimius Severus and Caracalla* (1769) caused him to withdraw from the academy and its Salon exhibitions altogether. While Greuze aimed at modernizing history paintings through the integration of

"genre-esque" elements – of which his *Roman Charity* is a first example – Jacques-Louis David (1748–1825) returned to the undiluted sternness of Poussin's classicism. His follower's *Roman Charity,* which only recently surfaced on the art market, provides one last proof of the fact that nearly all stylistic transformations in early modern European art since the Renaissance were accompanied by corresponding renderings of *Pero and Cimon*. In most cases, the adaptation of this allegory marked the expression of dissent, exemplified by the Beham brothers' pornographic digression on the respective qualities of visual and textual representation, Caravaggio's attack on the papacy, or French Enlightenment artists' debate on patriarchal reform. With the insistence on exclusive maternal breastfeeding since the late eighteenth century, the refashioning of erotic sensibilities after the French Revolution, and the emergence of a new body politic at a time of secularization, the era of queer – that is incestuous, ironic, and anti-patriarchal – breastfeeding imagery drew to a close.

Chapter 4 begins by analyzing the twin versions of Maximus's anecdote, in which a dutiful daughter breastfeeds her mother instead of her father, likewise condemned to starvation in a Roman prison. In this, prior, anecdote, prison guards watch the peculiar scene, wondering whether they are witnessing an act "against nature" – an allusion to the possibility of observing a female same-sex scene – or, rather, an expression of "Nature's first law," namely, to love one's parents.[53] Deciding for the latter, they hurry to let the judicial authorities know about the daughter's example of filial piety; as a reward for such self-sacrifice, the judges revoke the mother's sentence and rehabilitate her. Maximus is the only author to have mentioned both examples of filial piety; all other ancient, medieval, and early modern authors who appropriated and rewrote the story in their sermon collections, encyclopedias, novels, and moral treatises concentrate on either one or the other. An interesting pattern emerges: in the Middle Ages, the father-daughter version of the theme was almost entirely repressed in favor of the unnamed Roman daughter who breastfed her mother, especially in books on women's worthies such as Boccaccio's and Christine de Pizan's. When, in the Renaissance, *Pero and Cimon* experienced a revival, the all-female version survived mainly in textual sources in addition to a few prints and drawings, in stark contrast to the emerging popularity of the father-daughter couple in the visual arts.

The appearance of the numerous printed and translated versions of Maximus's *Memorable Doings and Sayings* since 1469 cannot sufficiently explain the conspicuous absence of the mother-daughter scene in the arts, as the book tells both stories back to back. In my view, the sudden neglect of the lactating same-sex couple has to do with the invention of erotic art in the early sixteenth century, within which *Pero and Cimon* acquired a newfound or, better, rediscovered intelligibility and identity. By contrast, an eroticized all-female lactation scene was nearly unimaginable in the heavily male-centered sexual universe

of Renaissance art, despite allusions to this possibility in Maximus.[54] The attraction that the mother-daughter version held for medieval authors, namely, to emphasize reciprocity in female relationships of care, became obsolete by the early sixteenth century. Now the ongoing institutionalization of charitable giving, complete with government interventions and the focus on "deserving" recipients only, transformed the charitable ideal of giving as receiving into an instrument of social control.

The sudden omission of the suckling mother and the simultaneous celebration of Cimon's displaced – and misplaced – desire for his daughter's milk seem to be causally related. No analogy was supposed to be drawn between a daughter who chastely returns her mother's gift of milk and Pero, who involves her father in a breathtaking spectacle for which words seem to be missing and whose heroic deed – according to Maximus – was best commemorated in non-verbal, visual form. In portraying Pero's act as unique and utterly distinct from that of the unnamed Roman daughter, filial piety vis-à-vis one's parents appears to be heavily gendered. The meaning of the same act differs vastly depending on whether it applies to moms or dads, which is why the question of reciprocity – or the lack thereof – in father-daughter relations emerges as one of the larger issues surrounding the iconography of Pero and Cimon.

Chapter 5 investigates adult lactations in medical discourse, followed by an analysis of the gendered usage of breast milk for therapeutic purposes and a discussion of contemporary anatomical research on milk production. Early modern medical scholarship was quite multi-faceted, allowing for observation of the erogenous qualities of the breast by followers of Galen and speculation about anatomical connections that were thought to exist between the pregnant womb and the lactating breast, thereby highlighting the importance of maternal milk in the process of generation. Nonetheless, heavily gendered treatises on the therapeutic value of breast milk in cases of gout and tuberculosis routinely present old men as model patients and young women or anthropomorphized cows in the role of suppliers for such cures. Only rarely do we find evidence of female same-sex suckling, when, as already mentioned, Countess Elisabeth Henriette was wet-nursed during a debilitating illness or Madame Roland employed female breast-suckers to cope with engorgement or re-establish her milk flow after a hiatus in breastfeeding. Investigations into the marvelous in nature, such as virginal lactations or milk production in men, were supposed to produce knowledge about the normative. Research on the chemical composition of animal and human milk sought to find alternatives to breast milk, a project that became especially pressing when rates of infant abandonment – and the mortality of foundlings – skyrocketed in the sixteenth century, but it was also motivated by contemporary polemics against wet-nursing.[55] Vilifying wet-nurses as prostitutes or adulteresses, seventeenth-century medical discourse paved the way for Rousseau's vision of exclusive maternal

nursing as the hallmark of bourgeois domesticity, which, ironically, coincided with an intensified debate on the erotic qualities of breastfeeding.

Chapter 6 lays out the wealth of ancient, medieval, and early modern lactation imagery in conjunction with rhetorical theories of allegorization as "other speech." It presents the proliferation of lactation scenes in the visual arts as a counter-discourse to legal and political constructions of patriarchy, which rested on the exclusion of women from the public sphere of lawmaking and the fiction of patrilineal kinship. A causal connection emerges between the politics of suppression, ancient rhetorical strategies that conjure up female figures as mute and pitiful reenactments of their own exclusion, and the allegorized reappearance of female bodies in the visual arts. The stress on breastfeeding accompanies, but also criticizes, contemporary notions of motherless kinship grounded in the transmission of paternal blood. Post-Byzantine artists in Italy and Flanders reinvent the focus on breastfeeding as a mark of divine abjection through depictions of the nursing Madonna and allegories of Charity. In the Renaissance, the naturalistic representation of wet-nursing follows the popularity of nativity scenes, but milk sharing is also eroticized as a form of Dionysian, i.e., exotic and Orientalizing, sexuality in mythological, classicizing visual culture. In post-Tridentine religious paintings, the semi-allegorical inclusion of nursing women in scenes of eschatological significance underscores the importance of Charity in Catholic discourse, but starting in the early seventeenth century, the iconography of Pero and Cimon expresses a visual language of dissent that parodies orthodox Catholicism and criticizes the papacy's claims to supremacy.

All of these different iconographies of lactation are characterized by the displacement of the mother and the attribution of universalizing qualities to non-maternal milk relationships. The Virgin Mary does nurse her own son, of course, but this son is also her God and father and represents all of suffering mankind. Both the Madonna Lactans and the visualization of Charity as a breastfeeding woman emerged at a time when nativity scenes became popular, particularly in representations of the *Birth of the Virgin Mary* and the *Birth of Saint John the Baptist*. Referring to saints' vitae in the *Golden Legend* (1264) and the apocryphal accounts on which they were based, fourteenth- and fifteenth-century representations of childbirth – excepting the nativity of Christ – are rendered as upper-class confinement-room scenes. They depict the recently delivered mother as resting on a ceremonial bed, covered in expensive fabrics, receiving servants who bring food and visitors who offer gifts. Baby Mary and baby John are shown in the care of wet-nurses and birth assistants who are washing, swaddling, and – in a rare number of cases – even breastfeeding them.

The split between birthing and care-giving that confinement-room scenes accentuate is the backdrop against which the Madonna Lactans and allegories

of Charity derive visual meaning. While secular mothers would normally avoid breastfeeding their babies, if they could afford it, the Virgin Mary voluntarily engages in this act of "humility" by nursing her son and extending her loving care and milk to all believers in Christ. Charity does not refer to biological mothers either, as she nurses several infants or even older children simultaneously, all of them competing for her breast. As the personification of a Christian virtue, she assumes allegorical significance insofar as she voluntarily nurses the children of strangers as symbols of the indiscriminately needy, in a discursive universe that equates spiritual nourishment with milk since late antiquity.[56] While Charity's semantic meaning initially emerges in reference to the Madonna Lactans and confinement-room scenes, she eventually comes to inspire and provide a framework of reference for the more naturalistic, narrative depictions of institutional wet-nurses in Italian hospital art since the late fifteenth century.[57] Wet-nurses who worked for foundling homes were charged with keeping the many abandoned infants alive until they could be placed with more permanent wet-nurses in the countryside – a charitable occupation if there ever was one, and a sad one at that, given the exorbitant mortality rates of foundlings. In the sixteenth century, Charities adopted both allegorical and narrative functions in Mannerist religious paintings such as Tintoretto's and Palma the Younger's. In those altarpieces, they refer to the metaphorical content of gratuitous breastfeeding as a source of grace but also represent women who take care of infants and deliver or beg for food as witnesses of prominent events in the history of redemption.[58] The pictorial differentiation of Charity into allegorical, narrative, and naturalistic representations, or a mix thereof, testifies to the ongoing importance of breastfeeding imagery in denoting and expressing the religious content and social practices of charitable giving.

The distinction between giving birth and offering infant care became even more pronounced in nativity scenes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as Saint Elizabeth and Saint Anne, mothers of Saint John and the Virgin Mary, respectively, vanish into the shadows and increasing numbers of highly visible birth-assistants crowd around the newborn baby. As mothers were relegated into invisibility in confinement-room scenes, the significance of ritual, spiritual, and mythological nursing was heightened in the visual arts. The Madonna Lactans fell out of favor with both Protestant and Catholic authorities because of the eroticized manner with which early sixteenth-century artists depicted her – except for a brief revival among Catholic painters around 1600. Generally speaking, the nursing Madonna gave way to the many permutations of charitable and eroticizing lactation imagery in the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, most notably *Roman Charity*. Caravaggio's momentous altarpiece *The Seven Works of Mercy* (1606) is programmatic for the way it depicts Pero as successor to the Virgin Mary, who has long weaned her – by now ca. ten-year-



Figure 0.2: Jesus Herrera Martínez, Altarpiece: The Fire and the Flame, Detail with Roman Charities, 2015

old – son and who benevolently and approvingly watches how the ancient Greek daughter performs "filial piety."

The many unusual, non-maternal nursing scenes in Renaissance and Baroque art flourished in a society in which increasingly harsh patrilineal inheritance laws aimed at minimizing both mothers' and fathers' bequests to their daughters, and in which the maternal contribution to the process of generation was highly debated. Father-daughter relations emerge as fraught with tensions in the later sixteenth century, of which legal practice gives ample evidence. Chapter 7 analyzes the lack of reciprocity in patrilineal kinship relations as codified by law, suggesting that Pero and Cimon represent the need of patriarchy for unreciprocal gifts from its daughters – meaning: the undue appropriation of their resources – for survival. It addresses the de facto expropriation of daughters and widows from their family inheritance after the receipt of a

dowry, investigates the adoption of the dowry system outside of Italy and its growing popularity among the working classes, and discusses contemporary legal proposals to view a daughter's dowry as a charitable endowment rather than an inalienable right on her father's properties. With respect to Germany, France, and the Netherlands, it points to the strengthening of patriarchal hierarchies as a result of the Protestant marriage reform, the criminalization of elopements, and the weakening of joint-property arrangements in marriage. The reinvigoration of patrilineal legal practices took place in the context of a political debate that sought to legitimize the undisputable authority of kings and popes by reference to the ancient Roman construction of paternal power. Of particular relevance for my discussion of Roman Charity as a figure of dissent is the inter-Catholic debate on the post-Tridentine papacy's claims to supremacy in temporal affairs. Theories of political absolutism promoted the ancient Roman institution of the pater familias as a metaphor and pars pro toto for a reformed monarchy, but dissidents sought to remind their readers that French common law was not patriarchal.

With the reform of gender relations in the early nineteenth century and the invention of bourgeois family relations – intent on limiting the circulation of female body fluids within the nuclear family – the intelligibility of Pero and Cimon started to wane. The construction of breastfeeding as an exclusively maternal and domestic practice led to the complete eradication of a symbolic universe in which the lactating breast functioned as a signifier of spiritual love, but also of queer desire, dissent, and Dionysian excess.[59] Except for sporadic appearances in twentieth-century film and literature, the motif has recently re-emerged in the art of Jesus Herrera Martínez, who interprets the decidedly transgressive meaning of the image by placing himself in the position of both Pero *and* Cimon (Figure 0.2).[60] With the creation of an all-male *Roman Charity,* we have come full cycle: Herrera's phantasy of self-care and self-nurture and his gender-bending performance of breast-envy show how the iconography might be ready for a comeback. Overcoming the motif's willful neglect of the past two centuries, Herrera taps into a new context of queer sensibilities, in which, who knows, adult erotic lactations may have re-entered the realm of signification.[61]

Notes

1 | Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, ed. and transl. by D.R. Shackleton Bailey, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000), 499–503, nos. V.4.7 and V.4 external 1.

2 | See, most recently, Robert Rosenblum, "Caritas Romana after 1760: Some Romantic Lactations," in: *Woman as Sex Object: Studies in Erotic Art*, ed. by Thomas B. Hess and Linda Nochlin (New York: Newsweek, 1972), 42–63; Anna Tuck-Scala, "Caravaggio's 'Roman Charity' in the Seven Acts of Mercy," in: *Parthenope's Splendor: Art of the Golden Age in Naples*, ed. by Jeanne Chenault Porter and Susan Scott Munshower (College Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993), 127–63; *Pietas e allattamento filiale: La vicenda – l'exemplum – l'iconografia*; colloquio di Urbino, 2–3 maggio, 1996, ed. by Renato Raffaelli, Roberto M. Danese, Settimio Lanciotti (Urbino: Quattro Venti, 1997); *Allattamento filiale: la fortuna*; colloquio di Urbino, 28–29 aprile 1998, ed. by Roberto M. Danese, Daniela De Agostini, Renato Raffaelli, and Gioia Zaganelli (Urbino: Quattro Venti, 2000).

3 | *Sunday Mirror,* 15 September 1963.

4 | David Freedberg, *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 1.

5 | W.J.T. Mitchell, *What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005); Whitney Davis, *A General Theory of Visual Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011).

6 | Mitchell, *What do pictures want?,* 77; Keith Moxey, "Visual Studies and the Iconic Turn," *Journal of Visual Culture* 7, no. 2 (2008): 131–46.

7 | Mitchell, *What do pictures want?,* 192; Hans Belting, *Bild und Kult: eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst* (München: Beck, 1970).

8 | Mitchell, *What do pictures want?,* 36.

9 | Mitchell, *What do pictures want?,* 49, 10.

10 | Mitchell, *What do pictures want?,* 49.

11 | Davis, *A General Theory of Visual Culture*, 196–98.

12 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 499–503.

13 | Davis, *A General Theory of Visual Culture*, 205.

14 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 501–03.

15 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 501.

16 | Margaret R. Miles, "The Virgin's One Bare Breast: Female Nudity and Religious Meaning in Tuscan Early Renaissance Culture," in: *The Female Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Susan Rubin Suleiman (Cambridge, Massachusetts; London: Harvard University Press, 1986), 193–208; idem, *A Complex Delight: The Secularization of the Breast 1350–1750* (Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2008); Megan Holmes, "Disrobing the Virgin: The *Madonna lactans* in Fifteenth-Century Florentine Art," in: *Picturing Women in Renaissance and Baroque Italy*, ed. by Geraldine A. Johnson and Sara F. Matthews Grieco (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 167–95.

17 | For Moreelse's painting, see Marilyn Yalom, *A History of the Breast* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997), 93. Sir Reynolds's painting is in the National Gallery, London, inv. no. 2077.

18 | For a first introduction into this complex topic, see Gianna Pomata, "Blood Ties and Semen Ties: Consanguinity and Agnation in Roman Law," in: *Gender, Kinship, Power: A Comparative and Interdisciplinary History,* ed. by Mary Jo Maynes, Ann Waltner, Birgitte Soland, and Ulrike Strasser (New York: Routledge, 1996), 43–64; Jane Fair Bestor, "Ideas about Procreation and Their Influence on Ancient and Medieval Views of Kinship," in: *The Family in Italy from Antiquity to the Present*, ed. by David I. Kertzer and Richard P. Saller (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 150–67; Joan Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages: Medicine, Science, and Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

19 | Entry: "obliquus/obliquo," in: Egidio Forcellini and Giuseppe Furlanetto, *Lexicon totius latinitatis*, ed. by Francesco Corradini and Josephus Perin, vol. 3 (Padua: Gregoriana, 1965, faksimile ed. of the 4th ed. from 1864–1926), 430.

20 | Carla Freccero, *Queer / Early / Modern* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), chap. 4.

21 | Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, "Blood Parents and Milk Parents: Wet Nursing in Florence, 1300–1500," in: *Women, Family, and Ritual in Renaissance Florence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 132–64.

22 | Sharon Marcus, "Queer Theory for Everyone: A Review Essay," *Signs* 31, no. 1 (2005): 191–218, especially 205.

23 | Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Tendencies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), xii.

24 | Fiona Giles, "'Relational, and Strange': A Preliminary Foray into a Project to Queer Breastfeeding," *Australian Feminist Studies* 19, no. 45 (2004): 301–14; Griselda Pollock, "What the Graces made me do ... Time, Space and the Archive: Questions of Feminist Method," in: Griselda Pollock, *Encounters in the Virtual Feminist Museum: Time, Space, and the Archive* (London; New York: Routledge, 2007), 9–38. See also: Robyn Longhurst, "'Queer Breastfeeding': (Im)proper Spaces of Lactation," in: Robyn Longhurst, *Maternities: Gender, Bodies, and Space* (New York; London: Routledge, 2008), 101-116.

25 | Pollock, "What the Graces made me do," 18.

26 | Hans Belting, "Die Herausforderung der Bilder. Ein Plädoyer und eine Einführung," in: *Bilderfragen. Die Bildwissenschaften im Aufbruch*, ed. by Hans Belting (München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2007), 11 24.

27 | Griselda Pollock, "The Object's Gaze in the Freudian Museum," in: Pollock, *Encounters in the Virtual Feminist Museum*, 67–86, especially 71–72.

28 | On the "milk of scripture," see Simon Richter, *Missing the Breast: Gender, Fantasy, and the Body in the German Enlightenment* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006), 45–46.

29 | Joel Fineman, "The Structure of Allegorical Desire," *October* 12 (Spring 1980): 46–66, especially 46.

30 | Fineman, "The Structure of Allegorical Desire," 48. On how to use post-structuralist analyses of textual allegorization in art historical research, see Cristelle Baskins's and Lisa Rosenthal's introduction to: *Early Modern Visual Allegory: Embodying Meaning*, ed. by Cristelle Baskins and Lisa Rosenthal (Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2007), 1–12.

31 | Fineman, "The Structure of Allegorical Desire," 48.

32 | Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt, *Practicing New Historicism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 15.

33 | Gottfried Boehm, "Die Wiederkehr der Bilder," in: *Was ist ein Bild*, ed. by Gottfried Boehm (München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1994), 11 38; idem, "Jenseits der Sprache? Anmerkungen zur Logik der Bilder," in: *Iconic Turn. Die neue Macht der Bilder*, ed. by Christa Maar and Hubert Burda (Köln: Dumont, 2004), 28–43; idem, "Iconic Turn. Ein Brief," in: *Bilderfragen. Die Bildwissenschaften im Aufbruch*, ed. by Hans Belting (München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2007), 27–36; idem, *Wie Bilder Sinn erzeugen: Die Macht des Zeigens* (Berlin: Berlin University Press, 2010; first publ. 2007).

34 | W.J.T. Mitchell, "Ekphrasis and the Other," in: *Picture Theory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 151–82.

35 | Richter, *Missing the Breast.*

36 | For a useful discussion of breastfeeding during the Enlightenment, see Mary Jacobus, "Incorruptible Milk: Breastfeeding and the French Revolution," in: Mary Jacobus, *First Things: The Maternal Imagery in Literature, Art, and Psychoanalysis* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 207–30.

37 | Valerie Fildes, *Wet Nursing: A History from Antiquity to the Present* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988); idem, *Breasts, Bottles, and Babies: A History of Infant Feeding* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1986); George D. Sussman, *Selling Mother's Milk: The Wet-Nursing Business in France 1715–1914* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982); Barbara Orland, "Enlightened Milk: Reshaping a Bodily Substance into a Chemical Object," in: *Materials and Expertise in Early Modern Europe: Between Market and Laboratory*, ed. by Ursula Klein and E.C. Spary (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 163–97.

38 | For a few of these critiques, see Luce Irigaray, *Speculum. Spiegel des anderen Geschlechts* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1980; first Fr. ed. 1974); Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982); Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Bracha Lichtenberg Ettinger, "Matrix and Metamorphosis," *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 4, no. 3 (1992): 176–206.

39 | Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1990); Katharine Park and Lorraine Daston, "Destiny is Anatomy," essay review of Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (1990), *The New Republic* (18 February 1991): 53–57; Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference.*

40 | Patricia Simons, *The Sex of Men in Premodern Europe: A Cultural History* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

41 | Giordano Bruno, *Il Candelaio,* ed. by Enrico Sicardi (Milan: Casa Editrice Sonzogno, 1888), 128–29; Giovanni Cipriani, "L'allattamento salvifico: un problema di papi e filosofi," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale,* 103–24, especially 118.

42 | Gianna Pomata, "A Christian Utopia of the Renaissance: Elena Duglioli's Spiritual and Physical Motherhood (ca. 1510–1520)," in: *Von der dargestellten Person zum erinnerten Ich: Europäische Selbstzeugnisse als historische Quellen (1500 1850)*, ed. by Kaspar von Greyerz, Hans Medick, and Patrice Veit (Cologne: Böhlau, 2001), 323 53, especially 336.

43 | Heide Wunder, "Frauenmilch-Muttermilch. Eine Geschichte aus dem 18. Jahrhundert," in: *Geschichte in Geschichten. Ein historisches Lesebuch*, ed. by Barbara Duden, Karen Hagemann, Regina Schulte, and Ulrike Weckel (Frankfurt a.M.: Campus, 2003), 295–305, especially 297, note 17.

44 | Madame Roland, Letter no. 39, 11 January, 1782, in: *Lettres de Madame Roland*, vol. 1 (1780–87), ed. by Claude Perroud (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1900), 131.

45 | In Jaucourt's article on "teter," the verb refers to infant breastfeeding, but this could be due to Enlightenment debates on wet-nursing and the proposed abolition of all but mother-infant nursing relationships. "Teter," in: *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers ...,* ed. by Denis Diderot and Jean Le Rond D'Alembert (Paris: Briasson, 1751–65), vol. 16 (1765), 205.

46 | For a related effort, see *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations: Images, Rhetorics, and Practices*, ed. by Jutta Gisela Sperling (Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2013). See also Yasmina Foehr-Janssens's research project at the University of Geneva entitled "Lactation in History."

47 | Marika Leino and Charles Burnett, "Myth and Astronomy in the Frescoes at Sant'Abbondio in Cremona," in*: Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 66 (2003): 272–88, especially 273–74.

48 | Tuck-Scala, "Caravaggio's 'Roman Charity'," 135–36.

49 | See one notable exception: Tuck-Scala,"Caravaggio's 'Roman Charity'," 137.

50 | Elizabeth McGrath, *Rubens: Subjects from History*, ed. by Arnout Balis (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1997), vol. 2, 97–114.

51 | On Vermeer, see Gregor J. M. Weber, "Caritas Romana: Ein neu entdecktes Bild von Johannes Vermeer," *Weltkunst* 70, no. 2 (Feb. 2000): 225–28. There seems to have been a painting by Rembrandt, which, however, does not seem to have survived. Bernard Picart produced a print of it in 1724–33, which is preserved in the British Museum (inv. no. 1861,1109.816).

52 | These paintings were by Jean-Charles-Nicaise Perrin (1791), Angelika Kauffmann (1794), and Etienne-Barthélemy Garnier (1801).

53 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 501.

54 | Patricia Simons, "Lesbian (In)Visibility in Italian Renaissance Culture: Diana and Other Cases of *donna con donna* [woman with woman]," *Journal of Homosexuality* 27, nos. 1–2 (1994): 81–121; special double issue: *Gay and Lesbian Studies in Art History*, ed. by Whitney Davis.

55 | Barbara Orland, "Why Could Early Modern Men Lactate? Gender Identity and Metabolic Narrations in Humoral Medicine," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations,* 37–54; Orland, "Enlightened Milk: Reshaping a Bodily Substance."

56 | Max Seidel, "Ubera Matris: Die vielschichtige Bedeutung eines Symbols in der mittelalterlichen Kunst," *Städel-Jahrbuch* 6, N.F. (1977): 41–99.

57 | Diana Bullen Presciutti, "*Carità e potere*: Representing the Medici Grand Dukes as 'Fathers of the Innocenti'," *Renaissance Studies* 24, no. 2 (2010): 234–59; idem, "Picturing Institutional Wet-Nursing in Medicean Siena," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations,* 129–46.

58 | Jutta Gisela Sperling, "Allegories of Charity and the Practice of Poor Relief at the Scuola Grande di San Rocco," *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 70 (2009): 119–46.

59 | On representations of breastfeeding in nineteenth-century French art, see Gal Ventura, "Nursing in Style: Fashion versus Socio-Medical Ideologies in Late Nineteenth-Century France," *Journal of Social History* 48, no. 3 (2015): 1–29.

60 | John Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath* (New York: The Viking Press, 1939); Abraham B. Yehoshua, *The Retrospective* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2013); Michelangelo Antonioni, *L'avventura* [The adventure] (Janus Films, 1960).

61 | Fiona Giles, *Fresh Milk: The Secret Lives of Breasts* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2003).

Part I: Images

Chapter 1: Breastfeeding Pero

Sign of Desire, Transgression, and Dionysian Excess (1525–50)

It is hard to do justice to the bewildering complexity of representations of Pero and Cimon in the arts, which started to appear in the early sixteenth century in a wide range of media: bronze medals, frescoes, engravings, drawings, oil paintings, ceramics, inlaid wood decorations, and statues. Each medium was associated with different viewing practices and generated its own framework of references. The significance of the motif differed, depending on the stylistic choices and visual rhetoric employed by printmakers in Nürnberg, gallery painters in Venice, or palace artists at Fontainebleau. What these different renderings have in common is a distinctly erotic presentation of the anecdote in response to Valerius Maximus's ekphrastic challenge (see Chapter 4).

The motif appeared in both its mother-daughter and father-daughter variety, although the cross-gendered version was more popular. The earliest depictions of the theme emerged independently of each other in Southern Germany and Northern Italy around 1525.[1] They consist of a miniature pornographic print by Barthel Beham (1525) (Figure 1.1); a Venetian oil-painting of the "bella donna" type, now lost, reproduced in an auction catalog in Vienna from 1922 (Figure 1.2);[2] a round monochrome ceiling fresco in the monastery of Sant'Abbondio in Cremona (Figure 1.3) inspired by a bronze medal preserved in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Figure 1.4);[3] and a ceramic dish from Pesaro.[4] Of the mother-daughter variety, we have fifteenth-century French book illuminations (Figure 1.5) and a few prints and drawings in the sixteenth century until Poussin rendered the motif famous in his *Gathering of the Manna* of 1639 (Figure 3.3). The two versions compete with each other for greater shock value, the former because of its incestuous implications and the latter because of the two women's potentially dangerous bodily intimacy. While the mother-daughter version expresses reciprocity in kinship relations despite its lesbian overtones, the father-daughter version is devoid of a moralizing frame other than its thinly veiled pretext of representing "filial piety." The latter cross-gendered scene



Figure 1.1: Barthel Beham, Pero and Cimon, 1525




Figure 1.2: Venetian, Pero and Cimon, ca. 1520



Figure 1.3: Francesco Casella or Galeazzo Rivelli (della Barba), Pietas, 1513



Figure 1.4: Pietati, early 16th c.



Figure 1.5: Unnamed Roman Girl Feeds her Mother in Prison, Illumination of Giovanni Boccaccio, De cleres et nobles femmes, 1402

became more popular, either because it was felt to be more daring – because of its incestuous insinuations – or because it was felt to be more normative. After all, what is more natural than for a father to consume his daughter's body fluids?

The story of Pero and Cimon struck at the heart of early modern patriarchy because it thematized the exploitation of daughters and the displacement of mothers on which its patrilineal family organization depended. Visually, it dramatizes the weakness and pitiful state of Pero's guilty old father, who depends on her for his survival and rehabilitation, and flaunts the beauty and life-giving power of the young woman, who bears her sacrifice well and assumes a variety of postures ranging from tenderness and modesty to open sexual defiance. The voyeuristic energies it mobilizes make the viewer complicit with what he sees. Due to its instant success in the early sixteenth century – after a long hiatus in the Middle Ages during which the mother-daughter version monopolized the discourse on filial piety – the motif proliferated in three different discursive and visual contexts that gave it meaning. In Reformation Germany, Pero and Cimon contributed to contemporary discussions on allegory and the purpose of visual representations in an age of iconoclasm. In Renaissance Venice, the motif emerged as a sensuous half-length portrayal of an eroticized "bella donna" in the context of man-murdering "women on top."[5] At court in Mantua and Fontainebleau, it merged with Orientalizing scenes of excess derived from Egyptian antiquity.

The existing literature on the topic is meager. Starting in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the motif generated some debate among historians of art and literature.[6] Monographs are entirely missing, but there are two interdisciplinary Italian essay collections with art historical contributions of varying quality.[7] A noteworthy recent article on Pero and Cimon in the arts is by Anna Tuck-Scala, with a focus on Caravaggio's rendering of the motif as part of his altarpiece *The Seven Works of Mercy* (1606).[8] In this article, the author shows the depth of Pero and Cimon's iconographical tradition by pointing to ancient representations of Artemis Ephesia, a multi-breasted fertility goddess, and by referring to W. Deonna's research on pre-Roman traces of the motif. Deonna argues that in Maximus's version of the two twin stories, earlier Etruscan notions of ritual kinship and divine adoption through breastfeeding are re-presented, but also problematized, in the framework of Roman – i.e., patriarchal – blood-kinship.[9] Maximus's anecdotes thus seem to colonize former, long defeated, expressions of ritual adult breastfeeding by superimposing a new meaning onto them, turning echoes of a lost semantic universe into a showpiece of patriarchal Roman family values. Tuck-Scala follows Deonna in suggesting that both the Christian tradition of Charity and the iconography of the Madonna Lactans harbor traces of such earlier pre-Roman traditions, since the charitable "nursing" of strangers can be viewed

as an expression of spiritual adoption. Tuck-Scala lists important precursors to Caravaggio's rendering of Pero and Cimon – most notably the fresco by Perino del Vaga and the stucco by Rosso Fiorentino, but also Giulio Romano's drawing and the Beham brothers' prints. She points to Caravaggio's followers Christiaen van Couwenbergh, Bartolomeo Manfredi, Matthias Stomer, Dirck von Baburen, and Willem van Honthorst, all of whom painted the motif at least once. And finally, she mentions former art historians' speculations about a lost *Roman Charity* by Titian and states that according to Neapolitan inventories of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, at least eleven collectors in this city owned a painting of the motif.[10]

Robert Rosenblum's article on "Romantic Lactations" is very informative as well, pointing to a late blossoming of the iconography in French art after 1760 (see Chapter 3).[11] Of special interest is a late comeback of the mother-daughter motif in the revolutionary period after a hiatus of nearly a century and a half, with three paintings by Jean-Charles-Nicaise Perrin (1791, lost), Angelika Kauffmann (1794, lost), and Etienne-Barthélemy Garnier (1801, lost).[12] Rosenblum also mentions Louis Hersent's colonial adaptation of the topic, which depicts Bartolomeo de las Casas in the role of languishing Cimon and an Amerindian princess as charitable Pero (1808).[13] Another late eighteenth-century rendering of *Roman Charity*, by Johann Georg Weber (1769), is the subject of Bettina Simmich's investigation.[14] Further worthy of mention is the exhibition catalog *L'allégorie dans la peinture*: *la représentation de la charité au XVIIe siècle* (1987), curated by, among others, Alain Tapié. In his introduction, Tapié squarely situates the iconography of Pero and Cimon within the larger framework of allegorical representations of Charity, referring, again, to Deonna's notion of breastfeeding as a form of ritual adoption.[15] As part of this exhibition, eighteen *Roman Charities* by early modern artists were – for the first and only time in a modern setting – exhibited.[16] Given that Andor Pigler lists 236 renderings of the topic in his *Barockthemen* (1956) – a number my research has increased to 328 – further curating work in this area seems desirable.[17]

For our purposes, most interesting is David Freedberg's discussion of Roman Charity in *The Power of Images* (1989), a book that seeks to understand why certain images move their viewers to "mutilate them, kiss them, cry before them, and go on journeys to them; [why people] … are calmed by them, stirred by them, and incited to revolt."[18] Taking Rubens's Amsterdam version of the motif as an example, Freedberg talks about the peculiar force of this picture to arouse sexually, in a perfect response to Valerius Maximus's challenge of ekphrastic desire (Figure 1.6). In his anecdote of Pero and Cimon, Maximus either claimed or wished to see their "living and breathing bodies" depicted in a painting of such fascination that viewers could not "take their eyes off the scene."[19] Chiding art historians for losing themselves in lengthy iconographic debates when confronted with Titian's Venus of Urbino, Cranach's nudes, or



Figure 1.6: Peter Paul Rubens, Roman Charity, 1630

the Behams' pornographic prints in an attempt to distance themselves from the emotional challenge these images pose, Freedberg affirms the "erotic basis of true understanding," even though – or perhaps because – "the hermeneutic quest is always based on the repression and perversion of desire."[20] Freedberg shies away from attributing the insight about "relations between sexual engagement and cognition" to Maximus himself, despite the fact that the Roman author claims that for purposes of historical education, paintings such as *Pero and Cimon* are "more effective than literary memorials."[21] Maximus's disclaimer of the power of his own words to evoke mental images compared with the visual arts is just another indication of the play with reversals that characterize his twin anecdotes about "filial piety." Freedberg argues that the resulting irony is unintended, an effect of the pictorial rendering of a virtue whose bodily exercise requires a focus on the young woman's breasts that almost inevitably produces sexual desire in its viewers.[22] In my view, the ambiguity inherent to Rubens's and other artists' renderings of the theme is indebted to the specific – and very deliberate – rhetoric of Maximus's narration, which sensationalizes the scene between Pero and Cimon through recourse to ekphrasis and openly speculates about the possibility of "misinterpreting" the mother-daughter breastfeeding scene as two women's sex play "against nature."[23]

In the Renaissance, artists and their audiences were particularly drawn to such ironies, which they connected with debates about the respective merits and flaws of verbal and visual representations. Already in fifteenth-century book illuminations of the mother-daughter scene in French translations of Boccaccio's *Famous Women* (1362), a certain erotic, thus ironic, effect can be detected. In manuscript Fr. 599 at the Bibliothèque Nationale, the depiction of the mother's half-naked leg, of the daughter's fully exposed big breast, and of the intently staring guard who scratches his beard in disbelief, contribute to a remarkable eroticization of the scene (Figure 4.5). In manuscript Fr. 12420, the depiction is less graphic, but the lavish nature of the two women's dresses, especially the red color and beautiful folds of the mother's gown, evoke considerable sensual pleasure, which is enhanced by the utopian landscape in which the act takes place (Figure 1.5).[24] A similar sensuous effect is achieved by Dürer's Madonna Lactans a century later, whose striking red dress draped in complicated folds, set in an illusionist landscape, is breathtakingly beautiful.[25] In manuscript Fr. 598, it is the daughter who wears a sumptuous red dress with a low-cut neckline; her breast is, again, centrally displayed, and the prominent bars of the prison window through which we see the scene add to the viewer's voyeuristic experience (Figure 4.4). The latter is true also for manuscript Fr. 599 and the woodcut in Steinhöwel's Boccaccio edition from 1473 (Figures 4.5 and 4.6).

In the first half of the sixteenth century, the mother-daughter version was depicted at least three more times. Each version depicts the couple in a more or less eroticizing manner. A trapezoidal bronze plaquette in the Bode-Museum, Berlin, shows a scantily clad young woman in a kneeling position in front of another semi-nude woman, whose facial wrinkles and saggy breasts reveal her to be older (Figure 1.7). The daughter's left arm and shoulder are entirely exposed, as is her left breast. The hungry mother clutches her daughter's left arm and suckles eagerly, crouching on the ground. In the background, a sculpted rectangle suggests an architectural setting, which, however, remains undefined. On top, two cornucopias are decoratively conjoined.[26]

A round medal, likewise held in the Bode-Museum, shows another adult breastfeeding couple (Figure 1.8). E.F. Bange calls it *Cimon and Pero,* even though the suckling figure wears a headdress, is of a tender constitution, reveals breasts behind her right arm when looked at from an oblique angle, and is positioned like the *Sleeping Ariadne* in the Vatican.[27] The nursing daughter kneels in front of her; both women embrace each other. The elaborate folds of their garments as well as the mother's semi-reclining position, her legs intertwined in the manner of Ariadne, reveal this medal's eroticizing and classicizing intention. The inscription below *(Pietate)* confirms a direct link with Maximus's anecdotes.[28]

Hans Kels the Elder depicts the daughter who breastfed her mother in the form of a carved tondo, which decorates his board game "für den Langen



Figure 1.7: Daughter Breastfeeding her Mother, Bronze Plaquette, early 16th c.



Figure 1.8: Pietati, Bronze Medal, early 16th c.



Figure 1.9: Hans Kels the Elder, Daughter Breastfeeding her Mother, 1537

Puff" (1537) (Figure 1.9). The daughter, again, kneels in front of her mother, who is seated on the ground. Both figures are properly dressed, except for the daughter's exposed right breast. A barred window in the back and thick iron chains hanging from the walls reveal the interior to be a prison. An inscription illuminates the viewer: "A young woman from the common folk nourishes her mother in prison with the milk of her own breasts."[29] This depiction is perhaps less overtly sensuous, but it is surrounded by representations of mythological love scenes – among them, the *Abduction of Amymone by Neptune*. Anja Ebert has recently shown how this latter roundel resembles three wooden miniature reliefs that show Nereides and Neptune riding on a dolphin, which in turn refer to Georg Pencz's print *The Sea Monster*.[30] Such juxtapositions of Roman Charity and mermaid scenes recur quite frequently, indicating that among artists intent on appropriating ancient erotic motifs, Maximus's examples of "filial piety" were seen as belonging to a repertoire of images that included long-tailed sea gods, breastfeeding sphinxes, Egyptian fertility goddesses, and similar "grotesques."[31] Kels's board game intensifies the impression of fantastic lushness through the rows of exotic birds, wild animals, and unicorns connecting the tondi.

Visual representations of the mother-daughter scene were thus either directly eroticized or placed in the vicinity of erotic images. Medals, in particular, had a special status for the development of Renaissance erotic art, as Ulrich Pfisterer has argued. They not only were among the first media to depict classicizing themes but also were often given as tokens of love, and figured prominently in the development of male homoerotic cultures.[32] They were choice objects for emotional arousal, as they could be secretly fondled and cried over.[33] Pfisterer ranks them among the "most intellectually challenging" Renaissance art forms, because of the interplay between image and inscriptions they offered and the cultured, and intimate, conversations they were apt to inspire.[34] It thus seems reasonable to propose that the two bronze plaquettes mentioned above, especially the medal of the Ariadne type, either openly celebrate or implicitly suggest physical love between women.

In the second half of the sixteenth century, representations of the mother-daughter couple continue to be rare and confined to the so-called "minor" genres, while images of Pero and Cimon proliferate after 1525. Modern scholars have little to say on the relative neglect of the same-sex scene in the visual arts. Maria Grazia Fachechi writes that only a heterosexual framing of the scene enables the eroticization of the image and marks the exaltation of the daughter's gesture as heroic.[35] Elisabeth R. Knauer calls the father-daughter version "artistically more feasible" [künstlerisch dankbarer].[36] Roberto Danese argues that the mother-daughter version "simply" celebrates reciprocity, while the father-daughter variety problematizes the "polar inversion of a highly illicit transfer of blood," namely incest. He concludes: "the two women simply



Figure 1.10: Hans Sebald Beham, after Barthel Beham, Three Women in a Bath House, 1548

exchange their roles … which is why such physical intimacy between two women could not result [to appear] so very insupportable."[37] In other words: the all-female nursing scene was too banal and unspectacular to merit artists' attention.

I tend to assume the opposite. In my view, the same-sex version became too daring once the proliferation of Maximus's text in vernacular languages made the irony and slipperiness of the daughter's alleged virtuous example obvious. While earlier literary references such as Boccaccio's *Famous Women* and Christine de Pizan's *Book of the City of Ladies* contained the potentially scandalous implications of the breastfeeding mother-daughter scene within a moralizing framework of women's worthies – of which echoes can still be found in Symphorien Champier's and Agrippa von Nettesheim's treatises – this possibility vanished with a greater awareness of the original source.[38] It is, of course, also reasonable to assume that early modern audiences were more at ease with depictions of cross-gendered incest than an all-female lactation scene, which is in sync with scholarship on the great provocation that the "rediscovery" of the clitoris posed to male scholars who immediately relegated this body organ to the illicit realm of lesbian sex.[39]



Figure 1.11: Hans Sebald Beham, after Barthel Beham, Pero and Cimon, 1544

However, the small prints of the brothers Barthel (1502–40) and Sebald Beham (1500–50), who between them produced six different renderings of *Pero and Cimon*, do not affirm this hypothesis. Among the many outrageous scenes they depicted were openly sexual images of women in a bathhouse (Figure 1.10).[40] Clearly at ease with depicting naked women tickling each other's genitals, they nonetheless preferred the father-daughter version of Maximus's anecdotes on "filial piety." Their preference for the cross-gendered nursing scene might be due to the specific ekphrastic challenge it was associated with since Maximus, which they explored in the context of Reformation debates on iconoclasm and the purpose of visual representations. Barthel's first rendering of the theme is usually brought in connection with a brief jail term that he, his brother Sebald, and their common friend Georg Pencz served for charges of atheism earlier that year (Figure 1.1).[41] It depicts a young woman, loosely draped in a piece of cloth but entirely naked from her waist down, kneeling between the chained legs of a bearded man. She offers him her right breast with a nursing woman's typical V-hold, i.e., the slightly splayed pointer and middle fingers of her left hand. The man, seen in profile, with lush hair, a beard, and a furry top, suckles her milk, eyes closed. Pero observes him from above, tenderly supporting his



Figure 1.12: Hans Sebald Beham, Pero and Cimon, 1525



Figure 1.13: Hans Sebald Beham, Pero and Cimon Flanked by Tritons, 1526–1530

back with her right arm. Her belly button and left nipple are clearly visible; her hair is neatly braided. The scene takes place in a small, dark, enclosed place, which the chains reveal to be a prison interior. The tiny picture is very intimate and sexual, because of Pero's gratuitous partial nudity and the couple's tangled legs and knees. Barthel's brother Sebald would reissue his print in reverse ca. two decades later, this time furbished with architectural details and two inscriptions informing the viewer of the father's identity ("Czinmon") and of the meaning of this act: "I live off the breast of my daughter" (Figure 1.11). With this print, Sebald revisits a topic he himself represented twice in his youth sometime between 1526 and 1530. Perhaps inspired by his younger brother, Sebald Beham published a tiny medal-shaped print of 4.7 cm in diameter, showing the breastfeeding couple in an architectural space clearly identifiable as a dungeon (Figure 1.12). Cimon, whose naked upper body is tied to a column, his feet chained to a wall, sits on the edge of a toilet, while Pero, almost entirely naked except for a thin piece of cloth wrapped around her belly, stands before him, knees bent in an impossible position, steadying herself with her left hand,

and embracing her father with her right. As in the print by Barthel Beham, her left nipple is clearly visible in Cimon's mouth. Her bosom and naked left leg are illuminated; behind her, the half-round space of a window opens up.

At about the same time, Sebald Beham adapted this composition for a decorative ribbon, placing the medal-shaped print at its center and flanking it with images of two tritons aggressively wielding their tridents (Figure 1.13). While preserving the overall composition of the figures, the couple's tangled legs and knees now almost touch each other; Pero's left and Cimon's right nipple are erect and clearly visible. The architectural details in the back are also slightly altered. The greater erotic appeal of this medal is enhanced by the two tritons flanking it, sporting not only scaly fishtails but also the hoofs of a horse in front of their lower bellies. Additional leafy ornaments qualify this image as a classicizing "grotesque."

Elaborating on this composition, Sebald Beham published another version of *Pero and Cimon* in 1544, the same year he "improved" on his deceased brother's early print by adding inscriptions. It is a rectangular, finely worked etching that shows the couple in a classicizing interior with double rows of arches and columns (Figure 1.14). Nothing but Cimon's ropes and chains indicate that this fancy, clearly defined, and well-ordered space might be a prison cell. Pero stands upright between Cimon's knees, her left leg slightly bent, Venus-like.



Figure 1.14: Hans Sebald Beham, Pero and Cimon, 1544




Figure 1.15: Hans Sebald Beham, Pero and Cimon, 1540

Otherwise, she makes no attempt at copying the "pudica" pose: her right arm embraces her father, and her left hand lifts gracefully, but without any apparent reason, the skimpy cloth that is wrapped around her hips. Another shawl-like piece of cloth, draped around her chest, draws attention to her naked breasts. Her shoulders, breasts, belly, and naked leg are thus in full frontal view. Cimon sits on a ledge, his head in a perfect position to reach Pero's right breast. His muscular upper body and legs are exposed. His right and Pero's left knee touch each other. If the couple's nudity, especially Pero's "shameless" Venus pose, and Cimon's suckling from her breast were not clear enough as an indication of sexual intent, the tangling of their legs and knees was further proof.[42]

The most provocative, openly pornographic, and also artistically most successful rendering of the scene is Sebald's drawing from 1540 (Figure 1.15). With its dimensions of ca. 40 x 25 cm, it is almost ten times bigger than most of the Beham brothers' other art works. No classicizing interior detracts from the stunning act the couple performs in the bare corner of a room. Cimon, arms tied behind his back, his feet in chains, sits on a stone bench, his shoulders and lower body covered in a jacket-like piece of cloth that offers a full view of his muscular, shaved chest and erect nipples. Pero, nicely coiffured and entirely naked, without even the scantiest veil attempting to cover her, stands between Cimon's knees. The V-hold with which she offers him her left breast seems to complete the arrested gesture of Botticelli's Venus.[43] Her belly and shaved genital area are in full view. The couple's eye contact enhances the provocation. The inscription in the upper left corner, which looks like graffiti etched into the smooth wall, reads: "Whither does Piety not penetrate, what does she not devise?" in an attempt to further puzzle and disorient the viewer.[44] Not only does the inscription contradict what we see – which clearly cannot be an illustration of "Piety's" endeavors – but it also quotes the wrong anecdote. In Maximus's story collection, it inaugurates the interior monologue of the guard who is observing the daughter who breastfeeds her mother. With this combination of references to both stories, the artist responds to Maximus's ekphrasis as well as his ironic exhortation. Literally expressing Pero's "silent outlines of limbs" through full nudity, Beham clearly "rivets men's eyes in amazement," while the overt eroticism, if not pornographic effect, of his print answers the guard's musings about the spectacular novelty and possibly "un-natural" quality of this act.[45]

This latter print and inscription shows how Sebald Beham intervened in the raging contemporary debate about the usefulness of pictures in an age of iconoclasm. While Lucas Cranach the Elder, friend of Martin Luther, seems to have depicted the "nakedness" and invisibility of truth in his altarpieces – by painting, in Joseph Leo Koerner's words, "under erasure" – the Beham brothers departed from Catholic and Lutheran theories on visual representations alike.[46] Clearly, they produced no art fit for Catholic worship. Their religious print



Figure 1.16: Hans Sebald Beham, The Virgin with the Pear, 1520

series are sober renderings of biblical stories or else highly eroticized renderings of the nursing Madonna that defy any expressions of spiritual desire. In *The Virgin and the Pear* (1520) (Figure 1.16), Mary's beautiful contemporary dress and opened bodice, her flowing strands of hair, and the sweet and juicy fruit she is offering to Christ violate decorum by bluntly eroticizing the nursing scene, while the parrot in *The Virgin with Child and Parrot* (1549) seems to contemplate picking at the apple of cognition (Figure 1.17).[47] In both scenes, Mary's breastfeeding is compared to or substituted by, respectively, Eve's momentous seduction, a drastic departure from both Catholic theories of milk as a source of grace and Lutheran calls for modesty in representing Christ's mother. Cranach's assembly-line production of paintings of the Madonna with Child, by contrast, observes Luther's indictment against the undue eroticization of the Virgin Mary as Madonna Lactans.[48]

Sebald Beham did not believe in the Lutheran transparency – and superiority – of words and Scripture. The inscription he added to his brother's print in 1544 ["Czinmon … I live off the breast of my daughter"] aims to contain the viewer's sexual fantasies that his image unleashes by pointing to Pero's



Figure 1.17: Hans Sebald Beham, after Barthel Beham, Virgin with the Parrot, 1549

charitable goal and intention. His print from 1540 reveals his attempt to expose the slipperiness and ambiguity of the text itself rather than his desire to pervert the meaning of Maximus's moral example (Figure 1.15). In contrast to Cranach's stress on the "nakedness" of pictorial truth, Beham's images cultivate a shock-like quality to arouse and depict emotions. Joseph in *Joseph and Potiphar's Wife* (1526) has a huge erection, probably against his will, thus terribly complicating the biblical story (Figure 1.18). So does Amnon about to rape his niece Tamar in *Amnon's Incest* (Figure 1.19).[49] Rather than keeping "emptiness on display," as does Cranach, Beham replaces the idolatrous beauty, venerability, and religious quest of Catholic imagery with a desperate, perhaps Augustinian but in any case a very full and drastic, depiction of male desire.[50] While Cranach's nude and stylized Charities refer to the nakedness of faith alone in an anti-allegorical move that negates the spiritual meaning of breastfeeding, the Beham brothers' Cimon is a figure of utter, sexualized want that is unbearable to look at.[51] Instead of "deadening" pictorial space through blanks and biblical quotations, the Beham brothers expand, even seek to violate, the boundaries of what is representable. This rings true for Sebald



Figure 1.18: Hans Sebald Beham, Joseph and Potiphar's Wife, 1526



Figure 1.19: Hans Sebald Beham, Amnon's Incest, 1525 c.

Beham's large *Kermis* prints (1528–30) as well, which include "scatological" scenes of vomiting and shitting.[52]

The small size of Barthel's and Sebald's prints seems to emulate the aura of secrecy that coins and medals enjoyed among Renaissance collectors since the fifteenth century.[53] Like coins, the tiny prints could be shared in intimate conversations with friends, looked at in private, and organized into series. They served as models for the decoration of ceramics, coins, jewelry, earthenware, and similar objects of everyday use, but they also became collectibles in their own right.[54] Like coins and medals, small prints figured as vanguard and experimental media; their importance for major iconographic and stylistic developments in Renaissance art has recently been pointed out.[55] More specifically, the Behams' prints derive their shock value not only from their choice of subject matter and pornographic approach but also from the irony produced through irreverent quotations of major Italian Renaissance artists. One example of such parody is Sebald Beham's print *The Night* (1548), which quotes the position of legs in Michelangelo's famous allegorical sculpture but shows the naked woman lounging on her bed frontally to reveal her genitalia (Figure 1.20).[56]




Figure 1.20: Hans Sebald Beham, The Night, 1548

Another example is the morphing of Botticelli's Venus's "pudica" pose into Pero's V-hold, which not only reveals the ambiguity of her classic posture but also polemicizes against the use of all forms of veiling, as if greater transparency of meaning could be achieved by stripping images of their semantic layers, in order to expose the ubiquity of male desire. Ultimately, it is this reduction that makes the Beham brothers' prints hard to look at.

Whether the two artists really thought a certain "truth" would emerge through the graphic depiction of erections – of both nipples and penises – is hard to say. Perhaps they aimed at the depiction of meaning *as* desire and want through the nakedness of their expressions. Such parody of truth as lack points to a certain disposition of disbelief, and it is in this sense that I concur with other art historians about a connection between the brothers' artistic output and their prison experience in 1525. As Herbert Zschelletzschky has carefully documented, the reformed Nürnberger Rat put Barthel and Sebald Beham, together with their friends Georg Pencz and Hans Denck, on trial for charges of atheism in 1525. During their interrogations, all four of them negated the importance of rites and sacraments. Barthel Beham doubted the truthfulness of Scripture, and Georg Pencz expressed his disbelief in Jesus Christ. Hans Denck, a follower of so-called negative theology, explained openly his "want [Mangel] of not being able to know whether bread and wine contain flesh and blood."[57] Georg Pencz harbored the greatest doubts by stating that he did not know "what to believe about God," that he "did not think much of Christ … could not believe in Scripture … did not believe in the sacraments … and in baptism … and knew no other lord than God."[58] What becomes visible in the art of the Nürnberg printmakers is their anti-authoritarian move to bare religion of its symbolic forms, even to doubt the very existence of God, and to strip other – ancient – modes of knowledge of their semantic overlay and hermeneutic depth. Such unveiling found expression in the nudity of their protagonists and the exposure of their wants as doubts (note the semantic collapse of the two words in Denck's deposition). This focus on male desire as "want" or absence of truth might also explain their privileging of Cimon over the starving mother in representations of Maximus's anecdotes. At least since St. Augustine's definition of phallic desire as post-lapsarian punishment and eternal sign of sin, male sex carried the weight of a millenarian intellectual and theological debate in the eyes of early modern artists and intellectuals, and deserved to be properly dismantled and resignified. Female desire for another woman, by contrast, was relegated to the burlesque mode of a bathhouse scene.

Flipping through the various illustrated catalogues of German prints – by Bartsch, Pauli, and Hollstein – it furthermore results that the Beham brothers' etchings of *Pero and Cimon* were grouped in the vicinity of ancient or biblical heroines. This indicates that in their – or their collectors' – minds, Pero belonged

conceptually to contemporary cycles of so-called *Ruses of Women*.[59] Of these print series of cunning or otherwise noteworthy women, Hans Burgkmair's etchings of three "good" Christian, Jewish, and Pagan women are probably the first (1516–19). In mid-century, this series was followed by Dirck Volkertsz. Coornhert's cycles on *The Power of Women* and *The Praise of the Virtuous Wife* as well as Philips Galle's series *Women's Tricks in the Old Testament* and *Exemplary Women from the Bible*.[60]

Literary examples of such "galleries of strong women" go back to Boccaccio's *Famous Women* (1362) and Christine de Pizan's *Book of the City of Ladies* (1405), which, as already mentioned, include the anecdote of the Roman daughter who breastfed her mother.[61] With her *Book of the City of Ladies*, a critique of the representation of women in medieval literature and a comprehensive proposal to view women as morally superior to men, Pizan single-handedly started the so-called "querelle des femmes," a literary debate on the status of women in society that would engage male and female writers for centuries to come.[62] Agrippa von Nettesheim (ca. 1486–1535) was the last participant in this debate to mention the Roman daughter, praising her milk as an illustration of nature's powers of preservation.[63]

Pero's story, by contrast, was never cited in literary collections of this kind, perhaps because of the morally questionable nature of her sacrifice and the difficulties in portraying her as a complex enough person with motives and intentions. Nonetheless, she emerges as a "strong woman" in the visual arts next to heroines such as Lucretia, Dido, and Cleopatra but also Judith, Salome, and Dalila. Formal characteristics played a decisive role in such juxtapositions – traceable in collectors' catalogs – but content issues soon followed, with interesting results for the reception of both Pero and the *Weibermachten* in her vicinity. How and why was Pero perceived to be commensurate with women who either committed suicide because of their problematic sexual and emotional entanglements or who, au contraire, used their sexuality to emasculate or kill their partners? The very ambiguity resulting from this unlikely mix of "famous women" might prove to be the answer, throwing further light on the paradoxical appeal that Pero had for viewers and collectors. Like Judith and Salome, Pero holds the power of life and death over a man, but in contrast to the two biblical heroines, she decides to let him live. Like Lucretia, she gets morally tainted in the course of her sacrifice, but unlike Lucretia, she does not commit suicide. Like Dalila, she emasculates a man but winds up restoring him to his personhood and freedom. Pero's action has a positive outcome, as do the deeds of Judith and Lucretia, but it has no civic impact and remains confined within the sphere of domestic relations. Pero seems to have been the very embodiment of contradictions from the outset, while heroines such as Lucretia and Judith grew doubtful in their motivations as a result of their eroticization in the visual arts.[64]



Figure 1.21: Hans Sebald Beham, Lucretia, 1519



Figure 1.22: Hans Sebald Beham, Dido, 1520



Figure 1.23: Barthel Beham, Judith, 1523



Figure 1.24: Hans Sebald Beham, Judith and her Maid, 1520–1530

In the art of the Beham brothers, Pero's naked appearance ranks high among the formal qualities that inspired early modern collectors to place the breastfeeding daughter in the vicinity of ancient "strong women." Both brothers insisted on representing not only Pero but also Judith, Cleopatra, Lucretia, and Dido in statuesque, gratuitous nudity.[65] They did so starting in 1519, with Sebald Beham's print of *Lucretia* (Figure 1.21), followed by his *Dido* (1520) (Figure 1.22) and Barthel's *Judith* (1523) (Figure 1.23). Especially the undated upright figures of Barthel's *Cleopatra*, his *Lucretia Standing at a Column*, and Sebald's *Judith and her Servant* remind of Pero in Sebald's later prints of 1540 and 1544.[66] Such drastic, and unnecessary, nudity flattens the narratives of these heroines' respective stories into acts of allegory or barely



Figure 1.25: Barthel Beham, Judith, 1525

disguised pretexts for pornographic pleasure. In Sebald's last-mentioned *Ivdith*, for example, even the maidservant is naked, but both women wear thin veils of allegory draped around heads, sword, and arms (Figure 1.24). Barthel's rendering of Judith from 1525 shows her, butt-naked, sitting on Holofernes's bare chest, his severed head in her left hand, her right hand holding a sword embellished with the moon of Artemis (Figure 1.25). Such blatant eroticization of ancient and biblical women's heroic deeds and sacrifices is rare in the sixteenth century. Among German painters, only Lucas Cranach the Elder, perhaps inspired by the Behams' prints, rendered Lucretia fully naked starting in 1529 – a visual oxymoron, given the cause of her suicide – but left Judith and Salome carefully clothed in precious garments.



Figure 1.26: Master with the Griffin's Head, Pero and Cimon, 1546

A decade or two later, German artists started representing Pero in the form of oil paintings, implementing another set of formal analogies between her portrayal and that of ancient heroines by adopting the half-length format for this purpose. Among the four extant *Roman Charities* from this time period in Germany, one was executed by the so-called Master with the Griffin's Head in 1546, who some art historians believe to be identical with Hans Brosamer (ca. 1495–1554) (Figure 1.26).[67] This latter painting bears a striking resemblance to the many renderings of *Judith with the Head of Holofernes* by Lucas Cranach the Elder because of its half-length format, the garments, jewelry, and oblique view of its protagonist, and the position of the male head just below the woman's



Figure 1.27: Lucas Cranach the Elder, Judith with the Head of Holofernes, 1530

waistline.[68] In the Master with the Griffin's Head's painting, Pero wears a stunning dress, the tiny bodice of which reveals the immaculate white skin of her breasts and shoulders behind a shirt of ultra-thin lace, which is parted in the middle and hemmed with golden thread. This transparent blouse, pleated into elegant folds, gives Cimon access to her nipple down below. Pero's fashionably wide sleeves of shiny, expensive fabric are tied with ribbons of gold brocade to produce ruffles and folds. She wears several pieces of heavy jewelry: a golden, finely wrought choker set with emeralds and rubies, ending in a Greek cross; a thick golden chain loosely draped around her shoulders; and a row of pearls that somehow seem to fasten the transparent veil below her throat. Her

hairdo consists of a thick mass of blond hair tied together in a net, revealing an impossibly high forehead and two strands of curls above her temples. Of Cimon, we see nothing but a seemingly severed, disembodied head, which Pero holds with both hands to let him suckle, as well as his left hand, with which he clutches one of her sleeves.

This painting is clearly inspired by Lucas and Hans Cranach's numerous portrayals of Judith and Salome. All paintings mentioned here, to which more could be added, show the heroine from the waist up, in expensive velvet and brocade garments that feature fashionably complicated sleeves with slits, puffs, and ribbons (Figure 1.27).[69] The women wear tight bodices, even though none of them is as revealing as Pero's in the Master with the Griffin's Head's version, and they parade finely chiseled gold ribbons around their necks and heavy chains around their shoulders. They look into the viewer's direction without making eye contact. Several of them sport high foreheads and neat-looking hairnets. Their hats and slanted eyes constitute a major difference to Pero's outfit and appearance. The – for our purposes – most striking similarity, however, consists of the severed heads of Holofernes and Saint John the Baptist, respectively, which Cranach's Judith and Salome figures hold directly in front of their bellies. Cimon's face in the Master with the Griffin's Head's painting is located in the same position. The latter artist's painting of Dalilah reveals the same compositional setup, with Samson sleeping in Dalilah's lap (Figure 1.28). This formal – and, in the case of Pero and Cimon, somewhat unrealistic – choice of posture has immediate consequences for the interpretation of our protagonist as a "strong woman": just as Judith, Salome, and Dalilah are engaged in unmanning their male partners by parading their severed or unconscious heads in front of them and wielding phallic instruments such as swords and scissors, Pero emasculates her father by reducing him to a suckling child. The painting is of minor artistic quality, but the effect of the Griffin's Head's composition proved to be so powerful and outrageous that later iconoclasts intervened by emulating Judith's cutting of the head of Holofernes: they sawed off Cimon's head just below his daughter's waist. In her article from 1941, Irene Kunze mentions how she found the severed piece of panel depicting Cimon's head.[70] Only in the post-war era were the two halves rejoined.[71] This mutilation was unintended by the artist, of course, and yet: had Cimon's head not looked so very dispensable and disembodied in the first place, and had it not been located in such a low and unlikely position in front of Pero's belly, the iconoclast might have never been able to perform his decapitation in such neat fashion. Without Cimon's head, the painting of Pero survived for several centuries as yet another eroticized half-length portrait of an anonymous woman.

Another set of formal resemblances between Pero and Judith emerges in the work of Georg Pencz (ca. 1500–1550), artist from Nürnberg and friend of



Figure 1.28: Master with the Griffin's Head, Samson and Dalila, 1539

the Beham brothers. Between 1538 and 1546, Pencz painted a series of four *Roman Charities,* two of which are accessible in museums in Warsaw and Stockholm, the other two hidden in private collections in Switzerland and Austria.[72] These paintings were preceded by his portrayal of *Judith with the Head of Holofernes* in 1531 (Figure 1.29). It shows a beautifully statuesque, pensive Judith, who dreamily looks away from the beholder to expose a perfectly "classic" face in semi-profile and reveals half of her right breast just



Figure 1.29: Georg Pencz, Judith with the Head of Holofernes, 1531

above the generous neckline of an Italian-style "camicia" [undershirt] slipping down her shoulder. She is in a similar state of undress as the many scantily clad "belle donne" painted in half-length format by Venetian artists in the manner of Giorgione's *Laura* (1506) and Titian's *Flora* (1515–16).[73] One barely visible breast is the trademark of these eroticizing portraits of unnamed women, many of whom appear in the guise of ancient goddesses or biblical heroines. Titian adapted the "sensuous half-length" already in 1510–15 for his portrayal of *Salome* (Figure 1.30); other artists, chiefly Palma the Elder, followed suit.[74] It thus seems reasonable to assume an Italian influence on Pencz's work; many art historians speculate about a possible trip of his to Italy in the late 1520s.[75]

Pencz's Judith is remarkable for the way she handles, almost fondles, Holofernes's severed head, whose slightly opened mouth is situated not far away from the nipple of her bare breast. She fiddles with a ribbon of her bodice, as if unsure whether to tie it up or not (or is it the dagger she's holding?). Behind her, a curtain is half drawn, as if she just left the chamber where she murdered the general. This remarkable work of art set, in formal terms, the stage for Pencz's series of *Roman Charities* starting in 1538. The first of his paintings of *Pero and Cimon* (Figure 1.31), today preserved in Warsaw, appeared at the




Figure 1.30: Titian, Salome, 1515



Figure 1.31: Georg Pencz, Pero and Cimon, 1538

same time as Erhard Schwetzer's rendering of the motif (Figure 1.32).[76] Pencz's painting is startling because of the way Pero turns her head to stare directly at the viewer, in distinction to the discreet pose observed by Judith seven years earlier. The half-length format with which she is painted and her partial state

of undress, drawing attention to her bare shoulders and left breast, do remind of the biblical heroine from 1531. Again, a nicely hemmed "camicia" peeks out of a bodice we see only from behind. Sleeves and skirt are simpler than in the Griffin's Head's version but do assemble into nice folds. The direct gaze and oblique view she offers the beholder form part of the repertoire of the Venetian sensuous half-length, as Anne Christine Junkerman has argued.[77] Cimon seems to be kneeling in front of her, his head just above the nipple to suckle from her breast; a block with iron chains, onto which Pero rests her left hand, confirms that the couple are placed in a dungeon. Her hair is curly and blond, with no recognizable hairdo; her face symmetrical and even.

Erhard Schwetzer's version of the motif shows a frontal view of Pero, who, observing a statuesque pose, offers her right breast to a diminished old man



Figure 1.32: Erhard Schwetzer, Pero and Cimon, 1538




Figure 1.33: Georg Pencz, Pero and Cimon, 1546

with an elegant V-hold. We see her face in three-quarter profile; strands of curly blond hair escape from two long braids wrapped around her head. In contrast to Pencz's Pero, Schwetzer's daughter wears no contemporary clothing but a toga-like garment tied with a knot over her left shoulder, fastened with a green belt around her waist. This garment reveals her right breast, from whose nipple a poorly drawn Cimon eagerly sucks. Despite the historicizing costume, this painting displays certain features of the Venetian half-length, such as Pero's state of undress, her prominent arm and sleeve, and the oblique view of her eyes. Departing from this model, but in sync with contemporary German print art, is the longish inscription Schwetzer includes, etched into the wall behind the couple: "Because of his suffering in the dungeon, Cimon's daughter has

turned her old father, like a child, toward her heart, and nourishes him with her breast."[78]

Georg Pencz's other extant *Roman Charity* from 1546 (Figure 1.33), preserved in Stockholm, is a remarkable departure from both of these earlier versions and constitutes a further development in the art of the sensuous half-length. Pero's slightly turned torso is visible from the front; she is draped in a thin, transparent piece of cloth that reveals both breasts. Cimon is also topless, exposing his left shoulder. His iron handcuffs are mounted on a wooden board in the bottom part of the painting. The two figures' profiles occupy the center of the panel in an interesting triangular composition that includes Pero's naked right arm and shoulder as well as her breasts. It is hard to make out how they are seated, since only their torsos are visible, but the composition is of a certain harmonious dynamic. Pero seems to be moving toward her father, or else pulling him closer to her, embracing him from behind. Her hair is not coiffed in any complicated fashion but is neatly drawn back to reveal her face. Light enters onto the scene through the window on the left. The whole scene is very intimate and erotic, but not provocative in the manner of the Warsaw version. The panel reminds of a Venetian half-length because of Pero's state of undress, the turn of her upper body, and the arrested movement captured by the artist.

A third one of Pencz's *Roman Charities* exists in the form of a poorly executed seventeenth-century copy held by the Bayrische Staatsgemäldesammlungen (Figure 1.34). This composition elaborates on his first version from 1538, with Pero directly staring at the viewer in a pose and garment reminiscent of her predecessor. She is standing in front of her father, who, seated, embraces her hips for support; she rests her left hand on his fashionably slit sleeve. As in the earlier version, Cimon is half bald and beardless. Pero wears her hair in a braid tied around her head; her "camicia" ends in a nicely ruffled hem. Pero's provocative glance at the viewer, who is thereby caught in an act of voyeurism, is rare in the iconography of the motif.[79]

Including the three later prints by Sebald Beham, a total of nine extant renderings of *Pero and Cimon* were produced in Germany between 1538 and 1546, an unusual clustering worth further inquiry. In Italy, oil paintings of the motif existed already a decade or two prior, especially in Venice, hub of "belle donne" in particular and of erotic art in general.[80] On November 5, 1523, a notary describes a painting in the possession of Pietro Luna, recently deceased, as a "large canvas in a gilded frame with a woman who nurses an old man."[81] On April 17, 1538, another notary lists a "big painting … with a woman who gives suck to an old man" in the house of Benediti di Franciscis.[82] And on May 15, 1576, a notary identified the scene correctly by listing "a portrait of a woman and her father whom she gives her milk" among the estate of miniaturist Gasparo Segizzi.[83] None of these versions of the motif are still extant, but in 1922, a photo of a Venetian *Roman*



Figure 1.34: Georg Pencz, after, Pero and Cimon, early 17th c.

Charity was published in the auction catalog of the Dorotheum in Vienna (Figure 1.2). Pencil marks to the catalog reveal that its estimated price amounted to 600,000 Austrian Kronen. Although its asking price was set low at 300,000 Kronen – note the years of hyperinflation – it was not sold. Dated to ca. 1520 by the staff at the Dorotheum, this painting is a perfect example of a Venetian "bella donna" in half-length format. Anne C. Junkerman describes the genre as follows: "The broad proportions of the figures more than fill the frames of the paintings. One or both arms of each figure overlap the edges of the frame, creating a sense of extension, of ampleness in the figures ... [There is] some variation in the degree of frontality of the torso ... the figures all face the viewer with a gaze that is direct, although the head is somewhat averted ... In a few cases, the figure looks away from the viewer."[84] The *Roman Charity* last seen in Vienna displays all of these features: the broad shoulders, the overlapping arm, the slightly turned head and torso, the averted gaze. The only unusual element is the window in the back, since most sensuous half-lengths are set in dark interiors. The window has no bars but gives open access to a beautiful landscape. Neither is the father shown to wear handcuffs or chains, which means that the space is not marked as a prison interior. Of

Cimon, we see, again, only a disembodied, bald, and bearded head. This lack of realism removes the painting from its textual source and produces a certain utopian effect.

A comparison with works by Palma the Elder suggests that this painting came from his workshop or from a painter emulating his manner. Palma's voluminous output of "belle donne" and his schematic approach qualify his paintings as model types of the new genre.[85] As Philip Rylands remarks, Palma endowed most of his women with "smooth boneless cheeks, extremely pale skin, blonde hair … a straight nose that verges on sharpness, a small round chin, slightly dimpled, a cupid's bow mouth, small but full in the middle with the lips sometimes fractionally parted, with an emphatic valley from the nose and with a shadow under the lower lip, oval eyes, large and well-set with a shadow under the eyebrow that intensifies towards the nose, a spacious forehead, and ears that tend (as Morelli observed) to be round rather than long."[86]

Pero's face fits this description perfectly, even if it is executed in a manner less masterful than those of Palma's signature paintings. Moreover, Palma the Elder – like Titian – adapted the sensuous half-length to portray ancient and biblical heroines such as Lucretia and Judith. It thus seems reasonable to attribute the painting to the circle of Palma, even if it is clearly of minor artistic merit.[87]

The framing of Pero as both a Venetian "bella donna" and a heroic "strong woman" in the tradition of Lucretia and Judith offers, again, important interpretive clues. In contrast to German Reformation artists' efforts to unambiguously freeze the meaning of the motif by adding inscriptions, the Venetian Pero remains vague and nondescript – "a woman who nurses an old man," as a notary described the version owned by Pietro Luna. While the inscriptions in Sebald's prints and Schwetzer's painting create more confusion than they dispel – accentuating the difference between textual and visual modes of representation and questioning any straightforward view of Pero as moral example – the illusionary character of the Venetian copy offers less resistance. The act of suckling is not directly depicted. If we did not know the story, Pero's right hand might appear to hide instead of offering her breast, and Cimon's head would, again, seem to be in an inexplicably low position. The composition would signify nothing beyond the painter's framing of Pero as a sexy "woman on top." Pero's commensurability with paintings of Judith (1525–28) and Lucretia (1515) from the same workshop shows how Venetian and German artists developed their own sets of analogies between Pero and ancient "strong women" simultaneously and independently of each other. While Venetian artists framed Pero as a sensuous half-length portrait in oil, the Beham brothers produced their first nudes on tiny prints. In both contexts, the erotic packaging of ancient heroines worked toward a certain erosion and leveling of what was left of their morale.




Figure 1.35: Bernardino Luini, after, Pero and Cimon, 19th c.

A final example, a nineteenth-century forgery of a painting formerly believed to be by Bernardino Luini (1485–32), confirms Pero's affinity with biblical celebrities – this time, Salome – and points once again to the difficult afterlife of sixteenth-century *Roman Charities* (Figure 1.35). Not every Cimon got sawed off of Pero's breast, as happened to the Master of the Griffin's Head's version, but many paintings of the motif simply vanished, probably as a result of post-Tridentine interventions and censorship of taste. Frederick Stibbert (1836–1906) bought the painting for his collection assuming Luini's authorship, but examinations of its paint and canvas in the second half of the twentieth century revealed it to be forged.[88] This is not generally known; recent art historical literature still assumes Luini's authorship.[89] In fact, a comparison with Luini's paintings of the Virgin Mary and his four portrayals of Salome shows a great

resemblance to the forged Pero.[90] Rather than a freely invented painting done by a nineteenth-century artist in the style of Luini, this work of art should be assumed to be a copy of a then-extant version.[91] Yet another example of a "bella donna" in half-length format, pseudo-Luini's picture shows Pero in a slightly slanted frontal position. Her eyes are directed squarely at the beholder, even if an inherent vagueness prevents them from piercing the viewer in the manner of Pencz's Pero from 1538. A thin "camicia," parted in the middle and loosely held together by a ribbon, exposes both breasts and a deep cleavage. Cimon, bearded and bald, suckles from the nipple that she offers him in a slightly unusual V-hold. He grasps her left sleeve, digging his fingers into its folds as if to feel the softness of its fabric. Her right arm rests on the back of his neck. A barred window to the left lets in some light. Pero's oval face, her fine eyebrows and almond-shaped eyes echo those of the Virgin Mary and Salome in other paintings by Luini. The most striking resemblance consists of Pero's loose white undershirt, parted in the middle but contractible by a thin string, and the "camicie" worn by the real artist's Madonna Lactans from Warsaw (Figure 1.36) and his *Salome* (1527–31) in the Uffizi. These finely observed sartorial details indicate that pseudo-Luini's *Pero and Cimon* is likely to be the copy of a lost original. If Pencz ever traveled to Italy, as is assumed by many, this was a painting he may have seen, unless he went straight to Venice to study Palma's work.

Aside from Luini's presumed original, all other early sixteenth-century Italian oil paintings of the motif originate in Venice – even Titian was at some point assumed to have painted one.[92] They formed part of a visual culture that was enigmatic, evocative, and deeply erotic and that had emancipated itself from its textual sources in an attitude of what David Alan Brown calls "self-conscious artfulness."[93] Lactation imagery was an essential part of this new intellectual attitude and visual landscape, of which Giorgione's *Tempest* and its eye-catching naked nurse sitting in a landscape (1508) is an early example (Figure 6.5). Fanciful play with Charity groups in the work of Titian, Giovanni Antonio Coróna, and, above all, Tintoretto, as well as the reappearance of nude nursing goddesses in Veronese's *Mars and Venus United by Love* (ca. 1575) (Figure 5.3) and Tintoretto's *The Origin of the Milky Way* (1575–80) followed suit.[94] Venetian artists' ongoing interest in lactation scenes may have been a late echo of Francesco Colonna's *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (1499) and his traveler's onyrical descriptions of a lactating Venus (Figure 1.37) and water-spouting Graces (Figure 1.38). Among the many fantastic works of art the narrator dreams about is a statue of Venus nursing Cupid, which he describes in openly erotic fashion:

"She was seated on an antique chair … whereas the entire Cytherean body was made with incredible artifice and skill out of the milky vein of onyx. She was almost undressed, for only a veil made from a red vein was left to conceal the secrets of nature, covering part of one hip; then the rest of it fell to the floor,



Figure 1.36: Bernardino Luini, Madonna Lactans, before 1532

wandered up by the left breast, then turned aside, circled the shoulders and hung down to the water, imitating with wonderful skill the outlines of the sacred members. The statue indicated motherly love by showing her embracing and nursing Cupid; and the cheeks of both of them, together with her right nipple, were pleasingly colored by the reddish vein."[95]

With this ekphrasis, framed by descriptions of Venus's grief for dead Adonis and an inscription that reveals it is not milk but tears that Cupid sucks, Colonna envisions divine motherhood as openly sexual.[96] In addition, he may single-handedly have invented the erotic vision of a woman in dishabille, chief






Figure 1.37: Venus Nursing Adonis
Figure 1.38: Polymast Fountain / The Three Graces Spouting Water from Their Breasts
Woodcuts, Illuminations, Francesco Colonna, Hypnerotomachia Poliphili, 1499

characteristic of the above-mentioned "belle donne" à la Giorgione, Titian, and Palma the Elder. In an earlier passage, Colonna's dreamy traveler comes upon a fountain of the Three Graces, from whose breasts pure water spouts onto the heads of six dragons who sit on a pedestal that shows three winged, bare-breasted sphinxes with mermaid tails and lions' paws. Here the nursing theme is connected to the idea of fertility goddesses and Orientalizing hybrid creatures, and it is in this context that another set of *Roman Charities* emerges in Italy and France in the first half of the sixteenth century.

Brian Curran has shown how the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* with its faux hieroglyphic inscriptions was part of a movement that took pleasure in promoting interest in ancient Egypt, inspiring a variety of artists to experiment with Egyptian themes and decors. Such interest, which according to Curran fed into a full-fledged "Egyptian Renaissance," manifested itself in Pinturicchio's decoration of Pope Alexander VI's Sala dei Santi with myths of Isis and Osiris (1492–94); Giulio Romano's depiction of a nemes-wearing sphinx in Palazzo Madama (1521–23); Raphael's and Romano's execution of an Egyptianizing telamon in the Stanza dell'Incendio in the Vatican Palace (ca. 1520); Rosso Fiorentino's and Primaticcio's frescoes of Pharaonic caryatids in the Pavilion des Armes at Fontainebleau (1530–45); and, most importantly, Giulio Romano's band of authentic Egyptian hieroglyphs on the vault of the Loggia delle Muse in the Palazzo Tè, executed by his team (1527–29).[97]



Figure 1.39: Egyptian Page with Image of Multi-Breasted Diana of Ephesus, Illumination, Mass of Saint John the Baptist, Colonna Missal, 1530–38

The fascination for Egyptian motifs and aesthetic included a focus on the goddess Isis, in ancient art often shown to nurse her son Horus in a seated position similar to the one adopted by Venus nursing Cupid in Colonna's onyrical narrative and its accompanying woodcut illustration. Since Herodotus, Isis was understood as an Egyptian version of Demeter, merging with her to form the multi-breasted figure of the Ephesian Artemis.[98] Such a polymast figure, here identified as Diana because of the stags that flank her, is the centerpiece of a

lavishly illuminated page in a missal commissioned by Cardinal Pompeo Colonna between 1517 and 1523 and completed in 1540 (Figure 1.39). This page also features representations of obelisks, Egyptian gods, and hybrid creatures as well as two male sphinxes decorated with hieroglyphs – all of them art works known to Renaissance Egypt lovers.[99] Polymast statuettes of the Ephesian Artemis were sought-after objects among early sixteenth-century collectors: in 1514, Gabriele Rossi acquired one for his collection in Rome, and Andrea Odoni emphasized a similar statue as the centerpiece of his collection in a portrait by Lorenzo Lotto (1527).[100]

Renaissance artists depicted statues of Artemis Ephesia quite frequently in their works. Raphael included one as a grotesque surrounded by Diana's stags, pictures of birds, and floral motifs among his frescoes in the Vatican Loggia (1518–19). Giulio Romano depicted a similar grotesque in the cross-vaulted room in the Palazzo Tè, and anthropomorphized the multi-breasted goddess in a ceiling fresco of the *Birth of Memnon*, a mythic Ethiopian king, located in the loggia of the palace's Appartamento del Giardino Segreto (1524–34) (Figure 1.40).[101] Giovanni Maria Falconetto (1468–1535) positioned a polymast statue from which putti nurse at the center of his *Archaeological Landscape* in the Palazzo d'Arco, Sala dello Zodiaco, likewise in Mantua.[102] Primaticcio, finally, drew the multi-breasted goddess at least twice, once as a caryatid in the vicinity of Ceres, and once as part of his composition *The Masquerade of Persepolis*, in preparation for his decorative programs at Fontainebleau.[103] For our purposes, the interesting fact is that among those artists with a taste for things Egyptian – and in particular, the multi-breasted Artemis Ephesia – several, i.e., Giulio Romano, Rosso Fiorentino, Primaticcio, Marcello Fogolino, and the unknown artist of Sant'Abbondio, produced drawings, frescoes, or stucco reliefs of *Pero and Cimon* in the context of palace decorations. So did Perino del Vaga, who worked with Giulio Romano as Raphael's assistant at the Vatican Loggia and



Figure 1.40: Giulio Romano, Birth of Memnon, 1524



Figure 1.41: Cima da Conegliano, Saint Mark Healing Ananias, 1497–1499, Detail

completed Rosso Fiorentino's print series *Amori degli Dei* in 1527, sharing these artists' interests in classicizing erotic art and the kind of decorative motifs derived from archaeological discoveries at the Domus Aurea.[104]

Giulio Romano, Marcello Fogolino, and the fresco artist of Sant'Abbondio combined their interest in the breastfeeding daughter with references to classicizing "grotesques" as well as mermaids, sphinxes, and other hybrid creatures. Especially the mermaid theme seems functionally and aesthetically related to other artists' taste for Orientalizing fertility goddesses or Egyptian motifs.[105] Often, these mermaids or sphinxes are themselves breastfeeding. Cima da Conegliano's painting of *Saint Mark's Healing of Ananius* (1497–99), for example, includes a frieze decorated with a mermaid Charity (Figure 1.41). It decorates the entrance to a mosque of classicizing architecture in Alexandria in front of a somewhat anachronistic group of turbaned "Egyptians." A sea goddess with a split fish tail embraces a male young to her left, nursing a mermaid baby to her right. In painting this frieze, Cima might have been inspired by the female sea hybrids and putti that Tullio Lombardo and his workshop sculpted for the marble plinths supporting the triumphal arch in Santa Maria dei Miracoli, Venice (1485–89). These latter fish-tailed nudes are not directly shown to be breastfeeding, but one of them offers her right breast to a neighboring putto with the typical V-hold of a nursing woman. Another mermaid is caught in an incomplete "pudica" pose, with fingers and thumb encircling her breast rather than covering it up.[106]

Cima never went on to paint a *Roman Charity*, but the Egyptian setting of his fantastically hybrid architecture shows that interest in nursing mermaids was rhetorically related to other artists' Egyptianizing adaptation of multi-breasted Artemis. Already in 1490, Bernardino Pinturicchio painted a mermaid nursing her infant for the ceiling of the Sala dei Semidei in Domenico della Rovere's Palazzo dei Penitenzieri in Rome (Figure 1.42), a few years before he adopted a

full-fledged Egyptian program for the ceiling frescoes of *Isis, Osiris, and Apis* in Pope Alexander VI's apartment.[107] A perfect fusion between a polymast fertility goddess and a mermaid Charity consists of a painting from the workshop of Giulio Romano featuring a multi-breasted *Mermaid Goddess Nursing her Young* (Figure 1.43). This lovely, but long neglected, painting from his Mantuan years preserved at Hampton Court shows a serenely smiling mermaid with what seem to be multiple fishtails. She tenderly embraces her seven children, five of whom suckle from a like number of breasts arranged in a semi-circle across her chest. Their curly fishtails are intertwined; wind blows into the mermaid mother's coat, and waves form at the surface of the sea to create the impression of movement. Already in the work of Hans Kels and Georg Pencz, interest in the motif of Roman Charity was accompanied by a love for mermaids, but in the visual universe of Giulio Romano, the depiction of breastfeeding Pero took



Figure 1.42: Bernardino Pinturicchio and workshop, Mermaid Nursing her Offspring, Ceiling Fresco, 1490



Figure 1.43: Giulio Romano and workshop, A Mermaid Goddess Nursing her Young, before 1534

place within a multi-faceted system of references to Egyptian motifs, hybrid sea creatures, and mythological lactation scenes.

Marcello Fogolino (1483/88–after 1558) may have been the first Italian artist to place a *Roman Charity* in the vicinity of sea gods, Nereids, and breastfeeding sphinxes (Figure 6.16). He painted a roundel of a young woman and an old man inscribed with *Pietas* as part of a frieze for the Villa Trissino (1516–25). It shows a surprisingly modest Pero, who, instead of offering her father a naked breast, gives him a round piece of bread as a symbolic substitute in the manner of certain nursing Madonnas. This roundel is flanked by a centaur and a Triton on whose fishtail a naked Nereid lounges seductively, holding a lyre. Another roundel shows a lactating Charity, held by another Triton-and-Nereid couple in the vicinity of a hippocampus and a winged sphinx nursing a mermaid baby (Figure 6.15).[108]

The frescoes at Sant'Abbondio, Cremona, variously attributed to Francesco Casella and Galeazzo Rivelli, or della Barba, and commissioned some time

before 1525 by the monastery's provost Gerolamo Landriani, include a tondo that shows Pero in the act of breastfeeding (Figure 1.3).[109] This roundel stands out in a series of eight medallions depicting Roman emperors and philosophers. As Marika Leino and Charles Burnett have pointed out, its composition resembles that of a plaquette held at the Victoria and Albert Museum (Figure 1.4). While the gendering of the couple on the medal is ambiguous, art historians writing about the roundel have so far not doubted the identity of the nursling as Pero's father.[110] The medallion is part of a ceiling fresco with the Virgin Mary at its center, surrounded by grotesques, floral and faunal motifs, centaurs and winged sphinxes. Two double-breasted female statues, split in halves, connect two parts each of this fresco, respectively. Except for their lack of multiple breasts, these statues remind of an Ephesian Artemis, given their outstretched hands and the decorative base that supports their torsos.

A similar lover of Egyptian motifs and grotesques, Giulio Romano went beyond these prior artists' depictions of *Pero and Cimon* by framing the breastfeeding daughter in an explicitly Dionysian setting. His drawing of the theme, produced some time between 1526 and 1534, served as the model for a stucco relief in the vault of the Sala degli Stucchi, Palazzo Tè (Figure 1.44).[111] This erotic drawing shows a bearded, muscular, topless man who casually lounges at the feet of a female figure, grasping her right breast and pulling it toward his mouth. Nothing about him suggests distress: elegantly crossing his legs, he rests his right arm in his lap, a pose suggesting comfort and relaxation. He is neither chained nor tied or locked up but sits in an open, nondescript environment. The woman from whom he nurses sits on a chair, clad in a classicizing garment that exposes her bosom and reveals her belly button and a well-shaped leg. With her left hand, she offers him the other breast to suck from as well, while her right hand rests on the old man's shoulder. Most remarkably, she wears the half-moon of Artemis as a headdress, while Diana's hunting dog crouches between her legs. Even more puzzlingly, another female figure, dressed in a flowing, revealing garment, approaches from the left, carrying a tree-branch. Unfortunately, Pero lacks her Artemisian headdress in the completed stucco relief, which Vasari attributes to Primaticcio, but retains Diana's hunting dog.[112]

While art historians have identified this drawing and the respective relief as a representation of *Pero and Cimon,* it echoes Etruscan mirrors that depict Juno in the act of breastfeeding a bearded Heracles surrounded by spectators. These mirrors were most likely unknown to Giulio Romano, but his fusion of Pero with Artemis shows a certain familiarity with Eleusinian cults in which ritual breastfeeding played a role. According to W. Deonna, Maximus's anecdote presents as blood kinship what among Etruscans qualified as adoptive kinship based on milk exchange. In his interpretation of the myth, Pero takes the place of a divine nurse.[113] Lucia Köllner argues that the legend of Pero and Cimon refers to a historical person – Kimon, son of Miltiades (509–450 BCE)



Figure 1.44: Giulio Romano, Pero and Cimon or Breastfeeding Artemis, before 1534

– as well as to the cults of Isis and Demeter, in which milk either renders the recipient divine or protects and regenerates him. She views Pero as yet another kourotrophos, i.e., a mortal or divine nursing caretaker.[114]

Giulio Romano attributes a decidedly Dionysian character to scenes of breastfeeding in his representations of Greek mythology. Pero, in his Camera degli Stucchi, is placed in the vicinity of Diana as a young child's caretaker and a lactation scene from the *Golden Age*.[115] In the latter stucco, a young woman breastfeeds a toddler, a man collects fruit for another child, and a bearded, naked old man stimulates the flow of water from his left nipple, which he squeezes in the V-hold of a nursing woman. With his left hand, he pours water from a jar. On the west wall of the Camera di Psiche, river gods and goddesses are represented in like fashion, i.e., either as spouting liquids from their nipples or as emptying vases full of water.[116] In the same fresco, a female satyr breastfeeds a ca. ten-year-old child riding on a goat amongst the revelry of guests at Psyche's wedding (Figure 1.45). Water-spouting Artemisia reappears as an allegory of *Water* in a design for yet another decoration at Palazzo Tè, and a winged sphinx with erect nipples is at the center of his *Allegory of Immortality*, next to

an oversized river god vomiting up red wine.[117] A naked woman offering both dripping breasts to a satyr in his drawing of *Bacchus and Ariane* underscores Romano's utopian and erotic approach to scenes of milk-exchange, which in his art tend to represent the excess of pleasure and the overflow of – his own? – mythological imagination (Figure 1.46).[118]

Primaticcio, who assisted Giulio Romano at Palazzo Tè until he left for France in 1531, produced a drawing of a so-called *Roman Charity* similar to the above-mentioned sketch by his master (Figure 1.47).[119] This drawing, done in red lapis, was completed sometime between 1547 and 1559, possibly in preparation for the vault decoration of the Gallery of Ulysses at Fontainebleau.[120] It shows a triangular composition with Pero in the back, Cimon to the left, and a large, seated female figure in the front. Pero seems to pull her father toward her breast by his neck and beard; of Cimon, we see his face in semi-profile,




Figure 1.45: Giulio Romano, Wedding Banquet of Amor and Psyche, Detail of Breastfeeding Satyr, 1524–1534




Figure 1.46: Giulio Romano, Bacchus and Ariane, before 1246

a muscular back and arm. The second female figure is elegantly draped in shawls and veils that reveal her belly button and right breast but modestly cover her hair and face. She watches intently as Pero nurses the naked old man. Again, the presence of this third person is seemingly unmotivated; as in Romano's drawing, prison accoutrements are entirely missing. A lock of Pero's hair assumes the form of a half-moon, once again attributing an Artemisian identity to the breastfeeding daughter.

Perino del Vaga and Rosso Fiorentino, who belonged with Primaticcio to the circle of Giulio Romano, presented yet another approach to the motif.[121] It is reasonable to assume that the specific interest in the theme of Roman Charity cultivated by these four artists derived from their first-or second-hand experiences of working with Raphael, with Giulio Romano acting as intermediary.[122] While Perino del Vaga joined Giulio as Raphael's assistant in the Vatican Loggia in 1517–18, Primaticcio became part of Giulio's crew in 1525 at the Palazzo Tè, possibly even executing the stucco relief of *Pero and Cimon*.[123] Rosso Fiorentino might have met Giulio in Rome in 1524, shortly before the latter left for Mantova.[124] Rosso and Primaticcio would become close collaborators at Fontainebleau in 1532, where Rosso had started to direct the decorative programs a year earlier.[125] All four artists belonged to a particular branch of post-Raphael mannerism that combined an openly erotic style with a Dionysian, exotic vision of antiquity. All four of them shared a commitment to Pero and Cimon in their palace decorations such that it emerges as a distinctive feature of their art.

Sometime between 1532 and 1534, Perino del Vaga created a large-scale fresco of *Pero and Cimon* at Palazzo Doria that Caravaggio quoted in his altarpiece *The Seven Works of Mercy* (1606) and that Rubens studied in preparation for his own multiple renderings of *Roman Charity* (Figure 1.48). At about the same time, Rosso Fiorentino designed – and Primaticcio may have executed – the stucco relief of *Pero and Cimon* in the Galerie François I at Fontainebleau (Figure 1.49), which the prints by Georges Reverdy from 1542 disseminated and rendered famous (Figure 1.50).[126] Perino del Vaga's fresco shows Pero gracefully



Figure 1.47: Primaticcio, Pero and Cimon, 1544



Figure 1.48: Perino del Vaga, Pero and Cimon, 1528–1539

leaning against a large window, through the bars of which Cimon suckles from Pero's left breast. Her beautiful face is shown in profile; her curly hair is carefully tied up; she wears a white dress and a red cloak puffed up by the wind. Her entire pose suggests a certain nonchalance, which is indicated by her comfortably crossed legs and the casual hand gesture she performs. Other emblems of classicizing elegance are the guards to the left of the big column next to the prison. Dressed in ancient Roman costumes, one of them lounges on the ledge of the prison wall, his naked legs coquettishly splayed. The other two stand behind him in statuesque postures, gesturing as if engrossed in a lively conversation. Pero's glance suggests that she is aware of the group behind her; it seems as if the discovery of her outrageous act is imminent.

Rosso Fiorentino's stucco relief, likewise, portrays Pero as breastfeeding through the bars of a large prison window. This is a busy street scene, with beggars surrounding and watching her as she exposes both breasts in an attempt to let Cimon suck; of him, we see only a ghost-like presence behind bars. The mother-with-child group behind her and the three men to her right create a sense of nervous dynamic. One of the beggars, a completely nude man lying on the street with his head moved back as if in pain, displays a classicizing, muscular body with splayed legs. Pero herself is seated comfortably on the ledge below the window, legs crossed, and exudes an aura of casual elegance despite the squirmy child she is trying to restrain. Here, as in Perino del Vaga's fresco, it seems to be a matter of minutes before Pero's illicit act will be discovered.




Figure 1.49: Rosso Fiorentino, Pero and Cimon, after 1530

Both Vaga's and Rosso's versions are characterized by an important deviation from Maximus's version of the story, the same aberration we also find in oral versions of the anecdote: they show the breastfeeding scene taking place through the bars of a prison window. Probably because of a historicizing, even "realist" impulse, they rejected the idea of Pero's improbable entry into her father's dungeon. In addition, they may have been concerned with removing any doubt about Pero's modesty and virtuous intention. Unlike Beccafumi, who envisioned Pero as an ancient "strong woman" of dubious morals at Palazzo Venturi – among the likes of Judith, Esther, Dido, Lucretia, and Cleopatra – and unlike Giulio Romano and Primaticcio, who assimilated her into an archaic fertility goddess performing a rite of rejuvenation, Vaga and Rosso presented a version of the motif that supports a strictly didactic reading of Maximus's anecdotes, while also trying to do justice to his ekphrastic challenge.[127]

As of yet, neither Vaga's nor Rosso's contributions to the iconography of *Pero and Cimon* have received appropriate attention among scholars. While the neglect of all earlier versions can be explained by the small size of the artworks, their marginal position in the context of large decorative programs,



Figure 1.50: Georges Reverdy (Gasparo Reverdino), Pero and Cimon, 1542

the ephemeral nature of the medium, or sheer loss, a similar excuse does not hold for the huge fresco at Palazzo Doria and the prominence that Rosso's stucco relief enjoyed among French artists. Anna Tuck-Scala does point to Vaga's fresco as an important precedent for Caravaggio's altarpiece; Renzo Villa argues that Rubens saw both Palazzo Doria and Palazzo Tè before painting his six (!) versions of *Roman Charity;* and Marianne Grivel alludes to Vouet and Poussin visiting Fontainebleau – but most art historians have nothing specific to say about the art works themselves.[128] Laura Stagno cites Vaga's fresco as an important Mannerist piece inspired by his Roman years, without, however, even trying to describe the artwork.[129] Cécile Scaillièrez shows how Jean Cousin quotes Rosso's Pero in his painting of Charity, but she neglects to point out that the workshop of Jean Goujon, another follower of Rosso, produced a massive relief of *Pero and Cimon* in ca. 1560 as part of a series of images related to questions of justice and court practice.[130]

Since Erwin and Dora Panofsky's attempt to interpret Rosso's relief in the context of the fresco of *Cleobis and Biton*, underneath which it is positioned, as well as the roundels that flank it, nobody has ventured to add new insights. Erwin and Dora Panofsky relate, somewhat unconvincingly, the relief as well as the adjacent art works to events in King Frances I's personal life, mapping the story of Pero and Cimon onto the loving memory the king had of his sister, Marguerite de Navarre, who came to visit him in prison while captive in Spain.[131] In my view, the fifth and sixth bays of the vault, which represent three of Maximus's anecdotes on "filial piety," celebrate the awesome powers of mythological mothers from the archaic period instead. Maximus's story of Cleobis and Biton tells of two sons who, instead of the usual oxen, pull their mother's cart and are "rewarded" for their pious act by a premature death, imparted by Juno, whose service the mother did not want to miss.[132] The roundel to the left of the fresco shows the death of the two sons, as well as an image of Ceres-Demeter; the roundel to the right is, according to the Panofskys, inspired by Raphael's painting *The Plague of Crete [or Phrygia]*, rendered in print by Marcantonio Raimondi, which features an infant trying to suck from his dead mother.[133] The sixth bay contains a fresco of the *Twins of Catania*, who saved their parents during an eruption of Mount Aetna.[134] Especially the images of the fifth bay show or remind of the power of mothers over life and death, with lactation scenes playing a central role.

The exact role that Pero and Cimon came to assume within the decorative programs of those six palace decorations varied according to the respective contexts and formal properties of the motif, but some parallels do emerge: *Roman Charity* was habitually positioned in the vicinity of classicizing grotesques or other decorative genres signifying the abundance and excess, whimsy and idiosyncrasy, emotional powers and shock value of mythological motifs.[135] The sphinxes, mermaids, satyrs, and multi-breasted goddesses

in Pero's vicinity underscore the artists' eroticizing, and often exoticizing, intent, no matter whether the "pious" daughter was securely positioned in front of prison bars or was shown as an Eleusinian Artemisia rejuvenating a bearded old man. Only Beccafumi depicts Pero as ancient heroine (1519), in the manner of German Reformation artists and Venetian painters of sensuous "belle donne" in half-length format. Among palace artists, Pero's inclusion in so-called "galleries of strong women" was soon replaced by either more fanciful or more historicizing approaches, as seen in the work of Giulio Romano and Primaticcio, on the one hand, and of Perino del Vaga and Rosso Fiorentino, on the other. It is the latter whom contemporaries found most convincing – as testified by the close attention that Vaga's and Rosso's versions enjoyed among later generations of painters – even though gallery paintings of *Pero and Cimon* in half-length format would celebrate a powerful comeback in the early seventeenth century.

Notes

1 | The very earliest representation of *Pero and Cimon* since antiquity consists, to my knowledge, of the misericord in the choir seats of the Cathedral of Magdeburg, completed 1360. But this is a single occurrence that had no afterlife. Hans Michael, *Das Chorgestühl im Magdeburger Dom. Leben-Jesu-Tafeln und Misericordien, um 1360 und 1844* (Norderstedt: Books on Demand GmbH, 2002), 143, Figure 100.

2 | Vienna, Dorotheum, Kunstauktion no. 328, 8. April 1922.

3 | Marika Leino and Charles Burnett, "Myth and Astronomy in the Frescoes at Sant'Abbondio in Cremona," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 66 (2003): 272–88, especially 273–74. The roundel was most likely commissioned by Gerolamo Landriani, provost of the cloister between 1479 and 1525, and painted by either Francesco Casella or Galeazzo Rivelli (della Barba): In my view, the gendering of the breastfeeding couple is unclear. Compare to Figure 1.8, which represents the mother-daughter breastfeeding scene.

4 | *Pero and Cimon,* Faence, 1520–30, Pesaro, Museo Civico. For a reproduction, see Grazia Maria Fachechi, "L'iconografia della Caritas Romana dal Medioevo a Caravaggio," in: *Pietas e allattamento filiale: La vicenda – l'exemplum – l'iconografia*; colloquio di Urbino, 2–3 maggio, 1996, ed. by Renato Raffaelli, Roberto M. Danese, and Settimio Lanciotti (Urbino: Quattro Venti, 1997), 227–45, especially 241, Figure I.3.

5 | Nathalie Zemon Davis, "Women on Top," in: *Society and Culture in Early Modern France. Eight Essays by Nathalie Zemon Davis* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975), 124–51. Anne Christine Junkerman, "Bellissima Donna: An Interdisciplinary Study of Venetian Sensuous Half-Length Images of the Early Sixteenth Century" (Diss., University of California–Berkeley, 1988).

6 | Adolf de Ceuleneer, "La Charité romaine dans la littérature et dans l'art," *Annales de l'Académie royale d'archéologie de Belgique* (1920): 175–206; Franz Kuntze, "Die Legende der guten Tochter in Wort und Bild," *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 7 (1904): 280–300; Paul Kretschmer, "Zur Geschichte von der 'säugenden Tochter'," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 43, no. 1 (1899): 151–57; Georg Knaack, "Die säugende Tochter: ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Volkskunde," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, ed. by Max Koch, *Neue Folge* 12, nos. 5–6 (1898): 450–54; see also Heinrich Ploss and Max und Paul Bartels, *Das Weib in der Natur- und Völkerkunde*, vol. III, ed. by Ferdinand Freiherr von Reitzenstein (Berlin: Neufeld & Henius Verlag, 1927), 249–58.

7 | Raffaelli et al., *Pietas e allattamento filiale*; *Allattamento filiale: la fortuna*; colloquio di Urbino, 28–29 aprile 1998, ed. by Roberto M. Danese, Daniela De Agostini, Renato Raffaelli, and Gioia Zaganelli (Urbino: Quattro Venti, 2000).

8 | Anna Tuck-Scala, "Caravaggio's 'Roman Charity' in the Seven Acts of Mercy," in: *Parthenope's Splendor: Art of the Golden Age in Naples*, ed. by Jeanne Chenault Porter and Susan Scott Munshower (College Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993), 127–63.

9 | Waldemar Deonna, "La légende de Pero et de Micon et l'allaitment symbolique," *Latomus* 13 (1954): 140–66; 356–75, especially 361–62.

10 | Tuck-Scala, "Caravaggio's 'Roman Charity'," 135–36, 138.

11 | Robert Rosenblum, "Caritas Romana after 1760: Some Romantic Lactations," in: *Woman as Sex Object: Studies in Erotic Art*, ed. by Thomas B. Hess and Linda Nochlin (New York: Newsweek, 1972), 42–63.

12 | Garnier's painting was still extant at the time Rosenblum wrote his article but was subsequently lost at the Musée Chintreuil in Pont-de Vaux. Also, Rosenblum did not know of Angelika Kauffmann's *Roman Charity* from 1794.

13 | See also Jutta Gisela Sperling, "Las Casas and His Amerindian Nurse: Tropes of Lactation in the French Colonial Imaginary (ca. 1770–1810)," *Gender & History* 23, no. 1 (2011): 47–71.

14 | Bettina Simmich, "Caritas Romana in Trier – Frauenmut und Männerstolz: Zur Rezeption einer antiken Legende in Trier in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Kurtrierisches Jahrbuch* 34 (1994): 141–69.

15 | *L'allégorie dans la peinture: la représentation de la charité au XVIIe siècle*, ed. by Alain Tapié, Caroline Joubert, Jennifer Montague, and Gisèle Jouet, exhibition catalog, Caen, 27 June–13 October, 1986 (Caen: Musée des beaux arts, 1986).

16 | These paintings and sculptures are by Nicolas Regnier (Modena, Galleria e Museo Estense); Niccolò Tornioli (Rome, Galleria Spada); Giacomo Galli, or Lo Spadarino (Rome, Galleria Doria Pamphili); anon., after Guido Reni (Marseille, Musée des Beaux-arts; anon. Venetian (Orleans, Musée des Beaux-arts); Johann Carl Loth (Geneva, Palazzo Reale); Theodor van Thulden, copy after Rubens, Amsterdam version (Dunkerque, Musée des Beaux-arts); attributed to Gérard Seghers (private collection); attributed to Matthias Stomer (Budapest, Szepmüveszeti Muzeum); Ferdinand Bol (Rome, Palazzo Barberini); Simon Vouet (Bayonne, Musée Bonnat); Charles Mellin (Geneva, Musée d'art et histoire); Jean Cornu (Paris, École nationale supérieure); Jean-Baptiste Deshays, or Deshays de Colleville or Deshays le Romain (Rouen, Musée des Beaux-arts); Louis Dubois (Saint-Lô, Musée de l'Art); Jean-Jacques Bachelier (Paris, École nationale supérieure); Claude-François Attiret (Dijon, Musée des Beaux-arts); Jules-Joseph Lefèbvre (Melun, Musée Municipal); and a variety of prints; see Tapié et al., *L'allégorie dans la peinture.* See also Alain Tapié, "L'Allégorie dans la peinture. La représentation de la Charité au XVIIe siècle," *Revue du Louvre: La Revue des musées de France* 36 (1986): 224–25.

17 | Andor Pigler, *Barockthemen, eine Auswahl von Verzeichnissen zur Ikonographie des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1974; first ed. Budapest: Verlag der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1956), vol. 2, 300–07.

18 | David Freedberg, *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 1.

19 | "In the combination of the luscious paint so characteristic of the artist, the full breasts of the girl and the senescent flesh of the old man on the one hand, and the extraordinary story of a daughter giving her father to suck on the other, it is not hard to understand Valerius' claim that people might stop in amazement and be unable

to take their eyes off the scene; and there seems little extravagance in the assertion that "in those mute figures people feel they are looking at real and living bodies." Freedberg, *The Power of Images*, 47–48.

20 | Freedberg, *The Power of Images*, 13–21, 317. On the sexual pleasure of viewers in the Renaissance, see also Sigrid Schade, "'Himmlische und/oder Irdische Liebe'. Allegorische Lesarten des weiblichen Aktbildes der Renaissance," in: *Allegorien und Geschlechterdifferenz*, ed. by Sigrid Schade, Monika Wagner, and Sigrid Weigel (Köln; Weimar; Berlin: Böhlau Verlag, 1994), 95–112, especially 102.

21 | Freedberg, *The Power of Images*, 360. Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, ed. and transl. by D.R. Shackleton Bailey (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000), vol. 1, 501–03, no. V.4. ext. 1.

22 | "Although Valerius wishes to stress that the effect of such pictures is edifying, it is not difficult to imagine that the moral point might have been lost or obscured, or a very different lesson drawn. Of the strength of its effect there could be no doubt … The picture is … art: it should pertain to our highest and most spiritual faculties. Instead it blatantly, almost palpably, arouses the senses. Furthermore, it does so sexually, or at the very minimum could do so. Who are so pure that when they see a painting like Rubens's Cimon and Pero (to say nothing of the Behams' prints of the subject) they will only draw the virtuous lesson …" Freedberg, *The Power of Images*, 360.

23 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings,* 499, no. V.4.7.

24 | Brigitte Buettner, *Boccaccio's Des cleres et nobles femmes: Systems of Signification in an Illuminated Manuscript* (Seattle: College Art Association and the University of Washington Press, 1996), f. 64.

25 | Albrecht Dürer, *Madonna Lactans,* early 16th c., London, National Gallery, inv. no. 5592.

26 | E.F. Bange, *Die Italienischen Bronzen der Renaissance und des Barock*, 2. Teil, Reliefs und Plaketten (Berlin; Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1922), 126, no. 959, Figure 78.

27 | I am grateful to Herrn Dr. Krahn from the Bode-Museum for this insight. Bange, *Die Italienischen Bronzen*, 56, no. 411 (A.N. 832, inv. no. 1226).

28 | In my view, the right arm of the suckling figure hides female breasts, which can be seen when holding the medallion at an oblique angle. Also the headdress of the nursling suggests that her gender is female. By contrast, Gaston Migeon identifies this plaquette as a representation of *Pero and Cimon.* Gaston Migeon, "La Collection de M. Gustave Dreyfus," *Les Arts* 80 (August 1908): 1–32, especially 29, Figure viii.

29 | "Mulier plebeia matrem in carcere lacte propria nutrivit." *Spielwelten der Kunst*: Kunstkammerspiele, exhibition catalog, Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien, 21. Mai bis 2. August 1998, ed. by Wilfried Seipel (Milan: Skira editore, 1998), Medallion Nr. 2/6, 206.

30 | Anja Ebert, "Fischfrauen, Meermänner und andere Wunder. Drei Reliefs aus dem Umkreis des Hans Kels," *Anzeiger des Germanischen Nationalmuseums* (2005): 121–32.

31 | I sometimes refer to the images of *Pero and Cimon* in this time period as *Roman Charity* for reasons of variety, despite the fact that I believe the latter title originates from the early seventeenth century.

32 | Ulrich Pfisterer, *Lysippus und seine Freunde. Liebesgaben und Gedächtnis im Rom der Renaissance, oder: Das erste Jahrhundert der Medaille* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008), 261–66, 307, 350.

33 | Pfisterer, *Lysippus und seine Freunde*, 250–51.

34 | Pfisterer, *Lysippus und seine Freunde*, 124, 232.

35 | Fachechi, "L'iconografia della Caritas Romana," 244–45.

36 | Elisabeth R. Knauer, "Caritas Romana," *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen* 6, Neue Folge (1964): 9–23, especially 19.

37 | Roberto M. Danese, "Lac Humanum Fellare. La trasmissione del latte e la linea della generazione," in: Raffaelli et al., *Pietas e allattamento filiale,* 40–72, especially 67, 70.

38 | Symphorien Champier, *La Nef des Dames Vertueuses*, ed. by Judy Kem (Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 2007; first ed. 1503); Agrippa von Nettesheim, *Von dem Vorzug und der Fürtrefflichkeit des weiblichen Geschlechts vor dem männlichen* (Tübingen: Edition Diskord, 1987; first Latin publication Antwerpen 1529).

39 | Katharine Park, "The Rediscovery of the Clitoris," in: *The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern England*, ed. by David Hillman and Carla Mazzio (New York: Routledge, 1997), 170–91.

40 | F.W.H. Hollstein, *German Engravings and Woodcuts, ca. 1400–1700*, vol. II (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1955), 203, print by Barthel Beham P. 44 and B. 36; and vol. III (1956), 122, print by Sebald Beham after Barthel P. 211 and B. 208.

41 | Herbert Zschelletzschky, *Die "drei gottlosen Maler" von Nürnberg: Sebald Beham, Barthel Beham und Georg Pencz* (Leipzig: VEB E.A. Seemann Verlag, 1975), 29–42, 48–65; *Die gottlosen Maler von Nürnberg: Konvention und Subversion in der Druckgraphik der Beham-Brüder*; Ausstellungskatalog; Albrecht-Dürer Haus Nürnberg, 31. March–3 July 2011, ed. by Jürgen Müller, Jessica Buskirk und Kerstin Küster (Emsdetten: Edition Imorde, 2011); Kurt Löcher, *Barthel Beham: Ein Maler aus dem Dürerkreis* (München; Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1999), 14–15.

42 | One of the earliest and most provocative compositions in this regard is Michelangelo's Leda with the Swan. See print by Cornelis Bos after Michelangelo (after 1537) in the Herbert F. Johnson Museum of Art at Cornell University.

43 | See, for example, Sandro Botticelli and workshop, *Venus,* before 1510, Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie. This gesture has often been misunderstood. Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, for example, sees the "V" formed by the splaying of the middle and index fingers as an allusion to either Venus or "virtue." Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, "Pictures of Women – Pictures of Love," in: *Bellini, Giorgione, Titian and the Renaissance of Venetian Painting*; exhibition catalogue; National Gallery of Art, Washington, June 18–Sept. 17, 2006; Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Oct. 17, 2006–Jan. 7, 2007, ed. by David Alan

Brown and Sylvia Ferino-Pagden (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 189–236, especially 196. More to the point, but still not quite clear on the ubiquity and everyday purpose of the gesture, is Rebecca Zorach, who in her description of a salt-cellar calls the V-hold the "breast press:" "The salt-cellar also contains one of the more famous examples of what I call the 'breast-press' (fig. 3.5) in which a female figure presses her own breast as a sign of lactation. This is a common motif in sixteenth-century European visual culture ... the gesture can suggest any sort of source ... wealth or wisdom, comfort or fortune." Rebecca Zorach, *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold: Abundance and Excess in the French Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 92.

44 | "Quo non penetrat aut quid non excogat pietas." Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 500–01, no. V.4.7.

45 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, 501–03. On the invention of pornography in the early sixteenth century, see Paula Findlen, "Humanism, Politics, and Pornography in Renaissance Italy," in: *The Invention of Pornography: Obscenity and the Origins of Modernity, 1500–1800*, ed. by Lynn A. Hunt (New York: Zone Books, 1996), 49–108.

46 | "Cranach, similarly, paints under erasure. Like an iconoclasm launched from inside the image's resources, the fluttering loincloth stamps the crucifix with a 'not': not here, not this." Joseph Leo Koerner, *The Reformation of the Image* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 181.

47 | *Virgin with the Pear* (1520), P. 19 and B. 18; and *Virgin and Child with Parrot* (1549), P. 21 and B. 19, in: Hollstein, *German Engravings and Woodcuts, ca. 1400–1700*, vol. III, 17, 19. See also Hans Baldung Grien's treatment of the same subject in *The Virgin Mary with the Parrot* (1533), Nürnberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum. Jutta Gisela Sperling, "Charity's Nudity and the Veil of Allegory," in*: Renaissance Studies in Honor of Joseph Connors*, ed. by Machtelt Israëls, Louis Alexander Waldman, and Guido Beltrami (Milan: Libraria Officina; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013), 520–26.

48 | Sibylle Weber am Bach, *Hans Baldung Grien (1484/85–1545): Marienbilder in der Reformation* (Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2006), 23, 119.

49 | On *Joseph and Potiphar's Wife,* see Jürgen Müller and Kerstin Küster, "Der Prediger als Pornograf? Konvention und Subversion in der Bildpoetik Sebald und Barthel Behams," in: Müller et al., *Die gottlosen Maler von Nürnberg*, 20–32, 25.

50 | Koerner, *The Reformation of the Image*, 84.

51 | On Cranach's *Charities,* see Sperling, "Charity's Nudity and the Veil of Allegory;" Dieter Köpplin, "Cranach's Paintings of Charity in the Theological and Humanist Spirit of Luther and Melanchthon," in: *Cranach*, ed. by Bodo Brinkmann (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2007), 63–80. On the veil as visual metaphor in Cranach's nudes, see Elke Anna Werner, "The Veil of Venus: A Metaphor of Seeing in Lucas Cranach the Elder," in: Brinkerman, *Cranach*, 99–109.

52 | Alison Stewart, *Sebald Beham and the Origins of Peasant Festival Imagery* (Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2008), 79, 145.

53 | Giulia Bartrum, *German Renaissance Prints 1490–1550* (London: British Museum Press, 1995), 12.

54 | Martin Knauer, *Dürers unfolgsame Erben: Bildstrategien in den Kupferstichen der deutschen Kleinmeister* (Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2013), 22.

55 | Ulrich Pfisterer credits collectors of coins and medals with launching the systematic comparison of style. He calls them, with Vasari, the "founding fathers of art history." Pfisterer, *Lysippus und seine Freunde*, 13. Martin Knauer argues that the works of the "Nürnberger Kleinmeister," namely Barthel and Sebald Beham und Georg Pencz, anticipated important developments of late sixteenth-century Flemish and Dutch art. M. Knauer, *Dürers unfolgsame Erben,* 9.

56 | Müller and Küster, "Der Prediger als Pornograf?," 26–27.

57 | Zschelletzschky, *Die drei gottlosen Maler*, 29.

58 | Zschelletzschky, *Die drei gottlosen Maler,* 48. On Denck, see Müller and Küster, "Der Prediger als Pornograf?," 21–22.

59 | *Die Galerie der starken Frauen: Regentinnen, Amazonen, Salondamen*; exhibition catalog; Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf, 10. September bis 12. November 1995; Hessisches Landesmuseum Darmstadt, 14. Dezember 1995 bis 26. Februar 1996, ed. by Bettina Baumgärtel und Silvia Neysters (München: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1995). The title is inspired by a contemporary treatise in the tradition of women's worthies by Pierre Le Moyne. Pierre Le Moyne, *La galerie des femmes fortes* (Paris: Somaville, 1647).

60 | Bettina Baumgärtel, "Die Tugenden als Symbol kirchlicher und staatlicher Macht. Über die Galerie der starken Frauen in Ausstattungsprogrammen und als Buchillustrationen," in: Baumgärtel and Neysters, *Die Galerie der starken Frauen*, 140–57; Birgit Franke and Barbara Welzel, "Judith. Modell für politische Machtteilhabe von Fürstinnen in den Niederlanden," in: *Böse Frauen – Gute Frauen: Darstellungskonventionen in Texten und Bildern des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. by Ulrike Gäbel and Erika Kartschoke (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2001), 133–53. On Burgkmair, see *The Illustrated Bartsch: Sixteenth Century German Artists*, vol. 11, ed. by Tilman Falk (New York: Abaris Books, 1980), 68, 70, 72. On Coornhert, see *The Illustrated Bartsch: Dirck Volkertsz. Coornhert*, vol. 55, ed. by Ilja M. Veldman (New York: Abaris Books, 1991), 161–66, 167–72. On Philips Galle, see *The Illustrated Bartsch: Netherlandish Artists (Philips Galle),* vol. 56, ed. by Arno Dolders (New York: Abaris Books, 1987), 97–102, 221–28.

61 | Pierre Le Moyne, *Gallery of Heroick Women*, transl. by Marquesse of Winchester (London: printed by R. Norton for H. Seile, 1652; first French ed. Paris 1647).

62 | Constance Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism: Literary and Political Models* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990).

63 | "I maintain that nature gave milk to women, not only because of [nourishing] infants, but because [it is] of such force, that it can prolong the life of elderly persons, of which one can read an example in book 5 chapter 4 paragraph 7 of Valerius Maximus, [who tells] of a young woman, who preserves the life of her mother through her milk." Nettesheim, *Von dem Vorzug und der* Fürtrefflichkeit, 21–22.

64 | Karin Hanika, "'Eine offene Tür, ein offenes Mieder'. Das Schicksal der Lucretia zwischen Vergewaltigung und Ehebruch," in: Gäbel and Kartschoke, *Böse Frauen – Gute Frauen*, 109–31.

65 | See, among others, Barthel Beham's prints Bartsch nos. 2, 3, 12, 14, 15; Hans Sebald Beham's prints Bartsch nos. 10, 11, 12, 76, 77, 79, 80. *The Illustrated Bartsch. Early German Masters*, vol. 15, ed. by Robert A. Koch (New York: Abaris Books, 1978), 11, 15, 43, 44, 66, 67.

66 | Koch, *The Illustrated Bartsch*, vol. 15: B. 12 [III], 15; B. 14 [II], 15; B. 10, 43.

67 | I. Kalden-Rosenfeld, "Brosamer," in: *Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon. Die Bildenden Künstler aller Zeiten und Völker*, vol. 14 (München; Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 1996), 384–85.

68 | Irene Kühnel-Kunze points out that the Master with the Griffin's Head was part of Cranach's circle, working for the same set of commissioners at the court of Sachsen. Irene Kühnel-Kunze, "Hans Brosamer und der Meister HB mit dem Greifenkopf: Ein weiterer Beitrag zur Brosamer-Forschung," *Zeitschrift für Kunstwissenschaft* 14, no. 1–2 (1960): 57–80, especially 70.

69 | See also Lucas Cranach the Elder, *Judith with the Head of Holofernes,* 1530, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, inv. no. 11.15; Lucas Cranach the Elder, *Judith with the Head of Holofernes,* 1520–37, Puerto Rico, Museo de Arte de Ponce, inv. no. 60.0143; Hans Cranach, *Judith with the Head of Holofernes,* ca. 1537, San Francisco, Fine Arts Museum; Lucas Cranach the Elder, *Judith with the Head of Holofernes,* 1526–30, Kassel, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister; Lucas Cranach the Elder, *Salome with the Head of Saint John the Baptist,* 1530, Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts.

70 | Irene Kunze, "Der Meister HB mit dem Greifenkopf. Ein Beitrag zur Brosamer-Forschung," *Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft* 8, no. 2 (1941): 209–38, especially 218–19. (I apologize for using an article printed during the Nazi-era.)

71 | The painting is now on display in the Martin-von-Wagner Museum in Würzburg.

72 | Pigler, *Barockthemen*, vol. II, 301. Heinrich Zimmermann mentions a painting of *Pero and Cimon* by Pencz in an inventory of the royal collection in Prague in 1621: Heinrich Zimmermann, "Das Inventar der Prager Schatz- und Kunstkammer vom 6. Dezember 1621, nach Akten des K. und K. Reichsfinanzarchivs in Wien," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* XXV, part 2 (1905): XIII–LXXV, especially XL, no. 946 (reprint Graz: Akademische Druck-und Verlagsanstalt, 1967).

73 | See Giorgione, *Laura,* 1506, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum; Tiziano, *Flora,* 1515–16, Florence, Uffizi. Junkerman, "Bellissima Donna."

74 | Philip Rylands, *Palma il Vecchio: L'opera completa* (Milan: Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, 1988).

75 | Hans Georg Gmelin, "Georg Pencz als Maler," *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* 17, no. 1 (1966): 49–126; Leona E. Prasse, "Engravings by Georg Pencz in the Museum Collection," *The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art* 23 (1936):

50–53; Bettina Keller, "'Weldtliche historien außm Livio, Ovidio etc.' (um 1543): Georg Pencz, die Antike und Italien," in: *Zwischen Dürer und Raffael: Graphikserien Nürnberger Kleinmeister*, ed. by Karl Möseneder (Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2010), 139–60, especially 160; Stephanie Hauschild, "Spiegelbild und Schatten. Bildnisse des Sebald Schirmer und des Jakob Hofmann von Georg Pencz," *Anzeiger des Germanischen Nationalmuseums* (2004): 105–14, especially 107.

76 | Hans Gmelin dates Schwetzer's *Roman Charity,* previously thought to be by Erhard Schön, to 1537. Gmelin, "Georg Pencz als Maler," 66; Dieter Köpplin dates it to 1538. Köpplin, "Cranach's Paintings of Charity," 77, note 14.

77 | Junkerman, "'Bellissima Donna'," 23.

78 | Hans Stegman, no title, in: *Mitteilungen aus dem Germanischen Nationalmuseum* 4 (1908): 49–61, especially 51.

79 | The only other version that similarly shocks the viewer is Mattia Preti's *Roman Charity* from Modena.

80 | Ferino-Pagden, "Pictures of Women – Pictures of Love."

81 | "Un teller grando soazado doro cum una dona che da teta a un vechio." Archivio di Stato di Venezia (=ASV), *Cancelleria Inferiore*, Miscellanea Notai diversi, inventory of Pietro Luna, 5 November 1523, busta 34, c. 9. I am very grateful to Monika Schmitter for alerting me to this and the other inventories.

82 | "Un quadro grando de nogera con una donna che da latte a un vecchio." ASV, *Cancelleria Inferiore*, Miscellanea Notai Diversi, inventory of Benediti de Franciscis, 17 April 1538, busta 36, c. 59.

83 | "Un quadro di retrato di una donna, et suo padre che [?] la glie [?] da il late." ASV, *Cancelleria Inferiore,* Misc. Notai diversi, inventory of Gasparo Segizzi, 15 May 1576, busta 42, c. 32. On Segizzi's inventory, see also Isabella Palumbo-Fossati, "L'interno della casa dell'artigiano e dell'artista nella Venezia del Cinquecento," *Studi Veneziani* 8, n.s. (1984): 109–53.

84 | Junkerman, "'Bellissima Donna'," 23.

85 | Junkerman, "'Bellissima Donna'," 22.

86 | Philip Rylands, *Palma Vecchio* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 93.

87 | Junkerman, "'Bellissima Donna'," 57.

88 | See personal communication by Dominique Charles Fuchs, curator at the Museo Stibbert, Florence (October 2013).

89 | Edmund W. Braun, "Caritas Romana," in: *Reallexikon zur Deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, vol. 3, ed. by Ernst Gall and L.H. Heydenreich (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1954), col. 357; Fachechi, "L'iconografia della Caritas Romana," 241, Figure I, 2.

90 | Bernardino Luini, *Salome* (1527–31), Madrid, Prado; idem, *Salome with the Head of John the Baptist* (1525–30), Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum; idem, *Salome Receives the Head of John the Baptist* (1525–30), Paris, Louvre; idem, *Salome* (1527–31), Florence, Uffizi.

91 | The curator of the Museo Stibbert, Dominique Fuchs, suggested to me that the nineteenth-century forger might have recombined different elements of existing

paintings to create this *Roman Charity* in the style of Luini. He also shared with me that x-rays of the painting revealed a *Mystic Marriage of Saint Catherine* underneath.

92 | Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., "A Titian Problem. The Seven Acts of Mercy," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* XXII (December 1942): 165–72.

93 | David Alan Brown, "Venetian Painting and the Invention of Art," in: *Bellini, Giorgione, Titian and the Renaissance of Venetian Painting*, ed. By David Alan Brown and Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, 15–37, especially 28.

94 | On Tintoretto, see Jutta Sperling, "Wet-Nurses, Midwives, and the Virgin Mary in Tintoretto's *The Birth of Saint John the Baptist* (1563)" in: *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations: Images, Rhetorics, Practices,* ed. by Jutta Sperling (Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Press, 2013), 235–54; idem, "Allegories of Charity and the Practice of Poor Relief at the Scuola Grande di San Rocco," *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* LXX (2009): 119–46. On Veronese, see Gianna Pomata, unpublished paper.

95 | Francesco Colonna (presumed author), *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili: The Strife of Love in a Dream*, transl. by Joscelyn Godwin (London: Thames & Hudson, 1999), 373.

96 | "You suck not milk, cruel child, but bitter tears / To give back to your mother, for love of dear Adonis." Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, 374.

97 | Brian Curran, *The Egyptian Renaissance: The Afterlife of Ancient Egypt in Early Modern Italy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 107, 198–208, 237.

98 | Curran, *The Egyptian Renaissance*, 17.

99 | Curran, *The Egyptian Renaissance*, 247–51.

100 | Lorenzo Lotto, *Portrait of Andrea Odoni,* 1527, London, Royal Collection at Windsor Castle. On Gabriele Rossi, see Curran, *The Egyptian Renaissance*, 251, note 24. On Andrea Odoni, see Monika Schmitter, forthcoming book.

101 | Amedeo Belluzzi, *Palazzo Te a Mantova* (Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini, 1998), vol. 2, 509, Figure 945; 666, Figure 1196.

102 | Giovanni Maria Falconetto, *Archaeological Landscape,* before 1535, Mantua, Palazzo d'Arco, Sala dello Zodiaco. *Giulio Romano*, ed. by Manfredi Tafuri et al., with a contribution by Ernst Gombrich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998; first Italian ed. Milan, 1989), 308.

103 | "Scènes de l'histoire de Proserpine et termes de Priape, Cérès, Cybèle et Bacchus," drawing, Paris, Louvre, inv. 3497; and "La Mascerade de Persépolis," drawing, Paris, Louvre, inv. no. 8568.

104 | Elena Parma, "Perino del Vaga, ingegno sottile e capriccioso," in: *Perino del Vaga tra Raffaello e Michelangelo;* exhibition catalog, Mantova, Palazzo Te, 18 marzo–10 giugno, 2001, ed. by Elena Parma (Milan: Electa, 2001), 13–38, especially 14; on Perino del Vaga and the Domus Aurea, see Laura Stagno, "Due principi per un palazzo. I cicli decorativi commissionati da Andrea e Giovanni Andrea I Doria a Perino del Vaga, Lazzaro Calvi e Marchello Sparzo per il Palazzo del Principe," in: *Il Palazzo del Principe. Genesi e trasformazioni della villa di Andrea Doria a Genova*; special issue of *Ricerche di Storia dell'arte* 82–83 (2004): 9–32, especially 15; on Rosso Fiorentino and the Domus Aurea, see Pascale

Climent-Delteil, *Il Rosso Fiorentino, pittore della Maniera* (Montpellier: Presses universitaires de la Méditerranée, 2007), 86.

105 | On the kinship of meaning and form between fish-tail folks and foliate hybrid creatures in particular and the impact of the discovery of the Domus Aurea in general, see Alison Luchs, *The Mermaids of Venice: Fantastic Sea Creatures in Venetian Renaissance Art* (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2010), 34.

106 | Alison Luchs mistakes the V-hold of the mermaid on the left front plinth, inner corner, as an expression of pain. Luchs, *The Mermaids of* Venice, 81–91, especially 85. More than a century later, a doorknocker embellished with a mermaid *Charity* was imported from Venice for a palace in Reggio. Luchs, *The Mermaids of* Venice, 180.

107 | Luchs, *The Mermaids of Venice,* plate 2.

108 | Gunter Schweikhart, "Antikenkopie und -verwandlung im Fries des Marcello Fogolino aus der Villa Trissino-Muttoni (Ca' Impenta) bei Vicenza. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Villendekoration des frühen 16. Jahrhunderts im Veneto," *Mitteilungen des kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 20, no. 3 (1976): 351–78.

109 | Leino and Burnett, "Myth and Astronomy," 273–74.

110 | This is also the impression of the restorer who was working on these frescoes while I took photos, but my suspicion is that nobody so far has examined the corresponding plaquette carefully.

111 | Belluzzi, *Palazzo Te a Mantova*, vol. 1, 439, scheda 839; Christine Begley, "Giulio Romano as Court Artist to Federico Gonzaga in the late 1520's," in: *Giulio Romano. Master Designer*, exhibition catalog, ed. by Janet Cox-Rearick, The Bertha and Karl Leubsdorf Art Gallery, Hunter College, 16 September–27 November 1999 (New York: Hunter College, 1999), 74–97, especially 76.

112 | Rodolfo Signorini, *Il Palazzo del Te e la Camera di Psiche* (Mantova, editoriale sometti, 2001), 35.

113 | Deonna, "La légende de Pero et de Micon," 361.

114 | Lucia Köllner, *Die töchterliche Liebe: Ein Mysteriumgeheimnis* (Frankfurt a.M.; New York: Peter Lang, 1997) (Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXVIII, Kunstgeschichte, vol. 307), 20, 29–40. On the representation of divine wet nurses in ancient Egypt, see Stephanie Lynn Budin, *Images of Woman and Child from the Bronze Age: Reconsidering Fertility, Maternity, and Gender in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

115 | Belluzzi, *Palazzo Te a Mantova*, vol. 1, 438, schede 833 and 834.

116 | Belluzzi, *Palazzo Te a Mantova*, vol. 2, 262, Figure 487.

117 | Sebastiano Giordano, "Una nuova lettura dell'allegorismo cinquecentesco. 'Igne Natura Renovatur integra: Dal Chaos alla redenzione' in Giulio Romano," in: *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, anno CDIV–2007; Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche; Memorie; Serie IX, Vol. XXI, Fascicolo 2 (Rome: Bardi Editore, 2007), 419–716, Figure 75 (Giulio Romano, "I Quattro elementi: Fuoco, Acqua, Terra, Aria"; design, perhaps model for a decoration in Palazzo Té; Mertoun House, Berwickshire, Scotland, Collection of Count of Ellesmere) and plate no. 1 (Giulio Romano, "Allegoria:

Igne Natura Renovatur Integra," ca. 1535–1540, Detroit, The Institute of the Arts, inv. no. Mr and Mrs Walter B. Ford II Fund, 66.41).

118 | *Giulio Romano*; Exposition, Cabinet des Dessins au Musée du Louvre du 11. 10. 2012 au 14. 01. 2013, ed. by Laura Angelucci and Roberta Serra (Paris: Musée du Louvre, 2012), 68, Figure 10. On lactation imagery as representing excess and abundance, both literally as well as figuratively, especially at Fontainebleau, see Zorach, *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold.*

119 | On Primaticcio at Mantova, see Vittoria Romani, "Primatice peintre et dessinateur," in: *Primatice, Maître de Fontainebleau*; exhibition catalog; Paris, Musée du Louvre, 22 septembre 2004–3 janvier 2005, ed. by Ugo Bazzotti, Geneviève Brese-Bautier, Dominique Cordellier, Marianne Grivel, and Vittoria Romani (Paris: Éditions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 2004), 18–30, especially 19.

120 | Bazzotti et al., *Primatice, Maître de Fontainebleau*, 319.

121 | On Vaga, Rosso, and Giulio, see Stagno, "Due principi per un palazzo," 12–13.

122 | According to Pascale Climent-Delteil, Primaticcio introduces Raphael's school of painting to Fontainebleau, via Giulio Romano and Perino del Vaga. Climent-Delteil, *Il Rosso Fiorentino*, 91. On the many stylistic similarities between the four artists, see Romani, "Primatice peintre et dessinateur," 18–30; Romani, among others, mentions a game dedicated to painters commissioned by Innocenzo Ringhieri in 1551 that lists Rosso, Giulio, and Primaticcio in close proximity. Romani, "Primatice peintre et dessinateur," 27. Elena Parma mentions that Perino del Vaga met not only Giulio Romano in 1516 but also Luca Penni, brother of the director of Raphael's workshop, who first worked with him at the Palazzo Doria and then, from 1531, in Fontainebleau with Rosso Fiorentino. Parma, "Perino del Vaga, ingegno sottile e capriccioso," 14.

123 | On Primaticcio and Giulio, see Signorini, *Il Palazzo del Te*, 35; on Perino del Vaga and Giulio, see Parma, "Perino del Vaga, ingegno sottile e capriccioso," 14; and: *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. by Ulrich Thieme and Felix Becker, CD-ROM (Leipzig: Seemann, 2008), vol. "V," 13; on Perino del Vaga and Rosso, see Parma, "Perino del Vaga, ingegno sottile e capriccioso," 24.

124 | Thieme and Becker, *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler*, vol. "Ro–Rz," 223.

125 | Romani, "Primatice peintre et dessinateur," 18.

126 | Unfortunately, this has been overlooked by scholars who work on printmakers' popularization of motifs at Fontainebleau. Catherine Jenkins, "Les Graveurs de Primatice au XVIe siècle à Fontainbleau," in: Bazzotti et al., *Primatice, Maître de Fontainebleau*, 38–44; Marianne Grivel, "La fortune de Primatice dans l'estampe au xviie siècle," in: Bazzotti et al., *Primatice, Maître de Fontainebleau*, 45–53. On Primaticcio as Rosso's stuccator, see Romani, "Primatice peintre et dessinateur," 22.

127 | On Beccafumi's frescos at Palazzo Venturi, see Andreas Vetter, *Gigantensturz-Darstellungen in der italienischen Kunst. Zur Instrumentalisierung eines mythologischen Bildsujets im historisch-politischen Kontext* (Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank

für Geisteswissenschaften, 2002), 34; Roberto Guerrino, "Il Ciclo di Palazzo Venturi a Siena e la sua iconografia," in: *Beccafumi*, ed. by Piero Torriti (Milan: Electa, 1998), 97–108; Antonio Pinelli, "Il 'picciol vetro' e il 'maggior vaso'. I due grandi cicli profani di Domenico Beccafumi in Palazzo Venturi e nella Sala del Concistoro," in: *Domenico Beccafumi e il suo tempo*, ed. by Piero Torriti (Milan: Electa, 1990), 621–51.

128 | Tuck-Scala, "Caravaggio's 'Roman Charity'," 133; Villa, "Quid hoc est rei?," 85; Grivel, "La fortune de Primatice dans l'estampe au xviie siecle," 45–53. Rubens's six versions include, most likely, copies by his followers.

129 | Stagno, "Due principi per un palazzo," 12–13.

130 | Jean Goujon and workshop, *Pero and Cimon,* 1560–64, Paris, Louvre, Cour Carrée. Cécile Scaillièrez, *Rosso: Le Christ mort* (Paris: Éditions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 2004), 72–73.

131 | Dora and Erwin Panofsky, "The Iconography of the Galerie François Ier at Fontainebleau," *Gazette des beaux-arts* 52, hundredth year, sixth series (1958): 113–90, especially 136–37.

132 | Zorach, *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold*, 56.

133 | Panofsky, "The Iconography of the Galerie François Ier at Fontainebleau," 138.

134 | Panofsky, "The Iconography of the Galerie François Ier at Fontainebleau," 136.

135 | On lactation imagery in French Renaissance art as a sign of excess, see Zorach, *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold.* On the difficulties in interpreting the decorative program of the Gallery of Frances I in greater detail, see Panofsky, "The Iconography of the Galerie François Ier at Fontainebleau," 115–18; and Climent-Delteil, *Il Rosso Fiorentino*, 85–86.

Chapter 2: The Caravaggesque Moment

Roman Charity as Figure of Dissent

In 1606, Caravaggio single-handedly, and momentously, changed the iconography of Pero and Cimon by integrating the motif in his altarpiece *The Seven Works of Mercy* at the Church of Pio Monte della Misericordia in Naples. He turned the scene into an eye-catching act of mercy performed on a busy street corner densely packed with various other protagonists immersed in distributing alms, offering hospice, and burying the dead (Figure 2.1). In his *Lives of the Modern Painters* (1672), Giovanni Pietro Bellori (1613–96) emphasizes right away that "the head of an old man can be seen sticking through the bars of a prison, sucking the milk of a woman who bends toward him with her breast bare," before describing the rest of the painting.[1] Bellori goes on to mention that Caravaggio's *Denial of Saint Peter,* likewise painted for a church in Naples, "is considered one of his best pictures; it depicts the serving maid pointing to Peter, who turns with open hands in the act of denying Christ; and it is painted in nocturnal light, with other figures warming themselves at a fire."[2] Both paintings sent shock waves through the art world right after Caravaggio's death in the summer of 1610, informing the peculiar style and unorthodox choice of subject matters among artists from all over Europe now known as "Caravaggisti" or "Caravaggeschi."[3] It is hard to think of a painting by Caravaggio that did not fascinate, inspire, or scandalize his colleagues, collectors, and wider audience, but the idiosyncratic rendering of Pero and Cimon in the *Seven Works of Mercy* as well as his peculiar secular approach to representing Saint Peter and other apostles became hallmarks of his fame. While several art historians have noticed that Caravaggio's *Denial of Saint Peter* was formative for Caravaggisti such as Bartolomeo Manfredi, Gerrit van Honthorst, Dirck van Baburen, Valentin de Boulogne, Simon Vouet, Nicolas Regnier, Nicolas Tournier, Giovanni Antonio Galli (Lo Spadarino), Giuseppe Vermiglio, Lionello Spada, the Pensionante del Saraceni, and Jusepe de Ribera,[4] interest in the motif of Roman Charity is routinely overlooked as a defining feature of his followers.[5]



Figure 2.1: Caravaggio, The Seven Works of Mercy, 1606

This neglect is quite astounding, given that eight of the above-mentioned twelve artists painted copies of *Pero and Cimon* alongside their renderings of the *Denial of Saint Peter*[6] and that other great artists who briefly flirted with Caravaggismo, such as Peter Paul Rubens and Guido Reni, produced their own, multiple, versions of *Roman Charity* starting in 1612.[7] Reni the "divine" even acquired Caravaggio's *Denial of Saint Peter* at twice the price he fetched for his own paintings.[8]

In this chapter, I argue that formal resemblances between Caravaggio's Pero and the maid in his *Denial* from 1610 as well as between Cimon and Saint Peter in his *Crucifixion of Saint Peter* connect the paintings on the level of meaning and establish relationships that later artists amplified (Figure 2.2). What does it mean if Caravaggio's suckling father, condemned to death by starvation, seems identical to Saint Peter in the act of being crucified – especially when keeping in mind that Saint Peter was precursor to the popes of Rome? The convenience of using the same model for both paintings cannot answer the question, since *The Seven Works* and *The Crucifixion of Saint Peter* were completed six years




Figure 2.2: Caravaggio, The Crucifixion of Saint Peter, Detail, 1600–01




Figure 2.3: Battistello Caracciolo, The Liberation of Saint Peter, 1615

apart from each other in different cities. Furthermore, Caravaggio's patrons from the Pio Monte della Misericordia seem to have wanted to accentuate the view of Pero's needy father as the first of the apostles when matching the *Seven Works of Mercy* with Battistello Caracciolo's *Liberation of Saint Peter* in 1615 (Figure 2.3). Caracciolo's Saint Peter not only emerges from prison through the help of an angel – just as Cimon gets rehabilitated through the intervention of his daughter – but also recalls the suckling father's physiognomy from the adjacent altarpiece. The doubling, fracturing, and reversing of meaning that results from these formal connecting signifiers suggests that the art works in question thrive on a high dose of irony. In the following, I hope to show that the

integration of Maximus's anecdote in Caravaggio's *Seven Works of Mercy* was meant as a figure of dissent vis-à-vis mainstream post-Tridentine Catholicism, expressing a heterodox approach to questions of faith, confession, and grace. A similarly skeptical view of the Roman church is articulated in Caravaggio's portrayal of the apostles, mainly in *The Denial of Saint Peter, The Calling of Saint Matthew,* and *The Incredulity of Saint Thomas*. Given Caravaggio's fame and currency, both friends and foes had to reckon with his challenge, by adopting, diluting, or rejecting his critical view of Counter-Reformation Catholicism, with *Roman Charity* emerging as a measure of their appreciation of his style and "manner."

The novelty of Caravaggio's rendering of the story of Pero and Cimon comes into clearer focus when looking at precursors of the motif in the later sixteenth century. In France, the workshop of Jean Goujon produced a massive relief of *Pero and Cimon* for the attic of the Louvre's "cour carrée" between 1560 and 1564, one of five reliefs with judiciary motifs. Two of the other sculptures depict ancient examples of "justice" involving fathers and their sons, such as *The Judgment of Cambyses* and *The Son of Zaleucus,* whose cruelty and sternness provide a vivid contrast to Pero's act of filial piety.[9] In 1572, Sébastian Nivelle published a print illustrating the concept of filial love, with a pelican feeding her young at the center and four medallions in each corner depicting ancient examples of filial devotion. Two of these medallions illustrate Maximus's anecdotes about a mother and a father being nourished with the milk of their



Figure 2.4: Sébastien Nivelle, Filial Piety, Woodcut, 1572



Figure 2.5: Étienne Delaune, The Daughter Breastfeeds her Mother, Drawing, before 1583

daughters (Figure 2.4). Finally, Étienne Delaune (1518/19–83) made a miniature ink drawing of the mother-daughter scene with an intricately classicizing interior and a prison guard peeking around the corner. This is a very tender and slightly eroticized scene, with Pero's nipples and belly button showing underneath a delicate, flowing garment (Figure 2.5).

In Northern art, the iconography is particularly well represented. Shortly before his death in 1532, already Jan Gossaert drew the scene, imaginatively rendering Pero as a veiled, Madonna-like figure holding a naked baby, with a toddler tugging impatiently at her garment.[10] Cimon crouches uncomfortably before her while suckling from her right breast; he is not manacled but holds a staff as if he were a pilgrim. Pero's body is clearly discernible underneath the soft fabric of her garment; a slit in her skirt reveals her left leg. The Latin inscription in the upper right-hand corner quotes a dictum by Saint John,



Figure 2.6: Pero and Cimon, Carved Boxwood Bowl, 1540–50

positioning the breastfeeding scene squarely within the framework of Christian love: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you" (John, 13.34).[11]

In mid-century, a German boxwood bowl appeared, with an adaptation of Barthel Beham's print from 1525 carved into the interior (Figure 2.6). Around the same time, a drawing by Flemish artist Lambert Lombard (1505/06–66) positions the mother-daughter scene among plenty of onlookers in an urban environment reminiscent of ancient Rome (Figure 2.7). A miniature engraving formerly attributed to Nürnberg printmaker Virgil Solis (1515–62) shows a buttoned-up Pero somberly offering her breast to a diminutive father sporting a long beard and moustache.[12] A Dutch terracotta sculpture from 1570



Figure 2.7: Lambert Lombard, The Daughter Breastfeeds her Mother, Drawing, before 1566

features the nude body of the suckling father in a graceful embrace, with his fully clothed daughter standing slightly bent before him.[13] Some time before 1585, Johannes Wierix completed a finely chiseled print of *Pero and Cimon,* with father and daughter properly dressed in fashionable garments.[14] Their modest posture and demeanor recall the anonymous print attributed to Solis mentioned above. Its inscription unambiguously defines it as an illustration of Valerius Maximus's anecdote of filial piety.[15] Two miniature woodcuts by German printmaker Jost Amman (1559–91) refer, again, to the Beham brothers' versions, showing Pero stark naked, Cimon's nipples aroused, and the couple's legs entangled. One of these prints appeared posthumously in



Figure 2.8: Jost Amman, Pero and Cimon,Woodcut, Kunstbüchlein, 1599



Figure 2.9: Hans Bernaert Vierleger, Pero and Cimon, Ceramic Dish, 1601



Figure 2.10: Theodor de Bry, The Seven Works of Mercy, Cup Design, 1588

a *Little Book of Art* from 1599 (Figure 2.8). At the end of the century, a large South-German pendant (12 cm long) with the breastfeeding couple modeled in enamel at the center highlights Cimon's almost entirely nude body.[16] Pero's left breast and right leg coquettishly peak out from underneath her garment. In 1601, a deep ceramic dish from the Southern Netherlands depicts Cimon eagerly nursing from his daughter's huge and naked breasts, clutching her right arm, and it features, in the manner of Rosso Fiorentino, Pero's baby as an add-on (Figure 2.9).

Last not least, Theodor de Bry produced an intricate design for the interior decoration of a porcelain cup in 1588, devoted to various themes of charity (Figure 2.10). In a startling departure from the rather modest depiction of various acts of mercy such as the clothing of the naked, the distribution of alms to the poor, the washing of the feet, the visiting of the sick, and the feeding of the hungry, the artist inserts an almost pornographic image of *Pero*



Figure 2.11: Roman Master, Pero and Cimon, late 16th c.

and Cimon, both of them stark naked, in a clear quotation of Sebald Beham's prints from 1540 and 1544. This is the very first time that Maximus's story of the breastfeeding daughter is included in a panorama of charitable acts. Caravaggio would most likely not have known the design – his sources were Perino del Vaga's fresco at Palazzo Doria and possibly Reverdy's prints of Rosso Fiorentino's relief – but it is interesting to recall Walter Friedlaender's remarks about prior Flemish representations of the *Seven Works of Mercy* by Marten de Vos (1532–1603) and Bernard van Orley (ca. 1487–1541).[17] In his eyes, these two artists were the first to devise a compositional strategy to depict all seven acts in one frame, rather than as a series of disjointed acts.[18]

The flourishing of the motif in late sixteenth-century German and Flemish art is not matched by samples from Italy, with the exception of a few pharmaceutical bottles from the workshop of Orazio Pompei (1540–80),[19] two drawings of insecure attribution, and two anonymous oil paintings hidden in the depositories of Roman collections. The drawing attributed to Amico Aspertini

(1474–1552) does not present as a full-fledged *Roman Charity,* with the old man only staring at the young woman's breast, and the lack of prison accoutrements.[20] The other drawing, attributed to Alessandro Casolani (1552–1606), does show the breastfeeding couple inside a dungeon, but in a manner reminiscent of Simon Vouet's version from Riazan (1613–27).[21] The early dating of the two oil paintings by Rome's Soprintendenza per i Beni Storici, Artistici ed Etnoantropologici is equally insecure. One is attributed to a late sixteenth-century Roman master, showing Pero poised and richly clad, modestly casting her eyes away from her father as she offers him her left breast (Figure 2.11).[22] Cimon chastely crosses his hands in front of his chest and seems to be wearing a hermit's garment. In fact, his features anticipate a certain resemblance to the physiognomy of Saint Peter alluded to above. It is tempting to assume that Caravaggio might have seen it before leaving for Naples, but the painting could equally well belong to the throng of gallery pictures produced in the wake of Caravaggio's death in 1610. The other early oil painting is attributed to a late sixteenth-century Bolognese artist by the Soprintendenza di Roma mentioned above (Figure 2.12). Of interest are its small size (26x20 cm) and its uncanny compositional resemblance to Rubens's 1630 *Roman Charity* from Amsterdam (Figure 1.6), which, again, leaves doubts about its anterior dating. It is a very




Figure 2.12: Bolognese Master, Pero and Cimon, late 16th c.

erotic portrayal of the breastfeeding couple, featuring Cimon's nude, muscular body and erect nipples. It depicts a scantily clad Pero in the act of bending backwards to avoid making eye contact with her father.

The relative lack of Italian renderings of the theme in the second half of the sixteenth century can, perhaps, be explained through artists' self-censorship in an era of religious orthodoxy and surveillance, but only if one assumes that already prior to Caravaggio's treatment, the topic carried a certain religious significance. Tridentine reformers such as Bishop Gabriele Paleotti (1522–97) were, after all, careful to limit their insistence on decorum to images of sacred content.[23] Such an infusion of Maximus's anecdote with spiritual meaning by Italian artists before Caravaggio's *Seven Acts of Mercy* is unlikely, given the early sixteenth-century framing of Pero as a bella donna and "woman on top" à la Judith and Salome, or else as Egyptianized fertility goddess. The only exceptions to this overwhelmingly secular interpretation of Pero's story in the sixteenth century are Jan Gossaert's drawing and Theodor de Bry's cup design mentioned above, which indicate a certain difference in religious style among Flemish artists, i.e., a greater tolerance for eroticization. Nonetheless, it is puzzling that of several documented Italian paintings of the motif – in addition to the assumed original of Bernardino Luini, the wished-for Titian, and the early Venetian piece that surfaced on the Viennese art market in 1922 – none should have survived except for the two paintings inventoried by the Roman Soprintendenza.[24] The disappearance of other early oil paintings of the topic might thus suggest a certain amount of censorship in an era of increased concern about lascivious subject matters.

Be that as it may, it is important to point out that in the sixteenth century, Northern artists and their audiences continued to be quite familiar with the topic, thanks to its frequent depiction in the applied arts, prints, and drawings, while Italy experienced a certain hiatus in its appreciation for Maximus's anecdote. Nonetheless, the craze for gallery paintings of *Pero and Cimon* starting in 1610–12 hit Italy, France, the Southern Netherlands, and Utrecht equally hard; even Spanish painters such as Ribera and, later, Murillo participated in it. The timing and form of the movement suggests that it needs to be seen as an effect of Caravaggio's treatment of the scene in his altarpiece *The Seven Works of Mercy*. Its peculiar religious enhancement and simultaneous hyper-real rendering constitutes what I would like to call a Caravaggesque "moment" à la J.G.A. Pocock, which resulted in the effacement and resignification of the iconography's prior meanings while preserving and extending its critical core.[25] Similar to what Pocock termed the "Machiavellian moment" in early modern political thought and its – unlikely, but extremely successful – fruition in Anglo-Saxon republican discourse, Caravaggio's take on Pero's "filial piety" crystallizes and redirects the story's subversive potential through a fusion with "charity," one of the most embattled Catholic concepts

of the Counter-Reformation. This momentous application constitutes a crisis of signification whose ripple effects Caravaggio's imitators and enemies alike were trying to appease. Pero's colonization through Charity – or was it the other way round? – set an end to both pictorial traditions. Gone is Charity's allegorical innocence, with its pretensions to abstract from any erotic connotation, but gone also is Pero, Dionysian goddess and pornographic superstar. What surfaces is a politically provocative gallery picture in an era of Catholic militancy and empire-building.

So what does Caravaggio's altarpiece actually show? Most viewers would probably start to approach it by examining the unusual and well-lit breast-feeding scene to the right, as Bellori did. It shows Pero pressing against the bars of a prison window, through which Cimon squeezes his head to reach his daughter's breast. His physiognomy resembles, as already noted, that of Saint Peter in his *Crucifixion of Saint Peter,* while Pero's features recall those of the maid denouncing the apostle in his *Denial*. Her dress falls in elegant folds, mainly because Cimon seems to be using her upper skirt as a bib. In fact, her milk streams so abundantly that drops collect on his beard. Pero seems to have heard some noise – perhaps the screaming man with a torch behind her – because she startlingly turns her head to observe the men to her side. She seems breathless and scared, perhaps anxious to satiate her father before being chased away. She looks onto a group of men who perform a variety of charitable acts, among them a well-dressed man offering his red cloak to a naked, muscular beggar seen from behind, crouching on the ground in the manner of a repoussoir figure from a Venetian religious painting.[26] Right next to them stand two pilgrims and a host in an impossibly dense arrangement – of the second pilgrim we only see his left ear. The host points to a location outside of the picture plane. Behind them, a tall, sweaty man drinks water from what art historians have called the jawbone of an ass, which serves to identify him as the biblical figure of Samson. Directly behind Pero, two men help to remove a corpse from the dungeon, whose feet almost touch Pero's skirt. Except for Pero, who watches the six men to her right, everybody is intently absorbed in their activities.[27] Nobody makes eye contact with the beholder or with each other, with the exception, perhaps, of the beggar and the donor of a cloak.

On this bustling street corner, all seven mandatory works of mercy are performed simultaneously, as if they were everyday activities that deserve no further mention, praise, or comment: Pero is helping a prisoner as well as feeding a hungry person; the well-dressed Saint Martin is clothing a naked beggar, who is possibly also ill; the man to the left is hosting pilgrims; somebody has offered Samson water to drink; and the two men behind Pero are burying a dead pauper and ex-convict. The upper forty percent of the picture plane is populated by four divine figures, densely arranged in a vortex-like composition. Two angels with enormous wings seem to precipitate towards

earth, decoratively wrapped in a green velvet cloth; the lower end of this curtain or blanket dangles down low enough to be in danger of catching fire from the prison guard's torch. The right angel embraces – and possibly tries to hold back – the left one, who stretches his arms as if to arrest the scene below. Tucked into what must be the angels' legs and lower bodies is the Madonna with her child, showing heads and shoulders only. Christ, who is no longer a baby but a pre-teen, looks tenderly, and perhaps amusedly, at Pero, while his mother watches her with a rather stern expression, frowning. After all, it is no longer she who is allegorically nursing needy mankind; the job seems to have passed on to Pero, leaving the Virgin unoccupied, watching from her post in heaven.

This substitution is the single-most creative, and provocative, iconographic reinterpretation in the history of Charity and the Madonna Lactans. It indicates Caravaggio's wish to secularize this most important of Catholic virtues, and to uncouple it from the notion of grace the Virgin Mary used to embody. At the same time, Pero's breastfeeding of her father – as hyper-real as it may look on Caravaggio's canvas – is spiritually enhanced through association with the Madonna, and perhaps it is this peculiar mixture of the sacred and the secular to which the angels object. It is not quite clear why else the left angel looks as if about to interfere in Pero's performance of "mercy." To arrest time, making visible a moment of grace? To assist Pero and the others, participating in the alleviation of human suffering? To remind the protagonists that Christ should be the ultimate recipient of all acts of charity? To end their self-absorption and oblivion?[28]

What is most remarkable is that the source of light in this nighttime scene is actually not the torch held by the man with the corpse; it could not very well illuminate the persons and objects in front of it, facing the spectator. The light seems to come from the position of the viewer in front of the picture plane, spotlighting the lame man's muscular back, Saint Martin's right lower calf and left upper leg, Pero's face and chest, the torch-bearer, the angels' arms and shoulders, and Mary's and Christ's faces. Does this mean that the entire scene would not exist if it were not illuminated by and for the artist and his audience? That it is the observer for whom the scene is taking place like a tableau vivant? That light is not a measure of grace but a facilitator of reality effects? In any case, the painting's play with light and shadow reiterates Caravaggio's rather complicated view of "truth" and its connection to the "visible." It is not necessarily empirical sight that establishes truth, rather the observation of reality and its reproduction in a lifelike, but also highly selective and controlled, manner. For this purpose, as Bellori already observed, Caravaggio "never brought any of his figures out into open sunlight, but found a way of setting them in the dusky air of a closed room, taking light from high up that fell straight down on the principal part of the body, and leaving the remainder in shadow in order to gain force through the intensity of light and dark."[29]

Despite the sometimes polemical assertions about his art and its supposedly slavish relationship to empirical reality – as indicated by Karel van Mander in 1604[30] and Louis Marin in 1981,[31] among others – Caravaggio's use of light has always been recognized as highly artificial, mystical, or psychological.[32] It is the peculiar mixture of lifelike presentation and dark context that cancels spatiality and produces the effect of hyper-real proximity that Friedlaender defines as Caravaggio's manner of "bringing … the object – the supernatural included – near to the spectator, almost to the degree of physical tangibility."[33]

Iconographically speaking, Caravaggio quotes his predecessor Perino del Vaga, whose fresco of *Roman Charity* he must have seen during his stay in Genoa in 1605.[34] Perino's idiosyncratic rendering shows Pero in the act of breastfeeding through the bars of a prison window, connecting the fresco to the story as it circulated in contemporary oral culture instead of Maximus's anecdote. Given Caravaggio's love for portraying people and things as if observed from nature, and for his representation of the "marginal" as "lifelike," he must have appreciated this – surprising, for a Mannerist artist – anti-classicizing move.[35] Whether he also saw Georges Reverdy's prints of Rosso's reliefs at Fontainebleau is unclear (Figure 1.50), but Caravaggio does envision the scene as taking place on a busy street corner, as did his Florentine predecessor (Figure 1.49).[36] Caravaggio's interpretation of the breastfeeding daughter as Charity might be indebted to Rosso as well, who not only inserted a mother-and-child group to the left of the scene but also had a child accompany Pero on her mission, squirming and tugging at her right arm. Unlike Rosso and later French artists, Caravaggio does not merge the motif with Charity by adding a child but refers to the erstwhile nursing Madonna in order to enhance the scene religiously. While his choice of a street scene is motivated by compositional reasons – how else could he have integrated the other five acts of mercy? – and by his distaste for illustrating classical literature, Caravaggio does not shun Maximus altogether. Instead of representing a "true slice[s] of life caught in the act," as if he had actually observed a young woman breastfeeding an old man through the bars of a Neapolitan prison, his eye-catching portrayal of Pero and Cimon engages Maximus stylistically, by taking up his ekphrastic challenge.[37] It is this demand for "enargeia" to which later artists responded repeatedly, while "correcting" Caravaggio for his misquote of the anecdote proper. Never again would the lactation scene be depicted from the outside through the bars of a prison window. Never again would Pero be competing with the Madonna in terms of charitable nursing. And only one artist would take up his challenge of dissolving the allegory of lactation into a larger narrative composition. That it had to be Poussin, his greatest foe, is not only ironic but also indicates that his lesser admirers found it hard to engage with the overall composition of the *Seven Works of Mercy* and the complex religious content matter it expressed.




Figure 2.13: Caravaggio, The Denial of Saint Peter, 1610

What exactly the provocation may have consisted of becomes clearer when juxtaposing the *Seven Works of Mercy* to Caravaggio's other late work, *The Denial of Saint Peter* (1610) (Figure 2.13). This painting, of a hitherto unusual subject matter, illustrates how Peter denied his acquaintance of Jesus the night of his arrest after being denounced by a servant woman and a man while warming himself at a campfire, an event recorded in all four gospels (Matthew 26:69–75; Mark 14:66–72; Luke 22:55–62; John 18:17–18, 25–27). It shows three half-length figures standing up close. To the left is a soldier wearing a fancy helmet, which Battistello Carracciolo quotes in his *Liberation of Saint Peter,* the companion piece to the *Seven Works of Mercy*. At the center we see the half-lit face of the maid, whose features and headdress resemble Pero's. Both are pointing to Peter in the act of making their accusations. His face is illuminated a bit better than the other two, perhaps from the fire located in front of the painting outside the picture plane, such that his sweaty forehead and nose reflect the light. Peter's features conform to a standard type developed in Italian art: deeply receding hairline, frowning forehead, bushy grey beard cropped underneath the chin.[38] His hand gesture is not so much one of outright denial but of fear and disbelief at having been found out: his fists are turned inward, his thumbs pointing at his chest. His facial expression shows stress or grave concern. From the Bible we know that right after denying Jesus three times, the rooster crowed a second time – just as Jesus



Figure 2.14: Bartolomeo Manfredi, The Denial of Saint Peter, 1615–16

had foretold. Peter then became aware of his betrayal and started weeping. Caravaggio caught the moment right before Peter's emotional breakdown, stressing his act of apostasy rather than the repentance that followed. In an era in which the papacy pronounced infallibility with renewed emphasis, and irritated secular governments by claiming supremacy in both temporal and spiritual affairs, Caravaggio's portrayal of Peter's *Denial* was of delicate political import.[39] That it should have been the first of the apostles to commit the mortal sin of apostasy was certainly embarrassing to Tridentine hardliners, and to remind them of the pope's predecessor's failing in such graphic manner as Caravaggio's must be read as an expression of the painter's internal resistance to Counter-Reformation Catholicism.[40]

The topic became immediately popular among his followers, closely followed by *Roman Charity*.[41] Table 1, "Caravaggisti, Caravaggeschi, and Their Iconographical Choices," shows how 139 painters identified by Alessandro Zuccari and Benedict Nicolson as followers of Caravaggio produced a total of sixty versions of the *Denial of Saint Peter* and fifty-three of *Roman Charity* (see Appendix).[42] Bartolomeo Manfredi (1580–1622), since Joachim von Sandrart's *Lives of Famous Painters* (1675) known to have devised a special method for presenting Caravaggio's ambiguous and complicated subject matters in the form of easier-to-digest gallery paintings,[43] produced a version of the *Denial* in 1615/16 that Roger Ward qualifies as a "supreme example of the [Caravaggist]



Figure 2.15: Dirck van Baburen, The Denial of Saint Peter, 1620–24

genre," following Bellori's assessment (Figure 2.14).[44] It shows Saint Peter – with his signature hairline, silver grey beard, and frowning forehead – crowded in by the accusatory maid and seven men, some of them soldiers with iron helmets. As in Caravaggio's painting, his gesture is ambiguous, as he points to himself rather than rejecting the accusation with hands turned outward. Dirck van Baburen painted a version of the topic in 1620–24 that relates more closely to Caravaggio's predecessor, featuring a soldier to the left, a turbaned maid at the center, and a frowning, bearded, and half-bald Saint Peter to the right (Figure 2.15). While Caravaggio's invisible campfire illuminates the three faces from the left, Baburen's source of light enters from the right, creating interesting shadows on Peter's face and spotlighting the servant girl's white skin and bosom. A similar stress on the maid's face, neck, and breasts, this time produced by a candle she holds in her hands, can be seen in the three versions attributed to Gerrit van Honthorst, produced between 1612 and 1624.[45] Saint Peter is, again, identified by his three trademark features (frown, beard, and circular hairline); the servant maid wears the obligatory turban in at least two cases; while the men's headdresses vary between helmets and plumed hats, as in Baburen's version. Deviating from Caravaggio's painting, Saint Peter's hand gestures more explicitly oscillate between denial and

acceptance, with one hand raised and the other one pointing inward. A similar gesture is repeated by the so-called Pensionante del Saraceni in his minimal version, featuring Peter and the maid only,[46] while the painting believed to be by Jusepe de Ribera in the Certosa of San Martino, which might be the work that Bellori wrongly attributed to Caravaggio, shows the apostle raising both hands in unambiguous defiance.[47]

Among the many other Baroque painters with an interest in the topic, Nicolas Tournier (1590–1639) stands out because he produced five extant versions of it. In each case, Saint Peter conforms to the prototype (grey, bushy, chin-long beard; receding hairline; wrinkles on his forehead), but his hand gestures differ in each painting. In Tournier's version preserved in the UK, Saint Peter repeats the gesture Caravaggio devised, with both hands ambiguously pointing inward.[48] As in Caravaggio's painting, the only other protagonists are the maid and a helmeted soldier (Figure 2.13). In Tournier's Atlanta version, Peter's right pointer is turned toward him, while his other hand is mysteriously tucked in beneath his garment.[49] In his Dresden picture, we do not see Peter's hands at all,[50] which produces problems in "reading" his response to the accusation, especially in the absence of a strong facial expression. In the Prado copy, the apostle raises his right hand in a gesture of rejection.[51] The different hand movements are combined in the painting of unknown whereabouts, showing his right hand turned inward and well lit and his left hand raised in defense, cast into shadow.[52] More examples could be mentioned, but the ones listed here might suffice to show that artists and their audiences took delight in determining the exact nature and extent of Peter's denial, a complex emotional response measurable through hand gestures that included varying degrees of fear, self-denial, acceptance, and resignation.

The concrete religious significance of Caravaggio's *Denial* is debated among art historians, some of whom call it a devotional painting in sync with the requirements of Tridentine image theory. As Marcia Hall observes, the capacity of a painting to move the spectator to worship is among those qualities.[53] In my view, a painting that highlights Saint Peter's guilt and doubt could hardly have aroused veneration and focused the worshiper's attention. Luisa Vertova points out that contrition and repentance are core values of Catholicism, but she neglects to mention that Caravaggio represents the apostle in the act of betrayal rather than contrition and that Counter-Reformation Catholicism was not exactly known for its generosity toward skeptics, dissenters, or apostates.[54] Commenting on all of Caravaggio's art, Maurizio Calvesi even detects religious symbolism in his hyper-erotic *Amor Vincit Omnia,* claiming that "obedience to the church is … continuously reconfirmed in Caravaggio's work, such that one can exclude … any suspicion of collusion or sympathy with Reformers." Unfortunately, he avoids the question of queer eroticism and provocative address in Caravaggio's secular art, favoring a somewhat sterile analysis of symbols and

allegorical allusions and neglecting to consider that internal Catholic dissent was not necessarily synonymous with Protestant leanings.[55]

More perceptively, Michele Nicolaci limits the appeal of Caravaggio's "naturalistic" style in religious imagery to the "more progressive and reform-oriented fringes of the church,"[56] perhaps in tacit agreement with Walter Friedlaender's thesis about Caravaggio's fascination with the Oratorian theology of Saint Filippo Neri (1515–95).[57] By contrast, Ferdinando Bologna sees Caravaggio as a painter whose ambition was to "reverse all hitherto accepted values" on the level of genre, iconographic elaboration, and style.[58] In his eyes, the naturalistic, "empirical" style of Caravaggio relates to the anti-authoritarian, egalitarian methods of the new sciences, inspired by Giordano Bruno's, Tommaso Campanella's, and Galileo Galilei's stress on the close observation of nature.[59] Bologna details how many of Caravaggio's religious paintings purposefully transgress Gabriele Paleotti's rules about the orthodox representation of sacred subject matter, such as the prohibition on integrating novelties and "superfluous" details and the observance of decorum.[60] He concludes that Caravaggio's religious iconographies, although by no means heretical, "do not conform under any point of view to the theoretical and disciplinary orthodoxy of Tridentine Catholicism."[61] Valeska von Rosen agrees with Bologna's view of Caravaggio as a dissenter, adding that the artist's play with ambiguities, paradox, and irritation subverts the Tridentine reformers' demand for clarity and objectivity in religious art.[62] Mieke Bal, finally, analyzes Caravaggio's painting of *Saint John the Baptist in the Wilderness* as an expression of heterodox thought and sacred eroticism, as an affirmation of subversive creativity in the face of the church's absolutist claims to power, rejecting Bert Treffer's view of Caravaggio's art as conforming to post-Tridentine demands.[63]

I agree with the more subversive readings of Caravaggio's art but would like to add that his religious paintings draw particular attention to the need for observation. Instead of arousing empathy with Christ's or a saint's sentiments and pains of martyrdom, or stimulating the spectator's hyperdulia for the Virgin Mary, they not only are the product of the artist's careful imitation of "nature," i.e., the close observation of his models and seemingly insignificant details such as ripped sleeves and dirty feet, but also often portray bystanders of an eschatologically important act in the very process of observing it. As such, they invite the beholder to witness the witnessing that takes place in front of his or her eyes in a process of reflective doubling or distancing that Niklas Luhmann has called "second-order observation." If we approach early modern religious art as a "system of communication" à la Luhmann, we see that in many of Caravaggio's religious iconographies, accidental onlookers are involved in making the initial and, for the system, foundational distinction of categorizing the events they see as "sacred" or "not sacred," which Luhmann would call a first-order observation.[64]



Figure 2.16: Caravaggio, The Calling of Saint Matthew, 1599–1600

Caravaggio emphasizes that this distinction is difficult to make, as in *The Calling of Saint Matthew,* for example, where, despite the stress on finger-pointing, the apostle's appellation remains ambiguous (Figure 2.16).[65] His *Incredulity of Saint Thomas* dramatizes the very doubt about what the apostles are seeing – is it or is it not the risen Christ? – without reassuring the viewer about his or her own power of observation; after all, the beholder cannot touch the wound, as Thomas does.[66] In his *Martyrdom of Saint Matthew,* every single person in the painting makes eye contact with the saint about to be martyred, including the angel who comes to his rescue, but whether they all agree on the sacred nature of the event is debatable.[67] By contrast, the two elderly pilgrims in the *Madonna of Loreto* seem clear about their object of hyperdulia, while the beholder is distracted by the Virgin Mary's coquettish posture, low neckline, and classic beauty, in addition to the pilgrims' famous dirty feet (Figure 2.17). A very busy scene of cross-observations is depicted in the *Madonna del Rosario,* in which the Virgin Mary looks at Saint Dominic, Saint Dominic at Christ, Christ and the donor at the beholder, the kneeling worshippers at Saint




Figure 2.17: Caravaggio, The Madonna of Loreto, 1604–06

Dominic, Saint Peter Martyr at another monk standing in front of him, the latter one at the Madonna and her child, and a fourth monk at Saint Dominic.[68] If the protagonists' first-order observation is supposed to authenticate the sacred nature of the event they are witnessing – the Madonna's gift of the rosary to Saint Dominic – utter confusion reigns in this picture, and the mira-

cle remains ambiguous. In his altarpiece *Death of the Virgin,* rejected because of the Madonna's resemblance to a drowned prostitute believed to have been Caravaggio's lover, three of the closest bystanders conspicuously bury their eyes in their hands – whether out of sorrow, desperation, or disbelief is hard to tell.[69] Only two bearded men actually look at the cadaver, while a third man facing the viewer seems immersed deep in thought, and additional groups of witnesses are busy chatting. In Luhmannian terms, the task of the second-order observer – in this case, the artist and his audience – consists of monitoring the choices made by the protagonists engaged in first-order observations, who, as already mentioned, are charged with distinguishing between who and what belongs to the system (sacred) or the environment (not sacred). The proliferation of such distinctions expands the autopoetic, or self-reproducing, system, which aims to colonize ever growing parts of the secular environment for its communication of the "sacred." This observation is useful in describing the purpose of Caravaggio's programmatic integration of indecorous details from secular life, but what is important for our purposes is his insistence on representing the difficulties not only of monitoring those distinctions but also of making them in the first place.[70] Caravaggio emphasizes the need for close observation but problematizes the search for religious truth in visibility. Rather than making paintings fit for worship, as some art historians claim,[71] Caravaggio encourages skepticism, doubt, and scrutiny in his audience.[72]

A similar effect is produced by the *Seven Works of Mercy,* in which the relationship between observers and performers of holy deeds is reversed, for it is the Madonna and child surrounded by two angels who authenticate the "sacred" nature of the charitable acts performed below. By no stretch of the imagination does the altarpiece "present an iconic image at its center ... one worthy of veneration," as demanded by Tridentine image theory.[73] Furthermore, the comparison of Cimon's features with those of Saint Peter's in Caravaggio's *Crucifixion* (Figure 2.2) produces a startling political subtext. If, as I find likely, the portrayal of Cimon as Saint Peter's look-alike was intended, the heroic impact of the apostle's martyrdom is somewhat diminished by his identification with a guilty old patriarch who is at the mercy of his daughter's breast. Other depictions of the first of the apostles are similarly inflected by reference to *Roman Charity*. Like Cimon, who achieves his unexpected release from prison through his daughter's courageous, and utterly gratuitous, sacrifice, Saint Peter is liberated by an angel, as mentioned in Acts 12:3–19. In Caracciolo's painting of the event, the companion piece to Caravaggio's Neapolitan altarpiece, a beautiful adult angel leads Saint Peter out of prison, as if completing what his colleague from the *Seven Works of Mercy* aims at with his precipitous fall to earth. The sleeping guards make reference to Caravaggio's crouching beggar with his beautiful muscular back and to the helmeted soldier in the *Denial of Saint Peter,* respectively. These quotations seem to

establish a faux causality between Peter's stay in prison, the question of guilt, and his liberation, perhaps alluding to the fact that in both prior works by Caravaggio, contrition and repentance are conspicuously absent. Caracciolo's painting seems to confirm that, like Cimon, Saint Peter is released from prison through no effort of his own. The sticky question of guilt and repentance is never broached.

Pero's resemblance to the maid in Caravaggio's *Denial* complicates the web of interconnections even further, establishing her as a figure of righteousness as well as charitable grace. If the nursing father really does represent the papacy as fallible, guilty, and in need of rehabilitation and reform, Pero's identity needs to be clarified in tandem. On the one hand, she can be seen as a Madonna-like figure, calling for divine intervention as a last resort in a moment of crisis; on the other hand, she looks like a "real" working-class woman and, as such, is re-allegorized to contain wider associations with the people and city of Rome.[74] As the anonymous compiler of an advice book for the nephew and cardinal of Pope Urban VIII, Francesco Barberini (1597–1679), proclaimed: "if one comes to Rome, one comes to the Mother, to the place where virtuous men are nurtured," as if the saying were a commonplace.[75] Furthermore, Pero's title *Roman Charity* originates most likely with Caravaggio's altarpiece in Naples. Paintings of Pero and Cimon were very common in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Neapolitan collections (11 copies), where inventories refer to them without fail as *Roman Charity*.[76] By contrast, most other early modern references identify the paintings by spelling out the iconography's literal signifier, i.e., the breastfeeding scene between a young woman and an old man in prison.[77] In other words: Neapolitan viewers and collectors identified the story as quintessentially "Roman," despite the fact that Maximus orientalized it as a Greek, i.e., "external" example.[78] The reason for this deliberate misnomer might lie in contemporaries' view of Pero's filial piety as Catholic charity and in their comparison of Cimon's pitiful state with the papacy's dire need of reform and rejuvenation.

A digression on Pero's headdress, seen in the context of a somewhat complicated chain of associations, might support the view of her as a specifically "Roman" allegory. This web of signifiers takes as its point of departure Stefano Maderno's statue of Saint Cecilia (1600), passes through Guido Reni's self-portrait as a Raphaelesque young woman in his *St. Benedict Presented with Gifts by Farmers* (1604), and ends with the eighteenth-century identification of a young woman as Beatrice Cenci in a painting attributed to Guido Reni. In all three instances, the young women wear turbans. Maderno's beautiful statue of Saint Cecilia, a third-century martyr, was completed right after Cardinal Sfrondato miraculously discovered her intact body under the altar of an ancient church dedicated to her in Trastevere on October 20, 1599. Her corpse was said to have worn a turban, which Maderno dutifully



Figure 2.18: Stefano Maderno, Saint Cecilia, 1600

represents (Figure 2.18).[79] The discovery of Saint Cecilia's body happened right after the execution of Beatrice Cenci, daughter of a Roman aristocrat, on September 11 of the same year, which had moved the people of Rome to great pity. Beatrice, alongside her older brother and stepmother, was convicted of parricide, after having been held hostage by her father in a remote castle for several years. Because Francesco Cenci was known for his violence and sexual abuse, the defendants and their many supporters expected the pope to pardon his son, daughter, and young wife, but in vain.[80] Like Saint Cecilia 1200 years before her, Beatrice Cenci was decapitated in a public spectacle that many artists, including Caravaggio and possibly Artemisia Gentileschi, may have witnessed. According to several art historians, this experience may have influenced their respective renderings of "Judith and the Head of Holofernes."[81]

Contemporaries commemorated Beatrice as a martyr, dedicating a mass for the dead in her honor sung to this day on the anniversary of her execution.[82] Guido Reni arrived in Rome only in 1601, i.e., too late to have seen her die; nonetheless, it was assumed that he represented Beatrice Cenci in a portrait of a turbaned young woman in the act of casting him a last glance (Figure 2.19).[83] Reni might not have authored this painting, nor does it necessarily represent Beatrice, but that Reni had a deep interest in images of beautiful, innocent, and vulnerable young women with a turban is a fact. As he confided to his biographer Carlo Cesare Malvasia (1616–93), he chose to represent himself as



Figure 2.19: Guido Reni, Assumed Portrait of Beatrice Cenci, 17th c.

a turbaned woman in a painting of Saint Benedict from 1604, probably in reference to the momentous discovery of Saint Cecilia's relics and the completion of her statue. As a result, contemporaries referred to Reni's self-portrait as *La Turbantina*.[84] In 1606, he portrayed Saint Cecilia wearing a scarf draped in complicated folds around her head.[85] Reni's idiosyncratic self-presentation as a virginal saint and the eighteenth-century "discovery" of his alleged portrait of a turbaned Beatrice Cenci suggest that at some point, the parricidal daughter and third-century martyr merged in the imagination of contemporaries.

Caravaggio used the public image of a turbaned Saint Cecilia, which contains references to the merciless execution of Beatrice Cenci, to endow his breastfeeding daughter with an allegorical identity signifying the innocence, courage, and sacrificial energy of the city of Rome and its inhabitants.[86] Her decidedly working-class, thus "urban," appearance suggests such allegorical enhancement, in particular because the symbolic identification of cities with female virtues was a ubiquitous phenomenon in medieval and early modern Europe.[87] The cult status of Beatrice Cenci and Saint Cecilia in the city of Rome reinforces the assumption of such allegorical connections, and might have served to articulate Caravaggio's political message with greater clarity. Caravaggio's portrayal of Pero and Cimon at the heart of the *Seven Works of Mercy*

expresses his contempt for the Roman papacy, which, guilty and condemned to die, is shown to parasitically consume the vital body fluids of his dutiful daughter, the people of Rome. Beatrice's and Saint Cecilia's blood and Pero's milk blend to form one combined image of female sacrifice, innocence, generosity, and mercy symbolically overcoming the injustice of clerical – and patriarchal – rule. The fact that also the denunciatory maid in Caravaggio's *Denial* wears a turban establishes a further link between representations of Saint Peter and *Roman Charity* and adds truthfulness and courage to the list of virtues she embodies. In several *Roman Charities* produced by leading Caravaggisti, Pero's turban would go on to have a complex and vivid afterlife.

A further measure of Pero's quasi-religious enhancement, and of Cimon's and Saint Peter's merging identities, consists of three paintings of *Saint Agatha Healed/Liberated/Visited by Saint Peter:* one by Giovanni Lanfranco (1614), another one formerly believed to be authored by Guido Reni, and a third one attributed to a follower of Simon Vouet.[88] Saint Agatha, whose martyrdom included the amputation of her breasts, was according to legend healed by an apparition of Saint Peter. She is usually represented in the act of offering her breasts on a platter, but Lanfranco shows her languishing in prison, in the company of Saint Peter and an angel who are in the process of mending her wound by touch (Figure 2.20).[89] Bright light enters through a barred window on the right, which illuminates Saint Agatha's boyish, still bleeding, chest;



Figure 2.20: Giovanni Lanfranco, Saint Agatha Healed by Saint Peter, 1614



Figure 2.21: Follower of Simon Vouet, Saint Agatha Healed by Saint Peter, 17th c.



Figure 2.22: Follower of Guido Reni, Saint Agatha Visited by Saint Peter in Prison, 17th c.



Figure 2.23: Vincenzo Camuccini, Anti-Roman Charity, 1797

a prison guard watches the miracle through the prison window as if it were Maximus's scene of filial piety. Saint Peter is about to touch the wound, recalling Saint Thomas in his incredulity. The follower of Simon Vouet echoes this composition but depicts the assembly of saints and angels a moment later, after Saint Agatha's breasts have been restored. References to the motif of Roman Charity consist of Saint Peter's Cimon-like features and Saint Agatha's chains (Figure 2.21). Jacopo Vignali concentrates on the moment of healing, with Saint Peter touching the young woman's bleeding chest. The painting from Geneva, associated with the school of Guido Reni, contains, quite literally, a reverse image of *Roman Charity* (Figure 2.22).[90] It shows a young woman, imprisoned and in chains, with her breasts, visible through the low neckline of her dress, restored as the result of Saint Peter's intervention. In both cases, the features of Saint Peter correspond to the prototype analyzed above and to those of Cimon in Caravaggio's and his followers' representations of *Roman Charity*.

In addition to associations between Pero and Saint Agatha and between Cimon and Saint Peter, other, less convincing, cross-identifications have been made. In a recent article, Arabella Cifani and France Monetti mistakenly "correct" the identification of a drawing by Vincenzo Camuccini from 1797 (Figure 2.23). While the collector Damiano Pernati called it *Roman Charity,* Cifani and Monetti refer to it as *Salomè Visiting Saint John the Baptist in Prison*. The drawing is unusual in that it depicts a young male prisoner with his right

nipple erect and in full view and a young woman who squeezes her head in between the bars of a prison window as if wanting to suckle from his breast. In my view, the drawing expresses yet another play with reversals of the theme of Roman Charity, rather than depicting Salome about to nurse from Saint John's breast, unless we assume that the mapping of Pero's and Cimon's identities onto Saint John and Salomè, respectively, was meaningful to the artist and his viewers. Cifani's and Monetti's iconographic "error" is nonetheless interesting because it shows the fluidity of associations the imagery produces, and its creative use in making cross-references between different prison stories.[91]

Any allegorical reading of Caravaggio's *Seven Works of Mercy* ought to be accompanied by a more literal reading of the subject matter, given the "realist" effects of his religious art and the debate on Caravaggio's conformity to contemporary trends in Catholic devotion. Aside from the – by now well-established – circumstances of the altarpiece's commission by a lay confraternity, the painting seems to respond to certain trends in contemporary religious culture. As a reflection of anti-clerical devotional practices, a certain "progressive" intention emerges, which matches and confirms the results of its visual and allegorical interpretation. The confraternity of Pio Monte della Misericordia, who commissioned the altarpiece, was devoted to tending the sick, assisting prisoners, burying the dead, redeeming Christian slaves, providing for the "shame-faced poor," i.e., impoverished elite members of society, and helping pilgrims.[92] The care and burial of prisoners was among its most important – and perhaps most useful – tasks, given the high mortality rates in Neapolitan prisons reported in 1622.[93] While Caravaggio's altarpiece depicts the biblical acts of mercy rather than the confraternity's actual performance of poor relief, it does pay special attention to the care of prisoners by depicting Pero's act of breastfeeding and the burial of an inmate.

Conspicuously absent from the Misericordia's activities is the distribution of charitable dowries to poor but deserving girls, the most popular form of social welfare in early modern Italy. As I have tried to show in an article on Tintoretto's decoration of the Scuola Grande di San Rocco in Venice, the selection and endowment of working-class brides by charitable institutions had the purpose of promoting legal marriage and patriarchal kinship structures rather than helping women in need.[94] Female poverty was, to a large extent, caused by unwanted pregnancies and the abandonment of pregnant women, which the transfer of a nominal dowry to a young girl's husband chosen by the confraternity could not prevent or alleviate. In Tintoretto's religious art, reproductive themes are so prevalent as to suggest his critical stance vis-à-vis an institutional policy that excluded those single women with infants as welfare recipients, who, as allegories of Charity, promote the concept of charitable giving itself. Unlike Tintoretto, Caravaggio was not in the difficult position of having to work for a confraternity whose politics he may have disagreed with;

nonetheless, his proposal to view pagan Pero as Catholic Charity may have had the intention of criticizing the ideological construction of this highest form of Christian virtue in the context of gendered forms of giving that left women empty-handed.

The dialectic between the exclusion of needy persons from the list of welfare recipients and their very much sought after representation in religious art has recently attracted the attention of art historians. Pamela Jones, for example, discusses Caravaggio's portrayal of the pilgrims' dirty feet in his *Madonna of Loreto* at Sant' Agostino in the context of a policy that banned beggars and "vagabonds" from the churches of Rome rather than assisting them.[95] According to a survey of 1625 on the "disturbances" of pilgrims during service, many churchgoers complained about "false" and unworthy beggars, which is why the Augustinian church of Santa Maria del Popolo stopped distributing alms in public.[96] Jones nonetheless concludes that the monks who commissioned and accepted Caravaggio's *Madonna of Loreto* (1604–06) must have continued to assist the vagabond poor, since they appreciated Caravaggio's lifelike representation of the pilgrims' dirty feet (Figure 2.17).[97] Without producing hard data of the monks' almsgiving practices at Sant'Agostino, however, this claim is hard to ascertain. By contrast, Todd Olson has recently argued that the popularity of low-life genre scenes such as Caravaggio's *Fortune Teller* (1596) was predicated upon the actual removal of gypsies from the streets of Rome. By no stretch of the imagination did the "zingara's" domestication for elite consumption "erase[d] her roots in actual social abjection."[98] Similarly, the fashion for Caravaggio's lifelike depiction of the poor among secular and clerical elite circles did not necessarily translate into greater sympathy for actual beggars.[99]

The monks' easy acceptance of Caravaggio's altarpiece *The Madonna of Loreto,* which Tridentine hardliners would have found objectionable because of its indecorous details, can be explained by reference to the contemporary debate surrounding the foundation of a reformed branch within the Augustinian order. This new branch, originating in Spain, had as its outward defining feature the monks' unshod feet, which signaled their devotion to a more austere lifestyle. In 1599 and 1604, Pope Clement VIII sanctioned the authority of the "discalced" vicar-general, not without provoking heavy protests within the unreformed quarters of the order.[100] The church of Sant'Agostino that commissioned Caravaggio's altarpiece was the hub of the "conventual" Augustinians who resisted the reform.[101] Caravaggio's depiction of the pilgrims' naked feet probably confirmed their opinion about who should and should not walk around barefoot, leaving the meaning of dirty soles as a symbol of social abjection intact. Thus the altarpiece did not necessarily conflict, conform, or in any way resonate with the Augustinians' alms-giving practices but expressed the conservative branch's wish for clean feet and shoes and for the maintenance

of strict boundaries between privileged givers of charitable contributions and the misery of their receivers.

Dirty feet were especially relevant as markers of humility because of Christ's washing of his apostles' feet the night before his arrest (John 13:1–17). In late sixteenth-century Rome, pauperist members of the elite competed for participation in the ritual staging of this event, as did Venetian patricians earlier in the century.[102] Pamela Jones has shown how Cardinal Carlo Borromeo (1538–84) revived the rite in Milan and later Rome, periodically inviting select beggars for the public display of washing their feet and feeding them.[103] Traditionally, bishops and secular elites washed the feet of thirteen beggars and thirteen canons each as part of their Maundy Tuesday celebrations at the Lateran Palace.[104] These and other performances of humility belonged to elite practices of charitable giving that did not necessarily alleviate the fate of the poor who crowded into early modern cities, but they served to anchor the elite's claims to power. Poverty itself was not to be abolished, since it was the raison-d'être for the kind of giving that promised grace and redemption to middle- and upper class practitioners of pious donations.[105] The discalced Augustinians' decision to imitate the involuntary poor by walking around barefoot – actually in sandals – thus threatened to confuse the boundaries between privileged washers of the dirty feet of others and the latters' abject situation in life.

While Caravaggio's art could not evade the dialectics of exclusion that governed the elite's fashion for his lifelike representations of the poor, he does endow the marginal with a rare, perhaps unprecedented, dignity and reality effect. In this sense, the pilgrims' dirty feet are meaningful, because they broaden the range of what could be included in representations of the "sacred." In Helen Langdon's words: "Caravaggio, like Filippo Neri … [pushes] the world of the poor before an elite audience … using a language that seems rough and vernacular … Yet his figures are also grand, and his massive, sculptural style conveys the power of a primitive, heroic era."[106] In the *Seven Works of Mercy,* however, the emphasis is less on the lifelike depiction of beggars than on the de-allegorization of figures of poverty. The lame recipient of Saint Martin's cloak and breastfeeding Pero recall the repoussoir figures that populate Tintoretto's religious paintings as embodiments of Charity and narrative witnesses to biblical events.[107] In Caravaggio's altarpiece, beggar and Charity have become full-fledged participants, even protagonists, of the events themselves; there is no other central person or activity their foregrounding brings into focus. At the same time, they cannot avoid being re-allegorized as embodiments of noble poverty and Roman Charity, respectively. The somewhat "unrealistic" beauty with which they are depicted – note the beggar's perfect muscular back and buttocks as well as Pero's stylishly elongated legs and posture – marks them as classically enhanced, thus dignified. The mysterious light that illuminates

them underscores their compositional importance as counterpoints to the divine group floating above. As such, Pero and the beggar are endowed with a symbolic significance that exceeds their role as literal representations of the Neapolitan underclass.[108]

The extent to which the details of Caravaggio's politico-religious message were appreciated and repeated by his followers varied. While the many renderings of his *Denial of Saint Peter* suggest that a critical view of the pope's predecessor became quite popular, the reconceptualization of Roman Charity as a gallery picture softened its political impact. All paintings of *Pero and Cimon* subsequent to Caravaggio's death removed the couple from the Catholic framework the artist had invented for them and re-established the topic as a historicizing genre scene. This enabled staunch promoters of Tridentine Catholicism such as Peter Paul Rubens and Guido Reni, who only briefly toyed with Caravaggismo and avoided the theme of *Denial,* to produce quite a few *Roman Charities* of their own. By contrast, artists who painted both topics can be suspected of sympathizing with Caravaggio's expressions of dissent, especially if they continued the master's game of casting Cimon as Saint Peter and Pero as a turbaned lady.

Up until now, *Roman Charity* has been systematically overlooked as a subject matter favored by many Caravaggisti, despite the frequency with which painters all over Europe started to depict it after 1610. Already two decades ago, Anna Tuck-Scala deplored this neglect, but no art historian has followed her suggestion of investigating the phenomenon in greater depth.[109] Given the explosion of books on Caravaggio and Caravaggismo and the proliferation of accompanying exhibitions since then, this omission is all the more surprising. It can only be explained by a variety of mutually reinforcing factors: many *Roman Charities* have not been securely attributed; they are hidden in private collections or museum depositories, presumably in a poor state of preservation; their subject matter does not conform to the genre scenes or religious paintings that most Caravaggisti are known for today; and the topic itself continues to generate embarrassed bafflement rather than genuine interest. All of these factors combined have the effect of decreasing the valuation of *Roman Charities* on the art market, which in turn perpetuates their scholarly neglect. As Natasha Seaman has remarked recently, academic attention and collectors' prices often go in tandem.[110]

Nonetheless, it emerges that Manfredi's *Roman Charity* from 1610–14, last seen on the Milanese art market in 1963, established the blue print for his famous "methodus" that allegedly launched Caravaggismo as a Europe-wide phenomenon (Figure 2.24).[111] Joachim von Sandrart is usually credited for having recognized this "Manfredian method" in his *Academy of the Arts of Architecture, Sculpture, and Painting* (1675) by describing the essentials of his art as follows:



Figure 2.24: Bartolomeo Manfredi, Roman Charity, 1610–14

"A Mantovan named Bartholomeo Manfredi diligently followed the good manner of Caravaggio, so that little difference [between their works] can be detected. He imitated life with great truthfulness and painted for the most part half-length figures true to life, and elaborated on his conversations, gambling-and tavern scenes, soldiers and other such perfect works."[112]

While Sandrart does not mention Caravaggio's religious paintings as significant for his approach, Nicole Hartje points out that Manfredi's treatment of Caravaggio's *Seven Works of Mercy* establishes a decisive feature of his method – namely, to isolate groups of figures from Caravaggio's more complex compositions into smaller-scale gallery paintings.[113]

In fact, Manfredi's early *Roman Charity* (1610–14) recalls the posture of Pero and Cimon in the Neapolitan altarpiece, with Pero standing to the left, slightly bent, one of her knees articulated to suggest a stylish pose underneath her garments. Caravaggio's Pero observes, with a startled expression, the activities taking place in front of the prison, but Manfredi's Pero stares intently out of the left picture frame, perhaps in response to some noise she just heard. Of Cimon, we see a lot more than in Caravaggio's picture, which reduces him to a disembodied head. Manfredi's father is half-naked except for a garment loosely

draped around his shoulder; his hands are in chains; he suckles discreetly, as his mouth is overshadowed, staring intently in the same direction as his daughter. Pero's left hand rests tenderly on his shoulder, a gesture made possible through the lack of bars separating the two. The couple is in an undefined, dark interior space into which light falls from the left, probably through a window behind which guards are approaching. Manfredi's painting is not overly eroticized; its chief aim seems to have been to isolate a "moment" à la Caravaggio, catching the protagonists "absorbed," as it were, in their fear of discovery, while being oblivious to the artist and its beholders.[114]



Figure 2.25: Bartolomeo Manfredi, Roman Charity, 1615–17

While this painting was completed shortly after Manfredi's return from Naples, a second version was produced in 1615–17 (Figure 2.25).[115] This latter version seems to be more refined and finished, but also less dramatic and "in the moment." Pero gazes vaguely, somewhat pitifully, but also gratuitously out of the picture plane into complete darkness, without indicating what might have aroused her attention. She is situated to the right, her bosom and face illuminated by an invisible light source placed to the left. Cimon again suckles discreetly, his face in the dark, overshadowing Pero's breast. He is seated, wrapped in a brown cloak, holding both hands in chains in front of his body. While we cannot identify his facial features, his bushy white beard and barely visible frown place him squarely in the vicinity of the prototype developed for representations of Saint Peter. On occasion, other biblical figures such as Saint Jerome also correspond to this prototype – as in, for example, Caravaggio's paintings *Saint Jerome Writing* (1605–06) and *Saint Jerome in Meditation* (1605) – but whenever Saint Peter is represented in the vicinity of other characters, his features are guaranteed to conform to this type. Variations do occur, of course, mostly with respect to the color and volume of Saint Peter's hair. In Caravaggio's *Denial*, for example, Saint Peter seems entirely bald, and his beard is neither bushy nor grey, but his deep and accentuated frown helps to identify him immediately. While the *Denial* seems to be the perfect picture for his frown, the gesture seems somewhat misplaced in Caravaggio's *Crucifixion,* where the saint wrinkles his forehead as if surprised and irritated at the martyrdom performed on him (Figure 2.2). He does have a bushy white beard and receding hairline, however, just as Cimon in the *Seven Works of Mercy*. This is the type Manfredi quotes in his second *Roman Charity,* even though Manfredi's father has more beautiful and abundant hair than Caravaggio's: it is silver, shiny, and curlier. Manfredi's Cimon recurs again in his *Denial of Saint Peter,* painted roughly at the same time (1615–16), where we detect his aquiline nose, frowning forehead, receding hairline, grey curly hair at his temples, and a bushy beard (Figure 2.14). The Cimon figure from his prior *Roman Charity* vaguely conforms to the prototype as well, but given the poor quality of the old reproduction, details are hard to make out.

At about the same time as Manfredi practiced his "methodus" by turning Caravaggio's Pero and Cimon into a gallery painting, Abraham Bloemaert from Utrecht (1566–1651), who never traveled to Italy, became interested in the topic as well. After producing a series of drawings in which he experimented with different postures, Bloemaert completed an oil painting of the scene in 1610, which he copied in grisaille (Figure 2.26).[116] This painting does not bear any traces of Caravaggismo except for the stark contrast between the couple's spotlighted body parts and the dark prison interior. However, the shaded background is architecturally defined with bricks, arches, and a barred window, thus not entirely corresponding to Caravaggio's undefined black



Figure 2.26: Abraham Bloemaert, Roman Charity, 1610

surroundings.[117] Pero's posture seems affected in its Mannerist elegance, an impression that the wonderfully complicated and unnecessarily abundant folds of her silken skirt magnify. Cimon's elongated right arm occupies the left foreground in a similarly unrealistic arrangement. The figures' nude upper bodies, and Cimon's gesture of grabbing his daughter's skirt, give the painting a decidedly erotic flavor, even though Pero's sweet devotion is at the center of attention. The painting is quite original in its composition, compared with prior renderings of the topic by Northern European and Italian artists.



Figure 2.27: Peter Paul Rubens, Roman Charity, 1610–12

Were it not for its Mannerist style, it would be most tempting to see it as early evidence of Caravaggio's influence on Bloemaert. Bloemaert was the teacher of Hendrick ter Brugghen and Gerrit van Honthorst, who, like Dirck van Baburen, went to Italy in the second decade of the seventeenth century to learn about – in Karel van Mander's words – the "wonderful things" of Caravaggio.[118] Upon their return to Holland in 1615–20, these three painters formed the artistic elite of Utrecht. According to Albert Blankert, Gerrit van Honthorst taught his former master to paint in Caravaggio's manner, as evidenced by Bloemaert's *Flute Player* of 1621.[119] Nonetheless, Axel Hémery calls Bloemaert the spiritual father and mediator of Caravaggismo in Utrecht.[120] Bloemaert's gallery painting of *Roman Charity,* completed in the year Caravaggio died and ter Brugghen left for Italy (1610), can be viewed as a transitional piece that inaugurated the craze for the topic in Utrecht, even though stylistically it remains stuck in a former era.

Another early example of a *Roman Charity* painted in the wake of Caravaggio's death is Rubens's Hermitage version (Figure 2.27).[121] Dated to 1610–12, it highlights the nude and aging body of Cimon in his sufferance, while Pero is shown properly clothed in a red dress and white blouse. Her blond curly hair is neatly braided and partially covered by a scarf; her left breast and nipple are clearly visible and highlighted through the V-hold with which she feeds her

father. This painting reminds of Caravaggio's preference for strong chiaroscuro effects and ochre coloring; it is full of realist details such as the straw Cimon sits on, the chain that reflects the light and throws a shadow, and the spider webs collecting between the bars of the window. The scene is very intimate, tender, and quiet: Pero observes her father feed, resting her left hand on his naked shoulder, while Cimon concentrates on his suckling. The couple is oblivious to the beholder as well as any danger of interruption. Rather than depicting the moment of Pero's scare, the painting shows the couple's continuous absorption, offering the spectator time for prolonged and undisturbed voyeuristic pleasure. The scene is erotically enhanced through the father's naked body and erect nipples. If Bellori was said to have objected to Caravaggio's "perceived assault … on the integrity of the male heroic body" because of the many "vile things" he depicted, a similar, perhaps more provocative and encompassing attack on classicizing masculinity is launched by Rubens's representation of an aging and starving yet beautiful male body shown in abject dependence on his breastfeeding daughter.[122] As a figure of male vulnerability and objectification, Rubens's Cimon competes with, even precedes, his *Saint Sebastian* of 1614. As a figure of male regression and submission to women's maternal powers, Cimon predates Rubens's famous depiction of Mars resisting temptation through a lactating Venus in *Minerva Protects Pax from Mars* (1629–30) (Figure 3.16). If the latter painting shows how "Venus's desire is both infantilizing and castrating in its maternal and carnal aspects," *Roman Charity* casts a patriarchal figure quite literally in the role of a baby.[123] Cimon's genitals are covered by a black cloak, but we have no reason to suspect they are missing. His body is marked as fully masculine through his sinewy muscles and full beard, despite the fact that he is engaged in the most infantile of all activities. As such, he resembles Rubens's Hercules in *Hercules and Omphale* (1606), who was temporarily "emasculated" by fulfilling the tasks of women but retained his heroic male appearance. Both Hercules and Cimon thus appear in stark contrast to Rubens's various representations of *Drunken Silenus* (1616–17), whose Bacchanalian revelries in the vicinity of breastfeeding satyrs made him assume the flesh of an aging female (Figure 2.28).[124]

Rubens and his followers went on to paint at least three further copies of *Roman Charity,* which shows how deeply he was attracted to representing male figures involved in, threatened by, or juxtaposed to performances of maternity. All subsequent versions attributed to Rubens have the same focus: the muscular yet haggard nude body of the starving father.[125] His *Roman Charity* from Amsterdam (1630) gives a slightly altered version of the scene, with two prison guards peeking in through the window to the right and Pero's head bending backwards in response to some noise she might have heard behind her (Figure 1.6). Cimon conforms to the prototype of Saint Peter with his full grey beard, receding hairline, and a frown; he sits on a stone bench, bent over to



Figure 2.28: Peter Paul Rubens, The Drunken Silenus, 1616–17

reach the beautiful white bosom of his daughter. Again, he is fully naked except for a piece of white cloth and a green blanket loosely draped around his genitals and upper legs. The many folds of his aging flesh and the ochre color of his skin contrast nicely with Pero's rosy cheeks and perky white breasts, both of which push out of her open blouse and the low neckline of a bright red gown. This painting is less intimate than the Hermitage version, even slightly pornographic, exposing Pero's breasts to full frontal view. In addition, the guards' voyeurism reflects and doubles that of the spectator in a somewhat preoccupying manner. Followers of Rubens copied this painting, not without introducing the novelty of a baby sleeping at the feet of the couple.[126] In both versions, the chiaroscuro is less pronounced, and Pero's breasts are modestly covered, but Cimon's wrinkled, ochre-colored body is rendered most accurately. This proves that contemporaries appreciated Rubens's *Roman Charities* primarily for his depictions of a nude old man. A similar version, last seen on the London art market in 1954 and dated to 1625, is also attributed to Rubens (Figure 2.29). Its

composition resembles the Amsterdam version from 1630, with Cimon sitting left and Pero standing to the right, but the daughter's bland facial expression and her covered bosom render it less eye-catching. Also, the prison window and the guards are missing, which is why Pero's gesture of bending backwards and staring out of the picture plane seems somewhat unmotivated. All three versions that can be securely attributed to Rubens himself – dated 1610–12 (Hermitage), 1625 (London art market), and 1630 (Amsterdam) – have been disseminated in the form of prints.[127]

Whether there is a relationship between Caravaggio's depiction of Pero and Cimon in his *Seven Works of Mercy* and Rubens's early *Roman Charity* is hard to tell. Rubens would not have known of Manfredi's painting of the subject matter, because he returned to Flanders from Italy in 1608, but might have seen or heard of Bloemaert's copy. He did not travel to Naples but




Figure 2.29: Peter Paul Rubens, Roman Charity, 1625

went to Genoa in 1606, which is where he could have been just as inspired by Perino del Vaga's fresco as Caravaggio had been a year earlier. He also spent extended time periods in Mantua (1604–05), where he could have seen the relief designed by Giulio Romano.[128] In fact, Renzo Villa declares Rubens's Hermitage painting to be the Ur-model of all Baroque *Roman Charities,* denying any influence through Caravaggio whatsoever.[129] This seems unlikely, however, because of the fame of Caravaggio's altarpiece and the formal properties of Rubens's Hermitage painting. Its pronounced chiaroscuro, ochre toning, and "realist" details remind of Caravaggio's style, even if the stress on Cimon's body proves Rubens's own idiosyncratic approach to the theme. Of Perino del Vaga's fresco, no influence can be detected, nor of the stucco relief at Palazzo Tè.

Several scholars have remarked that Rubens was influenced by a variety of painters during his stay in Italy (1600–1608), including Caravaggio.[130] Sure sign of his appreciation for Caravaggio was Rubens's advice to the Duke of Mantua to buy his rejected *Death of the Virgin*.[131] Rubens's *Entombment* (1611) and *Judith with the Head of Holofernes* (1616) seem both indebted to Caravaggio.[132] Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani, famous collector and patron of the arts, classified Rubens as a full-fledged Caravaggista alongside Jusepe de Ribera, Gerrit van Honthorst, Hendrick ter Brugghen, and Dirck van Baburen.[133]

Given that no gallery painting of *Roman Charity* predates Caravaggio's death in 1610 – with the exception of the two Italian paintings of uncertain date and attribution mentioned above – the *Seven Works of Mercy* remains the only plausible reference point for a fad that would continue for another two centuries. Manfredi's, Bloemaert's, and Rubens's early versions of *Roman Charity* were completed just before or around the time that Caravaggismo became a full-fledged European-wide phenomenon. As Alessandro Zuccari points out, it was in 1612–13 that Jan Janssens, Simon Vouet, Valentin de Boulogne, Gerard Seghers, Battistello Caracciolo, and Jusepe de Ribera moved to Rome on purpose to study his art.[134]

But aside from these formal considerations, Rubens's repeated portrayal of a pathetic and naked old man condemned to suckle from his daughter's breast for survival – who on one occasion bears Saint Peter's features – was surely inspired by Caravaggio's subversive, anti-authoritarian attitude. While Caravaggio's art was more pointedly political in its attack on Counter-Reformation Rome, Rubens's intention might have been to explore philosophical questions deriving from his love for neo-stoicism.[135] As his teacher Justus Lipsius (1547–1606), himself a convert to Catholicism, would have taught him, rigid confessionalism was to be avoided in favor of a differentiated observation of political realities. Lipsius's book *Politica* was put on the index in 1590 because of its cautious defense of Machiavelli's concept of reason of state; it



Figure 2.30: Dirck van Baburen, Roman Charity, 1623

stands out because of its cento-format, consisting entirely of quotations from ancient authors.[136] Such "weak" rhetoric expresses, on the level of content, his rejection of facile certitudes and polarized opinions. Above all, it performs stoic self-restraint. In Rubens's art, Lipsius's disciplined thinking manifests itself through a high degree of self-reflection, leading to an acknowledgment of male weakness and vulnerability. In this latter sense, the motif of Roman Charity is of almost programmatic importance, as it highlights the undoing of a guilty patriarch and his salvific regression into dependence on his daughter.

In 1623, Dirck van Baburen (1595–1624), one of the three famous Utrecht Caravaggisti, painted a *Roman Charity* inspired by both Rubens's Hermitage version and Manfredi's early rendering (Figure 2.30).[137] The seated figure of Cimon, naked except for his loincloth, reminds of Rubens's muscular yet aging male nude, while Pero stares out of the picture plane in analogy to Manfredi's composition. Pero seems startled, indicating that it is the moment of discovery the artist caught on canvas; even Cimon looks to the left in anticipation of an imminent interruption. Entering from the left, bright light illuminates the father's body as well as the daughter's naked chest and shoulder, creating a strong chiaroscuro effect. Yellowish-brown and red hues prevail in homage




Figure 2.31: Dirck van Baburen, Roman Charity, 1622–24

to Caravaggio. Also, Pero wears a turban wrapped around her head that does not reveal a single strand of hair. Cimon has a dark grey beard and a shock of hair with no sign of beginning baldness, thus not resembling his frowning *Penitent Saint Peter* (1618–19),[138] which in turn quotes Caravaggio's *Crucifixion* (Figure 2.2). Rather, Cimon's features replicate those of Prometheus in Baburen's *Prometheus Chained by Vulcan* (1623), creating a narrative continuum of masculine vulnerability and suffering.[139]

At about the same time, Baburen completed another version of *Roman Charity* (1622–24), last seen at Sotheby's on December 16, 1999 (Figure 2.31). This is a rather unique composition, with Pero standing in front of her father, offering him her left breast, and Cimon kneeling, revealing his naked torso and tied hands from the back. In this painting, Cimon looks less muscular; his features, with frown, grey beard, and deeply receding hairline, do conform to the prototype of Saint Peter. Pero wears a turban and a precious gown that reveals her left bosom and shoulder. Her left arm seems elongated and misplaced. This time, the noise that upsets Pero comes from the right, even though the window seems located on the left, judging from how the light enters the picture



Figure 2.32: Jan Vermeer, A Lady at the Virginals, 1662–65



Figure 2.33: Hans Jordaens III, An Artist's Cabinet, 1630

plane. The couple's glowing white skin is offset nicely through the black, undefined background; as in the York version, Baburen emphasizes the moment of imminent discovery, in analogy to both Caravaggio's Neapolitan altarpiece and Manfredi's first version. Georg Weber has recently identified this painting as appearing, cropped, in Vermeer's *A Lady at the Virginals* (1662–65), recognizable through Cimon's tied hands on his back (Figure 2.32).[140] It enjoyed a further cameo appearance in Hans Jordaens III's (1630) depiction of a collector's gallery, where it is hung in the upper left corner of the cabinet's northern wall, flanked by a painting of Salome and the head of Saint John the Baptist (Figure 2.33).[141] This painting was copied by Cornelis de Baellieur in 1637. Unlike Vermeer, who had the painting in front of him, as it – or a copy of it – formed part of his mother-in-law's collection, Jordaens must have painted it from memory or hearsay.[142] Cimon's torso can be seen from the back, as in Baburen's original, but Pero recalls the breastfeeding daughter in Rubens's Amsterdam version of the theme, given her posture and ample red dress. Whether this is a mishap or a deliberate fusion of two famous *Roman Charities*, its prominent position in Jordaens's and Baellieur's paintings affirms that by 1630, *Roman Charity* was recognized as a quintessential gallery painting. Matched with a painting of *Salome*, its placement suggests that collectors continued to associate it with depictions of man-murdering "strong women."

Gerrit van Honthorst (1592–1656), another Utrecht Caravaggista known for his tavern and gambling scenes but also for his religious works such as the

Denial of Saint Peter and the *Incredulous Saint Thomas,* painted numerous versions of *Roman Charity* himself. In their catalog raisonné, Judson and Ekkart attribute six paintings under this title to him, his workshop, and his brother Willem, but they do not include a single reproduction.[143] The most beautiful of the three images I have been able to locate is his studio version from Münster (Figure 2.34). Honthorst, famous for developing Caravaggio's chiaroscuro style into naturalistic nighttime scenes illuminated by visible, artificial light sources, situates the scene in a pitch-dark dungeon illuminated by a lantern. The lantern throws light onto Pero's bosom, entirely revealed under a loose-fitting blouse, and Cimon's torso, which, slightly emaciated, reminds of Baburen's version seen at Sotheby's. Departing from Rubens's model, Honthorst and Baburen depict a more "lifelike," less classicizing and heroic, old man, whose skinny upper body shows signs of starvation. His hands tied to the back, he concentrates on suckling, while Pero is alert and slightly startled, looking out of the picture plane.

A similar version attributed to Gerrit van Honthorst and his workshop is preserved at the Alte Pinakothek, München.[144] This time, the scene is illuminated by Pero's candle. She is just about to offer her father the breast but seems to hesitate, staring out of the picture to the left. Cimon looks in the same



Figure 2.34: Gerrit van Honthorst, Roman Charity, before 1656



Figure 2.35: Paulus Moreelse, Roman Charity, 1633

direction; his left biceps and chains are clearly visible in a posture recalling Baburen's painting last seen at Sotheby's. As in the Münster version, he has a frown, receding hairline, and bushy beard, just like Saint Peter in Honthorst's many representations of the apostle's *Denial*. The Potsdam copy attributed to his brother Willem is of lesser artistic merit.[145] It shows a skinny, bald father, his hands chained to the wall; he is in a seated position, modestly suckling from a breast that is not clearly visible. Pero, fully clothed, looks startled to the right, where a prison guard is just about to burst through an opened door, making a hand gesture of arrest.

We have no extant *Roman Charity* by the third major Utrecht Caravaggista, Hendrick ter Brugghen (1588–1629), even though Andor Pigler and Benedict Nicolson attribute a copy to him, last seen in Amsterdam, 1687, as part of the Peronneau collection.[146] Given his proximity to Dirck van Baburen, with whom he may have shared a workshop, it is not unlikely that he should have produced a version.[147] Like Honthorst, he was trained by Abraham Bloemaert, whose 1610 painting he must have seen prior to his trip to Italy (1615–20). Other Dutch artists with a strong Utrecht connection also painted *Roman Charities:* for

example, Jan van Bronckhorst (1603–61), who frequented Honthorst's workshop; Matthias Stomer, who was born in Utrecht but died in Sicily (1600–52); Christiaen van Couwenbergh (1604–67), who spent two years in this town (1622–24); and Paulus Moreelse (1571–1638), Dirck van Baburen's teacher.[148] Bronckhorst's painting is lost, and Stomer's is of insecure attribution, but Moreelse's version (1633) is preserved in the National Gallery of Edinburgh (Figure 2.35). It is inspired by both Rubens's Hermitage version and Baburen's



Figure 2.36: Christiaen van Couwenbergh, Roman Charity, 1639

copy from Sotheby's, as it shows the father, half-naked with outstretched legs, analogous to Rubens's painting, his hands tied behind his back. The light falls onto his right biceps and shoulder, as in Baburen's version. Pero, dressed in a beautiful, blue and yellow, silk gown, offers him an engorged breast in lifelike fashion. As in Rubens's picture, her V-hold is clearly visible, making deep indentations on her white and shiny flesh. Cimon has not yet put her rosy nipple to his mouth, first wanting to make eye contact with his daughter; she, however, averts her eyes sweetly and modestly. Like Rubens, Moreelse depicts the couple without hurry or fear of interruption, quietly immersed in their activity. Christiaen van Couwenbergh's version from 1639 takes Rubens's display of the pitiful nude father to a new level, depicting Cimon frontally (Figure 2.36). He is entirely naked except for a tiny transparent loincloth, exposing his body to a bright light in an otherwise pitch-dark prison interior. His body is muscular but shows signs of aging such as folds around his belly and neck. He is utterly helpless, as both feet and hands are chained. Seated on a bench, he bends over to reach the breast of his daughter, who is cast in shadows except for her bosom and face. As in Rubens's and Moreelse's painting, nobody has yet disturbed the couple in their self-absorption.

Flemish artists other than Rubens also depicted the theme, such as Jan Janssens (ca. 1591–c.1646), who copied Dirck van Baburen's York version, and Gerard Seghers (1591–1651), who seems to have produced two, now no longer extant, paintings of the theme.[149] However, it does seem to have been the particular religious and political climate of Utrecht, a residually Catholic city within the Calvinist Dutch Republic, which made the motif of Roman Charity thrive rapidly, in conjunction with representations of the *Denial of Saint Peter*. Even Seghers, who in addition to his two potential *Roman Charities* painted ten (!) versions of the theme of *Denial,* seems to have followed Gerrit van Honthorst rather than the other way round.[150] Early seventeenth-century Utrecht, in which one-third of the population remained Catholic despite the victory of Calvinism in 1581, was a relatively tolerant microcosm on a continent ravaged by wars and confessional strive.[151] In the words of Natasha Seaman: "Utrecht seems to offer the Third Way … neither Calvinist, nor Tridentine Catholic, yet Christian, in the form of the unchurched, or a-confessional believer … Its relation to art use or production has not yet been considered."[152] Seaman goes on to show how ter Brugghen's religious paintings did not conform to Counter-Reformation image theory[153] but reflected a "yearning for unmediated, personal contact with the divine."[154] In my view, paintings such as the *Denial of Saint Peter* resonated less with the – shrinking – "unchurched" segments of the population than with dissenters in both Protestant and Catholic camps. Utrecht Catholics, many of whom sympathized with the heterodox theories of Luis de Molina (1535–1600) and Cornelius Jansen (1585–1638), might have appreciated the iconography's implicit critique of the Roman papacy and its emphasis on doubt, moral failure,

and predestination, while Calvinist spectators might have revised their rejection of images for the purpose of religious introspection.[155] It is definitely not a theme that the Catholic clergy of Utrecht would have commissioned for their hidden churches. Xander van Eck has shown how most Catholic paintings ordered for official display in Utrecht depict medieval Flemish and Dutch saints alongside scenes from the life of Christ and the Virgin Mary, i.e., images fit for worship and missionizing.[156] On occasion, Caravaggesque subject matters were also chosen, such as the *Calling of Saint Matthew* and the *Doubting Thomas,* but never the *Denial of Saint Peter.*[157] Rubens, who worked for the Catholic churches in Antwerp, did not paint the subject matter.

It is thus fairly certain that the many paintings of Saint Peter's *Denial* by Gerrit van Honthorst, Dirck van Baburen, and Hendrick ter Brugghen were sold to private collectors. The latter two artists, being Protestant, were not on the list of painters who worked for Utrecht's hidden churches, in contrast to Honthorst.[158] The *Denial of Saint Peter,* which often includes scenes of gambling soldiers, was of immense interest also because of its presentation of New Testamentary subject matter as a genre scene. *Roman Charity* had the opposite effect, in religiously enhancing and distorting a historical legend. Both iconographies are part of the same visual universe, in which the similarity of Cimon to Saint Peter's prototype establishes cross-references of signification.[159] In the context of early seventeenth-century Utrecht, the motif of Roman Charity acquired anti-papist connotations that reflect Caravaggio's anti-hierarchical, anti-clerical approach. In nearby Flanders, the more overt political connotations receded in favor of a view of patriarchal vulnerability and weakness.

Simon Vouet (ca. 1590–1649) presented a different take on the iconography, painting at least two versions of the topic during his stay in Rome between 1613 and 1627.[160] His version from Riazan became immediately famous, with copies being made in the form of oil paintings, prints, a ceramic platter, and watch faces (Figure 2.37).[161] He must have seen Manfredi's Uffizi rendering of the theme, as his painting produces the same mystically enhanced and quietly erotic impression (Figure 2.25). As in Manfredi's painting, the focus is exclusively on the breastfeeding couple, surrounded by darkness. While Manfredi shows Cimon's hands in chains, Vouet limits himself to depicting the father's head and left shoulder, tightly held in Pero's embrace. The painting is a close-up of Pero, whose ample bosom and entranced face present themselves to the voyeuristic pleasure of the spectator, who is near enough to be brushed by the abundant folds of her silken sleeve. Pero's eyes are ecstatically directed heavenwards, her head bent to the left, as if pulling away from the task at hand. Nonetheless, Cimon is engulfed by the heavy corporeal presence of his daughter. The symbiotic proximity of the two bodies produces a pronounced erotic effect, which is offset, or even enhanced, by Pero's mystic facial demeanor.



Figure 2.37: Simon Vouet, Roman Charity, 1613–27

A copy of this painting is preserved in Nantes.[162] Claude Mellan engraved it sometime between 1624 and 1636 in reverse (Figure 2.38). His print served as a model for Ippolito Rombaldotti's ceramic dish from mid-century, which situates the couple in a well-articulated prison interior, cancelling the beholder's impression of immediate proximity.[163] Toward the end of the century, Henry Arlaud used it for his watch face (1675–1700), not without endowing Pero with fashionably blond curls and an oblique view almost addressing the spectator.[164] At about the same time, Augustin Rummel, Jean-Pierre Huaud, and Amy Huaud produced a similar watch, which locates the couple inside a prison and gives Pero the features and hairdo of a



Figure 2.38: Claude Mellan, after Simon Vouet, Roman Charity, 1624–36

contemporary dame à la mode (Figure 2.39). This Pero stares directly at the beholder, undisturbed in her charitable task. What identifies Mellan's print as the unambiguous model for these two watch faces and the ceramic bowl is Pero's splayed hand with which she pulls Cimon's balding head toward her. While indicating the eagerness with which she puts him to her breast, this gesture also marks her as a "woman on top," who at any minute might press down on her father and make him disappear. A third watch by Jean-Pierre and Amy Huaud takes Rubens's Hermitage version as its model (Figure 2.40), probably in the form of an engraving by Cornelis van Caukercken.[165]




Figure 2.39: Augustin Rummel, Jean-Pierre Huaud, Amy Huaud, Roman Charity, 17th c.



Figure 2.40: Jean-Pierre Huaud, Amy Huaud, Roman Charity, after Rubens, Hermitage version, before 1723



Figure 2.41: Nicolas Régnier, Roman Charity, 1638

Subsequent to his famous Riazan version, Vouet painted another *Roman Charity,* now held in Bayonne.[166] Here the couple is a bit further removed from the spectator, and the two are not melting together in a symbiotic embrace. Pero still directs her eyes heavenward but seems more poised. Rather than pulling on her father's shoulder and pressing down on his head, she offers him her breast with the typical V-hold and supports him at his neck. Cimon is not chained or otherwise placed in a prison interior. The composition of the painting reminds even more strongly than the preceding one of Manfredi's Uffizi version, with its dark surrounding and the couple's quiet, mystical demeanor (Figure 2.25).

Nicolas Régnier (1591–1667), a Flemish Caravaggista who came to Rome in the second decade of the seventeenth century and left in 1626, painted the theme twice.[167] One painting, held in Modena, it is a beautiful Caravaggesque rendering that shows Pero and Cimon in red and brown hues, pronounced chiaroscuro, and lifelike details (1638) (Figure 2.41).[168] The artist captured the moment of the couple's fear of discovery, with both father and daughter looking at the window to the right. The focus is on Cimon's muscular torso and erect nipples. His hands are tied to the back, recalling Baburen's composition of 1622–24 (Figure 2.31). This painting was copied, presumably by Régnier




Figure 2.42: Guido Reni, attr., Roman Charity, before 1642

himself, in a version now held in Braunschweig.[169] As in Manfredi's early rendering, the stress is on the moment in which prison guards appear near the window. Other followers of Caravaggio who traveled to Rome and seem to have painted a *Roman Charity,* but whose paintings are no longer extant, are Jusepe de Ribera (1591–1652) and Valentin de Boulogne (1591–1632).[170] The two latter painters also produced versions of the *Denial of Saint Peter.*[171]

It is perhaps appropriate to conclude this chapter with remarks on Guido Reni (1575–1642), Caravaggio's outspoken foe, who nonetheless took inspiration from him and seems to have produced – or had produced by his workshop – nine versions of *Roman Charity.*[172] This number is probably exaggerated; I have been able to identify three versions that may have been authored by him, even though one of them was recently attributed to Giovanni Giacomo Sementi (1580–1638). They are a painting held in Marseille (Figure 2.42), one, almost identical, preserved in Rouen,[173] and another one housed in Genoa.[174] All three versions show the breastfeeding couple in a pitch-dark environment, with an unnaturally bright light illuminating the white skin of Pero's face, hand, and bosom. Cimon's features are visible only insofar as they are illuminated by reflections radiating from Pero's naked body parts. As in Vouet's versions, the impression is one of mysterious sensuality, which the beholder can co-inhabit, undisturbed by architectural details that remind of a prison interior.

The couple occupies a dreamlike non-space; the light illuminating Pero's skin does not seem to come from an exterior source but radiates outward from her white skin.[175] Even though the Marseille and Rouen versions show Pero directing her eyes outside the picture plane, she does not seem startled or upset. No other human could possibly surprise the two in their intimacy, given the amorphous, utopian darkness that surrounds them like a protective shield.

The message of these pictures is a far cry from Caravaggio's intent, who cast Pero as the Madonna's successor in an entirely secular ambience. In those three paintings believed to be by Reni, Pero is mystically enhanced as a source of grace, which is indicated by the extra-terrestrial light emanating from her bosom. Richard Spear has shown how Reni's religious art expresses his undisturbed belief in grace and redemption, which remained unaffected by any doubts about predestination despite a raging debate among contemporary Catholics.[176] In the words of Jesuit Giovanni Domenico Ottonelli (1584–1670), Guido Reni's figures in the Cappella Paolina are the "gracious expression of devout inner feeling," rendering "the inward feeling of true devotion in such a vivid manner and so marvelously well that every judicious viewer who looks at them finds himself, rightly enough, greatly absorbed in thought and nearly overwhelmed by intense and unwanted wonder."[177] Spear echoes this opinion, stating that "Reni's figures are so persuasively self-assured of salvation through their infusion of divine grace that they can alienate even the most intelligent of viewers … The figures tend to make spectators with different beliefs uninvited, uninitiated, unbaptized outsiders."[178] Needless to say, Reni never painted Saint Peter in the act of denial but instead portrayed him weeping, in the act of penitence.[179] While Caravaggio addresses the skeptic as a second-order observer, inviting him to detect the sacred in the secular, Reni presents salvation as a fait accompli, in an imperturbable belief in the attainability of God's grace. The two artists' different use of light marks their diverging religious convictions. If Caravaggio's black, "negative" spaces express his existential doubts about visuality and certitude, Reni's use of light imitates how God "infuses figures with his splendor, making visible Ficino's metaphysical equation of lightness with nearness to God."[180] In this sense, the stark contrast between light and shadow in Reni's above-mentioned *Roman Charities* does not encourage close scrutiny of what is visible but, rather, blinds the viewer through the mystical beauty of Pero's bosom. In Reni's art, *Roman Charity* has shed all ironic, subversive, philosophical, or political connotations; instead, it has become what Tridentine picture theorists might have called an image worthy of veneration.[181]

Notes

1 | Giovanni Pietro Bellori, *The Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects,* transl. by Alice Sedgwick Wohl, notes by Hellmut Wohl, introduction by Tomaso Montanari (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005; first It. ed. 1672), 183.

2 | This painting is not identical with Caravaggio's *Denial of Saint Peter* from 1610 (Figure 2.13), preserved at the Metropolitan Museum of New York, as this latter version does not show other figures warming themselves at a fire. Bellori, *The Lives of the Modern Painters*, 183.

3 | *I Caravaggeschi. Percorsi e protagonisti,* ed. by Alessandro Zuccari with the assistance of Claudio Strinati, 2 vols. (Milan: Skira, 2010); Benedict Nicolson, *Caravaggism in Europe*; revised and enlarged by Luisa Vertova (Turin: Umberto Allemandi & C., 1990, first ed. 1979), 3 vols.

4 | Roger Ward, "Those Who Came Before: Caravaggio and His Principal Italian Followers," in: *Sinners & Saints, Darkness and Light. Caravaggio and his Dutch and Flemish Followers*; exhibition catalog; North Carolina Museum of Art, Sept. 27–Dec. 13, 1998; Milwaukee Art Museum, January 29–April 18, 1999; Dayton Art Institute, May 8–July 18, 1999; ed. by Dennis P. Weller (Raleigh: North Carolina Museum of Art, 1998), 17–34, especially 26; Michele Nicolaci and Riccardo Gandolfi, "Il Caravaggio di Guido Reni: la Negazione di Pietro tra relazioni artistiche e operazioni finanziarie," *Storia dell'arte* 130 (2011): 41–64.

5 | The only exceptions are: Anna Tuck-Scala, "Caravaggio's 'Roman Charity' in the Seven Acts of Mercy," in: *Parthenope's Splendor: Art of the Golden Age in Naples,* ed. by Jeanne Chenault Porter and Susan Scott Munshower (College Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993), 127–63; with respect to followers of Caravaggio in Utrecht, see the catalog entry for Paulus Moreelse, "Cimon und Pero," in: *Holländische Malerei in neuem Licht: Hendrick ter Brugghen und seine Zeitgenossen;* Ausstellung im Centraal Museum Utrecht, 13. Nov. 1986–12. Jan. 1987; Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum in Braunschweig, 12. Feb. 1987–12. April 1987, ed. by Albert Blankert and Leonard J. Slatkes (Braunschweig: Das Museum, 1986), 326.

6 | Bartolomeo Manfredi, Gerrit van Honthorst, Dirck van Baburen, Valentin de Boulogne, Simon Vouet, Nicolas Regnier, Giovanni Antonio Galli (Lo Spadarino), and Jusepe de Ribera.

7 | Elizabeth McGrath identifies five versions of *Roman Charity* by Rubens, plus a plethora of copies, prints, and drawings inspired by these. Elizabeth McGrath, *Rubens: Subjects from History*, vol. 2, Catalogue and Indexes, ed. by Arnout Balis (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1997), 97–98. Stephen Pepper identifies a total of nine paintings under this title for Guido Reni, attributions that most other art historians and museum curators find insecure, however. Stephen Pepper, *Guido Reni. L'opera completa* (Novara: Istituto Geografico di Agostini, 1988; first English ed. London, 1984), 350.

8 | Patrizio Barbieri, "Caravaggio's 'Denial of St. Peter' acquired by Guido Reni in 1613," *The Burlington Magazine* 154, no. 1312 (July 2012): 487–89.

9 | *The Judgment of Cambyses* refers to a story in Herodotus, according to which the son of a corrupt judge had to render justice on a seat furnished with the skin of his father, who had been flayed alive for his crimes by the Persian King Cambyses II. Zaleucus was the first Greek ruler to write up a law code in the seventh century BCE, and shared with his son the punishment for adultery he himself devised: the loss of an eye each.

10 | Jan Gossaert, *Pero and Cimon,* Drawing, before 1532, London, British Museum, 1911, inv. no. 0412.2. This female figure could be compared to representations of the Madonna with baby Christ and Saint John the Baptist, or with depictions of Charity. For the attribution of this drawing to Gossaert, see J.G. van Gelder, "Jan Gossaert in Rome, 1508–09," *Oud Holland* 59 (1942): 1–11.

11 | I am very grateful to my friend Heinrich Kuhn for deciphering and translating the Latin quote: "MANDATUM DO / VOBIS VT DILI / GATIS INVI / CEM SICUT DI / LEXI / VOS."

12 | Virgil Solis, attr., *Pero and Cimon,* Print, 90x60 mm, before 1580, London, British Museum, inv. no. 1873,0809.676.

13 | Netherlandish, *Pero and Cimon,* Terracotta Statue, 465 mm, Rome, Collection Capparoni.

14 | Johannes Wierix, *Pero and Cimon,* Engraving, before 1585, 26.5x18.5 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-P-1904–838.

15 | This inscription is grammatically incorrect, but it does highlight that a daughter served her father through piety, offering him her breast while he was old and languishing in a dungeon. "Filia patrem suum Cimon pietate servavit Val. Max. lib. 5 ca. 4, ss. 8. En pia nata suum proprio fouet ubere patrem ille senex duro carcere pressus erat." *The New Hollstein Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings, and Woodcuts 1450–1700*, vol. 67, The Wierix Family, Part IX, ed. by Zsuzsanna van Ruyven-Zeman, Marjolein Leesberg, and Jan Van der Stock (Rotterdam: Sound and Vision, 2004), 31.

16 | *Pero and Cimon,* Pendant, late 16th c., London, British Museum, inv. no. 1978.1002.536.

17 | On Caravaggio's immediate sources, see Walter Friedlaender, *Caravaggio Studies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), 209; and Tuck-Scala, "Caravaggio's 'Roman Charity'," 133.

18 | Friedlaender, *Caravaggio Studies,* 208. Note that Leonard Slatkes misunderstands Friendlaender's remarks in suggesting that these two Flemish artists already represented a *Roman Charity* as one of the seven acts of mercy (they did not). This is not what Friedlaender intended to say. Leonard A. Slatkes, *Dirck van Baburen (c. 1595–1624): A Dutch Painter in Utrecht and Rome* (Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1965), 83.

19 | *Pero and Cimon,* Pharmaceutical Bottle, 16th c., Smithsonian Museum, Whitney Warren Collection. Grazia Maria Fachechi, "L'allattamento filiale nella ceramica da farmacia cinquecentesca e la sua fortuna nei secoli successivi," in: *Allattamento filiale: la fortuna*; colloquio di Urbino, 28–29 aprile 1998, ed. by Roberto M. Danese, Daniela De Agostini, Renato Raffaelli, and Gioia Zaganelli (Urbino: Quattro Venti, 2000), 93–101, especially 93–94.

20 | Amico Aspertini, *Pero and Cimon,* before 1552, Paris, Louvre, Cabinet des Dessins, inv. no. 11848, recto.

21 | Alessandro Casolani, *Pero and Cimon,* before 1606, Paris, Louvre, Cabinet des Dessins, inv. no. 1034, recto.

22 | See also Andor Pigler, *Barockthemen: eine Auswahl von Verzeichnissen zur Ikonographie des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1974; first ed. Budapest: Verlag der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1956), vol. 2, 301; and Paolo Della Pergola, *Galleria Borghese: I dipinti* (Rome: Istituto poligrafico dello stato, 1959), vol. 2, Figure 148; inv. no. 187.

23 | Gabriele Paleotti, *Discorso intorno alle immagini sacre e profane*, ed. by Stefano della Torre, Gian Franco Freguglia, and Carlo Chenis (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2002; first ed. 1582); see also the original text of the Tridentine decree "On the Invocation, Veneration, and Relics of Saints, and on Sacred Images," in: *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent,* Twenty-Fifth Session, ed. and transl. by J. Waterworth (London: Dolman, 1848), 232–89; http://history.hanover.edu/texts/trent/ct25.html [accessed 1/9/14].

24 | On the speculative painting by Titian, see Tuck-Scala, "Caravaggio's 'Roman Charity'," 135–36; Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., "A Titian Problem: The Seven Acts of Mercy," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 22 (December 1942): 165–72.

25 | No pun on Michael Fried's book intended, which will be discussed below. Michael Fried, *The Moment of Caravaggio* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010); J.G.A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975).

26 | Bernard Aikema, "L'Immagine della Carità Veneziana," in: *Nel Regno dei Poveri: Arte e Storia dei grandi ospedali veneziani in età moderna 1474–1797*, ed. by Bernard Aikema (Venice: IRE, Istituzioni di Ricovero e di Educazione, 1989), 71–98.

27 | See Michael Fried's observations about absorption and address in Caravaggio's protagonists. Fried, *The Moment of Caravaggio*; Michael Fried, "Notes toward a Caravaggisti Pictorial Poetics," in: *Caravaggio: His Followers in Rome*, ed. by David Franklin and Sebastian Schütze (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 102–23.

28 | Michael Fried identifies "absorption" as one of the defining features of Caravaggio's gallery paintings, but in my eyes, it can be detected in this altarpiece as well. Fried, *The Moment of Caravaggio*.

29 | Bellori, *The Lives of the Modern Artists*, 181.

30 | Karel van Mander, *Het schilder-boeck waer in voor eerst de leerlustighe iueght den grondt der edel vry schilderconst in verscheyden deelen wort voorghedraghen* (Haerlem: Paschier van Wesbvsch Boeck Vercooper, 1604), 191a=r.

31 | Louis Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören* (Berlin: Diaphanes, 2003; first Fr. ed. Paris: Éditions Flammarions, 1981), 137.

32 | Joachim von Sandrart, *Joachim von Sandrarts Akademie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste von 1675; Leben der berühmten Maler, Bildhauer und Baumeister,* ed. by A.R. Peltzer (München: G. Hirth's Verlag A.G., 1925), 275. "Caravaggio's

significance lies in his fusion of realism with chiaroscuro in such a way that the realism is accentuated by the mystical light emanating from an unknown source, which establishes a strong psychological and religious mood." J. Richard Judson and Rudolf E.O. Ekkart, *Gerrit van Honthorst 1592–1656* (Doornspijk: Davaco Publishers, 1999), 8. See also Valeska von Rosen, *Caravaggio und die Grenzen des Darstellbaren: Ambiguität, Ironie und Performativität in der Malerei um 1600* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2009), 76.

33 | Friedlaender, *Caravaggio Studies*, 120.

34 | Friedlaender, C*aravaggio Studies*, 209; Vincezo Pacelli, *Caravaggio: Le Sette Opere di Misericordia* (Salerno: cooperative editrice, 1984), 57; Francesca Cappelletti, *Caravaggio: un ritratto somigliante* (Milan: Mondadori Electa, 2009), 131. Cappelletti dates his stay in Genoa to August 6–17, 1605.

35 | Todd P. Olson, "The Street Has Its Masters: Caravaggio and the Socially Marginal" in: *Caravaggio: Realism, Rebellion, Reception,* ed. by Genevieve Warwick (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006), 69–81, especially 79.

36 | Tuck-Scala, "Caravaggio's 'Roman Charity'," 133.

37 | Ferdinando Bologna, *L'incredulità del Caravaggio e l'esperienza delle "cose naturali"* (Turin: Bollati Boringhieri, 2006; first ed. 1992), 391; on Caravaggio's reception of Maximus, see Rudolf Preimesberger, "Textfaszination: Caravaggio liest Valerius Maximus," *Jahrbuch des kunsthistorischen Museums Wien* 11 (2009): 75–88.

38 | For an early version of this prototype see Jacopo Bellini, *The Apostle Peter* (ca. 1430/35), Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 1161.

39 | See Chapter 7.

40 | Ferdinando Bologna, "Il Caravaggio al Pio Monte della Misericordia," in: *Il Pio Monte della Misericordia di Napoli nel quarto centenario,* ed. by Mario Pisani Massamormile (Naples: Electa Napoli, 2003), 173–90, especially 180.

41 | On the popularity of the *Denial* after Caravaggio, see Von Rosen, *Caravaggio und die Grenzen des Darstellbaren,* 128. On the high value placed on Caravaggio's *Denial of Saint Peter,* see Barbieri, "Caravaggio's 'Denial of St. Peter' acquired by Guido Reni in 1613," 487–89. On the importance of the painting for the Manfrediana Methodus and as an expression of dissent with the Tridentine papacy, see Nicolaci and Gandolfi, "Il Caravaggio di Guido Reni." On connections between the *Seven Works of Mercy* and the *Denial of Saint Peter,* see Maurizio Marini, *Caravaggio "pictor preastantissimus" L'iter artistico completo di uno dei massimi rivoluzionari dell'arte di tutti i tempi* (Rome: Newton & Compton Editori, 2001), 75–76.

42 | Zuccari, *I Caravaggeschi: Percorsi e protagonisti*; Nicolson, *Caravaggism in Europe*. These authors' iconographic attributions are supplemented by information derived from Judson and Ekkart, *Gerrit van Honthorst*; Pigler, *Barockthemen*; and my own data collections.

43 | "A Mantuan named Bartolomeo Manfredi followed the manner of Caravaggio very diligently, so that little difference appears [between the two artists' works]. He imitated life with great truth, and painted mostly life-sized, half-length figures, in addition to

conversations, gambling and tavern scenes, soldiers and similar motifs, many of which could be seen ... [in Holland, France, and Italy], which were all painted very diligently and beautifully, and were done directly from life." Sandrart, *Joachim von Sandrarts Akademie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste von 1675*, 277.

44 | Ward, "Those Who Came Before," 26; Albert Blankert, "Caravaggio und die nördlichen Niederlande," in: Blankert and Slatkes, *Holländische Malerei in neuem Licht,* 17–41, especially 20; Bellori, *The Lives of the Modern Painters*, 186.

45 | Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Denial of Saint Peter,* 1622–24, Minneapolis, Minneapolis Institute of the Arts; Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Denial of Saint Peter,* 137x244 cm, England, Private Collection; Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Denial of Saint Peter,* 1612–20, Rennes, Musée des Beaux Arts.

46 | Pensionante del Saraceni, *The Denial of Saint Peter,* 1620–30, Dublin, National Gallery.

47 | Jusepe de Ribera, attr., *The Denial of Saint Peter,* 1620, Naples, Certosa di San Martino, Sacrestia.

48 | Nicolas Tournier, *The Denial of Saint Peter,* 100x134 cm, UK, Private Collection.

49 | Nicolas Tourner, *The Denial of Saint Peter,* Atlanta, High Museum of Art, inv. no. 1986–52.

50 | Nicolas Tournier, *The Denial of Saint Peter,* Dresden, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, inv. no. 413.

51 | Nicolas Tournier, *The Denial of Saint Peter,* Madrid, Museo del Prado.

52 | Nicolas Tournier, *The Denial of Saint Peter,* 133x175 cm, Private Collection.

53 | Marcia B. Hall, *The Sacred Image in the Age of Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 139–40.

54 | Luisa Vertova, "La religiosità di Nicolas Tournier a Roma," in: *Nicolas Tournier et la peinture caravagesque en Italie, en France et en Espagne*, ed. by Pascal-François Bertrand and Stéphanie Trouvé (Toulouse: Université de Toulouse II–Le Mirail; Collection "Méridiennes," 2003), 91–102, especially 91. On Counter-Reformation politics, see the vast bibliography on surveillance and confessionalization, the prosecution of Jews and heretics by the inquisition, and the criminalization of dissenters in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Rome. Regarding the latter, see, among others: Peter Rietbergen, *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome: Barberini Cultural Politics* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

55 | Maurizio Calvesi, *La realtà di Caravaggio* (Turin: Giulio Einaudi Editore, 1990), 59. For a critique, see, among others, John Varriano, "Caravaggio and Religion," in: *Saints and Sinners: Caravaggio & the Baroque Image;* exhibition catalog, February 1–March 24 1999, McMullen Museum of Art (Chestnut Hill: McMullen Museum of Art, Boston College; distributed by University of Chicago Press, 1999), 191–207, especially 195.

56 | Nicolaci and Gandolfi, "Il Caravaggio di Guido Reni," 45.

57 | Friedlaender, *Caravaggio Studies*, ix, xi, 126–29.

58 | Bologna, *L'incredulità di Caravaggio,* 9.

59 | Bologna, *L'incredulità di Caravaggio,* 154.

60 | Bologna, *L'incredulità di Caravaggio,* 34, 47, 54. Valeska von Rosen, likewise, points out that Caravaggio's ambiguous paintings violated Paleotti's dictate of clarity. Von Rosen, *Caravaggio und die Grenzen des Darstellbaren.*

61 | "The position emerging from the sacred iconographies of Caravaggio – which is not heretic, but adhering substantially and profoundly to Catholic demands, and yet, does not conform under any point of view to the theoretical and disciplinary orthodoxy of Tridentine Catholicism – belongs ... to the context of internal resistance against the movement of the Counter-Reformation that I alluded to above." Bologna, *L'incredulità di Caravaggio,* 82.

62 | Von Rosen, *Caravaggio und die Grenzen des Darstellbaren*, 1, 12, 14.

63 | Mieke Bal, "The genius of Rome: Putting things together," *Journal of Visual Culture* 1, no. 1 (2002): 25–45, especially 37–40; Bert Treffers, "The Arts and Craft of Sainthood: New Orders, New Saints, New Altarpieces," in: *The Genius of Rome:* 1592–1623; exhibition catalog; Royal Academy of Arts, London, 20 Jan.–16 April, 2001; Palazzo Venezia, Rome, May–August, 2001, ed. by Beverly Louise Brown (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2001), 340–71.

64 | For a brief introduction into Luhmann's systems theory, see Ilana Gerhon, "Seeing Like a System: Luhmann for Anthropologists," *Anthropological Theory* 5, no. 2 (2005): 99–116.

65 | Von Rosen, *Caravaggio und die Grenzen des Darstellbaren,* 246.

66 | Caravaggio, *The Incredulity of Saint Thomas,* 1601–1602, Potsdam, Stiftung Preußische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg.

67 | Caravaggio, *The Martyrdom of Saint Matthew,* 1599–1600, Rome, San Luigi dei Francesi, Contarelli Chapel.

68 | Caravaggio, *Madonna del Rosario,* 1604–1605, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum.

69 | Caravaggio, *Death of the Virgin,* 1604–1606, Paris, Louvre. Helen Langdon, *Caravaggio: A Life* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1998), 249.

70 | As also Valeska von Rosen points out, Caravaggio's art is characterized by deliberately staged ambiguities. Von Rosen, *Caravaggio und die Grenzen des Darstellbaren*, 224.

71 | Langdon, *Caravaggio: A Life*, 236–37; Friedlaender, *Caravaggio Studies*, 120; Hall, *The Sacred Image*, 258, 267.

72 | Von Rosen, *Caravaggio und die Grenzen des Darstellbaren*, 53–61.

73 | Hall, *The Sacred Image*, 258.

74 | Helen Langdon calls her a "Neapolitan" working woman, but I am trying to identify her allegorical significance as a "Roman" Charity. Langdon, *Caravaggio: A Life*, 329–30.

75 | See "Ambt und Stellung des Kardinalnepoten zur Zeit Urbans VIII (1623)," ed. by A. Kraus, *Römische Quartalschrift für Christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* (1958), 238–43; quoted in Rietbergen, *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome*, 152.

76 | Gérard Labrot, *Collections of Paintings in Naples 1600–1780* (München; New York: K.G. Saur, 1992), 105, 107, 173, 175, 190, 191, 193, 232, 239, 262, 272, 278, 280, 309, 316, 401, 403, 458, 460. He lists a total of eleven paintings under this title.

77 | I have found two exceptions to this rule: in 1625, the Abbot Alessandro Scaglia, agent for the Duke Carlo Emanuele I di Savoia, talks most likely about the *Roman Charity* of Bartolomeo Manfredi in the following terms: "The Duke of Buckingham has declared to be of service to Your Highness, who would do well donating him a nice picture ... I gave one to the Most Serene Father, a Roman Charity, which would be most dear to him." Quoted after Nicole Hartje, *Bartolomeo Manfredi (1582–1622): Ein Nachfolger Caravaggios und seine europäische Wirkung* (Weimar: VDG, Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaften, 2004), 79. Furthermore, Leonard Slatkes quotes from an inventory dated Feb. 11, 1675, by the Flemish art firm Forchaudt in Antwerp, who apparently tried to sell a *Roman Charity* by Dirck van Baburen. It reads "n. 73. 1 grooten doeck van Barbier Caritas Romeyn oft Suijger van Babuer niet gevonden, maer in plaets eenen Blomkrans naer Breugel gevonden." Slatkes, *Dirck van Baburen (c. 1595–1624),* 125. Contrast this with the entries from Venetian inventories mentioned in Chapters 1 and 4 and with the inventory of the treasury of Prag in 1621: "No. 946: how a daughter feeds her father in prison from her breasts, by Georg Pencz." Quoted after: Heinrich Zimmermann, "Das Inventar der Prager Schatz-und Kunstkammer vom 6. Dezember 1621, nach Akten des K. und K. Reichsfinanzarchivs in Wien," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* XXV, part 2 (1905), XIII–LXXV, especially XL, no. 946 (Reprint Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1967).

78 | Valerius Maximus lists the anecdote as the first of his "external" examples; his choice of names – Pero and Myko – suggests that he meant his protagonists to be Greek. Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings,* ed. and transl. by D.R. Shackleton Bailey (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000), vol. 1, 499. See also Giovanni Battista Bronzini, "Mitemi incestuosi fra ingorghi di latte e scambi parentali," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale,* 13–32, especially 14, 32.

79 | Langdon, *Caravaggio: A Life,* 162; Petra Pollákova, "The Case of Beatrice Cenci: From Guido Reni to David Lynch," *Umění Art* 59 (2011): 380–95, especially 387.

80 | On Francesco Cenci's prior convictions for homosexual rape, see Elisabetta Mori, "L'eredità di Francesco Cenci, il patrimonio, la memoria, la scrittura," in: *Beatrice Cenci: la storia di un mito*, ed. by Mario Bevilacqua and Elisabetta Mori (Rome: Fondazione Marco Basso; Viella, 1999), 38. On Beatrice's supporters during the trial: see Langdon, *Caravaggio: A Life,* 161.

81 | Langdon, *Caravaggio: A Life*, 161; Rossella Vodret, "Un volto per un mito, il "ritratto di Beatrice" di Guido Reni," in: *Beatrice Cenci: la storia di un mito*, ed. by Mario Bevilacqua and Elisabetta Mori (Rome: Fondazione Marco Basso; Viella, 1999), 131–41, especially 136–38.

82 | Belinda Elizabeth Jack, *Beatrice's Spell: The Enduring Legend of Beatrice Cenci* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2004), 2.

83 | Pollákova, "The Case of Beatrice Cenci," 382.

84 | Richard E. Spear, *The "Divine" Guido: Religion, Sex, Money and Art in the World of Guido Reni* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 54–56.

85 | Guido Reni, *Portrait of Saint Cecilia,* 1606, Pasadena, Norton Simon Museum.

86 | Of course, already his *Fortune-Tellers* of 1594 and 1595 wear a turban, but my contention is that with the discovery of the remains of Saint Cecilia, Reni's self-portrait, and the merging of Cecilia's and Beatrice's identities, this type of headdress acquired a more specific signification.

87 | For a wonderful example of an art-historical analysis of Florence's identity as "dovizia," see Adrian W.B. Randolph, *Engaging Symbols: Gender, Politics, and Public Art in Fifteenth Century Florence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002). For a study of Venice's allegorization as Venus and the Virgin Mary, see David Rosand, *Myths of Venice: The Figuration of a State* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).

88 | This last painting, attributed to a follower of Vouet, was sold by Millon & Associés on June 26, 2013, for 4200 Euro; http://www.millon-associes.com/flash/index.jsp?id=15172&idCp=61&lng=fr [accessed 1/25/14].

89 | Brown, *The Genius of Rome: 1592–1623,* 334, catalog no. 127.

90 | Mauro Natale, *Peintures italiennes du xvie au xviiie siècle* (Genève: Musée d'art et d'histoire, 1979), 67. The archivists at the Fototeca of the Kunsthistorisches Institut, Florence, entitled a photo of this painting *Anti-Carità Romana.*

91 | Arabella Cifani and France Monetti, "Angelica Kauffmann, Luigi Sabatelli, Pietro Benvenuti e Vincenzo Camuccini: Disegni Inediti nella Raccolta di Damiano Pernati," *Bollettino d'Arte* 115 (2001): 75–92, especially 83.

92 | Pacelli, *Caravaggio. Le Sette Opere di Misericordia*, 15–17; Langdon, *Caravaggio: A Life*, 328.

93 | "Relatione del stato delle carceri del Regio Tribunale della Vicaria di Napoli prima dell'anno 1609 e della mutatione fatta sin al presente 1622," quoted in: Pacelli, *Caravaggio,* 15.

94 | Jutta Sperling, "Allegories of Charity and the Practice of Poor Relief at the Scuola Grande di San Rocco," *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* LXX (2009): 119–46.

95 | Pamela Jones, *Altarpieces and Their Viewers in the Churches of Rome from Caravaggio to Guido Reni* (Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2008), 109.

96 | Jones, *Altarpieces and Their Viewers,* 108.

97 | Thus it is possible that poor beggars in S. Agostino did receive charitable assistance from the Augustinians despite being classified among the 'false' poor. What is undeniable, however, is that the friars at S. Agostino tended to the spiritual and material needs of poor pilgrims ... In summary, then, the Augustinians had many reasons to appreciate the imagery in the Cavalletti Chapel, including Caravaggio's altarpiece (Madonna di Loreto)." Jones, *Altarpieces and Their Viewers,* 109–10.

98 | Olson, "The Street Has Its Masters," 74.

99 | Roger de Piles, *The Art of Painting, with the Lives and Characters of ... the most Eminent Painters ...* (London: printed for Thomas Payne, in Castle Street, 1706; first Fr. ed. 1699), 42.

100 | Rietbergen, *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome*, 222.

101 | Rietbergen, *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome*, 240.

102 | Marino Sanudo reports in this diary on March 24, 1524: "Today after dinner in the hospital [of the Incurabili], the washing of the feet took place with great devotion. The patrician [hospital] guardians and others, twelve altogether, with great humility washed the feet of the impoverished and ill syphilitic men, and the gentlewomen washed the feet of the women, that is, the females sick with this disease. There was quite a crowd watching, and many were moved to piety seeing this pious work performed by the prominent people of the city." Quoted in: *Venice: Città excellentissima: Selections from the Renaissance Diaries of Marin Sanudo*, ed. by Patricia H. Labalme and Laura Sanguineti White, transl. by Linda L. Carroll (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 2008), 329; http://books.google.de/books?id=3qNzBgnkXSUC&pg=PA329&lpg=PA329&dq=sanudo+washing+feet&source=bl&ots=HizS8f-3fB&sig=daycgG7XVPe7eWh8wnaNMf-2Q0cE&hl=de&sa=X&ei=yS_dUraTN8W1tAaknIHoDQ&ved=0CDwQ6AEwAQ#v=onepage&q=sanudo%20washing%20feet&f=false [accessed 1/20/14]

103 | Jones, *Altarpieces and Their Viewers*, 186–88.

104 | Jones, *Altarpieces and Their Viewers*, 187.

105 | See Cardinal Bellarmino (1542–1621), who in his homily from July 7, 1602 encouraged the poor "to content themselves with their own ranks." Jones, *Altarpieces and Their Viewers*, 123.

106 | Langdon, *Caravaggio: A Life*, 225.

107 | On the depiction of Charity as repoussoir figure in sixteenth-century Venetian art, see Sperling, "Allegories of Charity;" Aikema, "L'Immagine della Carità Veneziana;" on future developments of this compositional device, see R. Rookmaker, "'Charity' in seventeenth century art," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 23 (1972): 61–66; on Honthorst's use of repoussoir figures – which Judson and Ekkart call a "Bassanesque" tradition, but which in reality is indebted to Bassano's master Tintoretto – see Judson and Ekkart, *Gerrit van Honthorst*, 18; on repoussoir figures in the work of Baburen, see Slatkes, *Dirck van Baburen*, 55.

108 | Langdon, *Caravaggio: A Life*, 330.

109 | Tuck-Scala,"Caravaggio's 'Roman Charity'," 137; for a few more references to the phenomenon, see Pigler, *Barockthemen*; idem, "Valère Maxime et l'iconographie des temps modernes," in: *Petrovics Elek Emlékkönyv* [Hommage à Alexis Petrovics] (Budapest, 1934), 214–16; Marcel G. Roethlisberger, *Abraham Bloemaert and his Sons: Paintings and Prints*, vol. 1 (Doornspijk: Davaco, 1993), 152.

110 | Natasha Therese Seaman, *The Religious Paintings of Hendrick ter Brugghen: Reinventing Christian Painting after the Reformation in Utrecht* (Farnham, Surrey, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2012), 15.

111 | See, most recently and most convincingly, Hartje, *Bartolomeo Manfredi*, 19.

112 | Since Sandrart himself does not mention the word "methodus," I am frankly not sure why art historians continue to affirm that he invented the term "Manfrediana methodus." Sandrart, *Joachim von Sandrarts Akademie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste*, 277; http://ta.sandrart.net/en/text/404?item=auto13291#auto13291 [accessed 1/24/14].

113 | "Next Manfredi used the possibility of isolating single motives or constellations of figures from his blue print and of transferring them into a comparable context. This is documented by [his treatment of] the couple of Cimon and Pero, which derives from the *Seven Works of Mercy* ... and became its own subject matter in the form of *Roman Charity* in Manfredi's work." Hartje, *Bartolomeo Manfredi*, 94.

114 | Fried, *The Moment of Caravaggio*.

115 | Hartje, *Bartolomeo Manfredi*, 309–10.

116 | Jaap Bolten, *Abraham Bloemaert, c. 1565–1651: The Drawings* (Netherlands: J. Bolten, 2007). According to Marcel Roethlisberger, this painting, preserved by the Kunsthalle, Kiel, has never been on display. Roethlisberger, *Abraham Bloemaert and his Sons*, vol. 1, 151–52.

117 | On Caravaggio's black backgrounds: see Itay Sapir, *Ténèbres sans leçons: Esthétique et épistémologie de la peinture ténébriste romaine 1595–1610* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2012), 141, 225.

118 | "Daer is oock eenen Michael Agnolo van Caravaggio, die te koom wonderlijcke dinghen doct." Van Mander, *Het schilder-boeck*, 191a=r; Slatkes, *Dirck van Baburen*, 3, 15.

119 | Blankert, "Caravaggio und die nördlichen Niederlande," 34.

120 | Axel Hémery, "La génération de Caravage dans le Nord: attractions et résistances," in: *Corps et ombres: Caravage et le Caravagisme européen*; exhibition catalog, Musée Fabre de Montepellier Agglomération et au Musée des Augustins de la Ville de Toulouse, 23 June to 14 October, 2012 (Milan: 5 Continents Editions, 2012), 139–56, especially 139.

121 | *Rubens and His Age: Treasures from the Hermitage Museum, Russia*, ed. by Christina Corsiglia (London: Merrell Publishers; Toronto: Art Gallery of Ontario, 2001), 42. On Rubens's painting in the context of other lactation images, see J. Vanessa Lyon, "Full of Grace: Lactation, Expression and "Colorito" Painting in Some Early Works by Rubens," in: *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations: Images, Rhetorics, and Practices*, ed. by Jutta Gisela Sperling (Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2013), 255–77.

122 | Olson, "The Street Has Its Masters," 78; Bellori, quoted in Jones, *Altarpieces and Their Viewers,* 121.

123 | Lisa Rosenthal, *Gender, Politics, and Allegory in the Art of Rubens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 155–56.

124 | See also Rubens's *Bacchanal,* Moscow, Pushkin Museum, undated. Svetlana Alpers, *The Making of Rubens* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 119–20, 133, 138, 139, 153.

125 | For information on the other paintings, see McGrath, *Rubens: Subjects from History*, 97–98. I have been able to identify four additional images of different copies of *Roman Charity* by Rubens and his followers: 1) a copy last seen on the London art market in 1954 of the dimensions of 61.5 x 45 inches (= 156 x 114 cm) dated to 1625, described in *A Loan Exhibition of Works by Peter Paul Rubens*; exhibition catalog,

London, Wildenstein, Oct. 4–Nov. 11, 1950, ed. by Ludwig Burchard (London: Wildenstein, 1950), 8, and in *Burlington Magazine* 96 (1954): Plate X (no pagination); 2) a copy owned by the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (1630); 3) a similar version with baby authored by a follower of Rubens with the dimensions 78 x 111 cm, sold by Sotheby's on Nov. 1, 2007; 4) and a painting attributed to Rubens's workshop supposedly held by the Rubenshaus in Siegen, according to Elisabeth Knauer, "Caritas Romana," *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen* 6, Neue Folge (1964): 9–23. Apparently, there is another copy by Rubens held in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Dunkirk, according to *Burlington Magazine* 96 (1954), but I have not been able to procure an image of it.

126 | Peter Paul Rubens and workshop, *Roman Charity,* after 1630, Siegen, Rubenshaus; Peter Paul Rubens and workshop, *Roman Charity,* after 1630, London, Sotheby's, sold November 1, 2007.

127 | For prints of the Hermitage version, see the engravings by Cornelis van Caukercken, 1650–60, British Museum (=BM) (reg. no. 1891,0414.900) and John Smith, 1681–1706, BM (reg. no. 1891,0414.901). For a print of the 1625 version, see Willem Panneels's engraving in reverse (ca. 1631), BM (reg. no. S.5352). For a print of the Amsterdam version, see Alexander Voet II (1650–90), BM (reg. no. 1917,1208.549).

128 | *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, founded by Ulrich Thieme and Felix Becker, ed. by Hans Vollmer, vol. 29 (Leipzig: Verlag von E.A. Seemann, 1935), 138.

129 | Renzo Villa, ""Quid hoc est rei?" Persistenze di una fortuna fiamminga," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale,* 79–92, especially 86.

130 | Sebastian Schütze, "Caravaggism in Europe: A Planetary System and Its Gravitational Laws," in: *Caravaggio: His Followers in Rome,* ed. by David Franklin and Sebastian Schütze (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 26–47, especially 26; Beverly Louise Brown remarks that Rubens "like a sponge absorbed whatever crossed his path." Beverly Louise Brown, "The Birth of the Baroque: Painting in Rome 1592–1623," in: Brown, *The Genius of Rome,* 16–41, especially 29.

131 | Genevieve Warwick, "Introduction: Caravaggio in History" in: *Caravaggio: Realism, Rebellion, Reception,* ed. by Genevieve Warwick (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006), 13–22, especially 15.

132 | Leonard J. Slatkes, "In Caravaggio's Footsteps: a Northern Journey," in: Weller, *Sinners & Saints, Darkness and Light*, 35–46.

133 | Blankert, "Caravaggio und die nördlichen Niederlande," 30.

134 | Alessandro Zuccari, "Il caravaggismo a Roma: Certezze e ipotesi," in: Zuccari, *I Caravaggeschi,* 31–59, especially 40.

135 | See, among others, *Peter Paul Rubens: Barocke Leidenschaften*; Ausstellung im Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum Braunschweig, 8. August bis 31. Oktober 2004, ed. by Nils Büttner und Ulrich Heinen (München: Hirmer Verlag, 2004).

136 | Jan Waszink, "Introduction," in: Justus Lipsius, *Politica: Six Books of Politics or Political Instruction,* ed. and transl. by Jan Waszink (Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2004; first publication 1589), 200–03.

137 | On the Utrecht Caravaggisti, see Seaman, *The Religious Paintings of Hendrick ter Brugghen; Caravaggio in Holland;* exhibition catalogue, 1 April–26 July 2009, Städel Museum, Frankfurt, ed. by Jochen Sander, Bastian Eclercy, Gabriel Dette (Frankfurt a.M.: Städel Museum; München: Hirmer Verlag; 2009); Leonard J. Slatkes and Wayne Franits, *The Paintings of Hendrick ter Brugghen 1588–1629: Catalogue Raisonné* (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007); Wayne Franits, *Dutch Seventeenth-Century Genre Painting: Its Stylistic and Thematic Evolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004); Judson and Ekkart, *Gerrit van Honthorst;* Blankert and Slatkes, *Holländische Malerei in neuem Licht;* Slatkes, *Dirck van Baburen;* Benedict Nicolson, *Hendrick Terbrugghen* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1958). On the Utrecht painters' interest in Rubens, see Judson and Ekkart, *Gerrit van Honthorst,* 14.

138 | Dirck van Baburen, *Penitent Saint Peter,* 1618–19, Private Collection.

139 | Dirck van Baburen, *Prometheus Chained by Vulcan,* 1623, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum. Wayne E. Franits, *The Paintings of Dirck van Baburen: Catalog Raisonné* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012), 53. Franits does not address Prometheus's facial features but detects a compositional similarity between the two paintings.

140 | Gregor J.M. Weber, "Caritas Romana: Ein neu entdecktes Bild von Johannes Vermeer," *Weltkunst* 70, no. 2 (Feb. 2000): 225–28. Wayne Franits doubts Weber's attribution to Baburen; Franits: *The Paintings of Dirck van Baburen,* 173.

141 | S. Speth-Holterhoff, *Les Peintres Flamands de Cabinets d'Amateurs au XVIIe siècle* (Bruxelles: Elsevier, 1957), 113–17.

142 | Franits, *The Paintings of Dirck van Baburen*, 175.

143 | Judson and Ekkart, *Gerrit van Honthorst*, 111.

144 | Gerrit van Honthorst, *Roman Charity,* München, Alte Pinakothek, Photo 6670.

145 | Willem van Honthorst, *Roman Charity,* Potsdam, Schloss Sanssouci, inv. no. GK I 2372; Photo: Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg.

146 | Nicolson, *Hendrick Terbrugghen,* 113; Pigler, *Barockthemen*, 303; Slatkes and Franits, *The Paintings of Hendrick ter Brugghen*, 269.

147 | Slatkes, *Dirck van Baburen*, 11–12.

148 | On Bronckhorst, see Pigler, *Barockthemen*, vol. 2, 304. On Couwenbergh, see Hartje, *Bartolomeo Manfredi*, 180. On Stomer, see Pigler, *Barockthemen*, vol. 2, 303; Stomer's painting in the Prado is now attributed to Gaspar de Crayer (1584–1669). On Paulus Moreelse as Baburen's teacher, see Slatkes, *Dirck van Baburen*, 3.

149 | On Jan Janssens (or Jansens), see *Real Academia de San Fernando, Madrid, Guía del Museo* (Zabalaga-Leku, VEGAP, Madrid, 2012), 64; http://www.realacademiabellasartessanfernando.com/assets/docs/guia_museo/guia_museo.pdf [accessed 1/30/14]. On Gerard Seghers, see Pigler, *Barockthemen*, vol. 2, 303.

150 | Benedict Nicolson, "Gerard Seghers and the 'Denial of Saint Peter'," *Burlington Magazine* 113, no. 819 (June 1971): 302–09, especially 307.

151 | Seaman, *The Religious Paintings of Hendrick ter Brugghen,* 5, 49.

152 | Seaman, *The Religious Paintings of Hendrick ter Brugghen*, 62.

153 | Seaman, *The Religious Paintings of Hendrick ter Brugghen*, 94.

154 | Benjamin Kaplan, quoted in: Seaman, *The Religious Paintings of Hendrick ter Brugghen*, 62.

155 | Xander van Eck, *Clandestine Splendor: Paintings for the Catholic Church in the Dutch Republic* (Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2007), 139.

156 | Van Eck, *Clandestine Splendor*, 204.

157 | Xander van Eck, "From Doubt to Conviction: Clandestine Catholic Churches as Patrons of Dutch Caravaggesque Painting," *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 22, no. 4 (1993–94): 217–34, especially 225.

158 | An inventory of paintings completed for the hidden Catholic churches in Utrecht reveals that of 201 paintings, 179 were executed by Catholic painters and only 11 by Protestants. Gerrit van Honthorst and Abraham Bloemaert are on this list but not Dirck van Baburen and Hendrick ter Brugghen. Nicolson, *Hendrick Terbrugghen,* 36; Natasha Seaman must be wrong in stating that ter Brugghen was the only painter not to have painted for the hidden churches of Utrecht – that is, she assumes that Dirck van Baburen also painted for them. Seaman, *The Religious Paintings of Hendrick ter Brugghen,* 6. On the Protestant baptism of ter Brugghen's children, see Blankert and Slatkes, *Holländische Malerei in neuem Licht,* 66–67. On Baburen's father, who already seems to have been a Protestant, see Franits, *The Paintings of Dirck van Baburen,* 41.

159 | Other art historians have noticed that the Utrecht Caravaggisti endowed Saint Peter with recognizable features, sometimes transferring them to other figures. I cannot detect the similarities Slatkes and Nicolson see between Saint Peter and the apostle to the left in ter Brugghen's Toledo *Supper at Emmaus.* Also, no convincing interpretation of this resemblance has been offered. Nobody so far has noted any similarity to representations of Cimon. See Slatkes, *Dirck van Baburen,* 49; Nicolson, *Hendrick Terbrugghen,* 11.

160 | On Simon Vouet as Caravaggista, see Schütze, *Caravaggism in Europe*, 43; Fried, "Notes toward a Caravaggisti Pictorial Poetics," 105; Hartje, *Bartolomeo Manfredi*, 22, 55, 286; Ward, "Those Who Came Before," 26; Zuccari, *Il caravaggismo a Roma: Certezze e ipotesi*, 40.

161 | Vittoria Markova, "Un Dipinto di Simon Vouet in Russia," *Bolletino d'Arte* LXVI/12, nos. 88–89 (1981): 139–42.

162 | Simon Vouet, *Roman Charity,* 1626, Nantes, Musée des Beaux-Arts, inv. no. 266. Claire Gerin-Pierre, *Catalogue des peintures françaises XVIe-XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 2005), 82.

163 | Ippolito Rombaldotti, *Roman Charity,* Ceramic Dish, 1650, Bologna, Museo Civico. For a reproduction, see Guido Arbizzoni, "La pietas erga parentes negli emblemi (e dintorni)," in: *Pietas e allattamento filiale: la vicenda, l'exemplum, l'iconografia*; il colloquio, Urbino, 2–3 maggio, 1996, ed. by Renato Raffaelli, Roberto M. Danese, and Settimio Lanciotti (Urbino: Quattro Venti, 1997), 247–69, especially 263, Figure 6.

164 | Henry Arlaud, *Roman Charity,* Watch Face, 1675–1700, Paris, Louvre, Département des Objets d'art, inv. no. OA 8330.

165 | Cornelis van Caukercken, *Roman Charity,* after Rubens, Hermitage version, 1650–60, London, British Museum, inv. no. 1891,0414.900.

166 | Simon Vouet, *Roman Charity,* Bayonne, Musée Bonnat.

167 | Schütze, *Caravaggism in Europe,* 42; Ward, "Those Who Came Before," 26. "Joachim von Sandrart ... bezeichnete Gerard Seghers, Nicolas Regnier und Valentine de Boulogne as "Nachfolger von Manfredi." Blankert, "Caravaggio und die nördlichen Niederlande," 20. See also *Dopo Caravaggio: Bartolomeo Manfredi e la Manfrediana Methodus,* ed. by Maria Cristina Poma (Milan: Mondadori Editore, 1987); Beverly Louise Brown, "The Birth of the Baroque: Painting in Rome 1592–1623," in: Brown, *The Genius of Rome: 1592–1623,* 16–41, especially 26.

168 | Annick Lemoine, *Nicolas Régnier, ca. 1588–1667: Peintre, collectionneur et marchand d'art* (Paris: Arthena, 2007), 271–72.

169 | Ugo Ruggieri, "Nouvelles Peintures d'Antonio Triva (1626–1699) en France et en Italie," *Revue du Louvre* 46, no. 2 (1996): 43–48; Lemoine, *Nicolas Régnier,* 288–89.

170 | Pigler, *Barockthemen,* vol. 2, 303, 305. On Ribera, see Schütze, *Caravaggism in Europe,* 37; Friedlaender, *Caravaggio Studies,* 15; Zuccari, *Il caravaggismo a Roma: Certezze e ipotesi,* 34, 40; Blankert, "Caravaggio und die nördlichen Niederlande," 30; On Valentine de Boulogne, see Zuccari, Il caravaggismo a Roma: Certezze e ipotesi, 40; Blankert, "Caravaggio und die nördlichen Niederlande," 30; Brown, "The Birth of the Baroque: Painting in Rome 1592–1623," 26.

171 | On Ribera's and Valentin's *Denial,* see Nicolaci and Gandolfi, "Il Caravaggio di Guido Reni," 54.

172 | Pepper, *Guido Reni. L'opera completa*, 350.

173 | Guido Reni, also attr. to Giovanni Giacomo Sementi, *Roman Charity,* Rouen, Musée des beaux arts de Rouen, inv. no. 859.6.

174 | Guido Reni, attr., *Roman Charity,* 1618–1619, Genoa, Palazzo Durazzo Pallavacini. Paul Louis Bouillon-Landais, *Catalogue des objets d'art composant la collection du musée de Marseille précédé d'un essai historique sur le musée* (Marseille: impr. Marseillaise, 1884), 129. The painting in Rouen is now attributed to Giovanni Giacomo Sementi (1580–1638) but was previously attributed to Carlo Dolci (1616–1686), Francesco Gessi (1588–1649), and Guido Reni. See *Musée des beaux arts de Rouen,* inv. no. 859.6. On the painting in Genoa, see Pepper, Guido Reni. *L'opera completa,* 350.

175 | Compare this with Caravaggio's black surroundings: Sapir, *Ténèbres sans leçons*, 141, 225.

176 | Spear, *The "Divine" Guido*, 116–19.

177 | Spear, *The "Divine" Guido*, 122.

178 | Spear, *The "Divine" Guido*, 124.

179 | Pepper, *Guido Reni: L'opera completa*, 248–49, 288.

180 | Spear, *The "Divine" Guido*, 200.

181 | Hall, *The Sacred Image,* 258.

Chapter 3: Poussin's and Rubens's Long Shadows

Roman Charity, French History Painting, and the Hybridization of Genres

In the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, gallery paintings of *Roman Charity* became ubiquitous all over Europe.[1] Inventories and cabinet paintings of private collections, including Vermeer's quotation of Dirck van Baburen's piece in *A Lady at the Virginals,* give ample evidence of this phenomenon (Figure 2.32). Sculptures, relief facades, prints and drawings, watch faces, figurines made from porcelain or amber, even bronze badges used as entrance tickets for – presumably risqué – theater shows depicted the theme.[2] Women artists such as Isabella Maria dal Pozzo (d. 1700), Isabella di Borbone (1741–63), and Angelika Kauffmann (1741–1807) engaged with the motif as well (Figure 3.1).[3] In the later eighteenth century, colonial adaptations of Maximus's



Figure 3.1: Angelika Kauffmann, Roman Charity, ca. 1765



Figure 3.2: Jean-Michel Moreau the Younger, The Illness of Las Casas, 1777

anecdote that cast Bartolomeo de las Casas as Cimon and an Amerindian princess as the breastfeeding Pero show the versatility and political resonance of the ancient emblem of filial piety (Figure 3.2).[4] Once again, the theme of Roman Charity proved "good to think with," as it connected with debates on good and bad fatherhood during the Enlightenment. The brief comeback of the mother-daughter version during the French Revolution shows how the reciprocity in kinship relations, which the all-female version of the theme embodied, resonated with the theme of political equality, while the momentary reversal of patriarchal relations symbolized by Pero and Cimon, which had been meaningful under the ancien régime, was now a thing of the past. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, interest in the motif started to wane.

In the midst of this explosion of visual engagement with Pero and Cimon, Nicolas Poussin (1594–1665) stands out because of his rendering of the breastfeeding mother-daughter couple in his famous painting *The Gathering of the Manna* (1639) (Figure 3.3). Much has been written about this art work and the lactation episode at its center, as a result of the attention that Charles Le Brun paid to it in his talk at the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture in 1667.[5] However, Poussin's idiosyncratic and unique choice of Maximus's first, not second, anecdote of filial piety and the triangulation of the scene through the addition of the daughter's son have largely gone unnoticed or underanalyzed.[6] Lactation imagery figures prominently also in an earlier masterpiece by Poussin, *The Plague at Ashdod* (1630–31), as Giovanni Pietro Bellori and Joachim van Sandrart point out in their respective artists' biographies of 1672 and 1675 (Figure 3.4).[7] As in *The Gathering of the Manna,* Poussin places a highly unusual adaptation of Charity at the center of this picture, a dead mother and her infant about to suckle from her bare breasts. As if inspired by Tintoretto's religious imagery, Charity groups appear in many of his depictions of scenes from the Old and New Testament as well, especially in representations of Moses's miracles, of Saint John baptizing the people, and in his two series of the *Seven Sacraments*.[8] In none of these paintings are the women with small infants in their care represented in the act of breastfeeding, however. Poussin's use of manifest lactation imagery is limited to his paintings of the *Manna* and



Figure 3.3: Nicolas Poussin, The Gathering of the Manna, 1639



Figure 3.4: Nicolas Poussin, The Plague at Ashdod, 1630

the *Plague*, in which odd, awe-inspiring, or "horrible" configurations of nursing – or almost-nursing – couples suggest his intention to play with, problematize, or even reverse the traditional meaning of charitable allegories.[9]

Poussin, who single-handedly established a new canon of French classicizing art that lasted until the revival of history painting under Jacques-Louis David (1748–1825), had his own canons to deal with – and overthrow – when he came to Rome in 1624. Although Caravaggismo was on its way out as an avant-garde movement after the return of Simon Vouet to Paris in 1627 and the death of Valentin de Boulogne in 1632, the stylistic revolution that Caravaggio imparted left long-lived, ongoing ripple effects.[10] Especially when taking the fashion for *Roman Charities* à la Manfredi as a measure of his influence, it appears that outside of Rome, Caravaggismo was well and alive until the end of the century.[11] Poussin, who famously remarked that Caravaggio "had come into the world to destroy painting," can be said to have established his own style in open antithesis to Caravaggio's art and everything it stood for.[12] Contemporary art critics were aware of this polarization, sometimes applauding, sometimes criticizing Poussin for his rejection of Caravaggio's style and method. Roger de Piles (1635–1709), for example, complains: "Poussin, by neglecting to imitate nature, the fountain of variety, fell often on very apparent repetitions."[13] Giovanni Pietro Bellori, by contrast, praises Poussin for his disdain of street life, taverns, and gambling – source of inspiration to his nemesis – and his

preference for early morning studies of ancient statuary on the Campidoglio.[14] Joachim von Sandrart juxtaposes Caravaggio's controlled use of light in dark chambers with Poussin's love of "open air" and "wide fields" in an impartial manner.[15] André Félibien (1619–95), who summarized and published Charles Le Brun's conference talk of 1667, pronounced the two artists as "entirely opposed to each other" because of Poussin's constant search for nobility in his subject matter and Caravaggio's alleged belief in the sole truth of nature. He claimed that only the beautiful was worth representing, not vile things, thus grounding the Royal Academy's programmatic distinction between "high" and "low" art on a comparison between the two artists.[16]

Elizabeth Cropper and Charles Dempsey, likewise, have seen Poussin's œuvre as a reverse interpretation of Caravaggio's art, as the attempt to undo the latter's "polemical attack on the traditions of art." They argue that most preceding art historians have "perceived [Nicolas Poussin] in curious isolation as the fons et origo of a permanent concept of style and national expression."[17] Already Louis Marin noted, however, how Félibien, Bellori, and other supporters of Poussin condemned Caravaggio for what they saw as his "slavish submission" to "unmediated" nature, presenting or doubling reality in the form of a simulacrum or trompe-l'oeil instead of re-presenting it with an edifying purpose in mind.[18] They criticized his neglect of design, ancient aesthetic, and Albertian perspective but also, above all, his preference for capturing moments that shock and freeze the viewer. Instead, they advocated for history paintings that represent the passage of time by showing human figures engaged in significant actions and dynamic relationships in a well-ordered pictorial space.[19] In Marin's view, Poussin's "condensation of … temporal succession and of different moments in one instant of representation"[20] distinguishes his art from the Medusa-like effect of Caravaggio's paintings, in which the collapse of pictorial space and the snapshot-like quality of his figures' movements arrest the audience without offering a narrative to dissolve their stupor.[21]

Other observations of difference include remarks on the two artists' use of light and color, their expression of emotions, and their choice of details. According to Richard Spear, Poussin wanted to "express the various passions of the soul and to make visible what is in the mind,"[22] while Caravaggio, paradoxically, limited the visible in favor of darkness.[23] Caravaggio's restraint in depicting strong emotions creates an impression of pensive interiority and absorptive subjectivity,[24] while Poussin aims at "objectivity" and transparency in the representation of movements of the soul through what he believed was a universally valid gestural vocabulary.[25] His canvas is the quintessential Albertian window looking out, while Caravaggio's resembles a closed cube.[26] With respect to the use of significant details in their paintings, both artists depart from Alberti's recommendations in interesting, mutually exclusive ways. While Poussin creates a particular ambience for the purpose of allegorizing antiquity in an

austere and controlled manner, i.e., without falling victim to the superfluities of "copia" and the narrative abundance of particulars,[27] Caravaggio chooses the occasional ripped sleeve or dirty foot to signify "reality" in the sense of empirical materiality.[28] The differences between the two painters are so pronounced that art historians find it hard to refrain from taking sides. As Michael Fried has recently affirmed, Poussin's "body of work … has always rightly been seen – in the first place by Poussin himself – as standing in the strongest imaginable contrast to Caravaggio's revolutionary but also deeply problematic achievement."[29] And Louis Marin chides Caravaggio for his alleged iconoclasm, his preference for embracing rather than discursively dissolving the paradox of pictorial representation, and confirms "yes, indeed, this man came into the world to destroy painting."[30]

What has gone unnoticed despite this long – and easily extendable – catalog of polar opposites is that at least on one occasion, Poussin allowed himself to be inspired by Caravaggio in a positive manner. His painting of *The Gathering of the Manna* is proof of this gesture, despite its momentous importance in the history of French classicism. Like Caravaggio, Poussin integrates a Roman Charity into a complex religious painting, and, like Caravaggio, he departs from the canonic representation of Pero and Cimon in interesting ways. Since both painters did not habitually depict lactation scenes – in contrast to Tintoretto and Rubens, for example – their choice of Maximus's anecdote of "filial piety" stands out in their respective œuvres and assumes programmatic significance. The two episodes can be regarded as lenses that highlight important features of their individual methods and philosophies. Both Caravaggio and Poussin express a marked disdain for traditional lactation scenes in *The Seven Works of Mercy* and *The Gathering of the Manna,* respectively, paintings devoted to depicting permutations of the very theme of Charity. And both seem intent on breaking the Church's monopoly on what it calls its "cardinal" virtue by disassociating the allegory from Catholic orthodoxy. They do so in different ways but wind up expressing similarly dissenting perspectives on mainstream Catholicism: while Caravaggio stresses the importance of anti-clerical spirituality at a time of Tridentine supremacy, Poussin elaborates heterodox narratives of the early Church and focuses on Old-Testament precursors to the history of Christian redemption.

Caravaggio secularizes and politicizes Charity by couching Pero as the breastfeeding Madonna's successor and representative on earth whose needy father, awaiting nurture, renewal, and redemption, is a Saint Peter look-alike. He thus openly calls for a reform of the papacy on an altarpiece of a Neapolitan church associated with a confraternity dedicated to poor relief and the assistance of prisoners. Caravaggio does seem to be responding to Maximus's ekphrasis and demand for enargeia in calling for a "life-like," i.e., vivid and breathtaking, manner of representing the scene, but he departs from his textual source by

having Pero breastfeed her father through the bars of a prison window, as the episode circulated in oral culture. Having chosen the moment of Pero's fear of discovery, Caravaggio succeeds in rendering the scene as an eye-catching point of entry into a busy painting teeming with his trademark "realism," classical allusions, and unorthodox spirituality.

While Poussin's choice of Maximus's mother-daughter couple to express the Israelites' suffering and hunger is idiosyncratic, his interest in the all-female lactation scene is not quite unprecedented, as some art historians claim.[31] Apart from illuminations of French manuscript editions of Boccaccio's *Famous Women* (Figure 1.5), a drawing attributed to Lambert Lombard (1505–66) already depicts the two nursing women (Figure 2.7). They are surrounded by onlookers in the midst of a ruinous cityscape, in front of remnants of what looks like the Colosseum, in an intriguing collapse of the ancient and the contemporary. It is unlikely that Poussin would have seen this drawing, but he might have known the print by Étienne Delaune (1518/19–88), which imagines the same episode to be taking place in a classicizing interior of magnificent architecture (Figure 2.5). Also, some French viewers were perhaps familiar with the morality play or "Histoire Rommaine" printed in Lyon in 1548, in which a very lively and verbose young woman challenges her mom to endure her suffering with greater dignity, before finally succumbing to her requests to be nursed (see Chapter 4).

In choosing to paint the mother-daughter episode, Poussin was able to demonstrate his knowledge of a lesser-known passage in Maximus's text and of French precedents of the theme. His choice suggests that he catered toward a highly educated, French humanist audience with a taste for the rare and slightly arcane.[32] In sync with his erudite style and ambition for the "correct" representation of ancient artifacts and texts, he may also have wanted to draw attention to the misnomer of contemporary portrayals of Pero as Roman Charity, whom Maximus envisioned to be Greek.[33] Most importantly, his version of the breastfeeding scene avoided the erotic or pornographic insinuations often associated with Pero's enactment of "filial piety." Caravaggio was careful to restrain and neutralize those fantasies by taking recourse to the prison bars, having the scene take place on a busy street corner, and reducing Cimon to a disembodied head. Poussin preempts the imminent danger of seeing the scene as an intimate sensual encounter between two women by adding the daughter's son to the episode, who, quite realistically but in deviation from his textual source, distracts his mother with his own demands for her milk. As an extra precaution against a "lesbian" reading of the two women's unusual display of physical love, Poussin supplements the scene with an observer to the left, who, according to Le Brun, models the proper reaction to the event in order to avoid the viewer's possibly "inappropriate" interpretation of the scene. In convoluted and obscure prose, Félibien has Le Brun explain why Poussin chose to display this middle-aged male observer in such a prominent place:

"He [Le Brun] said, it was not without intention that Monsieur Poussin represented a man of a certain age, who attentively watches the woman who is giving the breast to her mother. For such an unusual act of mercy has to be watched by a dignified person, so that it achieves validity and can be appropriately regarded in its content and meaning. By assuming the task of watching the woman, he [the observer] motivates those, who are beholding the painting, to pay closer attention to her. He [the artist] did not wish [the observer] to be a rough and uncouth man, because this sort of people does not consider things, which necessarily have to be contemplated [in viewing the picture]."[34]

In order to capture the audience's attention, the observer raises his hand as if to arrest the viewing process and ward off improper vibrations, thoughts, and feelings. He seems to want to restrain the spectator from engaging in a possibly dangerous misreading of the scene and protect the picture against an uninitiated beholder's faulty hermeneutics. The observer is of paramount importance for the correct "reading" of the painting, which Le Brun underscores by detecting traces of the Laocoon in his proportions.[35] Louis Marin, in fact, calls him a meta-figure "who, through a view of admiration and a gesture of surprise, gives the spectator … the exact key for the true reading of … the painting."[36] He resembles the kind of first-person observer who, according to Niklas Luhmann, structures any discourse about the painting by making the initial distinction: is it or is it not a true gesture of charity? Like Caravaggio, Poussin engages the viewer in a self-reflective meditation on the authenticating quality of this foundational distinction for meaning to emerge, but unlike Caravaggio, he does not create a grey zone of uncertainty or question the process of representation as such. The viewer, or second-order observer, needs to arrive at exactly the intended reading of the scene, which in this case needs to exclude any erotic fantasies and subversive underpinnings.

Poussin seems to have worried a lot about possible misunderstandings; his aim was to produce a Roman Charity truly in sync with its assumed meaning of filial piety, purged of all irony. In his correspondence, he assumes the observer's role himself, trying to guide and control his colleagues' and clients' reactions. In a letter to Jacques Stella, a fellow artist, he expresses his hope that the "mixture of women, children, and men of a certain age … will not displease those who are able to read [*sic*] them correctly." And to Paul Fréart de Chantelou, the commissioner of the painting, he wrote:

"If you … consider the painting as a whole, I believe you will easily recognize those who languish and those who admire, those who have pity, or show charity, great need, the desire to feed, consolation and other [emotions], because the first seven figures to the left will tell you everything which is written there [*sic*] and all the rest is of the same stuff."[37]

Poussin's conception of his painting as a text has been much commented upon. While his idea of an "alphabet" of *affetti*, i.e., of facial gestures and

bodily movements capable of expressing unequivocal emotions, was found to be convincing until at least the middle of the eighteenth century,[38] his effort to create pictorial unity despite the sequential representation of interrelated moments was much debated since Le Brun's conference talk in 1667.[39] His Roman Charity was at the heart of this debate.[40] While Poussin's critics did not openly question the moral intention of using Maximus's anecdote, or object to the use of a pagan story to illustrate an Old Testament event, they denied the need for the representation of the old mother's suffering, pointing to the fact that God had already sent quails to the Israelites the evening before the miracle of the manna.[41] In any case, one might add, now that the manna has fallen to the ground, the old mother could satiate her hunger by eating it instead of imposing on her daughter for milk. Le Brun counters these objections by arguing that Poussin intended to demonstrate the magnitude of God's miracle, for which purpose it was necessary to show the intensity of the suffering that preceded it.[42] The mapping of an ancient Roman example of filial piety onto the representation of an Old Testament miracle creates poetic – if not historical – truth, and it realizes the principle of peripeteia derived from Aristotle's drama theory.[43] It implies the representation of a plot reversal without violating the rule of verisimilitude. Pictorial unity is established through the convincing portrayal of the figures' emotions along with their proper spatial arrangement to indicate the unfolding of their relationships in time. The correct "reading" of the mother-daughter breastfeeding scene thus assumes programmatic importance in Poussin's development of a new brand of history painting that combines the collapse of different moments in time with the sequencing of its individual plot elements.

Le Brun and Félibien spell out exactly how to proceed in deciphering the painting's narrative. Because of its prominent position, bright light, and unusual action, the Roman Charity group catches the viewer's eyes first. Left of the daughter, we see a naked child that she addresses and consoles, followed by the above-mentioned observer dressed in red and another man in a crouching position who leans against a stick and watches the tender scene from behind. To the daughter's right, an old, half-naked man is seated on the ground, Cimon-like, with a deeply receding hairline and a bushy grey beard. He looks away from the nursing couple, following the outstretched hand of a young man who stands behind him, and points to the Israelites who kneel before Moses in gratitude.[44] The mother-daughter couple on the left is matched by a Charity group on the right, a woman seen from behind who supports an infant on her right hip and addresses a young man with a basket, pointing to the old man alias "Cimon" behind her who seems to need help. This woman is dressed in the same yellow and blue hues as the breastfeeding mother-daughter couple to the left; a similar bright light illuminates her upper body and left arm.[45] She is surrounded by children who fight over the manna, a man who kneels and prays



Figure 3.5: Tintoretto, The Birth of Saint John the Baptist, 1563

in gratitude, and other people collecting the food that has fallen on the ground. Finally, the viewer's gaze falls on Moses further in the back, whose right arm points upward to the sky, presumably to indicate to his worshippers that God is the true source of the miracle. In spite of the celebration of Moses's agency and leadership in and through this painting, the pictorial focus is on the two Charity groups in the foreground.[46]

Already Tintoretto made narrative use of allegories of charity. In his decorative program of the Scuola Grande di San Rocco, they served to connect Old Testament miracles with the gospels' promise of redemption by portraying Moses as a precursor to Christ, but they served also to give women greater prominence in the theater of salvation. Many of his portrayals of women engaged in reproductive activities are based on apocryphal sources, as, for example, the inclusion of Mary's midwives in his *Adoration of the Shepherds*.[47] His vision of the Virgin as – almost – wet-nursing Saint John the Baptist right after Elizabeth's delivery expands on these sources, in which breastfeeding women are given ample consideration (Figure 3.5).[48] Tintoretto's efforts to extend the visibility of female occupations and experiences such as the preparation and serving of food, birth, and lactation were politically motivated because of the concomitant stress on Venice's Byzantine, i.e., anti-Roman, traditions. By contrast, Poussin's interest in refashioning Charity as an ancient pagan and Jewish virtue had the purpose of establishing a more "masculine" counter-discourse to orthodox, post-Tridentine Catholicism based on historical research.[49] Poussin, who according to artist Giovanni Battista Passeri (1610–79) "vilified the Latin style" in favor of ancient Greek aesthetics – in anticipation of Winckelmann – was much influenced by anti-colonial visions of antiquity and alternative narratives of the early church.[50]

Many of Poussin's religious paintings emphasize the leadership of Moses and Saint Paul, art works that are inspired by the writings of, among others, Josephus Flavius (37–ca. 100 CE) and the "paper museum" of Cassiano dal Pozzo.[51] If his references to Josephus's *History of the Jewish War* (78 CE) and *Jewish Antiquities* (93 CE) served to hint at an anti-imperial tradition of history writing, dal Pozzo's collection of drawings and prints of ancient Roman artifacts fed Poussin's interest in the history of the early Church and comparative religion.[52] Both served to undermine the vision of Saint Peter as the sole, inevitable, and undisputed leader of the Roman Church. Commenting on his painting of the *Manna,* for example, Poussin calls Moses "legislator" under reference to Josephus; most importantly, he includes a Cimon-like character begging for help who resembles Saint Peter. A young man encourages this pathetic figure to follow the example of other Israelites who thank Moses by kneeling down, while the charitable lady to the right is receptive to his pleas and organizes help.[53] Such humiliating circumstances in portraying a figure meant to evoke associations with the papacy are at least as boldly anti-clerical as Caravaggio's fusion of Saint Peter with Cimon in his *Seven Works of Mercy*. Moreover, in his Edinburgh *Confirmation* (1645), Poussin gives explicit preference to Paul over Peter in portraying early Church leadership.[54] Saint Paul is the officiating priest, wearing the pallium [later: papal ribbon] over his tunic, while Saint Peter, recognizable by his well-known features, hides in semi-darkness behind an elegant young woman dressed in red.[55]

In many of Poussin's paintings of religious-political impact, Charity groups appear, but they are classically poised women clad in ancient garments with high necklines. By contrast, Tintoretto's nurses and female care workers elegantly lounge about in partial dishabille and contemporary dress, casually nursing infants as well as older children.[56] In Poussin's work, the lactation motif is usually not manifest but implied, as in his Hermitage version of *Moses Striking Water from the Rock* (1649) (Figure 3.6). In this companion piece to the *Gathering of the Manna,* a woman who wears a similar headdress to the nursing daughter's sits in the right-hand corner begging for water. Her toddler is not breastfeeding, but asking for it, while a sickly elderly woman lies in her lap. The addition of the elderly woman dressed in blue, a color scheme that matches the yellow dress of the mother, reveals this Charity group to refer back to the female nursing couple of the *Gathering of the Manna*. This time, the mother is not suckling, but lying weak and exhausted in her daughter's arms. A similar Charity group consisting of a woman with two naked toddlers dressed in yellow and blue is part of the *Adoration of the Golden Calf* (ca. 1633–37).[57] The woman sits right underneath Moses and impassively watches the dancers, while her fellow Israelites argue angrily with their leader. In the *Triumph of David* (1628–31), women with naked babies are decoratively placed in the front of the painting, wearing the obligatory colors of yellow and blue.[58] Le Brun and Félibien already commented on the programmatic importance of these colors in Poussin's works: "Because yellow and blue … resemble light and air the most, Monsieur Poussin dresses his main figures in yellow and blue cloth."[59]



Figure 3.6: Nicolas Poussin, Moses Striking Water from the Rocks, 1649



Figure 3.7: Nicolas Poussin, The Death of Germanicus, 1627

In the *Crossing of the Red Sea* (1633–37), women with small children in their care point to Moses at the opposite end of the painting, who is commanding the waters to drown the Egyptians.[60] In gospel scenes such as the *Entry of Christ into Jerusalem* and the Los Angeles and Paris versions of *Saint John Baptizing the People* (1633–40), women with children are either watching the proceedings or waiting their turn to participate. In several of his paintings from the two series of *Sacraments*, such as the Leicestershire *Matrimony* (1636) and *Extreme Unction* (1636), the Edinburgh *Baptism* (1646) and the two *Confirmations* (1636, 1645), Charity groups appear as well.[61] As in Tintoretto's œuvre, such allegories express the hope and joy connected with scenes of food multiplication and baptism. In Poussin's work, they also highlight the positive roles that King David, Moses, Saint John the Baptist, and Saint Paul played in the history of Christianity.

From this perspective, the casting of Germanicus's wife and son as a Charity group – dressed in yellow and blue – in his famous early masterpiece the *Death of Germanicus* (1627) is astounding and deserves commentary (Figure 3.7). His wife is not about to breastfeed – she grieves over the approaching death of her husband, who has just been poisoned by his stepfather – but the nude, pre-school-aged son standing by her side reminds of this pictorial tradition. Right behind her, a more literal Charity amplifies the positive meaning of the image; she wears the typical open blouse of a lactating woman, exposing her



Figure 3.8: Marcantonio Raimondi, Il Morbetto, after Raphael, 1515–16

left shoulder and chest. Germanicus is presumably in the act of asking his friends to avenge his death, so the hopeful expectations associated with the use of charity figures can only consist of his friend's promise to do so. His raised arm and pointed finger seem to indicate a positive response. Germanicus's young son imitates this gesture by cautiously raising his left pointer finger as well; in addition, he wears the same blue mantle as his dying father's avenger, coming across as an interesting mix of nude nursling and prospective general.

Poussin's most creative, but also shocking and provocative, use of a charity figure consists of his integration of a dead nurse in *The Plague of Ashdod* (1630–31). Many art historians have written about this piece, starting with André Félibien, Giovanni Pietro Bellori, and Joachim von Sandrart, who all agree that this painting rendered Poussin famous through its overwhelming effect of beautifully rendered horror.[62] The most forceful expression of such abomination is the dead woman in the foreground from whose poisoned breasts a young infant is about to suck before being held back by a man who protects his nose against the stench emanating from her corpse. Another man approaching from the right, likewise, covers his nose with his hands, and the observer figure to the left balks at the smell and bends away.[63] He cannot even look at this scene of terror and dread, endowing the painting with an interesting iconoclastic implication.[64] The picture is a close illustration of the Philistines'

theft of the Arc of God and their punishment as narrated in I Samuel 5.[65] Poussin has placed the Arc of the Covenant right in front of the fallen statue of Dagon further back in the painting, in front of a crowd of people who are deeply agitated by the destruction of their god. While they are investigating the extent of the damage, the unbearable sight of the infant about to suckle from a corpse mirrors God's horror of idol worship, symbolizing and doubling the Philistines' iconoclastic punishment. Alexandra Woolley and Elisabeth Hipp have called the dead mother and her infant an "anti-Charity" that expresses the Philistines' reversal of values and the destruction following God's punishment.[66]

The dead mother's iconographic "pedigree" could not be more exalted: her bodily posture recalls both the *Dead Amazon* (150 BCE) and the *Laocoon* (ca. 100 BCE–100 CE);[67] the lactation scene goes back to a lost painting by Aristides (4th century BCE) described by Pliny the Elder; ultimately, the image is inspired by the *Morbetto* (1515/16), a print from Raimondi after a lost painting by Raphael (Figure 3.8).[68] This complex mixture of biblical, ancient, and modern sources anticipates the rhetorical virtuosity that Poussin would display again in the *Gathering of the Manna*.[69] The various configurations of charity in these two paintings are proof of Poussin's strategy to produce meaningful novelties through the imaginative and densely layered refashioning of well-known, highly regarded images in the context of somewhat arcane, and carefully quoted textual sources. Variations on the theme of charity assume an almost talismanic importance in Poussin's rise to fame. Already in the *Death of Germanicus* (1627), a Charity-like group of mother and son plays an important role in the painting's emplotment of death and revenge, grief and hope, present and future. The dual importance of Poussin's Charities as narrative elements and allegorical embodiments of deep historical significance rendered them particularly good to "think with," or, in this case, paint with. They became emblematic for Poussin's invention of highly expressive "Pathosformeln."[70]

Both of Poussin's idiosyncratic Charity groups inspired numerous copies by subsequent artists. Most of these copyists used Poussin's images in analogy to Manfredi's "method" of quoting Caravaggio, i.e., by isolating them from the complex surroundings of the paintings that hosted them. In his sketch for an ex-voto fresco during the plague of Naples in 1656, Mattia Preti cites Poussin's dead mother and suckling infant for a very specific purpose, namely, to depict the horrors of the then-raging plague and a range of heavenly intercessors to mitigate God's wrath (Figure 3.9).[71] Preti's work, in turn, inspired Giovan Tommaso Fasano (ca. 1646–1723) to produce a similar votive painting dedicated to the Madonna del Carmine,[72] and it sparked wax artist Gaetano Zumbo (1656–1701) to complete a disturbingly live-like relief of the dead mother and suckling infant in a sculpture of plague victims (Figure 3.10). In all three of these later adaptations, Poussin's "anti-Charity" was used for its pure shock value, in an instrumental approach that suggests what viewers liked the most



Figure 3.9: Mattia Preti, The Plague, 1656–57

about the *Plague of Ashdod*. In France, Poussin's painting found more ambitious imitators. As Alexandra Woolley has shown, François Perrier (1594–1649) was the first to quote the group in his *Plague of Athens* (1635), including the man who, protecting his nose, keeps the infant away from his dead mother's poisonous breast.[73] Fifteen years later, Charles Le Brun integrated the dying



Figure 3.10: Gaetano Zumbo, The Plague, Wax Relief, before 1701

mother and her baby in his depiction of *The Brazen Serpent*, and Sébastien Bourdon completed a painting of the *Plague of Ashdod* in direct reference to Poussin's original in 1670.[74]

The afterlife of Poussin's Roman Charity in the *Gathering of the Manna* resembles the fate of Caravaggio's Pero and Cimon from the *Seven Works of Mercy* even more closely. Like Manfredi, who isolated Caravaggio's breastfeeding father-daughter couple and turned it into a gallery painting (1610–14) (Figure 2.24), Charles Le Brun produced a painting of just *Charity* (1642–48) in direct analogy to Poussin's composition (Figure 3.11).[75] While Caravaggio's provocative rendering of the nursing scene on a busy street corner was given up in favor of a more canonical placement in Maximus's dungeon, Le Brun normalized Poussin's same-sex lactation by replacing the suckling old mother with an infant. However, he preserved the association with Maximus's anecdote by adding a half-naked old man, who is presumably awaiting his turn, in a supplicant position right underneath the nursing baby. This gender swap of the needy parent and the substitution of a baby for the woman's mother amount to a deliberate "correction" of Poussin's original. Le Brun, who two decades later would praise the *Manna* for its ingenious sequencing of plot elements and expressive qualities, might have found his master's breastfeeding group



Figure 3.11: Charles Le Brun, Charity, 1642–48

too provocative and idiosyncratic to imitate in isolation. His alterations suggest that an all-female lactation scene was bearable to a seventeenth-century audience only in the midst of a convoluted array of erudite references and ethical purposes. Other than Poussin, only Guercino (1590–1661) dared to represent the female couple in a drawing (Figure 3.12). What reminds of Poussin's Roman Charity is Le Brun's triangular composition, which he achieved by rotating the Cimon-like figure by 180 degrees and substituting the old woman for an infant, leaving intact the interaction between the nurse and the pre-school-age

child approaching from the left. His corrective "reading" of the *Manna* definitively suggests that viewers recognized Maximus's starving father in the old man who opens his arms in supplication. A few years after his completion of Charity, Le Brun reused the configuration by placing it virtually unchanged into his *Moses Striking the Rock* (1648–50), a further indication of how much he admired Poussin's breastfeeding group in a celebration of Moses's food-related miracles.[76]

Independently of Le Brun's adaptation, dozens of more traditional representations of Pero and Cimon appeared in the second half of the seventeenth century that included an infant. Already Rosso Fiorentino had added Pero's child in an attempt to desexualize the scene and render it more verisimilar (Figure 1.49). Poussin is very likely to have seen this relief during his stay at Fontainebleau, or else knew of Reverdy's accompanying prints. Also, in early Flemish renderings of *Roman Charity,* a baby would appear on occasion.[77] After Poussin's inclusion



Figure 3.12: Guercino, The Daughter Who Breastfeeds her Mother, before 1661

of a pre-school-age boy who complains about his grandmother's consumption of his milk, a veritable rush of imitations set in, starting with Niccolò Tornioli (1598–1651) (Figure 3.13). Cecco Bravo (1607–61), Artus Quellinus the Elder (1609–1668), Louis Boullogne (1625–74), Jean Cornu (1650-1710), Johann Carl Loth (1632–98), Carlo Cignani (1628–1719), Adrian van der Werff (1659–1722), Gregorio Lazzarini (1657–1730), Francesco Migliori (1684–1734), and Johann




Figure 3.13: Niccolò Tornioli, Roman Charity, before 1651

Peter Weber (1737-1804) followed suit with their respective paintings, prints, and sculptures.[78] In distinction to Poussin, all of these artists depicted "family scenes" that centered on Pero's nursing of her father.

The debates that Poussin's paintings of the *Plague of Ashdod* and the *Gathering of the Manna* initiated, about the aesthetics of horror and suffering and the purpose of history paintings in capturing the passage of time, had deep resonance until at least the middle of the eighteenth century. Poussin's lactation imagery was at the center of these debates because of the emotions they aroused in the spectators and because of the narrative, temporalized function Poussin attributed to those modified allegories of Charity. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing never saw Poussin's paintings, but his essay on "Laocoon, or the Limits of Painting and Poetry" (1766) reads as if he implicitly referred to them as counter-examples of the classicizing aesthetic he proposes. He admires the *Laocoon* precisely because of its muted expression of pain and horror. In contrast to Vergil's poetry, which describes Laocoon as crying out loud, the visible arts and theater need to be mindful not to overwhelm the spectator with their demands of empathy. Lessing places great importance on the correct choice of moment to be depicted. In his view, it is more suitable to depict the moment that immediately precedes or follows an outburst of anger and violence rather than the incident itself. Medea, for example, should be shown right before she murders her children, and Ajax after he kills and rapes.[79] Lessing advises restraint and caution in visibly representing pain and horror because of the dialectic relationship between external and internal images: "The more we see, the more we need to be able to add through our imagination. The more we add through our imagination, the more we need to be able to believe what we think we are seeing."[80] Lessing would have found the image of the dead nurse with her infant not only repulsive but also inefficient, because it would have deadened rather than stimulated his imagination. Artists should refrain from painting corpses too "realistically" and should at all times observe proper decorum.[81]

Lessing would not have appreciated the Roman Charity in Poussin's *Gathering of the Manna* either, because of the intensity of the suffering it depicts and because of his skeptical attitude about history paintings in general. In contrast to poetry and prose, which in his view are good at representing successive moments in time, paintings should stick to the representation of one action alone. Even though he praises Raphael for his method of rendering successive moments in time by using the folds of a garment to suggest a figure's motion, Lessing advises the visual arts to concentrate on what is visible in the immediate present; artists should not sequence different actions, as Poussin did by portraying the Israelites as both starving and gathering food.[82] In Lessing's opinion, great art is about timelessly laying out beautiful bodies in space. True beauty requires the non-verbal skills of a visual artist – writers are better apt at




Figure 3.14: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, Septimius Severus and Caracalla, 1769

detailing ugliness. Both the degeneration of matter and writing evolve in time, in opposition to the eternal ideal of perfection that classic beauty represents.[83] Likewise, artists should refrain from expressing mixed emotions, as Poussin did by showing the nurse torn between the mutually conflicting demands of her mother and her son.[84] Least of all, one might add, should they depict lactating women to arouse horror and compassion; Poussin's use of the *Laocoon* and the *Dead Amazon* as models for his breastfeeding daughter and dead mother, respectively, appears in Lessing's essay as a complete oxymoron.

In France, the debates surrounding classicism had less to do with theorizing the ideal beauty of – male – Greek statues and the narrative potential of Homer's epics than with the hierarchy of genres in imitation of Aristotle's aesthetic.[85] Since at least the adoption of Poussin as the French academy's poster-child, history paintings were regarded as superior to all other forms of painting, analogous to Aristotle's preference for tragedy over comedy. This hierarchy led to a strict division between history and genre painting, which even the Enlightenment fondness for paintings of – bourgeois – "sentiment" and "morality" did little to disturb. The scandal surrounding Jean-Baptiste Greuze's *Septimius Severus and Caracalla* (1769) is proof of the rigidity with which even "enlightened" art lovers such as Denis Diderot (1713–84) defended the hierarchy of genres (Figure 3.14). Greuze's audacity



Figure 3.15: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, Roman Charity, 1767

consisted of aspiring to be admitted to the academy as a history painter, even though it was generally felt that his true and only talent was for painting genre scenes. Incidentally, Greuze (1725–1805) painted a *Roman Charity* in 1767 to announce his burgeoning interest in the "noble" genre (Figure 3.15), in imitation of Noël-Nicolas Coypel (1690–1734), Jean-Baptiste Deshays (1729–65), Giuseppe Baldrighi (1722–1803), Louis-Jean-François Lagrenée (1725–1805) and Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806), who in 1724, 1757, 1759, and 1765, respectively, exhibited their portrayals of Pero and Cimon at the Salon and other venues.[86] The discussion surrounding the six painters' *Roman Charities* is thus intimately tied up with a debate about the ranking of genres, at a time when concepts of paternity and their political implications underwent close scrutiny.

Because of his canonical status within the academy, Poussin's shadow loomed large over this debate, but so did Rubens's. Ever since Roger de Piles's "Treatise on the most famous painters" in 1681 had advanced the Flemish master's style in direct and open contrast to Poussin's, the importance of "fertile" coloring and a more flexible understanding of design had come to rival Poussin's more austere achievements. De Piles criticized Poussin for privileging the study of ancient statuary over the observation of nature, which is why his nudes resemble "painted stone … and [are like] … the hardness of

marble rather than the delicacy of flesh, full of blood and life."[87] Rubens, by contrast, "gives his nudes the true resemblance of flesh, which is what he liked to represent according to age, sex, and condition."[88] To a large extent, these distinctions hinge on the two painters' different approaches to design. While most painters – including Poussin – limit design to measuring and the observance of geometric rules, only very few of them understand the art of "spiritual" design, which consists of "imprinting on painted objects the truth of nature, and to collect in them the idea of what we have in front of our eyes, observing the rules of proper choice, decorum, and variety."[89] De Piles distinguishes Rubens not only from Poussin but also from Caravaggio, who neglected design of any sort, did not choose his objects properly, and violated decorum.[90] However, both Rubens and Caravaggio agreed on the importance of coloring, because "the painter who is a perfect imitator of nature … knows … that … [nature] is imitable to him only because it is visible, and that it is visible only because it is colored."[91] Poussin, by contrast, "neglected coloring … [and] knew nothing of … claro obscuro."[92]

As an example of Rubens's skill in rendering flesh and skin in their appropriate colors, de Piles praises his *Drunken Silenus* (1616–17) (Figure 2.28), in which "the complexion of the female satyr and her two children appear so verisimilar that one can easily imagine to feel the heat of blood upon touching it: … it is of a surprising freshness."[93] In fact, he continues: "I am convinced that in this work, Rubens wanted to carry the art of painting to its highest degree: everything is full of life, of a correct design, and of an extraordinary sweetness and force."[94] In this masterpiece, the naked satyress, whose complexion Rubens painted so truthfully and whose skin de Piles wished he could touch, is engaged in breastfeeding her two cubs, Charity-like, while Silenus is "dazed by the vapors of wine." He is a nude old man whose fat flesh and empty view characterize him as completely undone.[95] In this slightly disturbing picture, Silenus is ensnared by various companions who keep on offering him grapes and wine, while the satyress suckles her offspring in the manner of animals, with her two extended breasts dangling to the ground. De Piles, usually so concerned with the observance of decorum, overlooks the fact that the nursing satyress fondles the penis of one of her obese children, as if to mirror the excess of Silenus's sensuality and consumption. Svetlana Alpers observes how Rubens depicts the "physical satisfactions of what is usually described and painted as maternal nurture," turning the breastfeeding satyress into an anti-Madonna Lactans, or better: anti-Charity.[96]

In analogy to his various versions of *Roman Charity,* Rubens's *Drunken Silenus* combines lactation imagery with the depiction of a pathetic, naked old man whose suffering and anti-heroic fleshliness dominate the scene. These milk scenes suggest that male flesh is the result of female nurture and that loss of boundary threatens the male self through drunkenness and regression.[97]



Figure 3.16: Peter Paul Rubens, Minerva Protects Pax from Mars, 1629–30

Other paintings, such as *Juno and Argus* (1610), associate milk with the creative act of coloring.[98] In this latter painting, taken from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Rubens employs a milk-squirting Iris to turn Argus's hundred eyes into colorful peacock feathers.[99] Both fleshliness and coloring, which in de Piles's view are indicative of what is visible, and imitable, in nature, are the result of feminine nurture and creativity. This accounts for Rubens's association of paint with milk, the androgynous nature of many of his male nudes, and his view of artistic creativity as maternal generation.[100] Since flesh and fleshliness are cause and effect of nurture and nourishment, their representation demands correct coloring. Painting understood as the application of colors re-enacts the process by which words become flesh (on canvas). Lactation imagery is sign and symbol of such creative fleshliness – and of the painterly skill in using colors – which is why, perhaps, de Piles lauds the complexion of the breastfeeding satyress and her cubs over that of Silenus. In fact, the blue-veined engorged breasts of this white-skinned mother earth-goddess are surprisingly life-like, and they suggest the excess and "copia" of pleasure that comes with breastfeeding, and with emphasizing the materiality of color over the abstraction of the line.[101] As Régis Michel has observed, the pure line of painters like Ingres – but also Poussin, we might add – signifies guilt and male honor, "whereas color, in every sense, is a stain."[102] Such stains of pleasurable coloring that no clear line hems in are often expressed in Rubens's œuvre through drops or squirts of milk, whether in *The Origin of the Milky Way, Venus, Mars,*



Figure 3.17: Louis-Jean-François Lagrenée the Elder, Roman Charity, 1765

and Amor, Minerva Protects Pax from Mars (Figure 3.16), *Juno and Argus,* or the *Drunken Silenus* (Figure 2.28).[103]

Rubens's vision of Cimon as a suffering male nude who depends on a colorful Pero's white breast for sustenance inspired not only Greuze but also, two years prior to him, Lagrenée (Figure 3.17). Rubens's Amsterdam version of *Roman Charity* was a famous painting of which multiple engravings existed, but Lagrenée might have seen it in actuality, since the resemblance of his piece to the Flemish master's work extends to its colors.[104] As in Rubens's version, Cimon is seated to the left with angled knees. In slight deviation from his source, Cimon crouches on a bunch of straw, while in the original, Cimon sits on a rectangular block of wood or stone. Pero is seated, slightly elevated, on a stone bench to the right. Like Ruben's Pero, she bends her head away from her father, but unlike her model, she does not offer him her breast with a V-hold, nor are her nipples visible. A further alteration is the lack of a fully visible window through which the guards are peeking in. This omission shifts the depicted moment to that of the couple's intense absorption before their discovery rather than the very scene of interruption. Diderot and the reviewer for the *Mercure de France* interpreted the scene differently, probably because they were hyper-

aware of Rubens's original. The anonymous reviewer detects signs of Pero's "inquietude … in noticing a prison guard who watches her … through the bars,"[105] while Diderot even sees both father and daughter staring "fixedly at a barred window of the prison … through which we see a soldier who watches them."[106] In reality, only the frame of the window – and certainly no guard – can be seen on Lagrenée's painting, and Pero stares at a dark spot in the lower right-hand corner of the painting. She does seem to feel uneasy and embarrassed but not yet frightened at having been watched.

Both interiors show signs of classical architecture – a rusticated arch in Rubens's version, an Ionic pillar in Lagrenée's. In each painting, light falls onto Pero's naked bosom and shoulder, but the coloring of the figures' garments is reversed: while Rubens's Pero wears a red dress and her father a green blanket, Lagrenée's Pero is dressed in green, with her father draped in red. Lagrenée's Cimon is less exposed than Rubens's, but he does show his right nipple erect. Due to the white cloth that covers his lower trunk and genital area, less of his ailing body is exposed, and what is visible is less marked by wrinkles and aging muscles. Lagrenée's Pero is less life-like than both her father and Rubens's Pero; she is rather poised and statuesque, in contrast to Rubens's bouncy, perky, rosy-cheeked young lady with a blond contemporary coiffure.

Lagrenée's interest in Rubens had precedents. Already Giuseppe Baldrighi's *Roman Charity,* which debuted at the Salon of 1757 to great acclaim, was modeled after Rubens's Amsterdam version (Figure 3.18). All three major literary journals of the time express their pride in the Italian painter's formation at the French academy, while neglecting to mention the Flemish master's *Roman Charity* as his source. The *Journal Encyclopédique* attributes to this painting the "good taste of the Roman school," while the *Mercure de France* imagines even "seeing a piece by Guido [Reni]."[107] *L'année littéraire*, finally, lauds his "firm and decided manner and exact design" as well as the absence of any "servile imitation."[108] While Baldrighi's placement of Cimon's head right in front of Pero's bosom does, perhaps, recall Guido Reni's assumed Marseille version of the theme, the rest of the composition points unambiguously to Rubens's piece, a resemblance that goes unnoticed by contemporary critics (Figure 2.42). Cimon's posture and angled knees, Pero's bent head and slightly elevated placement, and the artist's choice of – somewhat muted – hues of red and green suggest that also Baldrighi might have seen the Flemish master's original, or at the very least prints of it. Lagrenée was obviously quite impressed by Baldrighi's work, since he imitated not only the Italian master's classical poise and muted coloring but also Pero's turban and left-hand gesture. Both eighteenth-century artists mitigate the stark contrast between Cimon's dark complexion and exaggerated wrinkles, on the one hand, and Pero's bright white skin and soft flesh, on the other, a juxtaposition that Rubens



Figure 3.18: Giuseppe Baldrighi, Roman Charity, 1757

emphasized. In Baldrighi's version, the difference in coloring is given up; Lagrenée reintroduces it but downplays the effects of age and suffering on Cimon's body. The classicizing manner of the two images anchors them firmly within the aesthetic of the French school of history painting.

Salon critics reviewed Lagrenée's painting quite favorably. The *Journal Encyclopédique* remarks that its style was "not new" – probably in a tacit recognition of Baldrighi's precedent – but appreciates the beauty of Pero's head. In addition, "the fear that seems to agitate her renders her inevitably more touching."[109] The *Mercure de France* applauds his *Roman Charity* in the context of his other works on display, whose "precious touch and finish" are hard to describe. "In this little painting of the 'Roman Charity' there is an engaging expression on

the face of the daughter ... that we should not omit to notice."[110] In contrast to these lukewarm expressions of approval, Diderot's highly critical remarks are perplexingly passionate. Apart from his insinuations of pornographic associations – "if this young woman doesn't watch out he [Cimon] will end up getting her pregnant" – Diderot objects to the classicizing beauty and statuesque poise of the couple. Cimon "doesn't seem to have suffered for an instant"; he is "as hardy looking as if he had two cows at his disposal." Everything about him is too perfect and idealizing. Diderot would have liked "to see his hunger reflected in his gestures, and his body betray some effects of his suffering." In his imagination, Cimon is chained to the wall by his wrists and hurls himself at Pero's breasts at the mere sight of her, "his chain stretching his arms out behind him." Pero, likewise, should give up her classical restraint; she should be "a woman of at least thirty, of an imposing, austere, and seemly character ... she should be coiffed rather carelessly, her long, loose hair falling out from beneath her headscarf." Most importantly, "she shouldn't have beautiful, rounded breasts but hardy, large ones that are full of milk." In other words, Pero should resemble a peasant wet-nurse, while Cimon's suffering ought to be depicted with greater



Figure 3.19: Jean-Baptiste Deshays, Roman Charity, 1752

"common sense," immediacy, and realist intuition, producing the spectator's empathetic understanding of the "terrible effects of … hunger."[111]

Lagrenée's and Baldrighi's imitations of Rubens's Amsterdam *Roman Charity* responded to Jean-Baptiste Deshays's interest in Dirck van Baburen's London version of the theme (Figure 2.31). Painted in 1752 but exhibited at the Salon only in 1759, Deshays's oval painting is a classicizing mirror image of the Utrecht master's painting (Figure 3.19).[112] Like Baburen's Pero, Deshays's daughter stands behind her father, offering him milk from an uncovered



Figure 3.20: Noël-Nicolas Coypel, Roman Charity, 1735



Figure 3.21: Jacques-Philippe Le Bas, Roman Charity, after Coypel, ca. 1735

bosom, nipples clearly visible. Both women wear complicated, nicely folded turbans and turn their heads away from their fathers, probably in response to the prison guards, whose presence they have noted. Baburen's Pero seems to emit a shout of fear, while Deshays's daughter is fairly composed, drawing a blanket over herself and her father to cover up their forbidden act. Deshays's Cimon faces the viewer; his right hand is chained to the wall, the only indication that the couple find themselves in a dungeon. No window or architectural detail is visible in either version; the breastfeeding couple is immersed in darkness, despite the sharp light that illuminates the couple from an invisible source above.

Deshays's painting was not much commented upon by contemporary art critics, in contrast to Noël-Nicolas Coypel's earlier version, exhibited during the Fète Dieu in Place Dauphine in 1724, one year before regular Salon shows resumed (Figure 3.20).[113] Inspired by Rubens's Amsterdam painting, it shows Pero with a fully bared chest, both nipples visible, in the act of offering her father milk with splayed fingers. Cimon sits on a bunch of straw on the ground, chained by his hands and feet. In a slight variation on the Flemish master's copy, it is Cimon who detects the prison guard barging in through a door, while Pero continues to tenderly look at Cimon, embracing him with her right hand. Coypel's original painting is lost; the painting preserved in Bremen seems to be




Figure 3.22: Jean Jacques Bachelier, Roman Charity, 1765

a copy produced after an engraving of the original by Jacques-Philippe Le Bas, which between 1728 and 1747 went through five separate editions (Figure 3.21). In 1765, at the height of the mid-century craze for renderings of Roman Charity, Jacques Claude Danzel produced yet another print. The *Mercure de France* faithfully documents the popularity of Coypel's painting and Le Bas's many prints: In 1724, the reviewer notes how the painting was "much applauded, and much

liked;"[114] in 1728, the journal quotes the explanatory verses that accompany Le Bas's print, composed by art critic Étienne La Font de Saint Yenne no less, and remarks that it appeared in tandem with an engraving of Coypel's painting of a nymph;[115] in 1735, it lauds, again, the "very beautiful" engraving done after "one of the best paintings by the recently deceased M. Noël-Nicolas Coypel;"[116] in 1737, 1740, and 1747 it positively mentions three new editions of the print.[117] Modern art historians have called Coypel's *Roman Charity* one of the "most Rubensian" of his works.[118]

Jean Jacques Bachelier's *Roman Charity,* presented at the Salon of 1765 at the same time as Lagrenée's picture, shows none of his colleagues' preoccupation with Rubens and Baburen, or any aspiration at a classicizing aesthetic (Figure 3.22). It is quite a unique work of art that attempts to give a non-idealizing, "realistic" description of the scene and radically re-envisions the positioning of the two figures. Cimon's back and shoulders are lodged between Pero's thighs, his head bent backwards, resting on her left knee. His body shows exaggerated signs of aging and starvation; his complexion is cast in yellow hues; his hands




Figure 3.23: Adolf Ulrich Wertmüller, Portrait of Jean Jacques Bachelier with Roman Charity, 1784

are chained and raised in prayer as he sucks from the ample bosom of his daughter. Pero has bared her entire upper torso, with a white scarf or blouse loosely draped around her back. The nipple of her right breast is clearly visible; her face, covered in shadow, is directed at her father's head below. She watches him intently as she offers Cimon her left breast with splayed fingers. The couple is in a dark interior, in front of a wall composed of huge slabs of stone. The source of the light that illumines Pero's head and bosom is invisible – perhaps it is natural light falling through an imagined window to the left of the viewer, located outside the picture plane opposite the couple. This trick would cast the viewer in the role of the two guards, making explicit the voyeuristic pleasure of watching the couple's absorption.

Bachelier regarded this *Roman Charity* as his masterpiece. In 1764, he successfully petitioned the French academy to register it as his official acceptance piece, after having been admitted a year prior as a history painter on the basis of his *Death of Abel*.[119] His promotion to history painter was quite a feat; until 1763, he was regarded as a genre painter with a specialty in plants and animals. After the Salon of 1765, Bachelier produced a slightly modified and enlarged version of his *Roman Charity,* improving the rendering of Pero's left hand and the curvature of Cimon's chains in response to Diderot's critique.[120] This is the version that appears behind Bachelier in Adolf Ulrich Wertmüller's portrait of him in 1784 (Figure 3.23), while Gertrude de Pélichy's copy is done after his acceptance piece from 1764. A third copy by Bachelier, likewise dated to 1765, is done in pastel colors.[121] The multitude of these copies suggests that Bachelier and his admirers were quite unfazed in their appreciation for the piece, despite the devastating reaction of Diderot and other art critics to his *Roman Charity* in particular and his aspirations as a history painter in general.

In its review of the Salon of 1765, the *Journal Encyclopédique* points out that Bachelier's lighting is wrong, producing a shadow on Pero's face, and that Cimon's figure is poorly designed and positioned. Most importantly, the reviewer patronizingly deplores the "tragic ambition" of artists who "renounce their manifest talents to run after those that are less natural to them." He doubts "whether Bachelier has gained by taking up the role of history painter" but is very certain "that the public and the academy have lost a painter of flowers of the highest merit."[122] The *Mercure de France* neglects to mention Bachelier's *Roman Charity* altogether but is full of praise for Lagrenée's version.[123] *L'année littéraire* does appreciate Bachelier's "manner of painting, large and facile," but criticizes his choice of model and wishes for more "agreeable aspects."[124]

Diderot, finally, unleashes a most vitriolic attack against Bachelier. In his contributions to Grimm's *Correspondance littéraire*, which was "published" in the form of manuscript copies and destined for a very exclusive audience although in reality it circulated among salon goers as well, Diderot bullies the artist into submission: "You're wasting your time. Why don't you go back to your flowers

and animals?" and: "You don't know how to paint historical pictures." He accuses Bachelier of pursuing "singular, bizarre effects, something that always signals conceptual sterility and lack of genius." He does not like Bachelier's "lighting, ... the placement of ... [his] figures, ... [his] draftsmanship, characterization, passions, expression, heads, flesh, color, and drapery." He points out that Pero has "the bizarre features of a child born of a Mexican mother and a European father," and calls Cimon "a monster ... thin, dried out and fleshless, near death ... so hideous he inspires fear." Most importantly, as already with Lagrenée, he wants Pero to have bigger breasts: "Your woman isn't the woman with ... large ample breasts that I'd want her to be."[125]

Diderot's unabashedly elitist, racist, and sexist attacks on Bachelier and his painting were the product of a culture of secrecy that characterized eighteenth-century art criticism.[126] In 1767, the complaint of painters against anonymous Salon reviews reached the ear of the government, which demanded that critics sign their articles – with little success.[127] Diderot's polemics were particularly scathing because in theory, they were accessible only to a small circle of subscribers to Grimm's *Corréspondance Littéraire*.[128] Nonetheless, Bachelier must have known of his venomous review. In his second rendering of *Roman Charity* in 1765, he changed the position of Pero's left hand, against which Diderot raised strong objections.[129] Diderot's repeated assertions that Bachelier should limit himself to the depiction of flora and fauna might have contributed to his decision not to produce history paintings any more, and to stop exhibiting at the Salon altogether after 1767. Especially after the *Journal Encyclopédique* amplified on Diderot's views in 1765 for the sake of maintaining proper boundaries between history and "genre" paintings, Bachelier must have realized his failure to gain public approval for his promotion at the academy.[130] Already in 1759, in his review of Bachelier's *Resurrection of Christ,* Diderot demanded that he "go back to his tulips."[131] Two years later he cried out in disgust at Bachelier's *Milo of Croton:* "Have you ever seen anything so bad and so pretentious? ... My dear Bachelier, go back to your flowers and animals."[132] And in 1767, Diderot expresses relief at Bachelier's withdrawal of his painting of *Psyche and Zephyrs:* "So much the better for the artist and for us." Diderot later insinuates that Bachelier's decision to leave the academy and open a school of design was due to improper, i.e., pecuniary, motives: "He renounced his title and his functions as member of the academy to become a school master; he has preferred money to honor."[133]

After spewing so much poison, Diderot's favorable opinion on one aspect of Bachelier's *Roman Charity* comes as a surprise: "The only thing you've been able to do well, without knowing it, is to avoid making your old man and your woman nervous about being observed."[134] He adores Bachelier's emphasis on absorption, which casts the spectator in the role of undisturbed voyeur, in contrast to Lagrenée's painting, in which he – who knows why – detects a rival in

the form of a prison guard: "I absolutely reject the notion of having this unfortunate old man and this benevolent woman suspicious of being observed; this suspicion impedes the action and destroys the subject."[135] The demand for the figures' total oblivion to being watched is in sync with his illusionist theories on theater and the cultivation of empathy in the spectator. Diderot's proposal that the spectator's pleasure go unnoticed by the painting's figures furthermore mirrors his demands for secrecy in writing Salon reviews. However, fully aware of the iconography's need of a barred window through which the guards can watch the couple – as in Rubens's painting – he engages in an ekphrastic digression:

"Which isn't to say one shouldn't open a barred window onto the dungeon, and even place a soldier or a spy at this window; but if the painter has any genius, the soldier will be perceived by neither the old man nor the woman giving him suck; only the spectator will be able to see him and the astonishment, admiration, joy, and tenderness registering on his face."[136]

In Diderot's mind, the pleasure of the spectator as voyeur should not be limited to watching the breastfeeding scene without interruption; it should extend to the – unobserved – observation of the observer. Once again, Luhmann's distinction between first- and second-order observers as a mark of differentiated systems of communication appears useful – in this case, for the purpose of understanding Diderot's excitement about an aspect of a painting which he otherwise loathed. According to Diderot, the depiction of the prison guard as if he were unobserved not only prolongs the nursing couple's absorption but also endows the spectator with the double pleasure of watching the voyeur in his decision-making process: Is it or is it not a scene of charity? What if it were pure sex?

In 1767, Jean-Baptiste Greuze, who was hitherto known and loved as a genre painter with a focus on middle-class family scenes, produced a *Roman Charity* as well (Figure 3.15). Unfortunately, he was not allowed to exhibit at the Salon that year, which is why the painting remained unnoticed by Paris's art-conscious public. The academy pressured him to produce an acceptance piece, but Greuze shied away from presenting his *Roman Charity* as such, probably because of Bachelier's precedent and the unhappy trajectory of his artistic career after the Salon of 1765.[137] Greuze's painting is inspired by Rubens's Hermitage version of the scene, which he most likely saw when it was auctioned off during the Julienne sale in 1767 (Figure 2.27).[138] It shows Cimon at the center, seated on a slightly elevated slab of stone, legs stretched out, and naked except for a red blanket and white cloth that cover his genital area and upper legs. His body is emaciated and wrinkled, his complexion of a darker hue than Pero's. Unlike in Rubens's painting, he is depicted not in the very act of breastfeeding but, presumably, right before he starts suckling, with his hands raised in gratitude. He is not chained, but the dark interior is recognizable as a dungeon, with a barred lower window to the left. Pero kneels to the left, offering her breast to Cimon



Figure 3.24: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, Roman Charity, 1767

with a V-hold, but her nipple is chastely hidden behind her father's bushy beard. She stares intently at a spot outside the picture frame to the right, but nothing indicates that she has detected the prison guards. She is very poised and beautiful; her profile is that of an ancient statue, her skin is soft and white, and her garments are producing elegant folds. Despite its formal resemblance to Rubens's Hermitage version, Greuze's painting is less graphic in its rendering of the lactation scene; however, the body of Cimon is shown in a more pathetic, presumably more "realistic," manner than in Rubens's painting, which endows the starving father with a beautifully muscular torso and shapely legs.[139]

Commenting on Greuze's preparatory drawing for the painting, Mark Ledbury detects a certain "intensity" of feeling and an "over-voluptuous" manner with which the artist chose to depict this act of heroic piety.[140] In fact, his sketch depicts the scene with greater fluidity and emotional abandonment than the completed painting, which seems to waver between a classicizing representation of the heroic daughter and a genre-esque depiction of the suffering father (Figure 3.24). Similarly striking is Greuze's painting of *Loth and his Daughters,* another topic that exposes the charged nature of father-daughter relationships (Figure 3.25). In this oil painting, Greuze shows the father and his daughters in what has been described as "post-coital repose." One of the daughters stares blankly at the spectator, one breast exposed, while



Figure 3.25: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, Loth and His Daughters, 1760–69

her father and sister sleep off their drunkenness.[141] This disturbing exploration of incestuous family relations seems to be the "morally opposite pendant" to Greuze's *Roman Charity,* even though the latter painting is not totally devoid of erotic enhancement either.[142]

With his forays into history painting since 1766, Greuze started to express his complex, and increasingly bleaker, views of patriarchal family relationships with greater sharpness. His earlier paintings, exhibited to rousing applause at the Salons of 1755, 1761, and 1763, depict the utopian sentiments of "good fathers" and their various household members. Despite their idealizing content, they are rendered in the "realistic" mode of genre paintings, but not without including traces of ironic detachment. In his *Family Bible Reading* (1755), Greuze depicts a peasant father reading to his wife, six children, and a servant, an audience engaged in various levels of absorption.[143] While his wife, oldest daughter, and two younger children seem to be listening intently, his oldest son has an expression of resentful boredom, his second-oldest son stares at the spectator, and his youngest son plays with the dog, giving him the "horns."[144]

In his *Marriage Contract* (1760–61), Greuze shows an assembly of family members, servants, and a notary organized around the head of household, who congratulates his daughter and son-in-law on the occasion of their engagement.[145] The groom is holding onto the sack of coins he has just received, the bride endures the signs of affection of her mother and younger sister while fishing for her fiancé's hand, a jealous older sister looks grudgingly at the couple, and the notary hands over the contract. In the foreground, a young girl feeds a hen and her chicks. This painting, which highlights the business-like manner of contemporary marriage proceedings, moved Diderot to hail Greuze as if he were Caravaggio reborn: "He is a ceaseless observer in the streets, in the churches, in the markets, in the theaters, in the promenades, in public assemblies."[146] Perhaps because of Diderot's strong endorsement of the piece, it was popular among playwrights and theater audiences. A few months after its exhibition at the Salon, it was put on display as a tableau vivant in a comedy entitled *The Marriage of Harlequin*.[147]

In 1763, Greuze exhibited a painting variously entitled *The Paralytic, Filial Piety,* or, as Diderot proposed, *Recompense for a Good Education Given [to One's Son]* (Figure 3.26).[148] It is another one of his domestic scenes organized around a "good father," and, incidentally, his last, because from now on his fathers would take on less agreeable character traits. In this painting, a young



Figure 3.26: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, The Paralytic, also called Filial Piety, 1763

man feeds his ailing father stretched out on an armchair in the middle of a rustic living room, which Diderot took to be a tender expression of proper reciprocity in kinship relations.[149] There is some confusion about the family relationships depicted, as Diderot assumed the painting to be a sequel to the *Marriage Contract*.[150] In this case, the young man would be the paralytic's son-in-law, and the kindness of nurture would find its origin in the sack of money he had received upon marrying the paralytic's daughter instead of the "good education" his own father gave him. The outburst of public applause for a presumably tender display of sentiment would have been somewhat misplaced, given that the young man might simply be speculating for a bigger chunk of the inheritance. After all, the daughter – alias daughter-in-law – sits right next to him with an account book on her knees. Perhaps the ambiguity was intended. The painting shows pictorial signs of irony in the form of a she-dog nursing her puppies in the right bottom corner – an anti-Charity of sorts – and a roast chicken and flask of wine that are waiting for the patient. These foods remind of Renaissance confinement room scenes, drawing an uneasy analogy between the attention paid to a mother right after delivery and the exaggerated concern for the old man, who is attended by his wife, the young couple, a servant, and five children all at once.[151]

Irony, however, was not what an enlightened Salon audience, least of all Diderot, wanted from Greuze. In a tone that could hardly be more patronizing, Diderot expresses great enthusiasm for his *Filial Piety,* coupled with a strong sense of identification with the painter. After all, Diderot himself invented a model father in his play *The Father of the Family* in 1758, a lenient and caring anti-patriarch who lets both son and daughter freely choose their marriage partners – an unheard-of utopia.[152] In his Salon review of 1763, Diderot brushes all possible ambiguities surrounding the paralytic aside and pronounces Greuze the new painter of morality:

"This Greuze really is my guy … First of all, I love genre paintings. This is the art of morality. What now, has the paintbrush not for the longest time been dedicated to debauchery and vice? Should we not be satisfied to see it compete with drama to touch us, instruct us, correct us, and incite us to virtue? Keep it up, my friend Greuze! Turn morality into painting, and do it always like that."[153]

Greuze did not heed his advice, a faux-pas for which he was brutally punished when he not only presented a history painting as his acceptance piece to the academy in 1769 but also chose a parricidal son as his protagonist. Already in 1765, when he exhibited the preparatory drawings for the *Ungrateful Son* and the *Punished Son,* it became obvious that Greuze did not want to be confined to hailing "good fathers" in the manner of the "comédie larmoyante" [tear-jerking drama] that Diderot supported. Because of the vehement critiques of his drawings, he turned them into full-fledged paintings only in 1777 and 1778,

respectively, i.e., at a time when his reputation among Salon-goers had long been damaged.[154] In the eyes of Diderot, their "taste is so wretched, so trivial that these two sketches might never be painted," and Charles-Joseph Mathon de la Cour found the two scenes of father-son conflict simply too "terrifying."[155]

Probably as a result of this criticism in 1765, Greuze decided to shift genres. From now on, he explored problems in patriarchal relationships in the more detached form of history paintings, of which his *Roman Charity* from 1767 is a first indication. But the decision to branch out into the more elevated domain of history paintings earned him crushing critiques from the public and members of the academy alike. His *Septimius Severus and Caracalla* (1769) was not only rejected as his acceptance piece – he was admitted as a "mere" genre painter instead of being promoted to history painter – but also was torn apart by Salon reviewers.[156] It shows, in a classicizing style reminiscent of Poussin, Emperor Septimius Severus sitting upright in his bed, naked except for a blanket thrown over his legs and genital area, in the act of reproaching his son Caracalla for having tried to poison him (Figure 3.14).[157] Caracalla stands to the left with a sulking expression, possibly brooding over his failure; two councilors are positioned to the right, whispering to each other. The scene takes place in a room with fluted marble pillars, ancient Roman pieces of furniture and decor, and heavy grey drapery hung over one side of the emperor's bed as a backdrop. Contemporary observers and modern scholars have found the painting to be unconvincing, objecting to Septimius's outstretched arm as the sole pictorial element indicative of "action," i.e., the emperor's speech in the presence of his son, and unduly burdened with holding the picture together compositionally.[158] Also, the gap between Caracalla's awe-inspiring military outfit and statuesque body on the one hand and the pouting expression of his face on the other, more appropriate for a scolded teenager than a parricidal successor to the throne, has been felt to be somewhat ludicrous.[159]

While Greuze's painting certainly exhibits shortcomings, the bulk of the contemporary critique was directed at his inappropriate ambition to be accepted as a history painter. Diderot, for example, scolds him for having tried to overcome the strict hierarchy of ranks between history and genre painters before he even starts to address the painting. In his eyes, Greuze violated a taboo:

> "You do know, my friend, that one has relegated to the class of genre painters those artists who tend to imitate subaltern nature as well as pastoral, bourgeois, and domestic scenes, and that it is only history painters who make up the other class [of artists] who can aspire to the ranks of professors and other honorific functions."[160]

Having thus shamed his former "friend" into submission, Diderot continues by giving an account of the embarrassing proceedings at the academy. He calls Greuze "dishonored" and affirms one more time: "Greuze has left his genre: scrupulous imitator of nature, he was unable to elevate himself to the

kind of exaggeration necessary for the painting of history." Only then does he proceed to analyze the painting, detailing its numerous shortcomings. In the midst of his offensive verbiage, however, Diderot does make the perceptive remark that Greuze's "Caracalla would have worked wonderfully in a pastoral or domestic scene," comparing him to the eldest son of the Bible-reading peasant in his painting of 1755.[161] Modern scholars have picked up on this remark, calling Caracalla's curious mixture between a "classical god and a frightened adolescent" indicative of Greuze's attempts to import elements of bourgeois genre scenes into depictions drawn from Roman history, in an effort to invent a new hybrid genre.[162] In the eyes of Mark Ledbury, Greuze wanted to accomplish in the visual arts what playwrights had done for the bourgeois melodrama.[163]

It is somewhat surprising that Diderot, who in his "Notes on Painting" (1765) seemed critical of the divisions between history and genre painters and who routinely ridiculed classicizing painters such as Lagrenée, should have closed ranks with the academy in 1769. Four years earlier, he had observed that genre painters regard "history painting as a genre of phantasy, devoid of verisimilitude or truth, in which extravagance is the norm; which has nothing in common with nature; in which duplicity betrays itself in exaggerated expressions that never existed anywhere."[164] At about the time he was writing these "Notes," several painters were engaged in blurring the lines between genre and history painting, which seems to have produced a crisis within the academy.[165] In 1765, Jean-Honoré Fragonard (1732–1806) exhibited his classicizing *Coresus and Callirhoe* as his acceptance piece to the academy but never produced any other history painting afterwards.[166] In 1764, as already mentioned, Bachelier got his genre-esque *Roman Charity* accepted as a history painting and qualified for the promotion to adjunct professor at the academy, but he stopped exhibiting at the Salon altogether in 1767.[167] When, in 1769, Greuze tried to enter the academy as yet another "history painter" in disguise, exhibiting a "hybrid" painting that, despite its heavily classicizing aesthetic, included references to his earlier genre paintings in the form of sulking Caracalla, the academy might have felt defensive about accepting the wrong kind of painter the third time in a row. They rejected his request in order to set an example but also because they felt fooled by Greuze's strategy to surprise them with a painting about which they had not been informed.[168]

Despite the rise of genre painting in the favor of collectors and Salon-attendants all throughout the eighteenth century, and despite the development of a third, hybrid genre in theater arts, the allure of "pure" classicism à la Poussin survived the crisis of the 1760s and soon experienced a rebirth with Jacques-Louis David's painting of the *Oath of the Horatii* (1784). Ironically, it is Greuze's vilified *Septimius Severus and Caracalla* that, according to modern art historians, initiated the neo-Poussinian style of the pre-revolutionary and revolutionary eras.[169] The many stylistic permutations of *Roman Charity* can serve as



Figure 3.27: Jacques-Louis David, School of, Roman Charity, late 18th c.

a measure of Rubens's and Baburen's popularity in eighteenth-century France, and they document the taste for history paintings that, to varying degrees, combined a classicizing style with genre-esque elements. In the Salon of 1777, a very mediocre *Roman Charity* by Jacques Antoine Beaufort (1721–84) was exhibited, the same year that Jean-Michel Moreau the Younger (1741–1814) illustrated Marmontel's novel *The Incas* with a beautiful engraving of Bartolomeo de las Casas in the guise of breastfeeding Cimon (Figure 3.2).[170] Sometime during the last decades of the eighteenth century, followers of Jacques-Louis David produced a *Roman Charity* that managed to defy all of its predecessors through a heavily classicizing style and a brand-new composition (Figure 3.27).[171] Pero, in playing with the spectator's voyeuristic demands, shows her beautiful back to the viewer, while Cimon is depicted frontally, leaning against a prison wall. Pero's silk garment throws beautiful, capricious folds, and her left arm and shoulder are of statuesque perfection. She kneels in front of her father, trying to shield him from view with the cloth of her ancient Roman dress. The couple is not currently engaged in breastfeeding but is shown at the moment of interruption – Pero has turned her head toward the dark right corner of the painting, probably in response to the prison guards' noise. Despite all attempts at novelty, Cimon's posture, muscular torso, and dark complexion remind of Rubens's Hermitage version of the theme.

With this neo-classical painting à la David, the fortune of *Roman Charity* came full circle since Poussin's momentous, and heavily classicizing, adaptation of the mother-daughter scene. While in the seventeenth century the

father-daughter version of the motif was useful for the expression of anti-papal dissent, it came to denote the full-fledged critique of patriarchal family relations during the Enlightenment and revolutionary period.[172] Especially in the work of Greuze, it appears to be situated in the middle of a spectrum that ranges from reformist, utopian images of the "good father" – as in his *Father Reading from the Bible*, the *Marriage Contract,* and *Filial Piety* – to depictions of attempted parricides such as *Septimius Severus and Caracalla*. Greuze's *Roman Charity,* which in the hybrid manner typical of his history paintings depicts a statuesque, classicizing Pero and a "realistically" suffering Cimon, expresses the exploitative quality and incestuous complications of contemporary father-daughter relationships, a motif the artist resumes in *Loth and His Daughters*. After the end of the ancien régime, interest in the theme of Roman Charity started to wane, probably as a result of dramatically altered family relations in bourgeois society and of narrowed views of sexuality that excluded lactation. Three paintings of the mother-daughter version – all of them lost – show how the "sisterly" relations between the mother-turned-daughter and the daughter-turned-mother occupied the French imaginary during the revolutionary period.[173] In the nineteenth century, the intelligibility of Catholic allegories of nursing started to wane. The confinement of breastfeeding to mothers and their infants and the slow rise of daughters' rights in civil law are responsible for the loss of rhetorical power of an iconography that for 300 years had fascinated early modern audiences.

Notes

1 | Andor Pigler, *Barockthemen: eine Auswahl von Verzeichnissen zur Ikonographie des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1974; first ed. Budapest: Verlag der ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1956), vol. 2, 300–07.

2 | Artus Quellinus the Elder, *Roman Charity,* Marble Statue, before 1668, Antwerp, Royal Museum of Fine Arts; *The Mammelokker,* Relief Façade, 1741, Ghent, Belfry; Joseph Willems, *Roman Charity,* Porcelain Figure, 1765, London, British Museum, inv. no. 1927,0411.1.CR; Joseph Maucher, *Roman Charity,* Amber Statuette, 1690, Berlin, Bode-Museum, inv. no. 5927; *Roman Charity,* Bronze Plaquette, 18th c., London, British Museum, inv. no. MG 483; *Roman Charity,* Bronze Plaquette, 18th c., London, British Museum, inv. no. MG 481.

3 | Isabella Maria dal Pozzo, *Roman Charity,* before 1700, Derby, Kedleston Hall; Isabella di Borbone, *Roman Charity,* 1759, Parma, Galleria Nazionale.

4 | Jutta Sperling, "Las Casas and His Amerindian Nurse: Tropes of Lactation in the French Colonial Imaginary (ca. 1770–1810)," *Gender & History* 23, no. 1 (2011): 47–71.

5 | See, most recently, Alexandra Woolley, "Nicolas Poussin's Allegories of Charity in *The Plague at Ashdod* and *The Gathering of the Manna* and Their Influence on Late Seventeenth-Century Art," in: *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations: Images, Rhetorics, and Practices*, ed. by Jutta Gisela Sperling (Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2013), 165–85; Louis Marin, "Lire un tableau en 1639 d après une lettre de Poussin," in: Louis Marin, *Sublime Poussin* (Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1995; first publ. 1983), 11–34; Wilhelm Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht: Le Bruns Akademierede von 1667 über Poussins "Mannawunder"* (Freiburg: Rombach Verlag, 1996); Bernhard Stumpfhaus, *Modus – Affekt – Allegorie bei Nicolas Poussin: Emotionen in der Malerei des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Reimer, 2007), 113.

6 | Stumpfhaus is of the opinion that Poussin got the idea for the motif from Pliny the Elder, while Schlink thinks Boccaccio was responsible for reversing Maximus's anecdote. Stumpfhaus, *Modus – Affekt – Allegorie*, 93; Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 87–89. For Le Brun's conference talk, see André Félibien, *Entretien sur Nicolas Poussin*, ed. by Joseph Aynard (Paris: Éditions Fernand Roches, 1929; first ed. Paris: chez Sébastien Mabre-Cramoisy, 1685). His first edition of Le Brun's conference talk appeared in 1669.

7 | Giovanni Pietro Bellori, *The Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, transl. by Alice Sedgwick Wohl, notes by Hellmut Wohl, introduction by Tomaso Montanari (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005; first It. ed. 1672), 312–13; Joachim von Sandrart, *Joachim von Sandrarts Akademie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste von 1675: Leben der berühmten Maler, Bildhauer und Baumeister*, ed. by A.R. Peltzer (München: G. Hirth's Verlag A.G., 1925; first ed. 1675), 258.

8 | Jutta Sperling, "Allegories of Charity and the Practice of Poor Relief at the Scuola Grande di San Rocco," *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 70 (2009), 119–46.

9 | Woolley, "Nicolas Poussin's Allegories of Charity," 184–85.

10 | Sebastian Schütze, "Caravaggism in Europe: A Planetary System and its Gravitational Laws," in: *Caravaggio: His Followers in Rome*, ed. by David Franklin and Sebastian Schütze (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 26–47, especially 43.

11 | See, for example, the *Roman Charities* by Mattia Preti (ca. 1660–1661), Guercino (1591–1666), Andrea Celesti (1637–1711), and Antonio Zanchi (1631–1722), as well as the serial production of *Roman Charities* by Johann Carl Loth (1632–1698) and Daniel Seiter (1642/47–1705). Gerhard Ewald lists ten different versions of the motif by Johann Carl Loth. Gerhard Ewald, *Johann Carl Loth (1632–1698)* (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger & Co, 1965), 104–05, catalog entries 386–95. The frequency with which he painted the motif is surpassed only by his fondness for another incestual father-daughter topic, *Drunken Loth and His Daughters,* which he painted eighteen (!) times. Ewald, *Johann Carl Loth*, 58–59, catalog entries 24–41. Matthias Kunze identifies six different *Roman Charities* by Daniel Seiter. Matthias Kunze, *Daniel Seiter, 1647–1705: Die Gemälde* (München; Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2000), 121–25, catalog entries G 82–G 87.

12 | Quoted after Michael Fried, *The Moment of Caravaggio* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 175; see also Jonathan Unglaub, "Poussin's Reflection," *The Art Bulletin* 86, no. 3 (Sept. 2004): 505–29; and Louis Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören* (Berlin: Diaphanes, 2003; first Fr. ed. Paris: Éditions Flammarions, 1981).

13 | Roger de Piles, *The Art of Painting, with the Lives and Characters of … the most Eminent Painters …* (London: printed for Thomas Payne, in Castle Street, 1706; first Fr. ed. 1699), 312.

14 | Bellori, *The Lives of the Modern Painters*, 180, 311. Bellori seems to echo Cardinal Federico Borromeo (1564–1631), who claimed that Caravaggio's life style was reflected in his art. Federico Borromeo, unpublished papers; quoted after Ferdinando Bologna, *L'incredulità del Caravaggio e l'esperienza delle "cose naturali"* (Turin: Bollati Boringhieri, 2006; first ed. 1992), 377.

15 | Sandrart, *Joachim von Sandrarts Akademie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste,* 275, 257.

16 | Joseph Aynard, Introduction to Félibien, *Entretien sur Nicolas Poussin*, x–xi; Claus Kemmer, "'Expression', 'effet' und 'esprit': Rubens und die Kunsttheorie des 17. Jahrhunderts," in: *Peter Paul Rubens: Barocke Leidenschaften*; Ausstellung im Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum Braunschweig, 8. August bis 31. Oktober 2004, ed. by Nils Büttner und Ulrich Heinen (München: Hirmer Verlag, 2004), 99–106, especially 100.

17 | Elizabeth Cropper and Charles Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 10–11.

18 | Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 137.

19 | Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 147.

20 | Itay Sapir, *Ténèbres sans leçons: Esthétique et épistémologie de la peinture ténébriste romaine 1595–1610* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2012), 168–69.

21 | Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 223.

22 | Richard E. Spear, *The "Divine" Guido: Religion, Sex, Money and Art in the World of Guido Reni* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 36.
23 | Sapir, *Ténèbres sans leçons*, 221.
24 | Fried, *The Moment of Caravaggio*, 174.
25 | Spear, *The "Divine" Guido*, 36; Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 224; see also Le Brun's description of the figures' gestures in *The Gathering of the Manna* in Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 38–39. The French art critic Roger de Piles famously gave Caravaggio a "zero" for expressiveness. Fried, *The Moment of Caravaggio*, 101.
26 | Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 221.
27 | Daniel Arasse, *Le Détail: pour une histoire rapprochée de la peinture* (Paris: Flammarion, 1992); Rebecca Zorach, *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold: Abundance and Excess in the French Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).
28 | Bologna, *L'incredulità del Caravaggio*.
29 | Fried, *The Moment of Caravaggio*, 3.
30 | Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 224.
31 | Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 89.
32 | Todd Olson, *Poussin and France: Painting, Humanism, and the Politics of Style* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 15.
33 | On Poussin's erudition and empirical approach to history, see Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*, 27–32.
34 | André Félibien, quoted in Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 38–39.
35 | Anthony Blunt, *Nicolas Poussin* (London: Pallas Athene, 2nd ed., 1995; first ed. 1967), 230.
36 | Marin, "Lire un tableau," 33.
37 | See Poussin's letters to Jacques Stella and Paul Fréart de Chantelou, in Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 76. See also the German translation in Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 109.
38 | Spear, *The "Divine" Guido*, 36.
39 | Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 46.
40 | Stumpfhaus, *Modus – Affekt – Allegorie*, 78.
41 | Stumpfhaus, *Modus – Affekt – Allegorie*, 77.
42 | Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 86.
43 | Jonathan Unglaub, *Poussin and the Poetics of Painting: Pictorial Narrative and the Legacy of Tasso* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 5.
44 | Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 31.
45 | Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 41, 44.
46 | Already Le Brun and Félibien pointed this out. Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 45.
47 | Tintoretto, *The Adoration of the Shepherds,* 1579–81, Venice, Scuola Grande di San Rocco. Jutta Sperling, "Allegories of Charity and the Practice of Poor Relief."
48 | See, for example, Saint Anne's desire to breastfeed Mary in the Book of James. Jutta Sperling, "Wet-Nurses, Midwives, and the Virgin Mary in Tintoretto's *The Birth*

of Saint John the Baptist (1563)" in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations,* 235–54.

49 | On perceptions of his art as "masculine," see Svetlana Alpers, *The Making of Rubens* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 91–93.

50 | Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*, 27.

51 | On his privileging of Saint Paul, see Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting,* 135–38. On his use of Josephus Flavius's books, see Stumpfhaus, *Modus – Affekt – Allegorie*, 89; Olson, *Poussin and France*, 35, 64, 66.

52 | Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*, 111; on Poussin's interest in syncretism, see Blunt, *Nicolas Poussin,* 152.

53 | Olson, *Poussin and France*, 67.

54 | Nicolas Poussin, *Confirmation*, 1645, Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland.

55 | Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*, 134–38. Compare the apostle's features with those of Saint Peter in Poussin's *Ordination* (1636), where he is clearly identifiable through the keys that Christ hands to him.

56 | See, for example, his version of the *Gathering of the Manna* in the church of San Giorgio Maggiore; *Moses Striking the Rock* in the Scuola Grade di San Rocco; and the *Presentation of the Virgin Mary* in the church of the Madonna dell'Orto, just to name a few.

57 | Nicolas Poussin, *Adoration of the Golden Calf,* 1633–1637, London, National Gallery. C. Wright, *Poussin*, 126.

58 | Nicolas Poussin, *Triumph of David,* 1628–1631, London, Dulwich Picture Gallery, inv.no. DPG 236. Wright, *Poussin*, 104.

59 | Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 45.

60 | Nicolas Poussin, *The Crossing of the Red Sea,* 1633–37, Melbourne, National Gallery of Victoria. Wright, *Poussin*, 127.

61 | Nicolas Poussin, *Matrimony,* 1636–1640, Leicestershire, Belvoir Castle; Nicolas Poussin, *Extreme Unction,* 1636–1640, Cambridge, The Fitzwilliam Museum; Nicolas Poussin, *Baptism,* 1646, Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland; Nicolas Poussin, *Confirmation*, 1636, Leicestershire, Belvoir Castle; Nicolas Poussin, *Confirmation,* 1645, Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland. Wright, *Poussin*, 152, 153, 154, 176, 177.

62 | Félibien, *Entretien sur Nicolas Poussin*, 21; Bellori, *The Lives of the Modern Painters*, 312–13; Sandrart, *Joachim von Sandrarts Akademie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste*, 258.

63 | Schlink calls him a "figure of reflection." Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 66.

64 | On Poussin's interest in iconoclasm, in particular the theme of the *Adoration of the Golden Calf,* see W.J.T. Mitchell, *What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 130.

65 | Blunt, *Nicolas Poussin*, 94.

66 | Woolley, "Nicolas Poussin's Allegories of Charity," 184; Elisabeth Hipp, *Nicolas Poussin: Die Pest von Asdod* (Hildesheim; Zürich; New York: Olms Verlag, 2005), 136.
67 | *Dead Amazon,* marble sculpture, 150 BCE, Berlin, Pergamonmuseum; *Laocoon,* marble sculpture, copy after a Hellenistic original from 200 BCE, Rome, Vatican Museum, inv. nos. 1059, 1064, 1067.
68 | Unglaub, *Poussin and the Poetics of Painting*, 164; Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*, 85; Hipp, *Nicolas Poussin: Die Pest von Asdod*, 100–03.
69 | Blunt, *Nicolas Poussin*, 94.
70 | Unglaub, *Poussin and the Poetics of Painting*, 163–64; Sybille Ebert-Schifferer, "Vom Seicento zum Grand goût," in: *Die Galerie der starken Frauen: Regentinnen, Amazonen, Salondamen*, ed. by Bettina Baumgärtel und Silvia Neysters (München: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1995), 79–96, especially 90.
71 | *Mattia Preti tra Roma, Napoli, e Malta*, ed. by Nicola Spinosa, Jadranka Bentini, Arnaud Brejon de Lavergnée, Giorgio Ceraudo, Keith Christiansen et al. (Naples: Electa Napoli, 1999), 106.
72 | Giovan Tommaso Fasano, "Invoking the Madonna del Carmine against the Plague," 1656, Naples, Church of Santa Maria di Donnaregina Nuova.
73 | François Perrier, *The Plague of Athens,* 1635, Dijon, Musée des beaux arts.
74 | Charles Le Brun, *The Brazen Serpent,* 1649–1650, Bristol, City Art Gallery; Sébastien Bourdon, *The Plague of Ashdod,* 1670, private collection. Woolley, "Nicolas Poussin's Allegories of Charity," 178.
75 | Woolley, "Nicolas Poussin's Allegories of Charity," 181.
76 | Charles Le Brun, *Moses Striking the Rock,* 1650, Paris, Louvre. Olson, *Poussin and France*, 187.
77 | See a drawing of *Roman Charity* by Jan Gossaert, London, British Museum, inv. no. 1911,0412.2; the ceramic dish from 1601 (Figure 2.9); and a *Roman Charity* by a follower of Rubens sold at Sotheby's in 2007.
78 | See also the prints by Johann E. Haid after Loth, Michele Benedetti's drawing (1792) and Ignaz Krepp's print after Cignani, Pietro Peiroleri's print after Lazzarini, Eberhard Siegfried Henne's print after Rode (1784), plus a few anonymous drawings, prints, and paintings. In the nineteenth century, most *Roman Charities* included an infant.
79 | Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, "Laokoon: oder über die Grenzen der Mahlerey und Poesie," in: *Lessings Laokoon*, ed. by Hugo Blümner (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1880; first ed. Berlin: bey Christian Voss, 1766), 141–349, especially 165–70.
80 | Lessing, "Laokoon," 165. "For what we find beautiful in a work of art, is not judged to be beautiful by our eye, but by our imagination through the eye." Lessing, "Laokoon," 194.
81 | Lessing, "Laokoon," 213, 324.
82 | Lessing, "Laokoon," 250–51, 268.

83 | Lessing, "Laokoon," 282, 309.

84 | Lessing, "Laokoon," 215.

85 | On eighteenth-century German debates on ancient Greek art, see Whitney Davis, *Queer Beauty: Sexuality and Aesthetics from Winckelmann to Freud and Beyond* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010).

86 | For a first discussion of these paintings, see Robert Rosenblum, "Caritas Romana after 1760: Some Romantic Lactations," in: *Woman as Sex Object: Studies in Erotic Art*, ed. by Thomas B. Hess and Linda Nochlin (New York: Newsweek, 1972), 42–63.

87 | De Piles, *The Art of Painting*, 309–10.

88 | Roger de Piles, *Dissertation sur les ouvrages des plus fameux peintres* (Paris: chez N. Langlois fils rüe de la Harpe chez M.r Fourcroy m.d Epicier, 1681; reprint Farnborough, England: Gregg, 1968), 58.

89 | De Piles, *Dissertation sur les ouvrages*, 48.

90 | De Piles, *The Art of Painting*, 214–15.

91 | De Piles, *Dissertation sur les ouvrages*, 62.

92 | De Piles, *The Art of Painting*, 311.

93 | De Piles, *Dissertation sur les ouvrages*, 103–04.

94 | De Piles, *Dissertation sur les ouvrages*, 104.

95 | De Piles, *Dissertation sur les ouvrages*, 101.

96 | Alpers, *The Making of Rubens*, 119.

97 | Lisa Rosenthal, *Gender, Politics, and Allegory in the Art of Rubens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 102.

98 | Peter Paul Rubens, *Juno and Argus,* 1611, Köln, Walraff-Richartz-Museum.

99 | J. Vanessa Lyon, "Full of Grace: Lactation, Expression and "Colorito" Painting in Some Early Works by Rubens," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations,* 255–77.

100 | Alpers, *The Making of Rubens*, 133, 138, 153. Lyon, "Full of Grace," 258.

101 | On the connection between milk imagery, copia, and excess, see Zorach, *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold*.

102 | Régis Michel, "Diderot and Modernity," *Oxford Art Journal* 8, no. 2 (1985): 36–51, especially 37.

103 | Peter Paul Rubens, *The Origin of the Milky Way,* 1637, Madrid, Museo del Prado; Peter Paul Rubens, *Venus, Mars, and Amor,* 1630–1635, London, Dulwich Picture Gallery; Peter Paul Rubens, *Juno and Argus,* 1611, Köln, Walraff-Richartz-Museum. For an excellent analysis of breastfeeding Venus in *Minerva Protects Pax from Mars* (also called *Allegory of War and Peace*), see Rosenthal, *Gender, Politics, and Allegory*, chapter 2.

104 | Different engravings were made by Willem Panneels and Alexander Voet II. British Museum, inv. nos. S.5352 and 1917,1208.549, respectively. I am not sure how likely it is that Lagrenée might have seen this painting, as it happened to be in the collection of Jean Gillis Peeters d'Aertselaer de Cleydael in Antwerp, inventoried in 1763 and 1771.

Elizabeth McGrath, *Rubens: Subjects from History*, ed. by Arnout Balis (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1997), vol. 2, 105.

105 | *Le Mercure de France* (October 1765), 161, in: *Mercure de France* (Genève: Faksimile Slatkine Reprints, 1970), vol. LXXXIX, 261.

106 | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, ed. and transl. by John Goodman, introduction by Thomas Crow (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), vol. 1, 42.

107 | *Journal Encyclopédique* (October 1757), 106, in: *Journal Encyclopédique* (Genève: Faksimile Slatkine Reprints, 1967), vol. IV; *Le Mercure de France* (October 1757), 166, in: *Mercure de France* (1970), vol. LXXIII, 263.

108 | *L'année littéraire* (1757) vol. V, 341 in: *L'année littéraire* (Genève: Faksimile Slatkine Reprints, 1966), vol. IV, 451.

109 | *Journal Encyclopédique* (1. Novembre 1765), vol. VII, part 3, 106, in: *Journal Encyclopédique* (1967), vol. XX, 360.

110 | *Le Mercure de France* (October 1765), 159, in: *Mercure de France* (1970), vol. LXXXIX, 261.

111 | "Those willing to indulge the artist's lack of common sense, his ignoring the sudden, terrible effect of imprisonment and condemnation to die from hunger, will be enchanted by this work." Diderot, *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 43.

112 | André Bancel, *Jean-Baptiste Deshays, 1729–1765* (Paris: Arthena, 2008), 92–93, 121.

113 | Jérôme Delaplanche, *Noël-Nicolas Coypel 1690–1734* (Paris: Arthena, 2004), 87–88.

114 | *Le Mercure de France* (June 1724), 1391, in: *Mercure de France* (1968), vol. VI, 370.

115 | "What a touching spectacle! What a wonderful painting! / Burdened by years and iron chains, Cimon, who is close to the grave, / Finds a new life at the bosom of his daughter; / O! happy old man! Whose fortune makes us envious! / You will be reborn from your blood, and your daughter, in turn, / Is the mother of who has given her the light of day." *Le Mercure de France* (May 1728), 1015, in: *Mercure de France* (1968), vol. XIV, 267.

116 | *Le Mercure de France* (April 1735), 757, in: *Mercure de France* (1969), vol. XXVIII, 207.

117 | *Le Mercure de France* (June 1737), 1178, in: *Mercure de France* (1969), vol. XXXII, 313; *Le Mercure de France* (January 1740), 111, in: *Mercure de France* (1969), vol. XXXVIII, 39; *Le Mercure de France* (December 1747), 166, in: *Mercure de France* (1970), vol. LVII, 327.

118 | Delaplanche, *Noël-Nicolas Coypel 1690–1734*, 88.

119 | *Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806): Peintre du Roi et de Madame de Pompadour*; exhibition catalog; Musée Lambert, Versailles, 23 Nov. 1999–19 March 2000, ed. by Hélène Mouradian, Xavier Salmon, Tamara Préaud, Danielle Rice, Ulrich Leben (Paris: Somogy éditions, 1999), 15 16, 168, catalog entry 122.

120 | Mouradian, *Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806)*, 170, catalog entry 123.
121 | Mouradian, *Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806)*, 170, catalog entry 124.
122 | *Journal Encyclopédique* (15. November, 1765), vol. VIII, no. 1, 71, in: *Journal Encyclopédique*, (1967), vol. XX, 402.
123 | *Le Mercure de France* (October 1765), 159, in: *Mercure de France* (1970), vol. LXXXIX, 261.
124 | *L'Année Littéraire* (1765), vol. VI, 154, in: *L'Année Littéraire* (1966), vol. IV, 495.
125 | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 52–54.
126 | For a good discussion of art criticism and the role of the Salon in the emergence of a Habermasian public sphere in eighteenth-century France, see Thomas E. Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).
127 | As a result, hardly any meaningful analysis of the Salon was published that year. We know of this conflict through a note by Charles-Nicolas Cochin, high-ranking academician. Charles-Nicolas Cochin, Coll. Deloynes, pièce n. 114, quoted in: Mouradian, *Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806),* 48, note 102.
128 | Elisabeth Lavezzi, *La scène de genre dans les Salons de Diderot* (Paris: Hermann Éditeurs, 2009), 17.
129 | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 53.
130 | Mouradian, *Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806)*, 24.
131 | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1759," in: *Salons*, ed. by Jean Seznec and Jean Adhémar (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), vol. 1, 67.
132 | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1761," in: *Salons*, ed. by Jean Seznec and Jean Adhémar (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), vol. 1, 128.
133 | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1767," in: *Salons*, ed. by Jean Seznec and Jean Adhémar (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), vol. 3, 127.
134 | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 53.
135 | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 43.
136 | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 53.
137 | On Greuze's prohibition to exhibit in 1767, see Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris*, 164; on Greuze's choice not to present his painting as an acceptance piece, see Edgar Munhall, *Greuze the Draftsman* (New York: Merrell in association with the Frick Collection, 2002), 186.
138 | *Jean-Baptiste Greuze, 1725–1805*; exhibition catalogue; Hartford, Wadsworth Athenaeum, 1 Dec. 1976–23 Jan. 1977; San Francisco, The California Palace of the Legion of Honor, 5 March–1 May 1977; Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts, 11 June–7 Aug. 1977, ed. by Edgar Munhall (Dijon: Musée des Beaux-Arts, 1976), 138, catalog entry 60.

139 | On the difference from Rubens's painting, see *Greuze et l'affaire du Septime Sévère*; exhibition catalogue, Hôtel-Dieu–Musée Greuze de Tournus, 26 June–18 Sept. 2005, ed. by Clémence Poivet and Annick Lemoine (Paris: Somogy éditions, 2005), 26–27.

140 | Mark Ledbury, *Sedaine, Greuze and the Boundaries of Genre* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2000), 170.

141 | Mark Ledbury, *Sedaine, Greuze and the Boundaries of Genre*, 169.

142 | Mark Ledbury, *Sedaine, Greuze and the Boundaries of Genre*, 169, note 29.

143 | Michael Fried, *Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot* (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1980), 10; Munhall, *Greuze the Draftsman*, 21.

144 | Mark Ledbury, "Intimate Dramas: Genre Painting and New Theater in Eighteenth-Century France," in: *Intimate Encounters: Love and Domesticity in Eighteenth-Century France*, ed. by Richard Rand, with the assistance of Juliette M. Bianco (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 49–67, especially 56.

145 | Jean-Baptiste Greuze, *The Marriage Contract,* 1760–1761, Paris, Louvre.

146 | Quoted after Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris*, 142.

147 | Emma Barker, "Painting and Reform in Eighteenth-Century France: Greuze's "L'Accordée de Village," *Oxford Art Journal* 20, no. 2 (1997): 42–52, especially 43.

148 | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1763," in: *Salons*, vol. 1, 233.

149 | Emma Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 67.

150 | Lavezzi, *La scène de genre dans les Salons de Diderot*, 79.

151 | Jacqueline Marie Musacchio, *The Art and Ritual of Childbirth in Renaissance Italy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).

152 | Denis Diderot, "The Father of the Family," in: *Two Plays by Denis Diderot*, transl. and introduced by Kiki Gounaridou and John Hellweg (New York: Peter Lang, 2011).

153 | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1763," in: *Salons*, vol. 1, 233.

154 | Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment*, 207–08.

155 | Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment*, 80.

156 | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1769," in: *Salons*, vol. IV (1967), 42.

157 | For an analysis of Greuze's painting as reminiscent of Poussin's *Testament of Eudamidas,* see Eik Kahng, "L'Affaire Greuze and the Sublime of History Painting," *The Art Bulletin* 86, no. 1 (March 2004): 96–113, especially 99–100.

158 | Kahng, "L'Affaire Greuze," 98.

159 | Mark Ledbury, *Sedaine, Greuze and the Boundaries of Genre*, 179; Kahng, "L'Affaire Greuze," 102.

160 | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1769," in: *Salons*, vol. IV (1967), 103.

161 | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1769," in: *Salons*, vol. IV (1967), 104–06.

162 | Mark Ledbury, *Sedaine, Greuze and the Boundaries of Genre*, 179.

163 | Mark Ledbury, "Intimate Dramas," 62; Ledbury, *Sedaine, Greuze and the Boundaries of Genre*, 160–62, 182, 224–25.

164 | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 230.

165 | Crow, *Painters and Public Life*, 155.

166 | Kahng, "L'Affaire Greuze," 97; Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment*, 132–43; Crow, *Painters and Public Life*, 168.

167 | Mouradian, *Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806),* 16, 24.

168 | In Crow's eyes, his "surprise invader strategy" simply failed. Crow, *Painters and Public Life*, 164–66.

169 | Anita Brookner, *Greuze: The Rise and Fall of an Eighteenth-Century Phenomenon* (London: Elek, 1972), 109.

170 | Sperling, "Las Casas and His Amerindian Nurse."

171 | The attribution of the painting is insecure, but artnet recently listed this painting as authored by both Jacques-Louis David and "The School of Jacques-Louis David." On August 5, 2005, it sold for $11,700; http://www.artnet.com/artists/jacques-louis-david/roman-charity-V77BfGwpqpD4B3FaQlvT5g2 [accessed 3/31/14].

172 | Much has been written about this topic. For a first introduction, see Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992).

173 | The three paintings were by Jean-Charles-Nicaise Perrin (1791), Angelika Kauffmann (1794), and Etienne-Barthélemy Garnier (1801).

Part II: Texts and Contexts

Chapter 4: The Literary Tradition

Erotic Insinuations, Irony, and Ekphrasis

Even before the story of Pero and Cimon became a well-known subject matter in early modern art, European audiences were familiar with it through a millenarian textual tradition and an oral tradition that left traces in Spain, Italy, Greece, Germany, Pomerania, Albania, and Serbia until the nineteenth century.[1] The primary ancient source was Valerius Maximus's *Memorable Doings and Sayings* (ca. 31 CE), of which at least fifty-one different editions were printed in Italy, Germany, Spain, and France before 1500.[2] In the Middle Ages, Maximus's book ranked as the most frequently copied manuscript next to the Bible.[3] In addition, numerous retellings of Maximus's example of filial piety found their way into medieval fiction, moral treatises, sermon literature, and compilations of "women's worthies." The story about the breastfeeding daughter as an allegory of filial piety in both its maternal and paternal variety was thus widely known to both learned and illiterate audiences in medieval and early modern Europe.

The fame of Valerius Maximus's *Memorable Doings and Sayings* in medieval and early modern Europe stands in stark contrast to its neglect in the scholarly world since the nineteenth century. Only recently have literary historians rediscovered and translated his text, commenting on how the derivative nature of Maximus's anecdotes relegated them to near total obscurity in the modern academic world.[4] His compilation of historical and moral exempla acquired best-seller status already in antiquity because of the brief and succinct form in which he presented those memorable stories about the past, which he collected from a wide array of Latin and Greek authors, as well as their somewhat sensationalist content. His anecdotes illustrate upper-class Romans' political, military, and religious duties as well as the patriarchal values that, he seems to suggest, should inform contemporaries' family lives and private culture.

As I will argue in the following, Maximus's anecdotes are deeply unsettling because of the laconic – or stoic – manner with which violent or otherwise disturbing content matter is presented. Despite their overtly didactic purpose,

they thrive on a rhetoric of detachment and emotional ambiguity that serves to undermine the patriarchal message they allegedly pronounce. The two breastfeeding episodes, in particular, contain deviant erotic allusions that threaten to subvert the maxim of filial piety they were supposed to illustrate. In the medieval tradition, the daughter's love for her mother is treated as a perfect example of reciprocity in kinship relations, but such mutual regard is conspicuously missing in the original version and later retellings of the father-daughter example. The ekphrastic structure of the story of Pero and Cimon lends a certain shock value to this anecdote, which in its stress on pictorial, i.e., non-verbal, truth invites the reader's voyeuristic insinuations.

Maximus's anecdotes express the sternness and gravitas of first-century imperial discourse but also a certain ambiguity vis-à-vis the prohibitive nature of family relations that celebrated the unlimited power of the pater familias. The sense of ironic detachment unfolds gradually as his anecdotes move from illustrations of military virtue and obedience to the gods to contemporary Roman customs and stories about private life and gender relations. In book II of his *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, for example, Maximus treats the reader to several stories about fathers who had their sons executed for infringement of their military orders. Among others, he mentions the dictator Postumius, who, "because … [his son] went forth from his post and routed the enemy of his own motion and not by … [his] bidding … ordered the victor to be beheaded," and "Torquatus, Consul in the Latin war, [who] ordered … [his] son to be seized by a lector and slaughtered like a sacrificial victim as he was bringing back a glorious victory and splendid spoils, because … he had gone out to combat without … [his] knowledge."[5] Fond of crass opposites, even paradoxical situations, Maximus leaves the didactic purpose of these anecdotes in doubt. Summarizing the moral value of the story about Postumius, he suggests that this general must have suffered from depression when seeing his son exhibit the military talents he himself taught him. And directly addressing Torquatus – who turned his son into a sacrificial victim – as if in a court of law, he states laconically: "you judged it better that a father should lose a brave son than that the fatherland should lose military discipline."[6]

An even greater gulf between explicit message and erosive commentary is expressed in Maximus's anecdote about the wife of Drusus Germanicus in his chapter on "abstinence and continence." Mentioning that Drusus "kept his sexual activity confined within his love for his wife" and that Antonia, his wife, "balanced her husband's love with outstanding loyalty," he concludes with a somewhat strange description of Antonia's bedroom habits after she was widowed: "After his death, in the flower of her age and beauty, she slept with her mother-in-law in lieu of a husband. In the same bed the vigour of youth was quenched for the one and the experience of widowhood turned to old age for the other. Let this bedroom set the finishing touch on such examples."[7]

Evoking the image of a widow who invites her mother-in-law into her marital bed as the ultimate example of chastity must have surprised his readers, even provoked laughter. Here it is important to keep in mind that story collections such as Maximus's were read aloud at banquets as entertainment, a context that makes an entirely serious consumption of their moral exempla unlikely.[8] In his chapter on "ancient institutions," a reference to the prohibition against women's dining in a reclining position declares openly that among his contemporaries, this "form of austerity" and exhibition of female discipline had long been given up.[9]

The anecdotes that concern us directly, about the unnamed Roman daughter who breastfed her mother and Pero who breastfed her father, celebrate a spectacular, and ironic, reversal of values. They are tucked in between other examples of "piety towards parents and brothers and country," most of which express sons' duties toward their fathers. Their expressions of piety range from saving their fathers' lives in battle and dying to avenge their fathers' death to the stoic endurance of humiliation inflicted on them by their fathers. These latter anecdotes resonate most with the stories about paternal cruelty mentioned above: in Book V. 4. 3, Manlius forces the tribune to refrain from suing his father, despite the fact that he had prevented him from proving his manhood and seeking glory in war. In Book V. 4. 5, Flaminius, tribune of the plebs, retracts a law proposal when his father "placed a hand on him as he was already on the rostra putting the law to vote, overborne by private authority."[10] And in Book V. 4. ext. 2, Cimon (different Cimon) enters prison in his father's stead, an act that "gained [him] more glory in prison than in the senate house."[11] Two anecdotes recount stories about sons expressing reverence vis-à-vis their mothers at the cost of military defeat and death.[12]

Although favoring sons' expressions of filial piety and patriotism, three out of fourteen of Maximus's anecdotes involve daughters, arranged at the very center of this chapter. In Book V. 4. 6, the author tells the story of Claudia, the vestal who rescues her father from the mob that wants to kill him during his triumphant entry into Rome.[13] The two interlocking lactation scenes immediately follow suit, proposing a more humble model of female heroism. In line with his preference for juxtapositions, reversals, and paradoxes, Maximus structures the two breastfeeding anecdotes as alternate versions of each other. If the mother-daughter story is taken from Roman history, the story about Pero and Cimon (here Myco) is an "external" example from Greece. If the former creates suspense through narrative means, the latter one is couched as ekphrasis, the actual or presumed description of a painting. And if, in terms of the stories' allusions to deviant sexualities, the example of the Roman daughter who breastfed her mother conjures up the specter of a female same-sex encounter, Pero's act of nursing her father projects the danger of first-order incest as yet another boundary transgression.

The unusual nature of the two anecdotes is highlighted by Maximus in his preface to Book V. 4. 7: he openly apologizes for their squalid setting in a prison. The preceding story, we recall, was about Claudia's triumphant, warrior-like intervention during her father's infelicitous entry into Rome. Maximus conceived of the two stories as occupying different ends on a spectrum, moving from a "most sacred temple to a place in the city more necessary than splendid" and having the daughter of a female convict follow the example of an upper-class vestal priestess.[14] Instead of a battle, the workings of the Roman judicial system are at the center of this anecdote, while the breastfeeding episode is told obliquely through the eyes of the prison guard. The jailer appears to be the true protagonist of the story, as he refrains from strangling the mother right away and presents the daughter's rescue effort as an example of filial piety with the judges, an intervention that saves the mother's life and rehabilitates her:

"A Praetor had handed over a woman of free birth found guilty at his tribunal of a capital crime to the Triumvir to be executed in prison. Received there, the head warder had pity on her and did not strangle her immediately. He even allowed her daughter to visit her, but only after she had been thoroughly searched to make sure she was not bringing in any food, in the expectation that the prisoner would die of starvation. But after a number of days had passed, he asked himself what could be sustaining her so long. Observing the daughter more closely, he noticed her putting out her breast and relieving her mother's hunger with the succor of her own milk. This novel and remarkable spectacle was reported by him to the Triumvir, by the Triumvir to the Praetor, by the Praetor to the board of judges; as a result the woman's sentence was remitted. Whither does Piety not penetrate, what does she not devise? In prison she found a new way to save a mother. For what so extraordinary, so unheard of, as for a mother to be nourished by her daughters' breasts? This might be thought to be against nature, if to love parents were not Nature's first law."[15]

The daughter's piety is represented as contagious, as it is her "novel and remarkable spectacle" that inspires various members of the Roman court system to suspend her mother's sentence and, in a utopian turn of events, exchange charity for justice. Despite the emphasis on judicial proceedings, the reader's curiosity remains strangely unsatisfied with respect to the nature of the mother's crime. The fact that Maximus leaves her transgression shrouded in silence leads some medieval authors to speculate about the mother's innocence. Furthermore, both the mother and the daughter remain unnamed, which is unusual in Maximus's collection of facts. Almost all other stories derive the effect of immediacy and vividness from clearly locating their protagonists in time and space. By contrast, this story features "Piety" as a personified concept rather than a young woman endowed with agency, motivation, and determination. The story ends with a reference to "Nature's" laws, which, in the eyes of the prison warder, the daughter does not violate in this strange exchange of

body fluids with another woman. Instead, she affirms it insofar as she observes the rule of reciprocity in kinship relations. Nonetheless, the guard's brief hesitation in recognizing the daughter's sacrifice as a pious deed instead of an "unnatural" same-sex encounter introduces a moment of doubt and renders the anecdote too equivocal to serve as a straightforward example of female virtue.

To some extent, this story is about rivalry between different concepts of justice. The anonymous daughter, an embodiment of "piety," neutralizes her mother's violation of civil laws through her adherence to nature's laws and gains the commutation of her mother's sentence. She accomplishes through bodily gestures what other women who insisted that their voices be heard at court and in the political arena only rarely achieved. In a chapter entitled "Women who Pleaded before Magistrates for Themselves or for Others," Maximus gives three examples of women who dared to speak up in front of praetors and triumvirs. While he praises Maesia of Sentinum, who took over her own defense in a public trial and won, and lauds Hortensia for achieving the repeal of a tax on matrons, he speaks with great contempt of Carfania, who "[plagued] the tribunals with barkings to which the Forum was unaccustomed … [and] became a notorious example of female litigiousness."[16]

The unnamed Roman daughter who breastfed her mother can thus be viewed as one of those "women and other voiceless things," whose evocation in public speeches functions rhetorically as allegory. According to Greek and Roman theorists of oratory, successful allegories conjure up vivid images in the minds of the audience and are meant to arouse empathy and "piety."[17] Although achieved through linguistic means, the effects of allegory are located in the extra-linguistic realm of the listener's imagination, producing those feelings of empathy the orator needs to arouse in order to be persuasive. In this sense, the pious – but also pitiful, because voiceless – daughter both narratively enacts and metaphorically symbolizes the process of allegorization as such. Her example establishes "piety" as a counter-concept to justice as the original allegorical trope. This tight correspondence of form and content, uniting the evocation of female bodily form with the arousal of pity and piety, would dominate the workings of allegorization through the Middle Ages and beyond (see Chapter 6).

The story of Pero and Cimon (alias Myco) amplifies the notion of filial piety as quintessential allegory while enhancing the moral ambiguities of the event. Told as ekphrasis, Maximus structures the meta-plot of this anecdote as a competition between linguistic and visual means of representation:

"Let the same be considered as predicated concerning the piety of Pero, whose father Myco (Cimon) was in a like sorry plight and equally under prison guard. A man in extreme old age, she put him like a baby to her breast and fed him. Men's eyes are riveted in amazement when they see the painting of this act and renew the features of the long bygone incident in astonishment at

the spectacle now before them, believing that in those silent outlines of limbs they see living and breathing bodies. This must needs happen to the mind also, admonished to remember things long past as though they were recent by painting, which is considerably more effective than literary memorials."[18]

Declaring that visual representations are more efficient in arousing those mental images which not only produce feelings of empathy but also aid in the operation of memory, Maximus elaborates in this story on his complex views regarding parental breastfeeding, piety, and allegory. Paradoxically denying the force of his own words, he recommends that Pero's and Cimon's lactation be painted rather than narrated for greater effect. The gender switch of the parent is, of course, momentous for the ekphrastic structure of the account. The sensationalist celebration of the daughter who "put … [her father] like a baby to her breast and fed him" stands in stark contrast to the hasty denial of any sexual implications of the mother-daughter scene. The eroticization of Pero's quenching of her father's thirst detracts quite explicitly from the "pious" motif of the scene; it rather underscores the lack of reciprocity between her father's needs and wants and Pero's heroic sacrifice in satisfying them. Whether Cimon gets rehabilitated and released from prison just like the Roman mother is left in doubt. Maximus provides closure in this anecdote through a meditation on different methods of recording historical events, rather than by affirming the impeccable moral qualities of the act thus witnessed. The commentary on processes of allegorization finds in Pero's story a fitting sequel to the anecdote of the breastfeeding Roman daughter: if the latter exhibits stress on parental breastfeeding as a symbol of piety and exemplifies the effects of arousing pity in a judicial setting by reference to "voiceless" women, the former recommends the eroticized depiction of such women's bodily gestures in the arts for the arousal of "riveting" emotions in the male viewer.

The two anecdotes thus make important comments about gendered figures of speech, the function of these rhetorical devices for the workings of imagination and memory, and the "reality-effect" of the eroticized and naturalized depiction of female bodies. Both anecdotes displace the mother by substituting her with an eroticized figure of the maternal, arousing phantasies of regression and the specter of incest. While the first anecdote represents a mirror-like reversal of the roles of mother and daughter and a clear causal relationship between the daughter's sacrifice and the mother's rehabilitation, the second one is more complicated because the law of reciprocity does not necessarily apply. In Maximus's anecdotes, patriarchy is presented as a hierarchical structure in which fathers execute the right over life and death of their children, mainly their sons. In this context, Pero's act assumes a heroic (and also tragic) character, because she undermines the workings of justice to rescue a father whose guilt is beyond the shadow of a doubt. She could let him die, but chooses not to. She assumes a position of power only to be – quite literally – consumed

by him, and it is her oscillation between victim and woman on top that renders this allegory of filial love subversive and at the same time constitutive of the patriarchal order that Maximus takes such great pains to describe.

The story of Pero and Cimon is presented as an "external" example derived from Greek sources. This orientalization serves as an effective strategy of detachment from a morally ambiguous story. It is followed by another prison story centering on Cimon, son of Miltiades, a famous Greek general who won the battle of Marathon, who "did not hesitate to buy burial for … [his] father with voluntary chains."[19] Cimon, who eventually became a famous general and senator in Athens, voluntarily entered prison after his father had fallen from grace and died, just so that his body could be buried honorably. In later adaptations of Pero's anecdote, her father's name Myco(n) gets switched with the name of Miltiades's son Cimon, which produces a certain conflation of topics and characters. The appropriation of Cimon's name for Pero's father – facilitated by the two names' reverse alliteration – suggests the wish to present the suckling old man as an innocent victim rather than a guilty old patriarch, probably in order to render Pero's sacrifice more intelligible. This was not Maximus's intention, however; he never questions Myco's guilt or mentions his rehabilitation. Only by mapping his story onto the preceding mother-daughter anecdote does the reader imagine a "happy end" to Pero's father's trials and tribulations.

The fluidity and selectivity in appropriating Maximus's anecdotes by subsequent ancient and medieval authors characterize the creative process Maximus himself underwent in adapting known stories for his collection. The only identifiable source for his example of Pero and her father is Hygin's brief entry about Xanthippe in his *Fables* (written some time before 17 CE), an encyclopedic collection of Greek mythological stories. This entry laconically states that "Xanthippe offered her breast milk to her father Mycon, who was locked up in prison, to keep him alive."[20] Hygin's brief index receives its full meaning in the context of fourteen other short entries held together under the chapter heading "Exceptionally Devoted Women and Men." The theme of female devotion is treated here in a somewhat counter-intuitive manner, since almost all eleven entries about "pious" daughters and sisters in Hygin's *Fables* tell of disastrous family relationships involving incest and murder. Among those pious women are "Antigone, daughter of Oedipus, [who] buried her brother Polynices;"[21] Electra and Iliona, who took care of their baby brothers Orestes and Polydorus, respectively; Pelopia who was raped by her father and gave birth to his son; Hypsipyle, who saved her father from the women of Lemnos; Chalciope, who "did not abandon her father after he lost his kingship;" Harpalyce, who was nursed by heifers and mares and who "saved her father in war and drove the enemy to flight;" Erigone, who "killed herself by hanging after her father died;" Agave, who killed her own son but conquered a kingdom for her father; and Tyro, who "killed her sons to save her father."[22]

Hygin understands women's piety as daughters' and sisters' voluntary submission to the (then) new order of patriarchy. This gets expressed quite clearly in his example of Hypsipyle, who, as we read elsewhere in Hygin's *Fables*, saved her father Thoas from the women of Lemnos, who "conspired and killed every last male on the island" after their husbands had left them for Thracian women.[23] Hypsipyle never reaps any benefits from her heroic act; she flees after being found out, gets picked up by pirates, and is sold into slavery to become the wet-nurse for the son of King Lycurgus.[24] Eventually, the women of Lemnos themselves surrender to the new law: all those who become pregnant by an Argonaut name their sons after their father.[25]

Other "pious" women in Hygin's *Fables* suffer death and rape for the benefit of their fathers and brothers. Harpalyce, daughter of Harpalycus, king of the Amyneans, renounces her right to rule after her father's death. Raised, motherless, by wild animals, and trained in warfare by her father, she saves him in battle but when he dies accidentally, she retreats into the woods, bereft of grief, and lets herself be killed by shepherds.[26] Erigone, too, loved her father so much that she committed suicide upon finding his body.[27] Tyro killed the sons she conceived by her uncle when she learned they were destined to murder her father.[28] Pelopia suffered rape at the hands of her father in order to give birth to a son who could avenge her father against his evil brother.[29] Finally Antigone, herself the daughter of an incestuous union, is killed by Creon after burying her brother and giving birth to Creon's grandson.[30] The remaining four stories involving sons are less violent, consisting of straightforward rescue missions of their parents, except perhaps the last one about Cleops and Bitias, sons of Cydippe, priestess of Juno, who died in "reward" for a service they rendered to their mother.[31] This last example is also taken up by Maximus.

Hygin's entry about Xanthippe is thus situated in the midst of stories about "pious" women's consent to patriarchy, a context that lends an important interpretive clue to the breastfeeding episode. The charitable nursing of Xanthippe's father is equated to women's self-destructive love for their fathers and brothers, leading to incest and murder. According to Hygin's *Fables*, piety can only be performed by women as an act of submission vis-à-vis their male kin. In Maximus's anecdotes, echoes of Hygin's ironic, and slightly perverse, understanding of female "piety" survive. The labeling of his chapter "Of Piety towards Parents and Brothers and Country" shows that Maximus read Hygin's examples carefully, echoing their patriotic bend. Maximus, writing mostly about Roman history and culture, lends greater emphasis to father-son relationships, but it is his two differently gendered breastfeeding episodes that would become synonymous with the very concept of filial piety until the Renaissance and beyond. While Hygin promotes a concept of filial devotion that includes infanticide, incest, and insanity, Maximus points to the moral ambiguities of patriarchy in a more subtle manner.



Figure 4.1: Pero and Cimon, Pompeii, Casa IX, 2,5, before 79 CE

In the first century CE, Myco/Cimon and Pero were depicted several times in the visual arts as well, either serving as a foil for Maximus's ekphrastic description, or retroactively illustrating the breastfeeding scene with the kind of emotional intensity that he imagined. In Pompeii alone, three different wall paintings (Figure 4.1), two identical terracotta sculptures of Egyptian manufacture, and a ceramic fragment have been excavated since the late eighteenth century; also extant is a fragment of an ancient south-Gallic relief of *Pero and Cimon* (Figure 4.2).[32] The popularity of the motif in the visual arts found its equivalent in ancient literary sources, where filial breastfeeding was, since the second century, conceived of as the very allegory of "piety." It is noteworthy that no ancient artistic depiction of the mother-daughter lactation remains and that nearly every author who wrote about filial piety after Maximus chose either the all-female or the cross-gendered version to illustrate his point, never both at the same time (with very few exceptions).



Figure 4.2: Pero and Cimon, 1st c. CE, Sigillata Shard, Southern Gaul

Pliny the Elder concentrates in his *Natural History* (77 CE) on the all-female version of the theme. In his chapter on "Instances of the Highest Degree of Affection," he tells of a lower-class woman who "was detected nourishing her mother with the milk of her breast." Not only was the mother pardoned "in consideration of the marvelous affection of the daughter;" both "were maintained for the rest of their days at the public charge." Under the consulship of C. Quintius and M. Acilius, i.e., in 192–91 BCE, a temple was built in their honor on the former spot of that prison, dedicated to the goddess of Piety, "where the theatre of Marcellus now stands."[33] Pliny was the first author to highlight the tremendous public impact of the daughter's charitable act through the construction of a temple in her honor. At other points in his encyclopedia, Pliny mentions the many medicinal powers of women's milk, and returns to the theme of maternal and filial lactation in a section on eye diseases: "It is asserted that one who has been rubbed with the milk of mother and daughter together never needs to fear eye trouble for the rest of his life."[34]

At the turn of the third century CE, Sextus Pompeius Festus remembers the lactation scene in his alphabetically organized dictionary *On the Significance of Words*. Although relying on Pliny, he changes the gender of the nursing parent. Under the entry "piety," he explains: "The Romans honor piety as they honor all other gods. One says that the temple of Piety was consecrated by Acilius in the very space where the woman lived who had secretly nourished her father … with the milk from her breasts: and in recompense for her devotion she obtained his release [from prison]."[35] Later on in the third century, Gaius Julius Solinus remembers the story in his *Collection of Memorable Events*, amplifying on Festus's entry and, likewise, switching the mother for the father.[36] Memories of the breastfeeding mother-daughter couple thus seem to fade after Pliny. In yet another retelling of the episode, Nonnos of Panopolis integrates a much embellished and dramatized version of the father-daughter scene into his novel *Dionysiaca* (5th century).[37]

After a hiatus of 600 years, the story reappears in a medieval Byzantine account.[38] This twelfth-century text records the influence of an oral tradition that can be traced all over Europe until the nineteenth century. Typical of the oral tradition in which the motif circulated is its presentation as a riddle about kinship and the assumption that the daughter breastfeeds her father through the bars of a prison window. This medieval story, moreover, is couched as a story about a king who is jealous of his older brother. The king, fearing that his brother conspires to deprive him of his kingship, has him arrested and orders that he die by starvation. The daughter of the king's brother knows that her father was imprisoned without cause and reason and achieves permission to visit him twice a day. The king orders that an opening be made in the prison walls through which the prisoner and his daughter can talk. The young woman resolves to offer her breasts to her father through the crack in the wall, thus keeping him alive. The king, seeing that his brother does not die, suspects his niece of sorcery and prohibits any further visits. The daughter, deep in thought about what she could do next, encounters a soldier on the road who is cutting open the womb of a pregnant mare to extract the foal. He explains to her that the foal will survive, and that he will make a saddle from the mother's coat. The daughter is immediately very happy to hear this, as she thinks of a ruse to save her father. She buys both the foal and the mare's coat from the soldier, has a blanket made from the coat, and sends both the young horse and the saddle to the king as gifts. In return, she asks to be able to visit her father again. One day, she sees the king riding the horse. She approaches him, and says: "You are riding on an animal that was never born and you are sleeping under his mother."[39] The king is much astonished at these words and begs her to clarify them. She answers: "I will explain them, my king, when you have given me my child … who will become my father when you return him to me, but stay my child if you don't."[40] The king, embarrassed at not understanding her riddle, grants her what she is asking for, provided she decodes

her enigmatic words. So she uncovers to the king the details of her ruse and demands that her father be freed.

Nineteenth-century folklorists have gathered many versions of this riddle about the father-who-is-also-the-son of his daughter. A Spanish version goes as follows: "One day I was daughter / now I am mother / The prince whom my breasts are nursing / Is the husband of my mother / Guess correctly, gentlemen."[41] In Venice, a similar riddle was recorded: "Guess ... I am the daughter of a great lord / now I am daughter, tomorrow mother / I nurse a son, husband of my mother."[42] As in the Byzantine story, a version of which was recorded in nineteenth-century Lesbos, the father is here a prince or great lord.[43] In sixteenth-century Germany, the emphasis was placed on the daughter's "betrayal" of the judicial authorities: "Pulled through columns / lords betrayed / I will become the mother / Of whom I was the daughter / I raised my mother a beautiful husband."[44] The image of the daughter's nursing through a crack in the wall, or with the help of a tube, is repeated in stories collected in nineteenth-century Pomerania, Serbia, and Albania.[45] Archer Taylor mentions similar riddles from England, Sardinia, Sicily, Armenia, Denmark, and Lithuania.[46] In sixteenth-century Italy, oral culture found its way back into "high" literature with Latin versions of the riddle and, most importantly, Giovanni Straparola's novel *The Delightful Nights* (1550).[47] One of the stories in this collection, which happens to be about the incestuous sharing of a wife between two brothers, ends with our riddle: "I am a virgin / round and slim / I became mother and daughter of my father / and with the milk of my breast / I nourished a son, husband of my mother."[48]

Carla Freccero interprets the early modern frequency of riddles about incestuous kinship, of which additional evidence exists in the form of epitaphs on tombstones, as indicative of a profound uneasiness among contemporaries with all kinship based on arbitrary hierarchies and exclusions. Freccero argues that story no. 30 in Marguerite de Navarre's *Heptameron*, in which a widow who commits incest with her son and gives birth to a daughter who winds up marrying her father/brother, exhibits a "peculiar queerness" that allegorizes as "incestuous and endogamous [a] sixteenth-century monarchic strategy even as it aspires to a similarly parthenogenetic fantasy of maternal/matriarchal rule."[49] In her eyes, Marguerite de Navarre's implicit critique of patriarchal genealogies takes the form of a fantasy about matrilineal incest, thus revealing the peculiar exclusions of all forms of dynastic kinship. The riddles about Pero and Cimon enact a similar reversal of genealogical origins in emphasizing the daughter's fictive usurpation of her father's mother's place. They reduce the father to a passive plaything of his daughter, who, in taking on the role of her grandmother, "raises her mother a beautiful husband." The presentation of the father-daughter breastfeeding episode, as well as other incestuous encounters, in the form of a riddle has moreover the

effect of exposing all kinship as an arbitrary and non-obvious order based on gendered exclusions.[50]

The bewildering frequency with which the riddle was recorded in oral culture by nineteenth-century folklorists, and translated back into written culture in the sixteenth century, has left traces in the visual tradition as well. In those artistic representations, Pero nurses her father through a window or another opening in the prison wall, probably in order to highlight the boundary transgression that her incestuous milk sharing entailed, or else to prevent the nursing scene from degenerating into full-fledged intercourse. Robero Danese has pointed out how in Greek and Roman antiquity and medieval Islam, a powerful taboo against the mixing of sperm – i.e., blood – with milk led to chastity requirements for wet-nurses, and marriage prohibitions for milk siblings and all of their descendants, respectively.[51]

In certain tribal communities of Afghanistan, rituals of adult breastfeeding served until the nineteenth century as a punishment for and remedy against adultery, because the sharing of milk constituted kinship-like bonds of fosterage that rendered any further sexual intercourse unthinkable.[52] In the United States, remote and somewhat inconsistent echoes of this ancient ban found their way into Todd Akin's campaign for a senatorial post. On August 25, 2012, the Republican congressman explained on public radio that in his eyes, "female breast milk – when fed directly to an adult homosexual male daily for at least four weeks – has a 94% chance of permanently curing homosexual perversions." Lesbians, he added, would have to drink some other beverage to receive the same benefit.[53] Why Akin thought breastfeeding could cure male homosexuality in particular is unclear, but what resonates with our material is the deep-seated conviction that adult lactation ought not to be accompanied by ejaculation, and would, in fact, pose an obstacle to it.

In medieval and early modern Europe, the ancient Greek medical theories that rationalized this prohibition were still known, but it was no longer unimaginable that a father-daughter breastfeeding couple would proceed to engage in phallic sex. To make up for the weakening of the taboo on mixing milk with sperm, oral culture intervened, separating Pero from her father by a wall, as is shown in an illumination of a thirteenth-century manuscript of Solinus's *Collection of Noteworthy Things*.[54] This sketch indicates how medieval oral culture inflected artistic receptions, because the text itself clearly mentions that Pero obtained permission to enter the prison (Figure 4.3).[55] Likewise, sixteenth-century Italian artists such as Perino del Vaga, Rosso Fiorentino, Georges Reverdy, and Caravaggio show Pero nursing through the bars of a prison window, in open contrast to the – by then well-known – ancient literary tradition (Figures 1.48, 1.49, 1.50, 2.1).

At about the same time as the medieval Byzantine author embellished, and significantly altered, the anecdote about the daughter-who-breastfeeds-her-father,



Figure 4.3: Illumination of a Manuscript by Solinus, 13th c., Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana

a retelling of the mother-daughter lactation occurred in the *Life of Gerard*, a twelfth-century Latin epic poem.[56] Preserved in several fourteenth-century vernacular manuscripts, this poem tells of "good Berte," full of piety, charity, and "sweet loveliness," who saves her mother, a noble lady, convicted to death for a "very great infamy."[57] Going beyond Maximus in important details, the author of this Burgundian vita attributes to the daughter a name, a noble lineage, and a motivation for her deed, while the mother's crime is alluded to as adultery. There is even a short dialogue between the prison guards and Berte, who is not found out in voyeuristic fashion but voluntarily answers questions about how she keeps her mother alive. While this version is a thoroughly "modernized," i.e., feudal and Catholic, transposition of its ancient source, Michael Scotus (1175–ca. 1232) gives a fairly accurate summary of Maximus's mother-daughter anecdote in his *Philosophical Meal* a century earlier.[58] Despite his close attention to the ancient text, he leaves out any reference to Pero and Cimon – as would later writers of the fourteenth century. Scotus's contemporary, Jacques de Vitry (ca. 1170–1240), even changes the filial theme altogether in his sermon collection. In his exemplum no.

238, a "husband of a good woman" was thrown into prison but survives because his wife "nourished him with her own milk."[59]

The first medieval author to report both versions of Maximus's story is Vincent of Beauvais (ca. 1190–1264), who in his *Mirror of History* recounts, with only slight changes in syntax and word choice, Maximus's twin anecdotes. However, despite the otherwise close attention to his source, Vincent of Beauvais intervenes creatively, substituting Maximus's thoughts on affects aroused by naturalistically painted images for the use of memory with a digression on piety and love.[60] He either had no use for Maximus's theory of naturalism in the arts – a concept that much later would inspire Renaissance artists – or else found the ancient author's ekphrastic evocation of the couple's "living and breathing bodies" too immodest for his moralizing purposes. Vincent of Beauvais was also the first author to substitute Mycon's name for Cimona, thus assimilating the innocent son who voluntarily enters prison with the guilty old man that Pero pities. In another section of his book, he recounts a lactation miracle about a wealthy notary turned monk after the Virgin Mary interceded on his behalf during a terrible illness, curing him with the milk from her breasts.[61]

John of Wales (ca. 1260–1285) omits Maximus's provocative ekphrasis as well. He gives an extended summary of Maximus's example of the Roman daughter and her mother, citing the anecdote accurately, but mentions the father-daughter episode only in passing, referring to Solinus.[62] In 1297, Iacopo da Varagine neglects to mention the all-female version but quotes Maximus in his account of the cross-gendered story in his *Chronicle of the City of Genua*. He does not emulate the ekphrastic account but embellishes on the identity of the father. In his view, he was a mighty nobleman, which explains the judges' efforts to spare him a public execution. Also, he studiously notes, Pero was "married."[63]

A century later, another reference to Solinus can be found in Don Pascual de Gayangos's *Book of Examples* (14th century), in which a one-sentence summary of both anecdotes mixes the parent's gender, talking about how the daughter breastfed her mother but got her father released from prison.[64] This ambiguous reference to Solinus is all the more astonishing as Gayangos's next example refers to Maximus's anecdote about the mute son of Croesus who rescued his father. The *Dialogue of Creatures Moralyzed* (14th century; Engl. transl. 16th century) refers back to Maximus's *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, but here as well, a fairly wordy retelling of the mother-daughter episode is followed by the laconic sentence: "And a lyke tale is tolde of an agid man that was sustayned in all thinges by his doughter."[65] This deliberate censoring of Maximus's ekphrasis continues into the early sixteenth century with Bernardino de Bustis (1450–1513). His sermon collection mentions the breastfeeding daughter and her infirm father only briefly, even though the printing press by now flooded

early modern markets with full-text editions of Maximus's *Memorable Doings and Sayings* in various languages.[66]

With the exception of the *Dialogue of Creatures Moralyzed*, references to Pero and Cimon were entirely suppressed in the fourteenth century in favor of elaborate retellings of the mother-daughter story along the lines of Berte's anecdote in *Girard de Rossillon*.[67] The *Gesta Romanorum* (1342) quotes only Valerius Maximus's "unheard of, admirable spectacle" involving the "praetor and the woman," but not the story about Pero and Cimon.[68] In his book *The Moralized Game of Chess* (1347), which presents chess as an allegory of feudal society, Jacques de Cessoles (fl. 1288–1322) translates Maximus's anecdote V. 4. 7 quite accurately – but not the following one – in an attempt to define pity as a "very great goodness of heart in helping others."[69] Already in 1337, Konrad von Ammenhusen created a German version of this originally Latin text.[70] And Jean Gobi (1323–1350), another contemporary, reimagined the all-female breastfeeding episode, not the cross-gendered one, as an allegorical enactment of Catholic compassion, charity, and devotion. In his *Stairway to Heaven*, he has the mother nourished by two female ladies, one of whom offers her the "milk of repentance," the other one the "milk of devotion."[71] Gobi's allegorization of charity as a woman who gives milk to a female prisoner resonates with contemporary artistic representations of Charity in the act of breastfeeding more than one child.

In the second half of the fourteenth century, the exclusive focus on the daughter and her mother continued, albeit with a renewed emphasis on narrative representation and attention to historical detail. Boccaccio makes the "young Roman woman" the protagonist of one of his vignettes in *Famous Women* (1361–62), adding a commentary on the reciprocity of filial love and the power of female compassion:

"A wonderful thing, then, is the power of filial devotion. Not surprisingly, it pierces the hearts of women, who are easily moved to compassion and tears; but sometimes it makes its way even into cruel breasts of steel that have been deliberately hardened. Seated in the heart, filial devotion first softens every harsh act with supple kindness. Then, knowing well how to look for and find opportunities, it drives us to mingle our tears with those of the unfortunate and take (at least in sympathy) others' sickness and danger upon ourselves, and sometimes, if there are no remedies, death in their stead."

So great are the effects of filial devotion that we hardly wonder when we, as children, perform some pious deed for our parents; by so doing, we seem simply to do our duty and to repay fittingly what we have received from them.[72]

Boccaccio's story about women's empathy and compassion, as well as reciprocity in kinship relations, was illustrated numerous times. Three fifteenth-century illuminations of the breastfeeding daughter survive in French manuscript versions of his book, as well as one woodcut accompanying



Figure 4.4: Mother and Daughter, early 15th c., Illumination, Boccaccio, De cleres et nobles femmes, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Fr. 598

a German printed copy of *Famous Women* from 1473. The first picture, dated to 1402–03, shows the daughter seated in a fantasy landscape (Figure 1.5).[73] She wears a beautiful golden dress with a matching cap; gracefully, she offers one breast to her mother who is seated in front of her. The mother is covered in an elegantly draped red dress and a headscarf, holding her chained hands to her chest in a gesture of devotion and thankfulness. The absence of the prison environment lets the viewer focus on the daughter's charity and compassion. The second illumination, dated to the late fifteenth century, depicts a castle-like fortress with a huge window, through the bars of which we catch a glimpse of the breastfeeding couple (Figure 4.4). The daughter, dressed in a low-cut red dress and matching hat, exposes her left breast; the mother, modestly covered with a blue headdress, kneels in front of her, putting the nipple into her mouth. The third illustration presents a close-up of the window (Figure 4.5). Through the bars we see the daughter, dressed in a blue garment with a low neckline, her hair tucked away in a turban-like headgear. She stands in front of her mother, who eagerly holds on to her daughter and suckles from one huge, slightly dislocated breast. The strange placement of the daughter's bosom, reminiscent of late medieval Italian versions of the Madonna Lactans, has the effect of de-naturalizing, thus de-eroticizing, the lactation scene, while emphasizing its symbolic significance. To the right of the window, the prison



Figure 4.5: Mother and Daughter, 15th or 16th c., Illumination, Boccaccio, De cleres et nobles femmes, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Fr. 599

guard takes a good look at the two women. Scratching his beard, he seems totally absorbed by what he sees. The woodcut shows both women behind a big window secured with bars through which we can see inside. Two guards, who have not yet discovered the act, are placed in front of the closed door to the right (Figure 4.6).

Christine de Pizan's *Book of the City of Ladies* (1404) includes a retelling of Maximus's anecdote along the lines of *Famous Women*. Pizan's version of the scene contains even more narrative details concerning the daughter's feelings and state of mind than Boccaccio's, mentioning, for example, that "she begged and wept so much that the prison guards took pity on her."[74] Like Boccaccio, Pizan turns this story into an example of women's compassion and the reciprocity of mother-daughter relations. Both authors make the unusual choice of including Hygin's story about Hypsipyle in their collections of women's worthies, to which they had access through Ovid's *Heroides* (ca. 25–16 BCE). Hypsipyle, as we recall, saved her father from the rage of the women of Lemnos, in a story that Hygin presents in the context of numerous stories on violent and incestuous father-daughter relations. In Hygin's *Fables*, the story of Hypsipyle marks women's resistance against the onset of patriarchy. This combination



Figure 4.6: Mother and Daughter, 1473, Woodcut, Boccaccio, Von den berühmten Frawen, transl. by Heinrich Steinhöwel

of the breastfeeding daughter's and Hypsipyle's sacrifices would later be taken up by Dormont de Belloy, who in his play *Zelmire* (1762) – going back to Metastasio's opera *Issipile* (1732) – includes a filial breastfeeding scene, albeit in its paternal variety.[75] In combining Pero's story with Hypsipyle's, who pretends to have killed her father in order to save him from her fellow Lemnians, Belloy explains that he wanted to "collect in one piece what history and fables have preserved for us among the most touching and heroic instances of children's piety vis-à-vis their parents."[76] This fusion of Hypsipyle and Pero into one pious daughter exemplifies that according to Belloy, filial "heroism" consists in saving the lives of fathers who – arguably – should have died for their transgressions against a residually matrilineal society.

The fourteenth century, by contrast, stands out in its near-exclusive focus on the all-female breastfeeding scene. This happened at a time when charitable nursing was spiritually enhanced to become a universally acknowledged allegory of compassion, generosity, and humility. The flourishing of the interlocking iconographies of the Madonna Lactans and Charity are expressions of this cultural and religious trend, which, in the realm of Catholic devotion, was accompanied by food-centered practices and gendered forms of "imitatio

Christi" [imitation of Christ]. In this cultural milieu, literary adaptations of the father-daughter could not flourish. It would take until the year 1600 for another retelling of the father-daughter story to appear, in the form of a – heavily eroticized – Dutch theater play. The comeback of the paternal version in the literary tradition was accompanied by an explosion of interest in the topic among artists and their audiences. By contrast, the literary fortune of the mother-daughter story continued to thrive until the late seventeenth century while hardly leaving any traces in the visual arts – with the noteworthy exception of Poussin's *Gathering of the Manna* and a few sixteenth-century prints and drawings.

During the fifteenth century, one further literary adaptation of the theme appeared after Christine de Pizan's portrayal of the charitable daughter and her mother in the *Book of the City of Ladies*. In 1472, Albrecht von Eyb published his *Little Book on Marriage*, a humanistic treatise in favor of marriage that includes the story about the Roman mother and her pious daughter in order to convince readers of the benefits of having children.[77] In the sixteenth century, a full-fledged theater piece was devoted to the subject matter. Entitled "Morality play or Roman story about a woman who wanted to betray the city of Rome and about the daughter who nourished her for six weeks with her milk in prison" (1548), this French play enables mother and daughter to have their voices be heard in front of the Roman court.[78] Quite unlike the protagonists of Maximus's anecdote, the women are not mute expressions of allegorized piety but real persons who talk at great length about their misery. In this respect, they resemble the courageous women of his chapter on "Women who Pleaded before Magistrates for Themselves or for Others," some of whom Maximus approves of, and some of whom he chides for disrupting the all-male sphere of judicial procedures. In the play, the mother laments her fate and repents her crime of treason, while the daughter engages the judges in a lengthy debate about her mother's sentence. Proposing that they rather amputate their tongues and one leg each instead of decapitating her, the daughter negotiates with the court, trying to obtain mercy. The judges Oracius and Valerius at first insist on rendering justice but eventually are moved to pity, converting the mother's sentence into death by starvation.[79] Once inside the prison, the mother is encouraged by her daughter to be patient and strong, but she increasingly complains about her indigence and wants. She solicits help from her daughter in recompense for the trouble she took in raising her.[80] The daughter immediately responds that she cannot bear to hear of her cruel pain any more and offers her the milk from her breast.[81] Inquiring why the mother is still alive after several weeks, the judges admire the daughter's true "maternal" love and officially release the mother. The play ends with the mother profusely thanking God and the judges. The daughter downplays her mother's praise, explaining modestly: "I am very beholden to you, because I know that I came into this world through you."[82]

In 1555, Johannes Herold gives a verbatim account of Maximus's anecdote in his *Examples of Virtues and Vices*.[83] In 1569, Hans Sachs writes a short story about "Romana, the Suckling Daughter" with an explicit reference to "Joannes Bocacius."[84] He frames his story as a lament about the indifference and ungratefulness of the "children of this world," who no longer cherish their parents, as did the Roman daughter.[85] While following Boccaccio's story closely, Sachs introduces slight but important plot changes: he treats the mother's crime apologetically, by mentioning that "once, she forgot herself, and violated Roman law," and he emphasizes that the "daughter suckled with lust / her mother with breasts rich in milk."[86] This is to my knowledge the only instance of eroticizing the all-female breastfeeding episode in literature.

It took until 1630 for the next textual reference to appear, in Bishop Paolo Aresi's *Sacred Enterprises*, a voluminous sermon collection on Christ and all saints. Summarizing Maximus's story, Aresi emphasizes the theme of generational reversal and reciprocity in kinship relations by spelling out that "she who was in reality mother appeared daughter, while the daughter became the nurse of her from whom she in her childhood suckled milk."[87] This beautiful symmetry is amplified a generation later by Sibylle Schwarz von Greiffswald aus Pommern, who ends her poem "A Daughter Suckles her Mother" (1650) with the line: "We both want to be daughters, and both mothers [to each other]."[88] The literary tradition of the mother-daughter breastfeeding episode comes to an end in the late seventeenth century with the sermon collection of Abraham de Sancta Clara (1644–1709), who, in referring to Pliny the Elder, recounts the story of the foundation of a temple dedicated to Piety in 183 BCE.[89]

Among the many literary adaptations of Maximus's mother-daughter anecdote, Berte's story in Girard de Rossillon (12th/14th century) stands out in terms of the liberty it takes in reimagining the event. It is perhaps the first to psychologize and religiously enhance the daughter's sacrifice, framing it in the context of Catholic charity. It also adds important information about the mother's social background and crime and substitutes the guards' voyeurism with an explanatory dialogue. Boccaccio's story follows suit, adding even more narrative detail and attention to realistic representation, as well as moralizing commentary. His vignette of the "young Roman woman" would become the basis for subsequent adaptations by Christine de Pizan and Hans Sachs as well as for eighteenth-century playwrights such as Dormont de Belloy. Perhaps the most creative among all rewrites is the French morality tale of 1548, which transforms into dialogue what Maximus and later ancient authors envisioned as mute allegory. By letting the women argue, negotiate, and lament in court, the play almost defeats the story's original purpose, namely, to focus on women's body language as delivering morally important content about the reciprocity of maternal relations and their charitable transfer to needy "others." In a certain sense, the continuing interest in this episode seems to derive specifically from

the rhetorical tension between universalizing allegorization and situated, detailed, narrative, and historical knowledge.

The literary adaptations of Pero and Cimon's story follow a different trajectory. After a muted reference to Maximus's anecdote by Vincent de Beauvais (ca. 1190–1264), who leaves out the ekphrasis and changes the father's name to Cimon, a summary of Solinus's entry by John of Wales (ca. 1260–1285) in yet another attempt to censor Maximus's vision of a painting, and the retelling by Iacopo di Varagine in 1297, the textual adaptations stop altogether until 1600. During this hiatus of more than 300 years, when literary adaptations of the mother-daughter story flourished and oral culture promoted the father-daughter story as a riddle, visual representations of Pero and Cimon started to emerge in the early sixteenth century. Like their ancient precedents, these artistic renderings sought to eroticize the theme, in sync with Maximus's ekphrastic challenge to depict the scene as a trompe-l'oeil, i.e., to conjure up "living, and breathing bodies" in front of the viewer's eyes. Innumerable printed editions of Maximus's *Memorable Doings and Sayings* in various European languages turned both episodes of filial breastfeeding into ubiquitously known cultural resources about Roman antiquity. Any literary reference to Pero and Cimon since the seventeenth century thus resonates with deep prior knowledge about the event, either through the study of Maximus's book, oral culture, or visual representations in the form of coins, chessboard decorations, ceramic bowls, prints, sculptures, and paintings.

In addition, literary adaptations of Pero and Cimon were enhanced by or mixed with references to actually existing practices of adult lactation for medical purposes, especially between old men and young women. This is the case with Giordano Bruno's play *The Candle Bearer* (1582). Bruno introduces the motif of "breasting" – as adult nursing was called in Italian and French [It. tettare; Fr. têter] – right at the beginning, with a dedication to "You who suckle [tettate] on the muse of mamma, and who thrive on her greasy broth with your snout, hear me, your Excellency, if faith and charity inflame your heart. I cry for, ask for, beg for an epigram, a sonnet, a marriage poem, a hymn, an ode that could be placed in the breast [I suck] or the broth [I eat]."[90] In Act IV, scene 8, lecherous Bonifacio, an old man in love with a young prostitute, converses with Marta, a middle-aged lady. Quarreling about how appropriate it is for men or women to act on their sexual desires at an advanced age, Bonifacio declares: "God … has made the women for [the pleasure of] men, not the men for [the pleasure of] women … Isn't this what the doctors prescribed to Patriarch David, and, not long ago, to a certain holy father who … aroused himself too much and had to be breastfed and he suckled and so it's no wonder if …" – whereupon Marta interrupts him, interjecting: "Well, he put too much pepper to the milk-thistle."[91] Bonifacio's and Marta's pun is an irreverent reference to Pope Innocent VIII (1432–92) and his remedy of last resort, prescribed

to him by his doctors, namely, to suckle milk from a wet-nurse. A few days before he died, Filippo Valori, orator among the Otto di Pratica, a papal office dealing with foreign affairs, wrote in a letter to Giovanni Burcardo: "The last two nights His Holiness got worse and worse and has become so weak that he eats little more than woman's milk."[92] While Bruno does not mention Pero and Cimon specifically, other theatrical performances do so, according to Renzo Villa, who mentions a tableau vivante of Roman Charity conducted at Florence in 1589.[93]

Finally, in the year 1600, Dutch playwright Jacob Duym officially resumes the literary tradition of Pero and Cimon by publishing *The Mirror of Love*, "taken from Valerius Maximus as well as other writers ... [and written] in the manner of a tragicomedy."[94] This is – to present-day readers – a surprisingly outspoken play, which gives clear directions about who should play the role of Pero (here called Cimona): "Cimona should be a woman of ca. twenty years ... she should have two big and beautiful breasts ... in order to imagine her love all the more clearly."[95] Duym repeats Vincent de Beauvais's identification of Mycon with Cimon, son of Miltiades, in order to prevent Cimona (Pero) from having to breastfeed a guilty man. Instead of heated dialogues, which characterize the morality play of 1548, this play offers monologues. Cimona (Pero), for example, delivers a long introspective speech the first time she is on her way to the prison, in which she first laments about her father's fate, then reminisces about his kindness when she was young, and finally determines to offer him her breast:

"You have proved to me your love so often when I was a child; you were a true father to me ... I cannot ever properly thank you, but Nature asks that I should help you ... I bring here food and drink ... with my motherly breasts; I will deny them and my love to my own child; once I suckled my mother's breasts, now my father here shall consume my milk."[96]

This somewhat incongruous appeal to the symmetry of the mother-daughter version is supposed to render the breastfeeding scene, which is soon to take place in full view of the audience, morally intelligible. Once inside the dungeon, Cimona (Pero) announces to her father that she found a solution to his dire situation; when he asks her what she has in mind, "she takes out her breast and offers it to her father," saying "I bring you my breast ... it is very full and engorged."[97] Instead of immediately putting the nipple to his mouth, Cimon resists for a while, exclaiming: "Who would have ever seen or heard that a father should suckle the milk from his child?"[98] Soon, however, he is persuaded to do so, starts suckling, and says in great relief: "Now I am much refreshed, my pains are all gone, o dearest daughter of mine, I owe you many thanks."[99] The guard then reports the scene to the mayor of town, who subsequently releases Cimon from prison. This play is fairly astonishing for the amount of nudity displayed and for the eroticism of the delicate scene at its center.

In early seventeenth-century Venice, Giovanni Felice Astolfi published a collection of moralizing tales in the manner of Valerius Maximus, from whom he took quite a few ideas. In Chapter 20 of his *Curious Selection … of Various Ancient and Modern Stories* (1602), which deals with the "extreme love of children versus their fathers," he refers to the story of Pero and Cimon as a ubiquitous topic in the visual arts: "I repeat here the unique example of filial piety, which serves painters wonderfully as an ornament of their art."[100] This suggests that in 1602, i.e., four years before Caravaggio rendered the topic famous in Italy and ten years before Rubens first painted it, the subject matter was already well enough known in the visual arts for writers to casually refer to it as an illustration of their texts. Unfortunately, almost none of these early Italian paintings have survived. Inventories suggest that in sixteenth-century Venice, copies of *Pero and Cimon* existed that were subsequently lost;[101] a photocopy of a Venetian rendering from the 1520s, last seen on the Viennese art market in 1922, is further proof of the early dissemination of the topic as a gallery painting (Figure 1.2).[102] The only Italian oil paintings that have survived from the sixteenth century are two anonymous works of art by a Roman and Bolognese artist, respectively (Figures 2.11 and 2.12).

In 1603, the topic makes its appearance again, in Agrippa d'Aubigné's preface to one of his epic poems. In "The author to his book," d'Aubigné identifies himself with the father, his book with his son, and proceeds: "We have to do it like the nurse and daughter of the elderly Roman, whereby you nurse me and cherish your father in exile."[103] A more substantial reference can be found by mid-century in Secondo Lancelotti's *Impostures of Ancient Historians* (1647), a satirical and pseudo-scientific discussion of various stories, beliefs, and legends deriving from ancient literature and philosophy. Discussing the question of how long men can subsist on milk alone, Lancelotti criticizes Plutarch and Athenaeus for being too uncritical in repeating Aristotle's and Theophrastes's story of Philinus, who was said to have consumed only milk during his entire life. In his fastidiously long footnotes, Lancelotti mentions that according to Galen, milk consumption can prolong life, but not if eaten exclusively. The Scythians ate meat in addition to milk, according to Hippocrates; Zoroaster seems to have lived on nothing but milk, but only for six months; and Schenckius, a contemporary medical writer, observed that a young girl who ingested milk only died at age sixteen.[104] Complaining that these ancient Greek authors do not inform us whether Philinus's milk was from a sheep, goat, cow, or donkey, whether he did not have appetite for any other nourishment, and whether he was a bourgeois or a peasant, rich or poor – in his eyes, all important details to render the story credible – Lancelotti concludes that the story is as extraordinary as it is fabulous. In his long footnote to Philinus, he approves of Pliny's and Maximus's examples of filial piety, declaring that "those daughters who nourished their fathers with their milk did not do so for a long time," but

ridicules Athenaeus's story of Sagarin, who "took his milk from a wet-nurse for his pleasure, and for not having to masticate." He finds both Pliny's and Maximus's anecdotes laudable and credible, because the nursing went on for several days only, but expresses his outrage at the story of Sagarin, "who suckles from [tetta] his nurse his entire life long out of voluptuousness."[105] In addition to Bruno's satirical treatment of Pope Innocent VIII's use of a wet-nurse in his last illness, Lancelotti's text is the first to explicitly eroticize adult breastfeeding in old men, while Hans Sachs, as we recall, even spoke of the daughter's "lüesten" in nursing her mother. In 1662, Jan Vos (1612–67), a Dutch playwright, refers, likewise, to "lust" in an ekphrastic poem on a painting of *Pero and Cimon,* in possession of Jo[h]an Huidekooper.[106]

It would take more than a century for another textual reference to appear, this time in England. Inspired either by Duym or directly by Maximus, Arthur Murphy devoted an entire play to Pero and Cimon, entitled *The Grecian Daughter.*[107] This apparently very successful tragedy debuted in 1782, with Sarah Siddons in the title role. Because of her many pregnancies, and the fact that she was known for returning to work soon after delivery, this famous actress might have given a very realistic rendering of the breastfeeding scene.[108] However, it appears as if the nursing took place off-stage, with the two guards reporting on the scene as they watched it, thus enacting the ekphrastic, or better voyeuristic, effect of Maximus's two anecdotes. Carefully avoiding any erotic charge, Murphy stresses the daughter's innocent, i.e., maternal, motivations, as well as the father's pure gratefulness:

> On the bare earth
> Evander (Cimon) lies; and as his languid pow'rs
> Imbibe with eager thirst the kind refreshment
> And his looks speak unutterable thanks
> Euphrasia (Pero) views him with the tend'rest glance
> E'en as a mother doating on her child
> And, even and anon, amidst the smiles
> Of pure delight, of exquisite sensation
> A silent tear steals down, the tear of virtue,
> That sweetens grief to rapture! All her laws
> Inverted quite, great Nature triumphs still.[109]

In contrast to Murphy's sentimental approach to filial piety, Giovan Battista Casti openly eroticizes the theme of adult nursing in his *Amorous Novels* (1804). Rather than explicitly referring to Pero and Cimon, Casti seems inspired by Secondo Lancelotti and his discussion of milk diets in old men, as well as by Giordano Bruno's comedy *The Candle Bearer.* In Bruno's comedy, as we recall, the elderly Bonifacio justifies his lecherous behavior by mentioning both King David and

Pope Innocent VIII's encounter with a wet-nurse, the latter being (in)famous for his lovers and the two children he legitimized.[110] In Kings 1:1, it is reported that Abishaig the Shunammite, a virgin, was charged with keeping old King David warm at night, without sleeping with him, however.[111] For Bruno, this biblical indictment against intercourse with King David was enough to phantasize about a breastfeeding relationship along the lines of Pope Innocent VIII and his wet-nurse, even though the Bible text does not suggest that David suckled from Abishaid – after all, she was a virgin – and despite the fact that the "chaste" nature of Innocent's relationship with his nurse was immediately doubted by Marta, who interjects: "He put too much pepper to the milk-thistle." Drawing on these precedents, Casti elaborates on both the biblical and the clerical themes in his comical and pornographic novel *The Two Shunammites*. When Bishop Don Andronico develops the usual health problems of old men, "catarrh, fatigue, and cough," the doctor prescribes an all-milk diet. Don Andronico immediately insists that he receive the "milk of a young woman" instead of animal milk. The doctor quickly employs a beautiful young woman, Gnesa, "with two boobs of such beauty to seduce the most holy of men, overflowing with milk."[112] At first, the doctor offers to Don Andronico her milk in a glass, but then he decides to let Gnesa lay with Don Andronico, after the example of King David and the Shunammite, "and Monsignor started suckling [poppò]."[113] But then, "Gnesa, because of the suckling, felt such great tickle … that she kissed him."[114] The doctor, meanwhile, procures a second wet-nurse, to make more milk available for Don Andronico, who is on a strict milk diet. In the end, both women remain pregnant, while the bishop wonders why he, a "poor impotent man," gets blamed for "profanating" the diocese.[115] Casti's story, while not explictly quoting Pero and Cimon, elaborates on the wider theme of adult breastfeeding in old men and parodies lactation practices for medicinal reasons. The sexualization of the motif is carried to an extreme. This is the last one in a long line of literary adaptions and echoes of Maximus's anecdotes on "filial piety." What is perhaps most noteworthy is the divergent reception of the same-sex and cross-gendered anecdote by writers and visual artists. Narratives of the mother-daughter couple acquired fame as examples of charity and reciprocity in kinship relations especially in the fourteenth century, when Pero and Cimon seemed all but forgotten. They continued to inspire writers until the seventeenth century alongside literary adaptations of the father-daughter scene, even though artistic representations of the mother and her daughter remained rare. Pero and Cimon, by contrast, assumed cult status among Baroque artists and their audiences. While literary adaptations of the mother-daughter breastfeeding scene tend to stress the women's performance of reciprocity in kinship relations, stories about young women who nurse old men conflate with medical accounts – most notably, Pope Innocent VIII's use of a wet-nurse shortly before he died. As we will see in Chapter 5, milk-diets in old men and medicinal nursing were widely discussed remedies in early modern medical discourse.

Notes

1 | On Spain, see Demófilo, pseud., *Coleccion de Enigmas y Adivinanzas en forma de diccionario*, ed. by Antonio Machado y Alvarez (Sevilla: Imp. de R. Baldaraque, 1880), no. 238; on Italy, *see Indovinelli popolari veneziani*, ed. by Domenico Giuseppe Bernoni (Venice: Tipografia Antonelli, 1874), no. 63; Archer Taylor, "Straparola's Riddle of Pero and Cimon and Its Parallels," *Romance Philology* 1, no. 3 (1947): 297–303; Giovanni Francesco Straparola, *Le Piacevoli Notti*, ed. by Donato Pirovano (Rome: Salerno, 2000; first ed. Venice: Orpheo Dalla Carta tien per insegna S. Alvise, 1550), vol. II, 511–13; on Greece, see Émile Legrand, *Recueil de Contes Populaires* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1881), 47–51; G. Georgeakis and Léon Pineau, *Le Folk-Lore de Lesbos* (Paris: J. Maisonneuve, Libraire-Éditeur, 1894), 108; on Germany: *New vermehrtes Rath-Büchlein mit allerhand Weltlich- und Geistlichen Fragen sampt deren* Beantwortungen (no place, 1600), no pagination; on Pomerania, Serbia, and Albania, see Ulrich Jahn, *Volkssagen aus Pommern und Rügen* (Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1889), 540, no. 669; and Reinhold Köhler, "Eingemauerte Menschen," in: *Aufsätze über Märchen und Volkslieder*, ed. by Johann Bolte und Erich Schmidt (Berlin: Weidmann, 1894), 38ss; both quoted in: Georg Knaack, "Die säugende Tochter: ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Volkskunde," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte* 12, Neue Folge, nos. 5–6 (1898): 450–54.

2 | See a list of titles in World Cat [accessed 11/16/12].

3 | Ferdinand Edward Cranz and Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries* (Washington (DC): Catholic University of America Press, 1960–2003), vol. 5, 288–403.

4 | Clive Skidmore, *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen: The Work of Valerius Maximus* (Exeter; Devon, UK: University of Exeter Press, 2002); W. Martin Bloomer, *Valerius Maximus & the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992).

5 | Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, ed. and transl. by D.R. Shackleton Bailey and David Roy (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000), vol. 1, 185, no. II.7.6.

6 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 185, no. II.7.6.

7 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 369, no. IV.3.3.

8 | Skidmore, *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen*, 108–12.

9 | "Women used to dine seated with their reclining menfolk, a custom which made its way from the social gatherings of men to things divine. For at the banquet of Jupiter he himself was invited to dine on a couch, while Juno and Minerva had chairs, a form of austerity which our age is more careful to retain on the Capitol than in its houses, no doubt because it is more important to the commonwealth that discipline be maintained for goddesses than for women." Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 129–31, no. II.1.

10 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 499, no. V.4.7.

11 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 503, no. V.4. ext. 1.
12 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 495, no. V.4.1 (Coriolanus); Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 503–05, no. V.4. ext. 4 (Cleobis and Biton).
13 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 499, no. V.4.6.
14 | "Forgive me, most ancient hearth, give me your pardon, eternal fire, if the scheme of my work advance from your most sacred temple to a place in the city more necessary than splendid. For by no harshness of Fortune, no squalor, is the value of dear piety cheapened; on the contrary, the more unhappy in the trial, the more certain." Maximus, M*emorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 499–501, no. V.4.7.
15 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 499–501, no. V.4.7.
16 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 2, 211–13, no. VIII.3.
17 | Jutta Sperling, "'Divenni madre e figlia di mio padre.' Queer Lactations in Renaissance and Baroque Art," in: *Sex Acts: Practice, Performance, Perversion and Punishment in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Allison Levy (Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2010), 165–80.
18 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 501–03, no. V.4. ext. 1.
19 | Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, vol. 1, 503, no. V.4. ext. 3; 489, no. V.3.3.
20 | *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae: Two Handbooks of Greek Mythology*, ed. and transl. by R. Scott Smith and Stephen M. Trzaskoma (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2007), 174, no. 254.
21 | Smith and Trzaskoma, *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae*, 173, no. 254.
22 | Smith and Trzaskoma, *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae*, 174, no. 254.
23 | Smith and Trzaskoma, *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae*, 104, no. 15.
24 | Smith and Trzaskoma, *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae*, 122, no. 74.
25 | Smith and Trzaskoma, *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae*, 104, no. 15.
26 | Smith and Trzaskoma, *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae*, 163, no. 193.
27 | Smith and Trzaskoma, *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae*, 143, no. 130.
28 | Smith and Trzaskoma, *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae*, 117, no. 60.
29 | Smith and Trzaskoma, *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae*, 126, no. 88.
30 | Smith and Trzaskoma, *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae*, 122, no. 72.
31 | Smith and Trzaskoma, *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae*, 174, no. 254.
32 | *Pietas e allattamento filiale: La vicenda, l'exemplum, l'iconografia*; colloquio di Urbino, 2–3 May, 1996, ed. by Renato Raffaelli, Roberto M. Danese, and Settimio Lanciotti (Urbino: Quattro Venti, 1997), 129, Table I; 131, Table III; 132, Table IV; 127, Table VII.1; 127, Table VII.2. On the Sigillata shard: Elisabeth R. Knauer, "Caritas Romana," *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen* 6, Neue Folge (1964): 9–23, especially 9.
33 | Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, ed. by John Bostock, M.D., F.R.S., and H.T. Riley, Esq., B.A. (London: H.G. Bohn, 1855–57), book VII, chapter 36, 2180–81; http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0137%3Abook%-3D7%3Achapter%3D36; [accessed 1/3/13].
34 | Pliny the Elder (23–79 CE), *Natural History*, ed. by W.H.S. Jones (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963), vol. VIII, book XXI, 53.

35 | Festus Grammaticus, *De la signification des mots*, ed. and transl. by M.A. Savagner, books 1 and 2 (Paris: C.L.F. Panckoucke, 1846); http://remacle.org/bloodwolf/erudits/Festus/p.htm; [accessed 1/3/13].

36 | "Indeed a nobler example of piety occurred in the house of the Metelli, but most eminently, it can be found in a plebeian woman who just gave birth, humble and therefore of obscurer fame. When that woman was allowed to visit her father who was held in jail because of a death penalty, she was often examined by the doorkeepers that she might not bring food to her father – yet, she was caught feeding him with her breasts. This event, place, and deed were consecrated. For he, who was destined to death, is remembered as a gift to his daughter. The place, consecrated to him, is a sanctuary of divine piety." Gaius Julius Solinus, *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, ed. by Theodor Mommsen (Berlin: Weidmann, 1895), 39–30, no. 124–25; http://books.google.com/books?id=VNm5mjWUzMoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false; [accessed 1/3/13]. Settimio Lancelotti, "Pietas e allattamento negli scholia vallicelliana," in: *Allattamento filiale: la fortuna*, colloquio di Urbino, 28–29 aprile 1998, ed. by Roberto M. Danese, Daniela De Agostini, Renato Raffaelli, and Gioia Zaganelli (Urbino: Quattro Venti, 2000), 203–07.

37 | "There lay the man fettered in the depths of the earth, with no drink, no food, seeing no man, there in a cavern dug deep under the soil he lay in agony ... There was a band of jailers watching the imprisoned man, but his clever daughter outwitted them with delusive words, a young nursing mother, when she uttered a mournful appeal: ... "Do not let me die, watchmen, I have nothing here, I have brought no drink and no food for my father! ... If you do not believe me, if you do not believe, undo my innocent girdle, tear off my veil, shake my dress – I have brought no drink to save his life! Do but shut me up too with my father in the deep pit. I am nothing for you to fear, nothing, even if the king hears of it. Who is angry with one who pities a corpse? Who is angry with one dying a cruel death? Who does not pity the dead? I will close my father's sinking eyes. Shut me up there: who grudges death? Let us die together, and let one tomb receive daughter and father!" Her pleading won them. The girl ran into the den, bringing light for her father's darkness. In that pit, she let the milk of her breast flow into her father's mouth, to avert his destruction, and felt no fear. Deriades (the king) marvelled to hear the pious deed of Eërië. He set free the clever girl's father from his prison, like a ghost; the fame of it was noised abroad, and the Indian people praised the girl's breast, which had saved a life by its cunning." Nonnos of Panoplis/Nonnus of Panopolis, *Dionysiaca*, transl. by W.H.D. Rouse (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1940), vol. II, 301–03.

38 | Émile Legrand, *Recueil de Contes Populaires;* Greek version in: *Tzetzae Allegoriae Iliadis*, ed. by Jean François Boissonade (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1967, reprint of ed. Paris, 1851), 340.

39 | Legrand, *Recueil de Contes Populaires*, 50.

40 | Legrand, *Recueil de Contes Populaires*, 51.

41 | "Algun dia fuí hija / Ahora soy madre / El príncipe que mis pechos crian / Es marido de mi madre / Acertadla, caballeros, / Y si no dadme à mi padre." Demófilo (pseud.), *Coleccion de Enigmas,* no. 238.

42 | "Indovina, indovinatore: / Mi son figlia d'un gran signore; / Ancuo son figlia, e doman mare; / Late un figlio maschio, mario de mia mare." *Indovinelli popolari veneziani*, ed. by G. Bernoni, no. 63.

43 | Georgeakis and Pineau, *Le Folk-Lore de Lesbos*, 108.

44 | "Durch Seulen gesogen / ist Herren betrogen / des Tochter ist was / des Mutter bin ich worden / ich hab meiner Mutter ein schönen Mann gezogen?" *New vermehrtes Rath-Büchlein,* no pagination. See also Paul Kretschmer, "Zur Geschichte von der 'säugenden Tochter'," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 43, no. 1 (1899): 151–57; for reference to Strafsburger (Straßburger?) Rätselbuch from 1505, see 154.

45 | Knaack, "Die säugende Tochter," 450–51.

46 | Taylor, "Straparola's Riddle."

47 | Taylor, "Straparola's Riddle," 298–99.

48 | Straparola, *Le Piacevoli Notti*, 512.

49 | Carla Freccero, *Queer / Early / Modern* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 56.

50 | On Pero and Cimon in the context of proverbs and riddle culture, see Giovanni Battista Bronzini, "La Figlia che allatta il padre: Analisi morfologico-strutturale del motivo incestuoso nella letteratura popolare," in: Raffaelii et al., *Pietas e allattamento* filiale, 199–226.

51 | Roberto M. Danese, "Lac Humanum Fellare. La trasmissione del latte e la linea della generazione," in: Raffaelii et al., *Pietas e allattamento filiale,* 40–72.

52 | Peter Parkes, "Alternative Social Structures and Foster Relations in the Hindu Kush: Milk Kinship Allegiance in Former Mountain Kingdoms of Northern Pakistan," *Comparative Studies in History and Society* 43, no. 1 (2001): 4–36, especially 10.

53 | "Lesbians can be cured by drinking something else." *The Daily Currant*, 26 August, 2012. http://dailycurrant.com/2012/08/26/todd-akin-claims-breast milk-cures-homosexuality/ [accessed 1/8/13].

54 | Anna Tuck-Scala, "Caravaggio's 'Roman Charity' in the Seven Acts of Mercy," in: *Parthenope's Splendor: Art of the Golden Age in Naples*, ed. by Jeanne Chenault Porter and Susan Scott Munshower (College Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993), 127–63, especially 133. Grazia Maria Fachechi believes the manuscript dates to the fourteenth century. Grazia Maria Fachechi, "L'iconografia della Caritas Romana dal Medioevo a Caravaggio," in: Raffaelii et al., *Pietas e allattamento filiale,* 227–45, especially 227.

55 | Miniature in: codice C 246, 13th c., Biblioteca Ambrosiana, fol. 10r, "Humble and therefore of obscurer fame: When that woman was allowed to visit her father who was held in jail because of a death penalty, she was often examined by the door keepers that she might not bring food to her father – yet, she was caught feeding him with her breasts." Solinus, Latin quote in: Fachechi, "L'iconografia della Caritas Romana," 227.

56 | Jean Misrahi, "The Origina of 'De Roussillon'," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 51, no. 1 (1936): 8–12.
57 | Anon., "Girard de Rossillon" (written between 1155–1180), in: *Poème Bourguignon du XIVe siècle*, ed. by Edward Billings Ham (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936), 196–97, lines 3049–84.
58 | "In the same work [by Valerius Maximus], at chapter four: A magistrate handed over a free-born [Roman] woman, who was to be punished by death, to a certain man in prison in order to have her killed. That man was moved by pity and did not strangle her immediately. Solicited, he gave permission to her daughter [to meet her] and took care that she did not bring any food so that she would starve to death. Yet some days having passed, he wondered how she survived so long and he observed the daughter attentively, who – after pulling out her breast – calmed her mother's hunger with her own reserve of milk. When the novelty of this deed was conveyed to the council, the woman obtained the remission of her penalty. What does piety not think of, what is so unusual than to nurture a mother with the breasts of her daughter? Anyone would think of this as contrary to the nature of things if to love one's parents was not the first law of nature." Michael Scotus, *Mensa Philosophica seu Enchiridion* (Frankfurt: Typis Wolfgangi Richteri, 1602), 116. http://books.google.com/books?id=USdDAAAAcAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=snippet&q=filia&f=false [accessed 10/29/12].
59 | Jacques de Vitry, "Sermones Vulgares," in: *The Exempla: Illustrative Stories from the Sermones Vulgares*, ed. by Thomas Frederick Crane (Nendeln: Kraus Reprint, 1967), 232.
60 | "A magistrate handed over a freeborn [Roman] woman, who was condemned in his tribunal to capital punishment, to be killed in prison. Yet the man who was in charge of guarding her was moved by pity and did not strangle her immediately. He also allowed entrance [into the prison] to her daughter, who was diligently examined that she did not carry anything with her, expecting that she [the mother] would die of starvation. Yet some days having passed, he wondered what happened that she should survive for so long. With greater attention he observed the daughter, who had pulled out her breasts and assuaged her mother's hunger with her own milk. When this admirable, spectacular novelty was conveyed to the judges, the woman obtained the remission [of her sentence]. For what does piety not penetrate, what does it not devise, what is so unusual and unheard of than for a mother to be fed by her daughter's breasts? Would one not think of this occurrence as contrary to the nature of things? It is not, because the first law of nature is to love one's parents.

The same piety is said of Pero. Her father Cimon was struck by a similar fate, being handed over to prison as well. Of very high age, she nourished him with her breasts like a child. Men's eyes are struck and surprised when they see a painted image of this event. Other virtues merit much admiration; but piety merits great love as well." Vincent de Beauvais, "Speculum Historiale," in: *Bibliotheca Mundi seu Speculi Marioris Vincentii Burgundi Praesulis Bellovacensis, Ordinis Praedicatorum*, Tomus quartus, qui

speculum historiale inscribitur ... Omnia nunc accuratè recognita, distinctè ordinata ... (Duaci: B. Belleri, 1624), 218–19; http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k81676r.r=%22Bibliotheca+mundi%22.langEN [accessed 6/24/15].

61 | Vincent de Beauvais, "Speculum Historiale," in: *La vierge et le miracle: Le speculum historiale de Vincent de Beauvais*, ed. by Michel Tarayre (Paris: Champion, 1999), 45–47.

62 | "And with regard to the piety of children towards their parents, Valerius said many things very well, in book 5, chapter 8: that to love one's father or parents is the first law of nature. Therefore he gives an account of a daughter who nurtured her mother with the milk of her breasts. For when her mother was in jail, condemned to capital punishment, the person who was in charge of watching the prison was moved by compassion and gave the daughter access to her mother, taking care, however, that she would take nothing with her, reckoning that her mother would run out of food soon. Yet when some days passed and when he wondered how long she would sustain herself, he observed the daughter more attentively. For the daughter calmed her mother's hunger, aided by her own milk. This spectacular and admirable novelty led him to the following deliberation: He obtained a remission of the woman's penalty. At the same place [in the book], it is spoken of another [daughter] who nurtured her father who was in a similar imprisonment. That father, who was already of high age, she nurtured like a child with the nourishment of her breasts. And of this, Solinus speaks at the end of book 1, where he speaks of a daughter who was caught feeding her father with her breasts. And he too was given to his daughter and saved up in the memory of all public criers; and the place is consecrated to the divinity." John of Wales, *Summa collationum*. *Explicit Galensis summa venustissima atque lepidissima summa collectionum, alio nomine sive Communiloquium vocitata* (Augsburg: Anton Sorg, 1475), no pagination, secunda pars, distinction secunda, capitulum secundum, rectus-versus; http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0004/bsb00043211/images/index.html?id=00043211&groesser=&fip=xsqrswweayafsdrfsdrsdasyzts&no=24&seite=174; [accessed 7/7/15].

63 | "And in order to show these three things, Valerius Maximus gave three examples. For in order to show that daughters must aid parents whenever they are caught in exigency, he tells us that when a certain noble, powerful and already aged man had committed a crime, due to that man's honor, the judge did not wish to punish him to death in public, but locked him up in prison that he might die there of starvation. His daughter, however, who was married, visited him daily in jail with the judge's permission. Yet before that, she underwent careful examination that she would not carry any food with her. Nevertheless, on every single day, she pulled out her breast and fed her father with her own milk. For when the judge was astonished that the man survived for such a long time, he arranged that the guards watched her through a chink [hostii] whenever the daughter met her father. When the guards observed that the daughter fed her father with her milk, they informed the judge. He, however, was moved by her piety and released the father to his daughter." *Iacopo da Varagine e la sua cronaca di Genova dalle origini al MXXCXVII* (= Fonti per la storia d'Italia; Scrittori, secolo XIII; vol. 85), ed. by Giovanni Monleone (Rome: Tipografia dello stato, 1941–xix), vol. 2, 210.

64 | "Solinus tell us that ... it was related that a daughter maintained her mother with the milk of her breasts, and that the father was returned to the daughter." Don Pascual de Gayangos, "El libro de los Enxemplos," in: *Biblioteca Autores Españoles, desde la formacion del lenguaje hasta nuestros dias. Escritores en prosa anteriores al siglo XV*, ed. by Don Pascual de Gayangos (Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra, 1884), 443–542; see 471, example no. 102.

65 | "Moreover Valery tellyth libro quinto, that whan a noble woman was comytted unto warde for a greate offence and there shulde have perisshed through hongir, her owne dowghter that was weddyd by the lycence of the iuge visited her daylye, but first she was serchyd with greate dylygence, that she shulde bere withe her no mete. But she daylye drough owt her brestis and fed her modir with her owne mylke. At laste the iuge mouyd with greate pyete, gave the modir to the doughter." *The Dialogue of Creatures Moralysed*, ed. by Gregory Kratzmann and Elizabeth Gee (Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1988), 199–200.

66 | "In book 5, Valerius relates that a certain Roman woman was condemned to capital punishment by the chief magistrate and put into prison that she might die of hunger. The guard of the prison, however, conceded to her daughter to visit her mother – taking nevertheless care that she would take nothing [to eat] for her mother. When that condemned woman survived several days, the above-mentioned guard was surprised and observed her daughter, and he discovered that she nurtured her mother with her milk. That discovery obtained the mother her release. And the above-mentioned scholar adds: One would believe this to be contrary to the fact of nature if it was not the first law of nature to love one's parents. Also, Solinus gives an example similar to that in almost all respects: of a certain old and aged father who was nurtured by his daughter in prison in such way. Valerius also relates in the above-mentioned book of another woman who nurtured her father like an infant with the nourishment of her breasts, who could not eat due to weakness and old age. And because this was memorized by all public criers, the woman's body was preserved against corruption and consecrated by spices and myrrh." Bernardino de Bustis, *Rosarium Sermonum predicabilium in quo quicquid praeclarum et utile in cunctis sermonarijs usque in hodiernum editis continetur: hic ingeniose enucleatum atque solerti cura collectum invenies* (Augsburg, 1513), vol. 1, f. CXXI v; http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0001/bsb00019395/images/index.html?id=00019395&groesser=&fip=193.174.98.30&no=&seite=298 [accessed 6/24/15].

67 | The one laconic sentence in the *Dialogus creaturarum moralizatus* about Pero and her father is the only exception.

68 | "Of the magistrate and the woman: In book 5, Valerius relates that a judge handed over a noble woman, who was condemned to capital punishment, to prison so that she would be killed in secret. The guard of the prison, moved by piety, did not execute her instantly, but allowed her daughter access to her mother, taking care that the married daughter took no food with her so that the mother would die of hunger. Some days later, wondering why the woman was still alive, he discovered the daughter relieving her mother's hunger with the assistance of her milk. This unheard of, admirable, and

spectacular novelty was carried to the judge who obtained the release of the woman." *Die Gesta Romanorum nach der Innsbrucker Handschrift vom Jahre 1342*, ed. by Wilhelm Dick (Erlangen; Leipzig: Deichert, 1890), 74, chapter 126.

69 | "Valerius tells us that the judge condemns a woman to be beheaded or die in prison. The jailer who has mercy for the woman doesn't want to make her die right away. And when her daughter comes to visit her, he lets it happen, but not without making sure that she does not bring anything to eat so that the mother would die of starvation. Time passes, and he wonders why the woman does not die; he begins to investigate, and finds that the daughter breastfeeds her. When the jailer sees this wondrous spectacle, he recounts it to the judge, and when the judge sees it, he pardons the mother and lets her go free. What is it that piety does not achieve? Who would have ever seen such a miracle that a daughter nurses her mother with her own breasts? Many people would believe that this might be against nature, if nature did not command us to love father and mother." Jacques de Cessoles, *Le Jeu des Eschaz Moralisé (1347),* transl. by Jean Ferron, ed. by Alain Collet (Paris: Champion, 1999), 159.

70 | Anton Schmid, *Literatur des Schachspiels* (Wien: Carl Gerold, 1847; faksimile ed. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR, 1975), 12.

71 | "On compassion. Perfect compassion has many good effects on us. First, it nourishes. Valerius reports that a certain woman was sentenced to death by the Roman Emperor. But when she was held in prison without any nutrition, two women, who had compassion with her needs, asked the guard whether they could visit the aforementioned miserable woman. The guard was moved by their requests and carefully examined whether they carried any nourishment or food with them. As he saw that they did not carry anything except their very selves, he allowed them to enter in exchange of a vow. Noticing that this woman was of great compassion and good fortune, each of them took out her breasts. With their milk she was nurtured and saved from death. When some days later the judge entered the prison and found the woman unchanged, he asked her from where she took her nourishment. To this, she answered that she always had compassion in her heart and that therefore God had sent her two women who nurtured her with their milk. When hearing of this new manner of practicing compassion, the emperor immediately freed her from death. Spiritually speaking: The woman condemned to death is the soul that committed an offense to God. The prison in which she was enclosed is the condition of sinners in which one is deprived of all benefits and gifts of the church. Noticing this, two women of paradise, namely, Compassion and Charity, give the nutriment of their milk: one gives the milk of the sting of conscience, the other the milk of devotion and compassion. The soul, thus nurtured, receives God's grace and is liberated from the danger of damnation. Secondly, it receives Christ." Jean Gobi, *Scala coeli* (Ulm: Johan Zainer, 1480), 38r-v; http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0004/bsb00042665/images/index.html?id=00042665&groesser=&fip=193.174.98.30&no=&seite=79 [accessed 6/24/15].

72 | Giovanni Boccaccio, *Famous Women*, ed. and transl. by Virginia Brown (Cambridge, Massachusetts: I Tatti Renaissance Library, 2001), 271.

73 | Brigitte Buettner, *Boccaccio's Des cleres et nobles femmes: Systems of Signification in an Illuminated Manuscript* (Seattle; London: College Art Association in connection with the University of Washington Press, 1996), figure 64.

74 | Christine de Pizan, *Book of the City of Ladies*, transl. by Earl Jeff Richards, foreword by Marina Warner (New York: Persea Books, 1983), 115–16, no. II.11.1.

75 | Renato Raffaelli, "Due incroci per Zelmire," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale,* 125–39.

76 | Quoted in: R. Raffaelli, "Due incroci per Zelmire," 131–33. See also Carminella Biondi, "La Scena della Carità Romana nella Zelmire di Dormont e Belloy," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 141–54.

77 | Albrecht von Eyb, *Ehebüchlein. Ob einem Manne sei zu nehmen ein ehelichs Weib oder nicht* (Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1986; reprint of first ed. 1472), 29.

78 | Mariangela Miotti, "Presenze della carità romana nel teatro francese del Rinascimento," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 65–78.

79 | "Moralité ou Histoire Rommaine" (Lyon: Barnabé Chaussart, preès Nostre-Dame-de-Confort, 1548), in: *Ancien théâtre françois; ou, Collection des ouvrages dramatiques les plus remarquables depuis les mystères jusqu à Corneille*, vol. III, ed. by M. Emmanuel-Louis-Nicolas Viollet Le Duc, Anatole de Montaiglon, and Pierre Jannet (Paris: P. Jannet, 1854–1857), 171–86, especially 179–80.

80 | "Oh my child, I suffer bitter pain / Please! Give me relief. / Have pity on seeing me so hungry; / I took such pains in nourishing you." "Moralité ou Histoire Rommaine," 183.

81 | "Oh, my heart almost faints / when I hear of your cruel pain / So, if you please, without using force / let me return your maternal love / come here to suck from my breast / and be refreshed." "Moralité ou Histoire Rommaine," 183.

82 | "Moralité ou Histoire Rommaine," 186.

83 | Johannes Herold, *Exempla virtutum et vitiorum, atque etiam aliarum rerum maxime memorabilium* (Basel: Henricum Petri, 1555).

84 | Michael Dallapiazza, "Boccaccio, de romana iuvencula in una versione tedesca del sec. XVI e in Hans Sachs," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 55–63.

85 | Hans Sachs, "Romana, die seugend dochter" (1569) in: *Hans Sachs*, ed. by A. von Keller und E. Goetze (= Bibliothek des literarischen Vereins, vol. 23) (Tübingen: Literarischer Verein, 1895), 470 71, especially 471. http://books.google.com/books?id=iRg3AAAAMAAJ&pg=PA470&lpg=PA470&dq=hans+sachs+romana+dochter&source=bl&ots=FUlok2miXP&sig=GJtjhckvIL8zZRE6KCKAYtq-Qlg&hl=en&sa=X&ei=-QuTMT5PFKePB6AGu3-y1DQ&ved=0CEMQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=hans%20sachs%20romana%20dochter&f=false [accessed 1/10/13].

86 | "Die edel fraw win muter het / Die sich ain mal vergessen det / Handelt wider römisch gesecz." Sachs, "Romana, die seugend dochter," 470. "Da die dochter sewget mit lüesten / Ir mueter mit milchreichen prüesten." Sachs, "Romana, die seugend dochter," 471.

87 | *Delle sacre imprese di Monsignor Paolo Aresi vescovo di Tortona libro quarto: In cui le fatte in lode di Cristo Signor N. e di altri Santi e Beati si contengono* (Tortona:

Pietro Giovanni Calenzano et Eliseo Viola compagni, 1630), 379; quoted from Guido Arbizzoni, "La pietas erga parentes negli emblemi," in: Rafaelli et al., *Pietas e allattamento filiale,* 266–67.

88 | "Wir wollen Töchtern beed / und beede Müttern seyn." *Sibyllen Schwarzin vohn Greiffswald aus Pommern Ander Theil Deutscher Poëtischer Gedichten nuhn zuhm ersten mahl Aus ihren eignen Handschriften heraussgegeben und verleget vohn M. Samuel Berencz aus dem Herzogtuhm Würtemberg*, ed. by Helmut W. Ziefle (Bern; Frankfurt a.M.; Las Vegas: Peter Lang, 1980; first ed. Danzig: Georg Theten Witwen, 1650), vol. 2, no pagination.

89 | "A temple was dedicated to Piety in Rome in the year 183 B.C., after a daughter had saved the life of her mother, according to legend, who was in prison, condemned to death by starvation, with the milk of her breasts." *Abraham a Sancta Claras Werke: In Auslese*, vol. VI, ed. by Hans Strigl (Vienna: Kirsch, 1907), 88, note 2.

90 | Giordano Bruno, *Il Candelaio,* ed. by Enrico Sicardi (Milan: Casa Editrice Sonzogno, 1888), 45; http://books.google.com/books?id=kcYuuFaLDSQC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false [accessed 4/10/14].

91 | Bruno, *Il Candelaio,* 128–29.

92 | Entry Roma XXIII luglio 1492, in: Giovanni Burcardo, *Diarium sive rerum urbanatum commentarii* (1483–1506), ed. by L. Thuasne (Paris: E. Leroux, 1884), vol. II, quoted in: Giovanni Cipriani, "L'allattamento salvifico: un problema di papi e filosofi," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 103–24, especially 118.

93 | Unfortunately, Renzo Villa does not give a reference for these spectacles. Renzo Villa, ""Quid hoc est rei?" Persistenze di una fortuna fiamminga," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 79–92.

94 | Jacob Duym, "Den Spieghel der Liefden," in: *Een Spiegelbock inhudende ses Spiegels, vvaer in veel deuchden claer aen te mercken zijn: Seer cortvvijlich ende stichtelijck voor alle Menschen om te lessen* (Leyden: Ian Bouvvensz; 1600), no pagination.

95 | Duym, "Den Spieghel der Liefden," no pagination.

96 | Duym, "Den Spieghel der Liefden," no pagination.

97 | Duym, "Den Spieghel der Liefden," no pagination.

98 | Duym, "Den Spieghel der Liefden," no pagination.

99 | Duym, "Den Spieghel der Liefden," no pagination.

100 | Giovanni Felice Astolfi, *Scelta curiosa, et ricca officina di varie antiche, & moderne Istorie, divisa in tre libri …* (Venice: apresso gli heredi di Marchiò Sessa 1602), 496.

101 | I want to thank Monika Schmitter for her kind reference to Venetian inventories. In the house of Pietro Luna, 5 November 1523: "Un teller grando soazado doro cum una dona che da teta a un vechio." Archivio di Stato di Venezia (=ASV), *Cancelleria Inferiore*, Miscellanea notai diversi, busta 34, c. 9. In the house of Benediti de Franciscis, 17 April 1538: "Un quadro grando de nogera con una donna che da latte a un vecchio." ASV, *Cancelleria Inferiore*, Miscellanea notai diversi, busta 36, c. 59. In the house of Gasparo Segizzi, a manuscript illuminator, 15 May 1576: "Un quadro di retrato di una

donna, et suo padre che [?] la glie [?] da il late." ASV, *Cancelleria Inferiore*, Miscellanea notai diversi, busta 42, c. 32. For futher information about the last inventory, see Isabella Palumbo-Fossati, "L'interno della casa dell'artigiano e dell'artista nella Venezia del cinquecento," *Studi Veneziani* 8, Nuova Serie (1984): 109–53.

102 | Auction catalogue, Vienna, Dorotheum, 328. Kunstauktion, April 8, 1922, 53, no. 82.

103 | Agrippa d'Aubigné, *Les Tragiques*, ed. by Jean-Raymond Fanlo, vol. 1 (Paris: H. Champion, 2003; first ed. 1603), 239.

104 | Secondo Lancelotti, *Les impostures de l'histoire ancienne et profane; ouvrage nécessaire aux jeunes gens, aux instituteurs, & généralement à toutes les personnes qui* ... (Paris: J.P. Costard 1770; first Italian ed. *Farfalloni degli antichi istorici*, Venice 1647), vol. 2, 36–38, note a.

105 | Secondo Lancelotti, *Les impostures de l'histoire ancienne*, 40–41.

106 | "Op een slaapende Harderin, die van Chimon gezien wordt; in de groote zaal van Abraham van Bassen: door Bakker geschildert:
Van Bassen hou toch standt; de Nimf die gy ziet slaapen,
Is niet door 't groot penseel, maar door Natuur geschaapen.
Laat Chimon toch bezien, wie hem de borst doet braân.
Men kan de lust, bywijl, door d'oogen ook verzaân;
Dies zijt een weinig stil: hier moet geen voetzool kraken.
Gy zult, zoo gy u rept, de veldtnimf wakker maaken.
Zy brandt ons nu zy slaapt; indien zy wakker wardt,
Zoo maakts' ons heel tot asch: want 't oog ontsteckt het hart." Jan Vos, "Byschriften op Schildereyen," in: *Alle de Gedichten,* verzamelt en uitgegeven door J.L. (Amsterdam: Jacob Lescaille, Boeckverkooper op de Midddeldam, naast de Vismarkt, 1662), vol. 1, 521–76, especially 541.

107 | Arthur Murphy, "The Grecian Daughter," in: *Cumberland's British Theater* (London: John Cumberland, 1830), vol. 25, no consecutive pagination. Roberta Mullini, "Behold the pious fraud of charity and love" ovvero narrare il non rappresentabile in the Grecian Daughter di Arthur Murphy," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale,* 155–72.

108 | I am indebted to my colleague Ellen Donkin for this observation.

109 | Murphy, "The Grecian Daughter," 22.

110 | Giovanni Cipriani, "L'allattamento salvifico: un problema di papi e filosofi," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 103–24.

111 | When King David was very old, he could not keep warm even when they put covers over him. So his attendants said to him, "Let us look for a young virgin to serve the king and take care of him. She can lie beside him so that our lord the king may keep warm. Then they searched throughout Israel for a beautiful young woman and found Abishag, a Shunammite, and brought her to the king. The woman was very beautiful; she took care of the king and waited on him, but the king had no sexual relations with her." The Bible, Kings 1.1; http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1%20Kings+1&version=NIV; [accessed 1/14/13].

112 | Giovan Battista (Giambattista) Casti, "Novella Terza: Le due Sunamitidi," in: *Opere di Giambattista Casti in un volume* (Bruxelles: Società Meline, Cans e Compagni, 1838; first complete ed. 1804), part 2, 13–18, especially 14.

113 | Casti, "Novella Terza: Le due Sunamitidi," 14.

114 | Casti, "Novella Terza: Le due Sunamitidi," 15.

115 | Casti, "Novella Terza: Le due Sunamitidi," 18.

Chapter 5: Adult Breastfeeding as Cure

Queer Lactations in Medical Discourse

The iconography of Pero and Cimon thrived against the background of medical practices that on occasion included adult breastfeeding. Giordano Bruno's comedy *The Candle Bearer*, Secondo Lancelotti's satirical treatise on ancient "impostures," and Giovan Battista Casti's erotic novella parody this ancient medical practice – especially the breastfeeding of old men. In a more serious vein, the practice was mentioned by Marsilio Ficino (1433–99) and adapted for scientific audiences by Geronimo Acoromboni (1536). The primary ancient authority on the subject matter was Pliny the Elder (23–79 CE), who, in his *Natural History*, writes abundantly on the use of body liquids for the purpose of incantations and medical cures, ranging from drinking the blood of gladiators by epileptics to ingesting the leg marrow and brains of infants.[1] He devotes an entire chapter to remedies from women's milk for illnesses in both male and female patients such as fevers, lung disease, abscesses in the breast, eye problems, and gout. Most efficacious, he says, is the milk from a woman who has had a baby boy and just weaned her infant; "girl's" milk is useful only in treating skin disease.[2] The gendering of the consumption of body fluids becomes quite pronounced when Pliny expresses his disdain for physicians who actually recommend the use of male sperm for the treatment of scorpion bites.[3] In Pliny's opinion, men ought not to offer up their liquids for other people's benefit. They are model consumers of fluids stemming from women, children, and slaves, even though female patients are not entirely missing in Pliny's account.

A Greek contemporary of Pliny, Pedanius Dioscorides (ca. 40–90 CE), praised human milk as efficacious in the treatment of lung disease, ulcers, eye problems, and gout, especially "if suckled directly from the breast." He deemed breast milk "very sweet" and nutritious.[4] Both Pliny's *Natural History* and Dioscorides's *On Medical Matters* were widely read all throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Neo-Platonist philosopher Marsilio Ficino, for example, updates and theoretically enhances some of this ancient knowledge about

female body fluids by recommending that old men drink the blood and milk of young women for purposes of rejuvenation in his *Three Books on Life* (1489).[5] Ficino's book might have inspired Pope Innocent VIII's physicians, who during the pope's illness in 1492 made him ingest the blood of three Jewish boys prior to his use of a wet-nurse. It is unclear how the blood was obtained, but the three boys died in the process of supplying it.[6]

Several decades later, Geronimo Acoromboni wrote eloquently about the multiple usages of breast milk in cases of lung disease, hypochondria, and fevers of all kinds in his 1536 *Treatise on Milk*. Acoromboni quotes liberally from Hippocrates, Galen, and Avicenna. Analyzing the composition of milk into its various components, and speculating about its origins in the female body, he concludes that breast milk is so very potent because of its "sanguine" nature.[7] As all medical scholars would do before the seventeenth century, Acoromboni frames his research on milk in the context of ancient hematological and humoral pathologies, according to which all body fluids derived from concoctions of blood. Giving a few concrete examples of successful milk diets, he cites the case of Cardinal Pietro Bembo (1470–1547), whom he cured of his chronic catarrh by prescribing the prolonged use of breast milk.[8] This happened during Bembo's tenure as secretary to Pope Leo X (ruled 1513–21). It thus appears that the use of women's milk, ridiculed by Bruno and other later writers as the epitome of debauchery, was quite frequent among members of the Renaissance papal court.

The discourse surrounding the medical use of breast milk, especially in cases of lung disease, continued undisturbed until the eighteenth century. Diderot's and d'Alembert's *Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire raisonné* (1765) elaborates on the therapeutic value of women's milk, mixing faith in this ancient remedy with sexual anxieties. Focusing on the treatment of tuberculosis and depression, the anonymous author of the entry "lait" [milk] explains that best results have been achieved in patients who "are closest to the nature of children … in their passions and movements of the soul."[9] Considering that the animating spirit of milk, i.e., its active ingredient, evaporates upon contact with air, the author proposes that it need not necessarily come from a woman: "The patient could very well suckle from a cow or donkey."[10] But this would be disgusting, as well as difficult to execute, which is why human milk and its particular "manner of administration" through direct suckling are important alternatives. In the eyes of the author, the patient needs to ingest the milk directly off the breast in order to ingest its revivifying spirit; at the same time, he finds the remedy's erotic form of presentation very preoccupying. In a manner similar to Casti's novella about Don Andronico, he fantasizes: "We certainly do not think it advantageous to let young men, absolutely exhausted, reduced to the last degree of consumption, lie [in bed] with young, pretty, fresh, and neat wet-nurses, so that the poor moribund can breastfeed at his ease."[11] Criticizing an unnamed author's reference to King David and the Shunammite, he doubts that any positive effect of breastfeeding might

be caused through the "transpiration" of the nurse's rejuvenating spirit. In his eyes, any revitalizing effect of women's milk derives from the manner in which it is offered: "If young people, reduced to the last degree of depression, can be cured by habitually lying with young and beautiful wet-nurses, this salutary revolution might be due to the constant excitement of the venereal appetite."[12] At the same time, this can also hasten death, especially when consummated by "skinny," "feverish," and "convulsing" patients. The investigation of the medicinal qualities of breast milk thus ends on a skeptical note with contradictory information, both affirming and denying the positive effects of adult breastfeeding in ailing men, especially in those young enough to exhibit "venereal appetite." Presumably, old men suffering from a child-like absence of sexual desire would be appropriate candidates for a milk cure, while the question of how to heal female patients is not even addressed. The sexual implications of medicinal lactation for women were unimaginable for most authors.

In the midst of such moralizing debates on therapeutic breastfeeding, gout emerged as a disease thought to be most eminently treatable by breast milk. Multiple treatises on the cure of gout were published since the sixteenth century, many of which exhibit a preoccupation with sexual matters and a strict gender difference between givers and takers of milk. The ideal recipient was always thought to be male. In his *Commentary on Gout* (1569), Girolamo Gabuccini explains why women were not even affected by the disease. Perusing a multitude of Greek and Latin authors, Gabuccini traces the gendered history of gout back to Hippocrates, who believed it to afflict sexually active men only: "Castrated men do not suffer from gout … women do not suffer from gout, unless their menses are suppressed; and … boys do not suffer from it before their first coitus."[13] According to Hippocrates, women's menstrual flow acts as a purgative; in addition, sexual licentiousness affects women less than men.[14] These "observations" indicate that gout was believed to derive from the buildup of excess fluids produced during intercourse, from which women could find relief during menstruation. Referring to ancient Roman authors who declared gout to be the effect of vice,[15] Gabuccini concludes that gout patients must abstain from both wine and sex.[16] Unlike Acoromboni, he shies away from recommending the suckling of milk directly off the breast. Instead, he suggests that unguents be made from breast milk,[17] and in addition he recommends rubbing his patients' ailing extremities with the menstrual blood of a virgin.[18] In his *Medicine Book* from 1568, Christoph Wirsung suggests a similar restraint in the treatment of gout. In contrast to patients suffering from phthisis or consumption, who need to drink their milk directly from the breast – or else the udder – men afflicted with gout were supposed to apply compresses dipped in woman's milk to their ailing hands and feet.[19]

A century later, Central European scholars took up the discourse on gout, eroticizing the disease and insisting, again, on the "internal" application of

breast milk. In his *Medical Treatise on the Milk Cure of Arthritis* from 1670, Johann Georg Greisel refers to Pliny and Dioscorides in this context. Poems on the wonderful effects of human milk introduce the volume, such as Matthaeus Ursinus's lyrics "To Sufferers from Podagra: … Return to the breasts and to milk in the manner of babies!"[20] Greisel presents this regression to an infantile state as both a remedy against and a punishment for the many vices that in his eyes cause the disease. Quoting the mystic and religious author Thomas von Kempen (1380–1471), he frames his investigation of gout with a polemic against libertines. He declares that only rich people with too much time on their hands suffer from this disease in the first place, as a result of indulging in sex and rich foods, while hard-working peasants "are not entertained by podagra."[21] Such interweaving of religiously moralizing and medical topics continues to characterize his treatise. Greisel quotes various early Christian authors on the "milky," i.e., innocent, state of early mankind and divulges his pessimistic view of man and society, which he sees as degenerating from a state of innocence into a state of bodily corruption signified by sexual desire. This digression leads him directly, and somewhat abruptly, into a polemic against wet-nursing. Quoting Cicero – "it seems that we suckled the errors of the wet-nurse together with her milk" – he complains about the promiscuity of commercial milk sharing as the origin of all evils and draws a connection between wet-nursing and prostitution: "What a difference between those who were nourished by maternal milk, i.e., their own sweet nourishment, and those raised on foreign, mercenary, depraved, and libidinous milk besmirched in every whorehouse – if it deserves to be called milk!"[22] During his lengthy digression on the moral problems of wet-nursing, Greisel seems to lose sight of his main topic – the treatment of podagra – were it not for the fact that he implicitly suggests to view gout as the punishment for the sins of one's wet-nurse or, rather, for the disposition to lead a sinful life that a "whorish" nurse might instill in her charge. Assuming that all those affluent, elderly male patients suffering from gout were raised by wet-nurses, he defines the punishment and cure as a repetition of the initial "sin" of wet-nursing in a brilliant rhetorical move reminiscent of Augustine's concept of "poena reciproca" [reciprocal punishment].[23]

Greisel's proposal that old men suckle milk from young women stands in open contrast to his attack on wet-nursing, but he solves the paradox by couching the cure as penitential act. The regression to infancy signified by breastfeeding is both an act of contrition and the return to a salutary state of innocence, which in Greisel's account seem to be as important in effecting a cure as the chemical properties of the milk itself. Greisel is reluctant, however, to spell out his preference for breast milk outright. Having set the stage with an exhortation to "return to the breast" in one of the opening poems, he expresses his opinion on the respective benefits of animal milk and breast milk only after an extended chemical analysis of their respective components. Finally,

he satisfies the reader's expectations in a footnote that refers to the relevant text passages in Pliny's *Natural History* and Ficino's *Three Books on Life*. In the main body of his text, he continues to be vague about the benefits of "milk" in a generic sense, seemingly reluctant to reveal that Pliny's and Ficino's passages on the treatment of gout patients and old men mention breast milk in particular.[24] Maintaining the tensions and ambiguities surrounding this question for a little while longer, he finally comes out with a full text quotation by Matthaeus Silvaticus (1280–1342) on the medicinal use of human milk: "The milk of a woman, whose nutrition and generative powers are good, is most healthy, especially if her body is healthy … young, beautiful, and of mild complexion."[25] Greisel adds to this Dioscorides's recommendation that the milk be suckled directly from the breast.[26] As if aware of the provocative nature of his proposal, he backs it up with multiple further references to ancient authors, concluding that both Pliny and Galen were correct in their assumption that contact with air spoils the milk.[27]

All throughout the eighteenth century, these questions were hotly debated. In 1705, Johann Doläus intervenes with his *New Treatise … on the Milk Cure against Gout … Written from Personal Experience*. Doläus shies away from recommending human breast milk outright, as Greisel did, but numerous references to nurses' milk suggest that it was very much on his mind. Although the treatise is ostensibly about the use of cow milk, which he proposes as a remedy due to its alkali nature, it juxtaposes animal milk and human milk on a number of occasions. Speculating about how best to feed the cow whose milk would be used, he notices how human milk turns yellow "if a nurse feeds entirely upon fresh meats, fish, and broths."[28] Assimilating the nurse into a cow in thinking about her nourishment, he anthropomorphizes the cow when explaining which animal would be most appropriate for a milk-cure. In a discourse reminiscent of treatises offering advice on how to choose a good wet-nurse, Doläus explains: "The animal from whence it is taken … should be a Heifer, or cow of middle age, of a good habit … neither fat nor lean, nor pregnant, and kept separate from the bull … if anyone can keep a cow for their own use … [they should take] good care, however, that the cow be of good habit, well fed, and not too old."[29] Like a wet-nurse, in other words, the cow should be young, good-looking, well-fed, and above all: not sexually active.[30]

In his 1737 *Commentary on Milk*, Heinrich Doorschodt returns to ancient prescriptions of human milk. Quoting medical writers such as Pliny and Galen, but also poets such as Ovid and Sallust, he rehabilitates their stories about men who survived for long periods of time on milk alone, which Secondo Lancelotti ridiculed a century earlier. On the question of whose milk to choose for these purposes, he says unequivocally: "Therefore the milk of a healthy woman, of flourishing age, well-exercised, well-nourished, is always preferable

… [to animal milk]."[31] In cases of gout and consumption, it is advisable to suckle the milk directly off the breast,[32] even though Doorschodt concedes that some people's sensibilities might prevent them from choosing this remedy: "Because many [people] shrink away from this milk in horror, donkey's milk is [a] fairly common [substitute]."[33] Floris Jacob Voltelen's 1775 treatise *On Human Milk*, which builds on Doorschodt's and Greisel's studies, analyzes the composition of breast milk in order to determine its closest alternative for medicinal purposes and infant nourishment. In his preface, he quotes Friedrich Hoffmann on the cure of gout and consumption through the milk of donkeys, goats, and cows.[34] Again, a certain conflation of references to animal milk and human milk makes the potential for interchangeability obvious.

While scientists tried to find a healthy (and cheap) alternative to breast milk for infants, mostly in response to the shortage of funds for wet-nurses in foundling homes and the horrendous death rates among abandoned babies, adult patients took to the breast at least until the late eighteenth century.[35] Heide Wunder documents the case of Gotthelf Greiner, who, suffering from dropsy, was prescribed human milk as a remedy of last resort when even the medicine made from human fat, harvested from the body of a woman executed for infanticide, failed to work. In his memoir, Greiner describes the repulsion he had to overcome before he could follow his doctor's recommendations:

"I was supposed to drink this milk five to six times a day; [the doctor said,] I could take a wet-nurse, but since my wife had a breastfeeding infant, I could nurse from her. Thereupon I explained to him that I found the idea revolting … and asked whether he could not recommend anything else. No, he said, this would be the very last remedy … What was I now to do? My wife did have milk, but I shuddered at the thought of it. Finally … I did make up my mind to do it. I tried it. Took milk from my wife and drank it. [As a result,] my wife had more and more milk and I drank every day what she had left after nursing her child. When she weaned it, I drank her milk for another two months. And my health gradually returned. When my cousin Lauterbachin from Alsbach offered to share her milk with me, I accepted. She sent me every day almost a liter [ein Maass] until her milk dried up. I regained my health entirely, so that I could work like before."[36]

Even though Greiner does not mention explicitly that he drank his wife's milk directly off her breast, the repulsion he initially felt suggests his fear of a boundary violation. As his diary entries reveal, he had complex associations with breasts and breastfeeding, and reasons enough to feel uneasy about the modalities of his cure. For example, he records that his mother could not produce any milk for him as a baby, "although she always had puppies suckle from her breasts," a situation whose psychological implications can only be imagined. Also, he was cured from a prolonged period of impotence only after Jungfrau Fröbel, who later became his wife, let him touch her breasts.[37]

The question of whether female patients experienced similar reservations and fears at the prospect of a milk cure is hard to answer based on the – very scarce – available evidence. As Countess Hedwig Sophie von Hessen-Kassel reports in her correspondence, her daughter Elisabeth Henriette (1661–1683) benefited from therapeutical lactations when she suffered from an unnamed disease that kept her bedridden all throughout the year of 1677. In November of that year, after three weeks of drinking milk from a wet-nurse, her mother noticed a remarkable improvement in her health. Unfortunately, she does not offer any information about her daughter's feelings surrounding this treatment.[38]

Countess Elisabeth Henriette was fortunate to receive this cure. In popular medicine, a woman suffering from typhoid was supposed to drink a man's urine, while a male patient would have enjoyed a woman's milk.[39] Oils and unguents made from breast milk seem to have been consumed by both men and women, but gender distinctions re-emerge in most pharmaceutical books through a differentiated use of male and female body fluids such as "girl's" and "boy's" milk.[40] According to Lorentz Burres von Neunkirchen, "urine from a boy who is still being nursed" and women's milk were interchangeable ingredients for his eye medicine.[41] Against most physicians' assumptions that "boy's" milk was more potent than that of girls, German pharmacist Christoph Wirsung was partial to "female" milk. In his comprehensive *Medicine Book*, he expresses his preference for the "milk from a woman who nurses a girl," which he recommends in cases of eye and ear disease, insomnia, and generic pains. He finds boy's milk effective only for the treatment of hot flashes, while milk against gout and consumption may derive from mothers of both male and female infants.[42]

The pervasive gendering of breast milk and its consumers – which couched women in the role of suppliers – explains why sources on the topic of women's active breastfeeding for medicinal purposes remain rare. Breast milk was next to never deemed efficacious in the treatment of diseases afflicting women: only in the medieval Jewish tradition was women's milk supposed to help in cases of "inflation of the womb."[43] By contrast, we have ample evidence of women's passive lactations. Gynecological treatises such as *On the Diseases of Women* (1587) by Girolamo Mercuriale (1530–1606) routinely recommended to women with "too much milk in their breasts" to use a pump, a baby, or a woman to extract the superfluous milk to avoid inflammations. "If the voiding is not done by instrument, I think one should use a woman, so that the milk gets sucked cautiously and lightly and the pain is not increased."[44] In the eyes of Girolamo Mercurio (d. 1615), this practice was unfortunately very widespread. In his book *The Midwife* (1601), which follows Mercuriale's book to a great extent, Mercurio writes: "If the abundance of milk is such that … [it causes] swelling in the breast [and] … pain [and] … the danger of an inflammation … it is good to let it be

sucked off by others, and in particular if the patient is used to letting herself be milked [lattare]."[45] The "abundance of milk" both authors talk about was mostly the result of a mother's decision not to breastfeed her infant and puts another spin on the ubiquitous polemic against wet-nursing. Mercurio deplores the absence of maternal nursing among the upper classes, not only because babies had to suckle from the breasts of social inferiors but also because mothers had to procure "breast-suckers" to help them deal with engorgement: "Because the infelicitous state of our modern times is such that only very few mothers, especially among the upper classes, breastfeed their own children, this manner of letting the milk dry out [i.e., through the employment of women who suckle it] is absolutely necessary, to avoid illnesses."[46]

Two centuries later, Marie-Jeanne Phlippon Roland (1754–1793) left impressively detailed personal evidence about her relationship with a "têteuse" [female breast-sucker] whom she employed to re-establish her milk flow after she became ill and took a break from breastfeeding her daughter.[47] Madame Roland was an Enlightenment thinker and close supporter of the French Revolution until she fell out of favor and was guillotined in 1793. She was much enamored of Rousseau's ideal of maternal breastfeeding and employed a variety of infants, wet-nurses, and breast-suckers to help her put it into practice. In her letters, she describes how her "femme à tirer" sucked her breasts two to three times daily from November 30, 1781 to January 11, 1782.[48] After five weeks of this treatment, small drops of milk were finally visible on her breast, but she hesitated dismissing her "têteuse." When, eight days later, she finally let her go, she paid her handsomely and said: "I was very happy with her; she is very content, and I even more so."[49] Such acknowledgment of feelings is rare in Madame Roland's letters, and indicates that a certain degree of emotional dependence might have developed in her relationship with her "tireuse."

In her posthumously published "Recommendation to my Daughter" (1799–1800), Madame Roland adopts a more critical approach in reflecting on this period of her life in which she experimented with maternal breastfeeding. Already before her above-mentioned illness, she used several persons to suckle her breasts, because her daughter did not drink enough to drain them and she felt in danger of developing an inflammation. The glass and metal pumps she tried "were all useless, as were the efforts of several persons in sucking me [pour me teter]."[50] Expressing a slight repulsion in thinking back at her milk suckers, she advised her daughter: "You have to make sure that the person who suckles you has a healthy mouth [and] a sweet breath, [and] does not consume hard liquors, refined cheese or onions."[51] In any case, "if one can find an infant, that's always better … [because] even those [adults] who suck the best have always a very tiresome movement of their heads. The fear of hurting [the nipple] with their teeth prevents them from applying their tongue all the way."[52] In a lengthy footnote, Madame Roland compares her

own, semi-scientific observations on the suckling techniques of adults versus infants against those presented by the Chevalier Jaucourt in his encyclopedia entry on "breasting" [teter].[53] In the main body of her text, she develops her personal story about her struggles to comply with the new Enlightenment ideal of maternal breastfeeding.[54] Her daughter seems to have been unable to drain her breasts, which is why she felt she needed the assistance of various adults and infants in suckling off her excess milk. As she depicts it, maternal breastfeeding was by no means a "natural" and seemingly effortless activity à la Rousseau but a very labor-intensive and costly enterprise: "After even a very well-trained woman did not succeed [in draining my breasts], we had to find an infant. Poor people agreed, in the end, to give me their baby."[55] But this infant, barely six weeks old, "bore already on his forehead the imprint of misery" and was so diseased that she shuddered at the thought of letting her own daughter drink from the same breast.[56] She then found another, much healthier, baby, five months old, whose breastfeeding she shared with his mother. We can conclude from Madame Roland's writings that in contrast to Rousseau's maxim of exclusive maternal nursing as the mark of bourgeois domesticity, lots of milk sharing and cross-suckling went on in her – upper-class – household.[57] Her observations exhibit an interesting set of contradictions: On the one hand, she did find it remarkable that most poor mothers refused to give up their nurslings for money, and she observed the stark contrast between their affective relationship with their infants and the ubiquitous employment of wet-nurses among the wealthier classes.[58] On the other hand, she ceased to breastfeed as soon as she got sick, handed her daughter over to a nurse, and employed a breast-sucker to make her milk flow reappear, not realizing that Rousseau's polemic was in part directed against well-to-do mothers like her and the ostentatious breastfeeding promiscuity they promoted.

A cheaper alternative to the employment of a "têteuse" was the use of puppies, especially if the purpose was to eliminate the colostrum right after birth or help with engorged breasts. Londa Schiebinger mentions, for example: "as Mary Wollstonecraft lay dying after childbirth, the doctor forbade the child the breast and procured puppies to draw off the milk."[59] A childbirth platter by the so-called Painter of the Coal-Mine Dish from 1545 contains a detail depicting a woman with one bare breast and a dog on her lap (Figure 5.1).[60] According to Pliny, feeding from a human breast was beneficial to a dog's health, as milk from a woman who had given birth to a boy protected against contracting rabies.[61] Gotthelf Greiner's mother tried to stimulate her milk flow – unsuccessfully – with the help of puppies.[62] Also other pets could, on occasion, fulfill this function.[63] Veronica Giuliani, for example, "took a real lamb to bed with her and suckled it at her breast in memory of the Lamb of God," but she did so for spiritual rather than health-related reasons.[64] Her claim to sanctity did not rest on the fact that she nursed a lamb but that she was a virgin.



Figure 5.1: Childbirth Dish, 1546, Tin-Glazed Earthenware from Urbino

The lactation of virgins, modeled after people's veneration for the Madonna Lactans, was not only a powerful motif in Catholic devotional practices, but a frequent topic of medical debate. In the case of Elena Duglioli, a "living" saint of the early sixteenth century, both discourses merged. After having lived in a chaste marriage for a few decades, she became famous when she developed milk in her breasts and started to nurse Catholic dignitaries, assisting them in their battle against sexual desire. Had she stopped menstruating when her milk flow began, her virginal lactations would not have seemed extraordinary from a medical perspective, since contemporary hematological theories taught that amenorrhea could be triggered or relieved through the draining of other excess fluids such as breast milk. But the miraculous nature of Elena's virginal milk was revealed through the fact that her engorgement was accompanied by the onset of menstruation after a prolonged period of amenorrhea. After she died, several leading anatomists conducted an autopsy with the aim of



Figure 5.2: Jusepe de Ribera, The Bearded Woman, 1631

clarifying whether a natural or super-natural phenomenon had produced her breast milk, with little success.[65]

Next to virginal breastfeeding, the lactation of men was a frequent topic of debate among reproductive anatomists. Physicians and milk experts liked to address these rare occurrences in nature to prove or disprove prevailing assumptions about female milk production in the context of humoral pathology and corresponding hematological theories. Jusepe de Ribera's painting of *The Bearded Woman* (1631) connects with the debates on male lactation as a manifestation of the "marvelous" in nature (Figure 5.2).[66] Purportedly, the painting is a portrait of Magdalena Ventura, a fifty-two year old woman from the Abruzzi in Italy, who started growing a thick beard when she turned thirty-seven. It was commissioned by Don Fernando Afán de Ribera y Enriquez, the third duke of Alcalá, a passionate collector and humanist.[67] Even though Ribera himself declared this portrait to be done "marvelously from nature" – an opinion shared by viewers of the painting – its most striking feature defies historical accuracy: the protagonist is nursing a baby from one gigantic, and conspicuously dislocated, female breast. The peculiar positioning of this breast is reminiscent of late medieval representations of the Madonna Lactans that emphasize the symbolic, religious, and decidedly non-natural, character of the milk-exchange depicted.[68] In Ribera's painting, the addition of this eye-catching detail would have been unnecessary had the painter really only wanted to portray the Abruzzese "bearded woman," who was long past childbearing age. It indicates that Ribera – perhaps encouraged by his commissioner, who was known to read books on medicine – aimed at conflating the depiction of two natural "wonders" in his painting, i.e., excessive female hirsutism and male lactation. The effect is deeply unsettling, because the viewer does not know how to match the title – *The Bearded Woman* – with what he or she sees: namely, the image of a man nursing a baby from a single miraculous breast.[69]

The topic of male lactation goes back to Aristotle, according to whom "with some men, after puberty, a little milk can be produced by squeezing the breasts." In these cases, the quantity of milk can be much increased upon prolonged "milking."[70] This theory was much debated since antiquity. Hippocrates, for example, denied that men could produce milk: "The glands in the chest are called breasts, and they swell in those producing milk, but not in those [who do] not. Women produce milk, men do not."[71] Medieval anatomists provided evidence for the exclusive production of milk in women by identifying a vein that transported blood from the uterus to the breasts, where it would get concocted into milk after delivery.[72] Leonardo da Vinci famously represented this vein in one of his anatomical drawings.[73] According to Gianna Pomata, Renaissance scientists followed Leonardo in returning "to the Galenic idea of an identical vascular system in both men and women," which made the

occurrence of male milk easier to explain.[74] In refuting Mondino de' Luzzi's anatomical treatise from 1316, Berengario da Carpi (1460–1530) was of the opinion that veins, originating in the chest, led to men's testicles and women's breasts for the production of sperm and milk, respectively.[75] According to Galenic theory, which aimed at minimizing anatomical gender difference and representing male and female reproductive organs as mirror images of each other, women were thought to concoct blood into seed in the uterus, while men were thought to produce milk in their breasts on occasion. This theory set the stage for the gathering of empirical evidence of male lactation. Contemporary Italian medical writers reported the cases of several men known to have lactated; Sabinocio da Carpi and Messer Pietro became especially well known in this regard.[76]

As Barbara Orland has shown, milk came to be seen more and more as a concoction of chyle rather than blood after William Harvey's discovery of blood circulation in 1628 and the subsequent waning of ancient hematology. Independently of Harvey, Gaspare Aselli discovered the so-called milk veins or lacteals a year prior (1627).[77] As a result of this momentous revision, which made milk appear to derive from ungendered chyle, observations of lactating men multiplied.[78] In 1665, Joseph Conrad Schenk Jr. wrote that he knew a man by the name of Lorenzo Wolff, who since his sixteenth year "has had and continues to have so much milk in his bosom that during parties, or whenever he is drunk, out of jest he squeezes his breasts and squirts milk into the faces of bystanders."[79] Johann Storch (1681–1751), physician in Eisenach, claimed that he knew a man who "had milked so much milk from himself that he made cheese from it."[80] In his *Essays and Observations on Natural History* (1861, posthumously published), John Hunter (1728–93) relates that a father nursed eight of his children. According to Londa Schiebinger, Hunter "began nursing when his wife was unable to satisfy a set of twins."[81] "To soothe the cries of the male child," Hunter wrote: "the father applied his left nipple to the infant's mouth, who drew milk from it in such quantity as to be nursed in perfectly good health."[82] In the nineteenth century, travellers to Brazil claimed that all indigenous men nursed their infants; in Portugal, a man was reported to have successfully breastfed two children of a female relative.[83]

In Renaissance treatises such as Girolamo Mercuriale's book *On the Diseases of Women* (1587), the analysis of breast milk is preceded by remarks on male or virginal lactation. In order to answer the question of what milk consists of, Mercuriale starts by discussing what it is not. Even though Aristotle, Avicenna, and Albertus Magnus all mention the occurrence of male milk, in his opinion "what appears to be milk in men is not really milk, but whitened blood."[84] The reason for this assessment is his strict belief that milk derives from menstrual blood, which during gestation functions as the fetus's nourishment and after childbirth is transformed into milk.[85] Accordingly, he does believe in the

occurrence of milk in virgins, at least insofar as they suffer from amenorrhea: "If a woman who has not given birth or has no uterus … has milk, it means that her menstrual flow is lacking."[86]

Mercuriale's opinion was somewhat outdated. Already in 1536, Geronimo Acoromboni claimed that the base-fluid for milk could not consist of menstrual blood alone, since many lactating women menstruated; menstruation did not occur in lactating animals; and even men on occasion produced milk. In his eyes, milk was a mixture of "wateriness, cheesiness, and butteriness."[87] A century later, Philip Hulden builds on this opinion, seeing men's and virgin's lactation in direct analogy. By now, milk was supposed to derive from – ungendered – chyle, which made its occurrence in men easier to explain.[88] Both men and virgins were supposed to be able to produce milk after prolonged stimulation of the nipples through suction; in addition, women's vivid – and erotic – imagination contributed to this effect.[89] In 1749, Johann Zedler reiterates that virgins or other non-pregnant women can produce "true milk."[90] In 1765, the Chevalier Jaucourt reiterates this position, taking recourse to contemporary knowledge about the nervous system and its intricate relationship with – women's – reproductive organs. In his encyclopedia article on "mamelles" [mammary glands], he argues that the excitability of women's nerves helps in the development of breasts in young girls. Through the "fire of passion" and "impressions of love," the blood vessels of their mammary glands are agitated, which stimulates their swelling.[91] In extreme cases, such as when "lascivious girls" engage in masturbation, their breasts can become engorged, especially when the menses are suppressed.[92] Such repeated medical observations on the erotics of breastfeeding and the disjunction between pregnancy and lactation not only ran counter to the emerging mystique on the virtues of maternal breastfeeding; they profoundly altered the meaning and corporeal signs of virginity itself. In 1737, Heinrich Doorschodt proclaims "neither the absence of a hymen nor the [presence of] milk in the breasts means that the virgin was deflowered."[93]

Religious devotion to the lactating Madonna was an important backdrop to these debates. Because of ancient medical theories linking lactation to the suppression of the menses, Mary's virginal breastfeeding of baby Christ was never seen as a miracle, unlike her virginal birth. On the contrary, worshippers might have felt relieved, knowing that, due to her lactation, she had ceased to menstruate and was exempt from the "venomous" state to which other women were subject. According to Pseudo-Albert, menstruating women could poison animals with their glance, infect children in their cradle, and cause leprosy and cancer in men who dared to have sexual intercourse with them.[94] While belief in her virginal delivery was judged to be a true miracle, Mary's virginal conception of Christ was naturalized in the medical literature as well. Michele Savonarola (ca. 1385–ca. 1466), author of *On the Treatment of Pregnant Women*

and Newborn Babies, presents the event of Mary's annunciation entirely in logical, i.e., Aristotelian, medical terms:

"Our Lady was made pregnant with the son of God … the limbs of her son were made of her most pure blood, which according to the philosophers, is the matter [pasta] of the fetus, and instead of the natural informative force which is in man's semen, the Holy Spirit was added. And so … when the angel said the Holy Spirit will come over you [superveniet in te], the Holy Spirit came over her. And when she responded to the angel: Behold the handmaiden of God [ecce ancilla Domini] … at this moment the matter [pasta], i.e., her most precious blood, was prepared to take on the form of a human body, and at this moment the son of God was introduced into the thus formed body."[95]

In contrast to Savonarola's scientific, normalizing presentation of Mary's virginal conception, certain pharmaceutical concoctions were seen as analogous to the frequent healing miracles that Mary's milk relics had worked. In 1549, Lorentz Burres von Neunkirchen called one of his signature drugs for eye disease "virgin's milk" in order to indicate its special potency.[96] Interestingly, it was made not from breast milk but from vinegar, which is perhaps indicative of a certain love of paradox that prevailed in early modern medical literature. Scientists proved their erudition and theoretical sophistication by trying to dissolve such contradictions. Michele Savonarola, for example, situated his gynecological text at the interstices of medical and religious discourse – probably because of his Dominican sensibilities – with the aim of naturalizing religious phenomena such as the Virgin Mary's conception, pregnancy, delivery, and lactation.[97] For the most part, however, medical authors analyzed the "marvelous" in nature for the purpose of finding out the paradigms of normalcy.[98] The debates on male and virginal lactations attest to this heuristic device, as they were supposed to clarify whether woman's milk was made from menstrual blood, pure blood, or chyle.[99]

At the same time as such unusual cases of milk production were cherished for their informative content among medical writers, and human milk was praised for its therapeutic value in the treatment of adult patients, the ubiquitous practice of non-maternal breastfeeding for the purpose of childrearing came increasingly under attack. The medical debates on non-maternal nursing for either therapeutic or theoretical purposes stand in stark contrast to the intense and ubiquitous polemics against wet-nursing.[100] All of those discourses combined show that the stress on exclusive maternal nursing was slippery, utopian, ideological – and anti-feminist – until, and even during, the Enlightenment period.

Especially in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, wet-nurses were vilified for being members of the lower classes or racialized inhabitants of the colonies.[101] A certain fear of sexual contamination through women's porous, dripping bodies characterized these debates, propelled by Aristotelian medical

theories that cast paternal sperm as the sole active ingredient in conception and milk production. This theory proved useful in medieval and early modern legal discourse aimed at demonstrating that true kinship passed through the father's blood alone, but it clashed with the ubiquitous practice of wet-nursing.[102] Anxious about the possibility of pollution, through not only the milk of the infant's wet-nurse but also the sperm of the nurse's husband – who, after all, was the true "author" of her milk – Renaissance humanists writing on issues of gender and marriage found themselves in a double bind.[103] On the one hand, they argued against wet-nursing for the purpose of protecting the ruling elites against the threat of degeneration through servant women's milk [and their husbands' sperm]; on the other hand, they supported it as a necessary means for the production of numerous offspring, as it allowed upper-class women to conceive again shortly after delivery.

Key to understanding this double bind was the ancient taboo against sex with a lactating woman, which reverberated in Renaissance debates on wet-nursing. Roberto Danese mentions how in a first-century Egyptian wet-nursing contract the nurse promised "to avoid harming the milk through intercourse with men, becoming pregnant, and nursing another child."[104] Similar restrictions were routinely placed on Florentine wet-nurses of the fifteenth century.[105] How exactly sperm could harm the milk is never spelled out by ancient Greek physicians, but Aristotle, Soranus, and Galen all agree that intercourse with a lactating woman stimulates her menstrual flow and gives her milk a bad odor. In the Renaissance, gynecologists discovered the erogenous qualities of the breast and implicitly proposed the possibility of a woman's sexual arousal during breastfeeding.[106] Philip Hulden claimed in 1697 that the erogenous qualities of the breast and nipple resemble that of the male penis.[107] Such phallic presentation of the breast may have been an important reason for wanting to curb sex with a breastfeeding woman. The recognition of lactation as an erotic physical activity may have contributed to this prohibition, especially after the rediscovery of the clitoris produced strong resistance against the notion of female sexual desire.[108]

Anthropologist Françoise Héritier explains the taboo against mixing milk with blood [= sperm] as an attempt to avoid rivalry between two "hot" elements, which, among the Yatenga in West Africa, was thought to endanger a man's virility.[109] Alternatively, the prohibition might derive from the superimposition of two different modes of establishing and theorizing kinship, one grounded in the horizontal exchange of milk, the other in the vertical passing of sperm. W. Deonna has shown how in the pre-Roman world, adoptive kinship ties were created through ritual breastfeeding, which resulted in powerful incest taboos.[110] According to Peter Parkes, similar incest taboos existed in the mountain regions of Pakistan, where the punishment for adultery consisted of ritual lactation until the nineteenth century. Such milk-exchange would have made any further sexual contact between the partners unthinkable.[111] In eighth-century Islamic

legal scholarship, the concept of milk-kinship emerged through the formulation of wide-ranging incest prohibitions with one's nurse and all of her and her husband's relatives, in a system modeled after patrilineal blood ties.[112] This happened as a result of the reception of Aristotelian philosophy and medicine. In pre-Roman societies and Islam, female milk-kinship forged through nursing and male blood kinship based on sex rival and exclude each other, while ancient Roman conceptions of paternity erase any notion of maternal belonging by entirely denying mothers any form of legal kinship with their offspring.[113]




Figure 5.3: Paolo Veronese, Mars and Venus United by Love, ca. 1570

The profound unease concerning sex with a lactating woman seems to conjure up pre-patriarchal modes of belonging and fears of regression. In the visual arts, the prohibition finds expression in paintings such as François Clouet's *Lady in her Bath* (1571), which juxtaposes the young woman's small, smooth, and perky bosom as well as her beautifully erect, but dry, nipples with the elderly nurse's over-sized lactating breast.[114] In Paolo Veronese's *Mars and Venus United by Love* (ca. 1570), an imminent violation of the prohibition is suggested by positioning Mars just below the right breast that Venus is offering in the typical V-hold of a nursing woman (Figure 5.3). It is unclear who is about to suckle from it – Mars, shown in full armor, or baby Eros down below, busily tying their two legs together.

Breastfeeding promiscuity was depicted in Renaissance art as well. Domenico Ghirlandaio's altarpiece *The Birth of John the Baptist* (1488) is unique not only for his depiction of baby John's suckling from his nurse but



Figure 5.4: Domenico Ghirlandaio, The Birth of Saint John the Baptist, 1488, Detail, Wall-Painting, Florence, Santa Maria Novella, Tornabuoni Chapel

also for the appearance of two wet-nurses simultaneously (Figure 5.4). The two women, dressed alike, are shown competing for the holy infant. One of them is already suckling him; the other one is stretching out her hands impatiently, as if to indicate that she wants to be next.[115] Benedetto Caliari (1538–98) depicts a similar situation in his painting *The Birth of the Virgin Mary* (Figure 5.5). In this picture, baby Mary is held, but not suckled, by a wet-nurse whose right breast is half-exposed. Behind the nurse and the birth-assistant, busily rolling

up a swaddling cloth, a third woman approaches. Her breasts are both entirely exposed; she looks longingly at the baby and presents her left nipple in the V-hold typical of a breastfeeding woman. She is in charge of a toddler, whose naked body indicates that he himself is not weaned yet, and she is restrained by an elderly lady to prevent her from intruding on baby Mary. This painting is unusual in suggesting that Mary was almost nursed by a woman other than her mother, in implicit violation of the theory of Mary's immaculate conception (which became official doctrine only in 1854). Traces of her wet-nurse's husband's seeds would have seeped into the milk and contaminated Mary's flesh, thus undoing her exemption from the eternal sin and rendering her unfit to bear the seed of Jesus Christ. Confinement room scenes such as Cagliari's and Ghirlandaio's, which art historians assume to give a fairly realistic representation of upper-class women's birthing experiences, indicate that casual and commercial nursing from friends, neighbors, or wet-nurses was the norm.



Figure 5.5: Benedetto Caliari, The Birth of the Virgin Mary, ca. 1550–80, Detail

Especially right after delivery, when the mother's colostrum was thought to be harmful, multiple women would collaborate in keeping the infant alive until a permanent nurse was found.[116]

Despite the ubiquity of non-maternal nursing practices in early modern Europe, the polemics against wet-nursing began to increase steadily in the early seventeenth century, reaching a fever pitch right before and during the French Revolution.[117] This debate was politically motivated, and aimed at limiting the circuits of women's fluids within the patriarchally organized nuclear family for the purpose of achieving female domesticity and class segregation.[118] Physicians participating in this debate struggled to identify medical reasons against wet-nursing. Until the sixteenth century, not every maternal milk was thought to be good, and not all non-maternal milk was thought to be bad. In Moschion's treatise "On the Diseases of Women" (first century CE, published 1566), maternal nursing is outright discouraged: "Certainly it is lovelier to nurse from one's mother, but in order for the matron to stay healthy after delivery, it is better to feed from a nurse. One mature milk is sufficient to nourish two infants."[119] In the fifteenth century, Michele Savonarola argued that a mother's milk was custom-tailored for her infant, because identical in substance to the menstrual blood with which it was nourished in the womb, and thus more appropriate than the milk of a wet-nurse. If, however, a mother's milk was "bad" for some reason, the milk of a healthy wet-nurse was preferable.[120] The topic of "bad" maternal milk was taken up by Eucharius Rösslin (d. 1526), who in his *Rosegarden of Pregnant Women and Midwives* (1514) proclaims: "If anyone says that the mother should not suckle her baby by herself, or if she is sick, or if her milk is evil [bös], one should give the infant to a wet-nurse."[121] In early modern Germany, fears surrounding witches' magic destroying a mother's milk were particularly intense.[122]

In the early seventeenth century, mother's milk came to be regarded as principally better than "foreign" milk, and the attack on wet-nursing took on polemical proportions. In his book on midwifery from 1601, Girolamo Mercurio engages in a full-fledged attack on vain and lazy mothers who refuse to breast-feed: "Sending the children away to be raised by wet-nurses is to give birth in an unnatural, imperfect, and diminished manner … She [the mother] sends him into exile, contenting herself with having given him his life, while others are giving him pleasure, as if God and Nature had outfitted her with breasts only as an ornament."[123] He laments how "cruel" it is to "deprive [a baby] of its own nourishment and familiar food which God and Nature prepared for him … and to provide him with the milk … of a foreigner, or even barbarous mountain dweller, [with the milk] not of a free woman, but of a servant; not of a chaste woman, but of a prostitute; … not of a healthy woman, but of a syphilitic one."[124] Mercurio rounds up his racial and sexist attacks on mothers and nurses by reference to ancient Roman writers, telling how Cornelius Scipius and Gaius Gracchus publicly shamed their mothers for not having breastfed them.[125] He

concludes with a fantasy of domestic bliss: "What is most important for a father, when he comes home stressed out from work, is to see and hear his lovely little son or daughter … who kisses and embraces him … and tells him stories that relieve him of every grave thought."[126] Having finally revealed who would be the prime beneficiary of his child-care reform – the father – he engages in a rhetorical gesture Julia Hairston has called "reverse occultatio," when, switching gears, he all of a sudden discusses how to choose a good wet-nurse.[127] Referring to Plutarch, he is of the opinion that she should not be a "foreigner" but should be from the same village and should move in with her employer, mainly so that "she abstain from Venus play."[128] Trying to explain this interdict on sex, Mercurio says in very general terms: "Venus play can be harmful to the milk, because of the danger of pregnancy, and because of the concoction of the nutriments."[129] The latter phrase alludes to the danger of super-imposing two hot elements in the "cooking" of milk, which remains unspecified.

Two years later, Rodrigo de Castro (1541–1627) reiterates most of Mercurio's arguments against wet-nursing in his treatise *On the Universal Medicine of Women* (1603), warning against the "contagion with foreign milk" and the nurse's "maliciousness," which the infant might suck up with his milk.[130] His polemic against breastfeeding promiscuity is brought to its zenith when he calls wet-nursed babies "semi-spurious" and their mothers "semi-adulteresses," "because in true adultery, the mother imposes the son of another father on her husband, in this one [she imposes] the son on another's mother."[131] As a mother's fluids ought to be consumed solely by her birth-children, a good wet-nurse keeps her milk untainted from contact with another man's sperm. Phantasies of how to close off women's hopelessly open, permeable, and leaking bodies for the exclusive uses of their legitimate husbands and children are at the basis of early modern polemics against wet-nurses. Understood as two different modes of controlling women's bodies, the request for maternal nursing and the nurse's prohibition against sex cease to appear contradictory: in the best of all cases, no wet-nurse should be employed, but if it could not be avoided, she should at least be chaste.

The polemic against wet-nursing was particularly intense among Protestant researchers in Germany, who in their campaigns for maternal breastfeeding implicitly attacked the concept of Catholic charity, allegorized since the Middle Ages as the breastfeeding of strangers. Philip Hulden's *Treatise on the Observation of Nature's Sources from which the Divine Nectar of Human Nourishment is Obtained* (1697) is an example of such a religiously enhanced scientific study of breast milk. Hulden, a physician in Würtemberg, calls all wet-nurses "prostitutes" and seamlessly moves from praise for Old Testament women such as Sara, who breastfed her own baby, to a radical redefinition of "true" charity:

"And if whoredom were a virtue, and the various virtues of other nations were brought together, would we not call that woman virtuous who exercises

charity every day [by breastfeeding her own baby], because charity is in this respect the mother of all virtues? In this way the most shameful whores rather merit the name of beasts and monsters."[132]

Juxtaposing the whorish, beastly, and monstrous wet-nurse to the mother who breastfeeds her own child, it is the latter who becomes the new embodiment of charity. Including midwives in his attack on wet-nurses, he declares that the colostrum is beneficial to the infant, contrary to what "prostitutes and birth attendants" [mulierculae & obstetrices] proclaim.[133] Hulden thus finds a medical solution to the "problem" of wet-nursing that undermines the authority of midwives as well, in a concerted attempt to eliminate the need for all female birth attendants. Johannes Greisel also equates wet-nurses with whores and milk sharing with adultery, as mentioned above. His solution to the moral problem of wet-nursing was to find an animal substitute for breast milk, an aim of many eighteenth-century studies as well.[134]

While research toward the invention of infant formula was well under way in the eighteenth century, a new preoccupation emerged: the transfer of emotional states and personality traits through breastfeeding.[135] It is noteworthy that emotional reasons for maternal breastfeeding were foregrounded at the same time as breast milk was found out to be – or hoped to be – replaceable by animal milk. Also, the new consensus that milk derived from chyle rather than menstrual blood made the older justification for a polemic against wet-nursing obsolete, which depended on casting the wet-nurse's husband as the owner and originator of her milk. Johann Heinrich Zedler, for example, claims that "a good and healthy woman's milk can suddenly get … spoilt due to … anger, fright, sorrow, cold, and an untidy [!] diet.[136] Heinrich Doorschodt's "Commentary on Milk" (first. ed. 1737) argues: "Milk varies according to the temperament of the nurse." In addition to contagious diseases, "the infant is marked by the sickly mental disposition of the nurse, as if it were a hereditary disease." Such diseases include epilepsy and melancholia. Above all, "not just these bodily vices but the moral seeds of all sorts of vices penetrate into the milk, and persevere throughout the child's life. If the nurse is lecherous, surreptitious, avaricious, irate, these weaknesses are transmitted to the nurslings."[137] He concludes that mothers ought to nurse their own infants.

In his book on the *Physical and Moral System of Women* (1775), M. Roussel agrees with this assessment of the nurse's emotions and personality traits: "All lively or sad emotions have a greater or lesser impact on the quality of the milk." He does not, however, categorically exclude the use of wet-nurses. In his eyes, a good nurse ought to refrain from sex and retire to the countryside, because "tranquility and sleep are especially important to them."[138] While strong emotions can wreak havoc on a nurse's milk, not to breastfeed can produce even greater nervous trouble in a mother: "… those women who choose not to breastfeed are most susceptible [to grave illnesses] and sometimes fall into a

state of languor and mental derangement, even a long time after delivery."[139] However, since urban women's milk was often "bad," he recommends sending babies off to peasant nurses, "whose milk, seasoned with the temperance and frugality [of rural life]" would act as a remedy against a host of evils, some of which were political in nature:

"They [the infants] would receive a much more solid upbringing [in the countryside] than those who are raised by enervated [urban] parents … Even moral effects could result from this, capable of tempering the inequality of [social] conditions … The rich, nourished among peasants, will be less disposed to despise honorable poverty."[140]

Despite the progressive effects that rural wet-nursing might have in terms of nation building, Roussel concludes by charging all mothers to breastfeed their own – and nobody else's – babies. This, again, is a political mandate: "It seems that a woman has the right to all advantages that society accords its members only if she fulfills her duties … She is not worthy of the rang she occupies [in society] unless … she contributes to strengthening it by supplying it with strong and healthy citizens, who should have received from her, with her milk, the example of the inviolable fulfillment of holy duties that it [société] imposes."[141] Roussel's conclusion, contradictory as it is in light of his preference for class-bridging, idyllic rural wet-nursing, ultimately does not surprise, given that both Rousseau and the *Encyclopédie* had turned maternal breastfeeding into a maxim for the renewal of society: "The first duty of a mother is to feed her infants."[142]

Even scientists who did not believe that character traits or emotional states were passed through breast milk routinely wound up recommending mother's milk. Friedrich August Meyer, for example, finds it astonishing that "not just good mothers but philosophers view the breast of a nursing person as a funnel through which one can implant virtues and vices in the minds of infants."[143] Following Albrecht von Haller, Meyer argues that the organization of the nervous system depends on the quality of the seeds. After all, "among children, who, without the least variation in nourishment, were raised on the same milk, one presents as impatient and angry, the other one relaxed and kind."[144] Despite this disempowering assessment of breast milk, he concludes by reminding mothers of "Nature's" commandment: "Offer your child the maternal breast. Nothing but a sickly disposition, which includes a lack in sufficient healthy milk, can exempt a mother from this duty, which the love for her own blood should render pleasant."[145] No matter what the presumed effects of breast milk on the emotional constitution of the infant were supposed to be, wet-nursing must be avoided as much as possible, either through maternal breastfeeding or the use of substitutes in the form of animal milk.[146]

It is ironic that the political demands for exclusive maternal nursing were made at a time when women's biological contribution to the process of generation

at the moment of conception were more and more recognized and when breast milk began to be stripped of the quasi-magical powers it had enjoyed since antiquity. Ancient Greek theories of reproduction, still popular in the Renaissance, were slowly laid to rest in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Even though ancient medical authorities were divided on the question of female seed – some affirming, others denying its existence – Plato's dictum that "a mother is nothing but a nurse" informed legal thinking about kinship in Roman law and its medieval and Renaissance permutations.[147] This line of thought – elaborated by Aristotle – implied that mothers contributed nothing but a hollow space and abject nourishing matter, menstrual blood, to the process of generation. All substantive qualities of the future child were passed through male sperm, the "active" ingredient to conception according to Aristotle. The Hippocratic-Galenic tradition insisted that mothers did provide seed, albeit of an inferior nature.[148] All throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, mixtures and variations of both strands of thought coexisted, but the legally relevant theory remained Aristotle's strictly patrilineal concept of kinship.[149] It was in the context of these humoral and hema-pathological theories that breast milk received its significance as a variant of menstrual blood, women's main contribution to the process of reproduction. Nursing was regarded as the hallmark of mothering, even though milk-exchange did not mark an individual mother's relationship with her infant, due to the ubiquity of wet-nursing. Rather, as its allegorization as Catholic Charity suggests, nursing developed into a symbol of maternal care that strangers could provide. Only in Islamic societies was breast milk regarded as a body fluid that rivaled male sperm in the construction of kinship. At the time of Muhammad, women used breastfeeding to widen the circle of men they could freely associate with – unveiled – because of the sexual prohibition that milk-exchange created.[150] Since the eighth century, the structure of patrilineal kinship was superimposed on former concepts of female kinship based on care, which resulted in powerful incest taboos with not only one's nurse and her children but also all of her husband's blood relations.[151]

When, in the seventeenth century, Reijnier de Graaf (1641–73) discovered the ovarian follicles, women's most significant contribution to conception came to resemble biological paternity. This did not immediately result in legal reforms aimed at loosening patrilineal hierarchies and exclusions in the construction of kinship – quite the contrary. In seventeenth- and eighteenth-century France, laws aimed at tightening the "family-state-complex" produced a very restrictive view of family, disadvantaging cadet sons, daughters, illegitimate children, and their mothers.[152] In contemporary Italy, however, testamentary practices slowly shifted toward a more egalitarian view of property relations between husbands and wives, sons and daughters.[153]

At the same time as mothers' contributions to conception began to be viewed as more substantial than previously imagined, human milk was found

to be a derivative of chyle rather than blood. This discovery worked to loosen the bonds between pregnancy and lactation; reports on breastfeeding men and virgins multiplied. Medicinal adult breastfeeding was frequently recommended as well, particularly in the treatment of gout in old men. The simultaneous attack on wet-nursing and the invention of exclusive maternal breastfeeding responded to cultural, social, and political demands aimed at policing the boundaries within which female body fluids circulated. In this context, the popularity of representations of Roman Charity appears as a powerful visual counter-discourse that questioned the use of mother's milk for patriarchal purposes. On the one hand, the rerouting of a daughter's milk into nourishment for her father rather than her infant observes the new expectation of a closed circuit in the consumption of breast milk. On the other hand, it violates reform proposals to upgrade maternity through the forging of exclusivity in mother-infant relationships.

Notes

1 | Pliny the Elder, *Natural History,* ed. by John Bostock, M.D., F.R.S., H.T. Riley, Esq., B.A. (London: Taylor and Francis, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, 1855) vol. 28, chapter 2; http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0137%3Abook%3D28%3Achapter%3D2; [accessed 1/21/13].

2 | Pliny the Elder, *Natural History,* vol. 28, chapter 21; http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0137%3Abook%3D28%3Achapter%3D21; [accessed 1/21/13].

3 | Pliny the Elder, *Natural History,* vol. 28, chapter 13; http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0137%3Abook%3D28%3Achapter%3D13; [accessed 1/21/13].

4 | "Human milk is very sweet, and therefore highly nutritive. When suckled, it is good for the gnawing of the stomach and for tubercolosis, called 'phthisis' by the Greeks. It is taken usefully against the drink of sea-hare. Mixed with ground fankincense, it is dripped onto eyes that are bloody from a blow, and when smeared on with hemlock juice, it works against gout." Dioscorides Pedanius of Anazarbus, *Pedaci Dioscoridae Anazarbei Simplicium medicamentorum reique medicae Libri VI*, ed. and transl. by Marcello Vergilio (Basel: A. Cratander & J. Bebelius, 1532), book 2, chapter 63, 159; http://dfg-viewer.de/show/?tx_dlf%5Bpage%5D=194&tx_dlf%5Bid%5D=http%3A%2F%2Fdaten.digitale-sammlungen.de%2F~db%2Fmets%2Fbsb00015530_mets.xml&tx_dlf%5Bdouble%5D=0&cHash=1a154621d203e2ebdfd68f4549f07199 [accessed 6/24/15]. Translation modified from: Dioscorides Pedanius of Anazarbus, *De materia medica*, translated by Lily Y. Beck (Hildesheim; Zürich; New York: Olms-Weidmann, 2005), Book II, chapter 70, 112.

5 | "Therefore choose a young girl who is healthy, beautiful, cheerful, and temperate, and when you are hungry and the Moon is waxing, suck her milk; immediately eat a little powder of sweet fennel properly mixed with sugar." Marsilio Ficino, *Three Books on Life*, ed. by Carol V. Kaske and John R. Clark (Tempe, Arizona: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies in conjunction with the Renaissance Society of America, 1989), book II, chapter 11, 196–97.

6 | "Meanwhile, in Rome, tribulations and deaths did not cease. First, three ten-year-old boys, from whose veins a certain Jewish doctor, who promised the pope to cure him, extracted blood, passed away due to weakness. For the Jew said to them that he wanted to cure the pope and that he needed a certain quantity of human blood, especially young blood. For that reason, he commanded to extract blood from three boys and gave each of them one ducat after bloodletting. And a bit later, these boys passed away; the Jew however fled and the pope was not cured." *Diario della città di Roma di Stefano Infessura scribasenato* (= Fonti per la storia d'Italia pubblicate dall'istituto storico italiano, vol. 5, no. 9), ed. by Oreste Tommasini (Rome: Forzani E.C. tipografi del Senato, 1890), 275–76. See also Giovanni Cipriani, "L'allattamento salvifico: un problema di papi e filosofi," in: *Allattamento filiale: la fortuna*, colloquio di Urbino,

28–29 aprile 1998, ed. by Roberto M. Danese, Daniela De Agostini, Renato Raffaelli, and Gioia Zaganelli (Urbino: Quattro Venti, 2000), 103–24, especially 116–17.

7 | Geronimo Acoromboni, *Tractatus de Lacte* (Venice, 1536), no pagination, 64th–71th page.

8 | "In the fourth year after my arrival, Petro Bembo was in Rome, a Venetian patrician, a most erudite man of Latin and Greek letters and secretary of Pope Leo X. A slight fever that resulted from catarrh made his tonge feverish and … he ceased to work. In a miraculous way, this was resolved, when … several doctors … ordered him to drink the milk of a woman. Always following this advice and drinking milk from the breasts, contrary to the opinion of many, he was rescued. We could enumerate much more but for virtuous men, this will suffice." Acoromboni, *Tractatus de lacte*, no pagination; http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k588709/f75.image [accessed 7/7/15].

9 | Anon., "Lait," in: *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers …*, ed. by Denis Diderot and Jean Le Rond D'Alembert, vol. 9 (Paris: Briasson, 1765), 207; http://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/L%E2%80%99Encyclop%C3%A9die/Volume_9#LAIT; [accessed 1/23/13].

10 | Diderot and D'Alembert, *Encyclopédie,* vol. 9, 207.

11 | Diderot and D'Alembert, *Encyclopédie,* vol. 9, 207.

12 | Diderot and D'Alembert, *Encyclopédie,* vol. 9, 207.

13 | Hieronymi Gabvcinii Fanestris, *Commentarius De Podagra: Ad medicinam faciendam accommodatissimus* (Venice: Io. Baptistam Somascum, 1569), 5v; http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10166302_00018.html [accessed 7/7/15].

14 | "And the same thing occurs among married women as well: Despite their menstruation, they nevertheless suffer gout very frequently: due to incontinence, leisure, and their use of Venus play." Fanestris, *Commentarius De Podagra*, 5v.

15 | "While women suffer more rarely from this vice than men, they suffer harder … Therefore, gout occurs more often among mature men than among middle-aged men. It is reported, however, that gout turns out to be more troublesome for women, castrati, male children and young men." Fanestris, *Commentarius De Podagra*, 12v; http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10166302_00032.html?contextType=scan&contextSort=score%2Cdescending&contextRows=10&context=castratis [accessed 7/7/15].

16 | "However, abstinence is required in exchange with the use of wine boiled with anise or similar seeds; premature fruits, other coolants and the use of Venus play are to be shunned." Fanestris, *Commentarius De Podagra*, 41v; http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10166302_00090.html?contextType=scan&contextSort=score%2Cdescending&contextRows=10&context=castratis [accessed 7/7/15].

17 | "Female milk, i.e., the milk of a woman, who brings forth a male child or rather two, is spread very usefully together with hemlock on those suffering gout … White poppy seeds ground with the milk of a woman: it is said that seed-grown pumpkins and shreds

of barks from the forest cool down gout." Fanestris, *Commentarius De Podagra*, 46v–47r; http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10166302_00101.html?contextType=scan&contextSort=score%2Cdescending&contextRows=10&context=castratis [accesed 7/7/2015].

18 | "A little sheet imbued with the first menstrual blood of a virgin girl ..." Fanestris, *Commentarius De Podagra*, 46v.

19 | "Tuberculosis or Phthisis is a disease of the lungs ... One should know that women's milk is a far better remedy than the preceding one ... It needs to be drunk directly off the breast or udder ... But if you find such milk disgusting, prepare the following drink." Christopherus Wirsung, *Artzney Buch darinn werden fast alle eusserliche und innerlich Glieder des Menschlichen leibs mit ihrer gestalt aigenschafft und würckung beschriben ...* (Heidelberg: Mayer, 1568), 220 a, b, c. "Gout is a flow which attacks with freezing and burning the veins and nerves and their surrounding tissues and hurts members and legs with tumors and pains ... For a stronger remedy, put heated ground [Bilsen] seed in a little bag and put it where it hurts. It might also suffice to moisten a piece of cloth in vinegar or woman's milk and drape it, heated up, around the wound." Wirsung, *Artzney Buch*, 473c, 477c.

20 | Johann Georg Greisel, *Tractatus medicus de Cura Lactis in Arthritide in quo indagata natura lactis et arthritidis tandem rationibus, et experientiis allatis, diaeta lactea, optima arthritidem curandi methodus, proponitur* (Leipzig: Ioh. Garb. Bueschelii Viduae, 1779; first ed. Vienna: Typis Johannis Jacobi Kürner, 1670), 145.

21 | "Gout is not contracted by rough men of the fields who rarely rest and assiduously exercise their bodies through physical labor ... but [by] these very bright and boisterous revelers who celebrate during the night, are weak from leisure, abhor any form of work like the pest, are enervated by all kinds of lust, mostly that of Venus, conquer lands and seas for precious food, assiduously provoke their palates through spices, desserts and delicacies, and who drink not out of necessity, but desire, and extinguish their thirst least of all with provincial wine." Greisel, *Tractatus medicus*, 156–57; https://books.google.de/books?id=Itg-AAAAcAAJ&lpg=PA156&ots=im2nERYcYS&dq=perbacchatores&pg=PR1#v=onepage&q=perbacchatores&f=false [accessed 7/7/15].

22 | "How great is the discrepancy between those nurtured by maternal milk ... and others nurtured by external, i.e., meretricious, wasted, and libidinous milk, defiled in every whore house (if this merits to be called 'milk')." Greisel, *Tractatus medicus*, 182; https://books.google.de/books?id=Itg-AAAAcAAJ&lpg=PA156&ots=im2nERYcYS&dq=perbacchatores&pg=PR1#v=onepage&q=perbacchatores&f=false [accessed 7/7/15].

23 | Elaine Pagels, *Adam, Eve, and the Serpent* (New York: Vintage Books, 1989), 108–09.

24 | "Whether the use of milk is beneficial to arthritis? It is responded that the use of milk is beneficial to arthritis. This follows not just from Pliny's authority (book 28) but it is also proven elsewhere." Greisel, *Tractatus medicus*, 255–56. "Because in his Three Books on Life, chapters 17 and 15, Marsilius Ficino argues for milk from the breasts as general nourishment." Greisel, *Tractatus medicus*, 283.

25 | Greisel, *Tractatus medicus,* 284.

26 | "However, he adds this from Dioscorides: Every milk, whenever it flows directly from a breast, is of greater help, nourishes more quickly and does not get corrupted. And the milk of a woman is sweeter and more nourishing than any other milk." Greisel, *Tractatus medicus*, 284.

27 | "Galen, in book VII of the Methods of Medicine, chapter 6, argues that milk is to be suckled off the breast, so that it would not get altered by contact with air." Greisel, *Tractatus medicus*, 295.

28 | Johann Doläus, *Upon the Cure of the Gout by Milk-Diet* (London: J. Smith and W. Bruce, 1732), 48.

29 | Doläus, *Upon the Cure,* 87–88.

30 | For recommendations on how to choose a good wet-nurse in the Renaissance, see Julia L. Hairston, "The Economics of Milk and Blood in Alberti's Libri della famiglia: Maternal versus Wet-Nursing," in: *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations: Images, Rhetorics, Practices,* ed. by Jutta Gisela Sperling (Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2013), 187–212.

31 | Heinrich Doorschodt, "De Lacte Commentatio," in: *De Lacte Humano eiusque cum Asinino et Ovillo comparatione observationes chemicae Accesserunt Henrici Doorschodti De Lacte atque Ioh. Georgii Greiselii De Cura Lactis in Arthritide ...,* ed. by Ioh. Georgius Fridericus Franzius (Leipzig: Ioh. Garb. Bueschelii Viduae, 1773; first ed. Leiden: apud Johannes Hasebroek, 1737), 117.

32 | "In case of gout, there is no more outstanding remedy found than milk ... For tuberculosis, milk is the most powerful remedy ... For, while there are several kinds of milk, a woman's milk is preferable to all of them, since it is more familiar to our nature. And it will be of greater use when sucked from the breast." Doorschodt, *De Lacte Commentatio*, 119–21.

33 | Doorschodt, *De Lacte Commentatio,* 121.

34 | "Milk is useful for important therapies, in particular [in cures] against gout and tuberculosis ... If you ask, which milk might be the most useful? The best one seems to be asinine milk, if you can get it, followed by goat's milk, but one shouldn't have too many scruples about cow's milk in the absence of these." Floris Jacob Voltelen, *De Lacte Humano eiusque cum Asinino et Ovillo comparatione observatines chemicae Accesserunt Henrici Doorschodti De Lacte atque Ioh. Georgii Greiselii De Cura Lactis in Arthritide ...,* ed. by Ioh. Georgius Fridericus Franzius (Leipzig: Ioh. Garb. Bueschelii Viduae, 1779; first ed. Utrecht: ex officina Abraham van Paddenburg, 1775), xiii–xiv.

35 | On experiments with milk, see Barbara Orland, "Why Could Early Modern Men Lactate? Gender Identity and Metabolic Narrations in Humoral Medicine," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations,* 37–54. On infant mortality rates connected with wet-nursing and child abandonment, see George D. Sussman, *Selling Mother's Milk: The Wet-Nursing Business in France 1715–1914* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982).

36 | Heide Wunder, "Frauenmilch – Muttermilch: Eine Geschichte aus dem 18. Jahrhundert," in: *Geschichte in Geschichten: Ein historisches Lesebuch* (Frankfurt; New York: Campus Verlag, 2003), 295–305, especially 295–96.

37 | Wunder, " Frauenmilch – Muttermilch," 299.

38 | "Kassel, 23rd of October, 1677: Miss Vrecken has now begun her service with Hanriet; she seems to be a good person, and I don't doubt that she will serve my daughter well ... Kassel, 16th of November, 1677: Thank God Hanriet is getting better every day, and I hope that the wetnurse's milk will improve her status even further, whom she might need for another three weeks." "Briefe der Landgräfin von Hessen-Cassel Hedwig Sophie vom 20. August 1657 bis den 21. Januar 1678," in: Leopold von Orlich, *Friedrich Wilhelm der Grosse Kurfürst: Nach bisher noch ungekannten Original-Handschriften* (Berlin; Posen; Bemberg: Mittler, 1836), 115–17.

39 | Heinrich Vorwahl, "Deutsche Volksmedizin in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart," in: *Volksmedizin: Probleme und Forschungsgeschichte,* ed. by Elfriede Grabner (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967; first ed. 1939), 223–77, especially 260–61.

40 | On oils and unguents destined for male and female patients, see Lorentz Burres von Neunkirchen, *Ein new Wund Artzney Büchlein vor nihe an den Tag gegeben Durch den erfarnen Meister Lorentzen Burres von Neunkirchen* (no place, 1549), 5v, 7r, 10r; Benedetto Vettori, *Empirica Benedicti Victorij Faventini, Medici clarissimi, necnon Camilli Thomaii Ravennatis morborum humani corporis curandorum Rationalis Methodus, ac Trotulae antiquissimi authoris Compendiu, de Passionibus mulierum curandis* (Leiden: apud haeredes Jacobi Iuntem, 1558), 72; Christopherus Wirsung, *Ein new Artzney Buch* (Ursel: durch Cornelium Sutorium, 1605; first ed. 1568); Anna von Diesbach, "Anna von Diesbachs Berner 'Arzneibüchlein' in der Erlacher Fassung Daniel von Werdts (1658)," part I, in: *Würzburger medizinhistorische Forschungen,* ed. by Gundolf Keil (Hannover; Pattensen: Wellm, 1978), vol. 16, 43; Hermann Schelenz, *Geschichte der Pharmazie* (Hildesheim: Gg. Olms, 1965; first ed. Berlin: Springer, 1904), 40, 57, 96, 100, 167, 891.

41 | "Another [recipe for eyes' diseases]: take vineleaves ... [Attich kraut], and honey in equal proportions, and pour a little bit of urine on it from a boy who is still being nursed, or else woman's milk, then grind [the ingredients] well, moisten a cloth with it, and apply the wet cloth onto the eyes." Burres von Neunkirchen, *Ein new Wund Artzney Büchlein,* 10r.

42 | "Worn out eyes: take the milk of a young woman who nurses a girl and dribble it fresh into the eyes." Wirsung, *Ein new Artzney Buch*, 60c–d. "Clogged up ears: Whisked egg white with milk from a woman who nurses a girl is particularly useful." Wirsung, *Ein new Artzney Buch*, 96a. "Reasons for sleeping problems can be multiple: anger, sadness, pain, and bleak thoughts ... take milk from a woman who nurses a girl." Wirsung, *Ein new Artzney Buch*, 108a–b. "A good balm: take three measures of oil [Veielöl], two measures of butter, melt it and pour it into a mortar, then add three measures of milk from a woman who nurses an girl." Wirsung, *Ein new Artzney Buch*, 224a. "Unnatural heat: take a live cock, chop him up and take the liver, put it into a mortar and mix it with milk from a woman who nurses a boy." Wirsung, *Ein new Artzney Buch*, 532c.

43 | "On the inflation of the womb. If she has pains in her hidden places or if she feels biting sensations in her womb during sexual relations, you should know that the womb is inflated ... Take the milk of a woman who has given birth to a male infant, mix it gradually with rose oil, and warm it. Make a suppository of soft wool, immerse it and place it at the head of the womb." Hebrew translation of "De passionibus mulierum," ca. 12th century, in: Ron Barkai, *A History of Jewish Gynaecological Texts in the Middle Ages* (Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 1998), 163.

44 | Girolamo Mercuriale, *De Morbis Mulieribus praelectiones ex ore Hieronymi Mercurialis iam dudum à Gaspare Bauhino exceptae, ac paulo antea inscio autore editae: nunc vero per Michaelem Columbum ex collatione plurium exemplarium consensu auctoris locupletiores, & emendatiores factae* (Venice: apud Felicem Valgrisium, 1587), 77.

45 | Aetius the ancient physician said that it occurs very frequently to have one's milk sucked off; and I say, it would be better if one could do without it ... but if the abundance of milk is such that ... it swells in the breast and causes pain, in addition to the danger of an inflammation; in such a case, to be on the safe side, it is good to have others suck it off, especially if the patient is used to have herself sucked." Scipio (Girolamo) Mercurio, *La Commare Oriccoglitrice* (Venice, apresso Gio. Bat. Giotti, 1601), 306.

46 | Mercurio, *La Commare,* 306.

47 | Madame Roland, Letter no. 39, 11 January, 1782, in: *Lettres de Madame Roland,* ed. by Claude Perroud (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1900), vol. 1 (1780–1787), 131.

48 | *Lettres de Madame Roland,* 80–131, letters no. 25, 34, 35, 38, 39.

49 | *Lettres de Madame Roland,* 131, letter no. 39.

50 | Madame Roland, "Avis à ma fille," in: *Œuvres de J.M.Ph. Roland, femme de l'ex-ministre de l'Intérieur,* ed. by L.-A. Champagneux (Paris, an VIII, 1799–1800), vol. I, 307–08.

51 | Mme Roland, "Avis," 308.

52 | Mme Roland, "Avis," 308.

53 | "After having made this observation, which circumstances taught me, my curiosity has enticed me to read the article "Breastfeeding" from the Encyclopédie ... it is not true that the tongue, after having approached the nipple, never leaves a void between itself and the nipple, when it retreats; it is the same with adults who want to suckle and who hardly ever succeed ... but babies leave their tongues on the nipple, partially enveloping it." Mme Roland, "Avis," 309–10, note 1. Chevalier Jaucourt, "Teter," in: Diderot and D'Alembert, *Encyclopédie*, vol. 16 (1965), 205. For a full-text edition, see Artful Encyclopédie Project [accessed 1/18/13].

54 | On the debate on breastfeeding during the French Enlightenment and the Revolution, see Londa Schiebinger, *Nature's Body: Gender in the Making of Modern Science* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993).

55 | Mme Roland, "Avis," 312.

56 | Mme Roland, "Avis," 312.

57 | On Enlightenment debates on maternal breastfeeding, see Mary Jacobus, "Incorruptible Milk: Breastfeeding and the French Revolution," in: Mary Jacobus, *First Things: The Maternal Imagery in Literature, Art, and Psychoanalysis* (New York: Routledge,

1995), 207–30; Simon Richter, *Missing the Breast: Gender, Fantasy, and the Body in the German Enlightenment* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006), 12–13.

58 | "I have to remark, in honor of the indigent classes, that it is very difficult among them to find mothers who, for money, give their infants away to breastfeed [i.e., to suckle another mother's breast], as it is common in the other class to see women pay in order to have theirs nursed." Mme Roland, "Avis," 312.

59 | Schiebinger, *Nature's Body,* 56.

60 | See the illustration in Jacqueline Marie Musacchio, *The Art and Ritual of Childbirth in Renaissance Italy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 96, Figure 79.

61 | "Dicono che i cani che hanno assaggiato il latte di una donna che ha partorito un maschio non prendono la rabbia." Quoted in: Roberto M. Danese, "Lac Humanum Fellare. La trasmissione del latte e la linea della generazione," in: *Pietas e allattamento filiale: La vicenda – l'exemplum – l'iconografia;* colloquio di Urbino, 2–3 maggio, 1996, ed. by Renato Raffaelli, Roberto M. Danese, and Settimio Lanciotti (Urbino: Quattro Venti, 1997); 40–72, especially 51, note 36.

62 | Wunder, "Frauenmilch," 299.

63 | Britta-Juliane Kruse, *Verborgene Heilkünste: Geschichte der Frauenmedizin im Spätmittelalter* (Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), 212. See also Valerie Fildes, *Breasts, Bottles, and Babies: A History of Infant Feeding* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1986); idem, *Wet Nursing: A History from Antiquity to the Present* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988).

64 | Schiebinger, *Nature's Body,* 56.

65 | Gianna Pomata, "A Christian Utopia of the Renaissance: Elena Duglioli's Spiritual and Physical Motherhood (ca. 1510–1520)," in: *Von der dargestellten Person zum erinnerten Ich: Europäische Selbstzeugnisse als historische Quellen (1500–1850),* ed. by Kaspar von Greyerz, Hans Medick, and Patrice Veit (Köln: Böhlau, 2001), 323–53; Katharine Park, *Secrets of Women: Gender, Generation, and the Origins of Human Dissection* (New York: Zone Books, distributed by Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2006), 176.

66 | Lorraine Daston and Katharine Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature, 1150–1750* (New York: Zone Books, 1998).

67 | Barry Wind, *'A Foul and Pestilent Congregation': Images of Freaks in Baroque Art* (Aldershot, England; Brookfield, Vermont: Ashgate, 1997), 55.

68 | Wind, *'A Foul and Pestilent Congregation',* 55, note 34; 56. Margaret Miles, "The Virgin's One Bare Breast: Female Nudity and Religious Meaning in Tuscan Early Renaissance Culture," in: *The Female Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Susan Rubin Suleiman (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1986), 193–208; Megan Holmes, "Disrobing the Virgin: The *Madonna lactans* in Fifteenth-Century Florentine Art," in: *Picturing Women in Renaissance and Baroque Italy*, ed. by Geraldine A. Johnson and Sara F. Matthews Grieco (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 167–95.

69 | Art historians have unfortunately not addressed this ambiguity sufficiently. See Susanne Thiemann, "Sex trouble. Die bärtige Frau bei José de Ribera, Luis Vélez de

Guevara und Huarte de San Juan," in: *Geschlechtervariationen: Gender-Konzepte im Übergang der Neuzeit,* ed. by Judith Klinger (Potsdam: Potsdam Universitäts Verlag, 2006), 47–82.

70 | *The complete works of Aristotle:* The revised Oxford translation, ed. by Jonathan Barnes (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), vol. 1, 828.

71 | Quoted after Orland, "Why Could Early Modern Men Lactate?," 37–54.

72 | Gianna Pomata, "La meravigliosa armonia: il rapporto fra seni ed utero dall' anatomia vascolare all'endocrinologia," in: *Madri: Storia di un ruolo sociale,* ed. by Giovanna Fiume (Venice: Marsilio, 1995), 45–82, especially 58.

73 | Leonardo da Vinci, "The Cardiovascular System and the Principal Organs of a Woman," Anatomical Drawing, 1509–10, London, Royal Collection of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, inv. no. RCIN 912281. Park, *Secrets of Women,* 34, Figure I.7. Huldrych M. Koelbing, *Ein schön lustig Trostbüchle von den empfengknussen und geburten der menschen; Einführung zu Jakob Rüff's Trostbüchle* (Zürich: Verlag Bibliophile Drucke von Joself Stocker, 1981), 15.

74 | Pomata, "La meravigliosa armonia," 58–59.

75 | Pomata, "La meravigliosa armonia," 59–60.

76 | Pomata, "La meravigliosa armonia," 60.

77 | Gaspare Aselli, *De lactibus sive lacteis vasis quarto vasorum mesaraicorum genere* (Milan: apud Io: Baptãm Bidellium, 1627). Quoted in Orland, "Why Could Early Modern Men Lactate?," 51. See also Barbara Orland, "White Blood and Red Milk. Analogical Reasonig in Medical Practice and Experimental Physiology (1560–1730)," in: *Blood, Sweat, and Tears: The Formation of Early Modern Medicine,* ed. by Manfred Horstmannshoff, Helen King, and Claus Zittel (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012), 443–80.

78 | Pomata, "La meravigliosa armonia," 68–71; Orland, "Why Could Early Modern Men Lactate?," 51.

79 | Quoted after: Pomata, "La meravigliosa armonia," 60.

80 | Quoted after: Orland, "Why Could Early Modern Men Lactate?," 40.

81 | Quoted after: Schiebinger, *Nature's Body,* 49.

82 | Quoted after: Schiebinger, *Nature's Body,* 49.

83 | Schiebinger, *Nature's Body,* 238–39, note 35; on indigenous inhabitants of Brazil and Alexander von Humboldt, see also Orland, "Why Could Early Modern Men Lactate?", 37–39.

84 | Mercuriale, *De Morbis Mulieribus,* 62.

85 | Mercuriale, *De Morbis Mulieribus,* 62–67 [note that after page 65, the numbering is not consecutive].

86 | Mercuriale, *De Morbis Mulieribus,* 66 [note that after page 65, the numbering is not consecutive].

87 | Acoromboni, *Tractatus de Lacte,* no pagination, 11th–15th page.

88 | "Much less is milk simply generated from blood, but from that white fluid and a sweet juice of chyle." Philip Hulden, *Tractatio de mirandis naturae fontibus ex quibus Ambrosinum Humane Sustentationis Nectar hauritur illorum origine ductibus & reliquis,*

tam in excessu quam defectu existentibus qualitatibus publici juri facta (Jena: Bielkium, 1697), 16. See also Voltelen, *De Lacte Humano*, 65.

89 | "The reason for the generation of milk is the frequent suction, observed by Salmuth ... If the breasts are frequently presented to the infant ... and not only in virgins, but also in men, through frequent contact and suction [milk is produced] ... But Diemerbroeck says that it is necessary to add the intense and frequent phantasy of nursing to the causes [of lactation]." Hulden, *Tractatio de mirandis*, 14–15; http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb11219098_00022.html [accessed 7/7/15]. See also Gianna Pomata on Diemerbroeck, Pomata, "La meravigliosa armonia," 73.

90 | "Through mere suction true milk can be produced by single maids or other women." Johann Heinrich Zedler, *Grosses Vollständiges Universal-Lexikon* (Halle: J.H. Zedler, 1739), vol. 21, columns 142–48.

91 | Chevalier Jaucourt, "Mammelle ou Mamelle (Anat. & Physiol.)," in: Diderot and D'Alembert, *Encyclopédie,* vol. 10 (1765), 1–4, especially 3; Artful Encyclopédie Project [accessed 1/18/13].

92 | Jaucourt, "Mammelle," 3–4.

93 | Doorschodt, "De Lacte Commentatio," 133.

94 | "The reason for ... [writing this book] is that women are so full of venom in the time of their menstruation that they poison animals by their glance; they infect children in the cradle; they spot the cleanest mirror; and whenever men have sexual intercourse with them they are made leprous and sometimes cancerous ..." Pseudo-Albertus Magnus, *Women's Secrets: A translation of Pseudo-Albertus Magnus's De Secretis Mulierum with Commentaries,* ed. by Helen Rodnite Lemay (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 60.

95 | Michele Savonarola, *Il trattato ginecologico-pediatrico in volgare: ad mulieres ferrarienses de regimine pregnantium et noviter natorum usque ad septennium,* ed. by Luigi Belloni (Milan: Società italiana di ostetrica e ginecologia, 1952; written ca. 1460), 37.

96 | Burres von Neunkirchen, *Ein new Wund Artzney Büchlein*, 7r.

97 | Incidentally, he was the grandfather of Domenico Savonarola, the famous Dominican mystic and revolutionary in late fifteenth-century Florence. The Dominicans objected to the theory of Mary's Immaculate Conception, which was promoted by the Franciscan order.

98 | Daston and Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature.*

99 | Orland, "Why Could Early Modern Men Lactate?," 46–49.

100 | Fildes, *Wet Nursing*; also Hairston, "The Economics of Milk and Blood."

101 | Jennifer Morgan, *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Megan Vaughan, *Creating the Creole Island: Slavery in Eighteenth-Century Mauritius* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005); Bianca Premo, *Children of the Father King: Youth, Authority, and Legal Minority in Colonial Lima* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005).

102 | Jane Fair Bestor, "Ideas about Procreation and Their Influence on Ancient and Medieval Views of Kinship," in: *The Family in Italy from Antiquity to the Present,* ed. by David I. Kertzer and Richard P. Saller (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 150–67; Gianna Pomata, "Blood Ties and Semen Ties: Consanguinity and Agnation in Roman Law," in: *Gender, Kinship, Power: A Comparative and Interdisciplinary History,* ed. by Mary Jo Maynes, Ann Waltner, Birgitte Soland, and Ulrike Strasser (New York: Routledge, 1996), 43–64. See also extended Italian version: "Legami di sangue, legami di seme: consanguinità e agnazione nel diritto romano," *Quaderni Storici* 86, no. 2 (1994): 299–334.

103 | Danese, "Lac humanum fellare," 52.

104 | Berlin Griech. Urk, 1107 [ed. Schubert], quoted in: Danese, "Lac humanum fellare," 63, note 71.

105 | Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, "Blood Parents and Milk Parents: Wet Nursing in Florence, 1300–1500," in: *Women, Family, and Ritual in Renaissance Florence,* ed. by Christiane Klapisch-Zuber (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 132–64. These restrictions may not have applied in other areas of the Mediterranean such as Iberia. See Rebecca Winer, "The Mother and the Dida [Nanny]: Female Employers and Wet Nurses in Fourteenth-Century Barcelona," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations,* 55–78.

106 | Pomata, "La meravigliosa armonia."

107 | "On top of this big gland lies a small, round, and longish body part … which is called nipple, and [which] corresponds to the gland of the penis, which, flaccid, can become erect due to suction [and physical] contact." Hulden, *Tractatio de mirandis naturae,* 2.

108 | Katharine Park, "The Rediscovery of the Clitoris," in: *The Body in Parts. Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern England*, ed. by David Hillman and Carla Mazzio (New York: Routledge, 1997), 170–91.

109 | Héritier mentions that the Yatenga in West-Africa used to believe that a boy's penis, when coming in contact with breast milk, would remain impotent. Danese, "Lac humanum fellare," 61, note 58.

110 | Waldemar Deonna, "La légende de Pero et de Micon et l'allaitment symbolique," *Latomus* 13 (1954): 140–66; 356–75.

111 | Peter Parkes, "Alternative Social Structures and Foster Relations in the Hindu Kush: Milk Kinship Allegiance in Former Mountain Kingdoms of Northern Pakistan," *Comparative Studies in History and Society* 43, no. 1 (2001): 4–36, especially 10.

112 | Mohammed Hocine Benkheira, "'The Milk of the Male': Kinship, Maternity, and Breastfeeding in Medieval Islam," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations,* 21–36.

113 | Pomata, "Blood Ties and Semen Ties."

114 | François Clouet, "Lady in her Bath," 1571, Washington, D.C., National Gallery, Samuel H. Kress Collection inv. no. 1961.9.13.

115 | For background information on this frescoe, see Patricia Simons, "The Social and Religious Context of Iconographic Oddity: Breastfeeding in Ghirlandaio's 'Birth of

the Baptist'," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations,* 213–34; see also Holmes, "Disrobing the Virgin," 188.

116 | It would take until the late seventeenth century for colostrum to be recognized as beneficial for the infant.

117 | For recent research on the practice of wet-nursing in early modern Europe, see Winer, "The Mother and the Dida [Nanny]," 55–78; Debra G. Blumenthal, "'With My Daughter's Milk': Wet Nurses and the Rhetoric of Lactation in Valencian Court Records," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations,* 101–14.

118 | Schiebinger, *Nature's Body,* 68–71; Jacobus, "Incorruptible Milk."

119 | Moschion, "De morbis mulieribus liber unus," in: *Gynaeciorum hoc est de mulierum tum aliis, tum gravidarum, parientium & puerperarum affectibus & morbis, Libri veterum ac recentiorum aliquot partim nunc primum editi, partim multo quam antea castigatores* (Basel: per Thomam Guarinum, 1566), 77.

120 | "I will say that mother's milk is better and more useful to the infant and more protective of his health, if it is good and not spoilt: because it resembles the food with which he was nourished in the womb, i.e., menstrual blood, from which milk is produced, as we have said. And the phrase "if it is not spoilt" [makes sense] because, where the mother is indisposed for some reason, the milk from another, healthy woman would be better under the condition that we specify [what qualities] a good wetnurse needs to have." Savonarola, *Il trattato,* 145.

121 | Eucharius Rösslin, *Der swangern Frauwen vnd Hebamen Rosengarten* (Argentine: Martinus Flach iunior impressit, 1514; first ed. Strassbourg 1513), no pagination.

122 | Eva Labouvie, *Beistand in Kindsnöten: Hebammen und weibliche Kultur auf dem Land (1550–1910)* (Frankfurt a.M.; New York: Campus Verlag, 1999), 88–89. See also Lyndal Roper, "Witchcraft and Fantasy in Early Modern Germany," in: *Oedipus and the Devil: Witchcraft, Sexuality, and Religion in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 199–225.

123 | Mercurio, *La Commare Oriccoglitrice,* 112.

124 | Mercurio, *La Commare Oriccoglitrice,* 112.

125 | Mercurio, *La Commare Oriccoglitrice,* 113–14.

126 | Mercurio, *La Commare Oriccoglitrice,* 115.

127 | Hairston, "The Economics of Milk and Blood," 194.

128 | "[Lei] ... sia del Paese e non straniera, prendendola in casa ... perche la Balia si asternerà dall'uso di Venere," Mercurio, *La Commare Oriccoglitrice,* 116.

129 | Mercurio, *La Commare Oriccoglitrice,* 117.

130 | "It is not to be permitted that the infant is infected with the contagion of a stranger's milk ... because he would imbibe maliciousness with the milk of his wetnurse." Rodrigo de Castro, *De universa mulierum Medicina novo et antehac a nemine tentato ordine opus absolutissimum et studiosis omnibus utile, medicis vero pernecessarium; pars prima theorica* (Hamburg: in officina frobeniana; typis Philippi de Ohr, 1603), 131.

131 | De Castro, *De universa mulierum Medicina,* 131.

132 | Hulden, *Tractatio de mirandis naturae*, 39.

133 | "In this matter, however, young mothers and midwifes run into error, believing colostrum to be noxious to the infant, for they are misled by a wrong principle. For nature, like a foreseeing mother, does not offer to the newborn child a thick and dense milk, but it prepares colostrum, i.e., a thinner extract made from chyle." P. Hulden, *Tractatio de mirandis naturae*, p. 41; http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/goToPage/bsb11219098.html?pageNo=49 [accessed 7/9/15].

134 | Greisel, *Tractatus medicus,* 194ss.

135 | Barbara Orland, "Enlightened Milk: Reshaping a Bodily Substance into a Chemical Object," in: *Materials and Expertise in Early Modern Europe: Between Market and Laboratory,* ed. by Ursula Klein and E.C. Spary (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 163–96.

136 | Zedler, *Grosses Vollständiges Universal-Lexikon,* vol. 21, column 145.

137 | Doorschodt, "De Lacte Commentatio," 80.

138 | Pierre Roussel, *Systeme physique et moral de la femme, ou tableau Philosophique de la Constitution, de l'Etat organique, du Tempérament, des Moeurs, & des Fonctions propres au Sexe* (Paris: chez Vincent, Imprimeur-Librarie, rue des Mathurins, Hôtel de Clugny, 1775), 361–62.

139 | Roussel, *Systeme physique,* 367–68.

140 | Roussel, *Systeme physique,* 368–69.

141 | Roussel, *Systeme physique,* 372.

142 | "Mere," in: Diderot and D'Alembert, *Encyclopédie,* vol. 10, 379. On Rousseau, see Orland, "Enlightened Milk," 175.

143 | Friedrich August Meyer, *Werden die Neigungen und Leidenschaften einer Säugenden durch die Milch dem Kinde mitgetheilt?* (Hamburg: B.G. Hofman, 1781), 2.

144 | Meyer, *Werden die Neigungen,* 37.

145 | Meyer, *Werden die Neigungen*, 56–57.

146 | Orland, "Enlightened Milk."

147 | Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex* (New York: Routledge, 1993), chapter 1, 27–55; Pomata, "Blood Ties and Semen Ties."

148 | Patricia Simons, *The Sex of Men in Premodern Europe: A Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

149 | Joan Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages: Medicine, Science, and Culture* (Cambrdige: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Bestor, "Ideas about Procreation;" Pomata, "Blood Ties and Semen Ties."

150 | "When he was still a baby, Aisha [one of Muhammad's wives] is said to have arranged for Salim b. Abdallah Ibn Umar ... to be suckled by her sister, Umm Kulthum, clearly with the idea that when he grew up, she would be allowed to have free and open social contact with him. For this to be valid, the boy should have been suckled for at least five ... sessions ... Hafsa, another of the Prophet's wives, and a daughter of Umar b. al'Khattab, is reported to have been more successful when she had Asim b. Abdallah b. Sa'd sent as an infant to her sister Fatima, guaranteeing that she would have free access to him in years to come." Avner Giladi, *Infants, Parents, and Wet Nurses:*

Medieval Islamic Views on Breastfeeding and Their Social Implications (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 27–28.

151 | Benkheira, "'The Milk of the Male'."

152 | Sarah Hanley, "Engendering the State: Family Formation and State Building in Early Modern France," *French Historical Studies* 16, no. 1 (1989): 4–27.

153 | Samuel Kline Cohen Jr., *Death and Property in Siena, 1205–1800: Strategies for the Afterlife* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988), 204.

Chapter 6: Charity, Mother of Allegory

Breastfeeding as "Other Speech"

This chapter explores the visual tradition of lactation imagery that eventually gave Pero and Cimon their particular resonance as Roman Charity. I argue that the embodiment of breastfeeding women in the arts can be more fully understood against the backdrop of ancient rhetorical theories of allegorization and the emergence of patriarchal kinship structures. The exclusion of women from the public sphere was necessary for images of breastfeeding women to signify ancient "piety" and Catholic "charity." Also, in order to assume such symbolic significance, images of lactation had a decidedly non-maternal bent. Milk-relations in the arts only rarely depicted a mother and her child – with the exception of the Virgin Mary and her son, perhaps, but this was a very special mother nursing a very special son whose neediness came to represent all of suffering mankind. With the emergence of the Madonna Lactans and representations of Charity in the fourteenth century, the lactating breast became the object of spiritual desire. In the Renaissance, when breastfeeding imagery acquired secular connotations, the spiritual breast had to compete for meaning with representations of wet-nurses, lactating goddesses and eroticized mythological creatures. In the Baroque, the motif of Pero and Cimon appropriated earlier meanings of the charitable breast, but also provided for ironic distance through a deliberate eroticization of the imagery. In the eighteenth century, the incestuous encounter between the daughter who breastfed her father came to signify the perversion of kinship relations under the ancien régime.

Since Roman antiquity, the allegorization and deification of "pietas" was associated with the stories of Pero and Cimon and of the daughter who breastfed her mother. Other than Valerius Maximus, who recounts both anecdotes as examples of filial piety, Pliny the Elder mentions in his *Natural History* (77 CE) that in the second century BCE, a column was erected to commemorate the Roman daughter who breastfed her mother in prison. This column was




Figure 6.1: Juno Nursing Hercules as a Grown Man, 5th–4th c. BCE, Drawing of an Etruscan Mirror

dedicated to the goddess of piety. More than a century later, Sextus Pompeius Festus refers to the same story in his dictionary *On the Significance of Words* (ca. 200 CE), albeit exchanging the mother for the father. He explains the concept of "piety" by referring to the "woman who secretly breastfed her father with the milk of her breasts." At the same time, and somewhat incongruously, Festus declares that piety, in its allegorized form, was worshipped as a goddess: "The Romans honored Piety as they honored the other gods."[1] In his view, humble and self-debasing Pero had become the embodiment, symbol, and content of "piety" itself.

Already in pre-classical antiquity, nursing deities were frequently represented. In Cypriot art of the archaic period, kourotrophoi were statues of mostly female caretakers, often shown in the act of breastfeeding infants.[2] Kourotrophoi were imagined to turn mortals into demigods through the nourishment

they provided. Also nymphs could fulfill this function on occasion, according to Virgil's account of Aenaes. Kourotrophoi were imagined to be virgins, which may have accounted for the magic qualities of their milk. According to Theodora Hadzisteliou Price, "the sacramental act of nursing [becomes] symbolic of divine adoption, protection, or initiation as a means to divinity."[3] Wild animals or hybrid creatures such as centaurs and satyrs could also, on occasion, confer special powers through their milk. Harpalyce, a protagonist in one of Hyginus's *Fables*, became a mighty warrior after being raised by heifers and mares.[4] This story illustrates that not only male but also female infants could benefit from the exceptional qualities of non-maternal, non-human milk.

The theme of a Greek hero's sacramental nursing may have derived from earlier Egyptian cults, according to which Ishtoar, Nehbet, and Isis breastfed kings and pharaohs. Isis, in particular, is sometimes shown to nurse her son Horus as a grown youth, in an image that may have influenced Etruscan representations of Hera nursing Hercules as a bearded man.[5] In Italian versions of the myth, Hera does not create the milky way after refusing to nurse Zeus's bastard son and spraying her milk into the universe, but willingly confers immortality on him through an act of ritual breastfeeding (Figure 6.1).[6] In contrast to Greek art, pre-classical Roman nursing scenes in Italy usually involve a mother and her infant, although starting in the fifth century BCE, kourotrophoi also appear. In classical Greek and Roman art, breastfeeding is no longer something in which a civilized mother would engage. Nursing belongs to the world of goddesses, animals, and barbarians, who foster cross-species infants to form unlikely bonds of affiliation, fosterage, and protection. Human mothers shown in the act of nourishing their own children are marked as social inferiors and colonized others, while wet nurses are often shown past the age of breastfeeding.[7] Maximus's twin anecdotes about the pious daughters who nurse their mother and father, respectively, participate in this visual and religious universe in which the depiction of breastfeeding stresses ritual or symbolic, not biological, maternity. As already mentioned, Festus's dictionary shows how in the early third century CE, Pero's sacrificial act of breastfeeding had become the very hallmark of "piety." It suggests that worship of lactating goddesses also survived, couched as veneration for this female virtue.

With the Christianization of the empire, a new development began to take place, which attributed greater significance to mother-son relationships in the depiction of nursing. Two fourth-century bronze medallions show how Christian empresses Helena and Fausta, mother and wife of Emperor Constantine (272–337 CE), respectively, appropriated earlier strands of meaning associated with lactation imagery: piety and female (divine) authority. The coin from 325 CE featuring Helena depicts on its reverse side a woman holding a child on her left arm in the manner of Isis nursing Horus; with her right hand, she offers an apple to another child. This image resembles later representations



Figure 6.2: Empress Flavia Maxima Fausta Nursing her Son, 316 CE, Double Solidus, Gold Coin, reverse

of the Hodegetria, the Byzantine icon of the Virgin and Child. The inscription reads "Pietas Augustes." At about the same time, coins of Empress Fausta show her enthroned and in the act of breastfeeding one or both of her sons (Figure 6.2). Again the intention was to promote the concept of imperial "piety," as the accompanying inscriptions make clear.[8] Piety, which earlier had been personified by Pero, an outcast who dared to defy imperial justice by nourishing her imprisoned father with the milk of her breasts, now became an attribute of Christian imperial rule. On Helena's and Fausta's medals, "piety" is personified as a figure of maternal authority denoting abundance and generosity, transferring special powers onto her son and ruler.

While a certain ambiguity and love of paradox can be detected in Festus's dictionary, which identifies "piety" as both goddess and self-sacrificing Pero, the contradiction is resolved on those medals. Helena and Fausta gave breastfeeding a new meaning by associating it with maternal authority and imperial largesse, of which the coins that bore their imprint were themselves sign and symbol. This transformation was possible only after visual representations of Pero and Cimon had gone out of fashion. The only remaining ancient wall paintings of the motif date to the first century CE (Figure 4.1), which suggests that in early fourth-century art, breastfeeding as piety was ready to assume new semantic connotations.

Isis, Cybele, Diana of Ephesus, Juno, Vesta, and Tellus Mater – all powerful maternal deities – were still being venerated in various parts of the Roman Empire when Helena and Fausta adopted lactation imagery for their political purposes.[9] Also, the cult of the Virgin Mary was rapidly spreading. The medallions of Helena and Fausta can thus be seen as an attempt to appropriate and

possibly monopolize the religious significance of breastfeeding imagery. Just as pagan maternal deities confer special qualities onto their nurslings, Helena and Fausta seem to be lending legitimacy and quasi-divine power to their sons through their milk. However, the strategy of the two first Christian empresses to promote images of breastfeeding as signs of imperial power and abundance did not win out, as worship for the Virgin Mary came to eclipse their visual rhetoric.

Historians are still debating whether the cult of Isis, usually shown in the act of breastfeeding her son Horus (later Harpokrates), might have inspired veneration for the Madonna Lactans, especially since the first known representation of the nursing Madonna is a fourth- or fifth-century Coptic image (Figure 6.3).[10] Images of the nursing Virgin, however, may have developed independently of the cult of Isis. Third-century wall paintings in the catacombs of Priscilla show a breastfeeding woman, whom some art historians believe to be Mary and her son.[11] This image remained unique in early Christian Italy, however. The Virgin Mary differed from pagan goddesses in that



Figure 6.3: Madonna Lactans or Tombstone of a Young Woman, 4th–5th century CE, Egyptian

she rendered her son fully human through her milk – she did not confer any divine qualities on him.[12]

In the Byzantine Empire, the development of the cult of the Virgin Mary took a different turn, perhaps due to the co-optation of breastfeeding imagery by Empresses Helena and Fausta, or because of its dangerous proximity to pagan fertility cults. Elevated to the status of "Theotokos" [God-bearer, not mother of God] at the Council of Ephesus in 431, the Virgin Mary came to be worshipped as a rather stern motherly figure. Mary's more tender, maternal feelings for Christ developed only gradually throughout the Byzantine period, as measured by representations of the Hodegetria in the arts.[13] In Byzantine art, she would only rarely be depicted as nursing (Galaktotrophousa) before the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries.[14] One early example consists of *Theotokos the Milk-Giver* from the Hilander Monastery on Mount Athos, Greece (6th century). In Italy, to my knowledge, the earliest representation after antiquity dates from 1270 in Santa Lucia alle Valve in Matera.[15] By and large, the iconography of the Madonna Lactans was invented or reinvented in fourteenth-century Tuscany, where her imagery developed in tandem with Charity, both of which enjoyed tremendous popularity.[16] This happened roughly 1000 years after the catacombs of Priscilla were decorated with what might have been the very first artistic rendering of the nursing Virgin, and 800 years after at least in two instances, Coptic and Greek Christians chose to worship her in this manner.

The ascent of lactation imagery to allegorical status in antiquity and early Christianity happened within the context of contemporary theories of allegorization and the construction of kinship as patrilineal in ancient Greece and Rome. Both phenomena, that is, the rhetoric of female embodiment with its emphasis on milk-exchange and the invention of agnatic kinship, have to be seen in the context of an oratorical culture that denied women their own voice. As interlocking mechanisms of exclusion, the codification of patriarchal kinship and the construction of a male sphere of politics worked hand in hand. Legislation about patriarchal family structures, inheritance, and belonging was issued by men who made public use of their voices and who defined the transmission of paternal blood as the basis for their hierarchical vision of family relations.[17] In this context, the promiscuous sharing of maternal milk between goddesses, empresses, hybrid creatures, even pious daughters and their – mostly male – recipients in the arts and literature served as a reminder of alternative, and possibly prior, ways of defining kinship based on care.

As allegorical embodiments, representations of women found their way back into the public sphere – as mute and spectral figures, lamenting and re-enacting their own exclusion. Ancient Greek oratory deemed female figures of speech useful for the illustration of abstract concepts and for the signification of places of origin. Interestingly, Demetrius of Phalerum (3rd century BCE)

imagines such female personifications to address reproaches to the audience – one wonders what motives he envisioned for their complaints?[18] In his treatise *On Style*, he praises allegories for "shrouding" one's words in ambiguity, aesthetic appeal, and complexity, since "any darkly-hinting expression is more terror striking, and its import is variously conjectured … by different hearers." He likens allegories to fanciful clothes, insofar as "things that are clear and plain are apt to be despised, just like men when stripped of their garment."[19]

In Roman rhetoric, allegories continued to be embraced for their functions to "conjecture" meaning, to arouse "suspicion" and "doubt," and to lend female figures an outlet for complaints.[20] As their Greek etymological meaning suggests, they were regarded as a kind of "other speech," as alien, but imaginative and impressive, ways of addressing an audience, capable of producing strong affects.[21] Cicero (106–43 BCE) defines the ventriloquizing of emotions of "children, women, nations, and even of voiceless things" as the prime function of allegorical impersonations, which an attorney would use to arouse pity on behalf of his clients. Such "fictitious speeches" might conjure up "the voice and feelings of the unhappy victims" in the mind of a judge, moved to pity by the employment of "enargeia," i.e., the vividness of the orator's description.[22] The same effect would not at all be achieved by the victims' direct representation of their suffering in a public sphere governed by the exclusion of women and slaves. The anonymous author of *Rhetoric*: *for Herennius* (ca. 90 BCE) states unambiguously that rhetorical forms of embodiment work only insofar as the persons to whom they refer – such as women – are absent, excluded, or incapacitated:

"Personification consists in representing an absent person as present, or in making a mute thing or one lacking form articulate, and attributing to it a definite form and a language of certain behavior appropriate to its character … Personification may be applied to a variety of things, mute and inanimate. It is most useful in the … Appeal to Pity."[23]

The *Rhetoric* thus claims that it is the very exclusion of those absent persons that arouses pity, rather than any attributes they might acquire as personifications. Quintilian (35–100 CE), finally, likens allegories to inversion, illusion, and irony and lists the rhetorical work they are apt to perform as "prosopopeia (personification), visions (phantasia), illustratio, and evidentia (enargeia)."[24] As Theresa Kelley states, Quintilian endowed allegories with the subversive effect of disturbing the "ordinary expectations that outward appearances might accurately convey meaning." In his view, visual allegories thrive on multiple and complex relationships they establish between their signifiers and various referents. Eventually, allegories transform into enigmas or riddles, following their "logical angle of repose as … [figures] of irony or illusion."[25]

Quintilian's definition of allegory as well as the concept of personification proposed by the author of *Rhetoric*: *for Herennius* align perfectly with




Figure 6.4: Tintoretto, The Circumcision of Christ, 1550–55

Maximus's narrative employment of Pero as central figure of filial piety. As the *Rhetoric* prescribes, the breastfeeding daughter is quintessentially pitiful, doubly silenced as both an outsider (Greek) and a woman. Instead of speaking, she is forced to take recourse to a most humble body language in attempting to achieve her father's survival and release from prison. Quintilian's emphasis on visual allegories' multiple, competing referents resonates with the irony, moral ambiguity, and enigmatic character of Maximus's anecdote about Pero and Cimon, which circulated as a riddle about kinship relations since the eleventh century. Moreover, Maximus frames his story as ekphrasis, describing the "riveting" and "amazing" effects of its artistic rendering and pointing to the painting's force in re-presenting the father-daughter couple to the viewer's eyes as if "in those silent outlines of limbs they see living and breathing bodies."[26] Here the eroticized or sensationalist language seems to defy the explicit purpose of the story, namely, to illustrate "filial piety." Instead, Maximus's readers are left with a desire to see those "silent outlines of limbs" – in their nudity, one would assume – as well as Pero's and Cimon's "breathing bodies." The gap, or semantic antagonism between the viewer's voyeuristic desire to witness an erotic and incestuous exchange of body fluids and its alleged moral, didactic meaning, produces irony. Such perversion of intent can, perhaps, explain the immense fortune the iconography enjoyed in first-century art and again since the Renaissance.

With the emergence of Christianity, new views on allegories emerged. Especially since Saint Ambrose's contributions to biblical exegesis, the emphasis was on allegorical interpretations rather than the invention or analysis of rhetorical figures of speech.[27] According to Ambrose, meaningful connections between the Old and New Testament could only be established by mapping events and persons from Jewish Scripture onto the gospels in the form of pre-figuration and fulfillment.[28] Such a figurative approach led to the invention of a new type of causality, which collapsed different events evolving in historical time before and after the advent of Christ into the ever-present truth of divine revelation – by presenting Moses as a pre-figuration of Jesus, for example, or viewing Mary as the redeemer of Eve. An illustration of this method can be found in Tintoretto's decoration of the Scuola Grande di San Rocco, which establishes multiple visual connections between the gospels and the Old Testament. Not only does Tintoretto stress Jesus's Jewish identity in his painting of *The Circumcision of Christ,* but he also emphasizes Charity as an over-arching concept of his decorative program, which thematically connects central events such as *Moses Striking the Rock, Elisha Multiplying the Bread, The Baptism of Christ,* and Christ's *Multiplication of Bread and Fish*.[29] In all of these paintings – and several others as well – breastfeeding women appear as both allegories and narrative elements to signify the eternal truth of charity as the ultimate aim of Catholicism and the history of redemption (Figure 6.4).[30]




Figure 6.5: Giorgione, Tempest, 1508, Detail

In medieval rhetoric, such overlay of figurative interpretations of existing texts was called "veiling." Allegoresis became the "integumentum" [veil] through which the original meaning of an ancient or biblical text was to be glimpsed. In Renaissance and German Reformation art, veils of allegory were sometimes depicted with great effect and virtuosity, especially when employed to mark nude women as breastfeeding Charities. In Giorgione's *Tempest* (1508), for example, the veil that covers the nursing woman's shoulders, but not much else, amplifies the riddle-like nature of this painting (Figure 6.5). Through this veil that reveals more than it hides, Giorgione presents his breastfeeding Charity as allegory and figure of desire. Sometimes identified as a portrait-cover itself, the painting draws attention to the semantic paradox established by defining the act of veiling or covering as a method of seeking insights and truth.

Lucas Cranach the Elder (1472–1553), a friend of Martin Luther (1483–1546), adopted a similar device for expressing his critical stance vis-à-vis the medieval method of allegoresis, especially when applied to the visual arts. In line

with the reformers' insistence that Scripture be read "literally," he produced numerous representations of Charity, each one unnecessarily and shockingly naked and embellished with a veil of finely woven lace (Figure 6.6). The artful transparency of Cranach's veils highlights that allegorical embodiments can – and should – become their own subject matter. Cranach's beautiful breast-feeding nudes problematize, just like Giorgione's enigmatic *Tempest,* not only the theological meaning of charity, but also the very work of allegorical representation. The women's nakedness acquires symbolic meaning in and of itself, overwhelming the viewer with the promise of literal truth. That such knowledge and revelation should be visually represented in the form of an



Figure 6.6: Lucas Cranach the Elder, Charity, 1534

erotic nude exemplifies the dilemma of Reformation artists, caught between the new demands for unambiguous representation and the figurative nature of contemporary art.[31]

As mentioned earlier, the gendered aspects of ancient allegory and medieval allegoresis are causally related to the exclusion of women from the signifying scene since antiquity, i.e., the discourses of philosophy, medicine, and law that feminist theorists have sometimes called "phallogocentric."[32] The fact that breastfeeding imagery in particular acquired allegorical status might be related to the definition of paternal blood in ancient Greek medicine. Concocted to semen, male blood was viewed by Aristotle as the only generative fluid that truly mattered in the process of conception. Women were thought to contribute nourishing matter.[33] Following Aristotle's mapping of "active" and "passive" principles onto gendered bodies in the process of generation, Plato claimed that any mother was nothing but a nurse, interchangeable in the functions she provided. Her main role was to offer a hollow space within which materialization took place but which in and of itself did not participate in the form- and life-giving process it harbored.[34] Carrying the mother's exclusion to an extreme, even matter was no longer associated with the feminine but was declared to be unintelligible to the human mind and quasi non-existent unless shaped by the signifying, dialectic encounter with the male.[35]

Contemporary Roman culture made its own contribution to the fiction of motherless kinship, supplementing Greek medicine and metaphysics with the legal definition of family as strictly agnatic (patrilineal).[36] Children were related to their mothers only according to the law of nature, which carried no consequence in terms of inheritance in a public court of law. Again, paternal blood was viewed as the essence and conveyor belt of everything that mattered in the process of generation, the originating principle of all forms, qualities, and properties. Only fathers had true heirs.

The quasi-mystical enhancement of paternal seed in classical Greek philosophy and Roman legal discourse, and the concomitant debasement of pregnancy and nursing, stand in an interesting contrast to the proliferation of kourotrophoi in the archaic period and their pronounced emphasis on milk-exchange. The representation of lactating goddesses or divine wet-nurses in the visual arts often seems to entail an anti-patriarchal view of kinship, such as when Hera nurses Heracles on Etruscan mirrors to adopt him ritually and render him immortal. The fact that he is a grown man emphasizes the fictive or, better, voluntary nature of the kinship bond thus created, i.e., the absence of any sperm-oriented "biological" connection.[37] Outside the Greco-Roman world, such alternative milk-based models of belonging survived until the early modern period and beyond.[38]

The "other speech" of allegory thus seems to coalesce around the theme of kinship and the kinds of activities and essences that establish meaningful

relationships between people and words. Lactation imagery, in particular, constitutes a powerful counter-discourse to the hierarchies and exclusions in law and philosophy. "Piety," defined by Festus, subverts prevailing notions of patrilineal kinship in her embodiment as Pero, who in nursing her own father reverses the generational trajectory, returning milk for blood. "Piety" signified as imperial largesse, and configured as Helena and Fausta nursing their sons, supplants a story of patriarchal origins based on sex and birth with a matriarchal principle based on care. The non-verbal, visual, and figurative form of "piety," allegorized through maternal body language, constitutes its own referent. That is, the very meaning of piety consists of signifying and validating extra-legal relationships of care and belonging that exists outside the boundaries of public discourse.

Allegorized piety and lactating goddesses resemble each other in emphasizing breast milk as a reproductive fluid of prime cultural significance, fertile in its capacity to designate meaningful relationships. In the Middle Ages, the reciprocal relationship between breastfeeding as divine attribute and symbol of abstract moral significance reappears in the guise of the Madonna Lactans and Charity as Christianity's most important virtue. The Virgin Mary created "true" kinship with Christ by breastfeeding him, passing on her – human – flesh and qualities to God in an interesting reverse gesture vis-à-vis Isis, who rendered Horus divine. Charity stepped in for ancient "piety," recreating the split between humility and divinity that Festus recorded in his dictionary *On the Significance of Words*. Both phenomena, the promotion of the Virgin Mary from "God-bearer" to humble, nursing mother of God and the view of Charity as a woman breastfeeding more than one infant, thrive on the displacement and re-evocation of mothering. While Mary adopts all of Christianity into her powers of intercession by nursing Christ, in and through whom believers enjoy access to redemption, Charity qualifies as love of one's neighbor precisely because she takes care of strangers.[39]

The Madonna Lactans and the representation of Charity as a breastfeeding woman developed in tandem in the first half of the fourteenth century. Robert Freyhan has shown how a century prior, artists depicting Charity had not yet settled on lactation imagery but were experimenting with different attributes such as cornucopias and flames. While cornucopias were of ancient extraction, signifying abundance, flames were a contemporary invention. They represented Charity's burning heart and desire, thought to be inseparable from the love of God, especially since twelfth- and thirteenth-century mystics collapsed Saint Augustine's distinction between charity and desire.[40] Max Seidel argues that in twelfth- and thirteenth-century theological discourse, especially in commentaries on the *Song of Songs* and other mystical writings, multiple associations emerged between the breasts of Charity, Ecclesia [Church], and the Virgin Mary. In the visual arts, Giovanni Pisano was the first to represent *Charity*, also



Figure 6.7: Giovanni Pisano, Charity or Ecclesia, 1310, Detail, Pisa, Cathedral



Figure 6.8: Ambrogio Lorenzetti, Madonna Lactans, ca. 1335

called Ecclesia on occasion, as a woman who through the slits of her garment nurses a child from each breast in 1310 (Figure 6.7). Tino da Camaino followed suit with a formally very similar representation in 1321.[41] In ca. 1330, Giovanni di Balduccio sculpted *Charity* as a woman who breastfeeds two children from her left breast,[42] and Ambrogio Lorenzetti painted one of the very first nursing Madonnas (Figure 6.8).[43] While Seidel calls these Charity figures "maternal," it is important to point to their allegorical, universalizing function. Already in 1196, Wilhelm von Newburgh sees the nursing Madonna as yet another embodiment of Charity, who through her two nurslings nourishes all of suffering mankind.[44] Thomas of Aquinas (1225–74) states unambiguously that the only and ultimate object of charity ought to be God.[45] The semantic range of meanings associated with lactation imagery could not be wider, nor could the metonymic shifts produced by it be more ambitious. The proliferation of lactation imagery attests to Charity's importance as a "trope of tropes" à la Joel

Fineman, i.e., as a figure of speech – here: visual allegory – that reflects on its own status as allegory and formally re-enacts the fertility it signifies.[46]

The Madonna Lactans also relates to representations of Christ Crucified, who through his blood promises redemption to all believers. Mechthild von Magdeburg (1212–94) writes in her revelations: "His wounds and her breasts were opened. The miracles poured, and the breasts flowed … The blood came from mercy, like the milk, which I drank from my virginal mother."[47] Such symmetrical views of Christ's blood and Mary's milk entered the visual arts in the early fifteenth century – among others, in a painting entitled *The Intercession of Christ and the Virgin* (ca. 1402) attributed to Lorenzo Monaco.[48]



Figure 6.9: Quirizio di Giovanni da Murano, Christ about to Nurse a Poor Clare from his Wound, 1460–80

Quirizio di Giovanni da Murano even depicts Christ offering his wound like a nipple in the V-hold typical of breastfeeding women to a Clarissan nun (1460–78) (Figure 6.9). Already in the twelfth century, William of Saint-Thierry (ca. 1075–1148) called Christ's spiritual nourishment "milk" in a commentary on the *Song of Songs* that drew on Saint Paul's letters: "I had to feed you with milk, not with solid food, because you weren't ready for anything stronger" (1 Corinthians 3:2).[49]

Because of Paul's equation of milk with Christian teachings, lactation metaphors survived even in seventeenth-century Protestant catechisms.[50] At the same time, milk-relics continued to enjoy great currency in Catholic regions. In 1618, Cardinal Tiepolo of Venice published a treatise on the miraculous rediscovery of a medieval milk-relic during reconstruction works at Saint Mark's Chapel. In this book, he explains in great detail how the Virgin's milk was so abundant that it sprayed onto a rock while she was resting during her flight to Egypt, and how it hardened to form a chalk-like substance, which, if powdered and dissolved in water, cured diseases and prolonged the milk-flow in mothers and nurses.[51] This is exactly the kind of discourse Erasmus of Rotterdam had made fun of a century earlier. In his colloquium "A Pilgrimage for Religion's Sake" (1526), he has the Virgin Mary herself complain – to Ulrich Zwingli, of all persons! – about being hopelessly overworked: "Every Thing was asked of me, as if my Son was always a Child, because he is painted so, and at my Breast, and therefore they take it for granted I have him still at my Beck, and that he dares not deny me any Thing I ask of him."[52] She also regrets that she is no longer represented as Queen of Heaven but as a breastfeeding mom in raggedy clothes. Erasmus's two interlocutors ridicule contemporary Catholics' belief in milk-relics and poke fun at Saint Bernard, who, "when he was very old, had the Happiness to taste Milk from that same Nipple which the Child Jesus sucked."[53]

In medieval Catholicism, milk, blood, and the body of Christ were interchangeable substances to be ingested. Caroline W. Bynum has shown how female mystics of the Middle Ages played with food-related metaphors to express their yearning for a union with Christ, a God they hungrily devoured.[54] In their writings and religious practices, they expanded Eucharistic forms of devotion to include self-starvation and the miraculous feeding of others. Sometimes, their bodies leaked nourishing matter. Thomas of Cantimpré (1201–72) remarks in his "Life" of Christina the Astonishing (1150–1224) that Christ filled her breasts with milk so that she could nourish herself.[55] On another occasion, she produced miraculous oil in her breasts, with which she cured skin sores and other diseases. Lutgard of Aywières (1182–1246), another female mystic featured by Thomas, exuded healing oil from her fingertips after repeated visions of suckling milk from Christ's wounds.[56] Gertrud von Oosten (d. 1358) experienced engorgement after meditating on the nativity, and Lidwina of Schiedam (d. 1433) had a vision of the nursing Madonna surrounded

by lactating virgins. She was in the habit of breastfeeding a former caretaker, who in turn saw Lidwina's breasts fill with milk on Christmas day.[57]

Italian holy women were less apt at producing miraculous milk and other body fluids than their Flemish counterparts; they saw themselves as recipients of divine nourishment instead. Saint Catherine of Siena (1347–80), for example, was nursed repeatedly by both Christ and the Virgin Mary.[58] Once, this miracle happened after she sucked off pus from the cancerous breast of a fellow *mantellata* [third-order nun].[59] Monks and male mystics such as Saint Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153) also enjoyed the Virgin's milk in their visions, and they adopted maternal metaphors for themselves in legitimizing their authority as abbots.[60] Saint Clare of Assisi (1194–1253) had visions of nursing from the breasts of Saint Francis, as reported by fellow nuns during her canonization proceedings in 1253.[61] In an illumination analyzed by Helga Kraft, a nun nurses from the breasts of the Virgin Mary.[62]

Both the Madonna Lactans and the representation of Charity in the visual arts developed within a gender-bending religious context that placed high value on the symbolic aspects of breastfeeding. The seemingly infinite supply of breast milk and the bliss it conferred on suckling infants appeared to fit form and content of the Christian message since the writings of Saints Paul and Augustine. If the lactation miracles mentioned above can be taken as an indication of how paintings of Caritas and the nursing Virgin resonated among viewers, it is reasonable to assume that Catholic beholders identified with both nurse and nursling. After all, giving and receiving – or, better, giving as receiving – went hand in hand in medieval definitions of charity as the highest religious virtue.[63] In paintings such as Lorenzo Monaco's and Quirizio da Murano's, in which donors direct their hopes for intercession to both Christ's wound and Mary's breasts, the ancient theme of divine adoption and protection re-emerges, as the veneration of Mary's milk and Christ's chest wound is seen as conferring and constituting spiritual kinship.

Art historians and religious scholars are still debating whether the nursing Virgin had the didactic function of exhorting mothers to breastfeed their infants. Were contemporary women expected to imitate the Madonna, and if so, how? Margaret R. Miles, in her epoch-making article "The Virgin's One Bare Breast," denies the status of the Madonna Lactans as a maternal role model, suggesting that Mary's breastfeeding of her son marked her uniqueness in a culture in which wet-nursing was commonplace.[64] Aelred of Rievaulx (1110–67) was of the opinion that "she [Mary] is our mother much more than our mother according to the flesh,"[65] a view that the many lactation miracles of male and female mystics who received the grace of Mary's milk seem to confirm. Direct competition with the Madonna Lactans as a dispenser of spiritual nourishment was rare, confined to Flanders, and possibly blasphemous. Saint Bernardino of Siena, for example, saw Mary's importance in redemption history as rivaling

Christ's.[66] Clarissa W. Atkinson and Rosemary Drage Hale expand on Miles's view by arguing that both women and men identified with the Virgin Mary insofar as she was a role model for spiritual, not corporeal or biological, motherhood.[67] Naomi Yavneh and Charlene Villaseñor Black, by contrast, view the Madonna Lactans in the context of fifteenth-century Florentine "pro-maternal lactation propaganda" and sixteenth-century humanist polemics against wet-nursing, but they lack records from contemporary mothers to prove their point.[68]

Megan Holmes shifts the debate by investigating the intelligibility of the nursing Madonna's religious meaning in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, when naturalism in the arts demanded an anatomically correct portrayal of the Virgin's breast. In earlier paintings, Mary's breast was shown as slightly deformed and dislocated in order to highlight its symbolic significance, but Renaissance representations threatened to blur the distinction between the Madonna's spiritual role and her formal resemblance to human mothers.[69] As a result, Mary's breasts became eroticized to the point at which their spiritual meaning was hard to communicate. The extent to which more naturalistic fifteenth-century Flemish representations of the Madonna Lactans – for example, by Rogier van der Weyden – contributed to the abandonment of the dislodged breast in Italian art still remains to be investigated.

The spiritual motherhood of Elena Duglioli (1472–1520), a spontaneously lactating saint, offers a late, and most spectacular, example of forms of devotion that according to her hagiographers were inspired by identification with the Virgin Mary.[70] Her extravagant religious practices represent the last flourishing of a religious culture that saw the Madonna's nursing of Christ as a symbol of divine protection. In the Italian context, Elena is unique in her resemblance to Mary; up until then, only Flemish mystics Lidwina of Schiedam and Gertrud van Oosten had experienced virginal engorgement after meditating on the nursing Madonna. Elena became known for the anti-libidinal qualities her milk could transmit, in direct defiance of the contemporary scientific discovery of the breast as an erogenous organ.[71]

As Gianna Pomata informs us, Blessed Elena, who for many years lived with her husband Benedetto Dall'Olio in a chaste marriage, found her breasts to be filled with milk one day in 1510. She took this to be a sign of God's grace, especially since she resumed menstruating at the same time. As already mentioned, virginal lactations were within the law of nature if they were accompanied by amenorrhea, according to medical theories of the time. Elena would have liked to use her milk to nurse foundlings, but God forbade it to her in a vision. Instead, she helped raise the baby of her niece. She soon moved on to breastfeed grown men, however, presenting herself as their spiritual mother, as if re-enacting an ancient rite of spiritual adoption. Among her spiritual sons were her confessor Pietro Ritta and Antonio Pucci, papal nuncio, Bishop of

Pistoia in 1519 and Cardinal in 1531. According to Pomata, Pucci came to her with the express wish to be rid of his carnal desires:

"[He] wished to have the milk "directly from the maternal breast," longing for "the singular grace … of turning into a baby again [come fanciullo rimbambire], and from a woman obtaining the first act of infant feeding … So that the elect of God on his knees received the heavenly liquor with plenty of tears, devotion and reverence, as if suckled at the divine breast of the glorious Mother of God herself"."[72]

It is ironic that among the six anatomists asked to assist in Elena Duglioli's post mortem dissection, initiated by clerics who wanted to find material proof of the miraculous nature of her milk, was Berengario da Carpi, who discovered the erogenous function of both male and female nipples.[73] Just as contemporary erotic representations of the breast in visual culture clashed with the spiritual values of Catholicism, the anti-erotic nature of Elena's spiritual nursing sessions became doubtful from the point of view of early modern



Figure 6.10: Jacopo della Quercia, Charity, 1409–19, Original Replaced by Tito Sarrocchi in 1868, Siena, Fonte Gaia




Figure 6.11: Giulio Romano or Raphael, Charity, 1520–24

science. Unsurprisingly, her two autopsies did not reveal any unambiguous signs of the supernatural origin of her milk, much to the disappointment of her hagiographers, who complained that "the medical men … are always enemies of miracles and have recourse to the works of nature."[74]

By the time of Elena's death in 1520, lactation imagery had become quite varied, to include the representation of wet-nurses and mythological hybrid creatures as well as the first renderings of parental breastfeeding à la Maximus. Even though the quintessential erotic breast was small and dry, lactation scenes could be quite sensual.[75] Charity's bosom, for example, had in the course of the fifteenth century become more naturalistic, free of the stylistic alienation to which the nursing Madonna's "one bare breast" was subjected.[76] Jacopo della Quercia's sculpture at the Fonte Gaia in Siena (1409–19) shows her seated, with one big round breast exposed, suckling an infant (Figure 6.10). Another baby rests asleep on her lap. Andrea Guardi depicts her surrounded by three small children, shoulders exposed, in his choir relief of Santa Maria della Spina in Pisa (1452).[77] Filippino Lippi's *Charity* (1487–1502) is standing upright in classicizing elegance, shoulders and breasts revealed. One baby is sitting on her right arm, another one is suckling from her left breast, and a third one clutches her

right leg.[78] Giulio Romano's *Charity,* sometimes attributed to Raphael, is even more sensual, with one baby nursing, another one playing with her breasts, and a toddler reaching up to touch her (Figure 6.11). This fresco was completed four years after Elena died (1524). Starting in the 1490s, the Madonna Lactans, likewise, became quite erotic, revealing one or both of her beautiful breasts to the viewer. The new distancing devices included showing her as queen of heaven or enthroned on a marble dais to make up for the omission of a deliberate



Figure 6.12: Leonardo da Vinci, Follower, Madonna Lactans, ca. 1490



Figure 6.13: Domenico di Bartolo, The Assignment and Payment of Wet-Nurses and the Marriage of Foundlings, 1443, Detail

dislocation of her breasts that contemporary viewers would no longer have tolerated.[79] Only Leonardo da Vinci – or one of his followers – portrayed her in a highly intimate scene, with baby Christ searching for her nipple, her gorgeous breast exposed through a slit in her garment (ca. 1490) (Figure 6.12).[80]

Less eroticized were the representations of wet-nurses and "passive" Charities, i.e., women beggars with nursing infants and small children in their care. Domenico di Bartolo (1400/04–1445/47) painted both varieties in his frescoes in the Sala del Pellgrinaio of the Ospedale di Santa Maria della Scala in Siena. In *The Assignment and Payment of Wet-nurses* (1443), three wet-nurses perform their tasks in the interior of the foundlings' ward where a swaddled newborn is handed over to a veiled assistant (Figure 6.13). The nurse in the back stands upright, cuddling a naked infant; a second one is seated, playing with a baby in her lap; and a third one nurses a baby, Charity-like, with another infant clinging to her back. In *The Distribution of Alms* (1443), a woman carries a naked infant who is reaching for her breast, and she holds a toddler at her left hand, who waits patiently for her turn (Figure 6.14). Next to her, a poor man receives new clothes and a lame beggar crouches on the floor. Another woman-and-child-couple lines up in the background for their bread ration. These frescoes are exceptional for their "reality-effect," i.e., the amount of interior



Figure 6.14: Domenico di Bartolo, The Distribution of Alms, 1443, Detail

detail depicted, the lively composition of their many varied figures, and the naturalistic representation of both alms-seekers and officials working for the hospital. The women-and-child dyads and triads are particularly noteworthy for the care Bartolo took in depicting them in a range of different narrative poses and configurations.[81] Neither the nurses nor the female beggars are particularly eroticized, probably in order to highlight their working-class status.

Another wet-nurse shown in the act of suckling a baby is featured in Ghirlandaio's fresco *The Birth of Saint John the Baptist* (1487–88) in Santa Maria Novella, Florence (Figure 5.4). In this rather solemn and stern composition, two wet-nurses vie for the same holy child, while Saint Elizabeth, poised and disciplined, sits on a throne-like bed, accepting red wine and receiving a stream of female visitors.[82] A classicizing "dovizia," carrying a fruit basket and another flask of wine, approaches from the right.[83] The fresco is unique for its depiction of a suckling baby – in all other confinement room scenes except for Tintoretto's sixteenth-century versions, baby Mary and baby John are being washed and swaddled, never nursed.[84] Art historians have pointed to the realistic interior settings of these, quite popular, representations of delivery rooms, but the absence of nursing scenes in the iconographic tradition indicates a formal indictment that may have derived from the apocryphal sources on which they




Figure 6.15: Marcello Fogolino, Charity, 1516–25, Predella, Detail

are based. In texts such as the *Book of James* (ca. 145 CE), which, among others, inspired Jacopo di Voragine's *Golden Legend* (ca. 1260), lots of birth assistants populate holy birthing scenes, but wet-nursing is never explicitly mentioned.[85] The violation of this prohibition in Ghirlandaio's fresco is thus all the more remarkable, since it depicts not only a non-maternal but also promiscuous nursing of baby John, who is cared for by two wet-nurses simultaneously.

Among the more eroticized lactation scenes that entered early sixteenth-century visual culture were depictions of mythological hybrid creatures. Marcello Fogolino's frieze painted for the Villa Trissino-Muttoni (1516–25) is of note, as it combines the depiction of virtues – among them, a breastfeeding *Charitas* – with a procession of sea nymphs, centaurs, and Eros figures (Figure 6.15). The tondo featuring Charity is being held by a male sea creature, on whose curvy fishtail a naked Nereid lounges. Charity is bare-breasted and surrounded by three children. Next to the mermaid couple a dragon opens its muzzle. He faces a winged sphinx, who breastfeeds a mermaid baby and holds up a tiny dragon in her right hand. According to Gunter Schweikhart, an ancient sarcophagus inspired the mythological portions of this frieze.[86] Why Fogolino combined the portrayal of Christian and humanistic virtues with the depiction of ancient hybrid sea creatures and centaurs, mirroring Charity with a breastfeeding sphinx, remains a mystery, but the effect of Charity being showcased by a long-tailed merman is decidedly ironic. Also noteworthy is Fogolino's depiction of Pietas, consisting of an oversized woman offering a bread roll to an old bearded man whose head reaches up to her bosom (Figure 6.16). An uncanny resemblance to Pero and Cimon emerges, even if the two do not share any milk. All virtues other than Charity are depicted in formal analogy to Pietas.



Figure 6.16: Marcello Fogolino, Pietas, 1516–25, Predella, Detail

A similar conflation of mermaids and Charity appears in a painting attributed to Giulio Romano and his workshop, completed during his Mantovan period (1527–45).[87] It shows a lovely mermaid with five breasts, arranged in a semi-circle on her chest, from which seven mermaid children of varying ages suckle eagerly (Figure 1.43). The group seems to be protected by a giant shell in the back; the mermaid babies' snake-like, curvy tails are hopelessly intertwined. Maybe this whimsical and thoroughly eroticized Charity was inspired by Giovanni Maria Falconetto's polymast statue from his *Archaeological Landscape,* a fresco adorning the Sala dello Zodiaco in the Palazzo d'Arco in Mantua (before 1535).[88] This dreamlike, fantastical figure sprouts eleven breasts from which milk drips onto tiny naked children. As enigmatic allegory, which probably embodies Nature and Abundance, she opens both arms in a gesture of welcome and generosity.[89]

Also around 1520, Venetian painters developed what I like to call the iconography of the "breastfeeding woman in a corner," i.e., representations of Charity-like figures that function as decorative details, allegories, and narrative elements of the biblical plots they embellish.[90] They are usually placed in one of the paintings' bottom corners, thus foreshortened and highly visible, dominating the picture plane. At the same time, they are marginalized figures, crouching at the edges of the composition, not directly participating in the events they witness. The first example of this mixed use of Charity – half allegory, half narrative bystander – is Titian's woodcut variously entitled *Moses Divides the Water* or *The Drowning of the Pharaoh's Host in the Red Sea* (1515–17) (Figure 6.17).[91] In the lower right corner of this woodcut, and next to Moses commanding the waters, sits a woman who nurses her child, one breast



Figure 6.17: Titian, Moses Divides the Water, 1515–17, Detail



Figure 6.18: Giovanni Antonio Coróna, The Preaching of Saint Anthony, 1509, Detail

exposed. Facing the beholder, she seems oblivious to the momentous events Moses unleashes. Entirely absorbed in her task, she smiles at the nursling who caresses her cheek. At the same time, she is part of the Israelites' flight and rescue, foreshadowing and anticipating their promise of peace and prosperity.

A similar, narrative use of Charity is evidenced in Giovanni Antonio Coróna's fresco of *The Preaching of Saint Anthony* in the Scuola del Santo in



Figure 6.19: Tintoretto, Last Supper, 1547

Padua (Figure 6.18).[92] Here a group of three women and their children faces the viewer in the lower right corner of the fresco, divided from the preacher's male audience by an ancient ruin. They lean against this architectural element, presumably a wall of a former Roman villa, which in its upper left corner is embellished with a relief of a reclining Venus and a tall vase. The woman right underneath the relief nurses her baby, eyes downcast. A toddler snuggles up to her right arm and shoulder, directly addressing the viewer. The women are protagonists of the scene, listening intently to Saint Anthony's sermon, but they also function as symbols by embodying the dawn of a new era, replacing the erotic consumption of Venus's breasts with the spiritual practice of charity.

A generation later, this mixed use of Charity figures – passive and active, allegorical and narrative – would become the hallmark of Tintoretto's religious paintings, starting with his *Last Supper* in San Marcuola (1547) (Figure 6.19), *The Miracle of Saint Mark Freeing the Slave* (1548),[93] *The Miracle of the Loaves and Fishes* (1545–50),[94] and *The Presentation of the Virgin* (1552) (Figure 6.20), culminating in his decorative program for the Scuola Grande di San Rocco (1575–87).[95] Tintoretto's representations of women engaged in reproductive activities – including begging, the serving of food, and nursing – are complex. In *The Presentation of the Virgin,* nursing Charities, probably inspired by the begging woman-with-child couple in Titian's painting of the same title (1534–38), are decoratively placed on the temple's intricately embellished staircase, dwarfing the three-year-old Virgin Mary in the back. In his *Last Supper* of San Marcuola, two serving women approach the apostles, one carrying a



Figure 6.20: Tintoretto, The Presentation of the Virgin, 1552, Detail

chalice with wine, the other one bringing a platter with bread. This latter servant also carries a naked infant on her arm, Charity-like, and is accompanied by a toddler to her right. Also in *The Miracle of Saint Mark Freeing the Slave* and in *The Miracle of the Loaves and Fishes,* women with small children in their care accompany the protagonists. In all these instances, the women are reminiscent of passive Charity figures, i.e., women with small children in their care asking for alms, but they also embody the active values of Charity. Dispensing the spiritual nourishment of milk, they anticipate the Virgin's nursing of Christ and accompany Jesus in his offering of bread and wine.

Tintoretto is, to my knowledge, unique in incorporating Charities into his various renderings of the *Last Supper,* i.e., women engaged in the highly symbolic acts of serving bread and wine to the apostles or asking for scraps from Jesus's table. Charities often serve as visual points of entry into Tintoretto's religious paintings, promoting his view of charitable activities as the most important value of Catholicism, embodying and anticipating Christ's promise of redemption. They also connect the Old Testament with the Gospels visually and semantically, as in the Scuola Grande di San Rocco. In his *Circumcision of Christ* (1587), a breastfeeding mother waits patiently for her turn, watching as baby Christ is being circumcised (Figure 6.4); in *Moses Striking the Rock* (1577), a nursing woman mirrors and doubles Moses's miracle of spouting life-giving fluids;[96] and in *The Baptism of Christ* (1578), the suckling mother's illuminated breast competes with Christ's shoulder, foreshadowing his sacrifice and promise of redemption to come.[97]

Charity became a highly embattled concept ever since German Protestants started doubting the redemptive value of charitable acts and questioned the theoretical value of allegorical representations in religious art and literature. But already long before the onset of the Reformation in 1517, Charity had crossed into the secular realm as a rather complex and multifaceted virtue. Adult nursing scenes that may have been inspired by Maximus's anecdotes blurred the boundaries between ancient Pietas and medieval Caritas. In 1150, for example, a manuscript preserved in the convent library of Engelberg was decorated with the image of a woman from whose naked breasts two old men



Figure 6.21: Woman Nurses Two Old Men from her Breasts, ca. 1150, Illumination, Detail



Figure 6.22: The Six Ages of Man, 13th c., Illumination, Detail

suckle milk (Figure 6.21). Wearing papal accoutrements such as mitre and stole, she surely represents Ecclesia nursing her believers.[98] A century later, in a "moralized Bible" from Toledo, an illumination of *The Six Ages of Man* shows a young woman nursing a seated, bearded old man (Figure 6.22).[99] And in 1491, a Flemish illumination of Boetius's *On the Consolation of Philosophy* shows Philosophy nursing her adult male devotees (Figure 6.23), possibly adapting Pisano's theme of *Grammar Nursing her Pupils* (1302–11) (Figure 6.24).[100]

In the fifteenth century, images of all-female lactation scenes started to appear, due to the popularity of Maximus's mother-daughter story and its adaptation by Boccaccio, as already mentioned (Chapter 4). Three French illuminations of Boccaccio's young Roman woman and her mother represent the very first renderings of all-female lactation scenes in the visual arts (Figures 1.5, 4.4 and 4.5). In 1473, the motif appears as a woodcut in a German print version of Boccaccio's *Famous Women* (Figure 4.6).[101] In later centuries, Maximus's mother-daughter couple decreased in popularity, especially compared to the fortune Pero and Cimon started to enjoy. It re-appeared on an early



Figure 6.23: Philosophy, Sitting on a Throne, Nursing Boethius and another Philosopher from her Breasts, 1491, Illumination

sixteenth-century bronze plaque (Figure 1.7), a carved chessboard by Hans Kels the Elder (1537) (Figure 1.9), a French woodcut by Sébastien Nivelle (1572) (Figure 2.4), and a beautiful drawing by Guercino (1591–1666) (Figure 3.12), in addition to Poussin's *The Gathering of the Manna* (Figure 3.3).[102] Andor Pigler even lists an oil painting by Gregorio Lazzarini (1655–1730), which, however,



Figure 6.24: Giovanni Pisano, Grammar, 1302–11, Detail

is no longer extant.[103] Three further *Roman Charities* of the mother-daughter variety appeared in the revolutionary period.

A further expansion – and possibly confusion – of Charity's meaning and associations came as a result of the success enjoyed by Maximus's story of Pero and Cimon since the later fifteenth century. Lactation imagery was, or would become, fairly complex by the time Elena Duglioli performed her spiritual nursing sessions. Adult breastfeeding scenes had entered visual culture, and Charity was eroticized to the point of becoming circumspect as a religious value. Scientific curiosity about the female body, in tandem with artists' desire for its anatomically "correct" visualization and classicizing eroticization, opened up a discursive space for the attribution of new significations to the lactating breast. Elena seized the opportunity to insert herself into a highly charged debate, by proposing to endow the practice of adult nursing with a spiritual meaning she may have derived from saints' legends, in open defiance of contemporary discoveries about the erogenous effects of stimulation of the nipple. She may, of course, also have been prompted by news about the use of wet-nurses by aging male clergy in Rome (see Chapter 4). Her death in 1520 concluded a long chapter in the history of medieval thinking, dreaming, and

meditating upon the female breast as a signifier of religious desire, symbol of unmediated access to God's promise of redemption, and sign of another world to come. In the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Charity and the Madonna Lactans continued to be painted on occasion but had to compete for meaning in a visual universe that now included queer lactation scenes such as Giulio Romano's *Jupiter Suckled by the Goat Amalthea* (before 1531) (Figure 6.25), Tintoretto's *Creation of the Milky-Way* (1575–80),[104] and Ribera's *Bearded Woman* (1631) (Figure 5.2). Even Venus, quintessential object of desire, was occasionally shown as having breasts full of milk, as in Paolo Veronese's *Venus and Mars United by Love* (1570s) (Figure 5.3) and Rubens's *Minerva Protects Pax from Mars* (1630) (Figure 3.16).[105] But most importantly, Charity and the Madonna Lactans had to stake out their territory vis-à-vis the burgeoning iconography of Pero and Cimon, which eventually came to eclipse the intelligibility of a religiously enhanced breastfeeding picture. Lactation imagery had become highly differentiated and complex since at least the sixteenth century, but a common characteristic of all those breastfeeding mythological creatures, wet-nurses, goddesses, and Charities is an emphasis on the non-exclusively maternal use of their milk and the eroticization of their lactating breasts. While the promiscuity of milk exchange seems to provide a counter-discourse to the "straight" and heavily policed line in which paternal blood was supposed to be passed down the generational ladder, the lactating virginal breast signified the utopian dimension of spiritual desire in Catholicism. In both contexts, lactation imagery appears as a heavily allegorized and "other" form of speech – or visual



Figure 6.25: Giulio Bonasone, after Giulio Romano, Jupiter Suckled by the Goat Amalthea, after 1531

rhetoric – that rivaled and threatened to subvert the normative legal discourse on family formation and the church's institutionalized practices of devotion. Pero and Cimon are important protagonists in this visual trend to configure the lactating breast as a queer, i.e. non-normative, signifier of desire.

In concluding, I would like to suggest how linking theories on allegory with Freud's language of the unconscious might open up new ways of thinking about the lactating breast in medieval and Renaissance art. Already in 1980, Joel Fineman proposed that figurative speech might indicate the allegorical structure of desire, assuming "that the movement of allegory, like dream-work, enacts a wish." Fineman claims that psychoanalysis itself is not only the "critical response to allegory ... but the extension and conclusion of the classic allegorical tradition from which it derives."[106] This assumption has various ramifications of interest for the current project. It supports the initial argument that allegories, as images or gendered rhetorical figures, need to be seen as instances of "other speech." Their dreamlike or non-verbal figurative language reminds of, highlights, and re-enacts a dynamic of repression – and regression – that emerged in antiquity. The invention of a male public sphere and its concomitant legal system and dialectic metaphysics that denied women subject status was crucial for these forms of "other speech" to emerge. In psychoanalytic language, allegories function as prime objects of desire insofar as they represent the re-emergence of the repressed or the excluded. In Fineman's view, psychoanalysis is based on the decoding of allegories and on the production of allegorical knowledge in return.

Of course, it is well known that Freud, followed by Lacan, was never seriously interested in the kind of maternal imagery presently under investigation. Despite the fact that he surrounded himself with ancient artifacts such as *Isis Nursing Horus,* he invented, i.e., named and defined, the Oedipus complex as formative of modern subjectivity.[107] In Freud's reading of Sophocles's tragedy, disaster ensues because of Oedipus's unintended violation of an incest taboo. Oedipus's downfall is seen as symbolic of the castration anxiety children experience when fantasizing about violating their father's prohibition of continued, and unmediated, access to the mother. However, Oedipus himself never enjoyed such mother-child intimacy in the nursing stage from which Freud's and Lacan's patients may have needed to be weaned. After being abandoned by his birthmother, a shepherd took him to Corinth, where King Polybius and Queen Merope became his foster parents. Since Merope was childless, she most certainly employed a wet-nurse to raise him. Oedipus would have never dreamed of violating the taboo against mixing milk with blood, i.e., sleeping with his nurse.[108] Likewise, there is no mention of him having erotic interest in his foster mother. The taboo he did transgress – inadvertently – supported a new order he was not familiar with: the emerging law of the father that singled out the birthmother and her offspring as constitutive of family relations based

on the fiction of paternal "blood." Oedipus's story is shocking because of the severity of his punishment rather than the danger of his transgression: sex with one's "biological" mother who abandoned her infant at birth. Only from the point of view of a thoroughly patriarchal culture such as Sophocles's Athens or Freud's Vienna could this "crime" be interpreted as a violation that engendered chaos and anarchy and as the construction of a universally valid economy of desire based on a parricidal death-wish, respectively.

Approaching the myth from the perspective of Oedipus's unknown nurse is useful, because a focus on milk-kinship renders concrete the many critiques that feminists have waged against Freud's interpretation of the story. Especially poignant are Griselda Pollock and Bracha Ettinger in their efforts to propose the sacred, the visual, and the maternal as alternatives to Freud's and Lacan's phallo-centric systems of signification.[109] In Pollock's language, the allegory of Charity seems to be exactly what Lacan's law of the father aims to suppress: "In this model, the initial dyad of Other and Child, Mother and Child in which the Mother includes all Others and carers, yields under the Father's Law. His name (nom) / prohibition (non) denies the Mother to the Child: the incest taboo."[110] My contention is that such "yielding" to the law of the father refers to a long and complicated historical process that was by no means linear. Medieval and Renaissance lactation imagery suggests that during this time, proposals of alternative models of kinship, signification, and belonging were quite numerous, amounting to a whole agenda of criticizing patriarchal law and politics. Among art historians, Patricia Simons has called most convincingly for a historicization of Lacanian concepts, laying out in great detail how the Renaissance phallus differed from its modern counterpart by incorporating associations with fertility, and focusing on ejaculation rather than erection.[111] I would like to go beyond her study by proposing the lactating breast as a powerful signifier of desire in its own right, arguing against recent notions of the Renaissance breast as metonymically always pointing to "something else" – the vagina – and remaining firmly ensconced within a phallic erotic economy.[112] In my eyes, allegories of Charity, the Madonna Lactans, and surrounding lactation imagery, including the iconography of Pero and Cimon, celebrate milk sharing in distinction and opposition to paternal models of blood transfer.

Notes

1 | Sextus Pompeius Festus, *De verborum significatu*, livres I et II, ed. and transl. by Savagner (Paris: Panckoucke, 1846); http://remacle.org/bloodwolf/erudits/Festus/p.htm; [accessed 4/23/13].

2 | See, for example: *Kourotrophos,* Cypriot, 3rd quarter of 6th century BCE, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. no. 74.51.2526. Stephanie Lynn Budin, *Images of Woman and Child from the Bronze Age: Reconsidering Fertility, Maternity, and Gender in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

3 | Theodora Hadzisteliou Price, *Kourotrophos: Cults and Representations of the Greek Nursing Deities* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 199–212, especially 202.

4 | *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae: Two Handbooks of Greek Mythology*, ed. and transl. by R. Scott Smith and Stephen M. Trzaskoma (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2007), 174.

5 | *Isis Nursing Horus,* Egyptian, 664–630 BCE, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. no. 23.6.9. Price, *Kourotrophos,* 212.

6 | Waldemar Deonna, "La légende de Pero et de Micon et l'allaitement symbolique," *Latomus* 13 (1954): 140–66; 356–75; Larissa Bonfante, "Nursing Mothers in Classical Art," in: *Naked Truths: Women, Sexuality, and Gender in Classical Art and Archaeology*, ed. by Ann Olga Koloski-Ostrow and Claire L. Lyons (New York: Routledge, 1997), 174–96, especially 180.

7 | Bonfante, "Nursing Mothers in Classical Art," 184–85. Patrizia Birchler Emery, "De la nourrice à la dame de compagnie: le cas de la trophos en Grèce antique," *Paedagogica Historica* 46, no. 6 (2010): 751-61.

8 | Ioli Kalavrezou, "Images of the Mother: When the Virgin became the 'Meter Theou,'" *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 44 (1990): 165–72, especially 166.

9 | Geri Parlby, "The Origins of Marian Art: The Evolution of Marian Imagery in the Western Church until AD 431," in: *Mary: The Complete Resource*, ed. by Sarah Jane Boss (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 106–29, especially 111–14.

10 | Parlby, "The Origins of Marian Art," 111–14.

11 | *Madonna Lactans,* 2nd century CE, Rome, Catacombs of Priscilla. Kalavrezou, "Images of the Mother," 165.

12 | Bonfante, "Nursing Mothers in Classical Art," 184.

13 | Kalavrezou, "Images of the Mother."

14 | Alfredo Tradigo, *Icons and Saints of the Eastern Orthodox Church*, transl. by Stephen Sartarelli (Los Angeles: J.P. Getty Museum, 2006), 183.

15 | I would like to thank Matteo Casini for this reference.

16 | Miri Rubin, *Mother of God: A History of the Virgin Mary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 40–42, 63–66, 211–16.

17 | Gianna Pomata, "Legami di sangue, legami di seme: consanguinità e agnazione nel diritto romano," *Quaderni Storici* 86, no. 2 (1994): 299–334.

18 | Quoted in James J. Paxson, *The Poetics of Personification* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 12.

19 | Demetrius of Phalerum, *On Style*, 365. Quoted in Theresa M. Kelley, *Reinventing Allegory* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1997), 18.
20 | Kelley, *Reinventing Allegory*, 17.
21 | Kelley, *Reinventing Allegory*, 5.
22 | Paxson, *The Poetics of Personification*, 18, 19.
23 | Anon., *Rhetorica Ad Herennium,* IV, 66; quoted in: Paxson, *The Poetics of Personification*, 13–14.
24 | Kelley, *Reinventing Allegory*, 20–21.
25 | Kelley, *Reinventing Allegory*, 22.
26 | Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, ed. and transl. by D.R. Shackleton Bailey (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000), vol. I, V.4. ext. 1, 501–03.
27 | Maureen Quilligan, *The Language of Allegory: Defining the Genre* (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1979), 31.
28 | Erich Auerbach, *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature* (Theory and History of Literature, vol. 9) (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984; first ed. 1959), 38.
29 | Tintoretto, *Moses Striking the Rock,* 1577, Venice, Scuola Grande di San Rocco; Tintoretto, *Elisha Multiplying the Bread,* 1577–78, Venice, Scuola Grande di San Rocco; Tintoretto, *The Baptism of Christ,* 1581, Venice, Scuola Grande di San Rocco; Tintoretto, *The Multiplication of the Loaves and Fishes,* Venice, Scuola Grande di San Rocco.
30 | Jutta Sperling, "Allegories of Charity and the Practice of Poor Relief at the Scuola Grande di San Rocco," *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 70 (2009): 119–46.
31 | Jutta Sperling, "Charity's Nudity and the Veil of Allegory," in: *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Joseph Connors*, ed. by Machtelt Israëls and Louis A. Waldman (Milan: Officina Libraria; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013), vol. I, 520–26.
32 | I am referring here to Jacques Derrida's and Luce Irigaray's critique of Western philosophy as based on binary oppositions, exclusions, and hierarchies, a view they elaborated by critically appropriating Lacan's theory of the phallus as main signifier in language.
33 | See the work of Thomas Laqueur and his critics: Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1990); Katharine Park and Lorraine Daston, "Destiny is Anatomy," review of Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (1990), *The New Republic* (18 February 1991): 53–57; Katharine Park, "Itineraries of the 'One-Sex-Body': A History of an Idea," unpublished manuscript; Jane Fair Bestor, "Ideas about Procreation and Their Influence on Ancient and Medieval Views of Kinship," in: *The Family in Italy from Antiquity to the Present*, ed. by David I. Kertzer and Richard P. Saller (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 150–67; Joan Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages: Medicine, Science, and Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 1993), Helen King, *The One-Sex Body on Trial: The Classical and Early Modern Evidence* (Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2013).

34 | On Plato's Timaeus and Luce Irigaray's critique, see Judith Butler, "The Lesbian Phallus and the Morphological Imaginary," in: Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 27–55. See also Luce Irigaray's critique of Plotin. Luce Irigaray, "Eine Mutter aus spiegelndem Eis," in: *Speculum: Spiegel des anderen Geschlechts* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1980; first French ed. 1974); see also Plotin, "Die Affektionsfreiheit des Unkörperlichen," in: *Schriften*, ed. by Richard Harder, Willy Theiler, and Rudolf Beutler (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1962), vol. II, 218–25.

35 | John Sallis, *Chorology: On Beginning in Plato's Timaeus* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), 98–99, 110–11.

36 | Gianna Pomata, "Blood Ties and Semen Ties: Consanguinity and Agnation in Roman Law," in: *Gender, Kinship, Power: a Comparative and Interdisciplinary History,* ed. by Mary Jo Maynes, Ann Waltner, Birgitte Soland, and Ulrike Strasser (New York: Routledge, 1996), 43–64; Bestor, "Ideas about Procreation."

37 | Deonna, "La légende de Pero et de Micon."

38 | According to Peter Parkes, fosterage and wet-nursing practices established rival family systems in Ireland, the Balkans, and the Mughal Empire, complementing, and sometimes even supplanting, paternal "blood" bonds. Peter Parkes, "Alternative Social Structures and Foster Relations in the Hindu Kush: Milk Kinship Allegiance in Former Mountain Kingdoms of Northern Pakistan," *Comparative Studies in History and Society* 43, no. 1 (2001): 4–36; idem, "Fostering Fealty: A Comparative Analysis of Tributary Allegiances of Adoptive Kinship," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 45, no. 4 (2003): 741–82; idem, "Fosterage, Kinship, and Legend: When Milk Was Thicker Than Blood?" *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46, no. 3 (2004): 587–615. To this day, milk-kinship as defined by Islamic law establishes powerful incest taboos that mirror those of birth families. Parkes, "Alternative Social Structures;" Avner Giladi, *Infants, Parents, and Wet Nurses: Medieval Islamic Views on Breastfeeding and Their Social Implications* (Leiden: Brill, 1999); Hocine Benkheira, "'The Milk of the Male': Kinship, Maternity and Breastfeeding in Medieval Islam," in: *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations: Images, Rhetorics, Practices*, ed. by Jutta Gisela Sperling (Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2013), 21–36.

39 | Caritas becomes "piety's" heiress also because of both virtues' antagonistic relationship to "justice." If Pero remains victorious over the Roman court system by achieving her father's release from prison, Charity is seen as complementing Justice, swords raised, on fifteenth-century decorations of the Ducal Palace in Venice. Bartolomeo Bon, *Charity,* 1438–41, Venice, Ducal Palace, Porta della Carta. David Rosand, *Painting in Cinquecento Venice: Titian, Veronese, Tintoretto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 127; Anne Markham Schulz, *The Sculpture of Giovanni and Bartolomeo Bon and Their Workshop* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 68, no. 3) (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1978), 33, 39.

40 | Robert Freyhan, "The Evolution of the Caritas Figure in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 11 (1948): 68–86; on the afterlife of cornucopia-bearing women as dovizie, see Adrian W.B. Randolph, *Engaging Symbols: Gender, Politics, and Public Art in Fifteenth-Century Florence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 29, 40.

41 | Tino da Camaino, *Charity,* ca. 1321, Florence, Museo Bardino.

42 | Giovanni di Balduccio, *Charity,* ca. 1330, Washington, National Gallery, Samuel H. Kress Collection, inv. no. 1960.5.4.

43 | Beth Williamson, *The Madonna of Humility: Development, Dissemination & Reception, ca. 1340–1400* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009), 115–18.

44 | Max Seidel, "Ubera Matris: Die vielschichtige Bedeutung eines Symbols in der mittelalterlichen Kunst," *Städel-Jahrbuch* 6, Neue Folge (1977): 41–99, especially 68.

45 | Seidel, "Ubera matris," 61.

46 | Joel Fineman, "The Structure of Allegorical Desire," *October* 12 (Spring 1980): 46–66, especially 48.

47 | Quoted in Seidel, "Ubera matris," 75. Caroline W. Bynum reports that when Mechthild asked Christ why he bled after he had died, Christ answered: "The blood issued forth by grace, just as did the milk that I drank from my virginal mother." Caroline W. Bynum, *Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 164.

48 | Lorenzo Monaco, *The Intercession of Christ and the Virgin,* before 1402, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. no. 53.37.

49 | "For Christ, in his humility, is our milk." William of Saint Thierry, *Exposition on the Song of Songs*, transl. by Columba Hart (Spencer, Massachusetts: Cistercian Publications, 1970), I.46, 36; quoted in: Thomas of Cantimpré, *The Collected Saints' Lives: Abbot John of Cantimpré, Christina the Astonishing, Margaret of Ypres, and Lutgard of Aywières*, ed. and introduced by Barbara Newman; transl. by Margot H. King and Barbara Newman (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), 132, note 12.

50 | Daniel Cramer, *Zehen Catechismus Predigten. Das ist: Die Vernunfftige Lautere Milch Des H. Catechismus Lutheri öffentlich gehalten und nunmehr zum andern mahl in truck geben durch Danielem Cramerum der H. Schrift Doctorem Pastoren der Stiffts Kirchen und Professoren des Furstlichen Pedagogij zu alten Stettin* (Alt-Stettin: David Rehten, 1635), no pagination.

51 | Giovanni Thiepolo Primicerio di San Marco, *Trattato delle santissime reliquie, ultimamente ritrovate nel Santuario della Chiesa di San Marco* (Venice: appresso Antonio Pinelli, 1618), 43–45.

52 | Desiderius Erasmus, "A Pilgrimage for Religion's Sake," in: *The Colloquies of Erasmus*, transl. by N. Bailey, ed. by the Rev. E. Johnson (London: Reeves and Turner, 1878), vol. 2, 1–37, here p. 5; http://lf-oll.s3.amazonaws.com/titles/726/0046-02_Bk.pdf; [accessed 5/6/14]. I would like to thank Kenneth Gouwens for having mentioned this text to me. For the identification of Glaucoplutus, the recipient of Mary's letter, as Ulrich Zwingli, see Hilmar M. Pabel, *Conversing with God: Prayer in Erasmus'*

Pastoral Writings (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 84; http://books.google.de/books?id=mPLyQnOWVewC&pg=PA84&lpg=PA84&dq=glaucoplutus&source=bl&ots=huCkATInOn&sig=9g1PkgVwThYp_E5ay7dJwN1FegY&hl=en&sa=X&ei=fPFoU9bYF8_7yAO8jIGwCw&ved=0CC8Q6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=glaucoplutus&f=false; [accessed 5/6/14].

53 | Erasmus, "A Pilgrimage for Religion's Sake," 19; http://lf-oll.s3.amazonaws.com/titles/726/0046-02_Bk.pdf [accessed 5/6/14].

54 | Caroline W. Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987).

55 | "When she turned her eyes to herself, she immediately saw that the dry paps of her virginal breasts were dripping sweet milk against the very law of nature." Cantimpré, *The Collected Saints' Lives,* 132.

56 | Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast,* 118–23.

57 | Gianna Pomata, "A Christian Utopia of the Renaissance: Elena Duglioli's Spiritual and Physical Motherhood (ca. 1510–1520)," in: *Von der dargestellten Person zum erinnerten Ich: Europäische Selbstzeugnisse als historische Quellen (1500–1850)*, ed. by Kaspar von Greyerz, Hans Medick, and Patrice Veit (Köln: Böhlau, 2001), 323–53, especially 334.

58 | Raymond of Capua, *The Life of Catherine of Siena*, translated, introduced and annotated by Conleth Kearns; preface by Vincent de Couesnongle (Wilmington, Del.: Glazier, 1980), 180, 183, 189.

59 | Raymond of Capua, *The Life of Catherine of Siena*, 156.

60 | According to Gauthier de Coincy (1177–1236), Abbot of the monastery of Saint Médard in Soissons, the lactating Virgin Mary cured one of his monks from a potentially lethal episode of inexplicable weakness. Margaret R. Miles, "The Virgin's One Bare Breast: Female Nudity and Religious Meaning in Tuscan Early Renaissance Culture," in: *The Female Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Susan Rubin Suleiman (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1986), 193–208. *L'allégorie dans la peinture: l'allégorie de la charité au XVIIe siècle,* ed. by Alain Tapié, Caroline Joubert, Jennifer Montague, and Grisèle Jouet (Caen: Musée des Beaux-Arts de Caen, 1986), 34–35. Caroline W. Bynum, "Jesus as Mother and Abbot as Mother: Some Themes in Twelfth-Century Cistercian Writings," *Harvard Theological Review* 70, nos. 3–4 (1977): 257–84.

61 | "Madonna Clare herself used to tell how once in a vision it seemed to her that she was carrying a basin of ... water to Saint Francis, with a towel for drying hands, and she was going up a staircase but with so light a step as if she were walking on flat ground. And having reached the Saint he bared his breast and told the virgin Clare: 'Come, receive and suck' ... And after she suckled, the round mouth of the breast whereof the milk had flowed stayed between her lips and she took it in her hands and looked at it, and it was as bright and shining as gold, so that she saw all of herself reflected in it as in a mirror." Quoted in: Pomata, "A Christian Utopia of the Renaissance," 333, note 32.

62 | Helga Kraft, "Töchter, die keine Muetter werden: Nonnen, Amazonen, Mätressen. Hildegard von Bingen, Mechthild von Magdeburg, Grimmelshausens Courasche, Lessings Marwood in Miss Sara Simpson," in: *Mütter – Töchter – Frauen: Weiblichkeitsbilder in der Literatur*, ed. by Helga Kraft and Elke Liebs (Stuttgart; Weimar: Verlag J.B. Metzler, 1993), 35–52, Figure 3. Unfortunately, Kraft does not give any information about the origin and whereabouts of this illumination.

63 | Jo Ann McNamara, "The Need to Give: Suffering and Female Sanctity in the Middle Ages," in: *Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Timea Szell (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 199–221; Sperling, "Allegories of Charity."

64 | "There is ... little evidence that women identified with the Virgin's power." Miles, "The Virgin's One Bare Breast," 205. See also idem, *A Complex Delight: The Secularization of the Breast 1350–1750* (Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2008), in which Miles expands her earlier arguments.

65 | Miles, "The Virgin's One Bare Breast," 206.

66 | "Only the blessed Virgin Mary has done more for God, or just as much, as God has done for all humankind." Miles, "The Virgin's One Bare Breast," 202.

67 | Clarissa W. Atkinson, *The Oldest Vocation: Christian Motherhood in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991); Rosemary Drage Hale, "Imitatio Mariae: Motherhood Motifs in Late Medieval German Spirituality," (Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1992).

68 | Naomi Yavneh, "To Bare or Not Too Bare: Sofonisba Anguissola's Nursing Madonna and the Womanly Art of Breastfeeding," in: *Maternal Measures: Figuring Caregiving in the Early Modern Period*, ed. by Naomi J. Miller and Naomi Yavneh (Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2000), 65–81, especially 69; Charlene Villaseñor Black, "The Moralized Breast in Early Modern Spain," in: *The Material Culture of Sex, Procreation, and Marriage in Premodern Europe*, ed. by Anne L. McClanan and Karen Rosoff Encarnacion (New York: Palgrave 2002), 191–219, especially 192.

69 | Megan Holmes, "Disrobing the Virgin: The Madonna Lactans in Fifteenth-Century Florentine Art," in: *Picturing Women in Renaissance and Baroque Italy*, ed. by Geraldine A. Johnson and Sara F. Matthews Grieco (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 167–95.

70 | Pomata, "A Christian Utopia of the Renaissance," 334.

71 | Pomata, "A Christian Utopia of the Renaissance," 343.

72 | Pomata, "A Christian Utopia of the Renaissance," 335–36.

73 | "And it is very true that if the nipple is touched, it immediately raises like the virga [penis]; and thus because of the connection of uterus and penis with the breasts, these organs are aroused, especially in those who are already prepared and ready for coition." Quoted in: G. Pomata, "A Christian Utopia of the Renaissance," 348–49. See also Katharine Park, *Secrets of Women: Gender, Generation, and the Origins of Human Dissection* (New York: Zone Books; distributed by Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2006), 168.

74 | Park, *Secrets of Women*, 176.

75 | On representations of the breast in Renaissance art, see Marilyn Yalom, *A History of the Breast* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997).

76 | Miles, "The Virgin's One Bare Breast."

77 | Andrea Guardi, *Charity,* 1452, Pisa, Santa Maria della Spina, Choir Relief, now in National Museum of San Matteo.

78 | Filippino Lippi, *Charity,* 1487–1502, Florence, Santa Maria Novella, Capella Strozzi.

79 | See the paintings by Domenico Ghirlandaio and workshop (ca. 1490) and Cosimo Rosselli (1492). Holmes, "Disrobing the Virgin," 180–81.

80 | Holmes, "Disrobing the Virgin," 183.

81 | For the allegorical and political significance of Bartolo's frescoes, see Diana Bullen Presciutti, "Picturing Institutional Wet Nursing in Medicean Siena," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations,* 129–46; see also idem, "*Carità e potere*: Representing the Medici Grand Dukes as 'Fathers of the Innocenti,'" *Renaissance Studies* 24, no. 2 (2010): 234–59.

82 | Patricia Simons, "The Social and Religious Context of Iconographic Oddity: Breastfeeding in Ghirlandaio's *Birth of the Baptist,*" in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations,* 213–34.

83 | On the civic importance of Florentine "dovizie," i.e., figures of abundance and generosity, see Adrian Randolph, *Engaging Symbols*.

84 | On Tintoretto's paintings of *The Birth of Saint John the Baptist,* see Jutta Gisela Sperling, "Wet Nurses, Midwives, and the Virgin Mary in Tintoretto's *Birth of Saint John the Baptist* (1563)," in: *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations,* 235–54.

85 | On confinement room scenes, see Jacqueline Marie Musacchio, *The Art and Ritual of Childbirth in Renaissance Italy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999).

86 | Gunter Schweikhart, "Antikenkopie und -verwandlung im Fries des Marcello Fogolino aus der Villa Trissino-Muttoni (Ca' Impenta) bei Vicenza. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Villendekoration des frühen 16. Jahrhunderts im Veneto," *Mitteilungen des kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 20, no. 3 (1976): 351–78, especially 358–60.

87 | Ernest Phillipe Alphonse Law, *A Historical Catalogue of the Pictures in the Royal Collection at Hampton Court* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1881), 96, entry 305.

88 | Giovanni Maria Falconetto, *Archaeological Landscape,* before 1535, Mantua, Palazzo d'Arco, Sala dello Zodiaco.

89 | *Giulio Romano*, exhibition catalog, Palazzo Te, Mantua, September 1–November 12, 1989, ed. by Ernst Gombrich et al. (Milan: Electa, 1989), 308. On polymast figures denoting abundance and excess in sixteenth-century French art, see Rebecca Zorach, *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold: Abundance and Excess in the French Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

90 | See also H.R. Rookmaker, "'Charity' in Seventeenth Century Art," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 23 (1972): 61–66.

91 | *Tiziano e la silografia Veneziana del cinquecento*, exhibition catalog, Fondazione Giorgio Cini, 1976, ed. by Michelangelo Muraro and David Rosand (Vicenza, N. Pozza, 1976) Scheda 8–B. My thanks to Monika Schmitter, who mentioned this image to me.

92 | *La pittura nel Veneto*: *Il Cinquecento*, ed. by Mauro Lucco et al. (Milan: Electa, 1996–), vol. 1, 173, Figure 218. This image was mentioned to me by Monika Schmitter as well.

93 | Tintoretto, *Saint Mark Freeing the Slave,* 1548, Venice, Galleria dell'Accademia.

94 | Tintoretto, *The Miracle of the Loaves and Fishes,* 1545–50, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. no. 13.75.

95 | *Jacopo Tintoretto, Le opere sacre e profane*, ed. by Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi (Milan: Alfieri, Gruppo Editoriale Electa, 1982), 2 vols. Diana Bullen Presciutti mentions a wet-nurse who represents one of the seven works of mercy, namely, "Feeding the Hungry," in a fifteenth-century fresco in the church of San Fiorenzo in the Piedmontese town of Bastia Mondovi. Presciutti, "Picturing Institutional Wet-Nursing," 140, note 27.

96 | Tintoretto, *Moses Striking the Rock,* 1577, Venice, Scuola Grande di San Rocco.

97 | Tintoretto, *The Baptism of Christ,* 1581, Venice, Scuola Grande di San Rocco; J. Sperling, "Allegories of Charity."

98 | *Pietas e allattamento filiale: La vicenda – l'exemplum – l'iconografia*; colloquio di Urbino, 2–3 maggio, 1996, ed. by Renato Raffaelli, Roberto M. Danese, and Settimio Lanciotti (Urbino: Quattro Venti, 1997), Figure VIII.1.

99 | Raffaelli et al., *Pietas e allattamento filiale*, Figure VIII.2.

100 | *Allegorie, Philosophie, Sages,* in: Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae* (1491), BN, Paris, Néerlandais 1, f. 12v. On Pisano, see Seidel, "Ubera Matris," 50–51.

101 | Giovanni Boccaccio, *De Claris Mulieribus*, transl. by Heinrich Steinhöwel, ed. by Karl Drescher (Tübingen: Litterarischer Verein Stuttgart, 1895; first German edition Ulm: Johann Zainer, 1473), 215–16.

102 | *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* 2 (1885), plate VIII; *Die Italienischen Bronzen der Renaissance und des Barock,* part II, Reliefs und Plaketten, ed. by E.F. Bange (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1922), 126, no. 959, plate 78; Albert Fidelis Butsch, *Handbook of Renaissance Ornament; 1290 designs from decorated books*, with a new introduction and captions by Alfred Werner (New York: Dover Publications, 1969), plate 130; Denis Mahon and Nicholas Turner, *The Drawings of Guercino in the Collection of her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), f. 184.

103 | Andor Pigler, *Barockthemen: eine Auswahl von Verzeichnissen zur Ikonographie des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1974; first ed. Budapest: Verlag der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1956), vol. 2, 297.

104 | Tintoretto, *The Creation of the Milky Way,* 1575–80, London, National Gallery, inv. no. 1313.

105 | On Veronese, see Gianna Pomata, unpublished paper; on Rubens, see Lisa Rosenthal, *Gender, Politics, and Allegory in the Art of Rubens* (Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 2005), 48–60; see also Lisa Rosenthal, "Venus's Milk and the Temptations of Allegory in Otto Van Veen's Allegory of Temptation," in: *Early Modern Visual Allegory: Embodying Meaning*, ed. by Cristelle Baskins and Lisa Rosenthal (Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2007), 219–42.

106 | Fineman, "The Structure of Allegorical Desire," 46.

107 | Griselda Pollock, "The Object's Gaze in the Freudian Museum," in: Griselda Pollock, *Encounters in the Virtual Feminist Museum: Time, Space, and the Archive* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 67–86, especially 72.

108 | See also Marianne Novy, *Reading Adoption: Family and Difference in Fiction and Drama* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005), 37–55.

109 | Griselda Pollock, "Woman as Sign: Psychoanalytic Readings," in: Griselda Pollock, *Vision and Difference: Femininity, Feminism and Histories of Art* (New York: Routledge, 1988), 120–54; idem, "What the Graces made me do ... Time, Space and the Archive: questions of feminist method," in: Pollock, *Encounters in the Virtual Feminist Museum*, 9–38; Bracha Lichtenberg Ettinger, "Matrix and Metramorphosis," *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 4, no.3 (1992): 176–206.

110 | Griselda Pollock and Victoria Turvey Sauron, *The Sacred and the Feminine: Imagination and Sexual Difference* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 39.

111 | Patricia Simons, *The Sex of Men in Premodern Europe: A Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

112 | Zorach, *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold*, 123.

Chapter 7: Patriarchy and Its Discontents

Father-Daughter Relations and the Emergence of Absolutism

In addition to the motif's literary tradition, the medical practice of adult breastfeeding, and the allegorical meaning of breastfeeding in visual culture, legal discourse constitutes yet another horizon of expectation that a contemporary viewer might have brought to bear on representations of Roman Charity. In depicting a father's – undue or at least unusual – consumption of his daughter's body fluids for his own survival, the motif of Pero and Cimon functions as a visual commentary on contemporary father-daughter relations. Even though Whitney Davis might accuse me of "high or extreme contextualism," I hope to not displace but, rather, enhance questions of "configuration and content" with the following essay on political and legal theory.[1] In former chapters, my analysis oscillated between what Erwin Panofsky has called pre-iconographic, iconographic, and iconological recognition – that is, between seeing how a young woman breastfeeds an old man, "recognizing" that they are father and daughter, and attributing, either seriously or in jest, the meaning of "charity" to the scene – but in this chapter, I pay attention exclusively to the gendered nature of filial relationships.[2] I aim to explain in greater detail the complexity of those "relays and recursions of recognition" that a contemporary viewer might have experienced when enjoying a painting of Pero and Cimon, even though the associations deriving from legal culture are admittedly non-visual and do not elucidate any artist's particular lactation scene.[3] My observations start from the premise that kinship relationships usually operate on the basis of reciprocity or the appearance thereof.[4] Maximus's story of Pero and Cimon, however, does not explain the daughter's sacrifice in terms of mutual obligations – in contrast to his twin story of the unnamed Roman daughter and her mother. The juxtaposition with a daughter who returned her mother's love and care makes Pero's act of filial piety seem all the more unmotivated, thus strange and extraordinary. In patrilineal family systems, what do daughters owe their fathers?

Father-daughter relations were at the heart of a complex system of exclusions and displacements governing early modern family law, with immediate repercussions for mothers, wives, and sisters. Unlike ancient Roman law, which gave ample disciplinary powers to the pater familias over his wife, children, and slaves but retained the concept (if not the practice) of equal inheritance for sons and daughters, medieval and Renaissance dowry systems introduced a heavily gender-inflected system of devolution. Especially in central and northern Italy, statutory laws severed any relationship between the "legitimate" part a male heir was supposed to receive from his father and the bridal portion his sister could expect. Daughters would get a dowry as compensation for their loss – if they agreed to an arranged marriage – but had no independent claims on their fathers' patrimonies. A strict distinction between male and female lineages was the result of this gendered exclusion. Widows lost their claims to one-third of their husbands' properties, which they enjoyed under Lombard law, and had to be content with a simple return of their dowries and the right to stay in their in-laws' house to raise their children. Mothers, likewise, had no inheritance rights if their children predeceased them, and they were pressured to funnel any independent properties they might hold into their daughters' dowry accounts, to supplement or substitute for their husbands' lack of commitment vis-à-vis female descendants. Sisters were supposed to receive marriage portions that were congruous with a brother's "legitima" [a fixed ratio of the father's patrimony], but no law specified what dotal "congruity" meant in practice. Dowries could vary in size even among sisters; only sons could look forward to a predictable and even distribution of their fathers' resources, unless they lived in regions where primogeniture prevailed.[5]

The dowry system as reinvented by medieval statutory law had a huge impact on structuring father-daughter relations and would have influenced the manner in which contemporary viewers approached representations of Pero and Cimon. Not only did the incestuously sexual implications enhance the shock value of the image but also Pero's milk-offer resonated powerfully in a culture in which the legal definition of patrilineal kinship was grounded in a fiction of paternal blood being passed down the generations. In medical terms, breast milk was just another permutation of blood, seen as analogous to sperm since Berengario's – erroneous – discovery of a vein connecting men's and women's genitalia to their nipples. The view of milk's origin in blood and its structural similarity to sperm was given up in the course of the seventeenth century, when breast milk came to be seen as derivative of chyle instead. Despite the efforts of sixteenth-century Galenic anatomists to view male and female reproductive organs as commensurate – if not identical – with each other, women's body fluids never attained any legal significance in early modern Europe. The sharing of female liquids was not viewed as constitutive of family relations according to the law. Legal kinship was defined as agnatic;

resting on the Aristotelian fiction of paternal blood, it codified ties between men who could inherit from each other, with compensations being made for daughters.[6]

Women found themselves in a somewhat paradoxical situation in that they shared their fathers' blood but could not pass it on to their offspring. According to Aristotle, they lacked the seed to shape their infants in the process of generation. In this medico-legal context, Pero's nursing of her father raises important questions of reciprocity. Did her "filial piety" consist of dutifully returning, in the form of milk, an essentially paternal substance? Or did it consist of the opposite, namely, the entirely gratuitous nature of her sacrifice, given the truncated and inactive nature of his gift of blood? What did a daughter owe her father? In a culture in which gift exchange was of prime significance for the structuring of social relationships, including family ties, representations of Roman Charity may have expressed a deep unease with the gendered asymmetry of early modern family relations. Perhaps they even inspired speculations about alternative – more inclusive, less hierarchical – ways of belonging. Early modern breast milk was never just baby food; it was a powerful rival to paternal blood on the level of phallocentric signification.

Contemporary notions of "consanguinity" had nothing to do with our understanding of bi-lateral or cognatic kinship, theorized by modern legal scholars on the basis of Justinian's *Body of Civil Law* (529–64).[7] The Renaissance notion of the term meant the exact opposite, in distinction to what contemporaries called "uterine" relationships. It denoted agnatic ties exclusively, that is, the legal relationship a father had with his children conceived in a legitimate marriage. For example, Giovanni Battista De Luca (1614–83), a famous legal scholar and judge at the Rota Romana, the papal Supreme Court, calls his claimants Olimpia and Anna Maria, whose last names are not mentioned, "uterine sisters" in distinction to their maternal half-brothers, the "consanguineous" sons of Giovanni Antonio de Constantini, their mother's second husband. Needless to say, Olimpia's and Anna Maria's claims to a portion of their mother's inheritance were denied.[8]

De Luca was an avid defender of women's exclusion from inheritance rights based on Italian statutory law, in contrast to what he called Justinian's Hellenistic – meaning Orientalizing – aberrations of ancient Roman principles. Applying polemical and racist terminology, he called those more woman-friendly revisions of the sixth century CE "Judaismi" on occasion.[9] He saw the properly masculine spirit of Roman law emerging at the time of the city's foundation, when the institutions of marriage, property, and the dowry system also emerged. Roman law's "masculinity" was thus intrinsically and causally connected to the arbitrary and gendered mechanisms of exclusion it codified. Aiming to revive Rome's original patriarchal spirit, he reviewed numerous cases of appeal brought to the Rota by disenfranchised women. He

rejected all of them, reconfirming women's losses in all intestate succession cases in which the preferred heirs were distant agnatic male relatives. Losing their suits were, among others, the mother and sister of Sebastiano de Muscoli, who hoped to inherit their son's and brother's estate at equal portions with his paternal cousins;[10] Elisabetha, niece of the deceased Octavio de Casatellis, who competed with Pietro Francesco, an agnatic relative of the sixth degree, for her uncle's inheritance;[11] and Philomena, who sued her brother Astorre Benincasa for failing to provide her with a dowry.[12]

De Luca explains how the strict medieval laws were by no means "hateful" but were evocative of the conservative spirit of Roman antiquity from "that time period, when civil law was invented."[13] The number of cases brought to his court of appeal suggests a mounting discontent with agnatic statutory law, but De Luca sternly defends Italian cities' medieval abrogations of Justinian's "ius novissimus." Chiding Justinian for his abolition of the differential treatment of heirs according to sex, agnation, and cognation in cases of intestate succession, he polemicizes against the "Greek customs" that inspired his reform and "the worship of the female sex, which was dominant at the time."[14] He emphasizes that, luckily, Justinian's laws were never applied in Italy, which at the time of their proclamation was invaded by Vandals and Goths, and that subsequent Lombard law adopted exclusions of women and cognates similar to those established by their Roman predecessors. He equates the rebirth of Roman law in Italy with the glossators' return to pre-Justinian laws and customs and the subsequent promulgation of statutory law codes.[15] Unable to wrap his head around the possibility of women's rights to equal inheritance, he speculates that either women would no longer receive dowries, "with great peril to society," or they would collect multiple dowries in the form of legacies from all of their ascendant and transverse relatives on both sides, thus potentially accumulating greater shares than their male counterparts.[16] In the former case, women would lose their honor or else remain celibate – because female honor resided in obeying a father's choice of partner in a dotal marriage – while in the latter case, men's properties would be squandered on women for the questionable purpose of rendering them independent.

To his credit, De Luca did entertain the question of whether the medieval dowry corresponded to the ancient Roman "legitima," i.e., an heir's fixed portion of his or her father's inheritance. Prior jurists sometimes avoided the question of whether the dowry constituted a legal right, or else they denied it altogether. The decision was of paramount important to women, because their legal right to a congruous dowry depended on it. De Luca's analysis of statutory law on the issue was hairsplitting: "If the statute says that a daughter does not succeed in the presence of a male, but has the right to a dowry, it follows the opinion of Bartolo, that she is not owed a legitima; if however it says … that a dowered daughter does not succeed with a male … she is not excluded according

to statute."[17] The distinction, which he artfully constructs based on the sequencing of the terms "succession" and "dowry," served to determine whether in any given medieval statute, a daughter's inheritance portion or dowry was legally assimilated to the notion of a legitima. Acknowledging that "there are lots of statutes that say that the dowry substitutes for the legitima, but nowhere does the exclusion precede the mandate to endowment," he concludes that in those former cases, women enjoy the right to a dowry and that "the privileges of the legitima need to follow."[18] Such privileges consisted, first and foremost, of the inalienability of a daughter's inheritance claims, but they could be more extensive depending on the legal situation. In the Realm of Naples, for example, where statutory law had never abolished basic tenets of Byzantine law, daughters received a "dos a paragio," i.e., a dowry that was fully equivalent to the legitima.[19]

Despite his acknowledgment of an explicit relationship between the ancient Roman legitima and the dowry as constituted by medieval statutory law, De Luca promotes a strict gender-based separation of properties. In particular, he strives to disinherit mothers who aim to succeed to their children and wives expecting to inherit from their husbands. One of his favorite terms to refer to such female legacies is "oblique," which he sees in direct opposition to the ideal, "straight" transfer of properties down the agnatic line. In a protracted case about the inheritance of Duke Stefano Bassarelli, De Luca declares that his wife Lucrezia Colonna, whom her predeceased husband appointed as universal heir, "does not deserve to be called straight heir, but supremely oblique, due to the testamentary codicil."[20] This highly unusual testament of Duke Bassarelli angered his remote agnatic heirs, who claimed that his patrimony was entailed in their favor – the couple did not have children – and that the entailment trumped the testament. The ensuing litigation was about determining the validity of Bassarelli's testamentary provision in favor of his wife. Complicating factors were Lucrezia's remarriage, which was to transform her full ownership of the Duke's estate into a life-long usufruct, and the death of Lucrezia's father, who, in the case of Lucrezia's remarriage, was to be appointed universal heir charged with redistributing the estate. The issue was whether Lucrezia could retain her first husband's inheritance entirely and pass it on to her heirs, or whether she needed to return three quarters of it in recognition of the entailment. In the latter case, the question surrounds the applicability of the so-called Trebellianica, or right to retain a fourth of an inheritance entailed in someone else's favor.[21]

De Luca's recurring use of the words "oblique" and "to obliquate" in referring to Lucrezia's inheritance bears an uncanny resemblance to modern notions of the term queer. Different etymological dictionaries of the Latin language explain the term "obliquus" both spatially, as a synonym of "transverse" and "crooked," and sexually, as in "having an illegitimate origin" or

"to bastardize."[22] The eighteenth-century *Dictionary of Latin in its Entirety* by Egidio Forcellini (1688–1768), finally, adds a third definition: "descending from a woman, because cognatic descent through women is transverse [or oblique]; the right one, however, is through men."[23] In Forcellini's definition of "obliquo," contemporary notions of non-normative sexuality, which focus on illegitimate reproduction and the violation of male lineages, are joined with a general sense of "crookedness." Such lack of straightness is explicitly and concretely linked to the practice of cognatic filiation and inheritance. In a remarkable case of circular reasoning, descent through women is called oblique, transverse, or crooked because descent through men is straight and "right." De Luca's campaign against "oblique" transfers of property to female and cognatic heirs thus illustrates beautifully Michel Foucault's distinction between present-day notions of heterosexuality and an earlier stress on – straight – alliances, concepts that organize discourses on normative sexuality in both modern and early modern times, respectively.[24] Calling Lucrezia Colonna's claims on her deceased husband's estate oblique – meaning: queer – has the advantage of identifying early modern "straightness" with a peculiar form of legal reproduction rather than the performance of heteronormativity or cross-gendered object choice. In this discursive context, images of Roman Charity may be seen to celebrate, dramatize, and eroticize "queer" kinship because of the exalted and at the same time abject position of the daughter. Pero's milk-exchange obliquates, subverts, and disintegrates contemporary notions of agnatic kinship not only because Cimon's suckling from her breast counts as an unusual, non-normative, and incestuous activity but also because she uses milk, a female substance, to tie her father in a bond of obligation, as if she possessed something that "mattered" in a mock performance of reverse filiation.

If De Luca – grudgingly – acknowledges the Roman principle of "legitimate" inheritance claims for daughters, Baldo Bartolini alias Baldo novello (1409/14–1490), a professor of jurisprudence at Perugia and Pisa, proposes to view the dowry in the context of religious endowments. In his frequently reprinted *Most Noteworthy, Singular, and Useful Treatise on Dowries* (1479), Bartolini does not give a conclusive answer to the question of whether the contemporary dowry substitutes for the ancient Roman legitima, thus establishing a legal right to inherit, or whether it simply refers to the father's obligation to pay alimonies. He does list the dowry's resemblance to the legitima as part of its fourth "privilege,"[25] but he insists on their difference a chapter later, speculating "that the dowry more often replaces the alimonies than the legitima, mostly because it is owed during the lifetime [of the father]."[26] He arrives at the question of the dowry's legal quality only at the very end of his treatise, where he finally, and seemingly reluctantly, states the father's obligation to pay for it.[27] The preceding two-thirds of his treatise are devoted to an alternative view of the dowry, equating it with a "pious cause" or act of charity. Playing on the medieval

allegorization of the church as Christ's "bride," he declares the endowment of religious institutions such as churches, chapels, and monasteries functionally related to the endowment of marriage.[28] Asking "whether the dowry or the reason for [giving] a dowry ... [are] pious," he answers in the affirmative, referring to the many contemporary testamentary bequests in favor of poor girls' dowries.[29] He thus takes the rapidly developing industry of charitable dowries as evidence for their extra-legal quality, even though he implicitly acknowledges the importance of dotal marriages for the social reproduction of elites. He even declares the endowment of rich brides a pious act, as long as persons other than their fathers contribute to it, thus alleviating the difficulties many fathers experienced in responding to the call for dotal congruity, especially given the inflationary dynamic of the marriage market. Dowries assembled or enhanced by supplementary legacies – presumably from cognatic relatives, who were in no way obligated to contribute to them – served a pious cause, since high-ranking daughters would be doomed to celibacy in the absence of a competitive dowry, given the taboo on downwardly mobile marriages.[30]

In his anthropologico-historical analysis of the dowry's emergence in ancient Roman times, Bartolini, like De Luca, relates the invention of civil law to the creation of procedures for the payment and restitution of dowries.[31] In the state of nature [de iure gentium primaevo], he reasons, marriage did not exist, and all children born of a woman were legitimate. But after the invention of private property and marriage, dowries emerged to support the burden of matrimony.[32] Rather than relating the dowry to a daughter's right to inherit, he refers to the object status of all women in need of distribution by and among men and calls the dowry a reward to husbands for undertaking this charge. Civil law, in his account, facilitated women's expropriation and their right to control reproduction, while in man's uncivilized past, all children were legitimate. Bartolini's remarkable causal connection between men's control of female sexuality and the very notion of legal kinship may have inspired later utopian accounts of marriage-less societies such as Tommaso Campanella's *City of the Sun* (written 1602, first published 1623). Instead of free sex and the abolition of legitimacy of descent, however, Campanella envisions a state that assigns women to their mates for the purpose of eugenic breeding.[33]

Baldo Bartolini's treatise argues that dowry exchange does not just facilitate agnatic reproduction but, further, establishes the very concept of social order. The dowry's importance far exceeds legal culture, merging with the universal Catholic mandate for charitable giving. According to Bartolini, its origins coincide with mankind's rise from pre-history. It is hard to imagine a more urgent defense of a financial instrument or a more sweeping function attributed to it than the one formulated by Bartolini. In the late sixteenth century, when complaints about dowry inflation and the pressures of conspicuous consumption – in particular, coerced monachizations – reached a fever pitch, Bartolini's treatise

was reprinted several times. It was in this context that Gianmaria Cecchi Fiorentino's comedy about a marriage impostor scheming to collect a dowry without actually receiving the bride must have seemed hilariously funny.[34]

Marco Ferro's *Dictionary of Common and Venetian Law* (1778–81), by contrast, written at the cusp of the modern age, shows signs of relaxation vis-à-vis the strictures of patrilineal kinship and dowry exchange. In his entry under "agnation," for example, Ferro's historical overview suggests that patrilinearity was an aberration rather than a venerable principle of Roman law, in direct contradiction to De Luca. He points out how the Twelve Tables (440 BCE) established the principle of equal inheritance, which began to be abrogated in 169 BCE when the lex Voconia [Voconius's Law] prohibited daughters from inheriting estates over 100,000 sesterces, but was fully reinstated by Justinian's reform 700 years later.[35] In his definition of "cognation," he even introduces the curious category of "mixed" cognation, which "unites blood relations and family ties, such as when siblings derive from a legitimate marriage."[36] He thus calls cognatic what De Luca would have called agnatic, in an attempt to soften and eradicate the difference between the two concepts. Likewise, Ferro claims "natural" kinship exists through blood ties with both mother and father, while De Luca would have called only "uterine" ties "natural."[37] Ferro follows his theoretical and historical explanations of legal categories with detailed summaries of Venetian statutory law on the issue, but the discrepancies he points out between Roman law, especially in its Justinian variety, and Venetian law suggests he was critical of the latter.

In his entry on "dowry," for example, he does give a fairly accurate description of contemporary dowry exchange, with nods to Bartolini's view of charitable endowments that assimilated bridal dowries to a pious cause. But he also points out that dowries were not necessary for valid marriages to take place, and he emphasizes an open disagreement among various Roman scholars and lawmakers on the issue. While legal scholar Ulpian (170–228 CE) declared that non-dotal marriages were dishonorable, and Emperor Gratian (359–83 CE) even prohibited them, Justinian (482–565 CE) reversed the trend by declaring informal, de facto marriages to be the norm for commoners, and he legitimized their offspring (novella 74,4).[38] In his summary of contemporary legal practice, Justinian declares the father to be "the natural debtor" of the dowry and points out the dowry's relationship to the legitima. Fathers were only alleviated of this burden if their daughters eloped before the age of twenty-five.[39]

In his legal definition of "mother," Ferro contrasts the degree to which mothers could inherit according to Roman law with contemporary Venetian legal practice. He traces a gradual improvement of their situation starting with the Senatusconsultum Tertullianum under Emperor Hadrian (133 CE).[40] The trend to include mothers among their children's heirs culminated in Justinian's legal reform, according to which mothers were not only admitted as heirs

of single offspring but also were included among their children's heirs even if siblings survived.[41] Referring back to contemporary Venice, where mothers did not have this option, he states laconically: "On this issue we uphold the maxim that the uterus does not give succession rights."[42] In his entry on "succession," he even tackles the – from the point of view of Italian statutory law utterly unthinkable – question of inheritance rights among spouses. Giving an overview of intestate succession laws in both Roman and Venetian legal cultures, he mentions how in ancient Rome, an edict allowed for this possibility, even if only at the exclusion of the fiscus [state], i.e., if no blood relative of the deceased was alive. In Venice, by contrast, "we have no precise law ... with respect to ... intestate succession, that is that which takes place between husband and wife."[43] Nonetheless, a precedent seems to have occurred in court practice, because "it was established by the councils of the Quarantia [Venetian court of law] in a certain manner that husband and wife succeed to each other at the exclusion of the state."[44] Such acknowledgement of inheritance rights between spouses, even if referring only to cases of intestate succession in which no relative up to the seventh degree of kinship was alive, was surprising in the context of Venetian statutory law, which aimed at a strict separation between lineages and their properties. Ferro's repeated mentioning of the issue suggests that he did think the question worthwhile pursuing.

Toward the end of the eighteenth century, the notion of agnatic kinship and the need for dowry exchange gradually came to be dismantled in Italy. Already in the seventeenth century, the frequency with which women sought recourse to the papal Rota for help in inheritance suits suggests a widespread discomfort with medieval statutory law. These litigations also point to the importance of Justinian's *Body of Civil Law* in helping women make their claims against statutory exclusions, even though De Luca and other members of the Rota rejected them under reference to a more ancient and unadulterated version of Roman law. This prior legal tradition was identified with greater masculinity and authenticity. The legacy of Roman law served to justify a great variety of legal opinions, depending on whether scholars and judges approved or disapproved of Justinian's reforms in favor of bilateral kinship and women's greater inheritance rights.[45] But even the earliest versions of Roman law, such as the Twelve Tables, seemed in certain respects generous compared to medieval statutes because of their explicit acknowledgment of all legitimate children's rights to inherit from their father on equal terms. While in Northern and Central Italy, recourse to Roman law even in its pre-Justinian version served to buttress women's claims for greater property rights, the opposite occurred in other regions of Europe. In parts of France, Central Europe, and Iberia, where marriage by consent and bilateral versions of kinship prevailed until the sixteenth century and beyond, the reception of Roman law served to introduce patriarchal notions of household and family.[46]

Outside of Italy, notions of absolutist power began to be formulated under recourse to Roman law, especially in France, where lawmakers were about to launch what Sarah Hanley calls the "family-state compact" in order to strengthen and reinvent patrilineal reproduction and governmental legitimacy.[47] These legal reforms entailed, among others, the requirement of parental consent for marriage, the registration of pregnancies – especially those by single mothers – and a stricter separation of goods between spouses.[48] Jean Bodin's (1530–96) political theories seem to reflect on and anticipate these interventions, as he privileges the – pre-Justinian – pater familias as the basic institution from which the concepts of indivisible sovereignty and absolute royal power can be derived. In Bodin's view, a king's power is grounded in paternal power both concretely as well as metaphorically, because society is – or ought to be – composed of patriarchally organized families and because "domestic power represents in a certain manner [the concept of] sovereignty."[49] In order for French families to properly mirror his ideal version of absolute and indivisible royal power, incisive legal reforms for the purpose of reconstituting paternal power were of the utmost importance. In his *Summary of Bodin's Republic* (1576), Bodin calls for a thorough politicization of private life, hoping to fix problems of government by intervening in marriage and family.[50] He blames customary law for Italian legal scholars' conviction that French people have no concept of patriarchy.[51] In ancient Rome, by contrast, as well as in many other ancient empires, fathers enjoyed the power of life and death over their offspring.[52] Nonetheless, children were "obligated to love, serve, and nourish their father, obey him, and tolerate and hide his imperfections."[53] At the time of Rome's foundation, husbands were allowed to kill their wives as well – in cases of adultery, supposition of offspring, the forging of keys, and wine consumption[54] – but Emperor Augustus's Lex Julia (18–17 BCE) abolished this privilege.[55] Blaming Empress Theodora for her influence on lawmaking in a rhetorical move De Luca probably appreciated, Bodin regrets Justinian's abolition of capital punishment for female adultery.[56] Interspersing his patriarchal history lessons with comments about France's contemporary situation, he urges the abolition of customary law, especially of partible inheritance and emancipation after marriage. In his eyes, French customs were dangerous in the liberties they accorded to wives and children, to the point of reversing "the order of nature."[57]

Bodin formulated his call for strong centralized patriarchal powers in both family and kingdom at a time when the French government was particularly crisis-ridden. Most problematic was the endemic lack of a male heir to the throne. Between 1559 and 1589, France was ruled by a sequence of three kings, each one of whom failed to produce a legitimate son. Francis II (ruled 1559–60) died at age sixteen; Charles IX (ruled 1560–74) only had a daughter and an illegitimate son; and Henri III (ruled 1574–89) was notorious for his

alleged preference of male companions. For much of this time period, France was governed by Catherine de' Medici as regent and advisor for her younger sons. This produced biting criticism in a country that desperately tried to bar women from rule.[58] An anonymous Protestant pamphlet from 1576 entitled "La France Turquie" charged her with effeminizing the French government and transforming it into an oriental form of despotism, while Agrippa d'Aubigné (1552–1630) reviled members of the court of Henri III as "hermaphrodites and effeminate monsters."[59]

The increasing veneration for paternal power cut across confessional lines, as d'Aubigné's remarks reveal, and became ubiquitous in most of Europe. Jean de Coras (1515–72), for example – Huguenot, member of the Parliament of Toulouse, and Professor of Jurisprudence – was among the first French legal scholars to introduce Roman law, and with it a renewed respect for paternal power. He became famous as the judge who presided over the case of Arnauld du Tilh, Bertrande de Rols's lover who usurped her long-lost husband's legal rights and properties.[60] In the Netherlands, stadhouders [chief executive magistrates] assumed the honorary title of "Vader des Vaderlands" beginning with Willem van Oranje (1533–84). Like their Florentine and Venetian counterparts, Dutch Calvinist elites developed a distinctly patriarchal view of family and marriage, focusing on dowry exchange as a means of social reproduction.[61] In seventeenth-century England, "systematic patriarchalism" flourished among political theorists, even in the absence of Roman law.[62] In both Protestant and Catholic parts of Germany, "fathers ruled" despite – or because of – a weak central government.[63]

Despite the overall tendency to strengthen paternal power, the increasing focus on Roman law and emerging absolutist theories were heavily contested in sixteenth-century Europe. In contrast to Jean Bodin and his admiration for Roman law, legal scholars Etienne Pasquier (1529–1615) and Antoine Loisel (1536–1617) emphasized French legal customs and the popular roots of monarchical power in France, claiming "paternal power has no place among us."[64] Similar theories were still being formulated in the seventeenth century, despite the fact that absolutism finally won out in France.[65] But the greatest opponents of royal absolutism – and, ultimately, of Justinian's claim to indivisible secular imperial power – was Catholic political theorist Cardinal Bellarmine (1542–1621), who defended the supreme power and infallibility of his very own Über-father against all rivals. Bellarmine states, under reference to Thomas of Aquinas (1225–74), that temporal governments, whether republics or monarchies, are man-made and not instituted by divine power, as claimed by proponents of royal absolutism.[66] In his view, all forms of state were necessarily imperfect, thus subject to change and revolutions. In Aristotelian fashion, Bellarmine judges all temporal matters to be inferior to spiritual affairs. The pope has absolute power over all secular rulers because of his divine charge to guide

them towards "eternal happiness."[67] Concretely, Bellarmine defends the power of the pope to excommunicate secular governments and entire populations. Bellarmine's treatise is a stubborn defense of papal supremacy at a time when the interdict of Pope Paul V (ruled 1605–1621) against Venice had just ended in a humiliating defeat for the Church of Rome and when William Barclay's posthumous attack on the papacy had just been published.

William Barclay (1546–1608), a Scottish Catholic and Professor of Civil Law in France, supported what he perceived to be the divine right of kings to prosecute all contenders, be they Calvinist "monarchomachs," i.e., those who defended tyrannicide, or Roman Catholic supporters of the papacy. In his *On the Power of the Pope* (1609) he vehemently attacks the pope's practice of excommunication and intolerance towards dissenters. He polemicizes harshly against the papacy, calling all popes "parasites" and condemning them for their greed and personal ambitions in conducting foreign policy.[68] Denying their claim of absolute power over temporal governments worldwide, he points to the utter lack of evidence for this in Scripture.[69] Concretely, he criticizes the popes' recurring excommunications of German emperors and French kings – most recently, the threats issued by Clement VIII (ruled 1592–1605) against Henri IV (ruled 1589–1610). According to Barclay, the pope's pressure on him to convert was not motivated by spiritual reasons but by personal hatred.[70] Perhaps due to his anti-republican leanings, Barclay does not mention Paul V's more recent interdict against Venice in 1606, but it is clear that his treatise was written in the aftermath of this Europe-wide crisis. The fact that France supported Venice in its claim to territorial and jurisdictional sovereignty, forcing the papacy into retreat, suggests that the pope's notion of spiritual and temporal supremacy found few followers even among Catholic monarchs, with the exception of Philip III of Spain (1578–1621).

Paolo Sarpi (1552–1623), who counseled the Republic of Venice in its standoff against Pope Paul V, undertook an almost Protestant-style attack on the Church of Rome, criticizing the post-Tridentine papacy for reasons that went far beyond the immediate jurisdictional cause of the conflict. In his "Report on the State of Religion," he attacks the Church for "erecting the most powerful monarchy that ever existed … enriching itself without effort, leading wars without risk, and rewarding [loyal supporters] without incurring expenses."[71] Like Luther before him, he condemns the exaggerated worship of the Virgin Mary at the expense of Jesus Christ and the neglect of the Eucharist in favor of miracle-working relics and images. He also opposes the fad for allegorical interpretations of the Bible and the stress on good works at the expense of true faith. Finally, he dismantles the pope's claims to supremacy in temporal affairs step by step. He rejects the maxim that there cannot be salvation outside the Church of Rome; that the Church acquired this power through direct divine intervention; that the pope owns Saint Peter's keys to heaven and can deny entry to whomever he

pleases; that he enjoys authority over all secular rulers on the basis of Aristotle's metaphysical distinction between spiritual and material/temporal things; that the world is but a mere passage to heaven; and that the pope claims to have supreme power over all dissenters, crushing any form of internal opposition.[72] Needless to say, Sarpi would have been prosecuted as a heretic had he not enjoyed Venetian protection.

The papacy's intransigence was responsible for many of the divisions cutting through Europe, running along confessional as well as inter-Catholic lines of dissent. An exit out of this polarized political situation presented itself by recourse to Roman antiquity, this time in its philosophical and literary tradition. The work of Justus Lipsius (1547–1606), a neo-Stoic philosopher and royal historiographer of the Spanish Netherlands, is especially important in this context, as he, like Barclay and Sarpi, qualifies as a Catholic dissenter. Most importantly for our purposes, he relied heavily on the anecdotes of Valerius Maximus for historical examples of his moral precepts and influenced the work of Peter Paul Rubens.[73] Lipsius's neo-Stoic moral philosophy, which promotes emotional detachment, rationality, and tolerance of dissent, seems to clash at times with his veneration for the Virgin Mary, but modern scholars have rarely emphasized this tension.[74] Probably because of his love for Roman antiquity, Gerhard Oestreich sees his political views as analogous to those of Jean Bodin, even though Lipsius stresses the need for limitations on political power, has nothing to say on the topic of paternal authority, and displays a certain disdain for strong, explicit arguments by writing in the cento tradition.[75] Other scholars are of the opinion that Lipsius's *Admonishments* of 1597 were "written with an outspokenly pro-Catholic perspective in mind … conceived as an unconcealed defence and eulogy of (notably the Spanish) hereditary monarchy."[76] Nonetheless, George Hugo Tucker detects a space for irony in his text, given the *Monita's* format as a commonplace book, i.e., a book composed of quotes or well-known sayings by Roman authors, which included distancing devices in the form of implicit commentaries and subtle strategies for contextualization.[77]

In my view, instances of Lipsius's critical detachment from his sources are entirely lacking. All forms of ironic exaggerations and juxtapositions contained in Maximus's anecdotes seem to be eliminated in Lipsius's excerpts, who, burdened with grief and despair at the violence of religious hatred in Europe, quotes from ancient Roman authors with utter sobriety and seriousness. But he does cultivate a certain weakness in authorial style, due to the cento form of the commonplace book in which he is writing. In his introduction to *Politics* (1590), he explains: "I have instituted a new kind of genre, in which I could truly say that everything is mine, and nothing. For although the selection and the arrangement … are mine, the words and phrases I have gathered from various places in the ancient writers."[78] This peculiar form of delivering arguments and insights stands in contrast to the vigorous authorial voice of most of the ancient

writers he is quoting. It enacts such differentiated, cautious, and balanced thinking that Lipsius's main message seems to be contained in his very medium of expression. Pondering the question of whether elected or hereditary rulers are better, for example, he advocates for dynastic successions, but not for any fundamentalist reasons. He argues negatively, pointing out "that to *assume a prince is less dangerous than to search for one* (Tacitus)" and that "succession even provides an obstacle to disorder. For otherwise, *transfers of power are excellent occasions for coups and revolts* (Tacitus)." Right afterwards, he backs away from this position, stating that "others prefer another reasoning and say that *he who is to rule all, must be chosen from all* (Pliny)."[79] When thinking about the nature of power, he advocates for a strong military, claiming that *"fiercely maintained Discipline alone brought the Roman Empire the Mastery of the world* (Maximus)" and that *"military discipline requires a harsh and concise sort of punishment, because forces consist of armed men: which, once they have strayed from the straight path, will oppress if they are not oppressed themselves* (Maximus)."[80] At the same time, he prefers an anti-Machiavellian style of government, stating that "it is proper to a true and *benevolent prince, for the benefit of Clemency sometimes to jump over the boundaries of Justice, when only Compassion is left, to which none of the virtues can honorably refuse to give way* (Cassiodorus)."[81]

In a political climate in which argumentative intransigence prevailed, Lipsius is perhaps unique in cultivating empathy for one's enemies, but also detachment from the cult of power and a differentiated view of history. No theoretical positioning could have been further removed from the contemporary politics of the papacy, but also of the pope's passionate opponents such as Barclay and Sarpi. Lipsius's writings, which catered to the Spanish monarchy but advocated Stoic restraint, prove one more time that the form and essence of political power were heavily contested in early modern Europe. At the center of debate were theories of sovereignty and central authority, which in turn were based on legal definitions of paternal power in ancient Rome. It is perhaps no coincidence that visual representations of Pero and Cimon became popular at a time when patriarchal forms of rule in family and government became the lynchpin of political discourse. After all, the images refer to the story of a guilty old father, condemned by Roman authorities to die by starvation, and of his pious daughter who, through her gift of milk and charitable spirit, keeps him alive and earns him legal rehabilitation. The meaning of this motif in the context of early modern political culture is multifaceted and ambiguous. As a utopian view of "pious" father-daughter relations, it clashes with the harshness of contemporary paternal rule and the exclusion of daughters facilitating it. As an ideological expression of gendered hierarchies in family relations, it works more straightforwardly as a story about exploitation and a father's undue consumption of his daughter's substances. Mindful of Whitney Davis's

admonition to distinguish "what is visual about culture and cultural about vision," I would thus like to conclude my analysis of Roman Charity.[82] The motif renders visible what could not be uttered in early modern Europe – the perversity, weakness, and morally questionable nature of contemporary patriarchy. But the cultural framework within which this message became intelligible was to a large extent non-visual. It consisted of a kinship system whose "straightness" and patrilinearity was based on a fiction of reciprocity that Pero's "filial piety" performs, but also queers and subverts.

Notes

1 | Whitney Davis, *A General Theory of Visual Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), 252.

2 | Davis, *A General Theory of Visual Culture*, 192.

3 | Davis, *A General Theory of Visual Culture*, 9.

4 | On the fiction of reciprocity maintained by dowry exchange, see Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, "Zacharias, or the Ousted Father: Nuptial Rites in Tuscany between Giotto and the Council of Trent," in: Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, *Women, Family, and Ritual in Renaissance Florence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 178–212.

5 | For an overview of family law in Europe and the Mediterranean, see the introduction in *Across the Religious Divide: Women, Property, and Law in the Wider Mediterranean (1300–1800)*, ed. by Jutta Sperling and Shona K. Wray (New York: Routledge, 2010). Primogeniture was a feature of feudal law rather than Italian statutory law and was most widespread in medieval and early modern France.

6 | On the contested nature of medieval patrilineal genealogies, see Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, "Albero genealogico e costruzione della parentela nel Rinascimento," *Quaderni Storici* 86, annata XXIX, no. 2 (1994): 405–20.

7 | On ancient Roman law and its reception in the nineteenth century, see Gianna Pomata, "Legami di sangue, legami di seme. Consanguinità e agnazione nel diritto romano," *Quaderni Storici* 86, annata XXIX, no. 2 (1994): 299–334; English version: "Blood Ties and Semen Ties: Consanguinity and Agnation in Roman Law," in: *Gender, Kinship, Power: A Comparative and Interdisciplinary History,* ed. by Mary Jo Maynes, Ann Waltner, Birgitte Soland, and Ulrike Strasser (New York: Routledge, 1996), 43–64; on medieval notions of filiation, see Jane Fair Bestor, "Ideas about Procreation and Their Influence on Ancient and Medieval Views of Kinship," in: *The Family in Italy from Antiquity to the Present*, ed. by David I. Kertzer and Richard P. Saller (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 150–67.

8 | Giovanni Battista de Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis et Justitiae, sive Decisivi discursus, ad veritatem editi in forensibus controversiis* (Coloniae Agrippinae: Sumptibus Haeredum Joannis Widenfeldt, & Goderfridi de Berges, 1690), vol. 2, 5, column 2–6, column 1. See other passages in his text where he distinguishes blood relatives from uterine relatives: "The succession [takes place] in accordance to the origin of the goods, such that the consanguineous heirs succeed to their father, and the uterine ones to their mother." De Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis*, "De successionibus ab intestato," vol. 2, part 3, II, 108, column 2.

9 | Defending the exclusion of sisters in favor of their brother's inheritance according to the statues of Faventino and Imola, he insists on the laws' literal adaptation against those "judaisms devoid of any probability and rationality, which are called the spirit of the law." De Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis*, "De successionibus ab intestato," vol. 2, part 3, II, 9, column 1.

10 | De Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis*, "De successionibus ab intestato," vol. 2, part 3, II, 2, paragraph 3.

11 | De Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis*, "De successionibus ab intestato," vol. 2, part 3, II, 37, column 1.
12 | De Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis*, "De successionibus ab intestato," vol. 2, part 3, II, 4, column 1.
13 | De Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis*, "De successionibus ab intestato," vol. 2, part 3, II, 3, paragraph 12.
14 | De Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis*, "De successionibus ab intestato," vol. 2, part 3, II, 110, column 2.
15 | De Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis*, "De successionibus ab intestato," vol. 2, part 3, II, 3, paragraph 12.
16 | De Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis*, "De successionibus ab intestato," vol. 2, part 3, II, 111, column 2.
17 | De Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis*, vol. 2, part 1, III, "Legitima, Trebellianica, & aliis Detractionibus," 2, column 1. His explanation of the difference is as follows: "[in the first case ...] the dowry is not a substitute for the legitima, because a woman is excluded from all succession, and that's why she can't demand a legitima ... [but in the second case] ... the statute begins with the endowment, and follows with the exclusion from succession, and that means that the dowry substitutes for the legitima, because the dowry is viewed as the nearest and most intrinsic cause of the exclusion." De Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis*, vol. 2, part 1, III, "Legitima, Trebellianica, & aliis Detractionibus," 2, column 1.
18 | De Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis*, vol. 2, part 1, III, "Legitima, Trebellianica, & aliis Detractionibus," 3, column 1.
19 | De Luca, *Theatrum Veritatis*, vol. 2, part 1, II, "Legitima, Trebellianica, & aliis Detractionibus," 41, column 2. On the inheritance system in Naples and Sicily, see Igor Mineo, *Nobiltà di Stato: Famiglie e identità aristocratiche nel tardo medioevo: La Sicilia* (Rome: Donzelli, 2001). See also Kalliopi Papakonstantinou, *Die collatio dotis: Mitgift- und Miterben-Auseinandersetzung im römischen Recht* (Köln: Böhlau, 1998). Papakonstantinou explains how in Byzantine law, the "collatio dotis" provided even married daughters with the right to claim an increment on their dowries, if at the time of their father's death they found themselves to be disadvantaged. The reverse case could also occur, however, forcing them to redistribute their dowries in case they exceeded the legitimate share all siblings could expect at the time of the father's death.
20 | Giovanni Battista De Luca, *Sacrae Rotae Romanae Decisiones, et Summorum Pontificum Constitutiones Recentissimae, Theatrum Veritatis & Justitiae Cardinalis De Luca eiusque tractatus de officiis venal. et stat. successionibus amplectentes, confirmantes, & laudantes* (Venice: Typographia Balleoniana, 1726, first ed. 1699), vol. I, 489, column 2.
21 | De Luca, *Sacrae Rotae Romanae Decisiones,* 489, column 2–494, column 2.
22 | Francesco Arnaldi and Franz Blatt, *Novum glossarium mediae Latinitatis, ab anno DCCC usque ad annum MCC* (Hafniae: E. Munksgaard, 1957–2011); Jan Frederik Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Leiden: Brill, 2002; first ed. 1976); Salvatore

Battaglia and Giorgio Barberi Squarotti, *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana* (Turin: Unione Tipografico-Ed., 1999, first ed. 1981).

23 | *Totius latinitatis lexicon*, ed. by Egidio Forcellini, Jacobo Facciolati, Gaetano Cognolato, John Gerard, Johann Matthias Gesner, and James Bailey (London: Baldwin and Cradock, 1828; first ed. Padua: Seminario, 1771), entry: "obliquus/obliquo."

24 | Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction* (New York: Vintage Books, 1990, first English ed. 1978, first French ed. 1976), 106–07.

25 | "The dowry is more often said to replace the legitima than the [father's] alimonies." Baldo Bartolini, "Tractatus notabilis, singularis, et utilis De dotibus, & dotatis mulieribus, & earum iuribus & privilegijs, Editus, per Excellentiss. ac Celeberrimum Iuris Pontificij, & Caesarie Docto. Monarcham, & Advocatum Consistorialem, D. Baldum de Bartholinis, de Perusio," in: *Tractatus illustrium in utraque tum pontificii, tum Caesarei iuris facultate Iurisconsultorum, De Matrimonio, & Dote ex multis in hoc volumen congesti, additis plurimis, etiam nunquam editis, ac nota designatis* (Venice: Società dell'aquila che si rinnova, 1584), 193v.

26 | Baldus Novellus, "Tractatus Notabilis singularis et utilis, de dotibus, et dotatis mulieribus, & earum iuribus & privilegijs. Editus per excellentissimum ac celeberrimum Iuris Pontificij & Caesarei doctorem monarcham & advocatum consistorialem, D. Baldum de Bartholinis, de Perusio: Inchoatus in almo studio Pisano, & completus sub anno Domini 1479, in excelso Gymnasio Perusino, cum iussu summi Pontefici ad patriam esset revocatus," in: *De Dote Tractatus ex variis iuris civilis interpretibus decerpti. His, quae ad dotium pertinent iura, & privilegia enucleantur,* with contributions by Baldus Novellus et aliis (Venice: apud Mauritium Rubinum, 1579), 22, column 2.

27 | "The father is forced in his lifetime to assign to his daughter a part of his patrimony as her dowry as he is held to assign alimonies to a son during his lifetime." Baldus Novellus, "Tractatus Notabilis singularis et utilis," in: *De Dote Tractatus*, 32.

28 | Baldus Novellus, "Tractatus Notabilis singularis et utilis," 2.

29 | Baldus Novellus, "Tractatus Notabilis singularis et utilis," 15.

30 | Baldus Novellus, "Tractatus Notabilis singularis et utilis," 16, column 2.

31 | Baldus Novellus, "Tractatus Notabilis singularis et utilis," 9, column 1.

32 | "After the institution of the primordial ius gentium [tribal law], during which time the people lived without mores, marriage was unknown: and all people were called legitimate, born of any and every woman. Then came the secondary ius gentium, in which marriage was recognized and ordered, for the preservation of good mores in society, and for the avoidance of fornication and scandals. Also, other contracts were invented by the secondary ius gentium: among the people, buildings and women were divided, so that everybody had their own. At that time the dowry was invented, to support the burden of matrimony." Baldus Novellus, "Tractatus Notabilis singularis et utilis," 8, column 2.

33 | Tommaso Campanella, *La Città del Sole: Dialogo Poetico [The City of the Sun: A Poetical Dialogue],* transl. and ed. by Daniel John Donno (Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1981; first published 1623; written in 1602).

34 | "And he'll give you the trousseau, and he won't give you the wife before the first year is up, so that you can have a really good time, like somebody who takes a wife and doesn't lead her home ... how many are there anyways who need a dowry without a wife?" Gianmaria Cecchi Fiorentino, "La dote," in: *Comedie di M. Gianmaria Cecchi Fiorentino Libro primo nel quale si contengono La Dote, La Moglie, Il Corredo, La Stiana, Il Donzello, Gl'Incantesimi, Lo Spirito* (Venice, appresso Bernardo Giunti, 1585; first ed. 1550), prologue.

35 | Marco Ferro, *Dizionario del diritto comune e veneto* (Venice: presso Andrea Santini e Figlio, 1845, first ed. 1778–81), vol. 1, tomo 1, 72.

36 | Ferro, *Dizionario*, vol. 1, tomo 2, 411.

37 | "Natural cognation is formed by the sole bonds of blood; it is the kinship of those who have been procreated by an illegitimate union, in relation to both father and mother." Ferro, *Dizionario,* vol. 1, tomo 2, 410. Ferro contradicts himself in a later chapter on "succession," however, when he states: "Uterine brothers and sisters who are competing with blood brothers and sisters are indeed excluded from succession, and are only admitted at the exclusion of the fiscus." Ferro, *Dizionario,* vol. 2, tomo 2, 764.

38 | Ferro, *Dizionario*, vol. 1, tomo 2, 642. Karl Eduard Zachariä von Lingenthal, *Imp. Iustiniani pp.a. Novellae quae vocantur sive Constitutiones quae extra Codicem supersunt, ordine chronologico digestae* (Leipzig: In aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1881); http://webu2.upmf-grenoble.fr/DroitRomain/Corpus/Nov74.htm [accessed 7/10/13].

39 | Ferro, *Dizionario*, vol. 1, tomo 2, 642–43.

40 | Ferro erroneously says the Senatusconsultum was issued under Emperor Claudius. Ferro, *Dizionario*, vol. 2, tomo 1, 213.

41 | Ferro, *Dizionario*, vol. 2, tomo 1, 213.

42 | Ferro, *Dizionario*, vol. 2, tomo 1, 214.

43 | Ferro, *Dizionario*, vol. 2, tomo 2, 763.

44 | Ferro, *Dizionario*, vol. 2, tomo 2, 764.

45 | JoAnn McNamara, "Women and Power through the Family Revisited," in: *Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages,* ed. by Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 17–30.

46 | For an overview of the differences in family law in the Mediterranean and other regions of Europe, see Sperling and Wray, introduction to *Across the Religious Divide;* for the differences in marriage cultures, see Jutta Sperling, "The Economics and Politics of Marriage," in: *The Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe,* ed. by Allyson Poska, Katherine McIver, and Jane Couchman (Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Press, 2013), 213–33; and idem, "Marriage at the Time of the Council of Trent (1560–70): Clandestine Marriages, Kinship Prohibitions, and Dowry Exchange in European Comparison," *Journal of Early Modern History* 8, nos. 1–2 (2004): 67–108.

47 | Sarah Hanley, "Engendering the State: Family Formation and State Building in Early Modern France," *French Historical Studies* 16, no. 1 (1989): 4–27.

48 | Hanley, "Engendering the State," 9–14.

49 | Jean Bodin, *Abrégé de la République de Bodin* (London: chez Jean Nourse, 1775), vol. 1, 23. Despite his criticism of Justinian for being too women-friendly, Bodin nonetheless was inspired by this emperor's notion of absolute and indivisible sovereignty. Donald B. Kelley, "Law," in: *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450–1700*, ed. by J.H. Burns, with the assistance of Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 66–94, especially 68.

50 | "If a republic consists of the connection between various families; if it cannot exist without them, they are its support. It is therefore important that they be the principal object of the government's attention. It is their strength that makes up ... the strength of the state." Bodin, *Abrégé*, vol. 1, 22.

51 | "These customs gave Accurtius and other Italian juridical scholars the impression that the French people did not have a concept of paternal power." Bodin, *Abrégé,* vol. 1, 57.

52 | "The right over life and death of fathers over their children was known in large parts of the universe. It was common among the Persians, all the peoples of upper Asia, the Celts, the Gauls, and practiced in all of the Indies before a part of them passed under the domination of the Spaniards; it was sacred among the Romans." Bodin, *Abrégé*, vol. 1, 51; on the father's power over life and death of his children in ancient Rome, see also the introduction to: *Padre e figlia*, ed. by Luisa Accati, Marina Cattaruzza, and Monika Verzar Brass (Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier, 1994), 7–14.

53 | "As nature obliges the father to nourish his children and to lead them to virtue through a good education; the children are obliged, but even more forcefully, to love, serve, and nourish their father, to obey him, and to tolerate and hide his imperfections." Bodin, *Abrégé,* vol. 1, 46–47.

54 | "By the law of Romulus the husband had an almost unlimited power over his wife; he could let her die without court order in four cases: adultery, supposition of fatherhood, making false keys, and drinking wine." Bodin, *Abrégé,* vol. 1, 33–34.

55 | "The law of Julia, granted by Augustus, prohibits this unlimited authority of husbands." Bodin, *Abrégé*, vol. 1, 35.

56 | "But in the following, Empress Theodora, mistress of Justinian's spirit ... let him make laws to the advantage of women, endangering the order of society as much as possible; she changed the capital punishment for adultery into a pronouncement of infamy." Bodin, *Abrégé,* vol. 1, 35–36.

57 | "To prohibit the father his usufruct, and to make laws which favor the equal partition of inheritance means to release children from their dependence, and, by consequence, to reverse the order of nature in a republic." Bodin, *Abrégé*, vol. 1, 60.

58 | Sarah Hanley, "The politics of identity and monarchic governance in France: The debate over female exclusion," in: *Women Writers and the Early Modern British Political Tradition*, ed. by Hilda L. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 289–304.

59 | Valentin Groebner, "Körpergeschichte politisch. Montaigne und die Ordnungen der Natur in den französischen Religionskriegen 1572–1592," *Historische Zeitschrift* 269, no. 2 (Oct. 1999): 281–304, especially 293–94.

60 | Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983); Kelley, "Law," 79.

61 | Julia Adams, "The Familial State: Elite Family Practices and State-Making in the Early Modern Netherlands," *Theory and Society* 23, no. 4 (1994): 505–39.

62 | J.P. Sommerville, "Absolutism and Royalism," in: *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450–1700*, ed. by J.H. Burns, with the assistance of Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 347–72, especially 360.

63 | Stephen E. Ozment, *When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Germany* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983); Ulrike Strasser, *State of Virginity: Gender, Religion and Politics in an Early Modern Catholic State* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004).

64 | Kelly, "Law," 81–83, especially 81.

65 | Sommerville, "Absolutism and Royalism," 362.

66 | "Saint Thomas ... says two things against Barclay – one is, that dominion and preference have been introduced by human law, not by divine law, as Barclay frequently affirms." Robert Franciscus Romulus Cardinal Bellarmine, *Power of the Pope in Temporal Affairs against William Barclay*, transl. and ed. by George Albert Moore (Chevy Chase: The Country Dollar Press, 1949; first ed. Köln 1610), 3.

67 | "For the temporal end is subordinate to the spiritual end, as is plain because temporal happiness is not the absolutely final end; and therefore it ought to be referred to eternal felicity." Cardinal Bellarmine, *Power of the Pope*, 94.

68 | "And because of that, a most learned and noble Councilman, if such can be found among the Jesuits (according to Bozius's opinion on that matter), called the pope a parasite." William Barclay, *De potestate papae: An & quatenus in Reges & Principes seculares ius & imperium habeat: Giul. Barclaii I.C. Liber posthumus. Reddite Caesari quae sunt Caesaris, & quae Dei Deo* (Mussiponti: apud Franciscum du Bois, & Jacobum Garnich, 1609), 6. "Certainly, to the learned and Catholic men, this issue offers no mediocre cause to doubt this mutation of law, namely to believe indeed in such immense and absolute temporal power of the person of the pope, which does not have its origin in God Almighty, but in the impotent desire of men." Barclay, *De potestate*, 32.

69 | "If it is true that the pope possesses a temporal power to govern indirectly the temporal affairs of all Christians, then he either possesses this power by divine law or by human law. If he does so by divine law, one would need to establish it from Scripture or certainly from the apostolic tradition. From Scripture, we have nothing of the kind except that the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given to the Pope: of the keys of the kingdom of earth, no mention is made. And the apostolic tradition offers nothing contrary to this." Barclay, *De potestate*, 45–46.

70 | "For, in truth, these past popes could control them [the rulers] more easily and with less damage to the people. Not just Henry IV, because of whose fault such a long lasting schism emerged, but Otto IV, Frederick II, Philip the Fair, Louis XII or John of Navarre and others: To these, in the heated order of events, the popes brought forth the

sentence of excommunication and the deprivation of their royal authority. Not because of heresy or a perishing empire or the supplication of their subjects, but rather on their own impulse, due to personal, heated, inimical hatred." Barclay, *De potestate*, 89–90.

71 | Paolo Sarpi, "Dalla 'Relazione dello stato della religione, e con quali dissegni et arti ella è stata fabricata e mandeggiata in diversi stati di queste occidentali parti del mondo'," in: *Storici, Politici e moralisti del Seicento (La letteratura italiana. Storia e testi,* vol. 35, tomo 1), ed. by Raffaele Mattiolo, Pietro Pancrazi, and Alfredo Schiaffini (Milan; Naples: Riccardo Ricciardi Editore, 1969), vol. I, 295–330, especially 320.

72 | Sarpi, "Dalla 'Relazione dello stato della religione'," 296, 299, 301, 315, 319–20.

73 | Ulrich Heinen, "Rubens' Präsenz," in: *Peter Paul Rubens. Barocke Leidenschaften: Ausstellung im Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum Braunschweig, 8. August bis 31. Oktober 2004*, ed. by Nils Büttner and Ulrich Heinen (München: Hirmer Verlag, 2004), 28–36, especially 32.

74 | Lipsius published two treatises on the Virgin Mary, which were translated into many vernacular languages. Justus Lipsius, *Miracles of the B. Virgin, or, an Historical Account of the Original, and Stupendous Performances of the Image entituled, Our Blessed Lady of Halle. Viz. Restoring the Dead to Life, Healing the Sick, Delivering of Captives, etc. Written Originally in Latin by Justus Lipsius; afterwards translated into French, then into Dutch, and now rendered into English* (London: 1688; first Latin ed. Antwerp 1604). Idem, *Ivsti Lipsi diva Sichemiensis siue Aspricollis: noua eius beneficia & admiranda* (Antwerp: ex officina Plantiniana, apud Ioannem Moretum, 1606).

75 | Gerhard Oestreich, *Antiker Geist und moderner Staat bei Justus Lipsius (1547–1606): der Neustoizismus als politische Bewegung,* ed. by Nicolette Mout (Göttingen: Vandenhoek und Ruprecht, 1989), 159. *"Only that power is safe, which restricts its own forces."* Justus Lipsius, *Politica: Six Books of Politics or Political Instruction,* ed. and transl. by Jan Waszink (Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2004, first publication 1589), 437; compare to Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings,* ed. and transl. by D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000), no. IV.1. ext. 8.

76 | *(Un)masking the Realities of Power: Justus Lipsius and the Dynamics of Political Writing in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Erik De Bom, Marijke Janssens, Toon Van Houdt, and Jan Papy (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 16.

77 | "Focusing on one particular passage, the author [George Hugo Tucker] demonstrates that there is a curious and quite telling intertextual tension between Lipsius's explicit (and uncontroversial) statements and the counter-balancing (and somewhat more subversive) implications of his judiciously chosen examples, in their original context." *(Un)masking the Realities of Power,* 18.

78 | Lipsius, *Politica*, 231–33.

79 | Lipsius, *Politica*, 305. Italics in the original.

80 | Lipsius, *Politica*, 589. The quotes are from Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, II.8. praef. and II.7.14.

81 | Lipsius, *Politica,* 331.

82 | Davis, *A General Theory of Visual Culture*.

Appendix

List of Figures

Figure 0.1: Sir Godfrey Kneller, workshop, *Portrait of Lady Mary Boyle and her Son Charles,* ca. 1720, oil on canvas, 91.5 × 68.6 cm, private collection, The Family of the Earls of Shannon © Lawrence Steigrad Fine Arts, New York / Bridgeman Images.

Figure 0.2: Jesus Herrera Martínez, *Altarpiece: The Fire and the Flame,* detail with Roman Charities, 2015, oil on canvas, 40 × 40 cm, Rome, Colleción Honos Art © Photo: Jesus Herrera Martínez.

Figure 1.1: Barthel Beham, *Pero and Cimon,* 1525, print, 55 × 36 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB 4189 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.2: Venetian, *Pero and Cimon,* ca. 1520, Vienna, Dorotheum, April 8, 1922 © Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek.

Figure 1.3: Francesco Casella or Galeazzo Rivelli (della Barba), *Pietas,* 1513, ceiling fresco, Cremona, Sant'Abbondio © Photo: Jim Kan.

Figure 1.4: *Pietati,* early 16th c., bronze medal, London, Victoria and Albert Museum, inv. no. 269–1864 © Courtesy of the Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 1.5: *Unnamed Roman Girl Feeds her Mother in Prison,* illumination, Giovanni Boccaccio, *De cleres et nobles femmes,* 1402, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MS Fr. 12420, fol. 100 © Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Figure 1.6: Peter Paul Rubens, *Roman Charity,* 1630, oil on canvas, 155 × 190 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, object no. SK-A-345 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.7: *Daughter Breastfeeding her Mother,* early 16th c., bronze plaquette, 11.3 × 9.6 cm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Bode-Museum, Skulpturensammlung und Museum für Byzantinische Kunst, inv. no. 1418 © Photo: Jörg P. Anders, bpk, Berlin / Art Resource, NY ART510740.

Figure 1.8: *Pietati,* early 16th c., bronze medal, diam. 10.5 cm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Bode-Museum, Skulpturensammlung und Museum für Byzantinische Kunst, inv. no. 1226 © Photo: Jörg P. Anders, bpk, Berlin / Art Resource, NY ART510741.

Figure 1.9: Hans Kels the Elder, *Daughter Breastfeeding her Mother,* 1537, detail, carved board game, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, KK 3419 © KHM- Museumsverband.

Figure 1.10: Hans Sebald Beham, after Barthel Beham, *Three Women in a Bath House,* 1548, print, 83 × 58 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB 10.923 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.11: Hans Sebald Beham, after Barthel Beham, *Pero and Cimon,* 1544, print, 70 × 48 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB 10.786 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.12: Hans Sebald Beham, *Pero and Cimon,* 1525, print, diam. 5 cm, Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen, inv. no. 216–1909 © bkp, Berlin / Kuperstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Photo: Dietmar Katz / Art Resource, NY ART515257.

Figure 1.13: Hans Sebald Beham, *Pero and Cimon flanked by Tritons,* 1526–30, print, 38 × 100 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB-10.783 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.14: Hans Sebald Beham, *Pero and Cimon,* 1544, print, 59 × 45 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB 10.784 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.15: Hans Sebald Beham, *Pero and Cimon,* 1540, drawing, pen and black ink, 39.7 × 24.1 cm, Washington, National Gallery, Woodner Collection, inv. no. 1998 © Courtesy National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC.

Figure 1.16: Hans Sebald Beham, *The Virgin with the Pear,* 1520, print, 110 × 74 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB 10.724 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.17: Hans Sebald Beham, after Barthel Beham, *Virgin with the Parrot,* 1549, print, 82 × 58 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P 1921.2138 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.18: Hans Sebald Beham, *Joseph and Potiphar's Wife,* 1526, print, diam. 52 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB-10.718 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.19: Hans Sebald Beham, *Amnon's Incest,* ca. 1525, miniature print, Bremen, Kunsthalle Bremen – Der Kunstverein in Bremen, Department of Prints and Drawings © Photo Karen Blindow.

Figure 1.20: Hans Sebald Beham, *The Night,* 1548, print, 110 × 78 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB 10.866 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.21: Hans Sebald Beham, *Lucretia,* 1519, print, 56 × 43 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB 10.789 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.22: Hans Sebald Beham, *Dido,* 1520, print, 130 × 97 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB 10.791 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.23: Barthel Beham, *Judith,* 1523, print, 58 × 39 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB 4178 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.24: Hans Sebald Beham, *Judith and her Maid,* 1520–30, print, 108 × 68 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB 10.715 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.25: Barthel Beham, *Judith,* 1525, print, 54 × 37 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB 4179 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 1.26: Master with the Griffin's Head, *Pero and Cimon,* 1546, oil on wood, Würzburg, Julius-Maximilians-Universität, Martin von Wagner Museum © Martin von Wagner Museum der Universität Würzburg.

Figure 1.27: Lucas Cranach the Elder, *Judith with the Head of Holofernes,* 1530, beech panel, 75 × 56 cm, Berlin, Jagdschloss Grünewald © Photo: Jörg P. Anders, Stiftung Preußische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg.

Figure 1.28: Master with the Griffin's Head, *Samson and Dalila,* 1539, Paris, art market, 1939.

Figure 1.29: Georg Pencz, *Judith with the Head of Holofernes,* 1531, oil on wood, 86 × 72 cm, München, Bayerische Schlösserverwaltung © Bayer&Mitko – ARTOTHEK.

Figure 1.30: Titian, *Salome,* 1515, oil on canvas, 90 × 72 cm, Rome, Galleria Doria Pamphili © Alinari / Art Resource, NY ART92169.

Figure 1.31: Georg Pencz, *Pero and Cimon,* 1538, oil on canvas, 76 × 53.5 cm, Warsaw, Museum Narodowe © Photo: Wilczynski Krzysztof / Muzeum Narodowe w Warszawie.

Figure 1.32: Erhard Schwetzer, *Pero and Cimon,* 1538, Nürnberg, Germanisches Museum.

Figure 1.33: Georg Pencz, *Pero and Cimon,* 1546, Stockholm, J. A. Berg Collection, Stockholm University, inv. no. 89 © Courtesy J. A. Berg Collection, Stockholm University.

Figure 1.34: Georg Pencz, after, *Pero and Cimon,* early 17th c., München, Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, inv. no. 7071.

Figure 1.35: Bernardino Luini, after, *Pero and Cimon,* 19th c., tempera on canvas, Florence, Museo Stibbert © Raffaello Bencini / Alinari Archives, Florence.

Figure 1.36: Bernardino Luini, *Madonna Lactans,* before 1532, oil on panel, 74 × 56 cm, Warsaw, Museum Narodowe © Wilczynski Krzysztof / Muzeum Narodowe w Warszawie.

Figure 1.37: *Venus Nursing Adonis,* 1499, woodcut, Francesco Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (1999), p. 369.

Figure 1.38: *Polymast Fountain / The Three Graces Spouting Water from Their Breasts,* 1499, woodcut, Francesco Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (1999), p. 81.

Figure 1.39: *Egyptian Page with Image of Multi-Breasted Diana of Ephesus,* 1530–38, illumination, *Mass of Saint John the Baptist,* Colonna Missal, Manchester, University of Manchester, John Rylands University Library of Manchester, MS 32, fol. 79r © Copyright of the University of Manchester.

Figure 1.40: Giulio Romano, *Birth of Memnon,* 1524, wall painting, Mantua, Palazzo Tè, Appartamento del Giardino Segreto © Courtesy of the Frick Art Reference Library.

Figure 1.41: Cima da Conegliano, *Saint Mark Healing Ananias,* 1497–99, detail, oil on wood, 172 × 135 cm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 15 © Photo: Jörg P. Anders, Gemäldegalerie / Art Resource, ART368335.

Figure 1.42: Bernardino Pinturicchio and workshop, *Mermaid Nursing her Offspring,* 1490, coffered ceiling, detail, Rome, Palazzo dei Penitenzieri (Palazzo of Domenico della Rovere), Sala dei Semidei © Scala / Art Resource, ART360968.

Figure 1.43: Giulio Romano and workshop, *A Mermaid Goddess Nursing her Young,* before 1534, oil on panel, 94.3 × 99.5 cm, London, The Royal Collection at Hampton Court, image no. 402918 © The Royal Collection at Hampton Court.

Figure 1.44: Giulio Romano, *Pero and Cimon* or *Breastfeeding Artemis,* before 1534, design, pen and brown ink, 18.5 × 20.5 cm, Chantilly, Chateau de Chantilly, Musée Condé © Photo: Michel Urtado, RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY ART511647.

Figure 1.45: Giulio Romano, *Wedding Banquet of Amor and Psyche,* 1524–34, detail of breastfeeding satyr, wall painting, Mantua, Palazzo Tè, Camera di Psiche © Photo: Erich Lessing / Art Resource, NY ART24471.

Figure 1.46: Giulio Romano, *Bacchus and Ariane,* before 1546, cartoon, pen and brown ink, 42.7 × 67.3 cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, inv. no. 3488, recto © Photo: Thierry Le Mage, RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY ART510332.

Figure 1.47: Primaticcio, *Pero and Cimon,* 1544, drawing, red pencil, 25.5 × 15 cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, inv. no. RF 563 © Photo: Madeleine Coursaget, RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY ART510333.

Figure 1.48: Perino del Vaga, *Pero and Cimon,* 1528–39, wall painting, Genua, Palazzo Doria Pamphili © Villa del Principe, Sezione Didattica.

Figure 1.49: Rosso Fiorentino, *Pero and Cimon,* after 1530, stucco relief, Chateau de Fontainebleau, Gallerie François I © Photo: Peter Willi, RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY ART173655.

Figure 1.50: Georges Reverdy (Gasparo Reverdino), *Pero and Cimon,* 1542, print, 141 × 320 mm, London, British Museum, 1926,1026.2 © Trustees of the British Museum.

Figure 2.1: Caravaggio, *The Seven Works of Mercy,* 1606, oil on canvas, 390 × 260 cm, Naples, Pio Monte della Misericordia © Pio Monte della Misericordia.

Figure 2.2: Caravaggio, *The Crucifixion of Saint Peter,* 1600–01, detail, oil on canvas, 230 × 175 cm, Rome, Santa Maria del Popolo, Cerasi Chapel © Alinari / Art Resource, NY ART125169.

Figure 2.3: Battistello Caracciolo, *The Liberation of Saint Peter,* 1615, oil on canvas, 310 × 207 cm, Naples, Pio Monte della Misericordia © Scala / Art Resource, NY ART105451.

Figure 2.4: Sébastien Nivelle, *Filial Piety,* 1572, woodcut, Paris.

Figure 2.5: Étienne Delaune, *The Daughter Breastfeeds her Mother,* before 1583, ink on paper, 3.5 × 4.3 cm, Vienna, Albertina, inv. no. 11166 © Albertina, Vienna.

Figure 2.6: *Pero and Cimon,* 1540–50, carved boxwood bowl, 17.1 × 20 cm, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 (17.190.643) © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Art Resource, NY ART513528.

Figure 2.7: Lambert Lombard, *The Daughter Breastfeeds her Mother,* before 1566, drawing, brown pen, 12.9 × 20.3 cm, Vienna, Albertina, inv. no. 35472 © Albertina, Vienna.

Figure 2.8: Jost Amman, *Pero and Cimon,* 1599, woodcut, 99 × 97 mm, *Kunstbüchlein,* Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek.

Figure 2.9: Hans Bernaert Vierleger, *Pero and Cimon,* 1601, dish, tin glaze, lead glaze, h 14 × d 44 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, BK-NM-12730 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 2.10: Theodor de Bry, *The Seven Works of Mercy,* 1588, cup design, diam. 120 mm, London, British Museum, 1870,0625.35 © Trustees of the British Museum.

Figure 2.11: Roman Master, *Pero and Cimon,* late 16th c., 103 × 103 cm, Rome, Galleria Borghese © Photo: Jutta Sperling.

Figure 2.12: Bolognese Master, *Pero and Cimon,* late 16th c., 26 × 20 cm, Rome, Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica, Palazzo Barberini © Photo: Jutta Sperling.

Figure 2.13: Caravaggio, *The Denial of Saint Peter,* 1610, oil on canvas, 94 × 125.4 cm, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art © The Metropolitan Museum of New York / Art Resource, NY ART358093.

Figure 2.14: Bartolomeo Manfredi, *The Denial of Saint Peter,* 1615–16, oil on canvas, 166 × 232 cm, Braunschweig, Herzog-Anton-Ulrich Museum, no. 495.

Figure 2.15: Dirck van Baburen, *The Denial of Saint Peter,* 1620–24, oil on canvas, 87 × 105 cm, Kraków, National Museum © From the Collections of the National Museum in Kraków.

Figure 2.16: Caravaggio, *The Calling of Saint Matthew,* 1599–1600, oil on canvas, 322 × 340 cm, Rome, San Luigi dei Francesi, Contarelli Chapel © Scala / Art Resource, NY ART85771.

Figure 2.17: Caravaggio, *The Madonna of Loreto,* 1604–06, oil on canvas, 260 × 150 cm, Rome, Sant'Agostino, Cavaletti Chapel © Scala / Art Resource, NY ART300447.

Figure 2.18: Stefano Maderno, *Saint Cecilia,* 1600, marble sculpture, Rome, Trastevere, Church of Santa Cecilia © Photo: Jim Kan.

Figure 2.19: Guido Reni, *Assumed Portrait of Beatrice Cenci,* first half of the 17th c., canvas, 75 × 50 cm, Rome, Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica, Palazzo Barberini, inv. no. 1944 © Scala / Ministero per i Beni e le Attività culturali / Art Resource, NY ART372737.

Figure 2.20: Giovanni Lanfranco, *Saint Agatha Healed by Saint Peter,* 1614, oil on canvas, 100 × 132.5 cm, Parma, Galleria Nazionale di Parma, inv. no. 65 © Mondadori Portfolio / Electa / Art Resource, NY ART434821.

Figure 2.21: Follower of Simon Vouet, *Saint Agatha Healed by Saint Peter,* 17th c., 30 × 42 cm, sold at Millon & Associés in Paris, June 26, 2013 © courtesy Millon.

Figure 2.22: Follower of Guido Reni, *Saint Agatha Visited by Saint Peter in Prison,* 17th c., Geneva, Musée d'art et d'histoire, inv. no. 1881–84 © Photo: Jutta Sperling.

Figure 2.23: Vincenzo Camuccini, *Anti-Roman Charity,* 1797, drawing, Turin, Collezione Eredi di Damiano Pernati.

Figure 2.24: Bartolomeo Manfredi, *Roman Charity,* 1610–14, Private Collection.

Figure 2.25: Bartolomeo Manfredi, *Roman Charity,* 1615–17, oil on canvas, 130 × 97 cm, Florence, Uffizi, inv. no. 1890/10038 © Segreteria Gabinetto Fotografico del Polo Museale Regionale della Toscana.

Figure 2.26: Abraham Bloemaert, *Roman Charity,* 1610, Sotheby's Sale AM1051, Lot 08 (May 7, 2008, Amsterdam) © Photograph Courtesy of Sotheby's, Inc.

Figure 2.27: Peter Paul Rubens, *Roman Charity,* 1610–12, oil on canvas, 140.5 × 180.3 cm, Saint Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, Photograph © The State Hermitage Museum, Photo by Yuri Molodkovets.

Figure 2.28: Peter Paul Rubens, The Drunken Silenus, 1616–17, oak panel, 212 × 214.5 cm, München, Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Alte Pinakothek, inv. no. 319 © Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Alte Pinakothek, München.

Figure 2.29: Peter Paul Rubens, *Roman Charity,* 1625, London, Art Market, 1954.

Figure 2.30: Dirck van Baburen, *Roman Charity,* 1623, York, City of York Art Gallery © Image courtesy of York Museums Trust: http://yorkmuseumstrust.org.uk, Public Domain.

Figure 2.31: Dirck van Baburen, *Roman Charity,* 1622–24, London, private collection; Sotheby's Sale L03939, Lot 350 (Dec. 16, 1999) © Photograph Courtesy of Sotheby's, Inc.

Figure 2.32: Jan Vermeer, *A Lady at the Virginals,* 1662–65, oil on canvas, 74 × 64.6 cm, London, Buckingham Palace © HIP / Art Resource, NY AR922084.

Figure 2.33: Hans Jordaens III, *An Artist's Cabinet,* 1630, oil on oak wood, 86 × 120 cm, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. no. 716 © Erich Lessing / Art Resource, NY ART25976.

Figure 2.34: Gerrit van Honthorst, *Roman Charity,* before 1656, 150 × 188 cm, Münster, Landesmuseum, inv. no. 194 WKV © LWL-Museum für Kunst und Kultur (Westfälisches Landesmuseum), Münster/Dauerleihgabe des Westfälischen Kunstvereins.

Figure 2.35: Paulus Moreelse, *Roman Charity,* 1633, oil on canvas, 147.5 × 162 cm, Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland, inv. no. 1024 © National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh.

Figure 2.36: Christiaen van Couwenbergh, *Roman Charity,* 1639, oil on oak, 61 × 46.7 cm, Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle, inv. no. 1893 © Photo: Annette Fischer / Heike Kohler, Staatliche Kunsthalle / Art Resource, NY ART503030.

Figure 2.37: Simon Vouet, *Roman Charity,* 1613–27, Ryazan, near Moscow, State Regional Art Museum.

Figure 2.38: Claude Mellan, after Simon Vouet, *Roman Charity,* 1628, print, 167 × 111 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-P-OB-69.926 © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 2.39: Augustin Rummel, Jean-Pierre Huaud, Amy Huaud, *Roman Charity,* 17th c., watch face, enamel, gilded metal, diamond, diam. 4.2 cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre – Documentation du Département des Objets d'Art, OA 8447 © Photo: Daniel Arnaudet, RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY ART510329.

Figure 2.40: Jean-Pierre Huaud, Amy Huaud, *Roman Charity,* after Rubens, Hermitage version, before 1723, watch face, enamel paint, diam. 3.9 cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre – Documentation du Département des Objets d'Art, OA 8443 © Photo: Stéphane Maréchalle, RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY ART513184.

Figure 2.41: Nicolas Regnier, *Roman Charity,* 1638, 139 × 171 cm, Modena, Galleria Estense, inv. no. 433 © Alinari / Art Resource, NY ART515500.

Figure 2.42: Guido Reni, attr., *Roman Charity,* before 1642, 129 × 97 cm, Marseille, Musée des Beaux Arts, inv. no. BA 33 © Photo: Jutta Sperling.

Figure 3.1: Angelika Kauffmann, *Roman Charity,* ca. 1765, drawing, Florence, Uffizi, inv. no. 12377 S © Segreteria Gabinetto Fotografico del Polo Museale Regionale della Toscana.

Figure 3.2: Jean-Michel Moreau the Younger, *The Illness of Las Casas,* 1777, print, Jean-François Marmontel, *Les Incas* (1777), Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France © Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Figure 3.3: Nicolas Poussin, *The Gathering of the Manna,* 1639, oil on canvas, 149 × 200 cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. no. 7275 © Photo: Mathieu Rabeau, RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY ART490849.

Figure 3.4: Nicolas Poussin, *The Plague at Ashdod,* 1630, oil on canvas, 148 × 198 cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. no. 7276 © Photo: Mathieu Rabeau, RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY ART490862.

Figure 3.5: Tintoretto, *The Birth of Saint John the Baptist,* 1563, oil on canvas, 270.5 × 204.2 cm, Venice, San Zaccaria © Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico Artistico et Etnoantropologico e per il polo museale della Città di Venezia e dei comuni della gronda lagunare. Permission: Patriarcato di Venezia.

Figure 3.6: Nicolas Poussin, *Moses Striking Water from the Rocks,* 1649, oil on canvas, 122.5 × 191 cm, Saint Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, inv. no. GE-1177, Photograph © The State Hermitage Museum, Photo by Leonard Kheifets.

Figure 3.7: Nicolas Poussin, "The Death of Germanicus," 1627, canvas, 148 × 198 cm, Minneapolis, Minneapolis Institute of the Arts © Photo: Erich Lessing / Art Resource, NY ART173099.

Figure 3.8: Marcantonio Raimondi, *Il Morbetto,* after Raphael, 1515–16, print, 198 × 252 mm, New Haven, Yale University Art Gallery © Yale University Art Gallery.

Figure 3.9: Mattia Preti, *The Plague,* 1656–57, sketch, oil on canvas, 127 × 75 cm, Naples, Galleria Nazionale di Capodimonte © Scala / Art Resource, NY ART61572.

Figure 3.10: Gaetano Zumbo, *The Plague,* ca. 1691, wax relief, Florence, Museo della Specola © Photo: Nicolo Orsi Battaglini / Art Resource, NY ART356505.

Figure 3.11: Charles Le Brun, *Charity,* 1642–48, oil on canvas, Caen, Musée des Beaux Arts, inv. no. 84.8.1 © Photo: Martine Seyve, Musée des Beaux Arts de Caen.

Figure 3.12: Guercino, *The Daughter Who Breastfeeds her Mother,* before 1661, drawing, London, Collection of Her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle, Royal Collection Trust, RCIN 902573 / © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2015.

Figure 3.13: Niccolò Tornioli, *Roman Charity,* before 1651, Rome, Galleria Spada © Polo Museale del Lazio, Archivio Fotografico.

Figure 3.14: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, *Septimius Severus and Caracalla,* 1769, oil on canvas, 124 × 160 cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. no. 5031 © Photo: R. G. Ojeda, P. Neri, RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource ART148155.

Figure 3.15: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, *Roman Charity,* 1767, oil on canvas, 65.4 × 81.4 cm, Los Angeles, Getty Museum, inv. no. 99.PA.24 © Courtesy of the Getty's Open Content Program.

Figure 3.16: Peter Paul Rubens, *Minerva Protects Pax from Mars,* 1629–30, oil on canvas, 203.5 × 298 cm, London, National Gallery, inv. no. 46 © National Gallery, London / Art Resource, NY ART377014.

Figure 3.17: Louis-Jean-François Lagrenée the Elder, *Roman Charity,* 1765, oil on canvas, 62 × 73 cm, Toulouse, Musée des Augustines © Photo: Daniel Martin, Toulouse, Musée des Augustins.

Figure 3.18: Giuseppe Baldrighi, *Roman Charity,* 1757, oil on canvas, 166 × 132 cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. no. 8712 © RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY ART510334.

Figure 3.19: Jean-Baptiste Deshays, *Roman Charity,* 1752, oil on canvas, oval, h 117 cm, w 94 cm, Rouen, Musée des Beaux Arts, inv. no. 1818.1.3 © Réunion des Musées Métropolitains Rouen Normandie.

Figure 3.20: Noël-Nicolas Coypel, *Roman Charity,* 1735, oil on oak, 29.1 × 23 cm, Bremen, Kunsthalle Bremen – Der Kunstverein in Bremen, inv. no. 265-1904/9 © Photo Lars Lohrisch.

Figure 3.21: Jacques-Philippe Le Bas, *Roman Charity,* after Coypel, ca. 1735, print, 35.9 × 26.5 cm, London, British Museum, inv. no. 1876,0708.2421 © Trustees of the British Museum.

Figure 3.22: Jean Jacques Bachelier, *Roman Charity,* 1765, oil on canvas, 131 × 98 cm, Paris, École nationale supérieure des Beaux Arts © Beaux-Arts de Paris, Dist. RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY ART508849.

Figure 3.23: Adolf Ulrich Wertmüller, *Portrait of Jean Jacques Bachelier with Roman Charity,* 1784, oil on canvas, 120 × 96 cm, Stockholm, National-museum © Photo: Nationalmuseum, Stockholm.

Figure 3.24: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, *Roman Charity,* 1767, design, pen and black ink, 37.8 × 41 cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, inv. no. 26983, Recto © Photo: Michèle Bellot, RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY ART161968.

Figure 3.25: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, *Loth and His Daughters,* 1760–69, oil on canvas, 74 × 80 cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. no. R.F. 1983–74 © Photo: Erich Lessing / Art Resource, NY ART150768.

Figure 3.26: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, *The Paralytic,* also called *Filial Piety,* 1763, oil on canvas, 115 × 146 cm, Saint Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, inv. no. GE-1168, Photograph © The State Hermitage Museum, Photo by Vladimir Terebenin.

Figure 3.27: Jacques-Louis David, school of, *Roman Charity,* late 18th c., Portland, Maine, Barridoff Galleries, August 5, 2005 © Barridoff Galleries.

Figure 4.1: *Pero and Cimon,* Pompeii, Casa IX, 2,5, before 79 CE, wall painting, Naples, National Archaeological Museum © Scala / Art Resource, NY ART174093.

Figure 4.2: *Pero and Cimon,* 1st c. CE, sigillata shard, Southern Gaul, Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Bode-Museum.

Figure 4.3: Illumination of a Manuscript by Solinus, 13th c., Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, cod. C 246, fol. 1or © De Agostini Editori.

Figure 4.4: *Mother and Daughter,* early 15th c., illumination, Boccaccio, *De cleres et nobles femmes,* Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Fr. 598, fol. 99 © Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Figure 4.5: *Mother and Daughter,* 15th or 16th c., illumination, Boccaccio, *De cleres et nobles femmes,* Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Fr. 599, fol. 57v © Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Figure 4.6: *Mother and Daughter,* 1473, woodcut, Boccaccio, *Von den berühmten Frawen,* transl. by Heinrich Steinhöwel (Ulm: Johann Zainer, 1473).

Figure 5.1: *Childbirth Dish,* 1546, tin-glazed earthenware from Urbino, diam. 41.5 cm, London, Victoria and Albert Museum, C 2223–1910 © Courtesy of the Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 5.2: Jusepe de Ribera, *The Bearded Woman,* 1631, oil on canvas, 126 × 194.9 cm, Sevilla, Fundación Casa Ducal de Medinaceli © Fundación Casa Ducal de Medinaceli.

Figure 5.3: Paolo Veronese, *Mars and Venus United by Love,* ca. 1570, oil on canvas, 205.7 × 161 cm, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 10.189 © The Metropolitan Museum of Art / Art Resource, NY ART336698.

Figure 5.4: Domenico Ghirlandaio, *The Birth of Saint John the Baptist,* 1488, detail, wall painting, Florence, Santa Maria Novella, Tornabuoni Chapel © Scala / Art Resource, NY ART6191.

Figure 5.5: Benedetto Caliari, *The Birth of the Virgin Mary,* ca. 1550–80, detail, Venice, Palazzo Loredan © Alinari Archives, Florence.

Figure 6.1 *Juno Nursing Hercules as a Grown Man,* 5th–4th c. BCE, drawing of an Etruscan mirror, Florence, Museo Archaeologico Nazionale © Photo: Jutta Sperling.

Figure 6.2: *Empress Flavia Maxima Fausta Nursing her Son,* 316 CE, double solidus, gold coin, reverse, diam. 25 mm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Münzkabinett, inv. no. 1873/393 © Bode Museum / Art Resource ART509450.

Figure 6.3: *Madonna Lactans* or *Tombstone of a Young Woman,* 4th–5th century CE, Egyptian, limestone, 55 × 34 cm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Bode Museum, inv. no. 4726 © Photo: Antje Vogt, Bode Museum / Art Resource, NY ART507072.

Figure 6.4: Tintoretto, *The Circumcision of Christ,* 1550–55, Venice, Santa Maria dei Carmini © Cameraphoto Arte, Venice / Art Resource, NY ART43336.

Figure 6.5: Giorgione, *Tempest,* 1508, detail, oil on canvas, 83 × 73 cm, Venice, Galleria dell'Accademia © Cameraphoto Arte, Venice / Art Resource, NY ART140448.

Figure 6.6: Lucas Cranach the Elder, *Charity,* 1534, oil and tempera on beech wood, 52 × 36 cm, Schaffhausen, Museum zum Allerheiligen, Sturzenegger Stiftung, inv. no. A 1781 © Museum zum Allerheiligen, Sturzenegger Stiftung.

Figure 6.7: Giovanni Pisano, *Charity* or *Ecclesia,* 1310, detail, marble sculpture, pulpit, Pisa, Cathedral © Nimatallah / Art Resource, NY ART106046.

Figure 6.8: Ambrogio Lorenzetti, *Madonna Lactans,* ca. 1335, tempera on wood, 90 × 48 cm, Siena, Palazzo Arcivescovile, Museo Diocesano.

Figure 6.9: Quirizio di Giovanni da Murano, *Christ about to Nurse a Poor Clare from his Wound,* 1460–80, tempera and oil on panel, 87 × 114 cm, Venice, Galleria dell'Accademia © Alinari / Art Resource, NY ART81475.

Figure 6.10: Jacopo della Quercia, *Charity,* 1409–19, original replaced by Tito Sarrocchi in 1868, Siena, Fonte Gaia © Jastrow, Wikimedia Commons.

Figure 6.11: Giulio Romano or Raphael, *Charity,* 1520–24, wall painting, Rome, Vatican Palace, Sala di Costantino © Wikimedia Commons.

Figure 6.12: Leonardo da Vinci, follower, *Madonna Lactans,* ca. 1490, tempera on canvas, 42 × 33 cm, St. Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, inv. no. GE-249, Photograph © The State Hermitage Museum, Photo by Vladimir Terebenin.

Figure 6.13: Domenico di Bartolo, *The Assignment and Payment of Wet-Nurses and the Marriage of Foundlings,* 1443, detail, wall painting, Siena, Ospedale di Santa Maria della Scala, Sala del Pellegrinaio © Scala / White Images / Art Resource, NY ART490051.

Figure 6.14: Domenico di Bartolo, *The Distribution of Alms,* 1443, detail, wall painting, Siena, Ospedale di Santa Maria della Scala, Sala del Pellegrinaio © DeA Picture Library / Art Resource, NY ART377523.

Figure 6.15: Marcello Fogolino, *Charity,* 1516–25, predella, Venice, Ca' d'Oro © Cameraphoto Arte, Venice / Art Resource, NY ART511436.

Figure 6.16: Marcello Fogolino, *Pietas,* 1516–25, predella, Venice, Ca' d'Oro © Cameraphoto Arte, Venice / Art Resource, NY ART511433.

Figure 6.17: Titian, *Moses Divides the Water,* 1515–17, detail, woodcut in twelve blocks, 118 × 215 cm, Venice, Private Collection © The Trustees of the British Museum / Art Resource, NY ART515508.

Figure 6.18: Giovanni Antonio Coróna, *The Preaching of Saint Anthony,* 1509, detail, wall painting, Padua, Basilica di Saint Anthony, Scuola del Santo © Photo: Ghigo G. Roli / Art Resource, NY ART507278.

Figure 6.19: Tintoretto, *Last Supper,* 1547, oil on canvas, 157 × 443 cm, Venice, San Marcuola © Cameraphoto Arte, Venice / Art Resource, NY ART107221.

Figure 6.20: Tintoretto, *The Presentation of the Virgin,* 1552, detail, oil on canvas, 429 × 480 cm, Venice, Madonna dell'Orto © Cameraphoto Arte, Venice / Art Resource, NY ART84967.

Figure 6.21: *Woman Nurses Two Old Men from her Breasts,* ca. 1150, illumination, Engelberg, Convent Library, codex 48, fol. 103v © Stiftsbibliothek Engelberg.

Figure 6.22: *The Six Ages of Man,* 13th c., detail, illumination, Toledo, Cathedral, *Moralized Bible*, vol. 3, fol. 21v © Archivo de la Catedral de Toledo.

Figure 6.23: *Philosophy, Sitting on a Throne, Nursing Boethius and another Philosopher from her Breasts,* 1491, illumination, Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae*, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Néerlandais 1, fol. 12v © Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Figure 6.24: Giovanni Pisano, *Grammar,* 1302–11, marble sculpture, Pisa, Cathedral © Alinari / Art Resource, NY ART515689.

Figure 6.25: Giulio Bonasone, after Giulio Romano, *Jupiter Suckled by the Goat Amalthea,* after 1531, print, 26.6 × 42.2 cm, London, British Museum, H, 6.3, image no. AN444983001 © Trustees of the British Museum.

Table: Caravaggisti, Caravaggeschi, and Their Iconographical Choices[1]

Painters	Liberation of St. Peter	Denial of St. Peter	Incredulity of St. Thomas	Penitence of St. Peter	Misc. St. Peter	Roman Charity
Adelo, R. van						
Alaleone, Paolo						
Baburen, Dirck		1		1		2
Baeck, Johannes						
Baglione, Giovanni					1	
Bassetti, Marcantonio						
Bernardi, Pietro						
Bigot, Trophime	1	4			1	
Bijlert, Jan van		1				
Bloemaert, Abraham						1
Bloemaert, Hendrick						
Bor, Paulus						
Borgianni, Orazaio						
Boulogne, Valentin de	1	3				1
Bronckhorst, Jan Gerrtisz van						1
Buoneri/Boneri, Francesco						
Callot, Jacques de						
Campen, Jacob van						
Campo, Giovanni del						
Caracciolo, Battistello	1					
Caravaggesque Unknown	2	5	1	1	3	
Caravaggio		1	1		3	1
Caroselli, Angelo						
Cassarino						
Cavarozzi, Bartolomeo						
Cecco del Caravaggio						
Cortona, Pietro da						

Cossiers, Jan						
Cossiers, Simon						
Coster, Adam de						
Couwenbergh, Christiaan van						1
Crabeth, Wouter Pietersz. II						
Dobson, William						
Domenichino = Domenico Zampieri						
Douffet, Gérard						1
Dovini, Tommaso						
Ducamps, Jean = Giovanni Martinelli						
Elsheimer, Adam						
Everdingen, Cesar van						
Faber, Martin Hermansz	1	1				
Fetti, Domenico						
Fiammingo, Giusto						
Fiasella, Domenico						
Finson, Louis			1			
François, Guy			1			
François, Jean						
Galen, Nicolas van						
Galli, Giovanni Antonio, detto lo Spadarino		1				1
Geest, Wybrand de						
Gentileschi, Artemisia						
Gentileschi, Orazio						
Grammatica, Antiveduto						
Grammatica, Imperiale, figlio di Antiveduto						
Guercino	1	1				2
Guerrieri, Giovanni Francesco						
Haen, David de						
Heimbach, Wolfgang						
Hermans, Martin Faber						
Heuvel, Anton van den	3					
Honthorst, Gerrit van	1	3		1	2	4
Honthorst, Willem van						2
Houbracken, Jan van						
Janssen, Jans						2
Janssens, Abraham						
Kuijl or Kuyl, Gerard van						

La Tour, Georges de		1		3		
Lana, Ludovico						
Le Clerc, Jean	1	1				
Lestin or L'Estain or Letin, Jacques de						
Lievens, Jan						
Liss, Johann						
Loon, Theodoor van	1					
Loth, Johann Ulrich						5
Maestro del Giudizio di Salomone		2			1	
Maestro dell'Annuncio ai pastori						
Maestro di Hartford						
Magnone, Carlo						
Maino, Juan Bautista				1		
Manetti, Rutilio					1	
Manfredi, Bartolomeo	1	5				2
Manzoni, Michiele			1			
Mattei, Asdrubale						
Mellan, Claude						1
Minniti, Mario						
Moeyaert, Claesz Cornelisz						
Molineri, Giovanni Antonio						
Moreelse, Johan						
Munnicks, Hendrick						
Musso, Nicolò						
Ottino, Pasquale						
Paolini, Pietro						
Pape, Josse de, detto Giusto Fiammingo						
Pensionante del Saraceni		3				
Pietersz, Wouter						
Polinori, Andrea		1				
Portengen, Lumen						
Portengen, Petrus						
Preti, Mattia		1				3
Quantin, Philippe						
Ragusa, Francesco						
Régnier, Nicolas						2
Rembrandt Harmensz, van Rijn						1

Reni, Guido				5	2	4
Ribera, Jusepe de = Spagnoletto		2				1
Riminaldi, Orazio						
Rodriguez, Alonzo			1			
Rombouts, Theodoor		1				
Rubens, Peter Paul					3	6
Rustici, Francesco	1					
Salini, Tommaso						
Sandrart, Joachim von						
Saraceni, Carlo						
Sarburgh, Bartholomäus						
Schedoni, Bartolomeo						
Seghers, Gerard		10		3		2
Sellitto, Carlo						
Serodine, Giovanni						
Simon Henrixz					1	
Spada, Leonello		1				
Stom[er], Matthias	1	2	2		1	2
Sweerts, Michael						
Terborch, Jan						
Terburgghen, Hendrick	3	1	1	2		1
Tilmann, Simon Peter						
Tornioli, Nicolò						1
Tournier, Nicolas		6				
Traivoel, Henry						
Tristan, Luis						
Turchi, Alessandro, detto l'Orbetto						
van Oost, Jacob il Vecchio						
Varallo, Tanzio da						
Velázquez, Diego						
Vermiglio, Giuseppe		1	1			
Verona, Antonio Giarola di						
Vignon, Claude		1				
Vitale, Filippo						
Volmarijn, Crijn Hendricksz						
Vouet, Simon					1	3
Woot, Tilmant						
total painters: 139	**19**	**60**	**10**	**17**	**20**	**53**

Notes

1 | The names and attributions are taken from Benedict Nicolson, *Caravaggism in Europe,* revised and enlarged by Luisa Vertova, 3 vols. (Turin: Umberto Allemandi & C., 1990, first ed. 1979); J. Richard Judson and Rudolf E.O. Ekkart, *Gerrit van Honthorst 1592–1656* (Doornspijk: Davaco Publishers, 1999); Alessandro Zuccari, with the assistance of Claudio Strinati, *I Caravaggeschi. Percorsi e protagonisti,* 2 vols. (Milan: Skira, 2010); Andor Pigler, *Barockthemen, eine Auswahl von Verzeichnissen zur Ikonographie des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó 1974, first ed. Budapest: Verlag der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1956); my research.

Works Cited

Accati, Luisa, Marina Cattaruzza, and Monika Verzar Brass, eds. *Padre e figlia*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier, 1994.

Acoromboni, Geronimo. *Tractatus de Lacte*. Venice, 1536.

Adams, Julia. "The Familial State: Elite Family Practices and State-Making in the Early Modern Netherlands," *Theory and Society* 23, no. 4 (1994): 505–39.

Aikema, Bernard. "L'Immagine della Carità Veneziana," in: *Nel Regno dei Poveri: Arte e Storia dei grandi ospedali veneziani in età moderna 1474–1797*, ed. by Bernard Aikema, 71–98. Venice: IRE, Istituzioni di Ricovero e di Educazione, 1989.

Alpers, Svetlana. *The Making of Rubens*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Angelucci, Laura, and Roberta Serra, eds. *Giulio Romano*; Exposition, Cabinet des Dessins au Musée du Louvre du 11. 10. 2012 au 14. 01. 2013. Paris: Musée du Louvre, 2012.

L'année littéraire (1757, vol. V; 1765, vol. VI) in: *L'année littéraire*. Genève: Faksimile Slatkine Reprints, 1966.

Anon., "Girard de Rossillon" (written between 1155–80), in: *Poème Bourguignon du XIVe siècle*, ed. by Edward Billings Ham. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

Antonioni, Michelangelo. *L'avventura* [The adventure]. Janus Films, 1960.

Arasse, Daniel. *Le Détail: pour une histoire rapprochée de la peinture*. Paris: Flammarion, 1992.

Arbizzoni, Guido. "La pietas erga parentes negli emblemi (e dintorni)," in: Raffaelli et al., *Pietas e allattamento filiale*, 247–69.

Aresi, Paolo. *Delle sacre imprese di Monsignor Paolo Aresi vescovo di Tortona libro quarto: In cui le fatte in lode di Cristo Signor N. e di altri Santi e Beati si contengono*. Tortona: Pietro Giovanni Calenzano et Eliseo Viola compagni, 1630.

Aristotle. *The Complete Works of Aristotle*: *The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. by Jonathan Barnes, vol. 1. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Arnaldi, Francesco, and Franz Blatt, *Novum glossarium mediae Latinitatis, ab anno DCCC usque ad annum MCC*. Hafniae: E. Munksgaard, 1957–2011.

Aselli, Gaspare. *De lactibus sive lacteis vasis quarto vasorum mesaraicorum genere*. Milan: apud Io: Baptām Bidellium, 1627.

Astolfi, Giovanni Felice. *Scelta curiosa, et ricca officina di varie antiche, & moderne Istorie, divisa in tre libri*. Venice: apresso gli heredi di Marchiò Sessa, 1602.

Atkinson, Clarissa W. *The Oldest Vocation*: *Christian Motherhood in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Auerbach, Erich. *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature* (Theory and History of Literature, vol. 9). Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984; first ed. 1959.

Bal, Mieke. "The genius of Rome: Putting things together," *Journal of Visual Culture* 1, no. 1 (2002): 25–45.

Baldus Novellus. "Tractatus Notabilis singularis et utilis, de dotibus, et dotatis mulieribus, & earum iuribus & privilegijs. Editus per excellentissimum ac celeberrimum Iuris Pontificij & Caesarei doctorem monarcham & advocatum consistorialem, D. Baldum de Bartholinis, de Perusio: Inchoatus in almo studio Pisano, & completus sub anno Domini 1479, in excelso Gymnasio Perusino, cum iussu summi Pontefici ad patriam esset revocatus," in: *De Dote Tractatus ex variis iuris civilis interpretibus decerpti. His, quae ad dotium pertinent iura, & privilegia enucleantur*, with contributions by Baldus Novellus et aliis. Venice: apud Mauritium Rubinum, 1579.

Bancel, André. *Jean-Baptiste Deshays, 1729–1765*. Paris: Arthena, 2008.

Bange, E.F. *Die Italienischen Bronzen der Renaissance und des Barock*, Part II, Reliefs und Plaketten. Berlin; Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1922.

Barbieri, Patrizio. "Caravaggio's 'Denial of St. Peter' acquired by Guido Reni in 1613," *The Burlington Magazine* 154, no. 1312 (July 2012): 487–89.

Barkai, Ron. *A History of Jewish Gynaecological Texts in the Middle Ages*. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 1998.

Barclay, William. *De potestate papae*: *An & quatenus in Reges & Principes seculares ius & imperium habeat*: *Giul. Barclaii I.C. Liber posthumus. Reddite Caesari quae sunt Caesaris, & quae Dei Deo*. Mussiponti: apud Franciscum du Bois, & Jacobum Garnich, 1609.

Barker, Emma. *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

—. "Painting and Reform in Eighteenth-Century France: Greuze's 'l'Accordée de Village'," *Oxford Art Journal* 20, no. 2 (1997): 42–52.

Bartolini, Baldo. "Tractatus notabilis, singularis, et utilis De dotibus, & dotatis mulieribus, & earum iuribus & privilegijs, Editus, per Excellentiss. ac Celeberrimum Iuris Pontificij, & Caesarie Docto. Monarcham, & Advocatum

Consistorialem, D. Baldum de Bartholinis, de Perusio," in: *Tractatus illustrium in utraque tum pontificii, tum Caesarei iuris facultate Iurisconsultorum, De Matrimonio, & Dote ex multis in hoc volumen congesti, additis plurimis, etiam nunquam editis, ac nota designatis*. Venice: Società dell'aquila che si rinnova, 1584.

Bartrum, Giulia. *German Renaissance Prints 1490–1550*. London: British Museum Press, 1995.

Baskins, Cristelle, and Lisa Rosenthal, eds. *Early Modern Visual Allegory: Embodying Meaning*. Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2007.

Battaglia, Salvatore, and Giorgio Barberi Squarotti, *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana*. Turin: Unione Tipografico-Ed., 1999, first ed. 1981.

Baumgärtel, Bettina. "Die Tugenden als Symbol kirchlicher und staatlicher Macht. Über die Galerie der starken Frauen in Ausstattungsprogrammen und als Buchillustrationen," in: Baumgärtel and Neysters, *Die Galerie der starken Frauen*, 140–57.

Baumgärtel, Bettina, and Silvia Neysters, eds. *Die Galerie der starken Frauen: Regentinnen, Amazonen, Salondamen*; exhibition catalog; Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf, 10. September bis 12. November 1995; Hessisches Landesmuseum Darmstadt, 14. Dezember 1995 bis 26. Februar 1996. München: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1995.

Bazzotti, Ugo, Geneviève Brese-Bautier, Dominique Cordellier, Marianne Grivel, and Vittoria Romani, eds. *Primatice, Maître de Fontainebleau*; exhibition catalog; Paris, Musée du Louvre, 22 septembre 2004–3 janvier 2005. Paris: Éditions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 2004.

Beauvais, Vincent de. "Speculum Historiale," in: *La vierge et le miracle: Le speculum historiale de Vincent de Beauvais*, ed. by Michel Tarayre. Paris: Champion, 1999.

—. "Speculum Historiale," in: *Bibliotheca Mundi seu Speculi Marioris Vincentii Burgundi Praesulis Bellovacensis, Ordinis Praedicatorum*, Tomus quartus, qui speculum historiale inscribitur ... Omnia nunc accuratè recognita, distinctè ordinata ... Duaci: B. Belleri, 1624.

Begley, Christine. "Giulio Romano as Court Artist to Federico Gonzaga in the late 1520s," in: *Giulio Romano. Master Designer*, exhibition catalog, ed. by Janet Cox-Rearick, The Bertha and Karl Leubsdorf Art Gallery, Hunter College, 16 September–27 November 1999, 74–97. New York: Hunter College, 1999.

Bellarmine, Robert Franciscus Romulus, Cardinal. *Power of the Pope in Temporal Affairs against William Barclay*, transl. and ed. by George Albert Moore. Chevy Chase: The Country Dollar Press, 1949; first ed. Köln 1610.

Bellori, Giovanni Pietro. *The Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, transl. by Alice Sedgwick Wohl, notes by Hellmut Wohl, introduction

by Tomaso Montanari. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005; first It. ed. 1672.

Belluzzi, Amedeo. *Palazzo Te a Mantova*, 2 vols. Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini, 1998.

Belting, Hans. *Bilderfragen: Die Bildwissenschaften im Aufbruch*, ed. by Hans Belting. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2007.

—. "Die Herausforderung der Bilder. Ein Plädoyer und eine Einführung," in: Belting, *Bilderfragen*, 11–24.

—. *Bild und Kult: eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst*. München: Beck, 1970.

Benkheira, Mohammed Hocine. "'The Milk of the Male:' Kinship, Maternity, and Breastfeeding in Medieval Islam," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations*, 21–36.

Bernoni, Domenico Giuseppe, ed. *Indovinelli popolari veneziani*. Venice: Tipografia Antonelli, 1874.

Bestor, Jane Fair. "Ideas about Procreation and Their Influence on Ancient and Medieval Views of Kinship," in: *The Family in Italy from Antiquity to the Present*, ed. by David I. Kertzer and Richard P. Saller, 150–67. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.

Biondi, Carminella. "La Scena della Carità Romana nella Zelmire di Dormont e Belloy," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 141–54.

Black, Charlene Villaseñor. "The Moralized Breast in Early Modern Spain," in: *The Material Culture of Sex, Procreation, and Marriage in Premodern Europe*, ed. by Anne L. McClanan and Karen Rosoff Encarnacion, 191–219. New York: Palgrave 2002.

Blankert, Albert. "Caravaggio und die nördlichen Niederlande," in: Blankert and Slatkes, *Holländische Malerei in neuem Licht*, 17–41.

Blankert, Albert, and Leonard J. Slatkes, eds. *Holländische Malerei in neuem Licht: Hendrick ter Brugghen und seine Zeitgenossen*; Ausstellung im Centraal Museum Utrecht, 13. Nov. 1986–12. Jan. 1987; Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum in Braunschweig, 12. Feb. 1987–12. April 1987. Braunschweig: Das Museum, 1986.

Bloomer, W. Martin. *Valerius Maximus & the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Blumenthal, Debra G. "'With My Daughter's Milk': Wet Nurses and the Rhetoric of Lactation in Valencian Court Records," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations*, 101–14.

Blunt, Anthony. *Nicolas Poussin*. London: Pallas Athene, 2nd ed., 1995; first ed. 1967.

Boccaccio, Giovanni. *Famous Women*, ed. and transl. by Virginia Brown. Cambridge, Massachusetts: I Tatti Renaissance Library, 2001.

—. *De Claris Mulieribus*, transl. by Heinrich Steinhöwel, ed. by Karl Drescher. Tübingen: Litterarischer Verein Stuttgart, 1895; first German edition Ulm: Johann Zainer, 1473.

Bodin, Jean. *Abrégé de la République de Bodin*, vol. I. London: Chez Jean Nourse, 1775.

Boehm, Gottfried. *Wie Bilder Sinn erzeugen: Die Macht des Zeigens*. Berlin: Berlin University Press, 2010 (first publ. 2007).

—. "Iconic Turn. Ein Brief," in: Belting, *Bilderfragen*, 27–36.

—. "Jenseits der Sprache? Anmerkungen zur Logik der Bilder," in: *Iconic Turn. Die neue Macht der Bilder*, ed. by Christa Maar and Hubert Burda, 28–43. Köln: Dumont, 2004.

—. "Die Wiederkehr der Bilder," in: *Was ist ein Bild*, ed. by Gottfried Boehm, 11–38. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1994.

Boissonade, Jean François, ed. *Tzetzae Allegoriae Iliadis*. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1967, reprint of ed. Paris 1851.

Bologna, Ferdinando. "Il Caravaggio al Pio Monte della Misericordia," in: *Il Pio Monte della Misericordia di Napoli nel quarto centenario*, ed. by Mario Pisani Massamormile, 173–90. Naples: Electa Napoli, 2003.

—. *L'incredulità del Caravaggio e l'esperienza delle "cose naturali."* Turin: Bollati Boringhieri, 2006; first ed. 1992.

Bolten, Jaap. *Abraham Bloemaert, c. 1565–1651: The Drawings*. Netherlands: J. Bolten, 2007.

Bom, Erik De, Marijke Janssens, Toon Van Houdt, and Jan Papy, eds. *(Un) masking the Realities of Power: Justus Lipsius and the Dynamics of Political Writing in Early Modern Europe*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Bonfante, Larissa. "Nursing Mothers in Classical Art," in: *Naked Truths: Women, Sexuality, and Gender in Classical Art and Archaeology*, ed. by Ann Olga Koloski-Ostrow and Claire L. Lyons, 174–96. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Bouillon-Landais, Paul Louis. *Catalogue des objets d'art composant la collection du musée de Marseille précédé d'un essai historique sur le musée*. Marseille: impr. Marseillaise, 1884.

Braun, Edmund W. "Caritas Romana," in: *Reallexikon zur Deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, ed. by Ernst Gall and L.H. Heydenreich, vol. 3. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1954.

Bronzini, Giovanni Battista. "Mitemi incestuosi fra ingorghi di latte e scambi parentali," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 13–32.

—. "La Figlia che allatta il padre: Analisi morfologico-strutturale del motivo incestuoso nella letteratura popolare," in: Raffaelli et al., *Pietas e allattamento filiale*, 199–226.

Brookner, Anita. *Greuze: The Rise and Fall of an Eighteenth-Century Phenomenon*. London: Elek, 1972.

Brown, Beverly Louise, ed. *The Genius of Rome: 1592–1623*; exhibition catalog; Royal Academy of Arts, London, 20 Jan.–16 April, 2001; Palazzo Venezia, Rome, May–August, 2001. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2001.

—. "The Birth of the Baroque: Painting in Rome 1592–1623," in: Beverly Brown, *The Genius of Rome*, 16–41.

Brown, David Alan. "Venetian Painting and the Invention of Art," in: *Bellini, Giorgione, Titian and the Renaissance of Venetian Painting*; exhibition catalogue; National Gallery of Art, Washington, June 18–Sept. 17, 2006; Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Oct. 17, 2006–Jan. 7, 2007, ed. by David Alan Brown and Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, 15–37. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Bruno, Giordano. *Il Candelaio,* ed. by Enrico Sicardi. Milan: Casa Editrice Sonzogno, 1888.

Budin, Stephanie Lynn. *Images of Woman and Child from the Bronze Age: Reconsidering Fertility, Maternity, and Gender in the Ancient World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Buettner, Brigitte. *Boccaccio's Des cleres et nobles femmes: Systems of Signification in an Illuminated Manuscript*. Seattle: College Art Association and the University of Washington Press, 1996.

Büttner, Nils, and Ulrich Heinen, eds. *Peter Paul Rubens: Barocke Leidenschaften*; Ausstellung im Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum Braunschweig, 8. August bis 31. Oktober 2004. München: Hirmer Verlag, 2004.

Burcardo, Giovanni. *Diarium sive rerum urbanatum commentarii* (1483–1506), ed. by L. Thuasne, vol. II. Paris: E. Leroux, 1884.

Burchard, Ludwig, ed. *A Loan Exhibition of Works by Peter Paul Rubens*; exhibition catalog, London, Wildenstein, Oct. 4–Nov. 11, 1950. London: Wildenstein, 1950.

Burres von Neunkirchen, Lorentz. *Ein new Wund Artzney Büchlein vor nihe an den Tag gegeben Durch den erfarnen Meister Lorentzen Burres von Neunkirchen*. 1549.

Bustis, Bernardino de. *Rosarium Sermonum predicabilium in quo quicquid praeclarum et utile in cunctis sermonarijs usque in hodiernum editis continetur: hic ingeniose enucleatum atque solerti cura collectum invenies*, vol. 1. Augsburg, 1513.

Butsch, Albert Fidelis. *Handbook of Renaissance Ornament; 1290 Designs from Decorated Books*, with a new introduction and captions by Alfred Werner. New York: Dover Publications, 1969.

Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Bynum, Caroline W. *Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

—. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women*. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.

—. "Jesus as Mother and Abbot as Mother: Some Themes in Twelfth-Century Cistercian Writings," *Harvard Theological Review* 70, nos. 3–4 (1977): 257–84.

Cadden, Joan. *Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages: Medicine, Science, and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Calvesi, Maurizio. *La realtà di Caravaggio*. Turin: Giulio Einaudi Editore, 1990.

Campanella, Tommaso. *La Città del Sole: Dialogo Poetico* (*The City of the Sun: A Poetical Dialogue*), transl. and ed. by Daniel John Donno. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1981; first published 1623; written in 1602.

Cantimpré, Thomas of. *The Collected Saints' Lives: Abbot John of Cantimpré, Christina the Astonishing, Margaret of Ypres, and Lutgard of Aywières*, ed. and introduced by Barbara Newman; transl. by Margot H. King and Barbara Newman. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.

Cappelletti, Francesca. *Caravaggio: un ritratto somigliante*. Milan: Mondadori Electa, 2009.

Capua, Raymond of. *The Life of Catherine of Siena*, translated, introduced and annotated by Conleth Kearns; preface by Vincent de Couesnongle. Wilmington, Delaware: Glazier, 1980.

Casti, Giovan Battista (Giambattista). "Novella Terza: Le due Sunamitidi," in: *Opere di Giambattista Casti in un volume*. Bruxelles: Società Meline, Cans e Compagni, 1838; first complete ed. 1804.

Castro, Rodrigo de. *De universa mulierum Medicina novo et antehac a nemine tentato ordine opus absolutissimum et studiosis omnibus utile, medicis vero pernecessarium; pars prima theorica*. Hamburg: in officina frobeniana; typis Philippi de Ohr, 1603.

Cecchi Fiorentino, Gianmaria. "La dote," in: *Comedie di M. Gianmaria Cecchi Fiorentino Libro primo nel quale si contengono La Dote, La Moglie, Il Corredo, La Stiana, Il Donzello, Gl'Incantesimi, Lo Spirito*. Venice, appresso Bernardo Giunti, 1585; first ed. 1550.

Cessoles, Jacques de. *Le Jeu des Eschaz Moralisé (1347)*, ed. by Alain Collet and transl. by Jean Ferron. Paris: Champion, 1999.

Ceuleneer, Adolf de. "La Charité romaine dans la littérature et dans l'art," *Annales de l'Académie royale d'archéologie de Belgique* (1920): 175–206.

Champier, Symphorien. *La Nef des Dames Vertueuses*, ed. by Judy Kem. Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 2007; first ed. 1503.

Cifani, Arabella, and France Monetti. "Angelica Kauffmann, Luigi Sabatelli, Pietro Benvenuti e Vincenzo Camuccini: Disegni Inediti nella Raccolta di Damiano Pernati," *Bollettino d'Arte* 115 (2001): 75–92.

Cipriani, Giovanni. "L'allattamento salvifico: un problema di papi e filosofi," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 103–24.

Climent-Delteil, Pascale. *Il Rosso Fiorentino, pittore della Maniera*. Montpellier: Presses universitaires de la Méditerranée, 2007.

Cohen Jr., Samuel Kline. *Death and Property in Siena, 1205–1800: Strategies for the Afterlife*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Colonna, Francesco (presumed author). *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili: The Strife of Love in a Dream*, transl. by Joscelyn Godwin. London: Thames & Hudson, 1999.

Corsiglia, Christina, ed. *Rubens and His Age: Treasures from the Hermitage Museum, Russia*. London: Merrell Publishers; Toronto: Art Gallery of Ontario, 2001.

Council of Trent, "On the Invocation, Veneration, and Relics of Saints, and on Sacred Images," in: *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent,* Twenty-Fifth Session, ed. and transl. by J. Waterworth, 232–89. London: Dolman, 1848.

Cramer, Daniel. *Zehen Catechismus Predigten. Das ist: Die Vernunfftige Lautere Milch Des H. Catechismus Lutheri öffentlich gehalten und nunmehr zum andern mahl in truck geben durch Danielem Cramerum der H. Schrift Doctorem Pastoren der Stiffts Kirchen und Professoren des Furstlichen Pedagogij zu alten Stettin*. Alt-Stettin: David Rehten, 1635.

Cranz, Ferdinand Edward, and Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries,* vol. 5. Washington (DC): Catholic University of America Press, 1960–2003.

Cropper, Elizabeth, and Charles Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Crow, Thomas E. *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Curran, Brian. *The Egyptian Renaissance: The Afterlife of Ancient Egypt in Early Modern Italy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

D'Aubigné, Agrippa. *Les Tragiques*, ed. by Jean-Raymond Fanlo, vol. 1. Paris: H. Champion, 2003; first ed. 1603.

The Daily Currant, 26 August, 2012.

Dallapiazza, Michael. "Boccaccio, de romana iuvencula in una versione tedesca del sec. XVI e in Hans Sachs," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 55–63.

Danese, Roberto M., Daniela De Agostini, Renato Raffaelli, and Gioia Zaganelli, eds. *Allattamento filiale: la fortuna*; colloquio di Urbino, 28–29 aprile 1998. Urbino: Quattro Venti, 2000.

—. "Lac Humanum Fellare. La trasmissione del latte e la linea della generazione," in: Raffaelli et al., *Pietas e allattamento filiale*, 40–72.

Daston, Lorraine, and Katharine Park. *Wonders and the Order of Nature, 1150–1750*. New York: Zone Books, 1998.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. *The Return of Martin Guerre*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983.

—. "Women on Top," in: *Society and Culture in Early Modern France. Eight Essays by Nathalie Zemon Davis,* 124–51. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975.

Davis, Whitney. *A General Theory of Visual Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.

—. *Queer Beauty: Sexuality and Aesthetics from Winckelmann to Freud and Beyond*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.
Delaplanche, Jérôme. *Noël-Nicolas Coypel 1690–1734*. Paris: Arthena, 2004.
Della Pergola, Paolo. *Galleria Borghese: I dipinti*, vol. 2. Rome: Istituto poligrafico dello stato, 1959.
Demófilo, pseud., *Coleccion de Enigmas y Adivinanzas en forma de diccionario*, ed. by Antonio Machado y Alvarez. Sevilla: Imp. de R. Baldaraque, 1880.
Deonna, Waldemar. "La légende de Pero et de Micon et l'allaitment symbolique," *Latomus* 13 (1954): 140–66; 356–75.
Dick, Wilhelm, ed. *Die Gesta Romanorum nach der Innsbrucker Handschrift vom Jahre 1342*. Erlangen; Leipzig: Deichert, 1890.
Diderot, Denis. "The Father of the Family," in: *Two Plays by Denis Diderot*, transl. and introduced by Kiki Gounaridou and John Hellweg. New York: Peter Lang, 2011.
—. "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, ed. and transl. by John Goodman, introduced by Thomas Crow, vol. 1. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
—. "Salon de 1767," in: *Salons*, ed. by Jean Seznec and Jean Adhémar, vol. 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
—. "Salon de 1759," in: *Salons*, ed. by Jean Seznec and Jean Adhémar, vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
—. "Salon de 1761," in: *Salons*, ed. by Jean Seznec and Jean Adhémar, vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
Diderot, Denis, and Jean Le Rond D'Alembert, eds. *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*. 17 vols. Paris: Briasson, 1751–65.
Diesbach, Anna von. "Anna von Diesbachs Berner 'Arzneibüchlein' in der Erlacher Fassung Daniel von Werdts (1658)," in: *Würzburger medizinhistorische Forschungen*, ed. by Gundolf Keil, vol. 16. Hannover; Pattensen: Wellm, 1978.
Dioscorides Pedanius of Anazarbus. *Pedaci Dioscoridae Anazarbei Simplicium medicamentorum reique medicae Libri VI*, ed. and transl. by Marcello Vergilio. Basel: A. Cratander & J. Bebelius, 1532.
Doläus, Johann. *Upon the Cure of the Gout by Milk-Diet*. London: J. Smith and W. Bruce, 1732.
Dolders, Arno, ed. *The Illustrated Bartsch: Netherlandish Artists (Philips Galle)*, vol. 56. New York: Abaris Books, 1987.
Doorschodt, Heinrich. "De Lacte Commentatio," in: *De Lacte Humano eiusque cum Asinino et Ovillo comparatione observationes chemicae Accesserunt Henrici Doorschodti De Lacte atque Ioh. Georgii Greiselii De Cura Lactis in Arthritide …*, ed. by Ioh. Georgius Fridericus Franzius. Leipzig: Ioh. Garb. Bueschelii Viduae, 1773; first ed. Leiden: apud Johannes Hasebroek, 1737.

Duym, Jacob. "Den Spieghel der Liefden," in: *Een Spiegelbock inhudende ses Spiegels, vvaer in veel deuchden claer aen te mercken zijn: Seer cortvvijlich ende stichtelijck voor alle Menschen om te lessen*. Leyden: Ian Bouvvensz; 1600.

Ebert, Anja. "Fischfrauen, Meermänner und andere Wunder. Drei Reliefs aus dem Umkreis des Hans Kels," *Anzeiger des Germanischen Nationalmuseums* (2005): 121–32.

Ebert-Schifferer, Sybille. "Vom Seicento zum Grand goût," in: Baumgärtel and Neysters, *Die Galerie der starken Frauen*, 79–96.

Eck, Xander van. *Clandestine Splendor: Paintings for the Catholic Church in the Dutch Republic*. Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2007.

—. "From Doubt to Conviction: Clandestine Catholic Churches as Patrons of Dutch Caravaggesque Painting," *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 22, no. 4 (1993–94): 217–34.

Emery, Patrizia Birchler, "De la nourrice à la dame de compagnie: le cas de la trophos en Grèce antique," *Paedagogica Historica* 46, no. 6 (2010): 751-61.

Erasmus, Desiderius. "A Pilgrimage for Religion's Sake," in: *The Colloquies of Erasmus*, transl. by N. Bailey, ed. by the Rev. E. Johnson, vol. 2, 1–37. London: Reeves and Turner, 1878.

Ettinger, Bracha Lichtenberg. "Matrix and Metamorphosis," *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 4, no. 3 (1992): 176–206.

Ewald, Gerhard. *Johann Carl Loth (1632–1698)*. Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger & Co, 1965.

Eyb, Albrecht von. *Ehebüchlein. Ob einem Manne sei zu nehmen ein ehelichs Weib oder nicht*. Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1986; reprint of first ed. 1472.

Fachechi, Grazia Maria. "L'allattamento filiale nella ceramica da farmacia cinquecentesca e la sua fortuna nei secoli successivi," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 93–101.

—. "L'iconografia della Caritas Romana dal Medioevo a Caravaggio," in: Raffaelli et al., *Pietas e allattamento filiale*, 227–45.

Falk, Tilman, ed. *The Illustrated Bartsch: Sixteenth Century German Artists*, vol. 11. New York: Abaris Books, 1980.

Fanestris, Hieronymi Gabvcinii. *Commentarius De Podagra: Ad medicinam faciendam accommodatissimus*. Venice: Io. Baptistam Somascum, 1569.

Félibien, André. *Entretien sur Nicolas Poussin*, ed. by Joseph Aynard. Paris: Éditions Fernand Roches, 1929; first ed. Paris: chez Sébastien Mabre-Cramoisy, 1685.

Ferino-Pagden, Sylvia. "Pictures of Women – Pictures of Love," in: *Bellini, Giorgione, Titian and the Renaissance of Venetian Painting*; exhibition catalogue; National Gallery of Art, Washington, June 18–Sept. 17, 2006; Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Oct. 17, 2006–Jan. 7, 2007, ed. by David Alan Brown and Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, 189–236. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Ferro, Marco. *Dizionario del diritto comune e veneto*, vols. I, II. Venice: presso Andrea Santini e Figlio, 1845, first ed. 1778–1781.

Festus Grammaticus. *De la signification des mots*, ed. and transl. by M.A. Savagner. Paris: Panckoucke, 1846.

Festus, Sextus Pompeius. *De verborum significatu*, ed. and transl. by M.A. Savagner. Paris: Panckoucke, 1846.

Ficino, Marsilio. *Three Books on Life*, ed. by Carol V. Kaske and John R. Clark. Tempe, Arizona: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies in conjunction with the Renaissance Society of America, 1989.

Fildes, Valerie. *Wet Nursing: A History from Antiquity to the Present*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.

—. *Breasts, Bottles, and Babies: A History of Infant Feeding*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1986.

Findlen, Paula. "Humanism, Politics, and Pornography in Renaissance Italy," in: *The Invention of Pornography: Obscenity and the Origins of Modernity, 1500–1800*, ed. by Lynn A. Hunt, 49–108. New York: Zone Books, 1996.

Fineman, Joel. "The Structure of Allegorical Desire," *October* 12 (Spring 1980): 46–66.

Forcellini, Egidio, and Giuseppe Furlanetto. *Lexicon totius latinitatis*, ed. by Francesco Corradini and Josephus Perin, vol. 3. Padua: Gregoriana, 1965; faksimile ed. of the 4th ed. from 1864–1926.

Forcellini, Egidio, Jacobo Facciolati, Gaetano Cognolato, John Gerard, Johann Matthias Gesner, and James Bailey, eds. *Totius latinitatis lexicon*. London: Baldwin and Cradock, 1828; first ed. Padua: Seminario, 1771.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. New York: Vintage Books, 1990, first English ed. 1978, first French ed. 1976.

Franits, Wayne E. *The Paintings of Dirck van Baburen: Catalog Raisonné*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012.

—. *Dutch Seventeenth-Century Genre Painting: Its Stylistic and Thematic Evolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

Franke, Birgit, and Barbara Welzel, "Judith. Modell für politische Machtteilhabe von Fürstinnen in den Niederlanden," in: Baumgärtel and Neysters, *Die Galerie der starken Frauen*, 133–53.

Freccero, Carla. *Queer / Early / Modern*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.

Freedberg, David. *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Freyhan, Robert. "The Evolution of the Caritas Figure in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 11 (1948): 68–86.

Fried, Michael. "Notes toward a Caravaggisti Pictorial Poetics," in: *Caravaggio: His Followers in Rome*, ed. by David Franklin and Sebastian Schütze, 102–23. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

—. *The Moment of Caravaggio*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
—. *Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1980.
Friedlaender, Walter. *Caravaggio Studies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.
Gallagher, Catherine, and Stephen Greenblatt, *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
Gayangos, Don Pascual de. "El libro de los Enxemplos," in: *Biblioteca Autores Españoles, desde la formacion del lenguaje hasta nuestros dias. Escritores en prosa anteriores al siglo XV*, ed. by Don Pascual de Gayangos, 443–542. Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra, 1884.
Gelder, J.G. van. "Jan Gossaert in Rome, 1508–09," *Oud Holland* 59 (1942): 1–11.
Georgeakis, G., and Léon Pineau, *Le Folk-Lore de Lesbos*. Paris: J. Maisonneuve, Libraire-Éditeur, 1894.
Gerhon, Ilana. "Seeing Like a System: Luhmann for Anthropologists," *Anthropological Theory* 5, no. 2 (2005): 99–116.
Gerin-Pierre, Claire. *Catalogue des peintures françaises XVIe–XVIIIe siècle*. Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 2005.
Giladi, Avner. *Infants, Parents, and Wet Nurses: Medieval Islamic Views on Breastfeeding and Their Social Implications*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
Giles, Fiona. *Fresh Milk: The Secret Lives of Breasts*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2003.
—. "'Relational, and Strange': A Preliminary Foray into a Project to Queer Breastfeeding," *Australian Feminist Studies* 19, no. 45 (2004): 301–14.
Giordano, Sebastiano. "Una nuova lettura dell'allegorismo cinquecentesco. 'Igne Natura Renovatur integra: Dal Chaos alla redenzione' in Giulio Romano," in: *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, anno CDIV–2007; Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche; Memorie; Serie IX, Vol. XXI, Fascicolo 2, 419–716. Rome: Bardi Editore, 2007.
Gmelin, Hans Georg. "Georg Pencz als Maler," *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* 17, no. 1 (1966): 49–126.
Gobi, Jean. *Scala coeli*. Ulm: Johan Zainer, 1480.
Gombrich, Ernst, et al., eds. *Giulio Romano*, exhibition catalog, Palazzo Te, Mantua, September 1–November 12, 1989. Milan: Electa, 1989.
Greisel, Johann Georg. *Tractatus medicus de Cura Lactis in Arthritide in quo indagata natura lactis et arthritidis tandem rationibus, et experientiis allatis, diaeta lactea, optima arthritidem curandi methodus, proponitur*. Leipzig: Ioh. Garb. Bueschelii Viduae, 1779; first ed. Vienna: Typis Johannis Jacobi Kürner, 1670.
Grivel, Marianne. "La fortune de Primatice dans l'estampe au xviie siècle," in: Bazzotti et al., *Primatice, Maître de Fontainebleau*, 45–53.

Groebner, Valentin. "Körpergeschichte politisch. Montaigne und die Ordnungen der Natur in den französischen Religionskriegen 1572–1592," *Historische Zeitschrift* 269, no. 2 (Oct. 1999): 281–304.

Guerrino, Roberto. "Il Ciclo di Palazzo Venturi a Siena e la sua iconografia," in: *Beccafumi*, ed. by Piero Torriti, 97–108. Milan: Electa, 1998.

Hairston, Julia L. "The Economics of Milk and Blood in Alberti's *Libri della famiglia*: Maternal versus Wet-Nursing," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactation*, 187–212.

Hale, Rosemary Drage. "Imitatio Mariae: Motherhood Motifs in Late Medieval German Spirituality." Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1992.

Hall, Marcia B. *The Sacred Image in the Age of Art*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

Hanika, Karin. "'Eine offene Tür, ein offenes Mieder.' Das Schicksal der Lucretia zwischen Vergewaltigung und Ehebruch," in: *Böse Frauen – Gute Frauen: Darstellungskonventionen in Texten und Bildern des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. by Ulrike Gäbel and Erika Kartschoke, 109–31. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2001.

Hanley, Sarah. "The politics of identity and monarchic governance in France: The debate over female exclusion," in: *Women Writers and the Early Modern British Political Tradition*, ed. by Hilda L. Smith, 289–304. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

—. "Engendering the State: Family Formation and State Building in Early Modern France," *French Historical Studies* 16, no. 1 (1989): 4–27.

Hartje, Nicole. *Bartolomeo Manfredi (1582–1622): Ein Nachfolger Caravaggios und seine europäische Wirkung*. Weimar: VDG, Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaften, 2004.

Hauschild, Stephanie. "Spiegelbild und Schatten. Bildnisse des Sebald Schirmer und des Jakob Hofmann von Georg Pencz," *Anzeiger des Germanischen Nationalmuseums* (2004): 105–14.

Heinen, Ulrich. "Rubens' Präsenz," in: *Peter Paul Rubens. Barocke Leidenschaften: Ausstellung im Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum Braunschweig, 8. August bis 31. Oktober 2004*, ed. by Nils Büttner and Ulrich Heinen, 28–36. München: Hirmer Verlag, 2004.

Hémery, Axel. "La génération de Caravage dans le Nord: attractions et résistances," in: *Corps et ombres: Caravage et le Caravagisme européen*; exhibition catalog, Musée Fabre de Montepellier Agglomération et au Musée des Augustins de la Ville de Toulouse, 23 June to 14 October, 2012, 139–56. Milan: 5 Continents Editions, 2012.

Herold, Johannes. *Exempla virtutum et vitiorum, atque etiam aliarum rerum maxime memorabilium*. Basel: Henricum Petri, 1555.

Hipp, Elisabeth. *Nicolas Poussin: Die Pest von Asdod*. Hildesheim; Zürich; New York: Olms Verlag, 2005.

Hollstein, F.W.H. *German Engravings and Woodcuts, ca. 1400–1700*, vols. II, III. Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1955–56.

Holmes, Megan. "Disrobing the Virgin: The *Madonna lactans* in Fifteenth-Century Florentine Art," in: *Picturing Women in Renaissance and Baroque Italy*, ed. by Geraldine A. Johnson and Sara F. Matthews Grieco, 167–95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Hulden, Philip. *Tractatio de mirandis naturae fontibus ex quibus Ambrosinum Humane Sustentationis Nectar hauritur illorum origine ductibus & reliquis, tam in excessu quam defectu existentibus qualitatibus publici juri facta*. Jena: Bielkium, 1697.

Hunt, Lynn. *The Family Romance of the French Revolution*. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992.

Irigaray, Luce. *Speculum: Spiegel des anderen Geschlechts*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1980; first Fr. ed. 1974.

Jack, Belinda Elizabeth. *Beatrice's Spell: The Enduring Legend of Beatrice Cenci*. London: Chatto and Windus, 2004.

Jacobus, Mary. "Incorruptible Milk: Breastfeeding and the French Revolution," in: Mary Jacobus, *First Things: Maternal Imagery in Literature, Art, and Psychoanalysis*, 207–30. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Jahn, Ulrich. *Volkssagen aus Pommern und Rügen*. Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1889.

Jaucourt, Chevalier. "Mammelle ou Mamelle (Anat. & Physiol.)," in: Diderot and D'Alembert, *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné*, vol. 10 (1765).

—. "Teter," in: Diderot and D'Alembert, *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné*, vol. 16 (1765).

Jenkins, Catherine. "Les Graveurs de Primatice au XVIe siècle à Fontainbleau," in: Bazzotti et al., *Primatice, Maître de Fontainebleau*, 38–44.

Jones, Pamela. *Altarpieces and Their Viewers in the Churches of Rome from Caravaggio to Guido Reni*. Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2008.

Jordan, Constance. *Renaissance Feminism: Literary and Political Models*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Journal Encyclopédique (October 1757, November 1765) in: *Journal Encyclopédique*. Genève: Faksimile Slatkine Reprints, 1967.

Judson, J. Richard, and Rudolf E.O. Ekkart, *Gerrit van Honthorst 1592–1656*. Doornspijk: Davaco Publishers, 1999.

Junkerman, Anne Christine. "Bellissima Donna: An Interdisciplinary Study of Venetian Sensuous Half-Length Images of the Early Sixteenth Century." Ph.D. diss., University of California–Berkeley, 1988.

Kahng, Eik. "L'Affaire Greuze and the Sublime of History Painting," *The Art Bulletin* 86, no. 1 (March 2004): 96–113.

Kalavrezou, Ioli. "Images of the Mother: When the Virgin became the 'Meter Theou'," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 44 (1990): 165–72.

Kalden-Rosenfeld, I. "Brosamer," in: *Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon. Die Bildenden Künstler aller Zeiten und Völker*, vol. 14, 384–85. München; Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 1996.

Keller, Bettina. "'Weldtliche historien außm Livio, Ovidio etc.' (um 1543): Georg Pencz, die Antike und Italien," in: *Zwischen Dürer und Raffael: Graphikserien Nürnberger Kleinmeister*, ed. by Karl Möseneder, 139–60. Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2010.

Kelley, Donald B. "Law," in: *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450–1700*, ed. by J.H. Burns, with the assistance of Mark Goldie, 66–94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Kelley, Theresa M. *Reinventing Allegory*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Kemmer, Claus. "'Expression' 'effet' und 'esprit': Rubens und die Kunsttheorie des 17. Jahrhunderts," in: Büttner and Heinen, *Peter Paul Rubens*, 99–106.

King, Helen. *The One-Sex Body on Trial: The Classical and Early Modern Evidence*. Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2013.

Klapisch-Zuber, Christiane. "Albero genealogico e costruzione della parentela nel Rinascimento," *Quaderni Storici* 86, annata XXIX, no. 2 (1994): 405–20.

—. "Blood Parents and Milk Parents: Wet Nursing in Florence, 1300–1500," in: Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, *Women, Family, and Ritual in Renaissance Florence*, 132–64. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

—. "Zacharias, or the Ousted Father: Nuptial Rites in Tuscany between Giotto and the Council of Trent," in: Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, *Women, Family, and Ritual in Renaissance Florence*, 178–212. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Knaack, Georg. "Die säugende Tochter: ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Volkskunde," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, ed. by Max Koch, *Neue Folge* 12, nos. 5–6 (1898): 450–54.

Knauer, Elisabeth R. "Caritas Romana," *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen* 6, Neue Folge (1964): 9–23.

Knauer, Martin. *Dürers unfolgsame Erben: Bildstrategien in den Kupferstichen der deutschen Kleinmeister*. Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2013.

Koch, Robert A., ed. *The Illustrated Bartsch. Early German Masters*, vol. 15. New York: Abaris Books, 1978.

Köhler, Reinhold. "Eingemauerte Menschen," in: *Aufsätze über Märchen und Volkslieder*, ed. by Johann Bolte and Erich Schmidt. Berlin: Weidmann, 1894.

Koelbing, Huldrych M. *Ein schön lustig Trostbüchle von den empfengknussen und geburten der menschen; Einführung zu Jakob Rüff's Trostbüchle*. Zürich: Verlag Bibliophile Drucke von Joself Stocker, 1981.

Köllner, Lucia. *Die töchterliche Liebe: Ein Mysteriumgeheimnis* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXVIII, Kunstgeschichte, vol. 307). Frankfurt a.M.; New York: Peter Lang, 1997.

Köpplin, Dieter. "Cranach's Paintings of Charity in the Theological and Humanist Spirit of Luther and Melanchthon," in: *Cranach*, ed. by Bodo Brinkmann, 63–80. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2007.

Koerner, Joseph Leo. *The Reformation of the Image*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Kraft, Helga. "Töchter, die keine Mütter werden: Nonnen, Amazonen, Mätressen. Hildegard von Bingen, Mechthild von Magdeburg, Grimmelshausens Courasche, Lessings Marwood in Miss Sara Simpson," in: *Mütter – Töchter – Frauen: Weiblichkeitsbilder in der Literatur*, ed. by Helga Kraft and Elke Liebs, 35–52. Stuttgart; Weimar: Verlag J.B. Metzler, 1993.

Kratzmann, Gregory, and Elizabeth Gee, eds. *The Dialogue of Creatures Moralysed*. Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1988.

Kretschmer, Paul. "Zur Geschichte von der 'säugenden Tochter'," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 43, no. 1 (1899): 151–57.

Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

Kruse, Britta-Juliane. *Verborgene Heilkünste: Geschichte der Frauenmedizin im Spätmittelalter*. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.

Kühnel-Kunze, Irene. "Hans Brosamer und der Meister HB mit dem Greifenkopf: Ein weiterer Beitrag zur Brosamer-Forschung," *Zeitschrift für Kunstwissenschaft* 14, nos. 1–2 (1960): 57–80.

Kuntze, Franz. "Die Legende der guten Tochter in Wort und Bild," *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 7 (1904): 280–300.

Kunze, Irene. "Der Meister HB mit dem Greifenkopf. Ein Beitrag zur Brosamer-Forschung," *Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft* 8, no. 2 (1941): 209–38.

Kunze, Matthias. *Daniel Seiter, 1647–1705: Die Gemälde*. München; Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2000.

Labalme, Patricia H., and Laura Sanguineti White, eds. *Venice: Cità excellentissima: Selections from the Renaissance Diaries of Marin Sanudo*, transl. by Linda L. Carroll. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 2008.

Labouvie, Eva. *Beistand in Kindsnöten: Hebammen und weibliche Kultur auf dem Land (1550–1910)*. Frankfurt a.M.; New York: Campus Verlag, 1999.

Labrot, Gérard. *Collections of Paintings in Naples 1600–1780*. München; New York: K.G. Saur, 1992.

Lancelotti, Secondo. *Les impostures de l'histoire ancienne et profane; ouvrage nécessaire aux jeunes gens, aux instituteurs, & généralement à toutes les personnes qui …*, vol. 2. Paris: J.P. Costard 1770; first Italian ed. Venice 1647.

Lancelotti, Settimio. "Pietas e allattamento negli scholia vallicelliana," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 203–07.

Langdon, Helen. *Caravaggio*: *A Life*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1998.

Laqueur, Thomas. *Making Sex*: *Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Lavezzi, Elisabeth. *La scène de genre dans les Salons de Diderot*. Paris: Hermann Éditeurs, 2009.

Law, Ernest Phillipe Alphonse. *A Historical Catalogue of the Pictures in the Royal Collection at Hampton Court*. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1881.

Le Moyne, Pierre. *Gallery of Heroick Women*, transl. by Marquesse of Winchester. London: printed by R. Norton for H. Seile, 1652; first French ed. 1647.

—. *La galerie des femmes fortes*. Paris: Somaville, 1647.

Ledbury, Mark. *Sedaine, Greuze and the Boundaries of Genre*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2000.

—. "Intimate Dramas: Genre Painting and New Theater in Eighteenth-Century France," in: *Intimate Encounters*: *Love and Domesticity in Eighteenth-Century France*, ed. by Richard Rand, with the assistance of Juliette M. Bianco, 49–67. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Legrand, Émile. *Recueil de Contes Populaires*. Paris: E. Leroux, 1881.

Leino, Marika, and Charles Burnett. "Myth and Astronomy in the Frescoes at Sant'Abbondio in Cremona," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 66 (2003): 272–88.

Lemoine, Annick. *Nicolas Régnier, ca. 1588–1667*: *Peintre, collectionneur et marchand d'art*. Paris: Arthena, 2007.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. "Laokoon: oder über die Grenzen der Mahlerey und Poesie," in: *Lessings Laokoon*, ed. by Hugo Blümner. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1880; first ed. Berlin: bey Christian Voss, 1766.

Lingenthal, Karl Eduard Zachariä von. *Imp. Iustiniani pp.a. Novellae quae vocantur sive Constitutiones quae extra Codicem supersunt, ordine chronologico digestae*. Leipzig: In aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1881.

Lipsius, Justus. *Ivsti Lipsi diva Sichemiensis siue Aspricollis*: *noua eius beneficia & admiranda*. Antwerp: ex officina Plantiniana, apud Ioannem Moretum, 1606.

—. *Miracles of the B. Virgin, or, an Historical Account of the Original, and Stupendous Performances of the Image entituled, Our Blessed Lady of Halle. Viz. Restoring the Dead to Life, Healing the Sick, Delivering of Captives, etc. Written Originally in Latin by Justus Lipsius; afterwards translated into French, then into Dutch, and now rendered into English*. London: 1688; first Latin ed. Antwerp 1604.

—. *Politica*: *Six Books of Politics or Political Instruction*, ed. and transl. by Jan Waszink. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2004; first publication 1589.

Löcher, Kurt. *Barthel Beham: Ein Maler aus dem Dürerkreis*. München; Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1999.

Longhurst, Robyn, "'Queer Breastfeeding': (Im)proper Spaces of Lactation," in: Robyn Longhurst, *Maternities: Gender, Bodies, and Space* (New York; London: Routledge, 2008), 101-116.

Luca, Giovanni Battista de. *Sacrae Rotae Romanae Decisiones, et Summorum Pontificum Constitutiones Recentissimae, Theatrum Veritatis & Justitiae Cardinalis De Luca eiusque tractatus de officiis venal. et stat. successionibus amplectentes, confirmantes, & laudantes*, vol. I. Venice: Typographia Balleoniana, 1726, first ed. 1699.

—. *Theatrum Veritatis et Justitiae, sive Decisivi discursus, ad veritatem editi in forensibus controversiis*, vol. 2. Coloniae Agrippinae: Sumptibus Haeredum Joannis Widenfeldt, & Goderfridi de Berges, 1690.

Lucco, Mauro, et al., eds. *La pittura nel Veneto: Il Cinquecento*, vol. I. Milan: Electa, 1996.

Luchs, Alison. *The Mermaids of Venice: Fantastic Sea Creatures in Venetian Renaissance Art*. London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2010.

Lyon, J. Vanessa. "Full of Grace: Lactation, Expression and 'Colorito' Painting in Some Early Works by Rubens," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations*, 255–77.

Mahon, Denis, and Nicholas Turner. *The Drawings of Guercino in the Collection of her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Mander, Karel van. *Het schilder-boeck waer in voor eerst de leerlustighe iueght den grondt der edel vry schilderconst in verscheyden deelen wort voorghedraghen*. Haerlem: Paschier van Wesbvsch Boeck Vercooper, 1604.

Marcus, Sharon. "Queer Theory for Everyone: A Review Essay," *Signs* 31, no. 1 (2005): 191–218.

Marin, Louis. "Lire un tableau en 1639 d'après une lettre de Poussin," in: Louis Marin, *Sublime Poussin*, 11–34. Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1995; first publ. 1983.

—. *Die Malerei zerstören*. Berlin: diaphanes, 2003; first Fr. ed. Paris: Éditions Flammarions, 1981.

Marini, Maurizio. Cara*vaggio "pictor praestantissimus:" L'iter artistico completo di uno dei massimi rivoluzionari dell'arte di tutti i tempi*. Rome: Newton & Compton Editori, 2001.

Markova, Vittoria. "Un Dipinto di Simon Vouet in Russia," *Bolletino d'Arte* LXVI/12, nos. 88–89 (1981): 139–42.

Mather Jr., Frank Jewett, "A Titian Problem. The Seven Acts of Mercy," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* XXII (December 1942): 165–72.

Maximus, Valerius. *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, ed. and transl. by D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000.

McGrath, Elizabeth. *Rubens: Subjects from History*, ed. by Arnout Balis. London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1997.

McNamara, JoAnn. "Women and Power through the Family Revisited," in: *Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski, 17–30. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

—. "The Need to Give: Suffering and Female Sanctity in the Middle Ages," in: *Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Timea Szell, 199–221. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Mercuriale, Girolamo. *De Morbis Mulieribus praelectiones ex ore Hieronymi Mercurialis iam dudum à Gaspare Bauhino exceptae, ac paulo antea inscio autore editae: nunc vero per Michaelem Columbum ex collatione plurium exemplarium consensu auctoris locupletiores, & emendatiores factae*. Venice: apud Felicem Valgrisium, 1587.

Mercurio, Scipio (Girolamo). *La Commare Oriccoglitrice*. Venice, apresso Gio. Bat. Giotti, 1601.

Mercure de France (June 1724, May 1728, April 1735, June 1737, January 1740, December 1747, October 1757, October 1765), in: *Mercure de France*. Genève: Faksimile Slatkine Reprints, 1968–1970.

Meyer, Friedrich August. *Werden die Neigungen und Leidenschaften einer Säugenden durch die Milch dem Kinde mitgetheilt?* Hamburg: B.G. Hofman, 1781.

Michael, Hans. *Das Chorgestühl im Magdeburger Dom. Leben-Jesu-Tafeln und Misericordien, um 1360 und 1844*. Norderstedt: Books on Demand GmbH, 2002.

Michel, Régis. "Diderot and Modernity," *Oxford Art Journal* 8, no. 2 (1985): 36–51.

Migeon, Gaston. "La Collection de M. Gustave Dreyfus," *Les Arts* 80 (August 1908): 1–32.

Miles, Margaret R. *A Complex Delight: The Secularization of the Breast 1350–1750*. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2008.

—. "The Virgin's One Bare Breast: Female Nudity and Religious Meaning in Tuscan Early Renaissance Culture," in: *The Female Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Susan Rubin Suleiman, 193–208. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Mineo, Igor. *Nobiltà di Stato: Famiglie e identità aristocratiche nel tardo medioevo: La Sicilia*. Rome: Donzelli, 2001.

Miotti, Mariangela. "Presenze della carità romana nel teatro francese del Rinascimento," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 65–78.

Misrahi, Jean. "The Origin of 'De Roussillon'," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 51, no. 1 (1936): 8–12.

Mitchell, W.J.T. *What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

—. "Ekphrasis and the Other," in: W.J.T. Mitchell, *Picture Theory*, 151–82. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Morgan, Jennifer. *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Mori, Elisabetta. "L'eredità di Francesco Cenci, il patrimonio, la memoria, la scrittura," in: *Beatrice Cenci: la storia di un mito*, ed. by Mario Bevilacqua and Elisabetta Mori. Rome: Fondazione Marco Basso; Viella, 1999.

Moschion. "De morbis mulieribus liber unus," in: *Gynaeciorum hoc est de mulierum tum aliis, tum gravidarum, parientium & puerperarum affectibus & morbis, Libri veterum ac recentiorum aliquot partim nunc primum editi, partim multo quam antea castigatores*. Basel: per Thomam Guarinum, 1566.

Mouradian, Hélène, Xavier Salmon, Tamara Préaud, Danielle Rice, and Ulrich Leben, eds. *Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806): Peintre du Roi et de Madame de Pompadour*; exhibition catalog; Musée Lambert, Versailles, 23 Nov. 1999–19 March 2000. Paris: Somogy éditions, 1999.

Moxey, Keith. "Visual Studies and the Iconic Turn," *Journal of Visual Culture* 7, no. 2 (2008): 131–46.

Müller, Jürgen, Jessica Buskirk and Kerstin Küster, eds. *Die gottlosen Maler von Nürnberg: Konvention und Subversion in der Druckgraphik der Beham-Brüder*; Ausstellungskatalog; Albrecht-Dürer Haus Nürnberg, 31 March–3 July 2011. Emsdetten: Edition Imorde, 2011.

Müller, Jürgen, and Kerstin Küster, "Der Prediger als Pornograf? Konvention und Subversion in der Bildpoetik Sebald und Barthel Behams," in: Müller et al., *Die gottlosen Maler von Nürnberg*, 20–32.

Mullini, Roberta. "'Behold the pious fraud of charity and love' ovvero narrare il non rappresentabile in the Grecian Daughter di Arthur Murphy," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 155–72.

Munhall, Edgar. *Greuze the Draftsman*. New York: Merrell in association with the Frick Collection, 2002.

Munhall, Edgar, ed. *Jean-Baptiste Greuze, 1725–1805*; exhibition catalogue; Hartford, Wadsworth Athenaeum, 1 Dec. 1976–23 Jan. 1977; San Francisco, The California Palace of the Legion of Honor, 5 March–1 May 1977; Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts, 11 June–7 Aug. 1977. Dijon: Musée des Beaux-Arts, 1976.

Muraro, Michelangelo, and David Rosand, eds. *Tiziano e la silografia Veneziana del cinquecento*, exhibition catalog, Fondazione Giorgio Cini, 1976. Vicenza: N. Pozza, 1976.

Murphy, Arthur. "The Grecian Daughter," in: *Cumberland's British Theater*, vol. 25, no consecutive pagination. London: John Cumberland, 1830.

Musacchio, Jacqueline Marie. *The Art and Ritual of Childbirth in Renaissance Italy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

Natale, Mauro. *Peintures italiennes du xvie au xviiie siècle*. Genève: Musée d'art et d'histoire, 1979.

Nettesheim, Agrippa von. *Von dem Vorzug und der Fürtrefflichkeit des weiblichen Geschlechts vor dem männlichen*. Tübingen: Edition Diskord, 1987; first Latin publication Antwerpen 1529.

New vermehrtes Rath-Büchlein mit allerhand Weltlich-und Geistlichen Fragen sampt deren Beantwortungen. 1600.

Nicolaci, Michele, and Riccardo Gandolfi, "Il Caravaggio di Guido Reni: la Negazione di Pietro tra relazioni artistiche e operazioni finanziarie," *Storia dell'arte* 130 (2011): 41–64.

Nicolson, Benedict. *Caravaggism in Europe*, revised and enlarged by Luisa Vertova, 3 vols. Turin: Umberto Allemandi & C., 1990, first ed. 1979.

—. *Hendrick Terbrugghen*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1958.

—. "Gerard Seghers and the 'Denial of Saint Peter'," *Burlington Magazine* 113, no. 819 (June 1971): 302–09.

Niermeyer, Jan Frederik. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. Leiden: Brill, 2002; first ed. 1976.

Nonnos of Panoplis alias Nonnus of Panopolis, *Dionysiaca*, transl. by W.H.D. Rouse, vol. II. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1940.

Novy, Marianne. *Reading Adoption: Family and Difference in Fiction and Drama*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005.

Oestreich, Gerhard. *Antiker Geist und moderner Staat bei Justus Lipsius (1547–1606): der Neustoizismus als politische Bewegung*, ed. by Nicolette Mout. Göttingen: Vandenhoek und Ruprecht, 1989.

Olson, Todd P. "The Street Has Its Masters: Caravaggio and the Socially Marginal," in: *Caravaggio: Realism, Rebellion, Reception*, ed. by Genevieve Warwick, 69–81. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006.

—. *Poussin and France: Painting, Humanism, and the Politics of Style*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Orland, Barbara. "Why Could Early Modern Men Lactate? Gender Identity and Metabolic Narrations in Humoral Medicine," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations*, 37–54.

—. "White Blood and Red Milk. Analogical Reasoning in Medical Practice and Experimental Physiology (1560–1730)," in: *Blood, Sweat, and Tears: The Formation of Early Modern Medicine*, ed. by Manfred Horstmannshoff, Helen King, and Claus Zittel, 443–80. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012.

—. "Enlightened Milk: Reshaping a Bodily Substance into a Chemical Object," in: *Materials and Expertise in Early Modern Europe: Between Market and Laboratory*, ed. by Ursula Klein and E.C. Spary, 163–97. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Orlich, Leopold von, ed. "Briefe der Landgräfin von Hessen-Cassel Hedwig Sophie vom 20. August 1657 bis den 21. Januar 1678," in: Leopold von Orlich, *Friedrich Wilhelm der Grosse Kurfürst: Nach bisher noch ungekannten Original-Handschriften*, 115–17. Berlin; Posen; Bemberg: Mittler, 1836.

Ozment, Stephen E. *When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Germany*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Pabel, Hilmar M. *Conversing with God: Prayer in Erasmus' Pastoral Writings*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

Pacelli, Vincezo. *Caravaggio: Le Sette Opere di Misericordia*. Salerno: cooperative editrice, 1984.

Pagels, Elaine. *Adam, Eve, and the Serpent*. New York: Vintage Books, 1989.

Paleotti, Gabriele. *Discorso intorno alle immagini sacre e profane*, ed. by Stefano della Torre, Gian Franco Freguglia, and Carlo Chenis. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2002; first ed. 1582.

Pallucchini, Rodolfo, and Paola Rossi, eds. *Jacopo Tintoretto, Le opere sacre e profane*. Milan: Alfieri, Gruppo Editoriale Electa, 1982.

Palumbo-Fossati, Isabella. "L'interno della casa dell'artigiano e dell'artista nella Venezia del cinquecento," *Studi Veneziani* 8, Nuova Serie (1984): 109–53.

Panofsky, Dora and Erwin. "The Iconography of the Galerie François Ier at Fontainebleau," *Gazette des beaux-arts* 52, hundredth year, sixth series (1958): 113–90.

Papakonstantinou, Kalliopi. *Die collatio dotis: Mitgift- und Miterben-Auseinandersetzung im römischen Recht*. Köln: Böhlau, 1998.

Park, Katharine. *Secrets of Women: Gender, Generation, and the Origins of Human Dissection*. New York: Zone Books, distributed by Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2006.

—. "The Rediscovery of the Clitoris," in: *The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern England*, ed. by David Hillman and Carla Mazzio, 170–91. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Park, Katharine, and Lorraine Daston. "Destiny is Anatomy." Review of Thomas Laquer, *Making Sex*. *The New Republic* (18 February 1991): 53–57.

Parkes, Peter. "Fosterage, Kinship, and Legend: When Milk Was Thicker Than Blood?" *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46, no. 3 (2004): 587–615.

—. "Fostering Fealty: A Comparative Analysis of Tributary Allegiances of Adoptive Kinship," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 45, no. 4 (2003): 741–82.

—. "Alternative Social Structures and Foster Relations in the Hindu Kush: Milk Kinship Allegiance in Former Mountain Kingdoms of Northern Pakistan," *Comparative Studies in History and Society* 43, no. 1 (2001): 4–36.

Parlby, Geri. "The Origins of Marian Art: The Evolution of Marian Imagery in the Western Church until AD 431," in: *Mary: The Complete Resource*, ed. by Sarah Jane Boss, 106–29. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Parma, Elena. "Perino del Vaga, ingegno sottile e capriccioso," in: *Perino del Vaga tra Raffaello e Michelangelo;* exhibition catalog, Mantova, Palazzo Te, 18 marzo–10 giugno, 2001, ed. by Elena Parma, 13–38. Milan: Electa, 2001.

Paxson, James J. *The Poetics of Personification*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Pepper, Stephen. *Guido Reni. L'opera completa*. Novara: Istituto Geografico di Agostini, 1988; first English ed. London 1984.

Pfisterer, Ulrich. *Lysippus und seine Freunde. Liebesgaben und Gedächtnis im Rom der Renaissance, oder: Das erste Jahrhundert der Medaille*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008.

Pigler, Andor. *Barockthemen, eine Auswahl von Verzeichnissen zur Ikonographie des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1974; first ed. Budapest: Verlag der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1956.

—. "Valère Maxime et l'iconographie des temps modernes," in: Szépmüvészeti Múzeum, *Petrovics Elek Emlékkönyv* [Hommage à Alexis Petrovics], 214–16. Budapest: Kiadják az Országos magyar szépmüvészeti múzeum, 1934.

Piles, Roger de. *The Art of Painting, with the Lives and Characters of ... the most Eminent Painters* ... London: printed for Thomas Payne, in Castle Street, 1706; first Fr. ed. 1699.

—. *Dissertation sur les ouvrages des plus fameux peintres*. Paris: chez N. Langlois fils rüe de la Harpe chez M.r Fourcroy m.d Epicier, 1681; reprint Farnborough, England: Gregg, 1968.

Pinelli, Antonio. "Il 'picciol vetro' e il 'maggior vaso'. I due grandi cicli profani di Domenico Beccafumi in Palazzo Venturi e nella Sala del Concistoro," in: *Domenico Beccafumi e il suo tempo*, ed. by Piero Torriti, 621–51. Milan: Electa, 1990.

Pizan, Christine de. *Book of the City of Ladies*, transl. by Earl Jeff Richards, foreword by Marina Warner. New York: Persea Books, 1983.

Pliny the Elder. *Natural History*, ed. by W.H.S. Jones, vol. VIII. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963.

—. *Natural History*, ed. by John Bostock, M.D., F.R.S., and H.T. Riley, Esq., B.A., book VII. London: H.G. Bohn, 1855–57.

Ploss, Heinrich, and Max and Paul Bartels, *Das Weib in der Natur- und Völkerkunde*, vol. III, ed. by Ferdinand Freiherr von Reitzenstein. Berlin: Neufeld & Henius Verlag, 1927.

Plotin, "Die Affektionsfreiheit des Unkörperlichen," in: *Schriften*, ed. by Richard Harder, Willy Theiler, and Rudolf Beutler, vol. II, 218–25. Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1962.

Pocock, J.G.A. *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.

Poivet, Clémence, and Annick Lemoine, eds. *Greuze et l'affaire du Septime Sévère*; exhibition catalogue, Hôtel-Dieu-Musée Greuze de Tournus, 26 June–18 Sept. 2005. Paris: Somogy éditions, 2005.

Polláková, Petra. "The Case of Beatrice Cenci: From Guido Reni to David Lynch," *Uměni art* 59 (2011): 380–95.

Pollock, Griselda. "What the Graces made me do ... Time, Space and the Archive: Questions of Feminist Method," in: Griselda Pollock, *Encounters in the Virtual Feminist Museum: Time, Space, and the Archive*, 9–38. London; New York: Routledge, 2007.

—. "The Object's Gaze in the Freudian Museum," in: Griselda Pollock, *Encounters in the Virtual Feminist Museum: Time, Space, and the Archive*, 67–86. London; New York: Routledge, 2007.

—. "Woman as Sign: Psychoanalytic Readings," in: Griselda Pollock, *Vision and Difference: Femininity, Feminism and Histories of art*, 120–54. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Pollock, Griselda, and Victoria Turvey Sauron, *The Sacred and the Feminine: Imagination and Sexual Difference*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Poma, Maria Cristina. *Dopo Caravaggio: Bartolomeo Manfredi e la Manfrediana Methodus*. Milan: Mondadori Editore, 1987.

Pomata, Gianna. "A Christian Utopia of the Renaissance: Elena Duglioli's Spiritual and Physical Motherhood (ca. 1510–1520)," in: *Von der dargestellten Person zum erinnerten Ich: Europäische Selbstzeugnisse als historische Quellen (1500–1850)*, ed. by Kaspar von Greyerz, Hans Medick, and Patrice Veit, 323–53. Köln: Böhlau, 2001.

—. "Blood Ties and Semen Ties: Consanguinity and Agnation in Roman Law," in: *Gender, Kinship, Power: A Comparative and Interdisciplinary History*, ed. by Mary Jo Maynes, Ann Waltner, Birgitte Soland, and Ulrike Strasser, 43–64. New York: Routledge, 1996.

—. "La meravigliosa armonia: il rapporto fra seni ed utero dall'anatomia vascolare all'endocrinologia," in: *Madri: Storia di un ruolo sociale*, ed. by Giovanna Fiume, 45–82. Venice: Marsilio, 1995.

—. "Legami di sangue, legami di seme: consanguinità e agnazione nel diritto romano," *Quaderni Storici* 86, no. 2 (1994): 299–334.

Prasse, Leona E. "Engravings by Georg Pencz in the Museum Collection," *The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art* 23 (1936): 50–53.

Preimesberger, Rudolf. "Textfaszination: Caravaggio liest Valerius Maximus," *Jahrbuch des kunsthistorischen Museums Wien* 11 (2009): 75–88.

Premo, Bianca. *Children of the Father King: Youth, Authority, and Legal Minority in Colonial Lima*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.

Presciutti, Diana Bullen. "Picturing Institutional Wet-Nursing in Medicean Siena," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactation*, 129–46.

—. "*Carità e potere*: Representing the Medici Grand Dukes as 'Fathers of the Innocenti'," *Renaissance Studies* 24, no. 2 (2010): 234–59.

Price, Theodora Hadzisteliou. *Kourotrophos: Cults and Representations of the Greek Nursing Deities*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Pseudo-Albertus Magnus. *Women's Secrets*: *A Translation of Pseudo-Albertus Magnus's De Secretis Mulierum with Commentaries*, ed. by Helen Rodnite Lemay. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.

Quilligan, Maureen. *The Language of Allegory*: *Defining the Genre*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1979.

Raffaelli, Renato. "Due incroci per Zelmire," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 125–39.

Raffaelli, Renato, Roberto M. Danese, and Settimio Lanciotti, eds. *Pietas e allattamento filiale*: *La vicenda – l'exemplum – l'iconografia*; colloquio di Urbino, 2–3 maggio, 1996. Urbino: Quattro Venti, 1997.

Randolph, Adrian W.B. *Engaging Symbols*: *Gender, Politics, and Public Art in Fifteenth Century Florence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Richter, Simon. *Missing the Breast*: *Gender, Fantasy, and the Body in the German Enlightenment*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006.

Rietbergen, Peter. *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome*: *Barberini Cultural Politics*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Rösslin, Eucharius. *Der swangern Frauwen vnd Hebamen Rosengarten*. Argentine: Martinus Flach iunior impressit, 1514; first ed. Strassbourg 1513.

Roethlisberger, Marcel G. *Abraham Bloemaert and his Sons*: *Paintings and Prints*, vol. 1. Doornspijk: Davaco, 1993.

Roland, Madame. *Lettres de Madame Roland*, vol. 1 (1780–87), ed. by Claude Perroud. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1900.

—. "Avis à ma fille," in: *Œuvres de J.M. Ph. Roland, femme de l'ex-ministre de l'Intérieur*, ed. by L.-A. Champagneux, vol. I. Paris, an VIII, 1799–1800.

Romani, Vittoria. "Primatice peintre et dessinateur," in: Bazzotti et al., *Primatice, Maître de Fontainebleau*, 18–30.

Rookmaker, H.R. "'Charity' in seventeenth century art," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 23 (1972): 61–66.

Roper, Lyndal. "Witchcraft and Fantasy in Early Modern Germany," in: Lyndal Roper, *Oedipus and the Devil*: *Witchcraft, Sexuality, and Religion in Early Modern Europe*, 199–225. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Rosand, David. *Myths of Venice*: *The Figuration of a State*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

—. *Painting in Cinquecento Venice*: *Titian, Veronese, Tintoretto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Rosen, Valeska von. *Caravaggio und die Grenzen des Darstellbaren*: *Ambiguität, Ironie und Performativität in der Malerei um 1600*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2009.

Rosenblum, Robert. "Caritas Romana after 1760: Some Romantic Lactations," in: *Woman as Sex Object*: *Studies in Erotic Art*, ed. by Thomas B. Hess and Linda Nochlin, 42–63. New York: Newsweek, 1972.

Rosenthal, Lisa. "Venus's Milk and the Temptations of Allegory in Otto Van Veen's Allegory of Temptation," in: Baskins and Rosenthal, *Early Modern Visual Allegory*, 219–42.

—. *Gender, Politics, and Allegory in the Art of Rubens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Roussel, Pierre. *Systeme physique et moral de la femme, ou tableau Philosophique de la Constitution, de l'Etat organique, du Tempérament, des Moeurs, & des Fonctions propres au Sexe*. Paris: chez Vincent, Imprimeur-Librarie, rue des Mathurins, Hôtel de Clugny, 1775.

Rubin, Miri. *Mother of God: A History of the Virgin Mary*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Ruggieri, Ugo. "Nouvelles Peintures d'Antonio Triva (1626–1699) en France et en Italie," *Revue du Louvre* 46, no. 2 (1996): 43–48.

Ruyven-Zeman, Zsuzsanna van, Marjolein Leesberg, and Jan Van der Stock, eds. *The New Hollstein Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings, and Woodcuts 1450–1700*, vol. 67, The Wierix Family, Part IX. Rotterdam: Sound and Vision, 2004.

Rylands, Philip. *Palma Vecchio*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

—. *Palma il Vecchio: L'opera completa*. Milan: Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, 1988.

Sachs, Hans. "Romana, die seugend dochter" (1569) in: *Hans Sachs*, ed. by A. von Keller and E. Goetze (Bibliothek des literarischen Vereins, vol. 23), 470–71. Tübingen: Literarischer Verein, 1895.

Saint Thierry, William of. *Exposition on the Song of Songs*, transl. by Columba Hart. Spencer, Massachusetts: Cistercian Publications, 1970.

Sallis, John. *Chorology: On Beginning in Plato's Timaeus*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999.

Sancta Clara, Abraham a. *Abraham a Sancta Claras Werke: In Auslese*, vol. VI, ed. by Hans Strigl. Vienna: Kirsch, 1907.

Sander, Jochen, Bastian Eclercy, and Gabriel Dette, eds. *Caravaggio in Holland*; exhibition catalogue, 1 April–26 July 2009, Städel Museum, Frankfurt. Frankfurt a.M.: Städel Museum; München: Hirmer Verlag, 2009.

Sandrart, Joachim von. *Joachim von Sandrarts Akademie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste von 1675; Leben der berühmten Maler, Bildhauer und Baumeister*, ed. by A.R. Peltzer. München: G. Hirth's Verlag A.G., 1925.

Sapir, Itay. *Ténèbres sans leçons: Esthétique et épistémologie de la peinture ténébriste romaine 1595–1610*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2012.

Sarpi, Paolo. "Dalla 'Relazione dello stato della religione, e con quali dissegni et arti ella è stata fabricata e mandeggiata in diversi stati di queste occidentali parti del mondo'," in: *Storici, Politici e moralisti del Seicento* (*La letteratura italiana. Storia e testi*, vol. 35, tomo 1), ed. by Raffaele Mattiolo, Pietro Pancrazi, and Alfredo Schiaffini, vol. I, 295–330. Milan; Naples: Riccardo Ricciardi Editore, 1969.

Savonarola, Michele. *Il trattato ginecologico-pediatrico in volgare: ad mulieres ferrarienses de regimine pregnantium et noviter natorum usque ad septennium*, ed. by Luigi Belloni. Milan: Società italiana di ostetrica e ginecologia, 1952; written ca. 1460.

Schade, Sigrid. "'Himmlische und/oder Irdische Liebe.' Allegorische Lesarten des weiblichen Aktbildes der Renaissance," in: *Allegorien und Geschlechterdifferenz*, ed. by Sigrid Schade, Monika Wagner, and Sigrid Weigel, 95–112. Köln; Weimar; Berlin: Böhlau Verlag, 1994.

Schelenz, Hermann. *Geschichte der Pharmazie*. Hildesheim: Gg. Olms, 1965; first ed. Berlin: Springer, 1904.

Schiebinger, Londa. *Nature's Body: Gender in the Making of Modern Science*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1993.

Schlink, Wilhelm. *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht: Le Bruns Akademierede von 1667 über Poussins "Mannawunder."* Freiburg: Rombach Verlag, 1996.

Schmid, Anton. *Literatur des Schachspiels*. Faksimile ed. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR, 1975; first ed. Wien: Carl Gerold, 1847.

Schütze, Sebastian. "Caravaggism in Europe: A Planetary System and Its Gravitational Laws," in: *Caravaggio: His Followers in Rome*, ed. by David Franklin and Sebastian Schütze, 26–47. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

Schulz, Anne Markham. *The Sculpture of Giovanni and Bartolomeo Bon and Their Workshop* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 68, no. 3). Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1978.

Schwarzin vohn Greiffswald aus Pommern, Sibylle. *Sibyllen Schwarzin vohn Greiffswald aus Pommern Ander Theil Deutscher Poëtischer Gedichten nuhn zuhm ersten mahl Aus ihren eignen Handschriften heraussgegeben und verleget vohn M. Samuel Berencz aus dem Herzogtuhm Würtemberg*, vol. 2, no pagination, ed. by Helmut W. Ziefle. Bern; Frankfurt a.M.; Las Vegas: Peter Lang, 1980; first ed. Danzig: Georg Theten Witwen, 1650.

Schweikhart, Gunter. "Antikenkopie und-verwandlung im Fries des Marcello Fogolino aus der Villa Trissino-Muttoni (Ca' Impenta) bei Vicenza. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Villendekoration des frühen 16. Jahrhunderts im Veneto," *Mitteilungen des kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 20, no. 3 (1976): 351–78.

Scotus, Michael. *Mensa Philosophica seu Enchiridion*. Frankfurt: Typis Wolfgangi Richteri, 1602.

Seaman, Natasha Therese. *The Religious Paintings of Hendrick ter Brugghen: Reinventing Christian Painting after the Reformation in Utrecht*. Farnham, Surrey, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2012.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Tendencies*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.

Seidel, Max. "Ubera Matris: Die vielschichtige Bedeutung eines Symbols in der mittelalterlichen Kunst," *Städel-Jahrbuch* 6, N.F. (1977): 41–99.

Seipel, Wilfried, ed. *Spielwelten der Kunst*: Kunstkammerspiele, exhibition catalog, Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien, 21. Mai bis 2. August 1998. Milan: Skira editore, 1998.

Signorini, Rodolfo. *Il Palazzo del Te e la Camera di Psiche*. Mantova, editoriale sometti, 2001.

Simmich, Bettina. "Caritas Romana in Trier – Frauenmut und Männerstolz: Zur Rezeption einer antiken Legende in Trier in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Kurtrierisches Jahrbuch* 34 (1994): 141–69.

Simons, Patricia. "The Social and Religious Context of Iconographic Oddity: Breastfeeding in Ghirlandaio's *Birth of the Baptist*," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations*, 213–34.

—. *The Sex of Men in Premodern Europe*: *A Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

—. "Lesbian (In)Visibility in Italian Renaissance Culture: Diana and Other Cases of *donna con donna* [woman with woman]," *Journal of Homosexuality* 27, nos. 1–2 (1994): 81–121; Special double issue: *Gay and Lesbian Studies in Art History*, ed. by Whitney Davis.

Skidmore, Clive. *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen*: *The Work of Valerius Maximus*. Exeter; Devon, UK: University of Exeter Press, 2002.

Slatkes, Leonard J. "In Caravaggio's Footsteps: A Northern Journey," in: *Sinners & Saints, Darkness and Light*: *Caravaggio and his Dutch and Flemish Followers*, ed. by Dennis P. Weller, 35–46. Raleigh: North Carolina Museum of Art, 1998.

—. *Dirck van Baburen (c. 1595–1624)*: *A Dutch Painter in Utrecht and Rome*. Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1965.

Slatkes, Leonard J., and Wayne Franits. *The Paintings of Hendrick ter Brugghen 1588–1629*: *Catalogue Raisonné*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007.

Smith, R. Scott, and Stephen M. Trzaskoma, eds. *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae*: *Two Handbooks of Greek Mythology*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2007.

Solinus, Gaius Julius. *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, ed. by Theodor Mommsen. Berlin: Weidmann, 1895.

Sommerville, J.P. "Absolutism and Royalism," in: *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450–1700*, ed. by J.H. Burns, with the assistance of Mark Goldie, 347–72. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Spear, Richard E. *The "Divine" Guido*: *Religion, Sex, Money and Art in the World of Guido Reni*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Sperling, Jutta. "The Economics and Politics of Marriage," in: *The Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Allyson Poska, Katherine McIver, and Jane Couchman, 213–33. Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Press, 2013.

—. "Charity's Nudity and the Veil of Allegory," in: *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Joseph Connors*, ed. by Machtelt Israëls, Louis Alexander Waldman, and Guido Beltrami, vol. I, 520–26. Milan, Libraria Officina; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013.

—. "Wet-Nurses, Midwives, and the Virgin Mary in Tintoretto's *The Birth of Saint John the Baptist* (1563)" in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations*, 235–54.

—. "Las Casas and His Amerindian Nurse: Tropes of Lactation in the French Colonial Imaginary (ca. 1770–1810)," *Gender & History* 23, no. 1 (2011): 47–71.

—. "'Divenni madre e figlia di mio padre.' Queer Lactations in Renaissance and Baroque Art," in: *Sex Acts: Practice, Performance, Perversion and Punishment in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Allison Levy, 165–80. Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2010.

—. "Allegories of Charity and the Practice of Poor Relief at the Scuola Grande di San Rocco," *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 70 (2009): 119–46.

—. "Marriage at the Time of the Council of Trent (1560–70): Clandestine Marriages, Kinship Prohibitions, and Dowry Exchange in European Comparison," *Journal of Early Modern History* 8, nos. 1–2 (2004): 67–108.

Sperling, Jutta, ed. *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations: Images, Rhetorics, and Practices*. Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2013.

Sperling, Jutta, and Shona Kelly Wray. *Across the Religious Divide: Women, Property, and Law in the Wider Mediterranean (1300–1800)*. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Speth-Holterhoff, S. *Les Peintres Flamands de Cabinets d'Amateurs au XVIIe siècle*. Bruxelles: Elsevier, 1957.

Spinosa, Nicola, Jadranka Bentini, Arnaud Brejon de Lavergnée, Giorgio Ceraudo, Keith Christiansen et al., eds. *Mattia Preti tra Roma, Napoli, e Malta*. Naples: Electa Napoli, 1999.

Stagno, Laura. "Due principi per un palazzo. I cicli decorativi commissionati da Andrea e Giovanni Andrea I Doria a Perino del Vaga, Lazzaro Calvi e Marchello Sparzo per il Palazzo del Principe," in: *Il Palazzo del Principe. Genesi e trasformazioni della villa di Andrea Doria a Genova*; special issue of *Ricerche di Storia dell'arte* 82–83 (2004): 9–32.

Stegman, Hans. Article without title, in: *Mitteilungen aus dem Germanischen Nationalmuseum* 4 (1908): 49–61.

Steinbeck, John. *The Grapes of Wrath*. New York: The Viking Press, 1939.

Stewart, Alison. *Sebald Beham and the Origins of Peasant Festival Imagery*. Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2008.

Straparola, Giovanni Francesco. *Le Piacevoli Notti*, ed. by Donato Pirovano, vol. II. Rome: Salerno, 2000; first ed. Venice: Orpheo Dalla Carta tien per insegna S. Alvise, 1550.

Strasser, Ulrike. *State of Virginity: Gender, Religion and Politics in an Early Modern Catholic State*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.

Stumpfhaus, Bernhard. *Modus-Affekt-Allegorie bei Nicolas Poussin: Emotionen in der Malerei des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin: Reimer, 2007.

Sunday Mirror, 15 September 1963.

Sussman, George D. *Selling Mother's Milk: The Wet-Nursing Business in France 1715–1914*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982.

Tafuri, Manfredo, et al., eds. *Giulio Romano*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998; first Italian ed. Milan 1989.

Tapié, Alain, "L'Allégorie dans la peinture. La représentation de la Charité au XVIIe siècle," *Revue du Louvre: La Revue des musées de France* 36 (1986): 224–25.

Tapié, Alain, Caroline Joubert, Jennifer Montague, and Gisèle Jouet, eds. *L'allégorie dans la peinture: la représentation de la charité au XVIIe siècle*, exhibition catalog, Caen, 27 June–13 Octobre, 1986. Caen: Musée des beaux arts de Caen, 1986.

Taylor, Archer. "Straparola's Riddle of Pero and Cimon and Its Parallels," *Romance Philology* 1, no. 3 (1947): 297–303.

Thiemann, Susanne. "Sex trouble. Die bärtige Frau bei José de Ribera, Luis Vélez de Guevara und Huarte de San Juan," in: *Geschlechtervariationen: Gender-Konzepte im Übergang der Neuzeit*, ed. by Judith Klinger, 47–82. Potsdam: Potsdam Universitäts Verlag, 2006.

Thieme, Ulrich, and Felix Becker, eds. *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, CD-ROM, vol. "V." Leipzig: Seemann, 2008.

Thiepolo, Giovanni. *Trattato delle santissime reliquie, ultimamente ritrovate nel Santuario della Chiesa di San Marco*. Venice: appresso Antonio Pinelli, 1618.

Tommasini, Oreste, ed. *Diario della città di Roma di Stefano Infessura scribasenato* (Fonti per la storia d'Italia pubblicate dall'istituto storico italiano, vol. 5, no. 9). Rome: Forzani E.C. tipografi del Senato, 1890.

Tradigo, Alfredo. *Icons and Saints of the Eastern Orthodox Church*, transl. by Stephen Sartarelli. Los Angeles: J.P. Getty Museum, 2006.

Treffers, Bert. "The Arts and Craft of Sainthood: New Orders, New Saints, New Altarpieces," in: Beverly Brown, *The Genius of Rome*, 340–71.

Tuck-Scala, Anna. "Caravaggio's 'Roman Charity' in the Seven Acts of Mercy," in: *Parthenope's Splendor: Art of the Golden Age in Naples*, ed. by Jeanne Chenault Porter and Susan Scott Munshower, 127–63. College Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993.

Unglaub, Jonathan. *Poussin and the Poetics of Painting: Pictorial Narrative and the Legacy of Tasso*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

—. "Poussin's Reflection," *The Art Bulletin* 86, no. 3 (Sept. 2004): 505–29

Varagine, Iacopo da. *Iacopo da Varagine e la sua cronaca di Genova dalle origini al MXXCXVII*, ed. by Giovanni Monleone, vol. 2 (Fonti per la storia d'Italia; Scrittori, secolo XIII; vol. 85). Rome: Tipografia dello stato, 1941–xix.

Varriano, John. "Caravaggio and Religion," in: *Saints and Sinners: Caravaggio & the Baroque Image*; exhibition catalog, February 1–March 24 1999, McMullen Museum of Art, 191–207. Chestnut Hill: McMullen Museum of Art, Boston College; distributed by University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Vaughan, Megan. *Creating the Creole Island: Slavery in Eighteenth-Century Mauritius*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.

Veldman, Ilja M., ed. *The Illustrated Bartsch: Dirck Volkertsz. Coornhert*, vol. 55. New York: Abaris Books, 1991.

Ventura, Gal. "Nursing in Style: Fashion versus Socio-Medical Ideologies in Late Nineteenth-Century France," *Journal of Social History* 48, no. 3 (2015): 1–29.

Vertova, Luisa. "La religiosità di Nicolas Tournier a Roma," in: *Nicolas Tournier et la peinture caravagesque en Italie, en France et en Espagne*, ed. by Pascal-François Bertrand and Stéphanie Trouvé, 91–102. Toulouse: Université de Toulouse II-Le Mirail; Collection "Méridiennes," 2003.

Vetter, Andreas. *Gigantensturz-Darstellungen in der italienischen Kunst: Zur Instrumentalisierung eines mythologischen Bildsujets im historisch-politischen Kontext*. Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank fuer Geisteswissenschaften, 2002.

Vettori, Benedetto. *Empirica Benedicti Victorij Faventini, Medici clarissimi, necnon Camilli Thomaii Ravennatis morborum humani corporis curandorum Rationalis Methodus, ac Trotulae antiquissimi authoris Compendiu, de Passionibus mulierum curandis*. Leiden: apud haeredes Jacobi Iuntem, 1558.

Villa, Renzo. ""Quid hoc est rei?" Persistenze di una fortuna fiamminga," in: Danese et al., *Allattamento filiale*, 79–92.

Viollet Le Duc, Emmanuel-Louis-Nicolas, Anatole de Montaiglon, and Pierre Jannet, eds. "Moralité ou Histoire Rommaine" in: *Ancien théâtre françois; ou, Collection des ouvrages dramatiques les plus remarquables depuis les mystères jusqu'à Corneille*, vol. III, 171–86. Paris: P. Jannet, 1854–57; first ed. Lyon: Barnabé Chaussart, preès Nostre-Dame-de-Confort, 1548.

Vitry, Jacques de. "Sermones Vulgares," in: *The Exempla: Illustrative Stories from the Sermones Vulgares*, ed. by Thomas Frederick Crane. Nendeln: Kraus Reprint, 1967.

Vodret, Rossella. "Un volto per un mito, il 'ritratto di Beatrice' di Guido Reni," in: *Beatrice Cenci: la storia di un mito*, ed. by Mario Bevilacqua and Elisabetta Mori, 131–41. Rome: Fondazione Marco Basso; Viella, 1999.

Vollmer, Hans, ed. *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, founded by Ulrich Thieme and Felix Becker, vol. 29. Leipzig: Verlag von E.A. Seemann, 1935.

Voltelen, Floris Jacob. *De Lacte Humano eiusque cum Asinino et Ovillo comparatione observatines chemicae Accesserunt Henrici Doorschodti De Lacte atque*

Ioh. Georgii Greiselii De Cura Lactis in Arthritide …, ed. by Ioh. Georgius Fridericus Franzius. Leipzig: Ioh. Garb. Bueschelii Viduae, 1779; first ed. Utrecht: ex officina Abraham van Paddenburg, 1775.

Vorwahl, Heinrich. "Deutsche Volksmedizin in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart," in: *Volksmedizin: Probleme und Forschungsgeschichte*, ed. by Elfriede Grabner, 223–77. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967; first ed. 1939.

Vos, Jan. "Byschriften op Schildereyen," in: *Alle de Gedichten*, verzamelt en uitgegeven door J. L., vol. 1, 521–76. Amsterdam: Jacob Lescaille, Boeckverkooper op de Midddeldam, naast de Vismarkt, 1662.

Wales, John of. *Summa collationum. Explicit Galensis summa venustissima atque lepidissima summa collectionum, alio nomine sive Communiloquium vocitata*. Augsburg: Anton Sorg, 1475.

Ward, Roger. "Those Who Came Before: Caravaggio and His Principal Italian Followers," in: *Sinners & Saints, Darkness and Light: Caravaggio and his Dutch and Flemish Followers*; exhibition catalog; North Carolina Museum of Art, Sept. 27–Dec. 13, 1998; Milwaukee Art Museum, January 29–April 18, 1999; Dayton Art Institute, May 8–July 18, 1999; ed. by Dennis P. Weller, 17–34. Raleigh: North Carolina Museum of Art, 1998.

Warwick, Genevieve. "Introduction: Caravaggio in History" in: *Caravaggio: Realism, Rebellion, Reception*, ed. by Genevieve Warwick, 13–22. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006.

Weber, Gregor J.M. "Caritas Romana: Ein neu entdecktes Bild von Johannes Vermeer," *Weltkunst* 70, no. 2 (Feb. 2000): 225–28.

Weber am Bach, Sibylle. *Hans Baldung Grien (1484/85–1545): Marienbilder in der Reformation*. Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2006.

Werner, Elke Anna. "The Veil of Venus: A Metaphor of Seeing in Lucas Cranach the Elder," in: *Cranach*, ed. by Bodo Brinkmann, 99–109. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2007.

Williamson, Beth. *The Madonna of Humility: Development, Dissemination & Reception, ca. 1340–1400*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009.

Wind, Barry. *'A Foul and Pestilent Congregation': Images of Freaks in Baroque Art*. Aldershot, England; Brookfield, Vermont: Ashgate, 1997.

Winer, Rebecca. "The Mother and the *Dida* [Nanny]: Female Employers and Wet Nurses in Fourteenth-Century Barcelona," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactation*, 55–78.

Wirsung, Christopherus. *Ein new Artzney Buch*. Ursel: durch Cornelium Sutorium, 1605; first ed. 1568.

—. *Artzney Buch darinn werden fast alle eusserliche und innerlich Glieder des Menschlichen leibs mit ihrer gestalt aigenschafft und würckung beschriben …* . Heidelberg: Mayer, 1568.

Woolley, Alexandra. "Nicolas Poussin's Allegories of Charity in *The Plague at Ashdod* and *The Gathering of the Manna* and Their Influence on Late

Seventeenth-Century Art," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations*, 165–85.

Wright, Christopher. *Poussin: Paintings. Catalogue Raisonné*. London: Chaucer Press, 2007.

Wunder, Heide. "Frauenmilch-Muttermilch. Eine Geschichte aus dem 18. Jahrhundert," in: *Geschichte in Geschichten: Ein historisches Lesebuch*, ed. by Barbara Duden, Karen Hagemann, Regina Schulte, and Ulrike Weckel, 295–305. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus, 2003.

Yalom, Marilyn. *A History of the Breast*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997.

Yavneh, Naomi. "To Bare or Not Too Bare: Sofonisba Anguissola's Nursing Madonna and the Womanly Art of Breastfeeding," in: *Maternal Measures: Figuring Caregiving in the Early Modern Period*, ed. by Naomi J. Miller and Naomi Yavneh, 65–81. Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2000.

Yehoshua, Abraham B. *The Retrospective*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2013.

Zedler, Johann Heinrich. *Grosses Vollständiges Universal-Lexikon*, vol. 21. Halle: J.H. Zedler, 1739.

Zimmermann, Heinrich. "Das Inventar der Prager Schatz-und Kunstkammer vom 6. Dezember 1621, nach Akten des K. und K. Reichsfinanzarchivs in Wien," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* XXV, part 2 (1905): XIII–LXXV; reprint Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1967.

Zorach, Rebecca. *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold: Abundance and Excess in the French Renaissance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Zuccari, Alessandro, "Il caravaggismo a Roma: Certezze e ipotesi," in: *I Caravaggeschi: Percorsi e protagonisti*, ed. by Alessandro Zuccari, vol. 1, 31–59. Milan: Skira, 2010.

Zuccari, Alessandro, with the assistance of Claudio Strinati. *I Caravaggeschi: Percorsi e protagonisti*, 2 vols. Milan: Skira, 2010.

Zschelletzschky, Herbert. *Die "drei gottlosen Maler" von Nürnberg: Sebald Beham, Barthel Beham und Georg Pencz*. Leipzig: VEB E.A. Seemann Verlag, 1975.

Index of Artists

Amman, Jost 109–110, 379, fig. 2.8
Arlaud, Henry 154, 173
Aspertini, Amico 112, 162
Attiret, Claude-François 91

Baburen, Dirck van 41, 22, 103, 120, 140, 144–146, 148, 150–153, 157, 160, 171, 204–205, 207, 217, 379–381, fig. 2.15, 2.30, 2.31
Bachelier, Jean-Jacques 91, 197, 206–209, 383, fig. 3.22
Baellieur, Cornelis de 22, 148
Baldrighi, Giuseppe 197, 201, 202, 204, 383, fig. 3.18
Balduccio, Giovanni di 320, 345
Barba, Galeazzo della 80
Bartolo, Domenico di 328, 329, 385, fig. 6.13, 6.14
Beaufort, Jacques Antoine 217
Beccafumi 87, 89, 100
Beham, Barthel 21, 37, 38, 46, 47, 49, 53, 55, 58, 59, 375, 376, fig. 1.1, 1.11, 1.23, 1.25
Beham, Brothers 41, 42, 51, 56, 63, 95, 109
Beham, Hans Sebald 10, 21, 46–50, 52–55, 58, 59, 69, 71, 112, 376, fig. 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.20, 1.21, 1.22, 1.24
Benedetti, Michele 223
Bloemaert, Abraham 22, 138, 139, 140, 143, 144, 150, 380, fig. 2.26
Bol, Ferdinand 91
Bolognese Master 113, 379, fig. 2.12
Bon, Bartolomeo 344
Bonasone, Giulio 339, 386, fig. 6.25
Borbone, Isabella di 219
Botticelli, Sandro 51, 56, 93
Boullogne, Louis 194
Boulogne, Valentin de 103, 144, 158, 160
Bourdon, Sébastien 191
Bravo, Cecco 194
Bronckhorst, Jan van 151
Brosamer, Hans 60
Brugghen, Hendrick ter 140, 144, 150, 152, 153, 172
Bry, Theodor de 111, 114, 379, fig. 2.10
Burgkmair, Hans 57

Caliari, Benedetto 286, 287, 384, fig. 5.5
Camaino, Tino da 320, 345
Camuccini, Vincenzo 131, 380, fig. 2.23
Caracciolo, Battistello 106, 126, 144, 379, fig. 2.3

Caravaggio 10, 19, 22, 23, 27, 40, 41, 85, 88, 103–174, 178–182, 185, 191, 198, 213, 243, 379, 380, fig. 2.1, 2.2, 2.13, 2.16, 2.17
Casella, Francesco 38, 80, 375, fig. 1.3
Casolani, Alessandro 113, 162
Caukercken, Cornelis van 155, 170, 173
Celesti, Andrea 220
Cignani, Carlo 194
Conegliano, Cima da 78, 378, fig. 1.14
Clouet, François 286, 303
Colonna, Francesco 22
Coornhert, Dirck Volkertsz. 57
Cornu, Jean 91, 194
Coróna, Giovanni Antonio 73, 332, 333, 385, Fig. 6.18
Cousin, Jean 88
Couwenbergh, Christiaen van 41, 151, 152, 381, fig. 2.36
Coypel, Noël-Nicolas 197, 205–207, 383, fig. 3.20
Cranach, Hans 62
Cranach the Elder, Lucas 41, 51–53, 59, 60–62, 94, 96, 316, 317, 377, 385, fig. 1.27, 6.6
Crayer, Caspar de 22

Danzel, Jacques Claude 206
David, Jacques-Louis 24, 178, 216, 217, 228
David, Jacques-Louis, school of 383, fig. 3.27
Delaune, Étienne 108, 181, 379, fig. 2.5
Denck, Hans 56
Deshays, Jean-Baptiste 91, 197, 203, 204, 383, fig. 3.19
Dolci, Carlo 173
Dubois, Louis 91
Dürer, Albrecht 43, 92

Falconetto, Giovanni Maria 77
Fasano, Giovan Tommaso 189
Fogolino, Marcello 21, 77, 78, 330, 331, 385, fig. 6.15, 6.16
Fragonard, Jean-Honoré 216

Galli, Giacomo 91
Galli (Lo Spadarino), Giovanni Antonio 91, 103, 160
Garnier, Étienne-Barthélemy 41, 228
Gentileschi, Artemisia 127
Ghirlandaio, Domenico 286, 329, 330, 348, 384, fig. 5.4
Giorgione 64, 73, 75, 96, 316, 317, 385, fig. 6.5
Gossaert, Jan 114, 161, 223
Goujon, Jean 23, 88
Greuze, Jean-Baptiste 10, 20, 23, 196, 197, 210–216, 218, 227, 382, 383, fig. 3.14, 3.15, 3.24, 3.25, 3.26
Guardi, Andrea 326, 348
Guercino 23, 192, 220, 337, 382, fig. 3.12

Haid, Johann E. 223
Herrera Martínez, Jesus 28, 375, fig. 0.2
Honthorst, Gerrit van 9, 22, 103, 120, 140, 144, 148, 149, 150, 152, 153, 160, 164, 171, 381, fig. 2.34
Honthorst, Willem van 22, 41, 150, 171
Huaud, Amy and Jean-Pierre 154–156, 381, fig. 2.40

Janssens, Jan 144, 152
Jordaens III, Hans 22, 148, 381, fig. 2.33

Kauffmann, Angelika 41, 175, 228, 381, fig. 3.1
Kels the Elder, Hans 43–45, 79, 337, 376, fig. 1.9
Kneller, Sir Godfrey 14, 375, fig. 0.1

Lagrenée the Elder, Louis-Jean-François 197, 200–202, 204, 383, fig. 3.17
Lanfranco, Giovanni 129, 380, fig. 2.20
Lazzarini, Gregorio 23, 194, 337
Le Bas, Jacques-Philippe 205–206, 383, fig. 3.21
Le Brun, Charles 23, 179, 181–183, 186, 190–193, 221, 223, 382, fig. 3.11
Lefèbvre, Jules-Joseph 91
Leonardo da Vinci 280, 301, 327, 328, 385, fig. 6.12
Lippi, Filippino 326, 348
Lombard, Lambert 109, 181, 379,fig. 2.7
Lombardo, Tullio 78
Lorenzetti, Ambrogio 320, 385, fig. 6.8
Loth, Johann Carl 91, 194, 220
Lotto, Lorenzo 77, 98
Luini, Bernardino 21, 73, 74, 97, 114, 377, fig. 1.36
Luini, Bernardino, after 72, fig. 1.35

Maderno, Stefano 126, 127, 380, fig. 2.18
Manfredi, Bartolomeo 9, 22, 41, 103, 119, 135–138, 143–145, 148, 153, 157, 160, 163, 169, 178, 189, 379, 380, fig. 2.14, 2.24, 2.25
Master with the Griffin's Head 21, 60, 62–63, 377, fig. 1.26, 1.28
Maucher, Joseph 219
Mellan, Claude 154, 155, 381, fig. 2.38
Mellin, Charles 91
Michelangelo, Buonarroti 55
Migliori, Francesco 194
Monaco, Lorenzo 321, 345
Moreau the Younger, Jean-Michel 176, 217, 382, fig. 3.2
Moreelse, Paulus 15, 22, 150–152, 381, fig. 2.35
Murillo, Bartolomé Esteban 114

Neri, Filippo 134
Nivelle, Sébastien 107, 337, 379, fig. 2.4

Orley, Bernard van 112

Painter of the Coal-Mine Dish 277
Palma the Elder 64, 71, 75
Palma the Younger 27
Panneels, Willem 170
Passeri, Giovanni Battista 185
Pélichy, Gertrude de 208
Pencz, Georg 45, 47, 56, 62–64, 66, 68–70, 73, 79, 95, 377, fig. 1.29, 1.31, 1.33, 1.34
Perrier, François 190
Perrin, Jean-Charles-Nicaise 41, 228
Pinturicchio, Bernardino 75, 78, 79, 378, fig. 1.42
Pisano, Giovanni 319, 320, 338, 385, 386, fig. 6.7, 6.24
Pompei, Orazio 112
Poussin, Nicolas 10, 20, 23, 37, 88, 117, 175–228, 337, 382, fig. 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.7
Pozzo, Isabella Maria dal 219
Preti, Mattia 189, 190, 220, 382, fig. 3.9
Primaticcio 77, 81, 84, 85, 87, 100, 378, fig. 1.47

Quellinus the Elder, Artus 22, 194, 219
Quercia, Jacopo della 325, 326, 385, fig. 6.10
Quirizio di Giovanni da Murano 321, 322, 385, fig. 6.9

Raimondi, Marcantonio 88, 188, 189, 382, fig. 3.8
Raphael 75, 77, 84, 88, 195, 326, 385, fig. 6.11
Raphael, school of 100

Raphael, workshop of 100
Régnier, Nicolas 91, 103, 157, 160, 381, fig. 2.41
Reni, Guido 22, 23, 91, 128, 131, 135, 158, 159, 166, 167, 173, 201, 380–381, fig. 2.19, 2.42
Reni, Guido, follower of 130, fig. 2.22
Reverdy, Georges (Gasparo Reverdino) 85, 87, 112, 117, 193, 243, 378, fig. 1.50
Reynolds, Sir Joshua 15
Ribera, Jusepe de 103, 114, 121, 144, 158, 160, 164, 279, 280, 339, 384, fig. 5.2
Rivelli (della Barba), Galeazzo 38, 80, 375, fig. 1.3
Roman Master 112, 379, fig. 2.11
Romano, Giulio 10, 21, 22, 41, 75, 77–82, 84, 87, 100, 144, 326, 327, 339, 378, 385, 386, fig. 1.40, 1.43, 1.44, 1.45, 1.46, 6.11, 6.25
Rombaldotti, Ippolito 154, 172
Rosso Fiorentino 21, 41, 75, 77, 84–89, 100, 111, 112, 117, 193, 243, 378, fig. 149
Rubens, Peter Paul 9, 10, 22, 41, 85, 91, 135, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 160, 169, 170, 175–228, 339, 349, 375, 380, 383, fig. 1.6, 2.27, 2.28, 2.29, 3.16
Rubens, follower of 223
Rummel, Augustin 154, 156, 381, fig. 2.39

Saraceni, Pensionante del 103, 164
Schwetzer, Erhard 21, 66, 67, 71, 97, fig. 1.32
Seghers, Gerard 91, 144, 152
Segizzi, Gasparo 69
Seiter, Daniel 220
Sementi, Giovanni Giacomo 158, 173
Smith, John 170
Solis, Virgil 161
Spada, Lionello 103
Stella, Jacques 182
Stomer, Matthias 41, 91, 151

Thulden, Theodor van 91
Tintoretto 27, 73, 98, 132, 184, 185, 186, 187, 221, 314, 315, 333, 334, 335, 339, 343, 348, 349, 382, 385, 386, fig. 3.5, 6.4, 6.19, 6.20
Titian 21, 41, 64, 65, 71, 73, 75, 114, 162, 331, 332, 377, 385, fig. 1.30, 6.17
Tornioli, Niccolò 91, 194, 382, fig. 3.13
Tournier, Nicolas 103, 121, 164

Vaga, Perino del 21, 84–89, 98, 100, 117, 144, 243, 378, fig. 1.48
Vermeer, Jan 147, 148, 381, fig. 2.32
Vermiglio, Giuseppe 103
Veronese, Paolo 73, 285, 286, 339, 349, 384, fig. 5.3
Vierleger, Hans Bernaert 110, 379, fig. 2.9
Voet II, Alexander 170
Vos, Marten de 112
Vouet, Simon 22, 23, 88, 91, 103, 113, 131, 144, 153–155, 157, 158, 160, 167, 172, 173, 178, 380, 381, fig. 2.37, 2.38
Vouet, Simon, follower of 130, fig. 2.21

Weber, Johann Peter 194
Werff, Adrian van der 194
Wertmüller, Adolf Ulrich 207, 208, 383, fig. 3.32
Wierix, Johannes 109, 161
Willems, Joseph 219

Zanchi, Antonio 220
Zumbo, Gaetano 189, 191, 382, fig. 3.10