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INTRODUCTION

Apart from the standard surveys, lists, and dictionaries of Italian art and artists, there are essentially only three publications on Domenico Puligo that successfully contribute to the establishment of a plausible corpus, suggest a reasonable chronology for some of his works, and directly focus on a definition of his style. The first is an article by Carlo Gamba written in 1909 on a group of five portraits, formerly attributed to Andrea del Sarto, that he convincingly attributed to Puligo.\(^1\) Advances furthering the research on Puligo were made in 1962 by Hans Werner Grohn, who wrote an article featuring the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist that had recently been acquired by the Pinakothek at Munich (cat.no. 36, fig. 51).\(^2\) In his study, Grohn placed the Munich Madonna in Puligo's oeuvre because of its stylistic similarities to other Madonna paintings attributed to Puligo and thereby established a basis for additional paintings to be assigned to the artist. The third work on Puligo is a catalogue raisonné written by Sheila Bruce Lockhart for her M.A. degree at the Courtauld Institute in London in 1973.\(^3\) Although the catalogue is limited in its scope and includes only 44 documented and attributable works that Ms. Lockhart saw either first hand or in photographs, her manuscript nevertheless marks the first effort to systematically catalogue the majority
of Puligo's paintings.

Mention should also be made of the importance of S. J. Freedberg's\(^4\) and John Shearman's\(^5\) monographs on Andrea del Sarto for the preparation of this dissertation. By clearly defining the style of Sarto, dispelling the issue of collaboration between Sarto and Puligo, and culling from Sarto's oeuvre paintings attributable to Puligo (especially noteworthy in Freedberg's catalogue of rejected attributions), they greatly expedited the task of locating and assigning works attributable to Puligo.

My approach to this project is twofold: to define Puligo's style and to order his works into a plausible chronological arrangement. Since Puligo essentially kept to the same style, the recognition of works by his hand is not difficult in spite of the relative scarcity of documented works. The major problem that ensues, however, is that among the approximately 70 works attributable to Puligo, only two extant works are dated by documents. These two paintings date from the last two years of the artist's life; we are therefore left without any fixed points relating to the artist's earlier career. Thus, the chronology suggested here is only approximate and may for some works allow a possible range of several years.

This dissertation follows the standard format used in most monographic studies. It begins with a critical essay comprising a biography and a discussion, primarily stylistic, of Puligo's paintings. A catalogue raisonné follows which gives information on the size, medium, provenance, exhibitions, bibliography, copies, and variants. These entries also provide information, and opinion,
regarding the dating, iconography, and style of each painting.

The absence of a perceptive study of the painter over the centuries has fostered an extraordinary assortment of paintings to be assigned to Puligo's oeuvre. A catalogue of wrongly attributed paintings is, therefore, included in an attempt to deal, of necessity in a cursory manner, with paintings that have been attributed to Puligo but that, according to my judgment, are not by him.

A list of lost works follows. Such works are considered lost if they are no longer extant or traceable, even though cited in sixteenth and seventeenth-century documents, or in Vasari or Borghini. These lost works are distinguishable from the untraceable paintings that follow in the next section. No visual record survives for these paintings but they are cited in sources dating from the seventeenth century to modern times. Supporting documentation appears in the Appendix.

The results of this investigation reveal Puligo as a painter whose style is somewhat at odds with that hypothesized by others. The number of works has been radically reduced by approximately two-thirds (from about 200 to about 70 paintings). Paintings formerly thought to be collaborative, executed by Sarto and Puligo, were eliminated, as well as works attributed to him for no other reason apparent than their sfumato or sweetness of facial expression. No work securely attributed to Puligo shows him to be anything other than a painter of fully modeled three-dimensional figures. The numerous small-scale narrative paintings on cassone that have been casually ascribed to him have also therefore been
judged incompatible with Puligo's style and removed from his corpus. When Puligo's _oeuvre_ is reduced to a reasonable number, taking into account that the artist lived to be only 35, a consistent style emerges, revealing him as a capable painter who responded to the example of the High Renaissance style and then to the onset of Mannerism, but always in such a way as to accommodate his own personal and, perhaps, eccentric mode of painting.
NOTES TO INTRODUCTION


CHAPTER I

When Bartolommeo di Domenico reported to the Estimo del Contado in Florence in 1504,¹ he provided the earliest record of the artist Domenico di Bartolommeo Ubaldini, called Domenico Puligo.² In this year Bartolommeo stated that his son, Domenico, was twelve years old, thus establishing the fact that Puligo was born in 1492.³

Puligo's father was a blacksmith, who descended from the Ubaldini of Marradi, blacksmiths by trade, in the Tuscan Romagna. In the first years of the fifteenth century, the Ubaldini left their native region and moved to Ponte a Rifredi, a little village on the outskirts of Florence. After a number of years, the family relocated in the Piazza di San Gallo, just outside the Porta San Gallo. Here Bartolommeo lived in a small house on the property of the Spedale di San Gallo with his wife Apollonia, daughter of the goldsmith Antonio di Giovanni, and their two children, Domenico and Francesca.⁴

After the notification of Puligo's twelfth year, the next record of the artist dates from twenty-one years later (1525), when he is 33, and just two years before his death in 1527. His name appears, most likely, as well, in 1523 on a portrait, now universally attributed to Puligo.⁵ This Portrait of a Young Man Writing, located at Firle Place near Lewes in East Sussex, depicts a young man seated at a table writing a letter (cat.no. 49, fig. 65). The
letter is addressed to the artist, who is simply identified as Domenico; it is dated December 8, 1523. While the first-name identification leaves some question as to who is referred to, the style confirms the portrait as Puligo's. While not a documented painting in the strictest sense, it is cited here as the only signed and dated work by the artist and the first reference to Puligo in his maturity.

From 1525 until the artist's death in 1527 the recorded information on Puligo's activities increases considerably. His name is written in the Libro Rosso of the Compagnia de' pittori di San Luca as "Domenichio di bartolomeo puligho dip. 1525." However, it is unlikely that Puligo only completed his apprenticeship in 1525. Instead, he probably matriculated from the Guild earlier and had been receiving commissions as an independent master for a number of years. Other artists' names appear in the Libro Rosso under similar circumstances. For example, Andrea del Sarto (1486-1531) is first recorded in the Guild's account books in the same year, 1525, but had already independently executed numerous works in the two previous decades.

On December 21, 1525, it is recorded that Puligo received a commission from two Genoese painters, Battista di Cristofano Grasso and Agostino di Marsiano Calvo, to paint two altarpieces in Genoa, one for the church of Santa Caterina and the other for the monastery of San Benigno. According to the contract, he was to complete the paintings in four months, for which he would receive a salary of fifteen gold fiorini larghi for food and lodging according to his
rank and for the quality and condition of his work. Whether Puligo traveled to Genoa to complete the commission is unknown; the two paintings' intended locations were destroyed in the eighteenth century, and the paintings were never cited in antiquarian guidebooks of this region.

Three other commissions are recorded for 1525-26. The first is recorded in a seventeenth-century Cistercian document, where Puligo is recorded as having painted an altarpiece for the third chapel on the garden side at Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi in Florence (cat.no. 30, fig. 41). Paolo di Ser Giovanni da Romena commissioned this altarpiece for a chapel that he acquired from the Cistercians on April 22, 1525; this work establishes a terminus post quem for the date of Puligo's painting. According to another document, the painting was put in place some time after the end of March in 1526. The second work, the Marriage of St. Catherine and St. Peter Martyr (cat.no. 31, fig. 45), is his only surviving fresco; it was commissioned by the Capitani of the Compagnia del Bigallo for an outdoor tabernacle on the corner of Via San Zanobi and Via delle Ruote in 1526. In this same year, Puligo also painted for Francesco del Giocondo the now lost Stigmata of St. Francis at SS. Annunziata in Florence.

In 1538 and 1539, the church Santa Maria degli Angiolini made payments to Filippo di Salvestro di Francesco, on behalf of his wife, Apollonia, Puligo's daughter. The payments total forty-two lira, and were made in connection with an unspecified painting by Puligo, undoubtedly the Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple.
(cat.no. 39, fig. 54) for the major altar of that church. Since these recorded payments occurred eleven and twelve years after Puligo's death, they suggest that the contract was left unfulfilled at the time of the artist's death, and the painting can be considered as one of the last works executed by the artist prior to his death in 1527.

On September 12, 1527, Puligo was suffering from the plague, and was close to death. Andrea Rulli drew up his will, the substance of which concerns the arrangements for the care of his family, the dispersal of his possessions, and the legacies left for prayers for his soul. Several days later, he died and was buried at San Lorenzo in Florence.20

In addition to this sparse documentation, information on Puligo is available in Giorgio Vasari's Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori ... (1550, 1st edition and 1568, 2nd edition), which devotes a separate essay to Puligo. Vasari (1511-1574) briefly worked in the shop of Andrea del Sarto as an adolescent (1524-25)21 and probably was personally acquainted with Puligo during those years when the latter was a close associate with Sarto. Vasari's direct familiarity with Puligo is further demonstrated by his fairly accurate list of the artist's works. Among the sixteen paintings that Vasari lists, three are documented and six are extant and attributable on the basis of style. Six others are untraceable, but only one is misattributed.22

Vasari informs us that Puligo was one of a large number of students trained in the shop of Ridolfo Ghirlandaio (1483-1561).
According to Vasari, among all of Ridolfo's apprentices, it was only Puligo and Antonio del Ceraiolo (active first quarter of the sixteenth century) who were especially noteworthy, on the grounds that they continued to work for their master for many years after the completion of their apprenticeship. Vasari states that Puligo and Ceraiolo received invitations to work in Spain and Hungary, but turned down the offers, unwilling to be drawn away from the joys of their own country even by the promise of money.\textsuperscript{23}

No other information on Puligo's apprenticeship is known. An approximate chronology for his study with Ridolfo can nevertheless be inferred, one based on several assumptions, as well as the fragmentary information provided by Vasari. If one assumes that Puligo began his apprenticeship between his twelfth and fourteenth year, the average age when boys started their training as artists, then Puligo would have signed on with Ridolfo between 1504 and 1506. Under typical conditions, Puligo's study would have been completed sometime between his eighteenth and twentieth year, therefore, around 1510. If, however, Puligo remained with Ridolfo for a protracted period of time, as Vasari suggests, then he may have worked for Ridolfo during the first few years of the second decade, probably assuming a position as an independent colleague, rather than that of an assistant or apprentice.

During the second decade of the sixteenth century, when Puligo probably was still connected with Ridolfo, he also established contact with Andrea del Sarto. This is known on the basis of stylistic evidence, to be presented subsequently, and also
from anecdotes written by Vasari, who speaks out of his own experience.

An account of Puligo's early association with Sarto appears in Vasari's *Vita* of Giovanni Francesco Rustici where he describes a banquet of the Compagnia di Paiuolo (the Kettle); he describes this incident at some length because such clubs had become unusual by the time of his writing. The Compagnia consisted of twelve men, mostly artists, who included Puligo, Sarto, Rustici, Aristotile da San Gallo, Spillo, the goldsmith Robetta, Francesco di Pellegrino, Niccolo Buoni, Domenico Baccelli, Solosmeo, Lorenzo called Guazzetto, and Ruberto di Filippo Lippi. The Compagnia gathered in rooms occupied by Rustici at the Sapienza, buildings located between SS. Annunziata and San Marco where other artists such as Sarto, Franciabigio, and Jacopo Sansovino had their workshops as well. Here they feasted, often with great revelry, bringing lavish dishes prepared with spectacular invention. On one occasion Puligo's entree was especially noteworthy. He brought a stuffed pig dressed as a servant girl holding a distaff and tending a brood of chickens. Vasari also makes special mention of Sarto's preparation; it was an octagonal temple constructed of sausage and parmesan cheese, complete with pavements of jelly, cornices of sugar, and a tribune of marzipan.

The existence of this Compagnia probably coincided with the gatherings of another social group, the Compagnia del Cazzuola (the Trowel) which also met at the Sapienza and was founded in 1512. Its membership included individuals from wealthy Florentine families,
such as the Rucellai and the Medici, but also included artists such as Bugiardini, Granacci, Rustici, and Sarto; the last two, as previously noted, were also members of the Compagnia di Paiuolo. The activities at the Sapienza of the Compagnia del Cazzuola, as well as the Compagnia di Paiuolo, probably continued until about 1517 when, according to John Shearman, Sarto married in 1517 and then went to France in 1518, and the buildings at the Sapienza were converted to stables for the Medici horses.26

If Vasari's account of the Compagnie is reliable—and there is no reason to doubt either his information or his good faith in this instance—then Puligo's association with Sarto would date to the second decade of the sixteenth century. Shortly after, the two artists traveled together. In Sarto's Vite, Vasari states that he went to Prato accompanied by some friends, Puligo being one of them.27 The trip is dated 1522,28 but whether Puligo actually went along cannot be otherwise verified.

After Vasari's introductory remarks about Puligo, he lists a number of works painted by the artist. Unfortunately, he chose to omit all discussion of the early works, those Puligo executed while with Ridolfo, naming only those Puligo painted when he was an independent master and in close association with Sarto.29

The first paintings Vasari lists are four Madonnas belonging to the following: Agnolo della Stufa who kept the painting in the Abbey of Capalona near Arezzo, Agnolo Niccolini the archbishop of Pisa, Filippo dell'Antella, and Filippo Spini who was the treasurer to Cosimo, the Grand Duke of Tuscany. All of these are untraceable;
however, the next two works Vasari cites are extant: the Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi (Palazzo Pitti, Florence, cat.no. 54, fig. 70) and the Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina (Salmond Collection, Salisbury, cat.no. 50, fig. 66).³⁰

After these portraits, Vasari describes a large painting with "una Nostra Donna con alcuni Angeli e putti ed un San Bernardo che scrive," belonging to Giovanni Gualberto del Giocondo and his brother Niccolò, canon of San Lorenzo in Florence. This painting undoubtedly is Puligo's Vision of St. Bernard now in the Walters Gallery, Baltimore (cat.no. 29, fig. 39).³¹

Vasari then lists two half-lengths, a Cleopatra with an asp biting her breast and a Lucretia killing herself with a dagger. Each of these can be associated with extant works assumed to be by Puligo; the Cleopatra is in the Museum of Fine Arts in Budapest (cat.no. 61, fig. 77) and the Lucretia was sold at Sotheby's in New York in 1982 (cat.no. 58, fig. 74). Vasari also mentions some portraits, no longer traceable, then said to be in the house of Giulio Scala. Following, Vasari cites the Stigmata of St. Francis (See Lost Works), commissioned by Francesco del Giocondo and located at SS. Annunziata in Florence, but lost during the eighteenth century.³²

Beginning with the Stigmata, the remainder that Vasari cites appear to be arranged in chronological order; whether this is his explicit intention is not clear. The St. Francis, which dates 1526, is followed by the Madonna and Child with Six Saints at the Cistercian convent of Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi in Florence, commissioned in 1525 and completed (presumably) in the following year
After this, the *Visions of Count Ugo*, no longer extant, is listed at Badia a Settimo. Vasari then states that not long after the completion of the *Visions*, Puligo executed the *Marriage of St. Catherine and St. Peter Martyr* (dated 1526) in the tabernacle on the corner of Via San Zanobi and Via delle Ruote in Florence for the Compagnia di Bigallo (cat.no. 31, fig. 45). The last painting named by Vasari is Puligo's *Deposition from the Cross* in Anghiari (cat.no. 38, fig. 53); while undated, it belongs stylistically to the last year of the artist's life.

Vasari's description of the character of the painter may be reliable as well, since Vasari had the opportunity of meeting Puligo in Sarto's workshop. He describes Puligo as a *bon vivant*, who more diligently pursued worldly pleasures than his art. We are further told that Puligo died suddenly, in 1527, as a result of the plague which he contracted in the house of his mistress. This, however, is a story Vasari applied to a number of artists, such as Raphael, and we might assume that the account is untrue except that citations of Puligo's merrymaking are repeated: cf., Vasari's account of Puligo in Rustici's *Vita*, with his participation in the Compagnia di Paiuolo as one example. Vasari adds in his closing remarks on Puligo's *Vite* that the artist associated with "persone allegre e di buon tempo e con musici e con femmine." Puligo even painted the portrait of one of these festive characters, the courtesan Barbara Fiorentina, renowned for her beauty, culture, and musical talents.
We learn from Vasari's account and by inference from the meager number of documents that record public commissions that Puligo devoted most of his time to painting Madonnas, portraits, half-lengths of saints, and historical and mythological figures for private patrons in the Tuscan region. While the artist initially did not receive grand-scale commissions, his patronage, nevertheless, suggests that he was admired by the leading citizenry, which included families such as the Niccolini, Spini, Carnesecchi, and Giocondo. Then, once Puligo reached his maturity, he began to receive commissions for large altarpieces and continued to be patronized by prominent families in Florence such as the Quaratesi, the da Romena, and, again, the Giocondo. The Bigallo, one of the leading Compagnie of Florence, also commissioned a work, as did the Confraternita del Corpus Domini in Anghiari. Puligo was even sought out by visiting artists from Genoa to execute two altarpieces in that northern Italian city.

The events of Puligo's career suggest that his life was uneventful, but one not lacking some jocularity. He traveled little and was content, as Vasari points out, to remain within the environs of his native Florence. Milanesi records that he married Felice di Francesco Silvani, and that they had three children: Bartolommeo, who died as a child shortly after his father; Apollonia, who married Filippo di Salvestro di Francesco Baldacci and after his death, Amaddio Baccelli; and Margherita, who died in infancy, also not long after her father. Regrettably for sixteenth-century Florentine
painting, Puligo's life ended at the age of 35 just as his artistic maturity began.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1Entry no. 4, Quarter of Santa Maria Novella, cited by Gaetano Milanesi in Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architetti*, 9 vols. (1568; Florence: Sansoni, 1906) 4: 472. The Estimo del Contado was a census taken of the populace living outside of the Florentine walls.

2The source or meaning of the name Puligo is no longer known. On the few occasions when the artist's name appears in documents, his official name typically is given as "Domenico di Bartolomeo Puligo," as in the *Libro Rosso* of the Compagnia de' pittori di San Luca in 1525 (in Michelangelo Gualandi, "Anni 1340-1550. Ascritti alla Compagnia dei pittori fiorentini sotto il titolo di S. Luca," *Memorie originali italiane risguardanti le belle arti*, 6 vols. [Bologna, 1845] 6: 180). Vasari, writing in the mid-sixteenth century, simply identifies the artist as Domenico Puligo, which is repeated thereafter by subsequent writers.

3Vasari implied that Puligo was born in 1475. After correctly recording Puligo's death in 1527, he states that the artist was fifty-two years old when he died, making the year of his birth 1475 (Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architetti nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568, ed. Rosanna Bettarini, Paola Barocchi, 7 vols. to date [Florence: Sansoni, 1966-] 4: 252; henceforth this work is referred to as "Vasari, 1550." Vasari 1568, 4: 467.


5The painting was attributed to Andrea del Sarto until Gamba in 1909 correctly identified the portrait as a work by Puligo ("Di alcuni ritratti del Puligo," *Rivista d'Arte* 6 (1909): 279. See cat.no. 49, fig. 65.

6The full text of the letter is given in cat.no. 49.

7The style of the painting is discussed in Chapter 4.

An attempt, albeit an unsatisfactory one, has been made to connect the Madonna and Child with Two Saints at the Ringling Museum in Sarasota with Puligo's commission for the altarpiece for San Benigno (see cat. no. 26, fig. 34).


Milanesi in Vasari 1568 (1906) 4: 472.

Milanesi (in Vasari 1568 [1906] 4: 472-73) gives the specific details of the will which are repeated in Document 9. The will provides some information on the painter's social position. The amount of 200 fiorini di suggeello (or 200 florins) left for dowries for each of his daughters, suggests that Puligo was of low social status and few means. In the mid-fifteenth century, the dowry of an upper-class woman of Florence ranged from about 1,000 to 2,000 florins (Lauro Martines, The Social World of the Florentine Humanists, 1390-1460, Princeton: UP, 1963, 37-38). Allowing for some fluctuation of the relative value of the florin during the sixteenth century in comparison to the mid-fifteenth century, one can infer that Puligo did not prosper and his daughters were not left with considerable wealth.

The specific individuals named in Puligo's will suggest that he had relatives and friends of some import. The guardianship of his children was left to his father-in-law Francesco di Ser Silvano, a goldsmith. If Puligo's father-in-law died, the care of his children was passed to his maternal uncle Giovanni d'Antonio, a goldsmith, Giovanni di Domenico, a weaver of brocade, Giovan Gualberto del Giocondo (who, according to Vasari 1568, 4: 465, owned Puligo's Vision of St. Bernard with his brother Niccolo, a Canon of S. Lorenzo in Florence) and Cristoforo da Soci, the Chancellor of the Dieci.
Although no specific listing of Puligo's personal possessions were made, they were to be given to the Spedale degli Innocenti. Also, there was no reference to his garzoni or to his workshop effects.

21Vasari 1568, 7: 651.

22The three documented paintings are the Madonna and Child with Six Saints (Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi, Florence), the Stigmata of St. Francis (lost, formerly SS. Annunziata, Florence), and the Tabernacle with the Marriage of St. Catherine and St. Peter Martyr (Via San Zanobi and Via delle Ruote, Florence). The six extant paintings are the Vision of St. Bernard (Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore), the Deposition from the Cross (Collegiata, Anghiari), the Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi (Palazzo Pitti, Florence), the Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina (Salmond Collection, Salisbury), the Lucretia (sold 4 November 1982, Sotheby's, New York), and the Cleopatra (Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest). The six untraceable paintings are portraits in the collection of Giulio Scala, the Visions of Count Ugo at Badia a Settimo, and four Madonna paintings in the collections of Agnolo della Stufa, Agnolo Niccolini, Filippo dell'Antella, and Filippo Spini. The notable exception to this list is a documented painting by Domenico and Davide Ghirlandaio (see Attributed Paintings, Florence, Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi) that Vasari gave to Puligo.

23Vasari 1568, 4: 462-65.
24Vasari 1568, 6: 609-11.
25Vasari 1568, 6: 611-12.
26Shearman 1965, 2-3.
27Vasari 1568, 5: 43-44.
28Sarto went to Prato over a dispute with Niccolò Soggi regarding a commission dated 1522 (see Milanesi in Vasari 1568 [1906] 6: 33). Vasari dated the dispute in 1524 (1568, 6: 21).
35 Vasari 1568, 4: 381-82.

36 Vasari 1568, 4: 467.

37 Vasari 1568, 4: 465.

38 Milanesi in Vasari 1568 (1906) 4:473. In a puzzling and no doubt incorrect citation, E. Bénézet, (Dictionnaire critique et documentaire des peintres, 10 vols. [Paris: Librarie Gründ, 1976] 8: 523) identifies a son of Puligo named Jacone Puligo, who, according to the writer, was a painter of the fifteenth century and student and collaborator of Andrea del Sarto.
CHAPTER 2

The paucity of documents pertaining to Puligo's life and artistic career makes the task of reconstructing his oeuvre difficult. Efforts toward chronologically organizing his paintings are further confounded by the fact that all of the extant documented works date from the last years of Puligo's life, just prior to his death in 1527. Vasari's biography of Puligo adds invaluable information by naming works not cited by the documents. Nevertheless, Vasari restricts his discussion to those works belonging to his maturity. Like the documented paintings, all the works Vasari cites that can be associated with extant works are datable late in the artist's career. Because of these limitations, I have chosen an unorthodox method for organizing the critical essay. To establish a criterion for a reasonable corpus of works, the discussion of Puligo's paintings will begin with the latter part of his career, and explore the securely attributed works and the other large-scale altarpieces and Madonna pictures that are closely associable with them in style and time (this Chapter 2). These works will be arranged in a plausible chronological order, beginning in the early part of the 1520s; admittedly, with the scarcity of fixed points, this dating can only be relative. Once Puligo's style is identified, the discussion will turn, in Chapter 3, to his early works; while none are
documented, all having been attributed to the artist on the basis of style. It is here, retrospectively, that the criterion established in this present chapter will be helpful.

Puligo's mature production is dominated by large-scale altarpieces among which the most outstanding are the *Vision of St. Bernard* (c.1523-24, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, cat.no. 29, fig. 39) and the *Madonna and Child with Six Saints*, the Cestello Altarpiece (1525-26, Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi, Florence, cat.no. 30, fig. 41). In comparison with the simply composed *Madonna and Child* paintings of his youth, the paintings of the 1520s have greater compositional and figural complexity, are often in larger dimension, and display voluminous figures which are nearly life-size. Narratives are undertaken, such as the *Vision of St. Bernard* or the *Deposition* (c.1527, Collegiata di Santa Maria delle Grazie, Anghiari, cat.no. 38, fig. 53). The overall execution shows a more practiced hand in the drawing, and the color is composed in careful harmony. Although these paintings were executed over a fairly short period of time, stylistically there is evidence of a gradual but deliberate evolution toward greater complexities in treatment of space, drapery, and figure poses. Figures tend to become more voluminous and ultimately rather elongated. It is this progression in style which serves as the primary means for determining the chronological order of the paintings.

To reiterate, the precise chronological span of Puligo's mature style is not easily determined. It ends, of course, with his death in 1527; on the basis of the available evidence I would place
its beginning, somewhat arbitrarily, around 1521-22, that is a couple of years before the c.1523-24 date that seems most reasonable for his Vision of St. Bernard. The date, c.1521-22, for the beginning of Puligo's maturity would allow for his having painted certain other large-scale altarpieces with full-length figures and several Madonna paintings, all of which share similar monumental qualities with the Vision and other securely attributed works, but stylistically appear to pre-date the Vision.

The work that most likely initiates Puligo's embarkation into these more demanding commissions of larger size is the Enthroned Virgin and Child with Two Saints at the Ringling Museum of Art in Sarasota, Florida (cat.no. 26, fig. 34). It depicts the Virgin seated in a niche-like throne holding the infant Christ. She is flanked by two kneeling saints—St. Quentin, at the left, holding two spits and a martyr's palm, and St. Placidus, at the right, wearing a white Cistercian robe. Hovering above the saints, in the upper corners, are two putti, who draw back curtains to ceremoniously present, in effect, the scene.

Stylistically, the painting should be dated c.1521-22, a dating suggested by the parallels to be found between both Puligo's later dated altarpieces and his youthful Madonna paintings. The clearest indication of the dating, however, is to be found in the facial types. The Virgin's young idealized face has lowered eyes and a tilted position of the head which are Bartolommesque in origin (compare his Madonna and Child with SS. Stephen and John the Baptist, 1509, Lucca Cathedral), but descend from Puligo's own early
treatment to be found in paintings of the *Madonna and Child* (see cat.no. 5, fig. 10; cat.no. 11, fig. 16; and cat.no. 23, fig. 31) that date c.1510-20. While the drawing of her face is more perfected than in the early works, it has not yet arrived at the rarefied form of the heavy-lidded, closely set eyes and long oval face found in later works, such as the Virgin in the Cestello Altarpiece of 1525-26 (cat.no. 30, fig. 41).

Poses and drapery treatment also support the chronological position for the painting in the 1520s. St. Placidus, shown with shorn head (at the right), is from the same mold as St. Bernard in the *Vision of St. Bernard*, c.1523-24, (fig. 39), and St. Quentin, shown in profile and with tilted head, takes the same pose as St. Bernard in the Cestello Altarpiece of 1525-26. However, the drapery, treated in uncomplicated folds, suggest that the Sarasota painting was produced earlier than these fully mature works. For example, the simple folds of the robe of St. Placidus are more closely connected to the robe of St. Bernard in the *Vision of St. Bernard* than to the more skillfully rendered and intricate folds of the robe of St. Bernard in the later securely dated Cestello Altarpiece. Such contrasts and comparisons show this Sarasota altarpiece to be an advance over the work of the 1510s yet one not possessing the complexities of the 1525 Cestello Altarpiece, thus supporting the date c.1521-22.

The composition is a simple arrangement of figures typical of Florentine classicism of the High Renaissance. The iconographic idea --putti drawing back curtains to reveal the enthroned Virgin and
Child with Saints—generally recalls the Baldacchino types by Fra Bartolommeo (Madonna and Child with Six Saints, 1509, San Marco, Florence) and Albertinelli (Madonna and Child with Four Saints, c.1510, Accademia, Florence). These works are basically figural and architectural reductions of Raphael's earlier precedent, the Madonna del Baldacchino begun in 1507 and left unfinished in 1508 (Palazzo Pitti, Florence). The simplicity and equipoise of these Florentine masters' works apparently appealed to Puligo's developing sense of classicism for the Sarasota painting reveals his response to their monumental figures that are structurally solid and comfortably occupy their own space. Like theirs, Puligo's composition is balanced along the central axis of the Virgin by evenly weighted forms that individually and collectively create triangular patterns on the surface plane. The soft chiaroscuro and modeling also suggest Puligo's appreciation of these early Cinquecento painters' works.

Puligo's acquisition of skill as a painter appears to have been a slow process. According to Vasari, Andrea del Sarto assisted Puligo with advice and drawings, but Puligo may have also improved upon his style through repetition and practice, for he often revised compositions several times by adjusting the poses, adding figures, or changing the background (see cat.no. 8, fig. 13; cat.no. 9, fig. 14; and cat.no. 10, fig. 15). Through this process, Puligo ultimately arrived at his aesthetically refined, mature works of art.
The Sarasota altarpiece is a case in point in which Puligo returned to an earlier work and greatly improved upon it. The painting is based upon the small Madonna and Child in the collection of the Earl of Wemyss of Longniddry, Scotland (cat.no. 11, fig. 16), attributed to Albertinelli, but given here to Puligo. That Madonna is an early composition dating c.1517 and is an ingenious reworking of Sarto's Marriage of St. Catherine (c.1512, Gemaldegalerie, Dresden, no. 76, fig. 17). This little Madonna compares almost identically with her depiction in the Sarasota altarpiece in the construction of the niche and footstool, the disposition of the Virgin's head and legs, her facial type, and the design and arrangement of her robe.

In its expansion of the Wemyss Madonna, however, the Sarasota altarpiece reveals what becomes apparent in many paintings from Puligo's maturity—that he was capable of deep insight, and of giving it a highly effective formal realization. This is evident in the composition, color, and general manipulation of paint in the Sarasota Altarpiece. While the composition is simple and uncomplicated, almost Quattrocentesque, the arrangement of the two saints in complementary curving positions so as to interlock with the form of the Virgin gives the scene a persuasive fluency. Colors are applied in luminous harmony; the creamy white of St. Placidus's robe is juxtaposed to the scarlet-orange of the robe covering St. Quentin's legs. Centered between is the crimson red of the Virgin's dress covered with a blue-green robe. The bottle-green color of the lining of St. Quentin's robe is rhythmically repeated in the curtains.
Pervasive chiaroscuro, warm in tonality and Sartesque in affinity, unites the colors. Demonstrating Puligo's mastery in the handling of paint are exceptional passages in St. Placidus's robe, realizing a texture of the heavy cloth bathed in filmy soft light. The face of the Virgin is quite exquisite, for her delicate features are smoothly modeled and framed by golden wavy hair.

Puligo's dependency upon the compositions of other artists, particularly Albertinelli and Sarto, is also evident in an Annunciation (private collection in Florence, cat.no. 27, fig. 35). The spacious interior setting with a centrally placed doorway and a bed to the right is taken from Albertinelli's Annunciation predella of the Visitation Altarpiece (1503, Uffizi, Florence, no. 1587). Gabriel's kneeling pose in the foreground (which as aforementioned resembles that of the Gabriel in Albertinelli's 1503 Annunciation) and the two angels, clustered at the left, recall another Annunciation by Albertinelli dated 1510 (the Accademia in Florence). While the contrapposto pose of Puligo's Virgin resembles most closely the one in Albertinelli's 1510 Annunciation, the facial type and costume most closely compare with the Virgin of Sarto's San Gallo Annunciation (c.1510, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 124, fig. 26).

The Puligo Annunciation is not widely published, nor is there extensive discussion of it; it was Berenson who first attributed the panel to Puligo, whereas Monti placed it in the œuvre of Sarto. Further comparison of the Virgin with the Virgin in Sarto's San Gallo Annunciation supports the attribution to Puligo as
more plausible. Examination of the faces shows Sarto's version to have more precisely drawn features; definition is given to the line of the jaw and the side of the nose. Furthermore, the various planes around the eyes are clearly indicated, leaving no uncertainty as to specifics of organic structure. Puligo, on the other hand, softens all the edges of the face, giving the figure, in particular, and the scene, in general, a diffused, atmospheric quality.

Drapery treatment in each painting also suggests two different hands. Sarto's numerous, well-placed folds give the figure a greater degree of fluidity and grace than the more broadly treated, heavy folds in cat.no. 27. The overlapping folds of this Virgin's mantle around the shoulders and across the arms recall the simple arrangement of the Virgin's mantle in the Sarasota Altarpiece.

The poses also suggest Puligo's hand. The juxtaposition of the left-hand angel in profile to another in three-quarter view appears in slightly earlier or near-contemporary Puligo paintings, such as the Madonna and Child with SS. Catherine of Alexander and John the Baptist (c.1518-21, Museo Civico, Pisa, no. 198, cat.no. 18, fig. 25) or the Madonna of Humility with Musical Angels (c. 1520-22, formerly Corsini Gallery, Florence, no. 175, cat.no. 17, fig. 24). The angels, although separated by the Virgin, also compare in poses and facial types with those in the slightly later Vision of St. Bernard, c.1523-24.

The compositional simplicity of the Annunciation, with forms placed harmoniously in space, suggests a date close to the one assigned the Sarasota Altarpiece, c.1521-22, but this painting
probably predates the *Vision of St. Bernard*, c.1523–24, which has figures of more grandiose scale and more bulky proportions.

The pose of Gabriel in the Florentine *Annunciation* is repeated in another *Annunciation*, one of the scenes the Cappella del Loretino Altar in San Miniato a Tedesco (cat. no. 28, fig. 36). This altarpiece is large (over 200 cm. long) and extends nearly the entire width of the chapel. Six panels flank a centrally placed statue of the Virgin and Child, and a predella runs the length of the altar. The paintings are housed in an elaborately designed gilded frame that resembles traditional sculptured altars, such as the Corbinelli Altar (1485–1500) by Andrea Sansovino at Santo Spirito in Florence (fig. 37). In fact, Puligo's altar is closely connected to the original altarpiece design of St. Nicholas of Tolentino for the Santo Spirito altar, preserved in a drawing by Jacopo(? ) Sansovino (fig. 38). This sculptured altar was never executed; but, a painted version by Franciabigio incorporating a statue of St. Nicholas was completed c.1516 or 1517. Even this work does not survive in its original state, but Puligo's knowledge of its original appearance is apparent when his design is compared with the drawing. In both, a statue is placed in the central niche and flanked by panels of angels, shown gliding gracefully on one foot. Above the angels are rectangular panels of the Virgin Annunciate on the right and the Archangel Gabriel on the left. To this, however, Puligo added two panels at the sides bearing images of Saints Miniatus and Genesius.
Prior to its transfer to the restoration laboratory, the ragged condition of the Cappella del Loretino Altar provided only a dim view of its original state. Even then, however, Puligo's sources were apparent in spite of condition. Albertinelli's Annunciations of 1503 (Uffizi, Florence, no. 1587) and 1510 (Accademia, Florence) again inspire the pose of Gabriel. The Virgin, seated in a chair, is modeled after an earlier work of Puligo's own at the Galleria Nazionale in Rome (cat.no. 15, fig. 22). The angels deployed below the Annunciation panels are energetically posed and generally recall the active and spiritus putti of Sarto's Dresden Marriage of St. Catherine, c.1512, (fig. 17).

The painting fits easily with the paintings of Puligo's early maturity. The similarity of the figure of Gabriel with the Gabriel in his Annunciation, datable c.1521-22, suggests that the works were created in close proximity to one another. Additional support for placing the altarpiece in the early 1520s is provided by the Saints Miniatus and Genesius, comparable in their nearly life-size proportion and sculpturesque poses to the Virgin in Puligo's Vision of St. Bernard, datable around 1523-24. The sheer ambition displayed in the execution of a large multi-paneled altarpiece also indicates that the Cappella del Loretino Altar is a part of Puligo's mature work.

Among the paintings from Puligo's maturity documented or named by Vasari, the Vision of St. Bernard (Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, cat.no. 29, fig. 39) most likely follows in date the Florentine Annunciation and the altarpieces at Sarasota and San Miniato. Although undated by documents, the painting is, of the extant and
identifiable works (excluding portraits) cited by Vasari, his first-mentioned. This citation precedes his references to Puligo's commissions dated 1525 and 1526. The full-length figures and large size of the panel (it measures 214 x 171.9 cm.) lead one to associate the painting with those dated works, which have similar full-length figures on panels with approximately the same measurements. But in contrast to the 1525-26 works, which have more elongated figures and exaggerated expressions, the Walters Vision represents Puligo in his most classical phase. The evenly weighted composition is united, left and right, by the gestural and visual exchange between the Virgin and St. Bernard. The wing of the angel to the right of the Virgin fills the void between the two main protagonists; the gentle downward sweep of the wing rhythmically extends the curvature of the hillock in the distant left. The quietude of the scene is enhanced by the limited number of figures, who remain motionless and transfixed. The Virgin, though an apparition, is volumetrically modeled in a contrapposto stance, recalling classical statuary. These High Renaissance qualities suggest a date preceding the later documented panels but postdating other paintings of Puligo's maturity that demonstrate a lesser degree of monumentality. As we shall see, the most reasonable and likely date is c.1523-24.

Puligo derived his poses for the Virgin and St. Bernard in his Vision of St. Bernard from a painting of the same subject painted by Perugino, now located at the Alte Pinakothek, Munich (fig. 40). Perugino's painting dates c.1489-93(?19 and was originally in the
Cistercian church of Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi, for which Puligo later painted the *Madonna and Child with Six Saints* in 1525-26. While Perugino's setting is totally altered, the poses of the Virgin and St. Bernard exactly repeat those in Perugino's *Vision*. However, Puligo's simple geometric approach to the mass of the figures and his broadly modeled drapery resemble Perugino's and suggest that he found Perugino's style helpful in the creation of his own monumental style. In the interest of monumentality, however, he has lowered the viewpoint, augmented the Virgin's volume, and classicized her visage.

The amplitude of the Virgin and her classicizing features may derive from Puligo's observations of Granacci, who in the second half of the previous decade had adopted a Michelangelesque monumentality. The Madonna in Granacci's *Madonna and Child with SS. Francis and Zenobius* (c.1515-16, Accademia, Florence) or the St. Apollonia in his *Apollonia Altar* (c.1517-18, Pinakothek, Munich) have a fullness of figure and large size that must have appealed to Puligo's sensibility, because this great breadth of treatment is perpetuated throughout the later works.

Besides borrowing from Perugino and Granacci, Puligo also continued to incorporate motifs from Andrea del Sarto. The angel to the right of the Virgin with its arms crossed in front of its body is similar to the right-hand angel of Sarto's San Gallo *Annunciation*, dating c.1510 (fig. 26). Precedents for hillocks topped with architectural complexes as depicted in the background right of Puligo's *Vision* are also found in paintings by Sarto, such as the
Barberini Madonnina (Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini, Rome) of c. 1508-09, or the Punishment of the Gamblers from the life of S. Filippo Benizzi (SS. Annunziata, Chiostriano, Florence) dating c. 1510.

While northern prints have been suggested as one of the sources for Sarto's landscapes, and these could have served Puligo as well, I believe Puligo relied more heavily on contemporary Tuscan paintings for inspiration. In addition to Sarto, the paintings of Sodoma and the Master of the Kress Landscapes should also be considered as inspiration. This is because Puligo treats the landscape as a small vignette filled with eccentric fantasies, fantasies that include three wrestling bears, two embracing putti, and a young man with fishing pole and fish. The energetic activity of the scene, the slender figures, and the upward zig-zag composition generally recall Sodoma's St. George and the Dragon (National Gallery, Washington, no. 1155) and the Master of the Kress Landscapes's Scenes from a Legend (also at the National Gallery, Washington, no. 437A,B,C). The connection between these painters is a real one. Puligo frequently turned to Sodoma's paintings and Sienese painting in general for inspiration, and art historians have often mistakenly attributed to Puligo small multi-figured paintings not unlike those formerly attributed to the Master of the Kress Landscapes but now given to Antonio di Donnino.

Although Puligo was strongly affected by Perugino's poses and less so by motifs from Sarto and other Tuscan painters, the Vision of
St. Bernard is a testimony to the artist's own great personal vitality and excellence as a colorist. Because of this, Vasari praised the Vision of St. Bernard as his finest work. It is fortunate that this painting by Puligo, one of such high caliber, still exists, is well preserved, and has been finely restored.

Unlike most of Puligo's paintings, which are darkened by centuries of accumulated dirt and layers of aged varnish, the Walters painting provides a rare opportunity to study Puligo at his best, unencumbered by problems of preservation.

By virtue of the exceptional condition of the painting, we are immediately struck by the refinement and vibrancy of Puligo's colors. Crimson-red heightened to bright pink make up the color of the Virgin's dress. Juxtaposed to the red is the dark blue-green of the Virgin's mantle; its lining is purple. The angel on the left wears a bottle-green robe, the one on the right a golden-orange garment. Offsetting the vibrancy of the colors of the left side of the composition is a broad area of creamy white, St. Bernard's robe. The remainder of the composition consists of various blends of blue-green, seen in the hills and sky, where they are employed to create a pervading cool atmospheric quality.

Many features of the painting are typical of the artist's mature style. The Virgin, especially, is of a type that Puligo repeatedly used and, although this particular example in the Vision of St. Bernard is almost entirely in profile, we can still gather a sense of the features that are Puligo's trademark. The face is long and ovoid, narrowing at the chin with a dimple. The eyes are closely set
and the upper lids are drawn downward to give a rather melancholy expression. The Virgin's hair is gathered at the back, while some wavy strands fall loosely over her shoulder. Her flesh is painted in pinkish-white with half tones of gray-green, as with most of his figures.

The artist likewise demonstrates his predilection for flanking a principal figure with one in profile and another in three-quarter view (in this case, the Virgin is framed by two angels). The angel in profile serves as a directional device as well, closing off the left side of the composition and focusing our attention on the center, while the gaze of the angel on the right is directed toward St. Bernard. His drawing of trees also rarely varies from the short, wispy strokes that he applies to singly drawn branches. The foliage treatment, however, is not exclusively indicative of Puligo's hand, but is one found throughout Florentine painting of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

In 1525, a year or so after the presumed completion date of the Vision of St. Bernard, Puligo began work on the Madonna and Child with Six Saints, the altarpiece for the da Romena chapel at Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi, then called Cestello (cat.no. 30, fig. 41). Paolo di Ser Giovanni da Romena purchased the chapel at this Cistercian church in 1525, and according to a seventeenth-century document, it was Puligo who received the commission to paint the altarpiece in that same year. By the end of March, 1526, the chapel decoration was nearly completed, except for the altarpiece.
For this commission Puligo painted a Madonna in full-length holding the Infant Christ. The Virgin is standing on a podium and slightly below her are six saints: John the Baptist, Paul, and Peter on the left, and Bernard, Matthew, and Catherine of Alexandria on the right. Like the Vision of St. Bernard, the altarpiece contains full-length figures, and it measures almost exactly the same in size. Similarly, the main compositional idea is not of Puligo's invention but, in this case, derives from Sarto's Madonna of the Harpies dated 1515-17 (Uffizi, Florence, no. 1577, fig. 42),\(^35\) hybridized, so to speak, with the Sacre Conversazioni of Fra Bartolommeo. Puligo has repeated the pose of Sarto's Virgin, but instead of holding a book in her left hand, Puligo's Virgin gathers up some folds of drapery at her hip. To the scene, Puligo adds other figures,\(^36\) instead of only two as depicted by Sarto, forming a Sacra Conversazione type, not unlike the standing Virgin with six saints in Fra Bartolommeo's Madonna with Six Saints (San Marco, Florence), dating c. 1509.\(^37\)

The two foremost saints attest to Puligo's observation of other High Renaissance works. St. John the Baptist on the left in Puligo's altarpiece was inspired by Sarto's Preaching of the Baptist fresco in the Chiostro dello Scalzo, completed by November, 1515 (fig. 44).\(^38\) The right arm of Puligo's Baptist extending across his body with its sharply up-turned wrist is closely analogous with Sarto's frescoed St. John. Puligo has even repeated the folded edge of drapery that sweeps around the right leg of the figure. The Baptist's direct gaze at the viewer closely resembles that of another
Baptist by Sarto, the one in the *Madonna of S. Ambrogio* (fig. 43), dating c.1514-15.\(^{39}\) (Here again the drapery treatment is present.) The adoring gaze of S. Ambrogio and his pose in Sarto's *Madonna of S. Ambrogio* may also have been an influence on the disposition of Puligo's St. Bernard, seen standing on the right side of the Cestello Altarpiece. Even more directly related, however, is the St. Bernard in Fra Bartolommeo's *Virgin in Glory with Saints* (Besancon Cathedral), dated 1512,\(^{40}\) where on the right St. Bernard's profile is similarly seen from below.

While the inspiration for Puligo's Cestello Altarpiece derives from High Renaissance works, the style of the painting reveals that by 1525 Puligo was gradually advancing toward a Mannerist style. Artists in Florence, such as Pontormo in the Pucci Altarpiece (Santa Maria Visdomini, Florence) and Rosso in the Santa Maria Nuova Altar (Uffizi, Florence), had already established the precedent for an anti-conventional style by 1518,\(^{41}\) and Puligo must have followed their lead in developing his altarpiece. Like the early Mannerist painters, Puligo creates elongated figures compressed into a narrow, undefined space and uses shadow to curtail depth. Poses, such as those of the two foremost saints, are more twisted and complex than their Sarto and Fra Bartolommeo prototypes or than those seen in Puligo's earlier altarpiece, the *Vision of St. Bernard*. St. Bernard in the Cestello Altarpiece is particularly noteworthy in terms of Mannerist configuration. His body is positioned frontally in contrapposto while he looks over his shoulder and gazes lovingly at the Virgin above and behind him. The composition is also enlivened
by the foreground figures' forming a shallow V, a shape that thrusts back and upward towards the Virgin and Child whose downward gaze returns our attention to the foreground saints.

One is impressed, when viewing the Cestello Altarpiece, with the degree of technical perfection that Puligo achieved in its creation. The subtlety of color is matched by a fluid handling of paint that conveys a pervasive atmospheric quality. This morbidezza, or softness, that was observed in Puligo's paintings by Vasari long ago,\(^42\) dissolves the figures into the dark umbers of the background. The rich color variations and diffused lighting enhance the somber mood and solemn interplay of movements and glances among the figures. While we remain cognizant of the uneven passage of drawing in the Virgin's left wrist and hand, the total effect of the painting is one of superb refinement and demonstrates Puligo's complete mastery of the medium.

Another full-length standing Madonna and Child with Saints follows Puligo's Cestello Altarpiece. The Marriage of St. Catherine with St. Peter Martyr was commissioned by the Capitani of the Compagnia di Santa Maria del Bigallo for the tabernacle on the corner of Via del San Zanobi and Via delle Ruote in Florence (cat.no. 31, fig. 45). Records of payments to Puligo date in the year 1526,\(^43\) and Vasari lists the painting shortly after his reference to Puligo's 1525-26 altarpiece at Santa Maria Maddalena de' Fazzi.\(^44\) This painting is Puligo's only surviving fresco and depicts the Madonna and Child with Saints Peter Martyr and Catherine of Alexandria. St. Peter Martyr, the patron saint of the Bigallo,\(^45\) stands on the
Virgin's right, his head framed by a row of trees which symbolically refer to the events of his martyrdom. St. Catherine, who is accompanied by her symbol of the wheel, extends her hand to the Infant Christ who places a ring on her finger thus constituting the components of their mystical marriage.46

This tabernacle has suffered badly from centuries of exposure to the outdoors, nevertheless, the painting is still quite visible; the composition is preserved in greater detail in an engraving published by Galvani in 1845 (fig. 46).47 The print reveals that the painting is closely related to Puligo's recently completed work at Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi. The pose of the Virgin in the altarpiece—in contrapposto standing on a small podium or altar with tilted head and downward gaze—is repeated here. Once again Puligo makes reference to Sarto's Madonna of the Harpies (fig. 42) by flanking the Virgin with a single figure, her placement on a podium, her contrapposto pose, and the architectural background at the right. An even more direct source for the tabernacle is an earlier work by Sarto, the Madonna of S. Ambrogio, c.1514-15 (fig. 43). Puligo had already studied this painting in connection with his Cestello Altarpiece, and now for the tabernacle he reverses Sarto's S. Ambrogio to create the figure of St. Peter Martyr.48 Again, as in the Cestello Altarpiece, the curtailment and compression of space around the monumental figures has Mannerist overtones.

"Family resemblances" between the Virgin of several Madonna and Child paintings and the Virgins in the Vision of St. Bernard, c.1523-24, and the Cestello Altarpiece, 1525-26, suggest that the
paintings adjoin chronologically. The Virgin of these Madonna paintings is characterized by an ovoid face with closely set eyes, heavy lids, and dimpled chin, and by an amplitude of proportion that seems to indicate the mid-1520s as a plausible dating.

The first is the Holy Family at the Columbus Museum of Art (cat.no. 32, fig. 47), which is distinguished among all of Puligo's Madonna paintings as being one of his finest. Upon seeing the Holy Family one is immediately struck by the bright vermillion color of the Virgin's dress. This red is brought up to a light pink and is set against broad areas of gray hues forming the background, the head of Joseph, and the shadows of the flesh. The pink in the dress also appears in the highlights of the flesh. Dark blue-green is found in the Virgin's veil and mantle, which is draped across her lap. The Virgin is especially charming with her wistful and dreamy expression, a startling contrast to the tortured look of the Christ Child. The animated pose of the Infant Christ and the Giovannino's whimsical interest in Him set up an interesting juxtaposition to the serene composure of the Virgin.

The Columbus painting is of exceptional quality and represents the culminating achievement of the artist in the treatment of the Holy Family theme. It can also be considered as an exemplar of the artist's working method and provides us with an opportunity to observe the means by which he created his compositions. Vasari's complained that Puligo's style rarely changed and that "tenne sempre il medesimo modo di fare e la medesima maniera." His observation is certainly correct in that Puligo often returned to his own earlier
treatments and types as a basis for subsequent works.

Puligo's relief-like approach to the composition in the Columbus Holy Family is particularly characteristic in all phases of his work. A centrally placed Virgin and Child nearly fill the picture plane, and, as if not to leave any empty space, figures are tucked into the upper corners. The facial types are also common to a number of other works. The Virgin—with heavy-lidded and closely set eyes, delicate mouth, and dimpled chin—is nearly identical to the Virgin of the Vision of St. Bernard (cat.no. 30, fig. 41) and the Cestello Altarpiece (cat.no. 32, fig. 43). She descends, however, from an earlier Madonna type of Puligo's, seen, for example, in the Madonna and Child with an Angel, Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini, Rome (cat.no. 15, fig. 22) and the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and a Martyr Saint, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 146 (cat.no. 16, fig. 23). The little Baptist's facial type repeats and his pose reverses that of the Baptist in the Pitti painting cited above (fig. 23). Joseph is a close variant of his counterpart in two Holy Families at the Palazzo Pitti in Florence, no. 294 (cat.no. 12, fig. 19) and no. 486 (cat.no. 24; fig. 32). The choice of colors, the red dress and blue-green mantle of the Virgin and the greenish-gray tones of flesh, also appears in the Holy Family with St. John the Baptist at the Galleria Borghese in Rome, no. 432 (cat.no. 34; fig. 49).

New to Puligo's oeuvre, however, is the pose of the Child, one that generally recalls the Infant Christ in Fra Bartolommeo's Madonna and Child with Six Saints, San Marco, Florence. The use of an
agonized expression for Christ also perhaps makes its initial appearance in Puligo's paintings. The look—mouth agape and eyes rolled back—is disconcerting and perhaps repellent to some twentieth-century tastes. Its appearance in Puligo's work in the second half of the 1520s occurs, I believe, as a result of his desire to heighten the emotional effect of his work; in this it parallels other anti-conventional or Mannerist devices, such as the less normative canon of proportion in his Cestello Altarpiece of 1525-26 (cat.no. 30, fig. 41). The specific source for the expression may be the Christ Child of Pontormo's Pucci Altarpiece, 1518, S. Michele Visdomini, Florence, which shares a similar intensity of expression. In both works, the artists utilize the facial expression as a means to heighten the drama and increase the emotional pathos of the scene.

This pathetic expression of the Christ Child appears again in his Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist, recently offered on the New York art market (cat.no. 33, fig. 48). While other similarities to the Columbus painting, such as the facial types of the Virgin and Baptist, indicate that the works were made in close proximity to one another, the form of the Virgin—small head and bulky expansive body—reveals Puligo's increased press toward a Mannerist style, typical of his late career as already suggested by the elongated proportions of the figures in the Cestello Altarpiece of 1525-26 (cat.no. 32, fig. 43). This altered physical description of the Virgin shadows relatively recent concerns of Sarto, Pontormo, and Fracciabigio, who while working in Florence in the early 1520s
explored expansive proportions in their treatments of the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist. Although Puligo's Mannerist endeavors cannot be considered unique or as innovative as his contemporaries' were, his efforts are highly satisfactory in terms of their figural and emotional vigor.

The pose and mien of the Virgin in the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist (cat.no. 33, fig. 48) are repeated in the Holy Family with St. John the Baptist at the Galleria Borghese in Rome, no. 432 (cat.no. 34, fig. 49). The composition of this Holy Family, however, is unique in Puligo's oeuvre. The Virgin and Child are pushed off center to the left and are flanked on the right by the little Baptist below and Joseph above. A prominent compositional diagonal is formed by the upward pointing of the Baptist, a direction that leads to the arm of the Christ Child, then on to the Virgin, whose lowered gaze directs the viewer's eye down again to its point of origin. Joseph's intense stare at the Virgin forces our attention back to the diagonal emphasis, as well. In terms of color, the painting is quite striking. The crimson red of the Virgin's dress is highlighted with a light pink that contrasts with the gray veil across her shoulders and over her head—the colors thus resemble those of the Columbus Holy Family (cat.no. 32, fig. 47). A mantle drapes across her lap; its blue-green color intensifies the yellowish color of the little Baptist's shirt. Joseph wears purple that flashes against the light gray color of his beard and hair. The shading of the figures' faces is a greenish tone. Framing the heads of the two adults is a gray cliff. A green distant landscape is
depicted at the left. These lively colors are reinforced by the Sartesque animated expressions of the Children and the multiple folds of drapery that embellish the forms.

The anguished expression of the Christ Child in the *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist* (cat.no. 33, fig. 48) recurs in the *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Three Angels*, New York art market (cat.no. 35, fig. 50). The second painting dates c.1525-27, to judge from the ambiguous space, crowded composition, and voluminous figures, comparable to those in Puligo's *Cestello Altarpiece*, 1525-26. It assembles types and compositional elements from several earlier works. While the Madonna, as a type, is similar to the one in the Columbus *Holy Family*, the splayed legs, thrust of the arm, and turned head of the Christ Child, on the other hand, recall one of Puligo's earliest paintings, the *Madonna and Child with an Angel*, at the Biskupska Pinakoteka in Dubrovnik (cat.no. 14, fig. 21). The angel in profile and the pose of the Virgin recur from the *Madonna and Child with an Angel* at the Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini, Rome (cat.no. 15, fig. 22), and the clustered angels in the upper left recall the angels in Sarto's *Madonna*, c.1517-18, in the Wallace Collection in London, no. 9.54 While the composition is unique, its general design, with the Virgin and Child flanked by an angel in three-quarter view on the left and one in profile on the right, reflects another early painting, the *Madonna and Child with Two Angels*, formerly in the Saunders Collection in London (cat.no. 5, fig. 10).
There are two remaining paintings showing the Madonna and Child that belong to Puligo's last years: the *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist* at the Pinakothek in Munich, no. 13188 (cat.no. 36, fig. 51) and its close variant, the *Holy Family* at the Palazzo Pitti in Florence, no. 169 (cat.no. 37, fig. 52). Both show a still more pronounced interest in Mannerism, evidenced in the oversized, elongated Virgin and Children, the poses, and the sources for these motifs. The little Baptist is a conflation of two precedents: his pose framing the lower corner, long legs, and placement on a spotted animal skin are taken from the Baptist in Raphael's *Madonna dell'Impannata*, c.1514 (Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 94),\(^5^5\) and his head is modeled directly on Sarto's Baptist in the Tallard *Madonna*, c.1513 (Hermitage, Leningrad, no. 62).\(^5^6\) Again, as in the Cestello Altarpiece, the Virgin refers to Sarto's *Madonna of the Harpies* (fig. 42), particularly the position of her right arm. Besides figural motifs, Puligo has extracted from these precedents their anormative qualitites by emphasizing the compressed space of Raphael's *Madonna dell'Impannata*, the animated expression of Sarto's Tallard *Madonna*, and the canon of proportion of Sarto's *Madonna of the Harpies*.

Since the darkened state of the Palazzo Pitti *Holy Family* does not permit a detailed discussion, we will therefore focus our attention on its counterpart in the Munich museum.\(^5^7\) This painting fits Vasari's characterization of Puligo's paintings as "velati da una certa nebbia."\(^5^8\) The edges of the forms are diffused by the silvery atmosphere that moves through the scene. Besides this,
interesting juxtapositions occur within the painting that disrupt the
harmony of the scene. For example, the balance of the pyramidal
composition is disturbed by the restricted movement of the Virgin who
is prevented from raising her head by the encroaching upper edge of
the panel. Her bowed head and lowered gaze evoke a sense of quietude
and serenity in contrast to the gesticulating Baptist who addresses
her. The space is compact and narrow with only a slight escape from
the constriction being provided by the window in the upper left
corner. The peculiar setting further adds to the disaccord; the
curved wall before which the figures are placed is architecturally
illogical in relationship to the parapet just behind it.

To conclude this exposition on Puligo's mature works, there are
two large altarpieces that can be placed at the very end of his
career, the Deposition from the Cross at the Collegiata di Santa
Maria delle Grazie in Anghiari (cat.no. 38, fig. 53) and the
Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple in Santa Maria degli
Angliolini, Florence (cat.no. 39, fig. 54). The Deposition is the
last painting cited by Vasari, coming in his text immediately after
the 1526 tabernacle of the Marriage of St. Catherine with St. Peter
Martyr (cat.no. 31, fig. 45). He states that the painting was
commissioned by a compagnia in Florence. According to an
eighteenth-century inscription, the compagnia was the Confraternita
del Corpus Domini, who ordered the work for the Cappella del Corpus
Domini, opposite Santa Maria della Misericordia in Piazza Mameli.

The painting depicts the body of Christ being lowered from a
centrally placed cross. Three men, standing on three separate
ladders, pass Christ's body to a young man, probably St. John the Evangelist. In the left foreground, the Mother of Christ swoons into the arms of three attendants. At the right, a disciple (in nearly lost profile) strides into the scene. Mary Magdalen kneels behind the cross, and is hardly visible in the shadows. The painting is very dark, but, in the background, three horsemen are distinguishable; they gallop up a hill to a distant building.

As was his practice with the other major commissions for large scale paintings, Puligo relies here on other artists' compositions. In this case, he received his chief compositional inspiration from the Deposition for SS. Annunziata begun by Filippino Lippi in 1503 and finished by Perugino in 1505-06 (now in the Uffizi in Florence, no. 8370). The cluster of three men on ladders and the ties waving from their supports generally recall the Lippi/Perugino work. The impervious darkness of the scene suggests the troubled gloom of Rosso's Volterra Deposition of 1521. Another source of inspiration for the Anghiari painting may be Sodoma's Deposition, dating 1509-10 now in the Pinacoteca in Siena. Puligo's upper right turbaned figure on the ladder resembles Sodoma's figure in the same location, and his pose for the young St. John receiving Christ's body generally recalls Sodoma's St. John. The lower left-hand group, with the swooning Virgin, may have also been inspired by Sodoma's Deposition.

Vasari considered the Anghiari Deposition one of Puligo's finest works, an accurate observation when the dynamic interplay of the figures is taken into account. The figures, who actively work to
free Christ's body from the cross, are arranged in a diamond-shape composition that enhances the sense of unrest. The action is thrust forward and occurs essentially in the foreground plane. Out of the hazy darkness emerges the brightly illuminated group that embraces the collapsed Virgin. Our attention is particularly directed toward the woman who looks out of the scene, her gaze confronting us. This woman's mien is of a type comparable to the Virgin of Puligo's mature paintings (see, e.g., cat.no. 32, fig. 47; cat.no. 35, fig. 50).

While there are no documents that date the painting, the Mannerist style, evidenced by the crowded and ambiguous space, the planar composition, and the arbitrary lighting, points to a date of 1527, after the Cestello Altarpiece of 1525-26.

The last painting securely given to Puligo by documents is the Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple at Santa Maria degli Angiolini in Florence (cat.no. 39, fig. 54). Although Vasari does not mention the work, payments made by the church to Filippo di Salvestro di Francesco on behalf of his wife, Apollonia, Puligo's daughter, are recorded in 1538 and 1539. The payments were made for an unspecified painting. Undoubtedly, it is this Presentation, for it hangs above the altar. The painting is undated, but the nature of the contract, left unresolved probably because of the death of the artist in 1527, suggests that it was one of the last works Puligo completed.

The painting depicts the young Virgin Mary ascending a flight of steps to the High Priest who awaits her with open arms. In the upper corners of the panel, the Annunciation is enacted; the Virgin stands
at the left and Gabriel at the right. At the foot of the steps are six saints: at the left, Saints Antoninus of Florence, Bernardino of Siena, and an unidentifiable male saint; and, at the right, Saints Helena, Lucy, and Catherine of Siena.

The foremost group in the Presentation is arranged like that in the Cestello Altarpiece at Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi. Again, Puligo created a wedge-shaped movement back into space that directs our attention to the Virgin. On the surface, the composition resembles a diamond, the lower portion formed by the cross and the crozier and the upper sides formed by the heads of the saints with the Virgin being at the apex. The diamond-shaped composition and the thrust of movement back into space give the painting a sense of unrest. This animation is further augmented by the jump in scale and space among the figures of the foreground, middleground and background. These pronounced Mannerist effects support dating the painting in the last year of the artist's life, 1527.

The inspiration for the composition—the Virgin ascending a frontally placed set of stairs to the High Priest—comes from Andrea Orcagna's relief, the Presentation of the Virgin from the tabernacle of c.1355 at Or San Michele in Florence (fig. 55). The desire to employ a stepped environment may have led Puligo to Rosso's Marriage of the Virgin at S. Lorenzo in Florence. Recently completed in 1524, Rosso's painting also appears to have served Puligo with the model for the stacking of the figures, their elongated but somewhat bulky proportions, and some of their enigmatic expressions (compare, for example, Puligo's St. Lucy with Rosso's Virgin's attendant at the
The shadowy chiaroscuro of Puligo's Presentation also resembles Rosso's. This interest in Rosso, along with the pronounced Mannerist effects, further supports a late date for the painting, in the last year of the artist's life in 1527.

In this exposition, the main emphasis was on defining Puligo's mature style. This was done by examining paintings given to him by documents and other works attributable to Puligo on grounds of closely associable style. This decision to begin the critical essay with his mature works was based on the fact that all of the documents refer exclusively to works of the artist's maturity and provide no information about his earlier works. Puligo's maturity, as we have seen, is characterized by a series of important commissions that required large-scale depiction of narratives, employing a number of full-length figures. Only two of these documented paintings are dated, the Cestello Altarpiece of 1525-26 and the Bigallo Tabernacle of the Marriage of St. Catherine with St. Peter Martyr of 1526. The other paintings were grouped in relationship to these dated works as they marked a development, stylistically, and compositionally from the High Renaissance to the Mannerist period.

Puligo must have realized the great significance these commissions had for his career, and as one who lacked invenzione, he turned for assistance to the example of his colleagues of the early Cinquecento. He relied for the most part on the compositions of Sarto, but turned from time to time to Fra Bartolommeo, Albertinelli, and Perugino. The Vision of St. Bernard, based on Perugino's work,
is his most exact adoption of another artist's composition. In addition to compositions, Puligo drew figural presentations from a number of Tuscan masters of the early Cinquecento, such as Fra Bartolommeo, Sarto, Franciabigio, and Pontormo.

From our study of his mature paintings, a number of assessments can be made of Puligo as a painter, assessments that in part corroborate Vasari's critique made in the sixteenth century. Vasari pointed out Puligo's difficulty with drawing, and this is most evident in his execution of hands and their connection to wrists and arms. Vasari goes on to say that Puligo disguised this deficiency by dissolving unevenly drawn forms in clouds of mist. Whether this was actually Puligo's intention can not be verified; I prefer to believe he simply had a penchant for Sarto's sfumato. It becomes evident, however, when observing paintings of Puligo's maturity that these failings are overridden by his bravura in color and handling of paint, and his ability to effectively interweave a broad figure style within a compact spatial configuration.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1 This Chapter and the one that follows will deal only with paintings with themes pertaining to the life of the Virgin and Christ. Because of the special artistic and iconographic nature of the genre of portraiture, Puligo's portraits will be treated separately from the religious works as is often art historical custom. The half-length paintings of saints and secular figures that are closely connected by style and often composition to the portraits will follow the portraits in Chapter 4.


3 See Freedberg, 1961, 2: fig. 254.

4 See Freedberg, 1961, 2: fig. 256.

5 See Freedberg, 1961, 2: fig. 60.

6 Vasari, 1568, 4: 464, 467.

7 Shearman (1965, 1: fig. 29; 2: 211) notes that altarpieces by Puligo were influenced by Sarto's Marriage of St. Catherine, but he does not specify which painting or how.


9 See Borgo, fig. 29.


11 Unpublished opinion given in Berenson's photographic archives.


15The statue of St. Nicholas of Tolentino designed by Jacopo Sansovino and the Angels by Franciabigio still exist at Santo Spirito. The two panels of the Annunciation are lost, but three scenes from the predella are at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, no. 164; the Pinacoteca Communale, Arezzo; and the National Gallery, Dublin, no. 1290 (McKillop 53).

16Franciabigio's panels of the Annunciation were painted, however, in tondo form and were not rectangular as in the drawing. (McKillop 53).

17Vasari, 1568, 4: 465.


19See Alison Luchs, Cestello, a Cistercian Church of the Florentine Renaissance (New York: Garland, 1977) 83-84.

20The Deposition of Christ at Anghiari reflects Puligo's study of Perugino's Deposition (with Filippino Lippi), 1503-06, Uffizi, Florence. Besides the Vision of St. Bernard at the Walters Art Gallery in New York, this is the only other example of Puligo's dependency upon Perugino. Nevertheless, some have overemphasized their connection. For example, the Deposition at the Seminario Patriarcale in Venice derives its composition from Perugino's Deposition at Citta della Pieve and has been attributed to Puligo. It is given here to Antonio di Donnino (see Attributed Paintings). Silvia Meloni Trkulja (Il Primato del disegno [Milan: Electa, 1980] 179, who is included among those that attribute the Seminario painting to Puligo, considers it an example of Puligo's homage to Perugino. The connection between Puligo and Perugino is considered to be even more significant by Melinda Kay Lesher ("The Vision of St. Bernard" and the Chapel of the Priors: Private and Public Images of Bernard of Clairvaux in Renaissance Florence. Diss. Columbia U, 1979 [Ann Arbor: UMI, 1979] 124). In a confusing passage regarding Puligo's Vision of St. Bernard, she states that Perugino was Puligo's teacher, although in the catalogue of the same thesis she correctly names Ridolfo Ghirlandaio as Puligo's master.

21See Freedberg, 1961, 2: fig. 600.

22See Freedberg, 1961, 2: fig. 603.

The events of the background appear to be unrelated to the iconography of St. Bernard's vision transpiring in the foreground. Lesher (54-55) remarks that the iconography of the Vision of St. Bernard becomes confused in the numerous versions made in Florence during the High Renaissance, and that painters no longer adhered to the texts that described the Saint's life.


This aspect of Puligo's art is discussed in length on pp.

Freedberg attributed the Adoration of the Magi, Brooks Museum of Art, Memphis, no. 64.19, and the Story of Joseph, Galleria Borghese, Rome, no. 463 to Puligo or the Master of the Kress Landscapes (1961, 1: 198, 499; in the corregenda of the revised edition of this text [1972, 1: 198, 499, 632n, 633n], he attributes them to Antonio di Donnino).

Vasari 1568, 4: 165.

Documents 1 and 2.

Document 3. The document was written by Don Ignazio Signorini, prior of the monastery of Settimo in the mid-seventeenth century. His information was based on documents which have since been lost or destroyed (see Luchs 337-38). Prior to Signorini, Vasari had given the altarpiece to Puligo in his 1550 (4: 251) and 1568 (4: 466) text, followed by Raffaello Borghini (Il Riposo, 2 vols. [1584; Milan: Edizioni Labor, 1967] 1: 396).

The inclusion of the six saints may have been determined by the patron da Romena. The saints represent the patron saints of various members of the da Romena family (see cat.no. 30).
The painting is dated c.1509, after Fra Bartolommeo's trip to Venice in 1508, due to the painting's Bellinesque qualities. Some have suggested the presence of Albertinelli's hand in the painting (see Ludovico Borgo, The Works of Mariotto Albertinelli [New York: Garland, 1976] 386-88, fig. 51).


Vasari 1568, 4: 463.

Documents 5 and 6.

Vasari, 1568, 4: 467. Vasari's reference to the Tabernacle follows his citation of the commission for the Visions of Count Ugo at the Abbey of Settimo (see Lost Works), which in turn immediately follows his citation of the Cestello Altarpiece.


See cat.no. 33 for the iconography of the painting.

F. Galvani, Reminiscenze Pittoriche di Firenze, Florence, 1845, 199, fig. 12b

Shearman has already noted this relationship ("A lost Altarpiece by Andrea Del Sarto The Madonna of S. Ambrogio," Burlington Magazine 103 [1961]: 229no.20).

Vasari, 1568, 4: 463-64.

Borgo, fig. 51.

Certainly an example of the "morbidity of emotion" that Freedberg said was contained in Puligo's paintings (Painting in Italy, 1500-1600 [Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979] 327).

The author observes this enlarged canon in Sarto's lost Madonna di Porta Pinti, c. 1521, copy formerly Hearst Collection, New York; Pontormo's Holy Family with St. John, c. 1521-22, Hermitage, Leningrad; and Franciabigio's Madonna and Child with Infant St. John, c. 1521-22, Liechtenstein Collection, Vaduz.


Attributed to Raphael or various members of his shop. See Raffaello a Firenze: dipinti e disegni delle collezioni fiorentine (Milan: Electa, 1984) 166-73 for a complete summation of the attributions and dating.


Dr. Hans Werner Grohn wrote an article with extensive analysis of the Munich painting ("Una Madonna di Domenico Puligo," Antichità Viva, 1 [1962]: 34-39). He bases his attribution of the Munich painting on its similarity to the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist (Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 145), the Madonna and Child (formerly Basel, private collection; sold Sotheby's, London, 24 March 1976), and the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Angels (New York art market, 1960s). Dr. Grohn draws a connection between the kneeling pose of Puligo's Madonna and that of the Virgin in Sarto's Holy Family, Louvre, no. 1515 (Shearman, 1965, 1: fig. 38b), and Raphael's Canigiani Madonna (Freedberg, 1961, 2: fig. 58), a relationship I find rather indirect. He feels the relationship between the Madonna and Child resembles Sarto's Fries Madonna, Rothschild Collection, Ascott (Shearman, 1: fig. 85a). The most interesting of Dr. Grohn's connections are the sources he suggests for the pose of the Christ Child. The conception of the pose, he feels, comes from several drawings by Pontormo for the Christ Child in the Pucci Altarpiece, 1518, S. Michele Visdomini, Florence (Freedberg, 1961, 2: fig. 464), and for the Vertumnus and Pomona lunette at Poggio a Caiano (Freedberg, 1961, 2: fig. 678). See Cox Rearick, 1964, 2: figs. 40, 41, 144 for some of the illustrations named by Grohn. The analogies that Dr. Grohn cited in this case are most convincing and illustrate Puligo's search for Mannerist types.

Vasari, 1568, 4: 463.

Vasari, 1568, 4: 467.

See cat.no. 39 for the inscription. Also repeated by Lockhart, n. pag., no. 1.

See Carol Castellaneta, L'Opera completa del Perugino (Milan: Rizzoli, 1969) 109, fig. 100A.
The comparison has been observed by Lockhart, n. pag., no. 1.

See Freedberg, 1961, 2: fig. 670.

See Hayum, fig. 24.

Lockhart, n. pag., no. 1. Lockhart also notes that the figure that strides into the scene is a reversal of a figure from Franciabigio's Sposalizio in the Chiostricino of SS. Annunziata, Florence.

Vasari 1568, 4: 461, 463. In another passage (4: 467) he states that Puligo was a good draughtsman but only because of Sarto's assistance.

Vasari 1568, 4: 463.

This again was noted by Vasari 1568, 4: 461, 463, 467.
Little is known in detail about Puligo's artistic training. According to Vasari, he was apprenticed to Ridolfo Ghirlandaio (1483-1561), for whom he worked for a protracted period of time. We can infer from this that his training was conservative, based in the tradition that Ridolfo had learned as a youth from his father, Domenico Ghirlandaio, and later from his uncle Davide. But, while Ridolfo never worked innovatively, he did manage to recognize and respond to the emergence of Florentine High Renaissance style. Thus, early in the first decade of the sixteenth century, Ridolfo sought inspiration from his contemporary and friend, Raphael. Dating c.1508, Ridolfo's Angels (fig. 2), at the Accademia in Florence, reflect in spirit and idealism paintings from Raphael's Florentine years. By the next decade, after Raphael had gone to Rome, Ridolfo moved into the sphere of Fra Bartolommeo's influence—softly modeled forms, facial types, and drapery treated in simple folds reveal this, as in Ridolfo's Nativity with Saints, c.1514 (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, no. 32.100.80). Then, Ridolfo's second decade classicism gave way to Mannerism, as as he continued to stay abreast of the changing trends.

Ridolfo maintained a large workshop during this time, and Vasari noted that Puligo was one of his finest pupils. Puligo's hand,
however, as a style distinguishable from that of his master, is not observable in Ridolfo's paintings, especially those executed between c.1504 and 1512, the most probable era of Puligo's apprenticeship. There are, however, later qualities in Ridolfo's paintings that appear as an influence on the younger painter. For example, Ridolfo's predella panels for the tabernacle at the Oratorio of the Compagnia del Bigallo in Florence, 1515, have softly modeled Bartolommesque forms that are close in style to those later found in Puligo's work, dating c.1518-27.

The date of Puligo's establishment as an independent master is not easily determined. During the Renaissance, an apprentice usually completed training around his 18th to 20th year. If Puligo's was typical, then he could have become an independent master as early as 1510, at the age of 18. But, as Vasari reports, his stay in Ridolfo's shop appears to have extended beyond the normal length of time; thus, he would not have begun working independently until around his 20th year, 1512; even, perhaps as late as 1514. Since Vasari provides no information concerning Puligo's first works, and there are no documents on his paintings that pre-date 1525, we are forced to conjecture, reconstructing the early works based on stylistic observations. As with almost all of Puligo's work, it is even more difficult to be sure of the earlier dates; thus those given here must allow for a range of years. As a logical starting point, I have placed Puligo's earliest paintings around his 20th year, c.1512.
Earlier in the second decade of the sixteenth century, when Puligo was setting out on his own, painting in Florence was dominated by Fra Bartolommeo. Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, and the young Raphael had departed, by the end of the first decade, leaving to their followers essential examples of their work for the advancement of a classical style. This style was successfully absorbed and transcribed by the Frate, who created effective and highly personal paintings that justify his assumption of the leading role in the Florentine school at this time. Other artists of this generation, of lesser talents and more conservative inclinations, produced works that acquiesced less to the Frate, being inspired to a greater degree by the Florentine works of Raphael, those c.1506-08. These artists include painters such as Ridolfo Ghirlandaio (Puligo's teacher), Bugiardini, Granacci, and Francisbigio. Andrea del Sarto was an exception; he sought the example of Fra Bartolommeo, and thus attained by the middle of the decade a shared prestige with the Frate. It is during this preeminence of Fra Bartolommeo, Sarto, and the predilection for translations of Raphael that Puligo emerges.

One of Puligo's earliest paintings is the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Two Angels (Karlsen Collection, Beverly Hills, cat.no. 1, fig. 1). It depicts a seated Madonna holding the Christ Child on her lap. They are flanked by two angels and, kneeling in the lower left, is the infant St. John the Baptist, who thrusts the Cross towards Christ.

This work is considered one of Puligo's earliest because of its close dependence upon the work of Ridolfo Ghirlandaio around 1507-08.
This is seen in figure drawing and paint handling especially reflective of Ridolfo's *Angels* (Accademia, Florence, fig. 2). Specifically, the Virgin's facial type, with almond-shaped eyes, parallels the left angel in Ridolfo's right panel. Profile treatment of the angel by Puligo and Ridolfo's profile angel in the left panel is close, and the decoration of their robes at the shoulder is the same. Treating the hands of the Virgin as rather large in comparison to her body and drawing them, like her arm and shoulder, with almost uninflected straight lines, Puligo achieves a somewhat wooden appearance; this also resembles Ridolfo's treatment, particularly for the right angel in the right panel. Further, Puligo borrowed Ridolfo's pervading sense of *morbidezza*, illustrating that his affection for this technique was present prior to his absorption of Sarto's style.

The question arises as to whether or not Puligo might have painted the angel on the right in Ridolfo's right panel. But, despite the numerous similarities, Ridolfo's over-all style precludes such an attribution. This is because, during the first two decades of the sixteenth century, Ridolfo maintained a descriptive realism that he had inherited from his father, Domenico Ghirlandaio. The *Madonna with SS. Francis and Mary Magdalen*, 1503 (Accademia, Florence) or the *Madonna della Cintola*, 1514 (Prato, Cathedral). Both reveal a typical quattrocentesque attentiveness to detail in such areas as drapery, faces, and background, a descriptiveness that is absent in the Puligo painting, but is present in the Ridolfo Academia angel. Moreover, figures in Ridolfo's
paintings tend to be shrouded in voluminous drapery, not having the robust plasticity evident in the Puligo Madonna. Ridolfo's paintings are also decidedly different in spatial conception, for he achieves a sense of spaciousness in the foreground, which the figures comfortably occupy, and of expansiveness in the landscape vistas, that provides additional roominess. The Puligo painting, as well as numerous others attributed to him, is airless (cf., cat.no. 4, fig. 8; cat.no. 5; fig. 10; cat.no. 17, fig. 24; cat.no. 35, fig. 50; and cat.no. 38, fig. 53). The background is closed and dark; the foreground is packed with figures. This negation of space and the strongly emphasized two-dimensional surface pattern is an element that does not correspond to Ridolfo's work.

Further substantiation of the Puligo attribution is gained by a comparison of the figures to those in other works attributed to him. While the inspiration for the figures, as noted, derives from Ridolfo, similar figures frequently appear in Puligo's oeuvre. The arrangement of a Madonna, closely flanked by one figure in profile and another in three-quarter view, is repeated in paintings such as the Madonna and Child with Two Angels (Galleria Borghese, Rome, cat.no. 3, fig. 4), Madonna and Child with Two Angels (formerly Saunders Collection, London, cat.no. 5, fig. 10), and the later, more securely attributed Vision of St. Bernard (Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, cat.no. 29, fig. 39). In facial type, the angels are relatives to those in the Madonna and Child with Two Angels, ex-Saunders Collection. The Virgin—with tilted head, widely-spaced almond-shaped eyes, long nose, and dimpled chin—corresponds in type
to her counterpart in the Borghese **Madonna and Child with Two Angels** or the **Madonna and Child with an Angel** (the St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church in Allentown, cat.no. 4, fig. 8). The shape of her head, its tilted position, and the dimpled chin reappear for the Madonna in the documented Cestello Altarpiece, 1525-26 (cat.no. 30, fig. 41).

Additional details are directly related to those in other Puligo paintings. The Virgin's right hand is exactly replicated in the **Madonna and Child** (Hermitage, Leningrad, cat.no. 2, fig. 3). The use of draped curtains in the upper corners of a work appears as a device throughout Puligo's oeuvre, whether paintings of the Madonna or portraits (cf., cat.no. 4, fig. 8; cat.no. 11, fig. 16; cat.no. 13, fig. 20; cat.no. 53, fig. 69; and cat.no. 64, fig. 80).

While all of these characteristics in the Karlsen painting were formulated in the shop of Ridolfo, the central compositional idea comes from Raphael. The grouping of a seated Madonna holding the Christ Child with the Infant Baptist thrusting a cross toward Him is reminiscent of Raphael's Florentine Madonna groups painted during the first decade of the sixteenth century, such as the **Madonna del Prato**, c.1506 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, no. 628). The pyramidal arrangement reflects Puligo's attempt to create volumetric forms in a High Renaissance manner.

Other effects reflect Puligo's study of Raphael as well. The exceptional strength of the dissolving chiaroscuro that fuses the forms with the unarticulated background appears Raphaelesque (compare with Raphael's **Madonna del Granduca**, 1505, Palazzo Pitti,
Florence, or the Bridgewater Madonna, 1507, National Gallery, Edinburgh). The Christ Child, while quite individual in type, also is inspired by Raphael's Bridgewater Madonna; compare the arm positions, turn of head, and fullness of cheeks.

Though not an adroit work, the Puligo painting, as one of his first efforts, is an ambitious one. Its success is dependent on his synthesis of these inspirations from Ridolfo Ghirlandaio and Raphael. Within this achievement, Puligo's individually is marked by a constricted and compressed spatial construction and a two-dimensional surface pattern.

He repeated the Karlsen Virgin in the Madonna and Child (Hermitage, Leningrad, no. 4738, cat.no. 2, fig. 3). At the museum, the work is attributed to Franciabigio, but Susan McKillop has correctly signaled it as being a very early Puligo. The Virgin's facial type, head tilt, right-arm position, and large hands are exactly like those of the Karlsen as well. Her facial type is also used for the Madonna in the Madonna and Child with Two Angels (Galleria Borghese, Rome, cat.no. 3, fig. 4) and the Madonna and Child with an Angel (Allentown, cat.no. 4, fig. 8). Her downward gaze and tilted head, so common in Puligo's work, appears ultimately in the Madonna in the documented Cestello Altarpiece, 1525-26 (cat.no. 30, fig. 41).

Other Puligo occurrences similarities support the attribution to him. The Christ Child's animated pose—legs in a running position and one arm extended outward—recalls His counterpart in the Borghese Madonna and Child with Two Angels (cat.no. 3, fig. 4). This outward
extension of His limbs tends to visually flatten His form making it a
two-dimensional shape. Similar, even more angular poses of the
Christ Child appear in numerous paintings, such as the Allentown
Madonna (cat.no. 4, fig. 8), the Borghese Madonna of Humility with
St. John the Baptist in the Background (cat.no. 9, fig. 14), and the
Pitti Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist (cat.no. 25, fig.
33). The background, which consists of a ruin framing the heads of
the Madonna and Child and to the left, a landscape vista, is an early
prototype for the background in the Borghese Holy Family with St.
John the Baptist (cat.no. 34, fig. 49). The landscape's trees,
painted as long thin lines with leaves of short, choppy strokes are
also common to Puligo's œuvre (cf., for example, cat.no. 15, fig.
22; cat.no. 36, fig. 51; and cat.no. 50, fig. 66).

The Hermitage Madonna, like the Karlsen painting, demonstrates
Puligo's approach to High Renaissance classicism—the figure group is
again derived from those developed by Raphael (specifically compare
with Raphael's Small Cowper Madonna, c.1505, National Gallery,
Washington), while the sfumato, or painterly effect, ultimately
derives from the example of Leonardo da Vinci. From this influence,
Puligo, thus, draws his forms as simple geometric shapes which he
then models with obvious light and dark.

Following these first two Madonna paintings in date is a tondo of
the Madonna and Child with Two Angels at the Galleria Borghese in
Rome, no. 468 (cat.no. 3, fig. 4). The Virgin is placed between two
angels. In her arms is the Infant Christ, who, in an extremely
twisted pose, looks over His left shoulder at one angel while He
blesses the other. The figures are arranged isocephalically, causing the tondo to be closely packed. There is no suggestion of space for the two flanking figures to move comfortably. The result of this spatial packing is a conspicuously clumsy drawing of the figures. For example, the shoulders of the angel on the right are too narrow, and the right arm extends across its body disrupting the circular flow of the panel. In part, this is a reason to place the works early in Puligo's career, somewhere between c.1512-15.

While the Borghese tondo is related to the two earlier works in figure types and motives, it is also generally reminiscent of certain post-Raphael and Leonardesque Florentine prototypes. The isocephalic arrangement of half-length figures recalls Sarto's Madonna of the Goldfinch, c.1507-08 (Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini, Rome, no. 570),¹⁴ his ultimate source may have been Raphael's Madonna with SS. Jerome and Francis, c.1502 (Staatliche Museum, Berlin, no. 145).¹⁵ Precedents for the active pose of the Christ Child, however, may be found in other paintings by Raphael, such as the Foligno Madonna, 1511 or 1512, (Vatican, Rome, no. 329),¹⁶ or the Madonna della Tenda, c.1513-14, (Alte Pinakothek, Munich, no. H.G.797).¹⁷ More Mannerist are the long tapering fingers of the angel on the left; they resemble those in Pontormo's early drawings, such as the Study for a Madonna and Child with St. John, c.1515, (GNSF.N.2943r, Rome).¹⁸

At this point it is necessary to call attention to another important influence on Puligo's art, one that has never been noted in art historical writings. It consists of a predisposition toward
Quattrocento and early Cinquecento Sienese painting. Puligo would have found these works easily accessible; Siena, as Florence's neighboring city, is not far and the distance would have been readily traversed, even for Puligo whom, we know from Vasari, was inclined to stay at home. But traveling to the works would not have been necessary since several Sienese painters are documented as having sojourned and worked in Florence during this time.\textsuperscript{19} Beyond an apparent innate fondness, there are no biographical clues that might suggest reasons for Puligo's interest. Nevertheless, Sienese influence on his style is far reaching, and his borrowings are often quite specific.

This influence is demonstrable in the Borghese tondo, where the isochephalic composition, as noted, parallels Sarto's \textit{Madonna of the Goldfinch}, and ultimately Raphael's prototype. But an abundant source for the overall compositional type—the Virgin flanked by two figures in a closely packed space—is found in Sienese painting dating from the Quattrocento. And, even though the styles of most Sienese painters are decidedly different from Puligo's, the concept is the same. The work of Neroccio de' Landi (1447-1500), however, provides representative examples in both composition and style. His painting of the \textit{Madonna and Child with Angels}, dating between 1475-80 (formerly Czartoryskich Muzeum, Cracow, fig. 5),\textsuperscript{20} possesses the same compositional arrangement and a similar sense of compressed space. Details such as the crossed arms of the left angel, the greenish pallor of the flesh tones, and the strands of wavy hair falling over the shoulder are also comparable. And, the splayed legs
of the Christ Child in Puligo's painting almost exactly repeat those of the Infant in Neroccio's *Madonna and Child with Angels*, dated 1476 (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Siena, no. 282, fig. 6).21

Besides Neroccio, several other Sienese painters are relevant. Important among these is Sodoma (1477-1549). Sodoma's appearance in Florence in 1504-05 is proposed by Hayum,22 but his 1515 sojourn is documented.23 This 1515 date coincides with Puligo's emergence from Ridolfo's shop and is the date that seems most appropriate for Puligo's Borghese tondo, as it is the work in which Sienese qualities are first observed. It appears, then, that Sodoma's presence may have provided the catalyst for Puligo's interest. So, too, in the discussion of Puligo's mature works, examples of borrowing from Sodoma were pointed out in the landscape of the *Vision of St. Bernard* (cat.no. 29, fig. 39) and in the figure of St. John in the *Deposition* (cat.no. 38, fig. 53).24 The Borghese tondo is specifically comparable to Sodoma's *Pieta* of c.1504-05 (Patrizi Collection, Rome, fig. 7).25 In each, figures closely flank the central figure creating a spatially constricted composition. The angel in Puligo's tondo resembles the hatchet/Grecian profile of St. John on the right in Sodoma's painting. The treatment of hair as ringlets in Sodoma's work is also imitated by Puligo.

Beccafumi (c.1486-1551) is another Sienese painter with whom Puligo appears to have established contact in Florence. The artist was in the city sometime after 1510, the year he left Rome, and before 1513, when he is recorded as working in Siena.26 His style is endowed with Mannerist qualities, but his *Madonna and Child*
compositions perpetuate the Quattrocentesque Sienese tradition. Beccafumi was especially fond of the tondo format for such subjects. His **Holy Family with St. John the Baptist**, dating c.1514-18 (Uffizi, Florence), parallels Puligo's contemporary Borghese tondo, not only in its constricted space, but in its softly modeled forms and atmospheric effect.

Still more specifically connected with Puligo is Andrea Piccinelli, called Andrea del Brescianino (active between c.1505-1525). The nature of his biographical relationship to Puligo is nebulous; however, their styles are linked closely enough so that attribution of several of their paintings have been confused.

The date of Brescianino's birth is unknown, but he appears to have arrived in Siena from Brescia around 1505 with his father Giovannantonio di Tommaso Piccinelli, a dance master, and his brother Raffaello, also a painter. By 1507, he was an established painter, executing commissions in Siena. He was last noted in 1525 in the **Libro Rosso**, the Florentine list of painters of the Compagnia de' Pittori. The date of his death is also unknown.

There are very few documented works in Brescianino's oeuvre, even fewer than in Puligo's. His only extant dated work is the **Baptism of Christ**, 1524, for the high altar at Pieve di S. Giovanni in Siena (now located at the Museo dell'Opera del Duomo, Siena), a work executed in collaboration with his brother. While there are roughly seventy works attributed to him no one has yet distinguished his personal style from his brother's, or determined the extent of their collaboration. His brother, Raffaello, is a painter by whom no
other painting besides the Baptism is known; yet, he must have been an artist with at least some skill, because he maintained a shop in Florence in which Francesco Salviati enrolled in 1527.23

For this present study, it is purposeless to attempt to cull paintings attributable to Raffaello from the corpus now assigned to Andrea in order to determine Puligo's relationship to either brother individually. I will therefore continue the conventional practice of citing the works as "Brescianino". The works indicate that initially the artist was a follower of Beccafumi, but by the second decade of the sixteenth century he had absorbed some stylistic traits from Raphael, Fra Bartolomaeo, and Sarto. It was probably at this time that he and Puligo met and their styles, for a while, were similar. Brescianino's predella panels of the Annunciation, Nativity, Crucifixion, and Ascension (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Siena, no. 408)32 are strikingly close in their painterly effects and color to works by Puligo, such as his Florentine Annunciation (cat.no. 27, fig. 35). Piero Torriti, who observed this affinity between Puligo and Brescianino, dates the predella panels after 1520.33 While this is later than Puligo's early paintings addressed in this chapter, it illustrates that Sienese associations continued to be available to Puligo throughout his career.

The Sienese qualities observed in the Borghese tondo recur in a tondo variant, Puligo's Allentown Madonna and Child with an Angel (cat.no. 4, fig. 8). The composition of a centrally placed Virgin flanked by two figures is varied here by the substitution of a green curtain for the right-hand figure in the tondo. The same sense of
compressed space, however, is maintained. The transparent shirt worn by the Christ Child was seen previously on the Giovannino in the tondo as well, and His angular pose again suggest the art of Neroccio, particularly the Madonna and Child with Saints (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Siena, no. 287, fig. 9).\(^34\) The persistent greenish hue visible in the flesh tones recalls Sienese painting in general.

The Allentown painting dates around the middle of the second decade, to judge from the lack of deftness in the drawing and the stylistic similarities to other early works by Puligo. For example, the Christ Child does not appear to be sitting on His mother's lap, and His angular pose reads as a two-dimensional surface pattern. The Virgin supports the Christ Child with one very long, formless left-arm as she attempts a graceful gesture with her right hand. Chronologically, the panel is in close proximity to the Borghese tondo, given not only its repetition with variations of composition, figure types, and poses, but also similar uncertainties in their execution.

During the second half of the first decade, Puligo continued under the influence of both Raphael and Sarto. His Madonna and Child with Two Angels (formerly in the Saunders Collection in London, cat.no. 5, fig. 10) is a conflation of several of their paintings dating from the same decade. The general idea of the composition—the Virgin and Child flanked by two angels, one in three-quarter view and the other in profile—is one Puligo had used before, as is their isocephalic arrangement recalling Sarto's Madonna of the Goldfinch. The nearly three-quarter length Virgin suggests
Raphael's *Madonna del Granduca*, 1505 (Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 178). The facial type of Raphael's Christ Child also appears to have served as a model for the Infant in Puligo's painting, while the pose of the Christ is very close to that in Raphael's *Madonna del Baldacchino*, c.1508, (Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 165) and the Large Cowper *Madonna*, 1508 (National Gallery, Washington, no. 25). The diamond shape formed by the Virgin and Child is similar to that seen in Sarto's Barberini *Madonnina* (Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini, Rome, c.1508-09).

Overall, the Saunders *Madonna and Child* is one of the most satisfactory examples of Puligo's early work. The mother and child are presented in a devotional manner, with heads having taciturn expressions, gazing directly at the viewer. The composition is evenly balanced with figures formed by simple geometric shapes, again suggestive of works from Raphael's Florentine years.

Raphael's *Madonna del Granduca* also served as the inspiration for another Puligo painting, the *Madonna and Child* now at the Baroda State Museum (cat.no. 6, fig. 11), executed probably close in time to the Saunders *Madonna and Child* (cat.no. 5, fig. 10). The painting is rather heavily restored. Nevertheless, the facial type and expression of the Virgin in both works closely correspond, and to another work by Puligo, the *Madonna and Child with Two Saints* (formerly Stanley Collection, sold Sotheby's, London, 14-15 July 1920, cat.no. 7, fig. 12).

This latter painting is a compositional counterpart to the Saunders *Madonna and Child*. But saints replace the angels, and the
Child rests on a round sack lying on a low wall. A drawing for this painting survives, and Valentino Pace observes that the Madonna in Puligo's drawing derives from studies by Pontormo, while the one in the painting is inspired by paintings of Fra Bartolommeo. A drawing by Pontormo, Studies for the Visdomini Altar, c.1517 (Uffizi, Florence, no. 6520Fr) may be the source for the painting's Christ Child pose; this differs from Pace's view, that Puligo's inspiration from Pontormo was limited just to the drawing. Also, Pace sees the softness in the painting as being derived from Fra Bartolommeo, but here again other sources, such as Sarto's Dresden Marriage of St. Catherine, c.1512, (fig. 17), can be suggested. This is even more believable because the Virgin's facial type and the Christ Child's animated expression in the Dresden Sarto are suggestive of Puligo's.

The Puligo paintings discussed so far should be considered as a group, having in common a style, differing from Puligo's later works. The remarkably rare evidence of Puligo's roots in the shop of Ridolfo Ghirlandaio is most strongly seen in his facial types, such as that of the Virgin in the following paintings: cat.no. 1, fig. 1; cat.no. 2, fig. 3; and cat.no. 3, fig. 4. Her eyes are set widely apart and differ from the closely set, heavy-lidded eyes of Virgin in his mature works.

These works' compositions and figural groupings, however, are often borrowed from Raphael's Florentine Madonna and Child paintings, those of the first decade; this is unlike Puligo's later works, such as the Munich Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist (cat.no.
which is dependent on Raphael's later work, such as the Madonna dell'Impannata. Puligo's isocephalic compositions hint at an association with Sarto (compare with cat.no. 3, fig. 4; cat.no. 7, fig. 12). Sarto's influence, however, is not as extensive in Puligo's early works as it will be in his later paintings.

The most obvious distinction between these early Puligo paintings and later ones is that, although the figures are modeled with an attentiveness to three-dimensionality, the early ones lack the expansive breadth of subsequent ones. Based on the association with Ridolfo Ghirlandaio facial-types, and Raphael and Sarto compositional characteristics, this early group of Puligo works seems likely to date within the first five years of his career; the earliest is perhaps c.1512, when Puligo was about 20 years old and the latest, c.1517, when he was about 25.

Following these seven paintings, the artist progressed beyond his exploratory phase and began to develop various stylistic habits that remained characteristic for the rest of his career. From his earliest studies, he organized a basic, yet limited, repertoire of poses and facial types. These facial types, in particular, were shaped by his ongoing association with Sarto, one that must have been rather constant in the years approaching 1520. His depiction of the Virgin, in fact, takes on a rarefied quality, with deep pooled, heavy-lidded, closely set eyes; oval face; and dimpled chin, which specifically derives from such Sarto representations as the Virgin in the Tallard Madonna, c.1513 (Hermitage, Leningrad, no. 62).
Puligo's compositions continued to be drawn from other contemporary Tuscan painters, and once formulated, were often repeated in a number of varied editions. These numerous variations, plus the copies and imitations of Puligo's paintings by other artists, clearly show how popular and admired his solutions were during the early Cinquecento. The later paintings also show a greater dexterity in drawing than the first seven works. This deftness may have derived from Sarto's assistance, as Vasari states, or, as I believe, came to him slowly, through practice and perseverance. His steadily increasing facility, as observed in the series of compositions and variations, suggests that problems encountered in first renditions were perfected through this repetition rather than having been corrected initially by another artist, as some have suggest. The painting dates are still extremely difficult to pinpoint, and only general ones will be suggested, ranging between c.1516 and c.1522, prior to the making of his large-scale works. Some of the paintings will be grouped according to theme and others will be linked according to reoccurring motifs. Finally, paintings that demonstrate an increased sense of monumentality and complexity are placed later, in closer proximity to his mature works.

The Madonna of Humility subject interested Puligo, and he created several variations of it. The Madonna of Humility (sold Sotheby's, London, 1953, cat.no. 8, fig. 13) would seem to be his first version of it. We deduce this from the presence of certain difficulties, such as the pentimenti and the awkwardly drawn
three-fingered right hand of the Christ Child; in later editions, these are resolved. In general, the composition of this work recalls Fra Bartolommeo's *Madonna of Humility with Music-making Angels*, signed and dated 1515, (Hermitage, Leningrad). However, the Christ Child is a conflation of two representations from other painters' works—his lower body, especially the position of the legs, is copied from Raphael's Large Cowper *Madonna*, 1508 (National Gallery, Washington, no. 25) and the upper body is taken from Sarto's version of Raphael's painting, the Barberini *Madonnina*, c.1508-09 (Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini, Rome).

Conflating such sources, Puligo effectively created an approach he continued to use. This approach incorporates three-dimensionally modeled figures with a two-dimensional pattern that is restricted to the picture plane. The emphasis is on the surface, decorated with a zig-zag pattern; in this work, it is seen in the Virgin's body, as the structure moves from foot to knee, knee to hip, and hip to head. The Infant's angular pose and animated expression calls attention to the surface plane even further. This preoccupation with planar surface design is relevant to my proposal that Puligo was interested in Sienese painting, where the focus is on surfaces embellished with lively colors and patterns, rather than on the illusionary three-dimensional structure emphasized in the Florentine tradition.

The Madonna and Child in this work (fig. 13) are repeated in a variant, the *Madonna of Humility with St. John the Baptist in the Background* (Galleria Borghese, Rome, no. 338, cat.no. 9, fig. 14). Here, Puligo backs the figures with a steeply rising hillock, upon
which a shepherd tends a flock of sheep. The representation of the hill may be Sartesque in origin, for similar crags appear in Sarto's works, such as in the left-hand area of the *Story of Joseph*, 1515-16 (Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 87). In the right middleground, the borrowing is from Fra Bartolommeo, where St. John the Baptist makes his way to the Madonna and Child, a motif borrowed from the *Holy Family*, c.1507-09 (National Gallery, London, no. 3914).

A third Puligo variation is now at the Musée Fabre, Montpellier (no. 123, cat.no. 10, fig. 15). It is similar to the work just discussed due to the inclusion of the little Baptist, who is now brought somewhat closer. But the craggy hill has been removed and the facial type and position of the Christ Child have been altered. In comparison to the earlier *Madonna of Humility*, the Montpellier work shows a considerable advance in drawing skill and in the degree of complexity in the drapery folds. The imperfections of the first are now more adequately corrected, and the painting on the whole more refined.

The first *Madonna of Humility* (cat.no. 8, fig. 13) was probably executed in the second half of the second decade, a date in the vicinity of Puligo's *Enthroned Virgin and Child* (Earl of Wemyss Collection, Longniddry, Scotland, cat.no. 11, fig. 16). This painting, however, has been attributed by most to Albertinelli, but the style is more closely analogous to Puligo's. The parted curtain that appears in the Karlsen *Madonna* (cat.no. 1, fig. 1) appears here, and the simple arrangement of the Virgin's mantle compares with the Saunders *Madonna and Child* (cat.no. 5, fig. 10).
Further, the awkward drawing of the Christ Child's hands and the pervasive sfumato are found in numerous examples of Puligo's work. And, as Puligo would, the pose of the Virgin, the position of the legs of the Christ Child, and the chimerical motif are modeled after Sarto's Dresden Marriage of St. Catherine, c. 1512, (fig. 17). Sarto's softly focused figures also appear to have been an influential factor in the formation of the painting. However, the painting is most securely linked to Puligo's oeuvre by being the prototype for a later work, the Sarasota Enthroned Virgin and Child with Two Saints (cat.no. 26, fig. 34).

While the Wemyss Enthroned Virgin and Child depicts the Virgin in full-length as in the Karlsen Madonna and Child, datable around 1512 (cat.no. 1, fig. 1), a somewhat later date must be proposed due to the painting's lack of influence from Ridolfo Ghirlandaio. Comparable details more closely suggest a date in the second half of the second decade. These are the Virgin's tapered fingers and foreshortened right hand which are repeated in the Pitti Holy Family (Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 294, cat.no. 12, fig. 19), the London Madonna and Child (cat.no. 13, fig. 20), and the Dubrovnik Madonna and Child with an Angel (Biskupska Pinakoteka, cat.no. 14, fig. 21), all of which should be dated around 1517-18. The Virgin's facial type—downward gaze, high forehead, and narrow chin—also relates to the Virgin in the Palazzo Pitti Holy Family.

Concurrent with the Madonna of Humility paintings, Puligo painted a variation of his Madonna and Child format, with them set in an interior having a view of a landscape through a window; they are
often joined by another figure. This type appears to have been
developed from a model provided by Ridolfo Ghirlandaio, such as the
Madonna and Child now at the Palazzo Pitti in Florence (no. 363, fig.
18), for it depicts an interior setting with a window.\(^49\) Puligo's
first attempt at this type is his Holy Family (Palazzo Pitti,
Florence, no. 294, cat.no. 12, fig. 19), and as in his first Madonna
of Humility effort, this initial try is ineffective. Some elements
in the painting are quite familiar from other works, such as the
splayed legs of the Christ Child which recall Ridolfo's example, His
transparent shirt, and the Sodomesque ringlets of the Virgin's hair.
Puligo's insistent use of a running-like pose for the Infant,
however, makes the Him appear to be floating above the Virgin's lap.
The Virgin's awkwardly drawn foreshortened right-hand is a variant of
the Virgin's right-hand in the Wemyss Enthroned Virgin and Child
(cat.no. 11, fig. 16); the fingers looks more like talons than part
of a supportive hand. Puligo's preferred early compositional design
is still essentially present; but here one of the two figures who
often flanked the Virgin is now replaced by the window. Joseph fills
the upper right corner and looks Sodomesque in type, perhaps derived
directly from Sodoma, or via Beccafumi; a more idealized Puligo
version appears later in his serial Holy Families (Palazzo Pitti,
Florence, no. 486, cat.no. 24, fig. 32, and Columbus Museum of Art,
cat.no. 32, fig. 47).

The type found in the Madonna of Humility paintings is brought to
life by what may be Puligo's second attempt, a Madonna and Child,
recently sold at Sotheby's, in London (1976, cat.no. 13, fig. 20).
Placed in an interior setting, it contains the same poses, even the oddly foreshortened hand of the Virgin, but the faces are more refined and idealized. The painting is enlivened by the animated Sartesque expression of the Christ Child and the more interesting landscape that contains a row of buildings and hills in the distance. A curtain is draped in the corner, substituting for Joseph's head in the earlier treatment, thus reducing the effect of a crowded space.

Puligo used this same compositional type, interior with window, in three other paintings; and in each instance, there is an increased monumentality in the figures' proportions. The Dubrovnik Madonna and Child with an Angel (cat.no. 14, fig. 21) depicts the Infant in nearly the same pose as the Christ Child in the London Madonna of Humility (cat.no. 8, fig. 13), while the angel seen in profile reflects the left angel in the Karlsen painting (cat.no. 1, fig. 1). The Virgin, in the same pose as in the two previous Madonna of Humility paintings (cat.no. 12, fig. 19 and cat.no. 13, fig. 20), is treated with greater breadth, although the reverse is true of the Christ.

The increased largeness of form becomes even more apparent in the Madonna and Child with an Angel (Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini, Rome, cat.no. 15, fig. 22). Now, the Virgin and Child's poses have been altered; they turn their gazes directly at the spectator and an iconic manner of presentation is achieved. This new arrangement is an improvement in that the Christ Child is seated
more gracefully and naturally on His mother's lap. The Virgin's facial type closely approaches those of Puligo's maturity, and the folds of the drapery fall in circular patterns giving greater rotundity to the form.

His reliance upon earlier treatments continues, however, to be a significant part of Puligo's approach. The angel is a copy of the one on the right in the Saunders Madonna and Child with Two Angels (cat.no. 5, fig. 10), his pose with the right arm crossed in front of his body is found also in the Borghese tondo (cat.no. 3, fig. 4). The angel's pose and ambiguous spatial placement again demonstrate Puligo's predilection for flat surface treatments and general disregard for spatial clarity.

The last picture of this series is the Pitti Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist (cat.no. 25, fig. 33). It is the most mature treatment, judging from the largeness of the forms and the practiced drawing. Puligo does return to the running position of the Child, but reduces the sentimentality in the expression of the Virgin by making her head upright and her gaze at the viewer direct and uncompromising. At the right, the facial type of the adolescent figure of the Baptist is close to the St. Quentin in the Sarasota altarpiece, c.1521-22 (cat.no. 26, fig. 34); this suggests that the paintings should be dated in close proximity, with the Pitti painting being slightly earlier, by a year or two, c.1519-20.

Next in time are nine Madonna paintings that stylistically show evidence of Puligo's advancing maturity; they most likely should date within the years 1518-21. Some may in fact be contemporary with
his early altarpieces dating from the first half of the second
decade. In them, there is an increased volume in the canon of
proportions of the figures. The Virgin's facial type takes on
Puligo's mature treatment—eyes are heavy-lidded and set widely
apart, the nose is long and rather pronounced, and the chin is narrow
and dimpled. These figures possess a more accomplished drawing, and
there is a greater complexity in the handling of their draperies.
Interesting grouping complexities appear (i.e., Stanford Madonna and
Child with St. John the Baptist and an Angel, cat.no. 22, fig. 30),
revealing Puligo's proto-mannerist development, ones foreshadowing
the anti-classical elements in his works of the late 1520s.

The first of this group, dating late in the second decade, is the
Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and a Martyr Saint at the
Palazzo Pitti in Florence, no. 146 (cat.no. 16, fig. 23). Its
composition and poses are reminiscent of Puligo's earlier work, the
Ex-Stanley Madonna and Child with Two Saints (cat.no. 7, fig.
12), for it possesses the isocephalic figure arrangement, as well
as a similar treatment of the Virgin's hair. The Virgin's facial
type resembles that of the Virgin in the Rome Madonna and Child with
an Angel (cat.no. 15, fig. 22), which and is the type Puligo employed
in his later work. The Christ Child's facial type is repeated in the
later Pitti Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist (cat.no. 25,
fig. 33). The little St. John's playful curiosity in the Christ
Child is used in the Columbus Holy Family (cat.no. 32, fig. 47).
While the figures have become more voluminous, and the chiaroscuro
more pronounced, Puligo still spatially compresses the composition
by filling the picture plane with figures and by flattening the pose of the Christ Child. The compactness is further emphasized by placing the figures in a shallow niche.51

Also belonging to this late 1510s group is the Madonna of Humility with Musical Angels, formerly at the Corsini Gallery, Florence, no. 175 (cat.no. 17, fig. 24). Like his early Madonna of Humility depictions, Puligo bases this work on the compositions of Fra Bartolommeo's Madonna of Humility with Music-making Angels, 1515 (Hermitage, Leningrad52) and Sarto's Corsini Madonna, c.1513 (Petworth House, no. 333).53 Further, the source for the heavily shadowed angel is also probably Andrea del Sarto's Madonna of c.1517-19 (Wallace Collection, London, no. 9,54).

The Corsini Madonna of Humility with Musical Angels is a fine example of Puligo's work at this time. The faces are sweetly idealized and the rendering of the slumbering Baptist, perhaps inspired by the sleeping child in Sarto's Charity (1518, Louvre, Paris, no. 1514),55 adds particular charm. A warm chiaroscuro envelops the figures. Puligo's individual brand of constricted space is also present by virtue of the ambiguously placed angels and the use of the rose-hedge stretched across the top of the scene. The closely grouped angels, one in profile and the other in three-quarter view, is a treatment that appears in other paintings, such as the Madonna and Child with SS. Catherine and John the Baptist (Museo Civico, Pisa, no. 198 (cat.no. 18, fig. 25) or the Annunciation (private collection, Florence, cat.no. 27, fig. 35).
For the third work of this group, the *Madonna and Child with SS. Catherine of Alexander and John the Baptist* (Museo Civico, Pisa, no. 198, cat.no. 18, fig. 25), Puligo again returned to an earlier composition for inspiration, his Saunders *Madonna and Child* (cat.no. 5, fig. 10). Both contain a three-quarter length Virgin, who extends her left arm across her body, and, on the right, a figure with crossed arms. So, too, the shadowy treatment of the Baptist, whose head is tucked tightly between the Virgin and St. Catherine, is similar in effect to the clustered angels in his Corsini *Madonna of Humility*, while the saints more closely compare, however, with the angels in Andrea del Sarto's *San Gallo Annunciation*, c.1510 (fig. 26). Also reminiscent of Sarto, his *Madonna of the Harpies*, 1515-17, (fig. 42), is Puligo's pose for the Virgin. But, the gathered drapery in the Virgin's left hand indicates that this painting became a prototype for Puligo's later Cestello Altarpiece, 1525-26, (cat.no. 30, fig. 41).

Like the painting in Pisa, the *Madonna and Child* (formerly at the Akademie in Vienna, no. 252, cat.no. 19, fig. 27) is also dependent upon Sarto's *San Gallo Annunciation*, c.1510, (fig. 26). While it is true that the Virgin in Puligo's painting is seated, the work recalls Sarto's *Annunciation* in the position of her left arm and in her hand with a finger tucked in a book, in the voluminous form, and in the hazy atmosphere. This work also foreshadows in the pose and facial type of the Christ Child, Puligo's Cestello Altarpiece of 1525-26 (cat.no. 30, fig. 41). Stylistically, the *morbidezza* of the scene continues to be heightened as the edges of the forms fade into the
shadows of the background.

The decorative folds of drapery in both the Pisa and Vienna treatments are also present in two paintings of the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist; this is what reveals them as transitional, linking them with the last group of paintings, those dating c.1518-21. Both of these paintings—the Palazzo Pitti in Florence, no. 242 (cat.no. 20, fig. 28) and the one formerly in the collection of Duca di Montaltino in Naples (cat.no. 21, fig. 29)—contain a pervasive misty quality with shadowy forms, an effect also similar to the Corsini Madonna of Humility with Musical Angels (cat.no. 17, fig. 24). The sweetness of mood and the idealized faces, particularly the Virgin's, are exemplary of Puligo's approach to the High Renaissance style.

While the emotive aspect and facial types reflect this classical ideal, the interlace of hands, arms, and legs appear proto-Mannerist, again indicating the work's transitional position between Puligo's early works and later works of the 1520s. This intricate and fascinating interlacing of limbs is reworked in another painting, now at Stanford University, no. 54.250, the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and an Angel (cat.no. 22, fig. 30). The compositional prototype for this is the Allentown Madonna and Child with an Angel, c.1515 (cat.no. 4, fig. 8) in which the Madonna and Child are flanked by an angel at the left. Also, in both works, the Virgin's left arm is treated similarly and her left hand repeats the finger separation gesture. The angel's facial type and downward gaze, however, are akin to the right-hand angel in the Karlsen
Madonna and Child with Two Angels (cat.no. 1, fig. 1).

Thus, connections with Puligo's early paintings are clearly observable, but other elements in the Stanford painting are comparable to works of the late 1510s. The chiaroscuro-sfumato conjunction is very well-handled and effective, resembling the Vienna Madonna and Child (cat.no. 19, fig. 27) and the Naples Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist (cat.no. 21, fig. 29). The Virgin's type (three-quarter profile, straight nose, and half-shadowed face) anticipates later ones (e.g., cat.no. 25, fig. 33; cat.no. 32, fig. 47; and cat.no. 33, fig. 48). The Christ Child's wide-apart eyes, face broad as it is long, and tilted pose become frequent in later works, as in the Columbus Holy Family (cat.no. 32, fig. 47). These treatments, combined with the complicated diagonal interlace of hands, arms, and legs, again support a transitional dating for the painting, c.1518-20.

Then, as we know, Puligo's style becomes increasingly monumental towards the 1520s. The Virgin in the Enthroned Virgin and Child, now at the Galleria Estense in Modena, no. 509 (cat.no. 23, fig. 31), exemplifies this effect. His pose for the Christ Child is borrowed from the Virgin and Child (National Gallery of Canada in Ottawa), attributed to the school of Andrea del Sarto. In each, the Child's contrapposto pose, position of left arm extended across the body, sharp turn of head, and curly hair are comparable. Besides the increased volume of Puligo's figures, there is also a change in his handling of the drapery. He now paints the fabric with broad ridges rather than with small folds as previously in, for example, the
Pisa Madonna and Child with Saints (cat.no. 18, fig. 25).

Close in style and time to the Modena painting is Puligo's Holy Family (Palazzo Pitti in Florence, no. 486, cat.no. 24, fig. 32). They compare in facial types, drapery treatment, and the Christ Child's pose. The Joseph, who appeared earlier in another Pitti Holy Family, no. 294 (cat.no. 12, fig. 19), is used here and again later in the Columbus Holy Family (cat.no. 32, fig. 48). The monumental proportion of the Virgin becomes typical of that which Puligo uses in his large scale altarpieces.

From this study of Puligo's early paintings featuring the Madonna and Child, we have observed that, from the very beginning, his treatments were heavily dependent on works by Tuscan masters. Ridolfo Ghirlandaio, as Puligo's teacher, was, of course, one of his first influences, but works by Albertinelli, Fra Bartolommeo, Raphael in his Florentine phase, Pontormo, and Andrea del Sarto rapidly provided inspiration. Very early in Puligo's career, he developed a taste for Sienese painting and, as a result, his style took on a flattened, two-dimensional decorative effect that, at times, appears retardataire, but serves as an individualizing characteristic. And, even though, as in his later work, there is a definite lack of invenzione, some of these early paintings of the Madonna and Child convey a genuine sense of endearment and compassion, an achievement equivalent to his Tuscan contemporaries, such as Sarto. The dating of the paintings is conjectural, but, in general, the works can be arranged according to the quality of the drawing, the gradual broadening of the figure proportions, an increased use of sfumato,
and a deepening of the shadows. While the popularity of Puligo's paintings in sixteenth-century Florence is difficult to measure, the number of his variations of his own subjects, the copies of his by others, and other's works based on his compositions suggest that these early paintings, neglected by Vasari and other art historians, were admired to a greater extent than has yet been appreciated.
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In Vasari's account of Puligo's life he correctly assessed Puligo as a painter of "quadri di Nostre Donne, ritratti ed altre teste."\(^1\) As we observed in previous chapters, Puligo's principal occupation was the creation of paintings of the Madonna and Child. This production, however, was closely followed in number by portraits and half-lengths, which comprise nearly half his artistic output. Puligo's partiality for portraiture must have been determined in part by his deep insight into the personality of the sitter and the great aesthetic harmony that he was able to achieve in these paintings, not to mention the satisfaction of his patrons. As in the Madonna paintings, Puligo's acquisition of skills was slow, but his devoted study of Tuscan painters of the early Cinquecento enabled him ultimately to create in his maturity remarkable portraits in which personalities are sensitively conveyed, faces expertly drawn, and colors and paint masterfully handled.

Puligo's portraits and half-lengths do not unequivocally reflect, as one might have expected, his artistic origins in the workshop of Ridolfo Ghirlandaio, who was one of the most prolific portraitists in Florence during the sixteenth century. Ridolfo's initial approach to the genre, realistic and descriptively detailed, was in the Quattrocentesque tradition of his father Domenico Ghirlandaio.
Physical features are faithfully reproduced, as in the *Portrait of a Woman*, 1509 (Palazzo Pitti, Florence) and draperies and objects are often handled with Flemish-like clarity. During the 1510s, Ridolfo's portraits became infused with a luminosity that is Bartolommesque in origin, but, as in his *Portrait of a Man*, c.1518-20 (Torrigiani Collection, Florence), faces continue to have the same descriptive literalness as in his earlier works. Later, during the 1530s, Ridolfo embraced the Maniera style and continued to work within that tradition until his death in 1561.

As with Puligo's paintings of the Madonna and Child, there are few documented or dated portraits, and those that are securely given to Puligo are datable late in his career. Vasari names only two portraits by Puligo, which is extremely helpful; that the attribution and chronology of most of the portraits must be determined primarily on the basis of style.

The only signed and dated painting in Puligo's oeuvre is the *Portrait of a Young Man Writing* (Gage Collection, Firle Place, cat.no. 49, fig. 65). In the letter that the young man holds, the sitter, named Andrea, thanks the artist for creating a good likeness of himself and inscribes the year 1523. While only Puligo's first name, Domenico, is cited in the letter, the style of the portrait is compatible with Puligo's work of the early 1520s, and leaves little doubt of his authorship.

The two portraits by Puligo named by Vasari are of Barbara Fiorentina and a portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi. Barbara Fiorentina was praised by Vasari for her musical talents, and the portrait he
cited is believed to be the one in the Salmond Collection (cat. no. 50, fig. 66). Vasari particularly admired the portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi. This work can be confidently identified with the portrait of Carnesecchi, datable in 1527, at the Palazzo Pitti in Florence (cat. no. 54, fig. 70). Judging from the style and external evidence—Carnesecchi's return to Florence from Rome in 1527—this date is fairly secure.

All of the rest of Puligo's portrait oeuvre must be attributed and dated by their analogies with and relation to the abovementioned fixed points. Analogies to the attributable portraits must also be drawn with securely attributable and/or datable works by Puligo in other genres. Once reasons for attributing the works to Puligo are presented, the portraits will be dated in accord with the overall chronological evolution that has been deduced and established in dealing with the non-portrait oeuvre. As in other genres, Puligo's skills as a portraitist increase progressively through time. This postulate will also be used as a means of chronologically ordering the portraits.

There are essentially three phases that can be distinguished in Puligo's evolution as a portraitist: the early period of about 1512–17, the early mature period of about 1518–23, and the mature period of about 1524–27. In his first portraits, there is an overall lack of finesse in the drawing. For example, eyes tend to be overly large in relationship to the size of the head, and drapery is painted as broad flat planes with few folds to break up the surface. After his initial efforts, there is an observable increase in the volume of
the figures beginning around 1518. Faces are more expertly drawn than the early works of c.1512-17, and the forms of the figures are drawn more responsive to their curving form. By the mid-1520s, Puligo begins to paint portraits of the highest pictorial quality in terms of handling of color, light and paint. Figures are often depicted in three-quarter length, given great breadth, and at times are elongated. In all instances of his mature portraits, Puligo renders a sense of intelligence in his sitters' faces, making his accomplishment highly admirable.

Puligo's early portraits reveal a plurality of sources. Initially his paintings were Raphaelesque in style, a style which he could have observed directly from Raphael's works or through Raphaelesque paintings by Ridolfo. This was infused with the soft modeling of Sarto. The Portrait of a Woman (Stenman Collection, Stockholm, cat.no. 40, fig. 56), is perhaps Puligo's earliest portrait; it is modeled after Raphael's Portrait of Maddalena Doni, c.1507-08 (Palazzo Pitti, Florence). The shape of the jaw, fullness of the cheeks, and rounded contouring of the sitter's neck and shoulders are nearly interchangeable with those in Raphael's portrait. Puligo, however, may have assimilated the composition through Ridolfo's transformations of Raphael's portraits. Ridolfo's Portrait of a Woman with a Rabbit, c.1508 (Yale University, New Haven), which is also based on Raphael's Maddalena Doni, has the broad almond-shaped eyes and shape of mouth that appear in the Puligo. In contrast to the Ridolfo, dense atmosphere softens the contours of the Stockholm portrait and reflects the painter's
incorporation of a sfumato like that employed by Andrea del Sarto in some paintings of the 1510s, such as in the Dresden Marriage of St. Catherine, c.1512 (fig.17).

Analogies in Puligo's Stockholm portrait to his other works include the mannered drawing that is found in the works we have dated c.1512-17 (see pp. 60-78). For example, the unusually large eyes and nose is closely related to those of the Virgin in the Karlsen Madonna, c.1512-17 (cat.no. 1, fig. 1), in which the compositional source similarly reflects Puligo's early Raphaelesque interests. As to the setting, the view through the window comprised of sketchily drawn buildings and pencil-thin trees dotted with leaves parallels the scene in Puligo's London Madonna and Child (cat.no. 13, fig. 20). The direct portrayal of the woman, without the richness of color and lighting of his later works, has the blandness of some of Puligo's early renderings of the Madonna (see cat.no. 4, fig. 8; cat.no. 12, fig. 20).

The basic shape of the face in the Stockholm portrait is repeated by Puligo in his Portrait of a Young Man, sold on the London art market v 1976 (cat.no. 41, fig. 57). Like the Stockholm portrait, the figure is bust-length, but turned slightly more sharply in space and placed against a partially illuminated background. The sitter is wearing a typical sixteenth-century Florentine three-cornered black hat and holds a scrolled letter in his left hand. Soft, dense atmosphere and dark, form-dissolving shadows reduce the figure's corporeality to a minimum and cloak the sitter in a somber mood. The artist further shields the dreamy, hesitant personality from the
viewer by painting the eyes of the young man heavy-lidded and partially closed.

Little remains of Puligo's alliance with Ridolfo in this portrait, and there appears only a distant allusion to Raphaelesque idealism. The sfumato and deep chiaroscuro are more closely connected to Sarto's style. The outcome of the use of these techniques, however, is decidedly different. Sarto's colors, in spite of their softness, retain a bright intensity in multiple color harmonies, whereas Puligo's, for the most part, are earthen, or more primary, as in the Muncie Portrait of a Woman (cat. no. 44, fig. 60). The difference between the painters' use of color and sfumato is especially apparent when one compares Sarto's Alnwick Portrait of a Young Man, c. 1512, with this Muncie portrait, one dating in close proximity to Sarto's. The Sarto portrait has softly applied areas of lively purple, lilac, and blue hues that endow the figure with a sense of charged animation. Puligo's portrait, on the other hand, contains mostly warm browns and blacks with a paint texture that gives the effect of an overall thick mist, conveying a personality withdrawn and removed. While Puligo's imitation of Sarto's compositions, poses, and sfumato is often literal, his treatment of color and light is quite distinct from Sarto's, a significant difference to remember when dealing with problems of attribution.

Scrutiny of Raphael's paintings doubtless led Puligo to an increased idealization in portraiture. In the Portrait of a Woman with a Music Book (Private Collection, Rome, cat. no. 42, fig. 58), the pyramidal composition of a seated figure, with hands positioned
in front of the body, has the unity and balance of Raphael's Maddalena Doni or its contemporary, La Muta, c.1507-08 (Ducal Palace, Urbino). The music book, quasi-Ridolfo Ghirlandesque in its descriptive quality and clarity, serves the same function as the writing utensils in Raphael's Portrait of Tommaso Inghirami, c.1513-14 (Gardner Museum, Boston), as a portrait d'appareil.

Warm tonalities of dark intensities pervade the portrait. The figure, dressed in black, is embraced by the semi-circular niche, flanked on either side by vertical divisions. Painted in umbers and lightened to a golden glow, the architectural background bears the characteristic cast shadow at the right that appears in other paintings by Puligo—e.g., the Pitti Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and a Martyr Saint (cat. no. 16, fig. 23), the Uffizi Portrait of a Man (cat. no. 51, fig. 67), and the Pitti Magdalen, (cat. no. 63, fig. 79). Like the architectural setting, smaller details are recognizably Puligo's: the matronly hat, called a cappello a ciambella, appears in almost all of his portraits of women, the minimal folds and broad treatment of the sleeves are seen in his Portrait of a Young Man Writing (cat. no. 49, fig. 65), and the simple idealization of the face with eyes spaced wide apart appears in his Karlsen Madonna (cat. no. 1, fig. 1). The sitter's facial type has an affinity to those of early Puligo Madonna's, suggesting a date around 1514-15.

The identity of the woman is unknown, but the presence of the music book suggests that she may be a musician, an amateur of music, or perhaps a courtesan. At some point, probably in the late
sixteenth century, the music book was overpainted with a figure of the Christ Child. Restorers have since removed the lower portion of the Infant's body to reveal the book, but have retained the head that now peeks over the shoulder of the woman, a rather distracting digression from Puligo's original intent.

Regardless of the identity of the woman, the patron of the portrait must have been satisfied with the result, because another portrait of her was commissioned. In this second effort, the woman is portrayed as a martyr saint standing next to a cloth-covered table upon which a vase with classical putti is depicted; her left hand holds a martyr's palm and the right rests on the vase (cat.no. 43, fig. 59). With the change in iconography, Puligo repositioned the hands and added more space around the figure, thus stabilizing the composition still further. From the appearance of the photograph, the London portrait is not as well preserved. Abrasions are visible on both sides of the panel and several severe vertical cracks exist in the lower portion. The portrait appears to have a more vaporous consistency and deeper shadows than its counterpart, perhaps reflective in part of its damaged condition or perhaps signifying a chronological interval between the two works, the second version dating a year or two later.

In the next portrait, the Portrait of a Woman at Ball State University Art Gallery, Muncie, Indiana (cat.no. 44, fig. 60), Puligo turns to Leonardo's Mona Lisa, c.1503-06 (Louvre, Paris). Like its prototype, the painting contains a pyramidally arranged figure, posed and seen from a three-quarter view on a loggia with a
column and a landscape view. Beyond the composition and the self-contained pose, the sfumato and chiaroscuro impart a sense of Leonardo's style.

The color scheme is predominantly green and blue as in Puligo's Vision of St. Bernard (cat.no. 29, fig. 39). The woman wears blue-green that deepens to black-green in the shadows. Her camicia is creamy white, and her tone light tan. The curtain at the right is emerald lightening to yellow-green. The blue-green of the background sky, the same color as the dress, moves toward light blue and then to pink at the horizon. The buildings fade into the distance and fuse with the foliage. The tenor of the color and the stability of the composition convey a gentle but one of a self-possession personality befitting the rank and wealth suggested by the costume.

Puligo approaches the composition in his usual assembling manner by which motifs worked out in previous paintings are reused to formulate a new conception. The landscape view through the window is typical of the dusky scenes visible in paintings with the Madonna and Child (see figs. 21-25). The curtain drawn back at the right appears in several of his works, but, in this particular case, is identical to that in the London Madonna and Child (cat.no. 13, fig. 20). The headdress is a common fashion worn among the women he portrayed. Also, the pose of her left hand appears in several works throughout the artist's career (see cat.no. 4, fig. 8; cat.no. 22, fig. 30; cat.no. 64, fig. 80). When these elements are united with the care, interest, and precision with which Puligo executed this work, the
results are an insightful and attractive depiction of a Florentine
woman, datable in the second half of the second decade.\textsuperscript{11}

In the study of Puligo's Madonna paintings and altarpieces, one
of the characteristics that we observed was that as his style
advanced the figures increased in volume. This expansive trend is
also evidenced in his portraits, as in the following two portraits of
women, one at Hampton Court, no. 1255 (cat.no. 45, fig. 61) and the
other at Koetsur, London (cat.no. 46, fig. 62). In each, the figure
is represented in bust length with a three-quarter turn of the head
so as to gaze directly at the spectator. The increased fullness
appears in given the large puffed sleeves, that are painted with
broad transparent strokes. The artist creates a cyclical pattern by
directing the folds of the sleeves toward the center of the painting
then sweeping our eye across the bottom of the composition and upward
along the curving folds at the left ultimately to reach the head of
the sitter. Besides giving greater breadth, Puligo frames the
figures more tightly and brings them closer to the picture plane,
making their presence more immediate.

Affinities with other works by Puligo securely place the
portraits in the painter's oeuvre. The curved folds of the drapery
appear again in the Pitti Magdalen (cat.no. 63, fig. 79) and the
transparent contouring of the neck, especially evident in the Hampton
Court portrait, is present in several other paintings (see cat.no.
49, fig. 65; cat.no. 55, fig. 71; cat.no. 62, fig. 78). By this time
the cappello a ciambella has become canonical in Puligo's portraits
of women. Further, the Hampton Court portrait closely relates in the
its facial structure and drawing of the eyes to the London Portrait of a Young Man (cat.no. 41, fig. 57). The Koetser Portrait of a Woman, however, shows a greater competency in the drawing of the features and compares with the Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina (cat.no. 50, fig. 66). The unevenness in the drawing of the eyes and jaw of the Hampton Court portrait in comparison to the Koetser portrait indicates that it may date slightly earlier, c.1518; the latter more expertly executed London portrait, c.1520.

We have observed that a common motif that appears in nearly every portrait of a woman by Puligo is the cappello a ciamella decorated with a medallion. The Portrait of a Woman, London art market (cat.no. 47, fig. 63), likewise follows in this tradition. The boldly painted flowers on her headdress are quite distinct and are somewhat reminiscent of north Italian examples, such as that worn by the woman in Lotto's Portrait of Messer Marsilio and his Bride, 1523, (Prado, Madrid). Despite this, the painting's morphological details convincingly indicate the hand of Puligo. Immediately recognizable is his handling of paint. Broad strokes of thin paint are applied to the folds of the drapery. The arrangement of the folds, curving inward toward the center and then carrying the eye in a cyclical pattern around the composition, follows earlier Hampton Court and London precedents (cat.no. 45, fig. 61; cat.no. 46, fig. 62). The drawing, likewise, resembles that in Puligo's other portraits; compare the ear and eyes with cat.no. 46, fig. 62; cat.no. 48, fig. 64; cat.no. 62, fig. 78. Her figure, in general, is monumentally proportioned, which suggest a date around 1518-22 (see,
e.g., the Walters Vision of St. Bernard, cat.no. 29, fig. 39, datable around 1523-24).

Another bust-length portrait of a woman also appeared on the London art market in the 1960s. This Portrait of a Woman, formerly in the Mond Collection (cat.no. 48, fig. 64), does not have the matronly hat worn by most of Puligo's other women. She wears, rather, a turban that closely resembles the headdress worn by some of his Madonnas, suggesting that his painting may in fact be a study for or a fragment of a painting featuring the Virgin rather than a portrait. The facial type and the parted wavy hair with ringlets falling on the shoulder are closely linked to the Virgin in the Columbus Holy Family (cat.no. 32, fig. 47), indicating that the painting probably dates from the 1520s.

The Portrait of a Young Man Writing (Firle Place, East Sussex, cat.no. 49, fig. 65) is significant for the study of Puligo's portraits, being his only signed and dated work. The painting shows a young man, wearing a black coat with large balloning sleeves and a black three-cornered hat, and placed against an emerald green background. He is seated behind a table covered with a fabric of slate gray, bottle green, orange, gold, and blue stripes, and has just finished writing a letter. The date and the signature are contained in the message in the letter, still legible, which has expressions of gratitude to the artist from the patron, who signs his
name as Andrea in the year 1523. The message reads:

8 Dicembre.
Mastro Domenico assai mi chiamo sodisfatto verso di voi avendo strato propinquo ingegno per dimostrarmi qual proprio sono...tanto...obigrato 1523
M. Andr....

The style of the painting is consistent with other paintings that date in the vicinity of the 1523 date on the letter. The figure fills the boundaries of the picture to capacity in a way that is in keeping with the increasing sense of volume observed in the portraits of the late 1510s and early 1520s (see figs. 62, 63) and is comparable in this to Madonna paintings of the 1520s, such as the Munich Madonna (cat.no. 36, fig. 51). The shape of the face, its shading, and the contouring of the neck with the strokes of the brush are also recognizably Puligo's and relate to the Hampton Court portrait (cat.no. 45, fig. 61) or the London Portrait of a Young Man (cat.no. 41, fig. 57). His less than punctilious drawing, observed in the religious works of this period, is also apparent here. Pentimenti have emerged on the left side around the hat and hair, and the inkwell does not align with the receding perspectival lines of the table covering. Furthermore, like the miscalculated digits on the Infant's hands and feet in Puligo's religious works, the painter has added the suggestion of an extra finger to the right hand of the sitter in the portrait.

In our study of Puligo's altarpieces, his dependency on other artists' compositions was noted. This is also the case in the Portrait of a Young Man Writing in which the artist conflates several paintings to create the work. The conceit of the sitter holding a
letter is a formula that was popular in Italy during the fifteenth and at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Puligo may have become aware of this tradition through his teacher, Ridolfo Ghirlandaio. Ridolfo's Portrait of a Man, c.1509, located in the same upstairs drawing-room at Firle Place as this portrait by Puligo, depicts the individual with letters placed before him on a parapet. The letters were often intended to convey some descriptive information about the sitter.

By the second decade of the sixteenth century, new meaning is given to this well established formula. Andrea del Sarto, in his Portrait of a Young Man at Alnwick dating between 1510-12, gives the letter a narrative function. The subject holds a letter that he has just written, presumably ready to be dispatched to its intended recipient. It is this specific conceit of implying an ongoing action that Puligo uses in his 1523 portrait.15

Puligo was not only aware of Sarto's invention, but he also borrows freely from Raphael's Portrait of Tommaso Inghirami, c.1512. Not only are the hands positioned in the same way, but Puligo also repeats Raphael's conceit of the interrupted sitter, an animating device whereby the individual looks up from his writing as if he has been momentarily distracted by some interuption.

Franciabigio's influence too is in the massive size of the sleeves, the angular pattern of the folds, and the tightly packed composition. Comparison with Franciabigio's Portrait of a Man Writing (Staatliche Museen, Berlin), reveals the stylistic analogies and reiterates how popular the letter motif was during the
first quarter of the sixteenth century. That portrait is dated 1522 and thus precedes Puligo's by only one year.

In Vasari's account of Puligo's life, the biographer praised his abilities as a portraitist and claimed "che tutti sono belli e molto somigliano." While we can not embrace Vasari's acclaim in its entirety, certainly after the execution of the 1523 Portrait of a Young Man Writing Puligo's talents in the genre improved considerably. One of the portraits Vasari particularly admired is the Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina, "in quel tempo famosa, bellissima cortigiana, e molto amata da molti, non meno che per la bellezza, per le sue buone creanze, e particolarmente per essere bonissima musica e cantare divinamente." 

This portrait is believed by most to be the one now in Salisbury in the collection of Julian Salmond, (cat.no. 50, fig. 66). It depicts a woman seated at a table. She is flanked on the right by architecture and on the left by a deep landscape vista. Placed before her on the table is an open book with musical notations. At the left is a closed book, and at the right is an open one with an Italian text and the name "Petrarcha" printed on the side. Two inscriptions appear in the painting; the one on the architecture reads, "Meliora. Latent.", and the one on the table reads, "TV. DEA. TV. PRESES. NOSTRO. SVCCVRRE LABORI."

The meaning of the inscriptions and musical notations in the painting have been brilliantly deciphered by H. Collin Slim. The texts, inscriptions, and musical notations (quoted from Ovid, Petrarch, Virgil, the Song of Songs, and a chanson from the late
1500s or early 1600s) glorify the woman's poetic and singing talents, as well as affirm the love of a suitor. Slim, assuming that this is indeed the portrait of Barbara Fiorentina cited by Vasari, notes that La Barbara, who frequently resided in Florence, was the mistress of Machiavelli beginning in 1523 until Machiavelli's death in 1527. From this, Slim places the portrait's date during these years.21

Slim's dating of the portrait in the mid-1520s can also be confirmed by placing the painting within the tradition of early sixteenth century painting. Puligo presents La Barbara as a seated half-length figure in which the large ballooning sleeves of her dress convey a sense of great breadth and monumentality. While this stately effect in seated male portraits had been achieved as early as 1511-12 by Raphael in his Portrait of Julius II,22 the same effect did not appear in female portraiture until c.1522 with the work of Andrea del Sarto in his Portrait of a Woman (that exists only as a fragment; Staatliche Museen, Berlin, no. 240), with the completed composition surviving in a drawing (no. 647E, Uffizi, Florence, c.1522).23 Puligo obviously borrowed Sarto's inflated scale and longer length of the figure to compose his portrait of the courtesan.24

Puligo's composition is not only dependent upon the work of his close colleague, Andrea del Sarto, but also upon the Roman milieu of Raphael. As was pointed out by Freedberg, the architecture in the middleground of the portrait is reminiscent of that which appears in Raphael's Portrait of Leo X with Cardinals Giulio de' Medici and Luigi Rossi, dating c.1517 (Uffizi, Florence).25 Although painted
in Rome, Raphael’s portrait was sent back to Florence in 1518 and was therefore familiar to the Florentine artists soon after its completion.26

Regardless of Vasari’s assistance in the identification of La Barbara’s portrait, its style places it within Puligo’s oeuvre beyond question. The woman wears the cappello a ciambella with medallion, and her dress has large puffed sleeves like those seen in the previous Portrait of a Young Man Writing (cat.no. 49, fig. 65). The prominent shadow of the sitter cast on the architecture behind is also found in the latter portrait and in later works (see cat.no. 54, fig. 70; cat.no. 57, fig. 73; cat.no. 61, fig. 77). The shadows on the right side of the face are deep, more so than in Puligo’s other portraits, which has the effect of reducing the head and neck to simple geometric shapes that recall his earlier portraits of women (see cat.no. 44, fig. 60; cat.no. 45, fig. 61; cat.no. 46, fig. 62). Despite the fact that the work is a portrait, the face of La Barbara is closely analogous to types Puligo adhered to when creating images of the Madonna or saints. The eyes are closely placed, the nose somewhat pronounced, the eyes heavy-lidded, and the chin round and dimpled (compare with cat.no. 64, fig. 80; cat.no. 65, fig. 81). The beauty in the portrait resides in the soft, gentle modeling, the deep chiaroscuro, and the dense atmosphere contained within a composition in which figure, architecture, and landscape are unified and balanced.

Close in time and style to the Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina is the Portrait of a Man at the Uffizi, Florence, no. 106 (cat.no. 51,
fig. 67). He is presented in half-length and turned in a three-quarter view, wears a white shirt with a black coat and three-cornered hat, and holds a book in his right hand and a rolled up letter in his left. The vertical divisions of the background are part of a niche, similar in design to those found in other paintings by Puligo, such as the New York Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist, (cat.no. 33, fig. 48). The names of Andrea del Sarto\(^2\) and Naldini\(^2\) have been suggested for the portrait, but the recent attribution to Puligo is correct.\(^2\) Besides the architectural background, other elements reveal Puligo's hand. The cast shadow recalls his Portrait of a Young Man Writing and the positioning of the fingers is the same as in his Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina (cat.no. 50, fig. 66).

While the heavy jowls and knitted brows make the figure's appearance moderate in its appeal, the darkly shaded face and direct, somewhat apprehensive stare (seemingly Pontormesque in origin; compare with Pontormo's Portrait of Two Friends, Cini Collection, Venice\(^3\)) endow him with a compelling psychological interest.

The reflective mood of the Uffizi portrait is also present in a work belonging to the Staatliche Museen, Berlin (cat.no. 52, fig. 68). Like the previous painting, the Berlin Portrait of a Man is Pontormesque in mood. The figure, immersed in vaporous atmosphere, stares directly at the spectator with eyes as dark pools overlaid with gently sloping lids. The somber coloring of the painting, primarily in blacks and browns, enlivened only by the green curtain at the side, enhances the pensive mood. The traditional attribution
to Pontormo is understandable, considering Puligo's interest in Pontormo's introspective types—e.g., the Portrait of an Engraver, c.1517-18 (Louvre, Paris)\textsuperscript{31} or the Portrait of a Musician, c.1518-19 (Uffizi, Florence)\textsuperscript{32}—an interest that will contribute to the deepening psychological interest of Puligo's works.

In the Berlin portrait, Puligo has effectively portrayed a member of Florentine society in the mid-1520s. The half-length figure is turned in space and has his arm positioned across his body to form a pyramidal composition. The folds of the sleeves and the pleats of the coat are masterfully handled; variation of pattern and more subtle gradations of light in comparison to the 1523 Portrait reveal the Berlin picture's more refined quality. Clearly a mature work, the portrait equals the delicate sensitivity of Puligo's later studies of Pietro Carnesecchi (cat.no. 54, fig. 70; cat.no. 56, fig. 72).

In the Portrait of a Young Man with a View of Florence, (Earl of Plymouth Collection, Oakly Park, Bromfield, cat.no. 54, fig. 69), Puligo overcomes the deficiencies visible, in the Portrait of a Young Man Writing (cat.no. 49, fig. 65) and creates a highly expressive work. Initially, the composition seems unexceptional by High Renaissance composition standards. The young noble stands in a nondescript interior decorated with a green curtain at the right, pulled back, and a window at the left, depicting in this particular example the Duomo and the Baptistery of Florence. But in the context of High Renaissance portraiture, the form and content are subverted for expressive purposes by the depiction of the elongated figure in three-quarter length, posed in an attitude of austere aristocratic
removal with the left hand resting authoritatively on his hip and his
right holding gloves. The nature of Puligo's expressive idea is
instantly conveyed by the young man's rarified physiognomy, which is
different from the types observed in the portraits of his early
oeuvre. The face is oval and elongated and has thin, transparent
lips, a long, narrow nose, and heavy-lidded eyes recalling the
figural vocabulary of Puligo's Madonnas of the 1520s. The
strangeness and eccentricity of the portrait indicates that Puligo's
achievement of a mannerist style is convincing.

The mannerist element in the portrait is most startling in the
use of color. Against the pastel blues and greens of the view seen
through the window and the warm brown tones of the interior, the
bright cadmium red of the great coat is vociferant and chilling. The
intensity of the orange-red is enlivened to an even greater degree by
its juxtaposition to the light yellow-green curtain in the upper
right corner. The violet of the lower sleeves and the yellow-tan of
the gloves are more subdued by their proximity to the red.

The mannered effect of the trenchant color is augmented by the
elongated canon of proportion emphasized by the tubular unbroken
folds of the coat, and the tapered fingers of the hands. The intent
of the artist to exaggerate is also apparent in the grand dimensions
of the puffed sleeves and the additional volume suggested by the
trailing black cape.

Figurally, the painting chiefly depends upon mannerist
portraiture of the early Cinquecento, particularly Pontormo. The
three-quarter length figure and the affected pose with the left hand
held at the hip and the right hand holding gloves derives from Pontormo's lost Portrait of Ippolito de' Medici for which a drawing survives, c.1525 (Uffizi, Florence, no.452F recto). Puligo has reversed the deployment of the figure and has generally appropriated the figure's costume: the hat, the voluminous coat, and the gloves. The work may also depend on the drawing's painted pendant by Pontormo, the Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici, c.1525-26 (Pinacoteca, Lucca), which resembles the Puligo in pose, costume, use of color, and haughty mood. The tapered fingers of Puligo's young man's hands resemble Pontormo's early drawing style, which Puligo had already borrowed for his Borghese Madonna and Child with Two Angels (cat.no. 3, fig. 4). Another contemporary source for the drawing of the hands are paintings by Rosso Fiorentino, cf., for example, the figure of St. Jerome in his Santa Maria Nuova Altarpiece, 1518, (Uffizi, Florence).

The dependency of Puligo's portrait upon Pontormo's drawing of c.1525 and the painted pendant of c.1525-26, establishes a general placement for the painting around 1526. Subsequently, the portrait may have had a reciprocal effect on Pontormo's Portrait of a Halberdier, (Chaucey Stillman Collection; exhibited at the Frick Collection, New York) dating around 1527-28 in the vicinity of the altarpiece at Sta. Felicita. In pose, the Portrait of a Halberdier compares with the Puligo and with Pontormo's own earlier drawing of Ippolito de' Medici. But in other respects, it nearly duplicates the heavy-lidded eyes, elongated face, and portentous haunted expression of Puligo's painting, suggesting that Pontormo's
portrait may date somewhat earlier or that Puligo's influence may
have extended beyond his short-lived career.

After the anomalous eccentricity of the *Portrait of a Young Man
with a View of Florence*, Puligo tempers his style and begins to
generate portraits of the highest quality in pictorial effects.
Vasari admired some of these portraits and signalled one as being the
most outstanding; "quello è bellissimo che fece di Monsignore Messer
Piero [sic] Carnesecchi, allora bellissimo giovinetto; al quale fece
anco alcuni altri quadri tutti belli e condotti con molta
diligenza."37 The esteemed painting is undoubtedly Puligo's
*Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi* (Palazzo Pitti, Florence: cat.no. 55,
fig. 70). Long misattributed during the eighteenth and nineteenth
century as a work by Sarto, the portrait was independently recognized
as Carnesecchi in 1909 by Carlo Gamba38 and Emil Schaeffer.39
Their identification was facilitated by another reference to
Carnesecchi in Vasari's *Ragionamenti*, published in 1588.40 In this
account, Vasari conducts Francesco I on an imaginary walking tour
through the Palazzo Vecchio in order to admire the decorated rooms
that Vasari himself had painted in fresco. While standing before the
scene of *Ippolito de' Medici Raised to a Cardinal* in the Sala di
Clemente VII, Vasari explains that Carnesecchi was painted as a youth
and that he portrayed the young man in the same way.41 The
portrait upon which he based his work is at the Uffizi in Florence
(cat.no. 55, fig. 71) by Puligo, depicting the same young man as in
the Palazzo Pitti portrait. Vasari's reference thus establishes
Carnesecchi's identity, enabling other depictions of the youth,
like the one at the Palazzo Pitti, to be recognized.\textsuperscript{42}

Pietro Carnesecchi (1508-1567) was an ill-fated follower of the Valdesian movement whose life was abruptly ended on October 1, 1567 when he was found guilty of heresy under Pope Pius V. His ecclesiastical career probably began at the age of ten, in the year 1518, when he was sent from Florence, his native city, to Cardinal Bibbiena in Rome. He fled the Sack of Rome in the spring of 1527 and returned to Florence at the age of nineteen.\textsuperscript{43} It is probably at this time that Puligo painted his portrait, just prior to his own death in September of that same year.

In the Pitti portrait, Puligo represents the young man in three-quarter length wearing ecclesiastical garb. His hands are brought forward; the right holds a pair of gloves and the thumb of his left is hooked inside the belt. As in the Bromfield portrait (fig. 69), Puligo employs the three-quarter length view and the motif of the gloves. The position and drawing of the hands are a near-exact borrowing (without the thumb behind the belt) from his Muncie Portrait of a Woman (fig. 60). The shadow cast on the right rear wall is used in numerous other portraits—e.g., the Portrait of a Young Man Writing (fig. 65), the Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina (fig. 66), and the Uffizi Portrait of a Man (fig. 67). The shape and shading of the face and shifted glance of the eyes also compare with his Portrait of a Young Man Writing. Softly modeled textures prevail as in any number of works by Puligo, exemplified by his Munich, Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist (fig. 51).
While Puligo synthesizes elements from his own work to create the Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi, it could hardly be more different from the previous portrait at Oakly Park in Bromfield. The dramatic color and mannerist drawing are severely curtailed. The figure, although still inflated in scale by the large balloning sleeves, is here stabilized by the placement of his hands in front of his body, in sharp contrast to the elongated proportion and the emphatic verticality of the drapery in the Bromfield painting. The near union of his hands creates circular patterns that are rhythmically repeated in the folds of his sleeves, and in the shape of his face and hat. These interlocking shapes are further connected by the sfumato which dissolves one form into another.

Puligo's scrutiny of Pontormo's drawings and paintings for the Bromfield portrait, led him to a style, exemplified in this portrait, infused with elements from Pontormo's early portraits of the late 1510s and early 1520s. The Carnesecchi portrait is mostly monochromatic, black in the coat and hat, and dark umbers in the background, and resembles in effect Pontormo's Portrait of Two Friends, c.1522 (Cini Collection, Venice) or his Portrait of a Musician, c.1518-19 (Uffizi, Florence). The young man's timid, apprehensive expression, heightened by the dense atmospheric quality, also reflects these portraits. Over-all, Pontormo's portraits appear to have provided the needed catalyst that enabled Puligo to create portraits of psychological interest in a capable and fluent style. The portrait, despite its darkened condition, is a somber penetrating study wrapped in warm colors and veiled in a pervasive mist, a mood
that is uncannily prophetic of the youth's ill-fated future.

In describing the portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi, Vasari stated that Puligo painted "alcuni altri quadri tutti e condotti con molta diligenza." The exact meaning of the ambiguous word "quadri" (pictures) is not clear, but Vasari may have been referring to the other portraits of Carnesecchi that Puligo painted. One of these paintings, already cited in connection with the Palazzo Pitti portrait, is the bust-length depiction of Carnesecchi at the Uffizi in Florence, no. 1489 (cat.no. 56, fig. 71). It is this portrait that Vasari copied when composing his scene of Ippolito de' Medici Raised to a Cardinal, hence it is one of the works that Gamba and Schaeffer were able to identify with the assistance of the text in Vasari's Ragionamenti.

Like the Palazzo Pitti portrait, the painting was traditionally given to Sarto until the studies by Gamba and Schaeffer were. Their attribution to Puligo was widely accepted, except for Freedberg, who prefers to call the painting a reduced replica of the Palazzo Pitti portrait, possibly from Puligo's shop. I believe, on the contrary, that the work is more properly called another rendition of Carnesecchi, conceived as a unique and independent creation, unquestionably by the master.

Beyond the obvious dissimilarity in costumes, the Uffizi painting cannot properly be assigned replica status in that both color and the handling of paint are decidedly different. The colors, limited to dark muted hues in the Pitti portrait, contain larger areas of color; the wedge of a light bluish-purple of the shirt is surrounded by the black of the coat, behind which is a green-gray background.
The forms are sharply defined rather than blurred, except for the face and hair. This latter area is left indistinct, the shapes softened until they appear out of focus. In addition to the wider range of colors and the limitation of the soft modeling to the area of the head, the figure is generally more brightly illuminated than the Pitti portrait, causing the mood of the young man to appear more straightforward and uncomplicated.

The authenticity of the portrait should also not be questioned. Its style, in fact, replicates that of Puligo's only signed and dated painting, the 1523 Portrait of a Young Man Writing at Firle Place (fig. 65). In each portrait, there is a similar distinction between the handling of the clothing and the face, with hard-edged contours in the coat and hat, and pervasive sfumato in the face and hair. Definition in each case is given to the neck by thin transparent strokes of color that model the form. The faces, illuminated from the left, are shaded with comparable gradations of light to dark. There is also a similar difficulty to the drawing of the hats where pentimenti have emerged, and to the sitters' right eyes in which the upper lid is angled too obliquely.

The more uneven quality of the Uffizi painting suggests that it may be Puligo's first rendering of Carnesecchi's portrait. Its stylistic similarity to the portrait at Firle Place permits a date close to the Firle portrait dated 1523 or perhaps a year or two later. Carnesecchi's youthfulness is evident in both the Pitti and Uffizi portraits, but his exact age is not determinable based upon his physiognomy alone and therefore does not increase our knowledge
regarding the dating. It is not impossible to envision that the portrait was executed during a visit by Carnesecchi to Florence prior to 1527; a visit to Rome by Puligo, on the other hand, is less easily imagined. While Gamba and Berenson date the Uffizi work 1527, the immaturity of its style suggests a slightly earlier date.

Closely based on the Uffizi portrait is another Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi, a work formerly in the collection of the Marquess of Lansdowne, Bowood (cat.no. 57, fig. 72). The drawing of the hat is identical to that in the Uffizi portrait and the face nearly so, but the young man has a change of costume. He wears a black coat with large puffed sleeves that give the figure a sense of greater fortitude in comparison to the sloping shoulders of the earlier Uffizi portrait. This air of stability is further enhanced by the simple geometricity of the composition which resembles a triangle. The base is formed by the decorative horizontal band running across the front of the chest, and the sides follow an imaginary line to the apex located at the center of the hat. The Uffizi portrait, on the other hand, is composed of small angular wedges—e.g., the area of the shirt and the shape of the face and hat—that fit within the over-all triangular design, giving the figure a greater sense of animation. There is also a difference in style. The sharp delineation in most areas of the Uffizi painting is dissolved in the Bowood picture, suggesting that it is more closely related to Puligo's late portrait style of the Palazzo Pitti portrait which we have conjecturally dated 1527. Furthermore, the unevenness of the drawing in the Uffizi portrait is resolved, suggesting, as in
other instances of Puligo's oeuvre, that his repetition of the subject enabled him to refine its execution and eliminate earlier mishaps. The sitter's reserved and contemplative mood also relates to the later Pitti portrait and thereby suggests a date in close proximity to it.

Perhaps, the most enthralling of Puligo's portraits is the work called *Il Fattore di San Marco* (cat.no. 57, fig. 73) that hangs on the wall opposite the Portrait of a Young Man Writing in the upstairs drawing-room at Firle Place. Like the Pitti Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi, this figure is in three-quarter length and is painted in warm hues. But among Puligo's portraits, the panel is singular in the carefully balanced equilibrium which the artist achieves between the proportion of the figure and the surrounding space, so that the diamond-shaped arrangement of the figure is held in a vacillating state of tension and repose within its narrow frame. The diamond, as a compositional structure, is an animating device that Sarto used in the Alnwick Portrait of a Young Man, c.1512, a work to which Puligo had made reference, in respect to its narrative conceit, in his 1523 Firle portrait. In the Alnwick portrait, Sarto intensified the liveliness of the composition through the use of bright color harmonies. Puligo, on the other hand, injects a sense of candidness: the sitter gazes directly at the viewer, his hat is tilted, and his hands are placed idiosyncratically—his right tucked inside the coat in a Napoleonic manner, and the left thumb hooked on his belt as in the Pitti Carnesecchi. The directness of the portrait, however, is subtly tempered by the warm colors. Black
areas predominate, silhouetted against the mixture of ochres, greens, and browns of the background. Interest is added to these earthen hues by the small area of red in the man's inner coat. And Puligo's system of lighting and atmosphere are brought under more rational constraints in comparison to his other works where thick mists often encroach upon the spectator's view of the image. In this portrait, the areas most directly illuminated by the light, such as the left side of the face, are brought into sharp focus. Other areas that recede into the shadows gradually become indistinct, and ultimately the figure and background fuse.

The quality of this portrait was especially admired during the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Crowe and Cavalcaselle, who attributed the work to Sarto, considered it to be "a very fine work in perfect preservation, genuine and masterly, very bold in handling, full of gaiety and transparence in tone."51 The first scholar to give the painting to Puligo was Gamba who believed "è forse il più bello di tutti per la prontezza della mossa e l'espressione di vita che ne emana."52 Even after Gamba's definitive attribution to Puligo, Clapp challenged the author and gave the painting to Pontormo,53 extolling it as a striking example of his early oeuvre.

The wish of these scholars to give the painting to Sarto or Pontormo is understandable considering the portrait's masterly execution and the tradition of Puligo's fluctuating and often unequal talents. Current scholars, however, are all proponents of Gamba's attribution to Puligo, for when compared to other works reliably identified as Puligo's, it is a fairly obvious example of his work.
Puligo's treatment, first of all, is evident in the prominent shadow cast on the wall, a recurring motif exemplified in the Pitti Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi (cat.no. 54, fig. 70) and the Salisbury Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina (cat.no. 50, fig. 66).

Also, the position of the subject's left hand is nearly identical to the left hand of La Barbara and that of the Magdalen (National Gallery, Ottawa, cat.no. 64, fig. 80). A close examination of the paint surface reveals Puligo's manner of contouring the neck with the strokes of the brush, as seen, for example, in the Firle Portrait of a Young Man (cat.no. 49, fig. 65), and his technique of applying color to certain areas in thin transparent layers with broad sweeping strokes, as seen, for example, in the garment of the Portrait of a Woman at Hampton Court (cat.no. 45, fig. 61). The folds of the sleeves are treated broadly as in the other Firle portrait, and pentimenti, now present in many of Puligo's portraits, have emerged around the collar of the coat.

Although Puligo's beginning efforts in portraiture generally include incongruous elements—faces that are inproficiently drawn and folds of drapery that are arbitrary and unstudied—his perseverance led to works of great fluency which often embody sensitive psychological study. His careful scrutiny of works in Florence by Raphael and Ridolfo Ghirlandaio and in greater measure by Sarto and Pontormo facilitated the painter's evolution to a portraitist whose works can hold their own in comparison to those of his contemporaries, Sarto included.
The final aspect of our painter's oeuvre to be discussed concerns his production of what Vasari called "altre teste." Undoubtedly, he was referring to the numerous half-length depictions of women of sacred or profane notoriety that Puligo painted. Vasari fortunately cited two specific examples from this category: a Cleopatra with an asp biting her breast and a Lucretia killing herself with a dagger. These two works are associated with paintings still extant (cat.no. 58, fig. 74; and cat.no. 61, fig. 77) and are part of a group of eleven paintings, mostly Magdalens, that belong to this group of "other heads." The paintings chronologically span the artist's short-lived career, and in some instances a direct stylistic and compositional correlation can be drawn between them and the portraits.

In our study of Puligo's paintings, we observed that the painter often created numerous works evolving around a particular theme or design. For example, the interior setting with a window at the left is used several times for paintings of the Madonna and Child with another figure (see cat.no. 12, fig. 19; cat.no. 14, fig. 21; cat.no. 15, fig. 22; 24, 25) and is repeated for several portraits (see cat.no. 40, fig. 56; cat.no. 44, fig. 60; cat.no. 53, fig. 69). Puligo was also prone to repeat the same composition making only slight changes, as in the example of the Munich Madonna and the Palazzo Pitti Holy Family (cat.no. 36, fig. 51; cat.no. 37, fig. 52). Puligo's reliance upon previously developed compositions, be they of his own origination or of other's, also marks his paintings of half-lengths.
The **Lucretia**, sold on the New York art market in 1982 (cat.no. 58, fig. 74), is perhaps his first or basic statement of this type, in which he reduces the depiction of the female nude to a simple formula. The basic recipe consists of a nude figure presented frontally in half-length. Her head is tilted to the left and wavy strands of hair fall over her shoulders. Her breasts are treated as hemispheres attached to the surface of her upper torso. At the left, the iconographic key to the identity of the figure is presented; in this example, she holds a dagger identifying her as Lucretia. Once his basic formula was established, Puligo repeated it in several variations for paintings of the Magdalen and other famous women whose histories, actual or legendary, allowed for portrayal in the nude.

Depictions of half-length or full length images of famous heroines or saints presented in a statuesque, or almost iconic, manner became especially popular in the early sixteenth century. Lucretia pictures, while not profuse, appear with some regularity, perhaps because of the alleged unearthing of an ancient statue of Lucretia in the Trastevere or the commissions that resulted from the fondness that Pope Leo X had for the heroine's name. In works of the early Cinquecento, the narrative of Lucretia's tragic life is all but eliminated, and her single figure is represented as a symbol of moral truth, or as in Puligo's work, an excuse for the depiction of the nude. Undoubtedly, paintings of nude legendary women were intended as collectors' pieces, commissioned for private consumption.

Puligo's *Lucretia*, perhaps the work cited by Vasari, has the over-all incongruous effect seen in his early works, most obviously
characterized by a lack of control and sophistication. Body parts are awkwardly drawn: Lucretia's left shoulder and arm are too underdeveloped in comparison to the right, the head rests unnaturally on the neck, and the neck appears overly massive in proportion to the body. The tilted head, drawing of the eyes and lips, and the the shape of the breasts find close counterparts in the Madonna in the work at the Galleria Nazionale in Rome (cat.no. 15, fig. 22), dating around 1518. The direct stare of Lucretia is also comparable to the Madonna's, but the gentle appeal of the Virgin's glance takes on an abrupt candor in the nude Lucretia. Missing, though, is any convincing emotional appeal that one would expect in the depiction of Lucretia's plight.

The attribution to Puligo, I believe, should not be questioned. The approach to the figure is in terms of simple geometric shapes evenly shaded from light to dark with thin transparent strokes of color. The effect is very much like what we see in the Hampton Court Portrait of a Woman, c.1518 (cat.no. 45, fig. 61), especially in the area of the neck that has similar ringed creases and visible brush strokes. If there is an exact prototype upon which Puligo based this nude, I am unaware of its existence. There is, however, evidence of Sodoma's influence in the ringlets of hair falling over her shoulder and the tilted head that recalls his paintings of Lucretia at the Kestner Museum, Hanover, c.1510, or at the Galleria Sabauda, Turin, c.1516. Puligo's painting has stylistic analogies to his other works dating c.1518, suggesting it dates from this time.
Finesse, however, in the depiction of the female nude never came to Puligo. His *Leda and the Swan* (Sotheby's, London, 1972, cat.no. 60, fig. 75) is in a league with the *Lucretia* in terms of lack of facility in the drawing of the nude. As her right hand awkwardly clutches the neck of the swan (compare with the hands of the little Baptist in the *Pitti Madonna*, no. 146, cat.no. 16, fig. 23), the swan appears to be strangling in her grip. The eyes of Leda are blank and without pupils, but this may be due to the poor condition of the piece.

Like the *Lucretia*, the Leda is presented frontally, her head tilted to the left, and her iconographic attribute, the swan, enters from the left side. A thick vaporous mist obliterates almost all sharp delineation, and a shadow is cast on the wall at the right, a standard element used many times by the painter (see, for example, cat.no. 48, fig. 64; cat.no. 49, fig. 65; cat.no. 61, fig. 77). Shading is evenly graduated from light to dark giving the figure a simple geometric appearance rather than a sensuous appeal as might be expected in a painting with this subject matter.

Perhaps the most famous *Leda and the Swan* of the sixteenth century was Leonardo's, executed, at least in part, while Leonardo was still in Florence, around 1506. His original work is lost, but the general composition is known through copies (e.g., Galleria Borghese, Rome). While Puligo may have had an opportunity to see the painting as a young man, the effect of the prototype was not deeply felt. Puligo's *Leda* lacks Leonardo's graceful twisting contrapposto and interlocking forms, as well as his full-length format, landscape
setting, and accessory figures; only to the choice of subject matter and the use of a nude figure can an analogy be drawn. The composition, rather, appears to be an expanded version of Puligo's *Lucretia* (cat.no. 58, fig. 74), upon which later variants were founded (see, for example, the Genoa *Magdalen* and the Budapest *Cleopatra*, cat.no. 60, fig. 76; cat.no. 61, fig. 77).

A frontally posed, nude figure like the Leda is repeated in two other paintings, the *Magdalen* (but, judging from the presence of a snake, probably originally intended as a Cleopatra; Palazzo Bianco, Genoa, no. 287, cat.no. 60, fig. 76) and the *Cleopatra* (Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest, no. 71.23, cat.no. 61, fig. 77). In each, the mood has been solemnized by the upward gaze of the figures. The prototype for this painful expression are Sodoma's versions of *Lucretia* (Kestner Museum, Hanover, c.1505, or Galleria Sabauda, Turin, c.1515), in which the emphasis on the whites of the eyes dramatizes the agonized countenance. The loosely trailing hair over the shoulders and the drapery in *Cleopatra* reflect Sodoma's design. Another source for the upward gaze may have been Raphael's depictions of ecstatic vision, as in his *St. Catherine*, c.1507 (National Gallery, London) or the *St. Cecilia Altarpiece*, c.1513-16 (Pinacoteca, Bologna). While difficult to place chronologically, the final two nude figures probably date in the 1520s.

Regardless of the sources, there is little advance in Puligo's facility in the execution of the nude figure. Shoulders are overly robust, the ear is too large, the hand is awkwardly drawn, and the
breasts are formless matter without specific distinction. Thick vaporous atmosphere separates the viewer from the figure, an effect that seems to be heightened in the Genoese picture by the severely damaged surface.

The Budapest Cleopatra, in contrast to the Genoese version, is relatively more refined, suggesting that the artist spent more time attempting to perfect his brushwork. Details of the face are more sharply outlined—a thin brown line for the brow, a slightly heavier red line around the upper lids of the eyes, and even a vague suggestion of teeth. The colors of the painting are limited in range and consist of umber in the niche, dark gray to white in the dress, and gray-green beige to light pink in the flesh. The spotlight illumination of the figure is dramatic and nearly whitens the color of the figure's forehead, shoulder, and right hand. The theatricality of the lighting and facial expression, nevertheless, is affected in its emotional appeal and most unconvincing of the ominous event transpiring.

Puligo may have been thinking of a nude figure when he composed the Magdalen (Pinacoteca Capitolina, Rome, cat.no. 62, fig. 78). Except for the robe draped over one shoulder, the Magdalen is depicted in a kind of quasi-nudity in a diaphanous sleeveless, low-cut garment, painted so transparently that the under-drawing is now visible. The saint holds an ointment jar and is placed in an interior with a curtain at the right and a window at the left, an arrangement that was used in the London Madonna and Child (cat.no. 13, fig. 20). The lower sill of the window slants downward as in the
Pitti Holy Family (cat.no. 12, fig. 19). The proportion of the figure, more expansive than the previous Lucretia or Leda (perhaps c.1518), suggests a slightly later date, c.1518-20. The Magdalen may coincide in time with the Palazzo Pitti Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist c.1520 (fig. 25), in which the pose and drawing of the head of the Baptist closely resemble the Magdalen's.

Sadly, very little can be said of the painting's color which is completely distorted by dirt and damage to the surface. The side of the Magdalen's face is extremely abraded, giving her a rather unsightly appearance. Irrespective of the surface damage, the painting manifests the faults of Puligo's previous half-lengths. Shoulders are of Amazon proportion, the head and neck appear improperly joined, and, as in the Leda, the ears are overly pronounced. Her dreamy gaze out the window is not of a substantial enough emotional appeal to befit a repentant Magdalen.

Fortunately, clothing alleviated many of the problems that Puligo encountered in executing nude half-lengths of women. Great puffed sleeves and gathered folds of fabric obscure the inelegant proportions that lie underneath. The figure of the Magdalen at the Palazzo Pitti in Florence (cat.no. 63, fig. 79) is frontally placed, and her attribute, the ointment jar, is held in her right hand in the lower left corner. In comparison to the Capitoline Magdalen (cat.no. 62, fig. 78), alterations occur in the turn of her head, directed to the right, not the left, and more toward the viewer. Also, Puligo has substituted a niche common to many of his works (i.e., cat.no. 33, figs. 48; cat.no. 51, fig. 67), the architectural edge continuing
the vertical thrust of the left arm, which is not present in the
Capitololine picture.

As in some of the portraits (cat.no. 45, fig. 61; cat.no. 46, fig. 62), the folds of the sleeves swing inward forming a triangular
design. Colors in the dress are rose-red to pink in the highlights
with a white camicia and a background of umbers. Expectedly
appearing in the work are Puligo's typical ringlets of hair falling
over her shoulder and the cast shadow on the wall. The facial type
likewise conforms to other Puligo visages, such as the Columbus
Madonna (cat.no. 32, fig. 47). The painting dates comfortably in the
early to mid-1520s.

By the mid-1520s, Puligo made substantial gains in the depiction
of saints in half-length. While we observed in his nude figures that
the old adage "practice makes perfect" is not always necessarily
true, with the seated figures of saints practice certainly did not
hurt. His Magdalen (National Galley of Canada, Ottawa, cat.no. 64,
fig. 80) is basically a variation on the theme of the Muncie Portrait
of a Woman (cat.no. 44, fig. 60). She wears a costume with large
puffed sleeves and a hat decorated with a medallion, and, as in his
Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina (cat.no 50, fig. 66), the increased
monumentality of her form derives from Sarto's Portrait of a Woman,
c.1522, which only survives as a fragment (Staatliche Museen, Berlin,
no. 240), but the complete composition exists in a drawing (no. 647E,
Uffizi, Florence).

In addition to Sarto's portrait, Puligo returned to Leonardo's
Mona Lisa, which he had observed for his Muncie Portrait, as a
compositional model. The Magdalen's hands, positioned in front of the body, form the base of a pyramidal composition. The viewer's eye enters the scene first examining the classically decorated ointment jar, sweeps the outline of the figure, and then returns to the jar by way of the arm at the right. The cyclical ovoid motion of the composition is deliberately repeated in smaller units; observe the shapes of the hat, face, necklace, and upper sleeves. The stable and regular order of the figure is enlivened by a sense of psychological animation that is introduced through her direct gaze at the spectator, demonstrating Puligo's absorption of lessons from Leonardo. The close connection of this Magdalen with Sarto's drawing of c.1522 and La Barbara of c.1525 suggests a date sometime between those years.

Puligo's hand can not be mistaken in this work, replete with his standard fare: an architectural niche with vertical divisions at the side, a curtain draped at the right, the pose of the left hand with the middle fingers joined (e.g., cat.no. 51, fig. 67; cat.no. 53, fig. 69, cat.no. 57, fig. 73), and the broad unruffled treatment of the fabric. Even the facial type is a recurring one (e.g., cat.no. 45, fig. 61; cat.no. 48, fig. 64, cat.no. 50, fig. 66).

In another painting, the figure's attribute has been changed to a tower to transmute her into a St. Barbara (Hermitage, Leningrad, no. 1477, cat.no. 65, fig. 81). This work is closely tied to the Ottawa Magdalen, and except for the alteration of the background and the pose of the left hand (compare with cat.no. 18, fig. 25; cat.no. 44, fig. 60; cat.no. 54, fig. 70), the two paintings come from the same
mold and date around 1523-24. A singular element in this rendition is the flat, overlapping folds of the lower sleeve at the right which recalls Andrea del Brescianino's idiosyncratic treatment. Brescianino's presence in Florence in the early 1520s is suggested through such borrowings as this, and although these inclusions are not of profound significance, their occasional appearance clearly indicates Puligo's continued interest in a Sienese style.

The influence of Raphael's *St. Cecilia Altarpiece*, c.1513-14, tentatively suggested in the expressions of his Genoese *Magdalen* and Budapest *Cleopatra*, is more deeply felt in what seems to be the last of Puligo's half-length paintings, the *Magdalen* in the Galleria Borghese, Rome, no. 328 (cat.no. 66, fig. 82). Raphael, who was residing in Rome, had been commissioned to paint the altarpiece by Beata Elena Duglioli dall'Olio for the family chapel in S. Giovanni in Monte in Bologna. Puligo may have seen the painting if it passed enroute from Rome to Bologna through Florence, or made the short trip north to study it. It is apparent that Puligo closely observed the figure of the Magdalen in the altarpiece; she stands at the right in profile and gazes directly at the viewer. Puligo, however, effectively reworked the idea into a half-length of provocative suggestion.

The figure is tightly contained within the borders of the panel; the upper horizontal brushes the top of her head, and the lower horizontal trims her arm just above the elbow. Like Raphael's Magdalen, the figure addresses the viewer, but Puligo alters the confrontation to convey a vague sense of solicitous appeal.
Contributing to this effect is a pervasive, dark smoky atmosphere, as in his *St. Cecilia Altarpiece*. (Puligo's picture is in need of conservation, and whether the dense degree of haziness seen today in the picture was intended by the artist is unclear). Colors are somber, comprised mostly of gradations of gray found in the background, dress, and ointment jar. Light rose pink in the veil that sweeps across the shoulder accents the composition. While the chief idea for the painting comes from Raphael, the facial type conforms to Puligo's. The drawing of the lids of the eyes and the structure of the nose is comparable to his later representations of saints, such as the Ottawa *Magdalen* and Hermitage *St. Barbara* (cat.no. 64, fig. 80; cat.no. 65, fig. 81). The subtlety of the Magdalen's illusory expression, is devoid of the unconvincing visionary ecstasy of the Genoese Magdalen. The enthralling appeal of the painting is analogous to the portrait called *Il Fattore di San Marco* in terms of the depth of inner vision that the artist conveys, suggesting a date for the work around 1527.

The Borghese *Magdalen*, like Puligo's late portraits such as the *Pitti Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi* or the *Il Fattore di San Marco*, reflects the maturity that the artist achieved at the end of his life. Colors, warm in tonality, are applied with deftness to well-drawn forms. The resulting effect is that a sense of inner being emerges from the figures, revealing that by 1527 Puligo had developed into a capable and mature painter.
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CONCLUSION

To say that the paintings of Domenico Puligo represent the most momentous and prestigious works of the early sixteenth-century in Florence would be a great exaggeration. His capabilities as a painter fall short of those of the most renowned masters who worked for a short time during the early sixteenth century in Florence: Leonardo, Michelangelo, and Raphael. Also, there are paintings by Puligo, particularly among his earlier production, that pale in comparison to works by his contemporaries and colleagues, such as Fra Bartolommeo, Andrea del Sarto, or Pontormo, who were among the leading, innovative, Florentine artists of the first half of the 1500s. Nevertheless, a great number of Puligo's paintings, particularly his altarpieces and portraits, achieve a quality comparable to that found in paintings by his Florentine contemporaries, and it is these superior works that are the catharsis for this study of his oeuvre. Bright, luminous colors, facility in the handling of paint, complex, spatial arrangements, an idiosyncratic canon of proportion, and a personal style of drawing of faces are some of the characteristics that consistently appear in his mature works and contribute to the creation of paintings of exceptional quality which are worthy of study.
The importance of a thorough examination of Puligo's works is also underscored by the fact that as a neglected artist his oeuvre is rich in art historical problems. As a colleague of Andrea del Sarto, Puligo occasionally borrowed figures and compositions from his friend. These similarities led to numerous misattributions, many of which originated as early as the eighteenth century. Puligo's paintings can also be found under a variety of other names in antiquarian museum catalogues and guide books, such as those of Fra Bartolommeo, Albertinelli, and Franciabigio. It is also true that literally hundreds of paintings have been attributed to Puligo which bear absolutely no relation to his documented or securely attributed paintings.

In addition to misattributions, Puligo's work has also been inaccurately assessed by contemporary scholars. For example, Freedberg believed that few of Puligo's paintings survive from the second decade of the sixteenth century.\(^1\) I have shown on the contrary, that a fair number of works, perhaps one-third of his total production, can be placed in this early period. Freedberg also exaggerated the emotional content in Puligo's paintings, describing it as "an excessive morbid sentimentality,"\(^2\) an overgeneralization when all of his works are considered.

The significance of Puligo's work to sixteenth-century painting, while difficult to measure, is not great. According to Vasari, Puligo was invited to work in Spain and Hungary,\(^3\) and from this we can speculate that his paintings may have been exported. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that Puligo's influence was felt in
other European countries. Vasari also states that Puligo had an assistant, Domenico Beceri. There is no other information about this painter, so the extent of Puligo's influence on his work is unknown.

An assessment of the importance of Puligo's work for sixteenth-century Florentine painting can be made by examining the Catalogue of Attributed Paintings in this thesis. Puligo's paintings, with those of Antonio del Ceriaolo, were influential for a painter called the Master of Volterra. He is an artist of perhaps third-rate abilities, but whose work presents interesting problems of attribution. Andrea del Brescianino is another painter whose style, during his stay in Florence, was affected by contact with Puligo and also Sarto. There are also a number of works that closely resemble Puligo's, but they lack sufficient stylistic qualities to be attributed to him. These works appear to date in the 1510s and 1520s, and based on the quality of the work, they suggest that Puligo's compositions and style were appealing to artists of lesser abilities. Puligo's influence on these artists appears to be the extent of his popularity, and those working later in the century in Florence, such as Michele Tosini or Pier Francesco Foschi sought works by artists, such as Sarto or Pontormo, for inspiration, not Puligo. Finally, in spite of the close contact that Puligo had with Sarto, Fra Bartolommeo, Albertinelli, and Pontormo and the influences that he derived from them, there is little evidence to suggest that Puligo's style had a reciprocal effect on them.
While the impact of Domenico Puligo's paintings on his own
generation was little and his contribution to subsequent art was
minor, affecting only lesser skilled artists, his merit must be based
on his actual production which as we have discussed is aesthetically
valuable. One of the pleasurable findings of this study is that he
executed a greater quantity of exceptionally fine works than
initially anticipated. It is regrettable, though, that so many of
Puligo's paintings are in desperate need of conservation or are
inaccessible, hidden away in private collections. Perhaps, as there
have been revivals of interest in his contemporaries of the early
Cinquecento, such as Franciabigio\(^9\) and Granacci,\(^10\) this state of
neglect will be lessened, and Puligo will receive wider attention, so
that others will come to appreciate his masterly works.
NOTES TO CONCLUSION

1 Freedberg, 1979, 689n.76.
2 Freedberg, 1979, 231.
3 Vasari, 1568, 4: 462-63.
4 Vasari, 1568, 4: 468. See also Milanesi in Vasari, 1568, 4: 468n.2.

5 See, e.g., Siena, Pinacoteca Nazionale, no. 562; Città di Castello, Pinacoteca; and formerly London, Farrer Collection.


7 See, e.g., Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts, no. 54; Cherbourg, Musée Thomas Henry; Halsingborg, A. Hyberg Collection; and Milan, Giulio Ferrario Collection.

8 The only exception to this is the possibility of Puligo's influence on Pontormo's Portrait of a Halberdier (see p. 113).


CATALOGUE OF PAINTINGS
No. 1. Madonna and Child with Infant St. John the Baptist and Two Angels, (fig. 1).

Beverly Hills, Karlsen Collection.

102 x 82 cm.


Given undisputedly to Puligo since the early Czernin catalogue.

The painting is one of Puligo's earliest compositions, as is evidenced by its dependency upon Ridolfo Ghirlandaio's style. The figure types are particularly close to Ridolfo's Angeles, c.1507-08, Accademia, Florence, fig. 2, (compare, for example, the Virgin with Ridolfo's left-hand angel in the right panel, or Puligo's angel in profile with Ridolfo's profile angel in the left panel). Puligo's drawing of the Virgin's hands, arm, and shoulder is also comparable to that in Ridolfo's painting, particularly those of the right-hand angel in the right panel.

While Puligo's figures closely relate to Ridolfo's, the over-all style of the Karlsen painting is distinct from Ridolfo's and prevents an attribution to him. In his painting, Ridolfo maintained a sense of descriptive realism, a quattrocentesque tradition that he inherited from his father. Draperies, faces, and landscapes, such as in the Madonna with SS. Francis and Mary Magdalen, 1503, Accademia, Florence, are carefully detailed and fully illuminated. This effect is absent from the Karlsen painting in which the figures are surrounded by shadow and pervading chiaroscuro. The Karlsen painting also differs in its spatial conception from those by Ridolfo, who
places his figures without crowding in the foreground and provides generous open vistas in the background (see, for example, the painting named above). In contrast, the Karlsen painting contains a compressed space with a closed background and thereby emphasizes a two-dimensional surface pattern. This sense of negated space and two-dimensional surface design is more indicative of Puligo's style than Ridolfo's and appears in numerous examples attributed to Puligo (see cat.no. 4, fig. 8; cat.no. 17, fig. 24; cat.no. 38, fig. 53).

Additional reasons for the attribution to Puligo are found in the presence in this painting of figurative arrangements and types that appear throughout his oeuvre. The placement of a figure in profile and another in three-quarter view on either side of the Virgin is repeated in the following paintings: The Madonna and Child with Two Angels, Galleria Borghese, Rome (cat.no. 3, fig. 4), the Madonna and Child with Two Angels, formerly Saunders Collection, London (cat.no. 5, fig. 10) and the securely attributed Vision of St. Bernard, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore (cat.no. 29, fig. 39). In facial types the angels are related to the Madonna and Child with Two Angels formerly in the Saunders Collection, and the Virgin compares with Madonna and Child with Two Angels in the Borghese painting cited above and the Madonna and Child with an Angel, St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Allentown (cat.no. 4, fig. 8). The Madonna in the documented Cestello Altarpiece, 1525-26, in Florence (cat.no. 30, fig. 41) is reminiscent of her counterpart in the Karlsen painting by the shape of her head, its tilted position, and the dimpled chin.
As other painters working in the second decade of sixteenth century, Puligo was inspired by the works of Raphael. The figurative arrangement of the Karlsen painting is based on Raphael's Florentine Madonna groups that he executed around 1506-08, particularly the *Madonna del Prato*, c.1506, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, no. 628. Puligo's pyramidal arrangement formed by the Madonna and two Children is a Raphaelesque design that attempts to create volumetric forms within a unified space. The chiaroscuro and dark background also compares with works by Raphael, such as the Bridgewater *Madonna*, 1507, National Gallery, Edinburgh. From this painting, Puligo also borrowed the general disposition of the upper torso of the Christ Child; compare the position of His arms, turn of the head, and fullness of the cheeks.

The evident borrowings from works by Ridolfo Ghirlandaio and Raphael place the painting among Puligo's first works, datable around c.1512. As one of his first efforts, the Karlsen painting is rather ambitious. The size of the panel itself is somewhat impressive; in Puligo's oeuvre, it is on the upper end of the mid-range scale. On the panel he paints three-dimensionally modeled figures but packs them in a constricted space. This spatial system emphasizes the surface design and appears to be a device entirely of Puligo's invention. It is used throughout his entire career and provides one of the means by which to determine the probability of Puligo's hand.

No. 2. *Madonna and Child*, (fig. 3).

Leningrad, Hermitage, no. 4738.

Panel; 93 x 68 cm.

Prov: Acquired in 1920 as "unknown Italian painter of the sixteenth century." Transferred from the State Museum Fund in Petrograd.

Attributed to Franciabigio by Levinson-Lessing and the 1976 Hermitage catalogue, but considered to be a very early Puligo by McKillop.

Puligo is the correct attribution, and close stylistic similarities to other early works attributable to him place it among his first paintings. The Virgin's facial type, tilt of the head, position of the right arm, folds of the right sleeve, and large hands are nearly identical to the *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist*, c.1512, Karlsen Collection, Beverly Hills (cat.no. 1, fig. 1). Like the Karlsen painting, many idiosyncracies of the style of the Hermitage painting, such as the Virgin's oval head, shape of the eyes, and large hands, derive from Puligo's early roots in Ridolfo Ghirlandaio's shop (compare, for example, with Ridolfo's *Angels*, c.1508, Accademia, Florence, fig. 2). This type is then repeated in other early paintings such as the *Madonna and Child with Two Angels*, Galleria Borghese, Rome (cat.no. 3, fig. 4) and the *Madonna and Child with an Angel*, Allentown (cat.no. 4, fig. 8), and her downward gaze and tilted head can generally be considered the prototype for the Virgin in Puligo's later documented Cestello Altarpiece, 1525-26, Florence (cat.no. 30, fig. 41).
Connections in the Hermitage Madonna with other paintings attributable to Puligo support the attribution to him. The animated pose of the Christ Child that is similar to the Christ in the Borghese Madonna and Child with Two Angels (cat.no. 3, fig. 4) appears as a flat two-dimensional design and has comparable motives in numerous paintings (see cat.no. 4, fig. 8; cat.no. 9, fig. 14; cat.no. 25, fig. 33). The hill in the background that frames the heads of the figures and the landscape at the left recalls Puligo's Holy Family with St. John the Baptist, Galleria Borghese (cat.no. 20, fig. 49). The trees in the landscape at the left, painted as long thin lines with short, choppy strokes for leaves are also common in Puligo's oeuvre (see cat.no. 15, fig. 22; cat.no. 36, fig. 51; cat.no. 50, fig. 66).

Like the Karlsen painting in which the figural group is based on Raphael's Florentine Madonna paintings, the Hermitage Madonna and Child is connected to Raphael's Small Cowper Madonna, c.1505, National Gallery, Washington by the placement of the seated Virgin on a bench before a low wall. The Child's pose, especially His legs, looks Raphaelesque. Because of the synthesis of ideas from Raphael and Ridolfo and the parallels to other early works attributable to Puligo, this painting can be placed c.1512, close in time to the Karlsen Madonna and Child.

No. 3. Madonna and Child with Two Angels, (fig. 4).
Rome, Galleria Borghese, no. 468.
Panel; tondo, 68 cm. diam.

Prov: In the Borghese inventories of 1693, St. I, no. 45; 1790, St. IX, no. 6; and 1833, 36.

Painted with Puligo's typical chromatic choices. The Virgin wears a crimson red dress with an orangish red sleeve and a dark blue-green mantle. The right figure, described as an angel but perhaps a saint holding a book, wears a light green robe. The figure on the left, clearly a winged angel, has a dark orange-colored robe with a green sleeve. The painting contains Puligo's misty melted forms, accentuated in this case by the dirty condition of the painting.

The painting was given to Andrea del Sarto in the antiquarian Borghese inventories until Venturi recognized it as a work by Puligo. All subsequent writers are in agreement with this latter attribution.

The isocephalic arrangement of figures in a constricted space and the painterly treatment reflects Puligo's study of early Cinquecento masters in Florence, particularly Raphael, Sarto, and Fra Bartolommeo. Sienese influences also pervade. These are observed in the angular pose of the Christ Child, the wavy ringlets of hair, the green-gray hues of the faces, and the general compositional arrangement. Sienese affinities occur early in Puligo's career and continue to appear steadily throughout his entire oeuvre. There is no one specific source for Puligo's Sienese borrowings. Neroccio
de'Landi, Sodoma, Beccafumi, and Andrea del Brescianino are some of the artists whose styles have elements that attracted Puligo's attention. Paola della Pergola may have also observed this Sienese bias when she stated that this painting was close in style and time to, and by the same painter as, the *Madonna and Child with Angels* at the Galleria Sabauda in Turin, no. 121 (see Attributed Paintings), a work that at the time of her writing was attributed to Brescianino and Girolamo del Pacchia. That painting is now given to Pacchia at the Galleria, no doubt a correct attribution, but once again the analogy to Puligo's work is clear in terms of composition, poses, hand gestures, and details such as decoration at the shoulders of the left angel and the diaphanous tunic of the Christ Child.

I would place the painting early in Puligo's career, c.1512-15.

No. 4.  *Madonna and Child with an Angel,* (fig. 8).

Allentown, (Pennsylvania), St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church, (Kress no. 1733).

Panel; 80.3 x 64.8 cm.


An unusual work in terms of its color. Rather than the traditional red dress, the Virgin wears a dark blue-green garment that darkens to black. The sleeve of her dress is gray mixed with a touch of purple. Her veil is also very dark with traces of blue-green. The Christ Child holds a gold crucifix and wears a pellucid tunic that buttons at the sides like that worn by the little Baptist in the Karlsen painting (cat.no. 1, fig. 1). Rose red is the color of the angel's dress with an unusual patch of yellow on the sleeve. His wing is gray with black shadows. On the opposite side is a green curtain, and the background of the scene is black.

The painting was given to Puligo by Longhi (ms. opinion, see Shapley) and Fredericksen and Zeri. Shapley calls it "Attributed to Andrea del Brescianino" based on its similarity to the *Madonna and Child in a Landscape* at Montpellier, (cat.no. 10, fig. 15), which is variously attributed to Brescianino and Puligo (here given to Puligo). Shapley acknowledges the possibility that the painting could be by Puligo and dates it around 1520, regardless of which painter it is by. She is correct in comparing the painting to the one in Montpellier. However, the pose of the Christ Child more closely imitates that in the *Madonna of Humility,* Galleria Borghese,
Rome, no. 338 (cat.no. 9, fig. 14), which is a variant of the one in Montpellier.

The painting is an early variation of Puligo's Madonna groups; in this case, the curtain supplants a figure. The tondo form of the composition, facial types, and the angular pose of the Christ Child are analogous to the Madonna and Child with Two Angels, Galleria Borghese, Rome, no. 468, (cat.no. 3, fig. 4). As in the Borghese panel, passages of awkward drawing appear, particularly in the pose of the angel and the long structureless arm of the Virgin. Influences from Sienese sources are also present as noted in the type of Christ Child and the green cast to the flesh tones.

Based on these observations an attribution to Puligo and an early date for the tondo are indicated. I would place it somewhere around 1515.

No. 5. Madonna and Child with Two Angels, (fig. 10).
Formerly London, Saunders Collection.
Medium and dimensions unavailable.
Prov: Untraced.

First ascribed to Puligo by Berenson. The painting is not widely published, but it represents Puligo at his best during his early career. Closely based in composition and the facial types and poses of the angels on one of Puligo's earliest works, the Karlsen Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Two Angels (cat.no. 1, fig. 1). In style the artist was inspired by paintings by Raphael and Sarto. The three-quarter length of the Virgin and the facial type of the Infant are derived from Raphael's Madonna del Granduca, 1505, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 178. The Christ Child's pose resembles that found in Raphael's Madonna del Baldacchino, c.1508, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 165, and the Large Cowper Madonna, 1508, National Gallery, Washington, no. 25. The diamond-shaped composition formed by the Virgin and Child resembles Sarto's Barberini Madonnina, c.1508-09, Galleria Nazionale Palazzo Barberini, Rome. Datable c.1516-20.

Puligo brings to the painting his own idiom of tightly constricted space, patented poses, and somewhat clumsy drawing of hands. Nevertheless, the tenderness of expression and the unity of the simplified shapes make the painting a fine example of High Renaissance classicism.
No. 6. **Madonna and Child**, (fig. 11).
Baroda, Baroda State Museum.
Panel, transferred to canvas; 66 x 49 cm.

**Prov:** Purchased by Marion H. Spielmann for the Maharaja Gaekwar of Baroda for the Baroda Gallery in the 1910s. Stored in London until 1920, then taken to India.

The painting was in very poor condition prior to its restoration in the late 1950s (see photos in Devkar and Drown, 97). The middle vertical section is almost entirely repainted; this includes the right side of the Virgin's face and left hand and portions of the Infant's body.

The work was attributed to Puligo in the early Baroda catalogue and by Devkar and Drown. It dates from Puligo's early career and is dependent in composition upon Raphael's **Madonna del Granduca**, 1505, (Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 178). The painting was made seemingly in close chronological proximity to another Raphaelesque work by Puligo, the Saunders **Madonna and Child with Two Angels** (cat.no. 5, fig. 10), and in the Virgin's facial type it is similar to the **Madonna and Child with Two Saints**, formerly Stanley Collection; sold Sotheby's, London, 14-15 July 1920, (cat.no. 7, fig. 12). Datable c.1515-17.

**Lit:** Baroda Catalogue, 1935, 4, no. 5. Devkar and Drown, 1960-61, 97-98.
No. 7. Madonna and Child with Two Saints. (fig. 12).

Formerly Stanley Collection; sold Sotheby's, London, 14-15 July 1920.

Panel; 90 x 69 cm.

Prov: Labouchere Collection, Stoke. Lord Taunton Collection.
Stanley Collection; sold Sotheby's, London, 14-15 July 1920, no. 42.


Attributed to Fra Bartolommeo in the collections of Labouchere and Taunton, but given to Puligo by Crowe and Cavalcaselle. In 1973 both Lockhart and Pace independently connected a drawing attributed to Puligo, the Madonna and Child with Two Saints, (Rudolf Collection, London), with the painting. Lockhart rejected the attribution of the drawing to Puligo and gave it and the painting to an unidentified follower of Sarto. Pace, on the other hand, retained the attribution of the drawing, and called the painting a Puligo also. I am in agreement with the latter.

Pace observed that the drawing is based on some drawings by Pontormo, the Study for the Visitation, c.1515, Berlin-Dahlem, Kupferstichkabinett, no. 4195 and the Study for a Madonna and Child with St. John, c.1515, Rome, GNS F.N. 2943r, (see Cox Rearick, 1964, 1: 109-10, 2: figs. 15, 18). Pace feels the painting and particularly the face of the Virgin, are inspired by Fra Bartolommeo's altarpieces, such as the Madonna and Child with Six Saints, San Marco, Florence, 1509, and the Pitti Pala, Accademia, Florence, 1512 (see Freedberg, 1961, 2: figs. 254, 264). He finds that the Christ Child recalls Sartesque infants, such as in his Holy
Family (Hermitage, Leningrad, no. 62). The Child's connection with Pontormo's Studies for the Visitomin Altar, c.1517 (Uffizi, Florence, no. 6520Fr) should also be pointed out.

While Pace's connections are plausible, one should not underestimate the importance of Sarto for the painting. The composition in general recalls his Madonna of the Goldfinch, c.1507, and the painterly effects and the facial types of the Virgin and Child are similar to those of the Dresden Marriage of St. Catherine, c.1512, (fig. 17).

The attribution to Puligo that Pace puts forward is plausible considering the painting's close stylistic connections to other works given to the artist. Compositionally, the isocephalic arrangement of the figures in a compressed, shallow space parallels the Madonna and Child with Two Angels, c.1515-17, formerly in the Saunders Collection (cat.no. 5, fig. 10) and the Madonna and child with Two Angels, c.1512-15, Galleria Borghese, Rome (cat.no. 3, fig. 4). Significant indicators of Puligo's hand are the Virgin's facial type, tilted head, and the diagonal placement of her left arm that recall the Virgin in the Saunders Madonna. Her visage is also reminiscent of the Madonna in the Madonna and Child, c.1515-17, Baroda State Museum, Baroda (cat.no. 6, fig. 11). While stylistic comparisons to Puligo's documented paintings are difficult to make, the painting should not be eliminated from his oeuvre as Lockhart suggests, based on the painting's close connections with other works attributable to Puligo during his first years as a painter.
The close stylistic relationship with the Saunders Madonna and Child with Two Angels and the Baroda Madonna and Child that are datable around 1515-17 suggest a date in the same vicinity. The sources of the painting, particularly those in Pontormo's works of c.1517, indicate that the work dates closer to c.1517.

The identity of the saints in the scene remains unclear. The bearded figure may be Joseph, but the young man in liturgical vestments cannot be named with certainty.

No. 8. **Madonna of Humility**, (fig. 13).

Sold Sotheby's, London, 1953.

Panel; 59 x 43 cm.


Given to Puligo at the Sotheby's sale.

The painting is Puligo's first version of the Madonna of Humility type (for variants, see below). The idea derives from Bartolommesque models, such as the *Madonna of Humility with Music-making Angels*, 1515, Hermitage, Leningrad. The Christ Child is imitative of Raphael's *Large Cowper Madonna*, 1508, National Gallery, Washington, no. 25 and Sarto's *Barberini Madonnina*, c.1508-09, Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini, Rome. The angular pose of the Child performs a similar function to poses in Puligo's earlier works in that the two dimensional pattern formed by his body co-exists with a three-dimensionality created by modeling. The zig-zag pose of the Madonna adds to this effect. Deficiencies in the drawing (e.g., the right hand of the Infant only has three fingers) and the presence of pentimenti in the Madonna's left foot cause me to date the painting around 1516-17 before the two other *Madonna of Humility* paintings, (cat.no. 9, fig. 14; cat.no. 10, fig. 15), which show a greater skill.
Lit: Unpublished.

Variants: Galleria Borghese, Rome, no. 338 (cat.no. 9, fig. 14).
Musée Fabre, Montpellier, no. 123 (cat.no. 10, fig. 15).
No. 9. Madonna of Humility with St. John the Baptist in the Background, (fig. 14).

Rome, Galleria Borghese, no. 338.

Panel; 86 x 64 cm.

Prov: Pergola states that the painting is not securely named in the antiquarian inventories of the Borghese. She suggests it may have come from the collection of Olimpia Aldobrandini, as a work by Andrea del Sarto. Listed in the Inventario Fidecommissario of the Borghese in 1833.

The Virgin wears a vermillion colored dress with a blue-green mantle and is placed in a landscape that is painted in lighter blue-greens for the vista on the right and dark browns for the hill on the left. A light cleaning would greatly enhance the colors which are darkened by dirt and varnish.

The painting was first given to the school of Raphael in the 1833 Borghese inventory. Giusti placed it in the Florentine school, and Venturi called it a work by Bugiardini. Bacchisacca was also suggested by Berenson in 1904, an attribution acknowledged but neither confirmed nor rejected by McComb. Longhi, after initially calling the painting an antique copy by an unnamed artist in 1927, suggested in 1928 that it might be a youthful work by Puligo. Berenson in 1936, Pergola, and Freedberg also attribute the painting to Puligo. Lockhart, however, states that the painting is wrongly attributed to Puligo, but does not give her reasoning.

The painting is a variant of the London Madonna and Child (cat. no. 8, fig. 13), different only in the more developed treatment of the background; a large hillock with pastoral vignette occupies the left-hand side of the panel and St. John the Baptist approaches
from the right-hand side. There is no reason to suggest that this version is not by Puligo's hand. The color choices, such as the red dress, blue-green robe, and light blue-green landscape at the right-hand side of the painting, are common to Puligo's oeuvre and are specifically comparable to cat.no. 16, fig. 22 and cat.no. 35, fig. 50. The soft handling of paint is characteristic of the artist's style, as are the broad treatment of the drapery and the stylized trees in the background (compare with cat.no. 16, fig. 22).

An additional, unmistakable indication of Puligo's presence is the awkward drawing of the Christ Child's hands. The fact that the painting is a variant also should not prejudice the attribution to Puligo; it is not unusual for the artist to repeat poses and facial types, even entire compositions.

Pergola found the painting to be reminiscent stylistically of Rosso's work and associated the painting with the Holy Family at the Galleria Borghese in Rome, no. 332 (now given to the Master of the Kress Landscape by Zeri, 1962, 220, 222). The comparison is relevant, particularly in the animated pose of the Christ Child, but Puligo's painting more closely relies on works by Raphael, Sarto, and Fra Bartolommeo (see text, pp. 75-77).

Freedberg dated the painting c.1514, but that seems too early to me. A couple of years later is probably more accurate.


Variants: Sold Sotheby's, London, 1953, (cat.no. 8, fig. 13).

Musée Fabre, Montpellier, no. 123, (cat.no. 10, fig. 15).
No. 10. Madonna of Humility with St. John the Baptist in the Background, (fig. 15).

Musée Fabre, Montpellier, no. 123.

Panel; 54 x 42 cm. The initials "A.A." are in the lower left corner.

Prov: Bruyas Collection, 1868; bequest to the Musée Fabre, Montpellier.

Originally called a work by Andrea del Sarto by the Museum (1904). This attribution was later questioned by the Museum (1926), and the painting was given to Sogliani. Crowe and Cavalcaselle considered it to be by a "tame imitator of Sarto." Venturi attributed the painting to Andrea del Brescianino. Berenson, Pergola, and Freedberg gave it to Puligo. Lockhart feels that the painting is wrongly attributed to Puligo, but does not give her reasoning.

As Freedberg pointed out (1972) the Montpellier painting is a later version of the Madonna of Humility at the Borghese, (cat.no. 9, fig. 14). In the complexity of the drapery and the evenness of the drawing, it shows a greater skillfulness in comparison to the previous Madonna of Humility paintings (cat.no. 8, fig. 13; cat.no. 9, fig. 14). The Madonna's pose repeats that in cat.nos. 8 and 9, but the Christ Child is more enveloped in the arms of His mother, the landscape is simpler, and the little Baptist is larger, appearing closer to the foreground.

The figures are modeled three-dimensionally, but the angular poses create a surface pattern that flattens out the sense of depth. This effect is found in Sienese painting in the Cinquecento which is like Puligo's also in that it is imbued with Florentine modeling, but
the surface is enlivened through color and lively poses and facial expressions. Venturi's attribution of the Montpellier to Brescianino, a Sienese painter, is understandable, considering Puligo's penchant for the Sienese style. Datable in the vicinity of 1517-18.


Variants: Sold Sotheby's, London, 1953, (cat.no. 8, fig. 13).

Galleria Borghese, Rome, no. 338, (cat.no. 9, fig. 14).
No. 11.  **Enthroned Virgin and Child**, (fig. 16).

Longniddry, (Scotland), Earl of Wemyss Collection.

Panel; 56 x 43 cm.

Prov: Purchased in Rome by the 10th Earl of Wemyss in 1845 or 1850.


Purchased by the Earl of Wemyss and exhibited at the Royal Academy as a Fra Bartolommeo. It is given to Albertinelli by Berenson, Venturi, and Borgo.

While there is a surprising consensus for Albertinelli, the painting is actually an early work by Puligo. The attribution to Albertinelli, however, may be explained by the painting's, albeit superficial, relationship to the central panel of Albertinelli's triptych of the **Madonna and Saints**, 1500, Museo Poldi-Pezzoli, Milan (Freedberg, 1961, 1: 55, 2: fig. 40). In Albertinelli's work the Madonna is seated on a throne, and curtains, drawn back and tied at the sides, flank the central figure. This essentially Quattrocentesque setting is also found in the Wemyss painting. Perhaps more closely associable with Albertinelli's style are the pervasive sfumato and chiaroscuro in the Wemyss painting that can be interpreted as an Albertinellian response to Bartolommesque principles which occurs towards 1510 and thereafter.

Elements of the painting are more closely linked to works by Puligo. The framing of the scene with curtains appears in the Karlsen **Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Two Angels** (cat.no. 1, fig. 1). The awkwardly drawn hands of the Christ Child,
His active pose, the simple folds of the Virgin's mantle, and the sfumato are all characteristics of Puligo's style. The facial type of the Virgin is analogous to that of the Virgin's in the aforementioned Holy Family, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 294 (cat.no. 12, fig. 19). Her tapered fingers and foreshortened right hand are repeated in the Palazzo Pitti Holy Family, the Madonna and Child, London (cat.no. 13, fig. 20), and the Madonna and Child with an Angel, Biskupska Pinakoteka, Dubrovnik (cat.no. 14, fig. 21).

The source for the Wemyss painting is Sarto's Marriage of St. Catherine in Dresden, c.1512, (fig. 17), from which Puligo borrows the pose of the Virgin, the position of the Christ Child's legs, and the chimerical motif.

The Wemyss painting is further linked to Puligo's oeuvre by being the prototype for the artist's later altarpiece, the Enthroned Virgin and Child with Two Saints, c.1521-22, at the Ringling Museum in Sarasota (cat.no. 26, fig. 34). Here the architecture of the throne, the type and pose of the Virgin, the arrangement of her robes, and the shape of the footstool correspond.

The stylistic ties of the Wemyss painting to cat.no. 12, fig. 19; cat.no. 13, fig. 20; and cat.no. 14, fig. 21, all of which are dated around 1517-18, suggest a date in the second half of the 1510s.

No. 12. **Holy Family**, (fig. 19).

Florence, Palazzo Pitti, no. 294.

Panel; 63 x 50 cm. Inscribed on the reverse of the painting: "1773 8 Luglio. Dall'Archivio Segreto del Palazzo dei Pitti."

**Prov:** Based on the inscription the painting has been at the Palazzo Pitti since at least 1773.

The painting depicts the Holy Family in an interior with a window and a landscape view. The Virgin, who supports the Christ Child with her right hand and holds a book in her left, wears a purple dress with an orangish red sleeve. Joseph holds a staff in his left hand and wears a crimson shirt with a dark coat. Gold paint trims the borders of their garments.

According to Rusconi, the **Holy Family** was formerly attributed to the school of Andrea del Sarto but he does not specify by whom; all citations give the painting to Puligo. The work undoubtedly is Puligo's first attempt among several versions of the Madonna and Child with a window and another figure. The crudely drawn right hand of the Virgin, her overly large eyes, and the large proportion of Joseph's head indicate Puligo's tentative beginnings at the composition.

Some aspects of the painting are derivative from his earlier paintings and other motifs reappear later. Familiar in Puligo's oeuvre are the pose and costume of the Child and the Sodomesque hair of the Virgin. The figure of Joseph reappears later in more refined versions in the **Holy Family** at the Palazzo Pitti in Florence, no. 486, (cat.no. 25; fig. 33) and at the Columbus Museum of Art (cat.no.
32, fig. 47). His cramped placement in the upper right hand corner
recalls Sienese compositional types that generally were influential
in the formation of Puligo's style. Probably painted around 1517-18.

475; 1936, 408; 1963, 1: 183. A. Venturi, 1932, 9/5: 249. Rusconi,
Bénézit, 1976, 8: 523.
No. 13. **Madonna and Child** (fig. 20).


Panel; 76 x 58 cm.


The painting was erroneously attributed to Franciabigio at the Mak sale. Given to Puligo by Grohn and at the Sotheby's sale.

Lockhart calls the painting a weak variant, not autograph, of the **Holy Family** at the Palazzo Pitti in Florence, no. 294 (cat.no. 12, fig. 19).

There is no satisfactory reason for rejecting the attribution of this painting to Puligo. Compositionally, it is a variant of the aforementioned Holy Family at the Palazzo Pitti, (fig. 19), and to my eye appears to be an improvement over his first attempt. The faces are more idealized, and there is a greater liveliness in the expression of the Christ Child, as against the vacuous look of the earlier one. The painting is further linked to Puligo's oeuvre by the facial type of the Infant which is repeated exactly in a later work, the Holy Family at the Galleria Borghese in Rome, no. 432, (cat.no. 34, fig. 49). Datable during the same period as its predecessor, the Pitti painting, c. 1517-18.


Dubrovnik, Biskupska Pinakoteka.

Panel; 86 x 63 cm. Inscribed with the name of Raphael on the reverse.

Prov: Located in a church in Lokrum in the seventeenth century where the work was considered to be by Raphael. Sent to Italy for repairs, to the dissatisfaction of the city who requested in 1672 that Cardinal Barberini intervene for its return. After the great earthquake in 1677, the monks of Lokrum sold the painting for 100 double gold Genoese coins. Later, it was bought back by the Republic and placed in the cathedral at Dubrovnik (see Fisković, 1963, 65 and Prijatelj, 1981, 47).

The painting is inscribed on the reverse with the name of Raphael, which probably led Skurla and Liepopili to attribute it to that artist. Westphal was the first to recognize the work as being by the hand of Puligo; her attribution is followed thereafter.

The painting is one of a group of works (cat.no. 12, fig. 19; cat.no. 13, fig. 20; cat.no. 15, fig. 22; cat.no. 25, fig. 33) based on the same compositional design—the Madonna and Child with a window and landscape view at the left and, often, another figure at the right. In this particular example an angel, similar in type to the left angel in the Karlsen painting (cat.no. 1, fig. 1), occupies the upper right corner. The Christ Child is in the same pose as that used in the London *Madonna of Humility* (cat.no. 8, fig. 13). The proportion of the Virgin is expanded in comparison to the two earlier variations, the *Holy Family*, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 294 (cat.no. 12, fig. 19) and the *Madonna and Child*, sold Sotheby's, London, 1976 (cat.no. 13, fig. 20), and suggests a more mature
reconsideration from around 1518. Prijatelj safely dates the work 1512-20.

No. 15. **Madonna and Child with an Angel**, (fig. 22).

Rome, Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini.

Panel; 86 x 62 cm. Inscribed on the reverse: I.M. Heberle Auktion Köln, Andrea del Sarto.

Provenance: Collection of Freiherr von der Ropp of Courland, Latvia; sold Heberle's, Cologne, 11 November 1890, no. 84. According to the sales catalogue, the painting was formerly in the Palazzo Vittori in Florence as a work by Andrea del Sarto, and it was praised by Vasari (not found in Vasari/Milanesi, and it is not mentioned in the Sarto monographs by Freedberg and Shearman). Richter incorrectly states that the painting was sold at Cologne in 1889. Bought from the von der Ropp sale by Henrietta Hertz, Palazzo Zuccari, Rome. Bequeathed by Hertz to the Italian government, 1913; deposited in the Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Corsini, Rome, 1919. At the Museo di Palazzo Venezia for a while; now stored at the Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini, Rome.

The Virgin wears a crimson dress with a blue mantle. The angel's robe is dark gray. Blue-green dominates the landscape scene. These are scattered losses of paint on the panel, especially in the area of the Virgin's nose. An excessive amount of gold paint decorates the borders of their garments and highlights the hair; it appears to have been added later. This gilding tends to detract from what over-all is a skillfully rendered painting, though in need of cleaning.

Attributed to Andrea del Sarto at the von der Ropp sale and by Lafenestre and Richtenberger. First signaled by Morelli (according to Richter) as a work by Puligo; all other writers are in agreement.

This painting is one of several variants of the Madonna and Child with a window and landscape view accompanied by another figure (cat.no. 12, fig. 19; cat.no. 13, fig. 20; cat.no. 14, fig. 21; cat.no. 25, fig. 33). In this example, the poses of the Virgin and Child are somewhat altered from the other types, and they look
directly out at the viewer. Compared to some of the other versions, such as the Holy Family, Palazzo Pitti, Florence (cat.no. 12, fig. 19), or the Madonna and Child, Sotheby’s, 1976 (cat.no. 13, fig. 20), the style shows a greater sense of monumentality enhanced by the circular flow of the drapery. There is also an increased virtuosity in the drawing, suggesting a date around 1518-19. The angel is a copy of the right-hand angel in the Saunders Madonna and Child, c. 1515-20, (cat.no. 5, fig. 10), and the motif of the angel's right arm crossed in front of the body is found in the Borghese tondo, c.1515, (cat.no. 3, fig. 4). Freedberg observes the style of Ridolfo Ghirlandaio in the painting and gives it a date around c.1512-13, a date that seems too early to me. Pergola places this work close in style and time to the Borghese tondo (cat.no. 3, fig. 4) and the Madonna and Child with Four Angels, Galleria Sabauda, Turin, no. 121 by Pacchia (see Catalogue of Attributed Paintings), but does not speculate on a date.

No. 16. Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and a Martyr Saint, (fig. 23).

Florence, Palazzo Pitti, no. 146.
Panel; 89 x 65.8 cm.
Prov: Un traced.

The Virgin wears a vermilion dress and the saint on the left is in purple. This saint wears liturgical vestments and hold in his right hand a martyr's palm and another object with a grid or cross-shaped pattern. The object could be a book, or as Rusconi suggested, a grill identifying the figure as St. Lawrence. (The saint is probably not a female martyr as Venturi believed.)

The attribution to Puligo first appeared in Inghirami and has never been questioned. The composition and poses resemble earlier types, such as the Madonna and Child with Two Saints, sold Sotheby's, London, 1920, (cat.no. 7, fig. 12). In general, the painting shows Puligo's artistic maturity in the increased volume of the figures. The Virgin's type closely relates to the Virgin in the Madonna and Child with an Angel, Galleria Nazionale, Rome (cat.no. 15, fig. 22) and has strong "family resemblances" to later ones (e.g., cat.no. 19, fig. 27; cat.no. 21, fig. 29). Other elements anticipate Puligo's later works. The facial type of the Christ Child later appears in the Madonna at the Palazzo Pitti, (cat.no. 25, fig. 33), and the pose and facial type of little St. John appears later in the Holy Family at the Columbus Museum of Art (cat.no. 32, fig. 47).
While the painting appears advanced in these aspects, there is still evidence of Puligo's disregard for details, such as the six-toed right foot of the Christ Child. Puligo's persistent emphasis on the picture plane is found in the frontal position of the figures, the flattened pose of the Christ Child, and the space constricted by the placement in a shallow niche. Lockhart called the painting an early work, but it more accurately belongs around 1518-21.

No. 17. Madonna of Humility with Musical Angels, (fig. 24).

Formerly Florence, Corsini Gallery, no. 175.

Panel; 114 x 82 cm.

Prov: Present location unknown.

Given to Sarto in the Gallery, but attributed to Puligo in the mid-nineteenth century by Fantozzi and Medici. Garneri retained the traditional attribution to Sarto; otherwise given to Puligo.

In this later version of the Madonna of Humility theme, the artist approaches the subject matter with inventiveness and a fine gentleness in mood. The composition is developed from works depicting the Madonna and Child with Musical Angels by Fra Bartolommeo and Sarto that date between 1513 and 1515. In this painting Puligo places the Madonna and Child off center and to the left. The little sleeping Baptist at the Virgin's knees contributes to the diagonal line that is formed by his body and those of the Virgin and Child. Above the Giovannino are two angels, one in profile and the other in three-quarter view, singing and playing the lute. The shadowy quality of the left angel recalls Sarto's Wallace Madonna of c.1517-19.

A charming painting in terms of the sweetness of mood and the harmony of the interconnecting forms—the Giovannino resting on the Virgin, the Virgin with her arms linked around the Christ Child, and the Christ Child with His arms encircled about the Virgin's neck. The heavy mist and the dark chiaroscuro warmly dissolve the forms into the rose bower that frames the figures' heads. The picture
space is still crowded as is Puligo's habit, but the engaging charm of the scene makes it one of the painter's most appealing works.

I agree with Freedberg's dating of c.1520-22.

No. 18. **Madonna and Child with SS. Catherine of Alexander and John the Baptist**, (fig. 25).

Pisa, Museo Civico, no. 198.

Panel; 101.5 x 78.5 cm.

Prov: In the early twentieth century, the painting was at the Duomo in Pisa, hanging in the nave in the area of the Cappella di S. Ranieri. Deposited by the Opera della Primaziale in the Museo Civico, Pisa (Bellini-Petri). It is tempting to speculate a connection between this painting and the lost or untraceable **Madonna and Child with St. Catherine** owned by Agnolo Niccolini, Archbishop of Pisa, that was cited by Vasari and Bocchi and Cinelli (see Lost Works).

In ruinous condition with only the right side of the Virgin's face and left hand, the faces of the saints, and the upper left corner of landscape essentially intact. Major losses of paint throughout. In spite of the condition, one can determine that the Virgin's dress is crimson red, the sleeve is gold, and the mantle is blue-green.

Given by all writers to Puligo.

The figure arrangement is essentially a reworking of an earlier work, the Saunders Madonna (cat. no. 5, fig. 10), with Puligo here making use of his knowledge of Sarto's paintings; the poses of the saints are derived from the angels in Sarto's San Gallo Annunciation, c.1510 (fig. 26) and the Virgin recalls the one in the Madonna of the Harpies, 1515-17, (fig. 42). The particular motif of the gathered drapery in the left hand of the Virgin, her pose in general, and the outward gesture of the Christ Child must have served as a prototype for Puligo's altarpiece at Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi, 1525-26, (cat. no. 30, fig. 41). The numerous folds of the drapery suggest
that the painting can be placed approximately in the period of
1518–21.

30. Berenson, 1932, 476; 1936, 409; 1963, 1: 184. A. Venturi, 1932,
No. 19. *Madonna and Child*, (fig. 27).
Vienna, Akademie, no. 252, destroyed.
Panel; 74 x 54 cm.
Prov: Untraced.

The attribution to Puligo is undisputed. The painting represents Puligo's style of his early maturity which is characterized by softly modeled voluminous forms placed in misty settings. The faces are idealized types that often appear around 1520. The composition closely compares with the Pisa *Madonna* (cat.no. 18, fig. 25), but is also closely connected to Sarto's San Gallo *Annunciation*, c.1510, (fig. 26), particularly the position of the left arm and hand, and the finger that marks a place in her book. The Vienna painting, like the Pisa one, foreshadows Puligo's altarpiece at Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi, 1525-26, (cat.no. 30, fig. 41) in the facial type and pose of the Christ Child.

The *Madonna and Child* dates c.1520-22.

No. 20. Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist, (fig. 28).
Florence, Palazzo Pitti, no. 242.
Panel; 105 x 88 cm.
Prov: In the 1624 inventory of the villa of the Poggio Imperiale.

One of Puligo's more colorful Madonna paintings. The Virgin wears an crimson dress with a blue-green mantle over her lap. The Christ Child is wrapped in purple and the little Baptist is painted in umbers. The background is draped with a curtain painted bottle green that contrasts with the Virgin's dress.

Given to Puligo in the 1624 inventory. All writers are in agreement, except for Crowe and Cavalcaselle who thought the painting was more like Fra Bartolommeo than Puligo, and Freedberg who in the second edition of his Painting of the High Renaissance . . ., 1972, qualified his attribution and gave it to Puligo with question.

This painting is a type new to Puligo's repertoire. The Virgin sits in profile as she nurses the infant Christ. St. John the Baptist cheerily looks at the Mother and Child. The hazy mist that softens the forms and the fluid handling of the drapery place the painting close in time to the Corsini Madonna of Humility (cat.no. 17, fig. 24). Freedberg dates the painting c.1517-18, but the work may have been executed a year or so later.


Copy: Crowe and Cavacaselle note a copy of the Virgin and Child at the Belvedere in Vienna, no. 17, by a pupil of Fra Bartolommeo.
No. 21. *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist*, (fig. 29).
Formerly Duca di Montaltino Collection, Naples.
Medium and dimensions unavailable.
Prov: Untraced.

Given to Puligo by Berenson and Lockhart.

In this composition Puligo returns to an earlier design found in the *Madonna of Humility*, sold Sotheby's, London, 1953 (cat.no. 8, fig. 13). The Child is pulled close to His mother and His legs are splayed in the customary manner. The little Baptist is positioned in the lower right-hand corner as he is in the Stanford *Madonna* (cat.no. 22, fig. 30).

While the composition and poses derive from earlier works, the hazy atmosphere, the shadowy forms, and the gathered folds of the drapery make this work closely associable with a group of paintings that seem to have been painted at the end of the second and the beginning of the third decade of the sixteenth century (see, e.g., cat.no. 20, fig. 28; cat.no. 22, fig. 30).

No. 22. Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and an Angel, (fig. 30).

Stanford, Stanford University Museum, no. 54.250.

Panel; 108 x 89 cm.


The Virgin wears a red-rose dress with a scarf in gray with purple striations. The angel's dress is painted in a reddish brown. Cool grays comprise the background.¹

A notice from the Newton Galleries attributes the painting to Puligo based on the opinion of Hermann Voss given at some prior unspecified time. The only other attribution is made by Fredericksen and Zeri, who also call the painting an authentic Puligo.

The inspiration for the composition of the Child standing on a low wall with the little Baptist below derives from paintings by Albertinelli—the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist of 1509 in the Basevi-Gambarana Collection in Genoa and the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist in the Harewood Collection, Harewood House, Yorkshire (Borgo, 326-29, figs. 30-31).

The placement of an angel at the left-hand side of the painting flanking the Madonna and Child is like that in the Allentown Madonna and Child with an Angel (cat. no. 4, fig. 8). Connections to the Allentown tondo can also be found in the position of the Virgin's left arm; her left hand repeats the separation of the fingers seen in the right hand in the tondo. The angel is analagous to the angel at
the right in the Karlsen Madonna and Child with Two Angels (cat.no. 1, fig. 1).

While relationships to Puligo's early works are apparent, the Stanford painting is more closely related to works of the late 1510s. The interlace of hands, arms, and legs moving in a diagonal from center left to lower right compares with the Naples Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist (cat.no. 21, fig. 29). The forceful chiaroscuro and sfumato compare with the Vienna Madonna and Child (cat.no. 19, fig. 27) and the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist (cat.no. 21, fig. 29). The Virgin's visage—three-quarter profile, straight nose, and half-shadowed face—corresponds to later versions (e.g., cat.no. 25, fig. 33; cat.no. 32, fig. 47; cat.no. 33, fig. 48). The twisted position of the Christ's head resembles the little Baptist in the Naples Madonna (cat.no. 21, fig. 29). His facial type anticipates the type used in the 1520s (e.g., cat.no. 32, fig. 47; cat.no. 33, fig. 48).

The interesting weaving of limbs, the elongated forms, and the twisting poses reveal Puligo's proto-mannerist tendencies and suggest a date around 1518-20.


Variant: Sold Berlin, Gesellschaft für Kunst und Litteratur, 11-12 November 1908, no. 9, Madonna and Child with St. John and Two Angels.

1My thanks to Dr. Francis L. Richardson for these observations.
No. 23. Enthroned Virgin and Child, (fig. 31).
Modena, Galleria Estense, no. 509.
Panel; 93 x 71.5 cm.
Prov: Entered the Gallery between 1814-1821.

The Virgin wears a crimson dress with a light pinkish-purple veil across her head and a green mantle across her lap. The Christ Child is wrapped with a diaphanous white cloth that Venturi believed to be a later addition.

The painting was attributed to Andrea del Sarto by Castellani Tarabini in 1854. Crowe and Cavalcaselle noted there were eight paintings wrongly attributed to Sarto in the Modena Gallery. Given to Puligo by all other writers, except Berenson in 1932 and 1936 who questioned the attribution to Puligo.

The painting depicts the Infant Christ standing on the left leg of the Virgin who is seated on a throne. Behind them is a view of a gently sloping mountainous landscape. The pose of the Child is reminiscent of the Madonna and Child, National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, given to the school of Andrea del Sarto (also at one time given to Puligo, see Attributed Works). The gesture and elongated fingers of the Virgin's right hand are repeated from an early work the Madonna and Child with an Angel at Allentown (cat.no. 4, fig. 8). The figures are becoming increasingly monumental and the drapery is painted with wide ridges that resemble the folds of the drapery in the Holy Family at the Palazzo Pitti in Florence, no. 486 (cat.no. 24, fig. 36). The Modena painting is further linked to cat.no. 24 by
the facial type and downward gaze of the Virgin, the contrapposto
pose and facial type of the Child, and the elongated hands of the
adult figures.

Modern scholars do not venture a date for the work. I believe,
however, it is datable in or near 1520.

Lit: Castellani Tarabini, 1854, 87, no. 316. A. Venturi, 1878, 96.
No. 24. **Holy Family**, (fig. 32).

Florence, Palazzo Pitti, no. 486.

Panel; 79 x 58 cm.

**Provenance:** Part of the early nucleus of the Palatine Gallery (Ciaranfi).

The Virgin wears a vermilion colored dress with orange sleeves, a purple veil, and a blue mantle. Joseph's shirt is purple with an orange mantle.

The attribution to Puligo is undisputed. The painting is closely related to the *Enthroned Virgin and Child* at the Galleria Estense in Modena (cat.no. 23, fig. 31), which dates c.1520. The two paintings are similar in the depiction of the Christ Child, the facial type of the Virgin, and the treatment of the drapery. The figure of Joseph recalls the type used in the *Holy Family* at the Palazzo Pitti (cat.no. 12, fig. 19) and repeated later in the Columbus *Holy Family* (cat.no. 32, fig. 47). Again, as in the Modena painting, the figures show an increased proportion which sets the precedent for Puligo's large scale altarpieces.

Datable in or near 1520 based on the figure's monumental proportion which approaches those found in Puligo's *Vision of St. Bernard* (cat..no. 29, fig. 39), datable c.1523-24. No other opinions on this point are offered by modern scholars.


**Copy:** Rotterdam, van Marle, De Silla and Baan sale, 15-16 July 1942, p. 13, no. 168.
No. 25. **Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist**, (fig. 33).

Florence, Palazzo Pitti, no. 145.

Panel; 95.8 x 70.5 cm.

**Prov:** May be the painting listed in the Tribuna inventory of 1589 as "uno simile d'una Vergine, in asse, con sue cornice simile alle di sopra, di mano del Puligo," (in Aurelio Gotti, "Estratto dell'inventario del 1589 esistente in Galleria nella sala della Tribuna," *Le Gallerie di Firenze* [Florence, 1872] 325. Definitely in the Tribuna of the Uffizi by 1763 as a *Madonna and Child with the Adolescent St. John the Baptist* by Puligo (in Benedetto Vincenzo de Greyss e Collaborati, *Inventario illustrato della Galleria degli Uffizi*, 1748-1765, Gainetto Disegni e Stampe, Uffizi, nos. 4492-4588F. Reproduced in Millar, 1966, 17, fig. 17). Milanesi suggested this painting may be the *Spini Madonna* cited by Vasari. The painting that Vasari described, however, had four figures, not three as there are in this work (see Lost Works).

This is Puligo's final version of the seated Madonna and Child in an interior with a window and a landscape view accompanied by another figure. In this case, the figure is the adolescent St. John the Baptist who with his left hand points at the Christ Child. Although the painting has darkened, Puligo's usual colors are present in the crimson dress and blue-green mantle of the Virgin.

Among all the paintings of this type, No. 25 is the most mature (see cat.no. 12, fig. 19; cat.no. 13, fig. 20; cat.no. 14, fig. 21; and cat.no. 15, fig. 22). The sweet expression of the Virgin in the *Madonna and Child with an Angel* at the Galleria Nazionale in Rome (cat.no. 15, fig. 22), c.1518-19, has become more resolute. The proportion of the Virgin is monumental, and there is an interesting play of drapery that encircles the large forms. St. John in type corresponds to St. Quentin, the saint on the left in the Sarasota
Altarpiece, c.1521-22, (cat. no. 26, fig. 34), indicating that this Madonna probably dates in proximity to it, or predates it by a year or two (c.1519-20). Grohn gives the painting a reasonable date of c.1518-20; Freedberg places it too late in c.1524-25.


Copy: Dublin, Mrs. James A. Murnaghan Collection.
No. 26. Enthroned Virgin and Child with Two Saints, (fig. 34).

Sarasota, Ringling Museum of Art.

Panel; 154.8 x 170.9 cm.

Prov: It is known with certainty that the Enthroned Virgin was in the collection of Robert Holford of London by 1851. It passed by descent to Sir George Holford (see Benson), who sold the painting at Christie's, London, 15 July 1927, no. 85; bought by Goldschmidt according to the sales information. John Ringling at some point purchased the work, and according to Tomory, it was acquired from the Holford sale (there are, however, no records at the Ringling Museum to verify this). Venturi (1932, 9/5: 249) cited an Enthroned Virgin with Two Saints in the collection of Julius Böhler of Munich in 1928, and Suida, followed by Lockhart, identified the Ringling painting as being in this collection prior to going to Sarasota. Since it is not known exactly when the Enthroned Virgin entered the Ringling collection, it is possible, as Suida suggested, that the work was in Julius Böhler's Gallery in Munich in 1928 after the Holford sale of 1927.

Gronau proposed that the Sarasota painting is the altarpiece that Puligo was commissioned to paint in 1525 for the Genoese church of San Benigno (Document 4). Tomory supported this theory and further identified the saint on left as St. Benignus, rather than St. Quentin as is traditional.

A more satisfactory proposal for the provenance is presented by Lockhart who suggests that the painting originated from the Cistercian Abbey of S. Salvatore at Badia a Settimo, where prior to World War II a copy (18th century?) hung. Silvia Meloni Trkulja in Il Primato del disegno has independently come to the same conclusion.

Exhib: London, British Institution, 1851, no. 93.

London, British Institution, 1867, no. 52.

The condition of the painting is good, in need of only a light cleaning to remove surface dirt. At some point the infant Christ received a purple crown which when viewed under ultra-violet light reveals that His evenly shaped head with curly hair are still intact. The colors of the painting are typical of Puligo's range and are especially luminous in this work, showing the high level of refinement that the artist was able to bring to the Florentine
classical tradition of the High Renaissance. The Virgin is dressed in crimson red trimmed in gold and is covered by a blue-green robe that is gray-purple underneath. The light greenish tan of her flesh—typical of the artist's style—compares with the Madonna and Child with an Angel, Galleria Nazionale, Rome (fig. 24) and the Holy Family with St. John the Baptist, Galleria Borghese, Rome (fig. 27). The shirt of St. Quentin is gray lightened with yellow, and the robe worn about his lower torso is a vibrant light scarlet color that is bottle green on the inside. St. Placidus on the right wears the white Cistercian robe of his order; the color here, however, appears brown from layers of dirt. Above the saints are two putti wearing diaphanous tunics that button at the sides, apparel that appears in other Infants depicted by the artist (see, e.g., fig. 1, 8, 21). The putti are drawing back green curtains of the same color and intensity as the inside of St. Quentin's robe.

The altarpiece almost surely came from the Cistercian Abbey of S. Salvatore at Badia a Settimo. When the original was removed, it was replaced with a copy (nearly destroyed during World War II with only fragments surviving). The saints were first identified by Crowe and Cavalcaselle as St. Sebastian and a Friar. In the Holford catalogue (Benson), they are identified as St. Placidus on the right, a Cistercian monk and follower of St. Benedict, and St. Quentin on the left, whose attributes are two spits which he holds in his right hand. Lockhart points out that the relics of St. Quentin are preserved in the Cappella di S. Quintino at the Abbey at Badia a Settimo. She further notes that the chapel was decorated in 1629 by
Giovanni da S. Giovanni with frescoes of St. Quentin and St. Lawrence in full-length, and, as in Puligo's painting, with flying putti raising curtains. While Tomory identified the left hand saint as St. Benignus, the patron saint of Dijon, whose attributes are also two spits, and thus connects the painting with Puligo's Genoese commission of December, 1525 for the church S. Benigno, the fact that a copy hung at Badia a Settimo and the evidence presented by Lockhart seem to indicate that the painting was originally intended for the Abbey. It should further be pointed out that Puligo received other commissions from the Cistercians, the Madonna and Child with Six Saints at S. Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi and the Visions of Count Ugo at Badia a Settimo, the latter noted by Vasari but no longer extant (see Lost Works).

Stylistically, the Sarasota painting does not readily accommodate the 1525 date of the Genoese commission, but seems rather to date around 1521-22. This important altarpiece appears to be the earliest of the large-scale compositions by Puligo that dominate his production during the 1520s. The style of the painting is characteristic of Puligo and reveals the moment when the sophistication and fluency of his later altarpieces is becoming evident. The composition is simply arranged, but forms are locked together in calculated complementary curves. The Virgin's face, Bartolommesque in type (compare with the Madonna and Child with SS. Stephen and John the Baptist, 1509, Lucca Cathedral), is analogous to Puligo's own early Madonnas (e.g., cat.no. 5, fig. 10; cat.no. 11, fig. 16; cat.no. 24, fig. 32) but lacks the specific idiosyncratic
qualities of his later works, such as the closely set eyes of the Cestello Altarpiece (cat.no. 30, fig. 41). St. Placidus shares the same physical traits as St. Bernard in the Vision of St. Bernard (fig. 39), giving additional support for dating the altarpiece early in the 1520s.

It is interesting that the same Virgin and Child framed by a niche is found in another work, the Madonna and Child in the collection of the Earl of Wemyss of Longniddry, Scotland (cat.no. 11, fig. 16). The painting is attributed to Albertinelli, but it seems to be in fact by Puligo. The work is early, c.1517, and is a reworking of Sarto's Marriage of St. Catherine, c.1512, Gemäldegalerie, Dresden (fig. 19). Its relationship to the Sarasota altarpiece shows Puligo's typical method of working--earlier compositions are reworked, expanded, and refined into remarkable works.


Copy: Enthroned Virgin and Child with Saints, Abbey of S. Salvatore, Badia a Settimo (nearly destroyed during World War II).
No. 27. **Annunciation**, (fig. 35).

Florence, Private Collection.

Panel; 94 x 144 cm.

Prov: Untraced.

Attributed to Puligo in Berenson's photographic archives, but given to Sarto by Monti, who observes that the panel is in poor condition.

The composition and figures of the Annunciation have several sources. The horizontal format of the scene, the interior setting with a doorway in the center and a bed at the right, and the pose of Gabriel derive from Albertinelli's predella of the Annunciation from the Visitation Altarpiece of 1503 (Uffizi, Florence, no. 1587). The angels grouped at the left of the scene suggest that Puligo may have also observed the Annunciation dated 1510 by Albertinelli (Accademia, Florence). A connection with Sarto's San Gallo Annunciation, c.1510, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 124 (fig. 26) also seems undeniable. The two clustered angels, one in profile and the other in three-quarter view, and the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove soaring above their heads, recall the group at the right in Sarto's painting. The similarity in Puligo's Annunciation of the Virgin's costume and facial type (observe the closely set eyes and downward gaze) to the Virgin in the San Gallo Annunciation reveal an additional connection between the two works.

Monti also observed a connection between No. 27 and Sarto's San Gallo Annunciation but concluded that the former was attributable to
Sarto. He linked the work stylistically with early paintings attributed to Sarto, such as the Borghese predella, c. 1507-09, Galleria Borghese, Rome, no. 375 (see Freedberg, 1963, 1: figs. 4-6), and believed it datable in the vicinity of the frescoes of 1510 on the life of S. Filippo Benizzi.

To me, however, the style of the Annunciation fits more convincingly in the oeuvre of Puligo than in Sarto's. If one compares the panel with, for example, the Borghese predella, as Monti suggests, two distinct styles can be discerned. Sarto draws numerous small folds in the drapery while Puligo treats the fabric as broad surfaces with few creases. In addition, Puligo creates a hazy ambience in which the edges of forms mingle with the atmosphere in a way that is very different from the sharply focused figures and drapery by Sarto.

Connections with Puligo's own paintings indicate that the Annunciation fits satisfactorily into Puligo's oeuvre. The costume of the Virgin and the simple treatment of the drapery resembles that of the Virgin in the Enthroned Virgin and Child with Two Saints, datable c.1521-22, Ringling Museum, Sarasota (cat.no. 26, fig. 34). The angels at the left of the Annunciation share similar poses and facial types to those that flank the Virgin in the Vision of St. Bernard, c.1523-24, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore (cat.no. 29, fig. 39). The stylistic association of the Annunciation with these paintings and the simplistic yet classicizing conception of the
painting suggests a date around 1521–22, but predating the *Vision of St. Bernard* by a year or so.

No. 28. **Altarpiece**, (fig. 36).

San Miniato al Tedesco, Cappella del Loretino.

Panel: **Annunciation**, c.40.5 x 40.5 cm. each; **Angels**, c.76 x 40.5 cm. each; **St. Miniato** and **St. Genesius**, c.132 x 58.5 cm. each.

**Prov:** Untraced.

The altarpiece is in a deplorable state, hopefully soon to be rectified by its move to the conservation laboratory in Pisa. The altarpiece is cited only by Berenson as a work Puligo.

A sculpture of the Virgin and Child stands in the large central niche, and on either side of the work are panels each depicting an angel. Above them are two panels that form the scene of the Annunciation; Gabriel is represented on the left panel and Mary on the right panel. The two outermost panels depict St. Miniatus on the left, a youthful figure wearing a crown and holding a wand,¹ and St. Genesius, a bearded man displaying a viol and bow.² Both saints are the patrons of San Miniato a Tedesco.³ Directly below each saint, in the predella, is a scene of their martyrdom by decapitation. Scenes from the Passion of Christ are depicted in the remaining predella scenes: **Christ Carrying the Cross**, **Pieta**, **Entombment**, and **Noli Me Tangere**.

The ornate gilded frame of the altarpiece resembles sculptured tabernacles of the late fifteenth century and early sixteenth century, such as the Corbinelli Altar, 1485-1500, by Andrea Sansovino at Santo Spirito in Florence (fig. 37). Puligo's work, however, is carried out in paint, rather than stone, and may have been based on the original design for the Santo Spirito Altar of St. Nicholas of
Tolentino preserved in a drawing by Jacopo (?) Sansovino (fig. 38). The sculptured version was never executed, but Franciabigio received the commission to execute the work in paint. While Franciabigio's altarpiece does not survive in its entirety, Puligo's knowledge of it is demonstrated in the similarity of the design of the Cappella del Loretino Altar to the original drawing by Sansovino. In each, a central statue is flanked by representations of angels. Above the angels is the Annunciation depicted in two panels; the Virgin is on the right panel and Gabriel is on the left. Puligo extended the design of the altarpiece in the drawing by adding the images of Saints Miniato on the left and Genesius on the right.

Figural sources for the paintings are found in Albertinelli's and Sarto's oeuvres. The pose of Gabriel is like that in Albertinelli's 1503 and 1510 Annunciations (Uffizi, Florence, no. 1587, and Accademia, Florence). The facial type and pose of the angels that flank the central statue are modeled on the Baptist in Sarto's Fries Madonna dated c.1520 or 1521 (Anthony de Rothschild Collection, Ascott).

Sarto's work therefore establishes a terminus ante quem for Puligo's painting. A confirmation of the chronological placement of the altarpiece in the early 1520s is suggested by the stylistic affinities of the painting within Puligo's own work. The pose of Gabriel is also found in the Florentine Annunciation, datable c.1521-22 (cat.no. 27, fig. 35). But the clearest suggestion of the date of the work is revealed by the large-scale and great breadth of the figures of Saints Miniato and Genesius who compare in
monumentality to the Virgin of Puligo's *Vision of St. Bernard*, c.1523-24, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore (cat.no. 29, fig. 39).

Although the condition of the work prevents any study of the painterly quality, I suspect that the altarpiece precedes by a year or two the *Vision of St. Bernard*, which is quite refined in its handling of paint. It would thus be datable c.1521-23.


3St. Miniato is the titular saint of San Miniato al Tedesco, and St. Genesius, patron saint of people of the theater, is another protector based on the city's special vocation for drama. The Institute of Popular Drama still conducts summer festivals at San Miniato (*San Miniato (Pisa) [San Miniato: Associazione Turistica Pro-Loco, n.d.]* n. pag.)

Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, no. 37.652.

Panel; 214 x 171.9 cm. Inscription: the monogram M.A. is engraved on the reverse of the panel and on the frame.

Prov: When Vasari noted this painting it was in the collection of Giovanni Gualberto del Giocondo and his brother Niccolo, a Canon of San Lorenzo in Florence (Vasari 1568, 4: 465). The large size of the panel suggests it was made as an altarpiece for a church but no evidence exists to confirm this. The painting is recorded in the collection of Don Marcello Massarenti, an appointee of Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius X, where it is attributed to Puligo (Catalogue d'une collection de tableaux de diverses écoles spécialement des écoles italiennes, Rome, 1881, no. 55 and Catalogue du Musée de peinture, sculpture et archeologie au Palais Accoramboni: première partie, tableaux, Rome, 1897, no. 126). It was acquired from the Massarenti Collection in 1902 by Henry Walters of Baltimore, becoming a part of the Walters Art Gallery in 1937.

First recorded by Vasari who described the painting as "...una Nostra Donna con alcuni Angeli e putti ed un San Bernardo che scrive...." Even though the Scint in the Walters painting is not actually writing and there are no putti present (unless the passage refers to the figures in the background), the painting undoubtedly is the one to which Vasari refers. The attribution to Puligo has never been questioned, although the painting is not widely published and did not appear in any literature from the late sixteenth to the late nineteenth century. Zeri, in 1962, was the first to associate the Walters painting with Vasari's reference.

Vasari regarded this painting as Puligo's finest work, an estimation almost assuredly correct in terms of the handling of color. Lively areas of crimson red, blue-green, golden orange, and dark green that comprise the garments of the figures on the left contrast with the mellow creamy white of St. Bernard's robe.
Elsewhere various gradations of blue-green create a cool atmospheric quality. Collectively, the colors form a striking **vivezza**, that is surpassed in Florence only by Sarto's colorism of the same time.

The specific source for Puligo's **Vision** is from Perugino's **Vision of St. Bernard** dating about 1494 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich; formerly located at Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi in Florence). Puligo repeats the poses of the Virgin and St. Bernard of Perugino's painting but increases the proportion of the figures, particularly the Virgin, to a breadth that may reflect and does resemble the female figure canon of Granacci in the 1510s (e.g., **Madonna and Child with SS. Francis and Zenobius**, c.1515-16, Accademia, Florence).

Other motifs in the **Vision of St. Bernard** are borrowed from Sarto. The angel with his arms crossed in front of his body appears in Sarto's **San Gallo Annunciation**, c.1510, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 124 (fig. 26), and the hillock topped with architectural complexes recalls in a general way the landscape backgrounds in Sarto's early work (e.g., Barberini **Madonnina**, c.1508-09, Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini, Rome, or **Punishment of the Gamblers**, c.1510, Chiostricino, SS. Annunziata, Florence). Even more specifically, the landscape with figures and animals that actively weave through the background at the right recall the distant vistas in Sodoma's paintings, such as the **St. George and the Dragon**, 1516-18, National Gallery, Washington, no. 1155, and in the Master of the Kress Landscapes' **Scenes from a Legend**, National Gallery, Washington, no. 437 A,B,C. While Puligo's choices of inspiration in this painting cannot fully be explained, especially the incorporation of Sienese
motifs which however are found throughout his entire career, the synthesis of compositions and figures from other artists underlines Fuligo's desire to create a harmoniously arranged scene with boldly modeled figures.

Various dates have been given to the painting. Berenson (1936) and Lockhart consider it an early work, while Freedberg gives the painting a c.1523 date, Zeri, c.1520, and Lesher, early 1520s. The grandeur of the figures and the equilibrium of the composition place the work in the most classicizing phase of Fuligo's maturity around 1523 or 1524 when he was painting large compositions with full-length figures, rather than half-length Madonna and Child paintings as he did almost entirely in the 1510s. The lack of exaggerated proportions or a sense of pathos suggests that the Vision of St. Bernard predates the artist's last works, such as the Deposition at Anghiari, c.1527 (cat.no. 38, fig. 53), or the Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple at Santa Maria degli Angiolini in Florence, c.1527 (cat.no. 39, fig. 54). Vasari implies the chronological position of the painting by citing it before the Madonna and Child with Six Saints (Florence, Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi, 1525-26) and the Florentine tabernacle, the Marriage of St. Catherine and St. Peter Martyr of 1526.

No. 30. Madonna and Child with Six Saints (John the Baptist, Paul, Peter, Bernard, Matthew, and Catherine of Alexandria), (fig. 41).

Florence, Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi (Cestello). Removed from this site after the 1966 flood, and presently stored at the Gabinetto del Restauro in Florence.

Panel; 213 x 175 cm.

Prov: Commissioned by Paolo di Ser Giovanni da Romena for the fourth chapel on the right at Cestello, which he purchased in 1525.

Engraved: Marco Antonio Lastri, L'Etruria Pitrice (Florence, 1791), 1: fig. 35.


The painting is in relatively good condition, notwithstanding a large vertical crack in the center of the panel. A light cleaning, made prior to the 1980 exhibition, reveals that Puligo used a broad range of colors muted by a dark sfumato that encompasses the entire scene. The Virgin is painted with Puligo's standard array of colors: a crimson red dress, a blue-green mantle that is purple on the inside, yellow sleeves, and a purple veil over her head. St. John the Baptist holds an orange-red cloak, and behind him St. Paul wears a blue-green robe, while St. Peter's is dark orange. St. Bernard's white Cistercian robe is painted with a light creamy yellow that grays in the shadows. Purple and bottle-green colors are used for the garments of St. Matthew, and St. Catherine's are pink. The marble flooring in the foreground of the scene is painted in light pinks and greens. Over-all the colors are sobered by the dark umber of the background that is brought up to a dark green-gray.
The altarpiece stood in a chapel purchased by Paolo di Ser Giovanni da Romena on 22 April 1525 for a tomb for his brother Bernardo (Documents 1 and 2). Da Romena originally wished to build a tomb chapel in the Duomo, but when his request was denied, he purchased a chapel from the Cistercians at Cestello. According to Signorini, Da Romena commissioned Puligo to paint the altarpiece in 1525: ...la qual' cappella per l'anno 1525 l'ebbero quei da Romena, ove e una Tavola di mano del Puligo pittore (Document 3). The decoration of the chapel was nearly completed by 31 March 1526, and the "bella tavola" by Puligo was installed sometime after that date: Et tutte le sopradette cose excepto la tavola sono finite questo ultimo di marzo 1526 (Document 3).

Da Romena dedicated the chapel to St. John the Baptist, who is prominently placed in the left foreground of Puligo's scene (Document 1). St. Bernard, the founder of the Cistercian order, occupies the other position of honor on the right. The saint's presence undoubtedly has a secondary significance in that he is the patron saint of Da Romena's brother, Bernardo, for whom the tomb chapel was constructed. In like manner, the other saints, who were first identified by Bocchi-Cinelli in 1677, bear a similar function as patron saints of family members. St. John the Baptist is the patron saint of Da Romena's father and grandfather, Giovanni; St. Catherine, represents the patron's mother Caterina del Nero; St. Peter, his brother Piero; and St. Paul, Paolo Da Romena himself. For all of these family members, Da Romena left legacies for prayers to be said in this chapel on their behalf (Document 1).
Although the painting is a documented work by Puligo and is specifically cited by Vasari and Borghini as a work by him, Bocchi-Cinelli, Richa, Follini, and Fantozzi attributed it to Pontormo. All other writers correctly name Puligo as the artist.

The altarpiece has close compositional ties with paintings by Fra Bartolommeo and Sarto. The over-all iconographic idea of the Madonna and Child with Saints as a Sacra Conversazione type recalls the Frate's Madonna with Six Saints, dating c.1509, San Marco, Florence. The pose of the Virgin and type of Christ Child are borrowed from Sarto's Madonna of the Harpies, dated 1515-17, Uffizi, Florence, no. 1577 (fig. 42). From this work, Puligo also exploits the drapery patterns, somber mood, softened edges of forms, atmospheric quality, and muted colors. The poses of the two foremost saints also have their prototypes in the aforementioned artists' oeuvre; St. John the Baptist is modeled on the Baptist in Sarto's Preaching of the Baptist of 1515 (Chiostro dello Scalzo, Florence, fig. 46), and the St. Bernard is a synthesis of S. Ambrogio in Sarto's Madonna of S. Ambrogio, c.1514-15 (fig. 43) and of St. Bernard in Fra Bartolommeo's Virgin in Glory with Saints, 1512, Besancon Cathedral.

Puligo also looks to the work of early Mannerist painters as resource. The elongated twisted figures, narrow undefined space, emphasis on a planar V-shaped composition, and the dark shadows that curtail depth is closely associable with the Mannerist style of Pontormo (e.g., the Pucci Altarpiece, 1518, Santa Maria Visdomini, Florence), and Rosso (e.g., the Santa Maria Nuova Altar, 1518, Uffizi, Florence).
The Cestello Altarpiece compares in excellence with Puligo's Vision of St. Bernard. There are passages of exceptional refinement, particularly in the surface treatment of the drapery of St. Bernard, demonstrating that the artist's painting skills have become highly developed by 1525. The fluidity of handling of paint is matched by a subtlety of color, rich in variation and enhanced by the dim lighting effects. The high degree of competency exhibited in the painting qualifies it as one of Puligo's finest undertakings.


1St Bernard may also be a generalized portrait of the brother, which may explain the unusual representation of the saint. St. Bernard, who typically is as represented clean-shaven, is bearded here.

2I have not been able to determine the significance of the saint at the left who holds a pen in his right hand. The figure was identified by Bocchi-Cinelli in 1677 as St. Matthew. I have no reason to question their identification, except that Doc. I does not name a corresponding family member to whom St. Matthew would be the patron saint. The document names a brother "Yllarcho," but this does not correspond with any identifiable surname in Italian. A name close to Yllarcho is Ilario, but St. Ilario's attributes as an old abbot or monk holding beads and a book (see Kaftal, 480) does not correspond with the attributes of the figure in the altarpiece at the left.
No. 31. **Marriage of St. Catherine with St. Peter Martyr**, (fig. 45).

Florence, Tabernacle on the corner of Via San Zanobi and Via delle Ruote. (The painting was removed from its site and has been stored at the Fortezza di Basso since 1981).

Fresco; dimensions unavailable. The stone tabernacle has the coat of arms of the Bigallo carved on it and bears a plaque with the inscription: *Virgo Fidelis Restauravit An.D. 1858 Carolus Franceschi Patronus*.

**Prov**: Commissioned by the Capitani of the Compagnia di Santa Maria del Bigallo in 1526.

**Engraved**: F. Galvani, *Reminiscenze Pittoriche di Firenze*, Florence, 1845, 199, fig. 12b.

This outdoor tabernacle is Puligo's only surviving fresco. While the condition is poor, the general composition is preserved in greater detail in a print published by Galvani.

The tabernacle was commissioned by the Capitani of the Compagnia di Santa Maria del Bigallo in Florence for which two payments were made by the Bigallo to Puligo in 1526: one for 12 gold florins (Document 5) and another for 31 lire, 11 soldi (Document 6). The attribution to Puligo has never been questioned.

The fresco depicts the Virgin and Child who are flanked on the left by St. Peter Martyr, the patron saint of the Bigallo. He is holding an open book in his hands, and his head is framed by a row of trees that refer to the events of his martyrdom. To the right is St. Catherine, who receives a ring from the Christ Child, thus enacting the scene of their mystical marriage.

The presence of St. Catherine in the Bigallo tabernacle is explained by the fact that she is the titular saint of the church Santa Caterina delle Ruote on Via Santa Caterina, the church in
closest proximity to the painting. The Bigallo took charge of the church in the late sixteenth century (Saalman 6), however, the close iconographic connection in the scene between the Bigallo and the church, Santa Caterina, suggests that the Bigallo's responsibilities to the church may have begun earlier in the century, by at least 1526 when Puligo received the commission.

This association between the Bigallo tabernacle by Puligo and the church Santa Caterina delle Ruote has long been noted. Richa (1754-62, 7: 99) mentioned the tabernacle in his discussion of the church which at the time of his writing was called Santa Caterina degli Abbandonati. The connection was also made by Galvani (1845, 200) and Wackernagel (1938, 189).

For the composition, Puligo returned to Sarto's Madonna of the Harpies, 1515-17 (fig. 42), for inspiration. Puligo borrows, as he did for the Cestello Altarpiece, the full-length Virgin of monumental proportion standing in contrapposto on a small podium or altar flanked by two saints. As Shearman has already observed (1961, 229n.20), reference is also made to Sarto's S. Ambrogio Altarpiece, c. 1514-15 (fig. 43), in which Puligo reverses the figure of S. Ambrogio for the figure of St. Peter Martyr. The narrow compressed space of the scene and the amplified proportion of the figures reflects Puligo's growing interest in a Mannerist style in the second half of the sixteenth century.

No. 32. **Holy Family with St. John the Baptist**, (fig. 47).

Columbus, Columbus Museum of Art, no. (57) 31.287.

Panel; 79.4 x 61.6 cm.

**Prov:** Louis Fournier, Paris; sold at Frederik Müller and Co., Amsterdam, 24 June 1924, no. 8; bought by Frederick W. Schumacher, Columbus, Ohio. Schumacher bequest to the Columbus Museum of Art, 1957.

**Exhib:** Columbus, Columbus Gallery of Fine Arts, "Loan Exhibition of Paintings from the Collection of Frederick W. Schumacher," January, 1931.


The attribution to Puligo, first made by G. Gronau in the Fournier Catalogue, has never been disputed. The condition of the painting is rather good, except for paint losses in the lower right-hand area that includes most of the left hand of both the Virgin and Child.

The striking bold vermilion of the Virgin's dress dominates the color scheme. The red is brought up to a light pink which is repeated in the highlights of the flesh tones. The intensity is heightened by the juxtaposition to broad areas of various gradations of gray comprising the background, the figure of Joseph, and the shadows of the flesh. Dark blue-green appears in the Virgin's veil and mantle draped across her lap.

Many of the elements that make up Puligo's characteristic style are evident in this work: the relief-like approach to the composition with figures tucked into the upper corners, the choice of colors of the Virgin's garments, the greenish-gray tones of the
flesh, and the facial types (compare, for example, the little Baptist with his counterpart in the *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and a Martyr Saint*, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 146, cat.no. 16, fig. 23, or Joseph in the two *Holy Families* at the Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 294, cat.no. 12, fig. 19, and no. 486, cat.no. 24, fig. 32).

Despite its links with paintings in all phases of Puligo's career, the chronological placement of the work is suggested by the close resemblance that the Virgin shares with the Virgins in the *Vision of St. Bernard*, c. 1523-24, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore (cat.no. 29, fig. 39) and the *Cestello Altarpiece*, 1525-26, Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi, Florence (cat.no. 32, fig. 43). Her ovoid face, closely set eyes, classical nose, and dimpled chin, compare with the above named paintings of the early to mid 1520s. This facial type descends from earlier Madonna types, such as *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and a Martyr Saint*, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 146 (cat.no. 19, fig. 26), and is repeated almost exactly in subsequent works such as the Madonna in the *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Three Angels*, New York art market (cat.no. 35, fig. 51) and the figure supporting the Virgin in Puligo's late work, the *Deposition* at Anghiara (cat.no. 38, fig. 53). However, the amplitude of the Virgin's form, which compares in volume to the Virgin of the *Vision of St. Bernard* and the Cestello Altarpiece, is the clearest indicator of the date in this case. In all likelihood, the painting is datable around 1525, which concurs with Freedberg's dating of c.1525.
The c.1525 dating is further supported by the proto-Mannerist attempts to heighten the emotional effect of the work by introducing exaggerated facial expressions. The Christ Child with mouth open and eyes gazing upward conveys a sense of pathos that compares in its intensity to the infant Christ in the Pontormo's early Mannerist Pucci Altarpiece, 1518, S. Michele Visdomini, Florence. Puligo's movement here toward a Mannerist style parallels other similar anti-classical investigations found in his work of the mid-1520s such as the Cestello Altarpiece.

No. 33. *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist*, (fig. 48).

Christie's, New York, 15 January 1985, no. 91.

Panel; 99.3 x 76.2 cm.

Prov: H. O. Watson Collection; bought by Catholina Lambert.
C. Lambert sale, American Art Galleries, 21-24 February 1916, no. 316. (This painting is not the same as the one referred to by Shearman, 1965, 2: 289, fig. 34a. The work he cites was sold at the American Art Galleries on 12-14 February 1916, no. 316.) Christie's, New York, 15 January 1985, 110-11, no. 91.

Attributed to Sarto at the American Art Galleries sale in 1916 and to Puligo at the recent Christie's sale.

The painting depicts the Madonna holding the infant Christ in her lap. At the left, is the Giovannino who recalls in type and pose his counterpart in the *Madonna and Child with St. John and a Martyr Saint*, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, 110.146 (cat.no. 16, fig. 23) and the *Holy Family with St. John the Baptist*, Columbus Museum of Art (cat.no. 32, fig. 47). The figures are placed in a niche that frequently appears in Puligo's paintings (see, e.g., cat.no. 51, fig. 68; cat.no. 64, fig. 80).

Elements of the painting suggest Puligo's late style. The facial type and expression of the Christ Child are identical to those of the Christ in the Columbus *Holy Family*, and contain the same Mannerist tendency to heightened emotional content. The Virgin is also closely associable with her counterpart in the Columbus painting, but there are adjustments to her figural proportion that suggest that the work may postdate the Columbus painting of c.1525. The canon of proportion is altered, so that the head is small in comparison to the rest of the body which in turn is rather elongated and
Michelangelesque in amplitude. The massive volumes and elongated proportions of the Virgin are comparable to the expansive forms found in themes of the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist by Pontormo (Holy Family, c.1521-22, Hermitage, Leningrad), Franciabigio, Madonna and Child with Infant St. John, c.1521-22, Liechtenstein Collection, Vaduz), Sarto (lost Madonna di Porta Pinti, c.1521, copy, formerly Hearst Collection, New York). Puligo's investigation of the anormative proportions of his contemporaries' paintings in No. 35 which parallels the Cestello Altarpiece of 1525-26 (cat.no. 30, fig. 41) suggest a date around 1525-27.

Lit: Unpublished.

No. 34. **Holy Family with St. John the Baptist**, (fig. 49).

Rome, Galleria Borghese, no. 432.

Panel; 74 x 54 cm.

**Prov:** In the Borghese inventory of 1833.

**Exhib:** Brooklyn, Brooklyn Museum, December 1965 - 3 January 1966.

Listed in the 1833 inventory of the Borghese as a work by Andrea del Sarto. Given to Puligo by Venturi; the attribution has never been questioned thereafter.

Compositionally, the painting is new to Puligo's oeuvre with the Virgin and Child pushed to the left and flanked by the Baptist below and Joseph above. Pergola claims that the composition may have been taken from a work by Sarto or one of his sketches. Although the faces of the Infants are rather Sartesque in their curly hair and lively expressions, there is no evidence to support Pergola's speculation regarding the composition. The active diagonal arrangement of figures with Joseph tucked into the upper corner reflects Puligo's predilection for surface patterning that is different from Sarto's style at this time. The colors are applied with a lively *vivezza* and interest is added by the multiple folds of the drapery.

Puligo continues to be relentlessly plagued by difficulty with the drawing of hands, evidenced here by the pentimenti in the Virgin's left hand and the awkward grasp of the left hand of the Christ Child.
Lockhart calls the painting early, and Freedberg places it late, c.1526. A date late in Puligo's career seems most correct, as Freedberg suggests.

No. 35. Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Three Angels, (fig. 50).

New York, Art Market, 1960s.

Panel; 96.5 x 69.5 cm.


First given to Sarto in sales catalogues until Richard Offner attributed it to Puligo in the Parke-Bernet Catalogue of 1945; thereafter given to Puligo.

The painting is a synthesis of figural and compositional motifs from Puligo's own works in all phases of his career. The active pose of the Christ Child recalls one of his earliest paintings, the Madonna and Child with an Angel (Biskupska Pinakoteka, Dubrovnik, cat.no. 14, fig. 21) and the general arrangement of the figures—angels, one in profile and the other in three-quarter view flanking the Virgin—is that of another early painting, the Madonna and Child with Two Angels (formerly Saunders Collection, London, cat.no. 5, fig. 10). The angel in profile and the pose of the Virgin are drawn from the Madonna and Child with an Angel (Galleria Nazionale, Rome, cat.no. 15, fig. 22). The cluster of angels in the upper left corner appears at the right in the earlier Madonna of Humility with Musical Angels (Corsini Gallery, Florence, cat.no. 17, fig. 24) and ultimately derives from Sarto's Wallace Madonna, c.1517-18 (Wallace Collection, London, no. 9).
Although the painting takes a number of elements from Puligo’s early work, stylistically it is more closely aligned with the works of the mid-1520s. The Madonna and Child, as types, resemble those in the Columbus Holy Family with St. John the Baptist, c.1525 (cat.no. 32, fig. 47). The volumetric Virgin compares with the Virgin of the Cestello Altarpiece of 1525-26 (cat.no. 30, fig. 41). Her expanded form combined with the constricted space, crowded composition and heightened emotive quality of the expression of the Christ Child place it close proximity to the Columbus Holy Family, c.1525, and the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist, c.1525-27, New York art market (cat.no. 33, fig. 48). Datable to the same time, c.1525-27.

No. 36. **Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist**, (fig. 51).

Munich, Alte Pinakothek, no. 13188.

Panel; 130.5 x 94.5 cm.

**Prov:** Collection of C. E. Liphart, of Rathsof near Dorpat; taken to Copenhagen and sold in November 1920. Pinakothek in Munich, early 1960s.

Puligo's standard color scheme with the Virgin in a red dress with gold sleeves and a blue-green mantle. The bodies of the two Children are painted in light tans. The group is placed against a brown wall with a view of a landscape with a building and a bridge in light blue-green. The scene is bathed in a light mist, Puligo's adaption of a Sartesque sfumato. Pentimenti have emerged in the Virgin's left hand.

The attribution to Puligo was first made by Neumann and has remained undisputed. When the painting entered the Munich Museum it was the subject of Dr. Grohn's insightful analysis. He correctly called the painting a late work but dated it in 1525 or in the first half of the 1520s. A date around 1525-27 seems most likely when one considers the oversize proportion of the Virgin, the elongated limbs of the Baptist and Christ, and the compressed spatial configuration.

The painting shares these attributes with other Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist paintings placed late in Puligo's career (see, e.g., cat.no. 32, fig. 48; cat.no. 35, fig. 50).

The painting is a conflation of several works. The pose of the Baptist derives from Raphael's **Madonna dell'Impannata**, c.1514, (Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 94), and his facial type repeats the
Baptist in Sarto's Tallard *Madonna*, c.1513, (Hermitage, Leningrad, no. 62). As in the Cestello Altarpiece the Virgin refers to Sarto's *Madonna of the Harpies*, 1517, Uffizi, Florence, particularly the position of her right arm. In addition to these figurative elements Puligo drew from their proto-Mannerist qualities: the constricted space of Raphael's *Madonna dell'Impannata*, the animated expression from Sarto's Tallard *Madonna*, and the broad figure style of Sarto's *Madonna of the Harpies*.

Puligo executed a variant of this painting, the *Holy Family*, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 169 (see below).


**Copies:** Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts, no. 51.803.

Florence, Palazzo Pitti, no. 169 (cat.no. 37, fig. 52).

Siena, Pinacoteca Nazionale, no. 609.
No. 37. **Holy Family with St. John the Baptist**, (fig. 52).

Florence, Palazzo Pitti, no. 169.

Panel; 131 x 95.4 cm.

Prov: In the inventory of 1624 at the Villa del Poggio Imperiale.

Attributed to Puligo in the 1624 inventory, an attribution that has never been queried. A variant of Puligo's scheme for the **Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist** at the Pinakothek in Munich (cat.no. 37, fig. 52) in which the window with a landscape view is replaced by the figure of Joseph. It is extremely darkened, so that it is nearly impossible to derive much information from its present condition. It is determinable, however, that the Virgin is garbed in Puligo's typical color scheme of a crimson colored dress with blue-green mantle.

Like its counterpart in Munich, the composition is based on the artist's study of Raphael's **Madonna dell'Impannata**, c.1514, (Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 94) and Sarto's, c.1513, Tallard **Madonna** (Hermitage, Leningrad, no. 62); and **Madonna of the Harpies**, 1517, (Uffizi, Florence, no. 1577). The relief-like approach to the composition and the great size of the Madonna who is cramped by the boundaries of the frame suggest a late date for the work. I would place it after the Cestello Altarpiece of 1525–26.

No. 38. Deposition from the Cross, (fig. 53).

Anghiari, Collegiata di Santa Maria delle Grazie.

Panel; dimensions unavailable.

The panel was commissioned by the Confraternità del Corpus Domini and it hung with two paintings by Sogliani (the Last Supper and the Washing of the Disciples' Feet) in the Cappella del Corpus Domini, located opposite Santa Maria della Misericordia in Piazza Mameli in Anghiari. In 1785, the following inscription was placed on Sogliani's Last Supper:

Sacra redemptoris coena pedumque lotio a i o antonio Sogliani et ex adverso e cruce deposito a domenico poligo depictae prima apud confratres S. Mariae de Misericordia altera in ecclesia sodalitatis ss. corporis Christi olim asservatae Petri Leopoldi I M.E.D. munificentia Angiar communitati an. MDCCCLXXV donatae heic depositum extant.

There are no known documents that date Puligo's Deposition, but stylistically the painting can be placed among the last works executed by the artist before his death in 1527. Vasari, by implication, also suggested a late date for the painting; it is the last work that he identifies by Puligo in a series of chronologically ordered paintings, and it follows his reference to the altarpiece at Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi dated 1525-26.

Vasari was the first to make reference to the Deposition, and although the work is not widely published, no one has disputed the attribution. He praised the painting as being among Puligo's finest works, and certainly it is one of his most ambitious, incorporating a great number of figures within a single narrative.
The basic composition is derived from the Deposition for SS. Annunziata begun by Filippino Lippi in 1503 and finished after his death in 1505 by Perugino, in 1505-06 (now in the Uffizi, Florence, no. 8370). From this work he derived the cluster of three men on the ladders and the fluttering ties attached to the supports. A suggestion of Sodoma's Deposition, 1509-10 (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Siena) is made by the right turbaned figure on the ladder and the pose of the St. John in the middle of the scene. Another source of inspiration may be Rosso's Volterra Deposition of 1521, which shares a similar sense of pervading darkness.

In its greater complexity of composition, this painting seems to be one of Puligo's latest works and compares with the Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple at the Santa Maria degli Angiolini in Florence (cat.no. 39, fig. 54). The composition is essentially planar and is arranged in a diamond shape, like the Presentation. The energetic design contributes to the over-all frantic flourish of activity in the scene: the body of Christ is removed from the cross, ties are fluttering in an airless space, a man rushes toward the cross from the right, the Virgin falls helplessly into the arms of her companions at the left, and in the distance horsemen gallop up a hill. The restlessness of the scene is compatible with the Mannerist tendencies typical of Puligo's works in the mid 1520s, and the broad figure style partakes, in part, of the excessive proportions present in other late works (see, e.g., cat.no. 33, fig. 48; cat.no. 36, fig. 51; cat.no. 39, fig. 54). Like Rosso, in his Deposition of the first part of the decade, Puligo packs the figures into a constricted but
indefinite space and lights them arbitrarily. The unexpected spontaneity and dynamism of the scene, rightly deserving of Vasari's praise, make the painting one of Puligo's masterpieces.


1Lockhart, 1973, n. pag., no. 1.
No. 39. **Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple**, (fig. 54).

Florence, Santa Maria degli Angiolini.

Panel; 211 x 171 cm.


According to Richa, the **Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple** was commissioned by Jacopo Quaratesi, the *operaio* of Santa Maria degli Angiolini, and the painting depicted members of Quaratesi's family. At the time of his writing, during the mid-eighteenth century, Richa states that the painting was variously attributed to Puligo, Pontormo, and Sarto (repeated by Carocci).

Follini-Rastrelli, a few decades after Richa, describes the altarpiece as attributed to Puligo or Pontormo. Cambiagi, followed by Gargioli, Biadi, Formigli, and Fantozzi, states that the painting was attributed by some to Puligo and by others to Sarto. The question of the attribution was finally resolved in 1907 by Lorenzoni who published some documents from Santa Maria degli Angiolini that list a series of payments made to Filippo di Salvestro di Francesco on behalf of this wife Apollonia, Puligo's daughter, for an unspecified painting by Puligo (Document 8). The painting in question is undoubtedly Puligo's **Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple** that still hangs above the altar at the church. The painting is undated, but because the payments for the altarpiece were made after Puligo's death, the work may be his last production. The maturity of the style and its mannered, elongated forms also suggest a date in 1527, although Paatz gave the painting a c.1525 date.
On 26 January 1515, Pope Leo X visited Santa Maria degli Angiolini and granted indulgences to the faithful who celebrated the feast of the Presentation of the Virgin on 21 November at that church. The choice of subject matter of Puligo's painting may have been determined by the special significance of this event.

Iconographically, the painting is one of Puligo's most interesting works. Unlike the more common representations of the Presentation of the Virgin that illustrate the young Virgin moving in profile up a laterally positioned set of stairs to the High Priest (e.g., Ghirlandaio School, Santa Maria Novella, Florence and Peruzzi, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome), Puligo places the steps and the Priest frontally. The Virgin ascends the stairs and looks back over her shoulder directly at the viewer. The precedent for this compositional arrangement comes from Andrea Orcagna's Presentation of the Virgin, a relief on the tabernacle at Or San Michele in Florence, dating c.1355 (fig. 55).

Like Orcagna's relief, which according to Meiss (1951, 27) is the first example in Italian representations of a frontally placed priest and temple, Puligo places the High Priest at the top of the steps within an architectural framework and also incorporates the attending figures who flank the Priest. In contrast to Orcagna's relief and the Apocryphal narrative itself, Puligo replaces the Virgin's parents, Joachim and Anna, who remain behind at the foot of the stairs, with six saints. In the upper corners of the sculpture above the kneeling parents, Orcagna depicts two balcony-like extensions of the temple where other young girls watch Mary's ascent. Puligo
substitutes for this scene another event in the life of the Virgin, 
the Annunciation.

The Annunciation likewise is presented in a non-traditional way. 
Typically, in this scene the Angel approaches the Virgin from the 
left, but here Puligo reverses the figures. The Virgin stands 
frontally in a niche at the left of the central portal. On the right 
in front of another niche is Gabriel in profile holding lilies, and 
rushing toward the Virgin. Sarto's San Gallo Annunciation, dating 
c.1512, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, (fig. 26), which Puligo had already 
used for a model in the Vision of St. Bernard, is an Annunciation 
from the right and may have provided the precedent for Puligo's 
painting. The setting for the Annunciation is also unusual. The 
arctitectural framework of niches separated by an elaborately 
decorated square portal finds its prototype in sculptured altars, 
such as Andrea Sansovini's Corbinelli Altar (Santo Spirito, Florence, 
1485-1500, fig. 37), or the drawing for the Altar of St. Nicholas of 
Tolentino at Santo Spirito by Jacopo (?) Sansovino (Louvre, Paris, no. 
1202, c.1505-06, fig. 38) based in design on the earlier Corbinelli 
Altar. In each of these examples niches with full-length figures 
flank a larger central niche framed by decorative architecture not 
unlike Puligo's. Interestingly, these sculptural prototypes also 
include reliefs of the Annunciation in the upper corners of the 
arctitecture, suggesting that Puligo was thinking of his painting in 
sculpture-like terms. The great monumentality of the figures 
certainly lends support to this idea.
Inspiration for the Presentation was also drawn from Rosso's *Marriage of the Virgin* of 1524 at S. Lorenzo in Florence. Puligc must have observed Rosso's stacked figures in a stepped environment, the bulky, elongated proportions, and the enigmatic expressions of some of the figures. The presence of these Mannerist effects suggest a late dating for the Presentation.

Documentary evidence for the commission of the Santa Maria degli Angiolini Altarpiece has not been discovered. Nevertheless, Richa states that the saints of the painting depict members of the family of Jacopo Quaratesi, the commissioner of the painting. Paatz, followed by Lockhart, identified the Saints on the right as Helena, Lucy, and Catherine of Siena, and those on the left as Dominic and two monks. Paatz's identification of the foremost male figure as St. Dominic is a logical choice considering that Santa Maria degli Angiolini was of the Third Order of Penance of St. Dominic. The Saint, however, does not bear his usual attribute of the lily, but rather wears a pallium with black crosses denoting his rank as an archbishop. These attributes indicate that the saint is Antoninus (1389-1459), the Archbishop of Florence of the Order of St. Dominic. The book that he holds refers to his numerous writings, and the crozier to his position as archbishop. The saint to the right of St. Antoninus, only identified by Paatz as a monk, is St. Bernardino of Siena. His identification is revealed by his attribute of the small insignia on his robe of a sun inscribed with IHS. St. Bernardino, who usually is depicted as a clean-shaven ascetic, is represented in this painting as robust and wearing a mustache and may be a portrait.
228

of a member of the Quaratesi family, as Richa suggested.

The dirty condition of the painting and the poor illumination of
the church prevents an adequate discussion of the color. The
painting is of exceptional interest, nevertheless, from a stylistic
point of view. The six saints in the foreground are arranged as the
saints in the Cestello Altarpiece of 1525-26, and like the Cestello
Altarpiece, the saints and the Virgin form a V-shaped wedge that
moves back into space. On the surface of the composition, a diamond
is formed by the crozier, cross, and heads, a design which tends to
make the scene more animated than the static pyramidal compositions
of the High Renaissance. The length of the figures is exaggerated to
the greatest degree that Puligo had yet drawn, revealing the
advancing Mannerist qualities of his work and suggesting a date for
the work in 1527, the last year of his life.

Cambiagi, 1793, 106. Gargioli, 1819, 1: 153. Biadi, 1829, 155,
155n.2. Formigli, 1839, 101. Fantozzi, 1846, 390. Carocci, 1907,
1: 115. Lorenzoni, 1907, 94-95. Garneri, 1924, 213. Paatz,
No. 40. **Portrait of a Woman**, (fig. 56).

Stockholm, G. Stenman Collection.

Panel; 48 x 38 cm.

Prov: Untraced.

Attributed to Puligo by Sirén, Berenson, Bacci, and Holst. Richter suggested Granacci as the artist, and Gamba gave the portrait to Piero di Cosimo.

Raphaelesque in composition, the figure compares in the fullness of the face and round modeling of the neck and shoulders with Raphael's **Portrait of Maddalena Doni**, c.1507-08, Palazzo Pitti, Florence. Suggestions of Puligo's inheritance from his teacher Ridolfo Ghirlandaio are also present, such as in the drawing of the eyes (compare with the **Portrait of a Woman with a Rabbit**, c.1508, Yale University, New Haven).

Over-all the drawing of the figure reflects the painter's immaturity, as in for example the proportion of the eyes to the head and the simple arrangement of the fabric of the sleeves. The facial type closely compares with the Virgin in Puligo's **Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Two Angels** in the Karlsen Collection (cat.no. 1, fig. 1), thereby suggesting a date in its vicinity, c.1512-17. At this early date, the window motif with a landscape view begins to be a regular part of Puligo's compositions. Sketchy and undeveloped here, the scene will ultimately become skillfully rendered villages with recognizable buildings, as in the case of the
Portrait of a Young Man with a View of Florence (cat. no. 53, fig. 69).

No. 41. Portrait of a Young Man. (fig. 57).


Panel, oval; 63.5 x 48.2 cm. Described as oval in the 1759 Cowper inventory.

Prov: Panshanger, Earl of Cowper 1759 inventory, no. 15; by descent to Lady Desborough, daughter of the 6th Earl of Cowper; by descent to her daughter, the Hon. Lady Salmond. Salmond sale, Christie's, London, 7 July 1972, no. 59; bought by Martino. Sold Christie's, London, 2 July 1976, no. 42.


The portrait was initially attributed to Andrea del Sarto in the 1759 Cowper inventory, in the catalogue of the Manchester exhibition, and by Passavant. Waagen questioned this attribution in 1854 and then reattributed the work to Pontormo in 1857. Gamba and Crowe and Cavacaselle gave the painting to Puligo, an attribution that has been followed thereafter.

Stylistically, the portrait bears the qualities of Puligo's early work of the second half of the 1510s. The structure of the head compares with that in his other Raphaelesque portraits, such as the Portrait of a Woman in the Stenman Collection in Stockholm (cat.no. 40, fig. 56), and the heavy-lidded eyes of the young man are cast from the same mold as the Virgin's in the Madonna and Child with an Angel, Galleria Nazionale, Rome (cat.no. 15, fig. 22). The portrait's pervasive sfumato and the cast shadow in the background set a precedent for Puligo's later portraits of the 1520s.

No. 42. Portrait of a Woman with a Music Book, (fig. 58).

Rome, Private Collection.

Panel; 73 x 55 cm.

Prov: Untraced.


Prior to its 1956 restoration, the painting depicted a Madonna and Child. The Child, however, was probably a mid to late sixteenth-century addition painted over a music book held by a young woman in a portrait that appears to be by Puligo. Restorers removed the over-paint that covered the book but retained the head of the Infant Christ who now distracting peers over the right shoulder of the woman.

The colors of the portrait consist mostly of blacks and browns; a broad area of black for the dress is juxtaposed to the dark umbers of the background. Lighter, brighter areas are found in the creamy white pages of the book, the white border of the dress, and the tan flesh tones.

The portrait was given to Puligo in the 1975 exhibition and by Slim. It appears to be an early work by Puligo and reflects his initial interests in Raphaelesque compositions as in, for example, the Karlsen Madonna (cat.no. 1, fig. 1), that is based on Raphael's Florentine Madonnas. The young woman, arranged in a pyramidal composition, has a round, smoothly modeled face that resembles Raphael's Florentine portraits, such as the Maddalena Doni, Palazzo
Pitti, Florence. The inclusion of a music book in the portrait, in essence a portrait d'appareil, has a similar descriptive quality and narrative function to the writing instruments in Raphael's Portrait of Tommaso Inghirami, c.1513-14, Gardner Museum, Boston, a painting Puligo later drew upon also in his Portrait of a Young Man Writing (cat.no. 45, fig. 65).

Other elements of the portrait are easily associated with Puligo's oeuvre. The semicircular niche with vertical molding at the sides appears in several paintings—e.g. the Palazzo Pitti Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and a Martyr Saint (cat.no. 16, fig. 23), the Uffizi Portrait of a Man (cat.no. 51, fig. 67), and the Palazzo Pitti Magdalen (cat.no. 63, fig. 79). The cappello a ciambella or headdress is a constant feature of the costumes worn by the women that Puligo portrayed. Also the placement and size of the eyes betray Puligo's early style as manifested in, e.g., the Karlsen Madonna (cat.no. 1, fig. 1) or the Borghese Madonna and Child with Two Angels (cat.no. 3, fig. 4). This association with Puligo's early paintings dates the portrait around 1514-15. Tofani and Fabbri in the 1975 Palazzo Medici-Riccardi exhibition catalogue date the portrait in 1515.

The writers of the entry in the Florentine exhibition catalogue (Tofani and Fabbri) identified the painting as Puligo's portrait of Barabara Fiorentina, the lovely courtesean with musical talents described by Vasari (1568, 4: 465). Slim, on the other hand, has convincingly connected Vasari's description with Puligo's Salisbury portrait (cat.no. 50, fig. 66), identifying the woman as the Barbara
of the Roman Salutati family who resided in Florence becoming Machiavelli's mistress from about 1523 to 1527 when Machiavelli died. While the portrait may be an early rendition of Barbara Fiorentina, until the music and the text, whose only legible words are text "non puoi," are identified the name of the woman remains obscure. Also, the portrait does not relate to Raffaello Borghini's description, that elaborates on Vasari's citation concerning La Barbara, stating that the portrait was in the collection of Giovambattista Deti who had the music book overpainted with the attributes of St. Lucy (1584, 396).


Variant: London, Art Market, Portrait of a Woman as a Martyr Saint, 1936 (cat.no. 43, fig. 59).
No. 43. *Portrait of a Woman as a Martyr Saint*, (fig. 59).


Exhib: York, 1879, lent by Marquis of Ripon.

Given to Sarto in the 1879 York exhibition and sold as his work in the 1927 and 1936 sales. Berenson was the first to give the painting to Puligo, an attribution repeated by Slim. Freedberg calls the painting a "Portrait of a Woman as the Magdalen" and feels that it is by a Puligo imitator, c. 1530.

The painting is a variant of the *Portrait of a Woman with a Music Book*, Private Collection, Rome (cat.no. 42, fig. 58) and depicts the same woman in the guise of a martyr saint. While the vase that the woman holds does indeed suggest the Magdalen as Freedberg indicated, the presence of the martyr's palm, strictly interpreted, disallows that identification. There are exceptions, however, in which the Magdalen appears with palm and an ointment jar, such as the *Magdalen* by Agnolo Gaddi, Clowes Collection, Indianapolis Museum of Art.

The photograph reveals considerable damage on the panel; there are abrasions on the sides and vertical cracks in the lower portion. Despite the condition, the portrait can be safely ascribed to Puligo. The figure is placed in a vaporous mist perhaps partially enhanced by the damaged condition. Traces are present of a niche with vertical side divisions that appear in the variant and in other numerous paintings by Puligo (see cat.no. 16, fig. 23; cat.no. 33,
fig. 48; cat.no. 51, fig. 67). The hat with medallion is also an accoutrement of the fashion worn by the women Puligo portrayed, and the facial type compares with Puligo's early Madonna groups (see cat.no. 1, fig. 1; cat.no. 3, fig. 4; cat.no. 4, fig. 8).

In comparison to cat.no. 42, Puligo has stabilized the composition by adding more space around the figure, which may signify that this work may be a somewhat later rendition, dating perhaps a year or two after the c.1514-15 date given the first work.


Variant: Rome, Private Collection, Portrait of a Woman with a Music Book, (cat.no. 42, fig. 58).
No. 44. Portrait of a Woman, (fig. 60).

Muncie, (Indiana), Ball State University, Art Gallery.

Canvas, transferred from panel; 85 x 63 cm.

Prov: Among the illustrated inventory of the Marchesi Gerini Collection, Florence in 1759 (Raccolti di stampe rappresentanti i quadri più scelti de' Signori Marchesi Gerini, 1786, XXVII). Cited in the Gerini Collection in 1846 (Fantozzi 451). Remained in the family's possession when the majority of the collection was dispersed at the end of the nineteenth century. Purchased by William H. Thompson, 1938; donated to Ball State University in 1940.

Exhib: New York World's Fair Exhibition, 1939, no. 2 (as Andrea del Sarto, Portrait of the Artist's Wife).

Indianapolis, Art Association of Indianapolis, John Herron Art Institute, November - 4 December 1938.

Engr: Raccolta di ottanta stampe rappresentanti i quadri più scelti di signori Marchesi Gerini di Firenze, 1786, XXVII (reproduced in Richter, 1938, 192, pl. IIIB).

In ruinous condition. There are paint losses due to flaking and abrasions in the area of the face, white camiscia, hands, and throughout the lower portion of the painting. The entire support of the painting is extremely warped.

The painting is dominated by large areas of light blue-green found in the sitter's dress and in the sky. Green is used in varying saturations: the curtain is bottle-green raised to yellow-green, the turban is dark green and gold, and the shadows of the dress are black-green. A small but bright patch of purple and pink appears on the left half of the bow at the bodice that contrasts to the brown and ochre on the opposite side.

The painting has been traditionally attributed to Andrea del Sarto as a portrait of his wife, until Berenson signaled it as a
Puligo. Freedberg, Fredericksen and Zeri, and Padovani and Meloni
Trkulja concur with the attribution to Puligo.

The portrait depicts a seated woman who holds a white
handkerchief in her right hand and a book in her left. There are
marks on the spine of the book, suggesting letters, but they are
undecipherable. The woman is placed in a loggia. Her head is framed
on the right by a curtain and on the left by a column. The open view
depicts a small village dotted with trees.

The painting shows a study of Leonardo. The pose of the sitter
and her placement in a loggia is based on Leonardo's Mona Lisa. The
painting is datable from the second half of the second decade and
compares with the London Madonna and Child (cat.no. 13, fig. 20),
that exactly repeats, in fact, the curtain at the right. The pose of
the sitter's left hand with two fingers extended is found in other
paintings by Puligo, such as those at Allentown and Stanford (cat.no.
4, fig. 8; cat.no. 22, fig. 30).

The unity of the composition and refinement of color reflect an
individual of serene composure, slightly self-conscious and cognizant
of her social standing.


Copies: Florence, San Salvi, Museo del Cenacolo di Andrea del Sarto,
Portrait of a Woman.

Florence, Uffizi, no. 3412. Portrait of a Woman.
No. 45. **Portrait of a Woman**, (fig. 61).

Hampton Court, Collection of H.M. the Queen, no. 1255.

Panel; 53.6 x 39.7 cm.

**Prov:** The provenance has been determined by Shearman, 1983, 205-06, which he details as follows:

Probably the picture acquired by Cardinal Francesco Barberini from the heirs of Cardinal del Monte in May 1628, 'Un ritratto d'una giovane con i capelli accolti in un panno, o berrettino, et una collanina al collo d'Andrea del Sarto, alto p.m. 2 2/3 largo p.m. 2 [i.e., c.60 x 45 cm] stimato ac. 100 - ridotto ac. 28' (1626-31 inventory (344): Lavin (1975), p. 90); that picture was removed from the Galleria Barberini and sent by Cardinal Francesco to Henrietta Maria (as a present to Charles I) on 28 July 1635, then described as 'un ritratto in tavola con una donna che porta in testa una ciuffa grande alta p.m. 2 incirca largo 1 1/2 in circha [i.e., c. 45 x 34 cm] chredosi essere mano de Andrea del Sarto'; on its arrival in England in January 1636 the 'Andrea del Sarto' was among the most admired of the gifts (Wittkower (1948), p. 50); these pictures are likely to have been placed in Somerset House, so the portrait may be 'A woman, in a yellow gowne. by Andrea dell Sarto' assessed there at L25 in September 1649 (Millar, 1972, 308), offered in the Somerset House list of May 1650 at L30, and sold to Jackson and others on 23 October 1651; the ex-Barberini picture was probably 'The head of a woman with a Chaine about her neck by Andrea' in the inventory drawn up at Colombes late in 1669, following the death of Henrietta Maria (P.R.O., S.P.78/128, fol.210v.), and that picture should have been returned to London; No. 213 is apparently in the Kensington inventory, 1697, 'A Woman's head with a Turbant & Red Slevens' (B.L., MS.Harl.7025), unattributed, and is certainly in the Kensington 1818 inventory (195) as Andrea; removed to Hampton Court on 12 September 1838, and soon after to Windsor; Windsor Castle inventory, 1872 (1119); returned to Hampton Court on 25 June 1901. On the back is a black wax seal, with the arms of Charles I and of France, a crown above, encircled by a knotted rope, which must be Henrietta Maria's, not otherwise known on pictures.

Antiquarian seventeenth and eighteenth-century inventories gave this portrait to Sarto, and Collins Beker suggested Andrea del Brescianino. Berenson was the first to give the work to Puligo, an attribution followed by Lockhart and Shearman. The latter noted that
the portrait is analogous to the Salisbury Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina (cat. no. 50, fig. 66) and the Palazzo Pitti Magdalen (cat. no. 63, fig. 79).

The attribution to Andrea del Brescianino by Collins Baker is an interesting one. Paintings by this Sienese master have often been confused with Puligo's and vice-versa (see text, pp. 69-71). While our understanding of their connection is tentative, Brescianino probably absorbed a vaporous handling of color—the element of his style that may be the cause of the confusion—from an association with Puligo and Sarto in Florence in the early 1520s. The Sienese style was likewise of interest to Puligo who incorporated in his work some of the flattened poses and decorative surface treatment of fifteenth and sixteenth-century painters, such as Neroccio and Sodoma. The attribution of this portrait to Puligo, not to Brescianino, or to Sarto for that matter, is however confirmed when it is compared with his other paintings.

In facial structure the portrait resembles Puligo's London Portrait of a Young Man (cat. no. 41, fig. 57) in which the angular shape of the jaw and partially opened eyes are similar. This portrait, however, dates somewhat after the London painting of c. 1512 because of the enhanced volumes. The large puffed sleeves and the emphasis on the structure of the neck by the pronounced modeling, place the work around 1518 close to the Madonna and Child with an Angel at the Galleria Nazionale in Rome (cat. no. 15, fig. 22).
As Shearman pointed out, the portrait is analogous to the Salisbury Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina, c.1525, and the Palazzo Pitti Magdalen, early to mid-1520s. The Magdalen particularly has a comparable handling of drapery. In the London Portrait of a Woman (fig. 62), the sleeves also have a similar curved sweep and broad handling of color in transparent strokes. The portraits also compare in headdresses and the direct gaze at the viewer. The apparent lack of refinement in drawing of the eyes and the shape of the jaw makes the portrait of lesser interest in comparison to his later more studied compositions.

No. 46.  **Portrait of a Woman,** (fig. 62).

London, Koetser


Given to Puligo at the Witt Library. The sitter is depicted with the *cappello a ciambella* and large ballooning sleeves typical of Puligo's repertoire in female portraiture. The ovoid face, substantial volumes, even modeling of the form, and quiet idealism are characteristic of Puligo's style around 1520.

The handling of the folds of the sleeves is particularly analogous to the Hampton Court portrait's in which thin transparent strokes of color are broadly applied to the surface. The flesh is treated with a rather diffused handling. The thinly ridged eyebrows that divide the planes of the forehead and eyes and the flat undifferentiated plane of the nose recall the style of Brescianino; compare with his **Portrait of a Woman,** Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, no. A370 (Christopher Lloyd, *A Catalogue of the Earlier Italian Paintings in the Ashmolean Museum* [(Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977) 3-4, pl. 3). Brescianino and Puligo's styles reveal a limited and brief exchange which most likely occurred in the early 1520s (see text, pp. 69-71).

Lit: Unpublished.
No. 47. Portrait of a Woman, (fig. 63).

Sold London, Christie's, 6 November 1964.

Panel; 41.2 x 33 cm.


Correctly identified as a Puligo in the sales catalogues.

The portrait is bust-length and is chronologically and stylistically joined with the Hampton Court and London portraits of women (cat.no. 45, fig. 61; cat.no. 46, fig. 62). In each example, a thin application of broadly stroked color is used in representing the fabric. The folds of the sleeves curve inward toward the center of the picture establishing a circular pattern that leads the eye around the form of the figure. Other details such as the drawing of the ears, eyes, and mouth reflect the artist's style (compare with cat.no. 50, fig. 66). The flowered hat is rather sharply defined in detail, recalling northern Italian examples (such as Lotto), nevertheless the close analogy of the painting technique with Puligo's portraits of the late 1510s places the work securely in his oeuvre.

Lit: Unpublished.
No. 48. Portrait of a Woman(?), (fig. 64).


Panel; 49.5 x 37 cm.


Given to Puligo in the sales catalogues and at the Arcade Gallery.

The turban worn by the young woman is different from Puligo's usual cappello a ciambella and more closely compares with that given to his figures of the Virgin. The facial type and arrangement of the hair is nearly identical to the Virgin in the Holy Family at the Columbus Museum of Art (cat.no. 32, fig. 47), suggesting that the painting may in fact be a fragment or study for a Virgin, datable in the 1520s.

Lit: Unpublished.
No. 49. Portrait of a Young Man Writing, (fig. 65).

Firle Place, East Sussex, Gage Collection.

Panel; 92 x 67 cm. Dated 8 December 1523.

Prov: Presumably acquired by the 3rd Earl Cowper, Panshanger. By descent to Lady Desborough, Panshanger. By descent to Lord and Lady Gage; brought to Firle Place in 1953.

London, Grafton Galleries, 1909, no. 45.

The condition of the portrait is basically good; a large vertical crack on the left side has been filled.

The figures wears a white shirt with a black coat lightened to gray. Behind the man is a green wall. The table covering is striped with colors of slate gray, orange, gold, and blue that are rather discordant in their juxtaposition.

The painting depicts a young man writing a letter which is addressed to the artist and reads:

8 Dicembre.
Mastro Domenico assai mi chiamo sodisfatto verso di voi avendo strato propinquo ingegno per dimonstrarmi qual proprio sono. . . tanto. . . obrigrato 1523
M. Andr. . . .

(December 8.
Master Domenico. I feel quite satisfied with you, your talent having been favorable to portraying me as I really am; much obliged. 1523. . . Andrea.)

Early writers on the painting interpreted the letter as being written by Andrea del Sarto and thus assumed his authorship of the work. Gamba, in 1909, was the first to observe that the letter was addressed to a painter named Domenico and associated the style of the
portrait with Puligo. After Gamba's attribution, the portrait has been universally given to Puligo.

The conceit of the sitter dispatching a letter was borrowed from Sarto's Portrait of a Young Man, c.1510-12, Alnwick. The composition and the interrupted moment are derived from Raphael's Portrait of Tommaso Inghirami, c.1512, Gardner Museum, Boston.

The 1523 date found on the letter places the work in Puligo's maturity. The voluminousness of the figure which compares with other figures datable in the mid-1520s, e.g., the Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina (cat. no. 50, fig. 66), places the painting in Puligo's maturity. The 1523 date of the work, however, suggests that the painting belongs to his early maturity; this is confirmed by the irregularities that appear in the drawing. Despite the relatively mature age at which Puligo painted the portrait, irregularities in the drawing appear, e.g., in the inkwell and the right hand of the sitter. The uninventive composition, discordant colors, and poorly drawn detail detract from its esthetic effect, but do not invalidate the special regard that should be given this work as the painter's only signed and dated work.

No. 50. **Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina**, (fig. 66).

Salisbury, Julian Salmond Collection.

Panel; 96 x 79 cm. Inscribed with the following: "MELIORA . LATENT.," above, on the architecture; "TV . DEA . TV . PRESS . NOSTRO . SVCCVRE LABORI," below on the table; "Petrarcha," on the side of the book at the right and on its open pages:

Grazie ch'a pochi il ciel largo destina:
Raca vertu, non gia d'umana gente,
Sotto biondi capei canuta mante,
E 'n umil donna alta belta divina.

The right page of the open music book has the following text:

Quam pulcra es amica mea, quam pulcra es et quam decora, et quam decora, vox enim tua
vox enim tua dolcissim a facies tua decora

and the left page of the book reads:

de bonne amo[ur].


Exhib: London, Burlington House, 1881, no. 159.
London, Grafton Galleries, 1909, no. 49.

Undoubtedly the portrait of the famous courtesan described by Vasari as follows: "Ritrasse anco in un quadro la Barbara Fiorentina, in quel tempo famosa, bellissima cortigiana, e molto amata da molti, non meno che per la bellezza, per le sue buone creanze, e particolarmente per essere bonissima musica a cantare divinamente." Borghini claims that the painting was in the collection of Giovanni Battista Deti who at the request of his wife had the music book in the woman's hands changed to the emblem of St.
Lucy. The Salisbury painting has not been examined in the laboratory
to determine whether the emblem of St. Lucy was added and then
subsequently removed. There is, however, some loss of paint on the
left page of the music book that suggests the possibility of
alteration. Borghini's remark led Berenson (1938) to conclude that
the portrait of La Barbara named by Vasari was actually the St.
Barbara at the Hermitage in Leningrad (cat.no. 65, fig. 81). He
believed the reference to St. Lucy by Borghini was a misprint that
should read St. Barbara.

At some time after Vasari's reference to the picture, the
attribution was changed to Andrea del Sarto. Sarto's name was given
to the portrait in the eighteen-century Cowper inventory, at the
London exhibitions, and by Passavant, Waagen, Boyle, and Crowe and
Cavalcaselle who called the work a portrait of Laura. Gamba was the
first to label the work as a Puligo. The attribution was followed
thereafter, except for Clapp, who gave the painting to Cranacci.

The iconography of the portrait was deciphered by Slim who found
that the inscription on the architecture, "Meliora latent," comes
from Ovid's Metamorphoses and pertains to Apollo's pursuit of
Daphne. The inscription on the table, "tu, dea, tu presens nostro
succure labori," is from Virgil's Aeneid and is the invocation of the
Trojan soldier Nisus to the goddess Diana. The book on the right
contains the first four lines of Petrarch's 213th sonnet from the
Canzoniere. The open book in the sitter's hands contains two musical
compositions; the one on her right has a text from the Song of Songs
and on the left is a chanson dating from the late 1400s to the
mid-1500s century. In the background, the tower and pool of water refer to the life of St. Barbara.

Slim, assuming that this painting is the portrait of Barbara Fiorentina cited by Vasari, believes that the program of the painting may have been created by Machiavelli for his mistress La Barbara. Slim notes that La Barbara, who frequently resided in Florence, was Machiavelli's mistress beginning in 1523 until Machiavelli's death in 1527 (see also Ridolfi, 1963, 207-09, 216, 222-23, 230).

Compositionally, the portrait derives from Sarto's Portrait of a Woman, c.1522, which survives only as a fragment (Staatliche Museen, Berlin, no. 240) but the complete composition is preserved in a drawing (Uffizi, Florence, no. 647E). The architecture in the background is similar to that in Raphael's Portrait of Leo X with Cardinals Giulio de' Medici and Luigi Rossi, c.1517, Uffizi, Florence.

Slim dates the painting in 1523 and late 1524 (or very early in 1525) based on Barbara's association with Machiavelli from 1523 until his death in 1527. Freedberg (1979) dates the painting c.1523. Stylistically, this painting is compatible with other works by Puligo that are datable at this time. I prefer to date the work closer to 1525. The great breadth and monumentality of the figure and the cast shadow on the rear wall are closely linked to Puligo's 1523 portrait, but the physiogonomy of the woman's face compares with facial types in Puligo's late Madonna paintings of c.1527, such as the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist, Christie's, New York, 1985 (cat.no. 33, fig. 48).
No. 51. *Portrait of a Man*, (fig. 67).

Florence, Uffizi, no. 106.

Panel; 83 x 64 cm.


The portrait is in rather abraded condition with paint losses on the cheek and chest.

It is painted in somber colors; black predominates in the man's attire and browns appear in the background. The shirt is white, and the flesh tones are in various gradations of tans.

The portrait was attributed to Sarto in the Feroni Catalogue and to Naldini by Venturi. Recently, in the latest Uffizi Catalogue, the painting was attributed to Puligo, an attribution that was supported by the Florentine Catalogue, *Il Primato del disegno*.

The portrait is closely linked to Puligo's portraits of the 1520s. The cast shadow recalls the *Portrait of a Young Man Writing* of 1523 (cat.no. 49, fig. 65), and the niche of the background appears in numerous paintings by Puligo, such as the *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist*, New York, (cat.no. 33, fig. 48).

The large expansive figure and the arrangement of the hands recall to the *Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina* (cat.no. 50, fig. 66). The portrait is datable in or near 1525.

No. 52  Portrait of a Man.  (fig. 68).

Berlin, Staatliche Museen.

Panel; 63 x 44 cm.

Prov:  Solly Collection, 1821.  Exhibited at the Berlin Museen, no. 239 (see Waagen, 1834).  Transferred to the Bonn Provinzial Museum in 1898.  Belonging to the Berlin Museen, on loan to Bonn.

The portrait depicts a man in black coat and three-cornered hat against a dark background with a green curtain at the right.

The painting was given to Pontormo prior to Berenson's reattribution to Puligo in 1932, and according to the early Berlin catalogues and Berenson (1932), the painting depicted Andrea del Sarto.  In the same 1932 list, Berenson attributed the portrait to Puligo, as also in his subsequent lists.  This attribution was followed by Forster and Lockhart.

The traditional attribution to Pontormo reflects Puligo's dependency upon the former's portrait style of the late 1510s and 1520s.  The sitter conveys a reflective mood that is similar to Pontormo's portraits, such as the Portrait of a Musician, c.1518-19, at the Uffizi in Florence.  The softly modeled forms, color, and handling of paint reveal Puligo's rather successful interpretation of Pontormo's style.  The pose of the figure and the broad treatment of the drapery connect the painting to the Uffizi Portrait of a Man (cat.no. 51, fig. 67), dating c.1525.

No. 53. Portrait of a Young Man with a View of Florence, (fig. 69).

Bromfield (Shropshire), Oakly Park, Earl of Plymouth Collection.

Panel; 114.2 x 83.5 cm.

Prov: In the collection of Conte Vincenzio Bardi Serselli, 1832; bought by Col. Ellis, 1884. Lord Windsor, 1902; by descent to the Earl of Plymouth.

Exhib: London, Royal Academy, 1902, no. 29.

Birmingham, "Art Treasures from Midland Homes," 1938, no. 64.


The intense vitality of the color of this painting marks a bold mannerist experiment in Puligo's oeuvre. The bright cadmium red of the young man's coat has a flaming potency that does not appear in Puligo's previous paintings, nor is it used thereafter. To set the raw red color apart, Puligo surrounds it with warm tones of rich browns in the interior and soft pastel blues and greens in the landscape background, only to impinge upon its forcefulness with the complementary green of the curtain in the upper right corner.

Overall, the forms are sharply defined, except in the landscape where Puligo's characteristic sfumato prevails.

In general, the vigorous color is unusual for Puligo, which may account for the hesitation in the past to attribute this painting to him. The portrait was first identified as a work by Puligo in the
1957 Manchester exhibition, after having been attributed previously to Andrea del Sarto and Pontormo. According to Biadi, who gave the painting to Sarto, the work was considered by its owner, Bardi Serselli, to be a self-portrait of Sarto. Since the 1957 Manchester exhibition, the portrait has been universally given to Puligo.

Despite the coloristic anomaly, the portrait belongs unquestionably to Puligo's oeuvre. The window and curtain motif are used frequently—e.g., combined, as in this portrait, in the Muncie Portrait of a Woman (cat.no. 44, fig. 60), or separately, with windows only, in the Munich Madonna (cat.no. 36, fig. 51), or with curtain only in the Allentown Madonna (cat.no. 4, fig. 8). The landscape itself with a single tree with sparse foliage and a diagonally arranged architectural vista is comparable to other views found in works given to the artist. The exceptional features of the man, particularly the structure of his eyes, is similar to Puligo's Madonnas of the 1520s, such as in the Holy Family at the Columbus Museum of Art (cat.no. 32, fig. 47), dating c.1525. Because of the portraits relationship to the Columbus Madonna, it probably dates c.1526, before the sensitive psychological studies of the Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi, Palazzo Pitti, Florence (cat.no. 54, fig. 70), presumably dated in 1527, and the portrait called, Il Fattore di San Marco (cat.no. 57, fig. 73), that is also datable in Puligo's last year. Freedberg gives the portrait a c.1527 date, and Roberts, c.1520-25.

The compositional connection of this picture with Pontormo's portraits is clear, lending additional support to the c.1526 date.
The composition and costume are derived from Pontormo's *Study for a Portrait of Ippolito de' Medici*, c.1525, Uffizi, Florence, no. 452F recto and possibly the *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici*, c.1525-26, Pinacoteca, Lucca. Puligo also incorporated from Pontormo a marked elongation of the figure and aggrandizement of the scale. Freedberg finds the painting "basically imitative of Pontormo" as does Lockhart. The latter emphasizes the significance of Venetian and Roman sources, provided in Raphael's (or attributed to Raphael) *Lorenzo de' Medici*, Private Collection, New York, and Titian's *Federico Gonzaga*, Prado, Madrid and the *Portrait of a Man*, Louvre, Paris. While these portraits were significant for the development of the three-quarter length portrait in Florence in the 1520s, their influence on Puligo was less direct than the models he derived from Pontormo.

No. 54. **Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi**, (fig. 70).

Florence, Palazzo Pitti, no. 184.

Panel; 103 x 75 cm.

**Prov:** In the Tribuna inventory of 1638 as a "ritratto di giovane vestito di nero" by Puligo (Berti, Rudolph, and Biancalani, 1971, 37). Inventory of Ferdinando de' Medici, Palazzo Pitti, 1713, c.29r: Un simile in tavola alto br. 1 3/4, bargo br. 1 1/4, dipintovi di mano d'Andrea del Sarto il ritratto di un giovane fino al ginocchio con capelli biondi, cappello in testa, vestito di nero, legato in cintola, nella quale vi tiene gli due diti grossi delle mani in guantate, con collana al colo, con adornato simile al sudd.egnato N.345 (Identified as Puligo's Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi at the Palazzo Pitti by Marco Chiarini, 1975, 88, 98n.176. See also: Florence, Palazzo Pitti, "La Galleria Palatina: Storia della quadreria granducale di Palazzo Pitti," 23 September - 31 January 1983, 49, 53, 78, 87). Confiscated and taken to Paris, 1799-1815; returned in 1815.

**Engraving:** Portrait by Andrea del Sarto in Wicar, Tableaux...de la gallerie de Florence, et du Palais Pitti, Paris, 1787-1807, 4: xliv.

The varnish is greatly darkened. The colors are somber, with blacks and umbers being the most predominant ones. At the time of Alazard's writing, he was able to observe "the yellow of the hair, the rose of the lips—very pure rose—and the little touch of violet which appears very discreetly on the chest."

Vasari was the first to state that Puligo painted the portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi. The identity of the subject became lost sometime after Vasari's writings in the sixteenth century, and by the 1638 inventory of the Tribuna, the painting was simply called a "portrait of a youth dressed in black" by Puligo. At the beginning of the eighteenth and throughout the nineteenth century the portrait was attributed to Andrea del Sarto. Biadi and Crowe and Cavalcaselle gave the painting to Sarto and further identified the figure as the
Portrait of the Commesso di Vallombrosa, a painting cited by Vasari (1568, 4: 48) and considered lost by contemporary Sarto scholars (Freedberg, 1963, 2: 211 and Shearman, 1965, 2: 314-15). Guinness and Lafenestre and Richtenberger also attributed the painting to Sarto. In 1909 both Gamba and Schaeffer independently identified the sitter as Pietro Carnesecchi. Schaeffer retained what was by then the traditional attribution to Sarto (he recognized the bust-length Uffizi version as by Puligo), but Gamba linked the portrait with the one by Puligo cited by Vasari. Since Gamba's article, the portrait is given by most to Puligo, except for Schubring and Ramsden who persisted with Sarto.

Both Gamba and Schaeffer were able to arrive at their identification of Carnesecchi's portrait through a reference which Vasari made in the Ragionamenti published in 1588. In this work, Vasari stated that he incorporated Carnesecchi's portrait into his fresco of Ippolito de' Medici Raised to a Cardinal in the Sala di Clemente VII at the Palazzo Vecchio. His portrait is actually a copy after Puligo's bust-length version of Carnesecchi, now located at the Uffizi (fig. 71). Through Vasari's reference, Carnesecchi's physical identity was revealed, enabling other portraits of him to be recognized.1

Pietro Carnesecchi (1508-67) was in later life a follower of the Valdesian movement in Italy and eventually was accused of heresy and put to death. He probably began his ecclesiastical career as a scholar and a cleric at the early age of ten (1518) when he left Florence and went to Rome. In 1527 when Rome was besieged,
Carnesecchi returned to Florence. It is probably at this time that Puligo painted his portrait; the adolescent depiction of Carnesecchi squares with the dating, though it would also allow a slightly earlier one. Cox Rearick agrees with the 1527 date, but Freedberg (1979) gives the date a broader range, c.1525-27.

The portrait derives in part from Puligo's own prototypes. The motif of the gloves, the inflated proportion, and the three-quarter length figure appear in the Portrait of a Young Man with a View of Florence (cat.no. 53, fig. 69). The position of the hands was originally used in the Muncie Portrait of a Woman (cat.no. 44, fig. 60), and the cast shadow on the rear wall at the right is used in several other works, such as the Uffizi Portrait of a Man (cat.no. 51, fig. 67).

The influence of Pontormo is also discernible. Puligo based a previous work, the Portrait of a Young Man with a View of Florence, upon Pontormo's drawings and paintings of 1525-26, and arrived at an interesting mannered figure with exaggerated form and bright pulsating color. While this portrait repeats the three-quarter length figure and the enlarged proportion, the style more closely refers to Pontormo's portraits of the late 1510s and early 1520s. The warm black and brown colors, the diffused atmospheric quality, and the chiaroscuro compare with the Portrait of Two Friends, c.1522, Cini Collection, Venice. The introverted psychological character of the young Carnesecchi is also Pontormesque.
It appears that all of the portraits of Pietro Carnesecchi derive from Puligo's originals: Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 184; Uffizi, Florence, no. 1489; and formerly Marquess of Lansdowne Collection, Bowood. The Cranbrook Museum's (Bloomfield Hills, Michigan) version is a close copy of the Bowood painting. The portrait formerly in the Methuen Collection, Corsham Court, is a variant, not by Puligo, of the Bowood picture. Vasari's version is based on Puligo's Uffizi painting.

An attempt by Rolfs was made (1925, 117-40) to identify the young man in a painting by Sebastiano del Piombo entitled Portrait of Pope Clement VII and a Companion at the Galleria Nazionale in Parma as Pietro Carnesecchi. Ramsden (1964, 430-34) rejected both the identity of Pope Clement VII and Pietro Carnesecchi and called them Pope Paul III and Alessandro Farnese. Hirst (1981, 111-12, 112n.94) prefers the identification of the Pope as Clement VII and correctly states that the other figure can not be Carnesecchi.
No. 55. **Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi**, (fig. 71).

Florence, Uffizi, no. 1489.

Panel; 59.5 x 39.5 cm.

Prov: In the Tribuna of the Uffizi by 1763 as a work by Puligo (in Benedetto Vincenzo Greys e Collaboratori, *Inventario illustrato della Galleria degli Uffizi*, 1748-1765, Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe, Uffizi, nos. 4492F-4588F. Reproduced in Millar, 1966, 18, pl. 18).

The black of the sitter's coat and hat predominate with colorful areas of bluish-purple in the shirt and green-gray in the background. The flesh tones range from light tan to umbers in the shadows. Sharp delineation is given to the coat and hat, but the face and hair have a softness that is typical of Puligo's blurred forms.

An eighteenth-century inventory gave the portrait to Puligo, but by the nineteenth century it became associated with Andrea del Sarto (see Inghirami and Lafenestre and Richtenberg). In 1909 Gamba and Schaeffer independently recognized the painting as a portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi by Puligo, the portrait that Vasari copied when creating the *Scene of Ippolito de' Medici Raised to a Cardinal* at the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence (*Ragionamenti*, Florence, 1588, 167). All others writing on the portrait are in agreement, except for Freedberg who believes the portrait is a reduced replica of the Pitti *Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi* (cat.no. 54, fig. 70) and possibly by Puligo's shop.

Vasari stated that Puligo painted the *Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi*, now believed to be the one at the Palazzo Pitti (cat.no. 54, fig. 70), and that he executed other pictures for the young
man. The Uffizi portrait, presumably, is one of the works to which Vasari was referring.

Stylistically, the painting closely compares with Puligo's Portrait of a Young Man Writing at Firle Place, signed and dated 1523 (cat.no. 49, fig. 65). The clumsy drawing of the right eye, the brightness of the color, and the modeling of the forms are analogous. There is also a similar handling of paint—sharply defined in the clothing and diffused in the area of the face. The execution of the portrait is greatly different from that of the Palazzo Pitti portrait in which somber colors and diffused atmosphere pervade.

Gamba and Berenson (1932, 1963) date the painting in 1527, but the uneven quality of the portrait and its stylistic relationship to the Portrait of a Young Man Writing hints at an earlier date between 1523, the date of the Firle portrait and 1527, the date that seems likely for the Palazzo Pitti portrait. Carnesecchi's presence in Florence prior to his recorded 1527 return is plausible, which permits an earlier dating for the Uffizi portrait. The converse, a trip to Rome on the part of Puligo, is less plausible because of the lack of Roman influences in his work.

No. 56. *Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi* (fig. 72).

Formerly Bowood, Marquess of Lansdowne.

Panel; 63.5 x 48 cm.

Prov: Marquess of Lansdowne Collection, Lansdowne House, Bowood, Wiltshire. Noted by Freedberg (1963, 2: 234n.3) as being recently placed on the art market.

Exhib: London, Royal Academy, Burlington House, "The Exhibition of Works by the Old Masters...," 1884, no. 192.

London, Agnew's, 4 February 1954.

During the mid-nineteenth century, the portrait was considered to be a self-portrait of Andrea del Sarto (see Hazlitt, Jameson, the Royal Exhibition, the Athenaeum, and the Lansdowne Catalogue). Waagen doubted the attribution calling it "too crude for [Sarto], too red in the flesh-tones, and too green in the shadows." The first to connect the portrait with Puligo was Berenson, and his attribution has since been universally accepted.

The painting closely follows Puligo's design for the Uffizi *Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi* (cat.no. 55, fig. 71) with some alterations. The drawing of the hat is nearly the same, but the refinement and idealization of the face shows the artist revising and improving upon the poorly drawn areas of the prototype. The compositional harmony and pervasive atmospheric quality place the work chronologically in the vicinity of th Plazzo Pitti Carnesecchi portrait of 1527 (cat.no. 54, fig. 70). The emphasis on the structural stability of the composition, the balance of the space around the figure, and the inflated breadth of the shoulders also connect the portrait with Puligo's later style just before his death.

Copy: Bloomfield Hills (Michigan), Cranbrook Academy of Art Museum, no. 1941.39.
No. 57. *Il Patriote di San Marco,* (fig. 73).

Firle Place, East Sussex, Gage Collection.

Panel; 94 x 71 cm.

**Prov:** Presumably acquired by the 3rd Earl Cowper of Panshanger. Passed by descent to the Desborough Collection of Panshanger and then to the Gage Collection.

**Exhib:** London, Royal Academy, "Old Master Exhibition," 1881, no. 153.


London, Royal Academy, "Italian Art and Britain," Winter, 1960, 50, no. 103.

The figure is depicted in a black coat modeled with a slightly lighter black-gray and placed against a mixture of warm earthen hues of ochres, earth greens, and umbers in the background. A small portion of the white shirt is visible between two sides of a crimson red inner coat. The flesh tones are painted with light tans with a slight greenish cast in the shadows as is common in Puligo's work.

The painting was given to Sarto during the nineteenth and early twentieth century and was exhibited as his work in the 1881, 1909-10, and 1922 London exhibitions. Gamba first established the portrait as a work by Puligo in 1909, but his attribution was challenged by Clapp and Fry who believed the painting was by Pontormo. Other than these exceptions, the general consensus of scholars writing after Gamba give the portrait to Puligo.
Like the Portrait of a Young Man with a View of Florence at Oakly Park (cat.no. 53, fig. 69) and the Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi at the Palazzo Pitti (cat.no. 54, fig. 70), Puligo makes the figure three-quarter in length. The painting, however, more closely resembles in style the latter Carnesecchi portrait, in its dark colors and soft chiaroscuro. The artist achieves a balance between the animating elements—e.g., the diamond-shaped composition, the tension created by the tightly fitted figure within the frame, the direct gaze of the subject, and the tilted angle of the hat—and the more calming aspects such as the warm dark colors and mellow expression of the figure. The coupling of this effective balanced with the masterful execution of the drawing makes the painting deserving of consideration as Puligo's finest portrait.

The belief on the part of early writers that the portrait was the work of Andrea del Sarto or Pontormo is understandable. The diamond-shaped composition was an animating device used by Sarto around 1512 in the Portrait of a Young Man at Alnwick. Puligo had studied this portrait in the context of its narrative formula for his Portrait of a Young Man Writing at Firle Place (cat.no. 49, fig. 65), and here in the other Firle portrait he effectively reworks the composition for the standing figure. The somber colors, the predilection for the longer length of the figure, and the somewhat introspective nature of the subject's expression suggest the style of Pontormo. On the other hand, various motifs within the portrait are clearly reflective of Puligo's hand. The shadow thrown against the right-hand side of the wall appears in the Carnesecchi portrait at
the Palazzo Pitti and the portrait of La Barbara at Salisbury (cat.no. 50, fig. 66), naming only two examples. The pose of the left hand is that of for the left hand of the Salisbury portrait and of the Magdalen at the National Gallery of Canada in Ottawa (cat.no. 64, fig. 78). The thin transparent application of paint, evidenced in the background, is a technique that appears in other works by the painter, such as the Portrait of a Woman at Hampton Court (fig. 61).

The identity of the sitter is unknown, as is the source of the name Il Fattore di San Marco or Il Pastore di San Marco as the work is sometimes called. As Gamba suggested, the name may derive from the campagnolo style of hat, but the man and/or the painting's relationship to the convent of San Marco has not been determined.

The close stylistic connection with the Palazzo Pitti Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi and the harmonious union of space, color, and emotive effects suggest the date of 1527. Oertel dated the portrait in 1525, but the expertise and quality of the painting place the work in the artist's last year.


Copy: Florence, Palazzo Ricasoli, Portrait of a Man.
No. 58. **Lucretia**, (fig. 74).

Sold New York, Art Market, 1982

Panel; 56 x 41.5 cm.


**Exhib:** Indianapolis, John Herron Art Institute, Pontormo to Greco, the Age of Mannerism, 14 February - 28 March 1954, no. 2.

In poor condition when viewed by Gilbert in 1950. He observed that two vertical cracks were improperly filled and other areas badly rubbed. The drops of blood below the dagger were later additions. Lucretia's head and torso, however, were well preserved.

The painting was published as a Puligo by Gilbert. Berenson, Stechow, and the Indianapolis exhibition catalogue were in agreement. Lockhart is the only exception, who states that the painting is not autograph and may be a copy of a lost painting by Puligo.

Vasari describes a Lucretia by Puligo in which the woman is killing herself with a dagger (1568, 4: 465), and Milanesi notes a citation in Puccini's annotated manuscript of Vasari's *Lives* who states that a *Lucretia* by Puligo is located in the Aldobrandini Collection (Milanesi in Vasari 1568, 4: 465n.3). In the 1682 Aldobrandini inventory, a *Lucretia* is listed, without attribution: un quadro di Lucrezia Roman in tavola, alto palmi tre, et un terzo di buona mano scrostato, come a detto Inventario a Carte 240 No. 432 et a quello del Signor Cardinale Ca 110 (Della Pergola, 1963, 68, no.
Whether these citations refer to this particular painting is not certain, but it is highly plausible.

Despite the rough execution that led Lockhart to challenge the attribution of the painting, the style of the work nevertheless conforms to Puligo's art of c.1518. The pose of the figure with tilted head and direct gaze resembles that of the Madonna, c.1518, at the Galleria Nazionale in Rome (cat.no. 15, fig. 24). The wavy flow of hair over the shoulders is also similar. The edgeless form silhouetted against the dark background and the thinly applied strokes of paint also recall some of Puligo's portraits, such as the Hampton Court Portrait of a Woman, c.1518 (cat.no. 45, fig. 61).

The subject of Lucretia became especially popular in the early sixteen century (see Stechow), and while an exact prototype for the figure does not seem to exist, the painting may have been inspired by the semi-nude Lucretias made by Sodoma (i.e., Kestner Museum, Hanover; Galleria Sabauda, Turin). The loose wavy strands of hair on the shoulder, observed in Puligo's Madonna paintings (e.g., cat.no. 3, fig. 4; cat.no. 15, fig. 22), also reflect Sodoma's style. In the 1954 Indianapolis exhibition catalogue, this Lucretia was described as having "strange pink and green flesh color." This peculiar treatment of the flesh is also used in the Madonna paintings (i.e., cat.no. 15, fig. 24; cat.no. 32, fig. 47), and, as noted earlier, appears to be a Sienese derivation which stems from Puligo's delight of decorative color and patterning (compare with the Madonna and Child with Saints by Neroccio at the Indianapolis Museum of Art, Indianapolis or the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York).
The depiction of the female nude must have been a difficult exercise for Puligo; in all examples, there is a disjunctive assemblage of body parts. Breasts appear to be only applied to the surface, the shoulders and biceps are overly developed, and the drawing of the hands is hopelessly clumsy. The facial expression of Lucretia, identical to the Virgin's in the Galleria Nazionale, Rome, painting (cat.no. 15, fig. 22), is sweet and appealing but enormously inappropriate for such a tragic subject matter. The total effect is one of crude unsophistication. Stylistic connections with other paintings of the late 1510s suggest a date of c.1518.

No. 59. *Leda and the Swan* (fig. 75).


Panel; 69 x 57 cm.

**Prov:** Sold Sotheby's, London, 16 February 1972, no. 43.

Judging from the photograph the painting is in poor condition. Two large vertical cracks appear on either side of Leda's head, and there are paint losses throughout, especially around the hand and lower portion of the panel.

A variation on the *Lucretia* (cat. no. 58, fig. 74) posed frontally and in three-quarter length. The brushwork softens the figure in a manner that immediately recalls Puligo's style. The shading gradually moves to deep shadows at the edges fusing with the background. The ever-present cast shadow darkens the rear wall.

The drawing of birds is not Puligo's forte; the swan, drawn in profile with his bill apart, lacks the inherent grace of this species. Over-all Puligo misses the mark in creating a convincing image of the narrative. Like his *Lucretia* that lacks a tragic mood, the *Leda* is void of the sensual seductiveness that effervesces from the archetypal Leda created by Leonardo in Florence around 1506. A suitable dating for the work would be in the late 1510s.

**Lit:** Unpublished.
No. 60. Magdalen (Cleopatra?), (fig. 76).

Genoa, Palazzo Bianco, no. 287.

Panel; 62 x 45 cm.

Prov: Senatore Giovanni Ricci Collection; bequest to Museum, 1892.

In extremely poor condition. There is loss of paint throughout, especially along the sides and in the upper corners. A vertical crack appears at the right of the Magdalen's head. Worm holes, piercing the surface, dot the entire panel.

First given to the school of Sarto by Gross, and then to Puligo by Berenson.

The painting depicts, in half-length, a nude woman topped with a halo and holding an ointment jar in her right hand, indicating that the figure represents the Magdalen. The snake appearing below the jar suggests that the artist originally intended the figure to be Cleopatra, but at some point changed his mind and added the attributes of the Magdalen.

The painting belongs to a series of nude half-length figures that Puligo executed in the late 1510s and early-to-mid-1520s. The frontal pose and the placement of the attribute in the lower left quadrant of the picture are comparable to the Lucretia (cat.no. 58, fig. 74). The pose, the position of the right hand, and the upward gaze are duplicated in the Budapest Cleopatra (cat.no. 61, fig. 77), suggesting that the two works were executed close in time to one another.
Over-all the painting reveals Puligo's ineptitude in dealing with the female nude. Body parts are misproportioned or clumsily drawn (e.g., the shoulders and hand), faults which, the misty atmosphere formed by the blurring of the edges to create a soft-focus effect does not conceal. The wavy hair on the shoulders derives from Sodoma's works, as does the upward gaze (see, e.g., *Lucretia*, c.1510, Kestner Museum, Hanover; *Lucretia*, c.1516, Galleria Sabauda, Turin). The idea for the expression may have also been suggested by Raphael's *St. Catherine*, c.1507, National Gallery, London, or *St. Cecilia Altarpiece*, c.1513-16, Pinacoteca, Bologna.

No. 61. Cleopatra, (fig. 77).

Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts, no. 71.23.

Panel; 71.5 x 55 cm.


In good condition. The colors are limited essentially to browns and whites. The background is painted in umbers, and the flesh in light tans graduated to pinkish white. The dress is white darkened to lead gray in the shadows.

This is perhaps the Cleopatra cited by Vasari (4: 465) and noted in Puccini's annotated manuscript of Vasari as being in the house of Senator Bartolommei (see Milanesi in Vasari 1568, 4: 465n.3). Given to Puligo by most scholars, except for Lockhart who believes the work is probably the work of a Sienese painter.

The painting is a free variation of the Genoese Magdalen (cat.no.60, fig. 76). In this work, the painter has partially draped the figure and sharpened certain areas of the form, especially in the face. Like the Genoese Magdalen, the composition may be Sodomesque in origin. The upward gaze emphasizing the whites of the eyes, the folds of the drapery, and the wavy hair falling over the shoulder recall Sodoma's paintings of Lucretia (Kestner Museum, Hanover, c.1510; Galleria Sabauda, Turin, c.1515). The diagonal fold of the drapery evidenced in Sodoma and Puligo's work is also found in a print by Marcantonio Raimondi of Lucretia that dates after 1508. All of these works may in fact derive from an ancient prototype no longer
While the drawing of the figure is rather clumsily handled (e.g., the hands and shoulders), the artist makes some advances in convincingly rendering the theatricality of the work. The agonized expression, although, superficially affected in its appeal, is more appropriate than the direct unemotional gaze of the Lucretia (cat.no. 58, fig. 74). Red lines drawn on the upper lids also enhance the emotional pathos of the figure, and the bright spotlight illumination, that nearly bleaches the flesh tones to white, contributes to its dramatic effect. The amplitude of the proportions indicates a date in the 1520s.


Cleopatra, Museo Civico, Pisa.
No. 62. **Magdalen**, (fig. 78).

Rome, Pinacoteca Capitolina, no. 180.

Panel; 40.5 x 58 cm.


In very poor condition; dirt completely obscures the true colors of the work. There is paint loss throughout, especially on the side of the Magdalen's face.

Attributed to Raffaellino del Borgo (Raffaello dal Colle) in the eighteenth-century antiquarian inventories. Berenson and Bruno give the work to Puligo, and it is unquestionably Puligo's work. It contains stock elements from his repertory: curtain at the right, window at the left, and half-length figure with attribute displayed in the lower left corner (compare with figs. 21, 22, 79). His sketchy way of applying paint, obviating the need to clearly define forms, is evident in the area of the torso. The paint, in fact, was applied so thinly in this area that it has now become transparent, and the underdrawing is visible. The drawing is very cursory, simply outlining the folds of the drapery and suggesting the roundness of the breasts. The turn of the head and facial type is comparable to the Baptist in the Palazzo Pitti **Madonna** (cat.no. 25, fig. 33) and St. Quentin in the Sarasota **Enthroned Virgin** (cat.no. 26, fig. 36).
The diaphanous garment that the Magdalen wears does not allow Puligo to hide his limited ability to draw a female figure not covered by form-obscuring fabrics. The shoulders are overly muscular and the breasts are ineffectively drawn. The painting may be the first Magdalen painted by Puligo, but it is more likely close in time to the Genoese Magdalen, (cat.no. 60, fig. 76); datable in the late 1510s or early 1520s.

No. 63. Magdalen, (fig. 79).

Florence, Palazzo Pitti, no. 39.

Panel; 61 x 58 cm.

Prov: Formerly in the Appartamenti Monumentali of the Palazzo Pitti; transferred to the gallery in 1928.

In need of restoration to remove darkened varnish, but the colors appear to suggest Puligo's typical range. The Magdalen is placed against an umber wall with vertical divisions. The figure wears a rose-red to pink dress with white camisia. The dirt covered flesh tones are generally non-descript, but the brown color of the wavy hair falling over the shoulder is discernible. Its attribution to Puligo is unquestioned by scholars.

The composition is typical of Puligo's half-lengths in which the figure is frontally placed and the attribute is held in the right hand in the lower left corner. The facial type is consistent with the heavy-lidded types that Puligo drew during the late 1510s and early to mid-1520s (compare with the Columbus Holy Family, c.1525, cat.no. 32, fig. 47). The arrangement of the folds of the sleeves is analogous to his portraits of the late 1510s (see cat.no. 45, fig. 61; cat.no. 46, fig. 62). A date in the early to mid-1520s is suitable.

No. 64. Magdalen, (fig. 80).

Ottawa, National Gallery of Canada, no. 567.

Canvas, transferred from panel; 91.5 x 68.5 cm.


London, New Gallery, 1894, no. 266.


Early references to the painting gave the work to Andrea del Sarto as a portrait of the artist's wife (see Waagen, the 1873 exhibition, Roberts, and Marillier) or as a painting of the Magdalen (see the 1894 exhibition). The catalogues of the 1919 exhibitions considered the work attributable to Sarto, but the catalogues of 1953 exhibitions placed it in his school. Crowe and Cavalcaselle, on the other hand, were convinced that the painting was not by Sarto, but "a slovenly thing" by Bacchiacca. Their attribution to Bacchiacca was followed by Salvini; McComb mistakenly associated this work cited by Crowe and Cavalcaselle with a Magdalen by Bacchiacca formerly in the Hertz Collection in Rome. Berenson was the first to link the painting with Puligo's style. The rest of the scholars cited below and the
1961 Baltimore exhibition catalogue are in agreement, except Freedberg who qualifies his attribution somewhat by calling it a work "at least of Puligo's school."

This Magdalen is basically a reworking of the Muncie Portrait of a Woman (cat. no. 44, fig. 60). Puligo has increased the volume to a more monumental proportion that is comparable to the Portrait of Barbara Fiorentina (cat. no. 50, fig. 66). As in the latter portrait, the inspiration for the volume and the large puffed sleeves may have derived from Sarto's drawing of c.1522 of a study for the portrait of Lucrezia. Leonardo's Mona Lisa also may have served indirectly, as a model for the painting. The direct gaze of the figure, the pyramidal arrangement, and the cyclical movement of the composition resemble Leonardo's precedent.

Puligo brings to the painting his own distinct style and familiar set of motifs: the vertical wall divisions at the left, the curtain at the right, and pose of the left hand. The facial type, the hat, and the broad simple treatment of the folds of fabric as in the sleeves are also common in the artist's oeuvre (compare cat. no. 45; fig. 61; cat. no. 48, fig. 64; cat. no. 50, fig. 66). The close stylistic connection of the painting with Sarto's drawing of c.1522 and Puligo's own La Barbara, c.1525, suggest a date sometime between those years.


Variant: St. Barbara, Hermitage, Leningrad, no. 1477 (cat.no. 65, fig. 81).
No. 65. **St. Barbara**, (fig. 81).

Leningrad, Hermitage, no. 1477.

Canvas, transferred from panel (1817); 93 x 71 cm.

Prov: Crozat Collection, Paris; bought by Catherine II in 1772.

Acquired by Catherine in 1772 as an Andrea del Sarto, an attribution that was repeated by the Hermitage Catalogue of 1869, Waagen, and Dacier. Others gave the work to Pontormo: Bruiningk and Somof, Somof, and Guinness. Clapp rejected the attribution to Pontormo and gave the painting to Granacci. Crowe and Cavalcaselle suggested Bacchiacca; followed by Salvini. Nikolenko, without offering an alternative suggestion, rejected the attribution to Bacchiacca. Berenson was the first to suggest Puligo. His attribution was followed by Colnaghi, Venturi, Shearman, Lockhart, the 1976 Hermitage Catalogue, and the 1980 Florentine exhibition catalogue *Il Primato del disegno*. Freedberg believes the painting is by Puligo or his shop.

In Berenson's brief essay on Puligo in *The Drawings...* (1903, 1938), most of his attention was devoted to this work, which he describes as the following:

It represents a young woman of pleasing countenance and elegant dress, seated, with her hand resting on a small tower. This toy does not seem well related to the hand, and may have been added somewhat later, by the same simpleton who thought that by, not over-appropriately, crowning the fashionable headdress with a halo, he would change this flower of worldliness into a saint, and, adding the tower as an emblem, into a St. Barbara.

Berenson continued this essay by associating the *St. Barbara* with the portrait of Barbara Fiorentina mentioned by Vasari (1568, 4:...
While the portrait that Vasari described is now securely linked with the painting in Salisbury in the Salmond Collection (cat. no. 50, fig. 66), Berenson was correct in his attribution to Puligo. Regarding the attribution, he aptly stated, "To one who knows this painter, argument will not be necessary: others are not to be argued with."

But for the sake of his readers, Berenson proceeds to compare the eyes, mouth, and ringlets of hair with the Madonna at the Galleria Nazionale in Rome (cat. no. 15, fig. 22) and the treatment of the folds with the Magdalen in the Galleria Borghese in Rome (cat. no. 66, fig. 82).

The painting is a variant of the Magdalen at the National Gallery of Canada in Ottawa (cat. no. 64, fig. 80). Except for the change in background and pose of the left hand, the paintings derive from the same mold and date around 1523-24. Of particular interest are the flatly pressed folds in the lower sleeves, that suggest the style of the Sienese painter, Andrea del Brescianino, who was probably in Florence in the 1520s. While the stylistic connection is not profound, the connection illustrates Puligo's fondness for the Sienese style persisted into his late career.


Variants: Magdalen, National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, no. 567 (cat. no. 64, fig. 80).

St. Catherine, C. Radewacher Collection, The Hague.
No. 66. Magdalen, (fig. 82).
Rome, Galleria Borghese, no. 328.
Panel; 58 x 41 cm.
Prov: Untraced. Inventoried at the Galleria Borghese since 1833.

The painting shows Puligo's standard color range. The Magdalen wears a gray dress covered with a light rose-pink mantle and is placed against a dark gray background. The figure is softly modeled and appears to be immersed in a dark smoky atmosphere.

The painting was given to Andrea del Sarto in the 1833 inventory, an attribution that was followed by Venturi (1893, 1921, 1925), Guinness, Lafenestre and Richtenberger, Rusconi, Guisti, and De Rinaldis. Crowe and Cavalcaselle believed the painting to be by one of Sarto's pupils or imitators. Morelli was the first to identify Puligo as the artist. This attribution was followed by Alazard, Longhi, Berenson, Venturi (1932), Della Pergola, Freedberg, and Lockhart.

As Lockhart correctly points out, the figure derives from Raphael's Magdalen in the St. Cecilia Altarpiece, c.1513-14, Pinacoteca, Bologna. The work was painted in Rome and sent to Bologna to the family chapel of Beata Elena Duglioli dall'Olio in S. Giovanni in Monte. Puligo may have observed the painting while it was en route to Bologna or traveled to that city to see the painting in situ. Puligo borrowed the pose of the Magdalen, but effectively reworked the composition into a half-length of compelling interest. While the structure of the nose and drawing of the eyes compare with
Puligo's other depictions of Saints (figs. 80, 81), the Magdalen's expression suggests the ongoing action of some inner workings of the mind that is comparable to his late portrait, *Il Fattore di San Marco*, dating c.1527, (cat.no. 57, fig. 73). Datable in its vicinity in the last year of the artist's life.


**Copies:** Magdalen, Mrs. John Flanagan Collection, Sandy Hook (Connecticut),—nineteenth century.

Magdalen, Lachniki Collection, Formerly Warsaw (see Freedberg, 1963, 2: 233-34).

**Variant:** Magdalen, Galleria dell'Accademia Albertina, Turin.
THE PAINTINGS OF DOMENICO PULIGO

VOLUME 2

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of the Ohio State University

By

Genetta Ann Gardner, B.A., M.A.

* * * * *

The Ohio State University
1986

Dissertation Committee:

M. Herban III
A. M. Morganstern
F. L. Richardson

Approved by

Francis L. Richardson
Adviser
Department of History of Art
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**LIST OF FIGURES AND THEIR SOURCES** ...................................... v
**CATALOGUE OF ATTRIBUTED PAINTINGS** ............................... 285

## APPENDICES

- **A. Documents** ......................................................... 390
- **B. Lost Works** ...................................................... 398
- **C. Untraceable Works** .............................................. 405

**BIBLIOGRAPHY** ........................................................... 413
**ILLUSTRATIONS** .......................................................... 445
LIST OF FIGURES AND THEIR SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURES</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Two Angels, Alfred S. Karlsen Collection, Beverly Hills (cat.no. 1). Photo: Witt Library.</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


11. *Madonna and Child*, Baroda State Museum, Baroda (cat.no. 6). Photo: Witt Library ........................................ 454


23. **Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and a Martyr Saint**, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 146 (cat.no. 16). Photo: Anderson 9109 .......................... 466


36. **Cappella del Loretino Altarpiece**, San Miniato a Tedesco (cat.no. 28). Photo: Reproduced from *San Miniato (Pisa)*, San Miniato, n.d., n.pag.


41. Madonna and Child with Six Saints (Cestello Altarpiece),
Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi, Florence (cat.no. 30).
Photo: Gabinetto fot. Soprintendenza di Firenze,
no. 306026 ................................................................. 483

42. Andrea del Sarto, Madonna of the Harpies, Uffizi,
Florence, no. 1577. Photo: Reproduced from S. J.
Freedberg, Andrea del Sarto, Cambridge, Mass., 1963,
1: fig. 76 ...................................................................... 484

43. Andrea del Sarto, Madonna of S. Ambrogio (copy perhaps
by Jacopo da Empoli), Stoke Pogee, Church. Photo:
Reproduced from S. J. Freedberg, Andrea del Sarto,
Cambridge, Mass., 1963, 1: fig. 58 ............................. 484

44. Andrea del Sarto, Preaching of the Baptist, det.,
Chiostro dello Scalzo. Photo: Reproduced from John
Shearman, Andrea del Sarto, London, 1965, 1: fig. 41 .. 485

45. Marriage of St. Catherine with St. Peter Martyr,
Tabernacle on the corner of Via San Zanobi and Via
delle Ruote, Florence (cat.no. 31). Photo:
Allinari, no. 29161 ......................................................... 486

46. Marriage of St. Catherine with St. Peter Martyr
(engraving from F. Galvani, Reminiscenze Pittoriche
di Firenze, Florence, 1845, fig. 12b). Photo:
Witt Library ................................................................. 487

47. Holy Family with St. John the Baptist, Columbus
Museum of Art, Columbus, no. (57)31.287 (cat.no.
32). Photo: Columbus Museum of Art, Columbus ....... 488

48. Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist,
Christie's, New York, 15 January 1985, no. 91
(cat.no. 33). Photo: Reproduced from Christie's,
New York, 15 January 1985 ........................................... 489

49. Holy Family with St. John the Baptist, Galleria
Borghese, Rome, no. 432 (cat.no. 34). Photo:
Reproduced from Paola della Pergola, Galleria
Borghese: i dipinti, Rome, 1959, 2: fig. 68 ............. 490

50. Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and
Three Angels, Art Market, New York, 1960s (cat.no.
35). Photo: Reproduced from Hans Werner Grohn,
"Una Madonna di Domenico Puligo," Antichita Viva,
1 (1962): fig. 6 .............................................................. 491
51. Madonna and Child w ith S t . John the B a p t i s t . A l t e
F in ako th ek , Munich, n o . 13188 ( c a t . n o . 3 6 ) . Photo:
Reproduced from Hans Werner Grohn, "Una Madonna d i
Domenico P u l ig o ." A n t i c h i t a Viva. 1 (1962): f i g . 2 . . . 492
52. Holy Fam ily with S t. John the B a p t i s t . P a la z z o P i t t i ,
F lo r e n c e , n o . 169 ( c a t . n o . 3 7 ) . Photo: Reproduced
from N ic c o lo C ip r ia n i, La G a lle r ia P ala tin a n e l
Palazzo P i t t i a F i r e n z e . F lo r e n c e , 1966, 35
......................... 493
53. D e p o s itio n from the C r o s s . Santa Maria d e l l e G ra zie ,
A nghiari ( c a t . n o . 3 8 ) . Photo: Soprintendenza per
b en i a m b ie n ta li a r c h i t e t t o n i c i , a r t i s t i c i e s t o r i c i ,
Arezzo, n o . 2210 .............................................

494

54. P r e s e n t a t i o n o f the V i r g i n in the Temple. S a n ta Maria
d e g l i A n g i o l i n i , F lo r e n c e ( c a t . n o . 3 9 ). P h o to :
G a b i n e t t o f o t . S o p r i n t e n d e n z a d i F i r e n z e , n o . 188774 . . 4 95
55. Andrea Orcagna, P r e s e n t a t i o n o f th e Virgin i n th e
Temple. Or San M ich ele, F lo r e n c e . Photo: Reproduced
from M illa rd M eiss, P a i n t i n g in Florence and S ie n a
a f t e r th e Black Death. P r in c e to n , 1978, f i g . 28 ..................496
56. P o r t r a i t o f a Woman. G. Stenman C o l l e c t i o n , Stockholm
( c a t . n o . 4 0 ) . Photo: Reproduced from Mina B a c c i ,
P ier o d i Cosimo. M ilan, 1966, f i g . 80 .......................................... 497
57. P o r t r a i t o f a Young Man. Art Market, London, 1976
( c a t . n o . 4 1 ) . Photo: W itt L i b r a r y ...............................................498
58. P o r t r a i t o f a Woman w it h a Music Book. P r iv a t e
C o l l e c t i o n , Rome ( c a t . n o . 4 2 ) . Photo: Reproduced
from F l o r e n c e , Palazzo M e d ic i- R ic c a r d i, "II Luogo
T e a tr a le a Firenze: B r u n e l l e s c h i , Vasari,
B u o n t a le n t i, P a r i g i ," 31 May - 31 October, 1 9 7 5 ,
p i . I l l ............................................................................................................... 499
59. P o r t r a i t o f a Woman as a Martvr S a i n t . Art M arket,
London, 1936 ( c a t .n o . 4 3 ) . Photo: Frick Art
Reference L i b r a r y ......................................................

500

60. P o r t r a i t o f a Woman. B a l l S ta te U n iv ersity A rt G allery,
Muncie, Indiana ( c a t . n o . 4 4 ) . Photo: Ball S t a t e
U n i v e r s i t y Art G a lle r y , Muncie .......................................................... 501
61. P o r t r a i t o f a Woman. Hampton Court, C o l l e c t i o n o f
H. M. th e Queen, no. 1255 ( c a t . n o . 4 5 ) . Reproduced by
g ra c io u s perm ission o f Her M ajesty, the Queen. Photo:
A. C. Cooper, no. 341862 ..................................................................... 502
x




65. Portrait of a Young Man Writing, Gage Collection, Firle Place, East Sussex (cat.no. 49). Photo: Witt Library ........................................... 506


67. Portrait of a Man, Uffizi, Florence, no. 106 (cat.no. 51). Photo: Gabinetto fot. Soprintendenza di Firenze, no. 204538 ........................................... 508

68. Portrait of a Man, Staatliche Museen, Berlin (cat.no. 52). Photo: Staatliche Museen, Berlin ........................................... 509

69. Portrait of a Young Man with a View of Florence, Earl of Plymouth, Oakly Park, Bromfield (cat.no. 53). Photo: Witt Library ........................................... 510

70. Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 184 (cat.no. 54). Photo: Alinari, no. 298 ........................................... 511


72. Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi, formerly Marquess of Lansdowne Collection, Bowood (cat.no. 56). Photo: Witt Library ........................................... 513

73. Il Fattore di San Marco, Gage Collection, Firle Place, East Sussex (cat.no. 57). Photo: Witt Library ........................................... 514


76. **Magdalen (Cleopatra?)**, Palazzo Bianco, Genoa, no. 287 (cat.no. 60). Photo: Palazzo Bianco, Genoa ........................................ 517

77. **Cleopatra**, Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest, no. 71.23 (cat.no. 61). Photo: Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest ........................................ 518

78. **Magdalen**, Pinacoteca Capitolina, Rome, no. 180 (cat.no. 62). Photo: Pinacoteca Capitolina, Rome ........................................ 519


CATALOGUE OF ATTRIBUTED PAINTINGS
Alnwick, Collection of the Duke of Northumberland.

**Portrait of a Young Man.**

Panel; 70 x 51 cm.


**Exhibitions:** Florence, SS. Annunziata, 1715, 1724, and 1737—lent by Marchese Luca Casimiro degli Albizzi (see Borroni Salvadori, 1974, 60-61).

Florence, SS. Annunziata, 1767—lent by Marchese Lorenzo Casimiro degli Albizzi.

London, British Institution, 1856, no. 45—from the Braschi Gallery.

London, Royal Academy, "Italian Art and Britain," 1960, 46, no. 89.

Berenson attributed the Alnwick portrait to Puligo in his early Lists, but questioned the attribution in the List of 1963.

Traditionally given to Andrea del Sarto beginning with the eighteenth-century exhibitions at SS. Annunziata in Florence. Scott was an exception, who suggested the possibility that the painting might be by Franciabigio.

The work is by Sarto, dating c.1512, based in part on Raphael's Agnolo Doni, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, as pointed out by Shearman.


Holy Family.

Panel; 81 x 64 cm.


Mistakenly attributed to Puligo in sales catalogues, and by Berenson in his photographic archives, Morgan, the Amherst Museum, and at the 1972 exhibition. The painting is a copy of the Borgherini Holy Family, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, no. 22.75 as noted by Freedberg, Shearman, and Fredericksen and Zeri. Freedberg states the painting is wrongly attributed to Puligo. Shearman finds the work characteristic of the circle of Carlo Dolci; an observation repeated by Fredericksen and Zeri.

The style of the painting is not at all like Puligo's. The dating is likewise incompatible with Puligo's career in that most scholars date the original Borghini Holy Family about 1527, the year of Puligo's death, or after his death in the late 1520s. Zeri and Gardner (1971, 198) state that most copies of the New York painting date from the last decades of the sixteenth century. The Amherst painting probably dates from this time; by a painter of the Florentine school.

Ashland, (Ohio), Ashland College.

Marriage of St. Catherine.

Panel; 48 x 61 cm. Inscribed in the upper left hand corner: ORATE POR; upper right hand corner: PITTORE; across middle portion of baldacchino: TOTA PULCRA ES AMICA MEA. Inscriptions probably not original. The panel must have had a semi-circular frame at the top that covered the two upper corners. Later, the frame was removed the the inscriptions were added to fill in the revealed empty spaces.

Prov: Newhouse Galleries, New York. Given to Ashland College on 19 November 1958 by John C. Myers. The name R. Dougana di Firenze appears on a stamp on the back. There is also a stamp with a no. 5 and a wax seal with a camel on the reverse.

The only literature on the painting is found in Fredericksen and Zeri's Census, who consider the work attributable to Puligo. The plaque on the frame of the painting attributes it to Albertinelli, and a stamp on the back of the panel names it as a work by Fra Bartolommeo.

The little panel depicts an enthroned Virgin and Child under a baldacchino with its drapery pulled back by two putti and an angel. The Christ Child leans forward from His mother's arms toward St. Catherine who kneels at the left on a step. St. Mary Magdalen, who holds her attribute of the ointment jar, kneels opposite St. Catherine and looks out toward the viewer.

The painting is a simplified rendition of the Marriage of St. Catherine based on prototypes created by Fra Bartolommeo, such as the one at the Louvre. The figure types are also imitative of the Frate's style; for example, the figure of St. Catherine closely compares with the right-hand female martyr of the Louvre Marriage.
The simplicity of the composition and the broadly treated drapery resemble the work of Ridolfo Ghirlandaio in the second decade of the sixteenth century when his vocabulary was Bartolommesque in style. In fact, the saints in the Ashland work are analogous in facial types and modeling to the kneeling female saints in the wings of Ridolfo's Nativity with Six Saints, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, dating c.1512. Another close comparison can be made with Ridolfo's predella at the Bigallo in Florence dating 1515.

Lit: Fredericksen and Zeri, 1972, 552.

Baarn, Holland, Private Collection.

St. Margaret.

Panel?; dimensions unavailable (fragment).

Given to Puligo by Berenson in his photographic archives and to Piero di Cosimo by Bacci.

Berenson's suggestion of Puligo is conceivable in terms of the handling, but the fragment is closer to Piero in the second decade of the sixteenth century as indicated by Bacci.


Barberino di Mugello, Compagnia di SS. Sebastiano e Rocco.

St. Sebastian.

Given to Puligo by Berenson. Judging from the photograph the painting is in poor condition. The work does not appear to be by Puligo, although I cannot suggest an alternative attribution.

Lit: Berenson, 1932, 474; 1936, 408; 1963, 1: 183.
Barcelona, Hernandez Collection.

**Madonna and Child.**

Given to Puligo in the Fototeca Berenson. No connection to Puligo. By a Bronzinesque Florentine painter of the late sixteenth century.

**Lit:** Unpublished.


**Holy Family.**

Panel; 84 x 89 cm.

**Prov:** F.W. Lawrence bequest in 1920 to the Victoria Art Gallery.

Attributed to Puligo by Wright, Lockhart, and McKillop. The painting was given to Franciabigio while in the Lawrence Collection.

The painting is a copy of the Holy Family at the Palazzo Pitti in Florence, no. 486 (cat.no. 24, fig. 32). The physiognomy of the Christ Child's face—the pronounced nose, large nostrils, and darkly shaded upper eyelids—is uncharacteristic of Puligo's style. The swirling parallel folds of the Madonna's robe also are not seen in Puligo's paintings. Lockhart stated that the painting is "drastically repainted," which may account for the anomaly in the style. In its present condition, the painting can not be attributed to Puligo.

Sold Berlin, Gesellschaft für Kunst und Litteratur, 11–12 November 1908, no. 9.

**Madonna and Child with St. John and Two Angels.**

Panel; 92 x 71 cm.

A derivation of Puligo's *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and an Angel* at Stanford University, no. 54,250 (cat. no. 22, fig. 30). Attributed to Andrea del Sarto in the 1908 sale.

Signalled by Freedberg as derivative from Puligo.

Judging from the photograph, the painting is not by Puligo. The facial types do not resemble the artist's style; for example, the shape of the Virgin's eyes does not resemble Puligo's typical heavy-lidded types.

**Lit:** Freedberg, 1963, 2: 219.

Berlin, Staatliche Museen, no. 240.

**Portrait of a Woman.**

Panel; 37 x 44 cm. Perhaps a fragment; cut on all sides.

**Prov:** Florence, Nerli Collection. Bought from Nerli for the Berlin Gallery by Rumohr, 1829.

**Drawings:** Florence, Uffizi, no. 647E, no. 6454Fv. Paris, Lugt, no. 5573(?)

Morelli is quoted as suggesting that Puligo was responsible for this portrait (see Shearman). Fraenckel and Wagner attributed it to a follower of Andrea del Sarto. The work is considered by all others to be an autograph Sarto.


Formerly Berlin, Lepke, Denant Sale.

Holy Family.
Panel; 91 x 73 cm.

Given to Puligo at the sale. Not by Puligo but derivative from his compositions. Perhaps by a late sixteenth-century imitator.
Lit: Unpublished.

Formerly Berlin, Lepke, Stumm Sale.

Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.
Panel; 75 x 68 cm.
Prov: Stumm Sale, Lepke, Berlin, 22 November 1921, no. 64.

Given to Puligo at the sale. The painting bears no relation to Puligo's style, more Raphaelesque in origin.
Lit: Unpublished.

Bloomfield Hills (Michigan), Cranbrook Academy of Art Museum, no. 1941.39.

Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi.
Panel; 62.2 x 49.5 cm.
The association with Puligo was first made in the 1949 exhibition in which the resemblance to Puligo's Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi at the Uffizi (cat.no. 55, fig. 71) was noted. Fredericksen and Zeri consider it an authentic work by Puligo, as does the Museum. While in the Northwick and Law collections, the painting was given to Andrea del Sarto. Roberts at Thomas Agnew's gave it to Pontormo.

The portrait is an exact copy of the Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi formerly at Bowood (cat.no. 56, fig. 72) and has all the qualities of being a Puligo, except that the portrait appears to be painted over another figure whose form is visible on the surface. The painting has not been thoroughly examined in the laboratory to determine the exact nature of the figure underneath.

While the other figure underneath the paint surface strongly prejudices my opinion against attributing it to Puligo, I also find the drawing of the eyes slightly more refined and evenly shaped in comparison to what Puligo was noted for doing on most occasions. The relationship of this painting to the original work formerly at Bowood is comparable to the Muncie Portrait of a Woman (cat.no. 44, fig. 60) and its copy at San Salvi near Florence (see Attributed Paintings).


**Madonna and Child.**

Panel; 100 x 79 cm.

Prov: Untraced.

Given to Puligo by Berenson, and attributed to Sarto in the Buccleuch Collection. Freedberg notes a resemblance to the style of Andrea del Brescianino.

The painting is conceivably by Puligo. The drawing of the Virgin's head closely resembles the Virgin in Puligo's *Vision of St. Bernard* at the Walters Art Gallery (cat.no. 29, fig. 39) or the Munich Madonna (cat.no. 36, fig. 51). Even the long slender fingers of her right hand recalls Puligo's style (see cat.no. 4, fig. 8). The handling of the drapery with numerous folds flatly pressed, is an enigma, and recalls, as Freedberg has already suggested, the style of Brescianino.

Until seen first hand, I withhold judgment on the attribution.


Copy: Madonna and Child, Formerly Paoletti Collection, Florence.

---

Brussels, Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts, no. 262.

**Madonna and Child with the Infant St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; 65 x 34.6 cm.

Prov: Sent from the French government to Brussels in 1811.

This painting was attributed to Puligo by Berenson. It was given to Lorenzo Fasolo in the 1811 Brussels Catalogue, and to Lodovico
Cigoli in the Catalogue of 1844 and 1861. Serena Padovani-Boskovits, of the Palazzo Pitti in Florence, in a verbal opinion places the painting in the sixteenth century in the Sienese school, between Andrea del Brescianino and Girolamo del Pacchia. The painting will be attributed to the Sienese school in a catalogue soon to be published by the Museum.

The Brussels painting bears no affinity to the style of Puligo. Padovani-Boskovits's connection of the painting with the style of Brescianino is understandable, considering that the Brussels work is a close variant of the Madonna and Child with the Infant St. John the Baptist at the Naples Museum, no. 144, there attributed to Brescianino.¹ Neither the Brussels painting, nor the Naples one are by Brescianino. The artist, who remains anonymous, but close to Pacchia, imitates the early Beccafumi. The Children, for example, have high foreheads and bulging cheeks, resembling the putti found in Beccafumi's Trinity Triptych, 1513, and Stigmata of St. Catherine, c. 1513-15, both located at the Pinacoteca Nazionale in Siena.


Brussels, Musées Royaux des Beaux Arts, no. 415.

Leda and the Swan.

Panel; 102 x 76 cm.

Prov: In the 1648 inventory of the Collection of King Rudolph II in Prague. Taken to Sweden in 1648. In the 1652 inventory of the Collection of Queen Christina of Sweden. Part of Queen Christina's Collection until 1687-88 when it exchanged hands numerous times (for and amplified account of the provenance see Shearman and McKillop). Purchased in 1858 by the Musées Royaux of Brussels where it has since remained.


Florence, Palazzo Strozzi, Il Primato del disegno, "Firenze e la Toscana dei Medici nell'Europa del Cinquecento," 1980, 59-60 (the painting was to have appeared in the exhibition but did not).

Attributed to Puligo by Wauters, the 1927 Brussels Catalogue, and Fierens (1949). Fierens in 1957 gave the painting to Franciabigio, cross-referenced with Puligo. Others who attributed the painting to Franciabigio include the following: Frizzoni, Berenson, Clapp, Gronau, A. Venturi, Suida, the 1939 Milanese exhibition, Freedberg (1961, 1963 with less certainty), and the 1983 Naples exhibition catalogue, Leonardo e il Leonardismo.... The majority of scholars writing on the painting have attributed the Leda to Andrea del Sarto: Dubois de Saint-Gelais, Vleughels, D'Argenville, Buchanan, Waagen, Campori, Mantz, the 1892 Brussels Catalogue, Lafenestre and Richtenerberger, Granberg, Guinness, Champier and Sandoz, Denuce, Shearman, McKillop, and the 1980 Florentine exhibition catalogue. Fraenckel rejected the attribution to Sarto, and Monti and Freedberg (1972) gave the painting to Sarto's shop. Salvini gave the painting to Bacchiacca, but Nikolenko rejected the attribution to Bacchiacca...
without explanation.

The attribution to Sarto is almost certain. Shearman places the painting most convincingly among Sarto's works of the first half of the second decade of the sixteenth century.


Sold Brussels, Giroux, 12 March 1927, no. 11.

Holy Family with the Infant St. John the Baptist.

Panel; 144 x 102 cm.

Attributed to Sarto at the sale, but correctly regarded as a derivation of Puligo's style by Freedberg. The pose of the Christ Child is taken from Sarto's Wallace Madonna, Wallace Collection, London, no. 9.


Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts, no. 51.803.

Madonna and Child with Young St. John the Baptist.

Panel; 112.5 x 96 cm.

Prov: Obtained by the Museum in 1951.
A copy, without approximately one-fourth of the lower portion, of Puligo's *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist* in Munich's Pinakotek, no. 13188 (cat.no. 36, fig. 51). The Budapest copy is by an imitator of Puligo with rather limited abilities. The painting may date from the late sixteenth century.

**Lit:** Pigler, 1968, 1: 235-36.

Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts, no. 54.

Holy Family.

Panel; 75 x 55.5 cm.

**Prov:** In the Eszterházy Collection, Inv. 1820, no. 923.

This painting has been variously attributed. Berenson originally gave the painting to Girolamo del Pacchia (1909) and then to Puligo (1936, 1963), prior to attributing it to Puligo with question (1932). The painting was attributed to Fra Bartolommeo in the 1820 inventory of the Eszterházy Collection, and Venturi gave it to the school of Fra Bartolommeo, perhaps Puligo. Granacci was named with question in the 1916 Museum Catalogue, and Sogliani was suggested by Gronau. Pigler, Tátrai, and von Holst place the painting in the Florentine school.

The style of the painting is close to Puligo, but not by him. It belongs to a painter of the Florentine milieu in the second decade of the sixteenth century.

Variants: Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist, Musée Thomas Henry, Cherbourg.

Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist, Private Collection, Madrid.

Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts, no. 69.

Madonna with Sts. Sebastian and Roch.

Canvas; 198.5 x 169.5. Dated 1527 with Andrea del Sarto's monogram.

Prov: Eszterházy Collection, 1823.

First given to Andrea del Sarto in the Eszterházy Catalogue.

Frimmel gave the painting to Puligo, an attribution that was followed with reservations by Freedberg. Venturi and Pigler placed the work in the shop of Sarto, which, I believe, is the most suitable choice.

The composition is derived from Sarto's Madonna of S. Ambrogio, c. 1514-15, (fig. 43), and although Puligo based some of his own paintings on that work (cat. no. 30, fig. 41; cat. no. 31, fig. 45), the style of the Budapest picture does not correspond with Puligo's own, particularly not his late style as Freedberg suggests.

Comparison with the Cestello Altarpiece (cat. no. 30, fig. 41) reveal disparate styles in facial types and the handling of drapery.

Moreover, the head of St. Roch, at the right, is rather specifically rendered, almost as a portrait, and is unlike the generalized types used by Puligo (compare St. Peter in the Cestello Altarpiece with other white bearded types such as Joseph (cat. no. 32, fig. 47).

Budapest, Sandor Lederer Collection.

Holy Family.

Bernardini describes a painting depicting the Madonna with the Christ Child on a parapet and Joseph at the right with little St. John below in the corner of the painting. The painting was attributed to Puligo in the Lederer Collection, but Bernardini placed it in the Florentine School around 1540.

I have no knowledge of this painting.

Lit: Bernardini, 1906, 105.

Burgos, Riano Collection.

Madonna and Child.

Attributed to Puligo in the Fototeca Berenson. The painting appears to be heavily damaged, and the poor quality of the photograph does not permit an attribution.

Lit: Unpublished.
Cherbourg, Musée Thomas Henry.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Tondo; 70 cm.

Given by all writers to Puligo, except von Holst who identifies it as a variant of the Budapest Holy Family, no. 54, which he gives to the Florentine school of the second to third decade of the sixteenth century. The painting is imitative of Puligo's style, but the Infant types are not conceivably his. By an imitator of the Florentine milieu.


**Variants:** Holy Family, Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest, no. 54.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist,** Private Collection, Madrid.

Chianciano (Chiusi), Collegiata.

**Madonna and Child with Infant St. John.**

Attributed to Puligo by Berenson. I have no knowledge of the painting.

**Lit:** Berenson, 1932, 475; 1936, 408; 1963, 1: 183.

Città di Castello, Pinacoteca.

**Madonna and Child with Infant St. John the Baptist.**

This painting was attributed to Puligo by Mancini and Berenson. Uncharacteristic of Puligo; more likely by the painter newly identified by Zeri as the "Master of Volterra" (see Torriti, 1978,
202 and my discussion under Attributed Paintings, Siena, Pinacoteca Nazionale, no. 562).

The Citta di Castello painting closely resembles one of the paintings Torriti identified as by the Master of Volterra, the Madonna and Child with the Infant St. John the Baptist, Florence, Convento delle Oblate. In both paintings the head of the little Baptist is identical, exhibiting a peculiar curvature of the face that slides down from the forehead and outward to the tip of the nose. The eyes of the figures are also distinctively marked. The lids are shaded with an upward sweep at the sides that gives the figures an exotic flair, to say the least.


Copenhagen, Royal Museum of Fine Arts, R.M., Sp. no. 8.

Virgin and Child with SS. Bernard and Catherine of Siena.
Panel; 1.34 x 1.065 cm.

Prov: Collection of Silvio Valenti Gonzaga, Rome; sold, Amsterdam, 18 May 1763, no. 1.

Ris, in 1875, attributed a Virgin in Glory with SS. Catherine of Alexander and Norbert at the Copenhagen Museum to Puligo or Pontormo. This maybe the Virgin and Child with SS. Bernard and Catherine of Siena at the Copenhagen Museum now given to Francesco Menzocchi.

Lit: Ris, 1875, 408. Olsen, 1951, 95; 1961, 78.
Copenhagen, Museum of Fine Arts.

Madonna and Child with St. John.

Attributed to Puligo by Freedberg. Neither the Museum, nor I have any knowledge of this painting.


Coral Gables, (Florida), Joe and Emily Lowe Art Gallery, University of Miami.

Portrait of a Young Girl.

Panel; 44.5 x 33.7 cm.


The portrait has traditionally been given to Correggio, except for Berenson who attributed it to Puligo and Winkler (verbally, see Shapley, 1968) who placed it with a Flemish artist under the influence of Correggio. Currently, the portrait has been removed from its autograph status and changed to "attributed to Correggio" (see Shapley, 1968; Fredericksen and Zeri; and Gould).

Not by Puligo, because of its animated, wide-eyed expression that is inherently different from his emotionally reserved portrait types. The circle of Correggio seems to be a logical attribution for the painting.

Sold Dordrecht, Mak Sale, 26 April 1932, no. 54.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; 64 x 51 cm.

Given to Puligo at the Mak Sale. Definitely not Puligo, but closer to a painter recently identified by Zeri as the "Master of Volterra" (see Torriti, 1978, 202 and my discussion under Attributed Paintings, Siena, Pinacoteca Nazionale, no. 562).

This painting closely resembles the **Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist**, Florence, Convento delle Oblate, that is attributed to the Master of Volterra by Torriti. The pose of the Virgin, the simple folds of the drapery, and the arrangement of the cloth covering her head are similar in style. The construction of the faces also corresponds, in that in each figure, the bridge of the nose is painted as one flat continuous plane extending from the forehead to the end of the nose.

**Lit:** Unpublished.

Dresden, Gemäldegalerie, no. 76.

**Marriage of St. Catherine.**

Panel; 167 x 122 cm. Inscribed: Signed on the first step with Sarto's monogram.

**Prov:** First recorded in the collection of the Duke of Buckingham. In the Antwerp inventory of Buckingham Collection, c.1650. York House inventory, 1635. Recorded in the list of works from the Imperial Collection in Prague, 1745; offered for sale, 1749. To Dresden in 1749 from the Imperial Gallery in Prague.
Considered to by Sarto with partial intervention by Puligo by the following: Hirt, Reumont, Guinness, Fraenkel, Freedberg (1961), and Monti. Goldschmidt attributed the painting to Sarto but signed Pontormo on as a collaborator. Otherwise considered to be an autograph painting by Sarto, inscribed by the artist.

Shearman (1965) is correct in stating that, "the suggestion of the intervention of Puligo derives no support from the stylistic character of the work, and this is perhaps more obvious since the recent cleaning; there is in fact no reason to suppose that Puligo was in Sarto's shop when this panel was painted." Freedberg (1963, 1972) now correctly regards the Dresden painting as an autograph Sarto.

Dublin, Collection of Mrs. James A. Murnaghan.  

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Canvas; 92.5 x 72.2 cm.

This painting is a copy of the *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist* located in Florence at the Palazzo Pitti, no. 145, (cat. no. 25, fig. 33). The Dublin picture is attributed to Puligo in the Fototeca Berenson.

The copy is fairly accurate, but specific elements, such as the handling of the paint and color, are unlike Puligo's style. The presence in the landscape background of a herd of grazing deer, distinguished by one stag staring directly at the viewer, is an unusual detail and certainly not found in Puligo's oeuvre. The canvas support is also suspect; Puligo always painted on panel.

**Lit:** Unpublished.

Dumfries House, Ayshire, Marquess of Bute Collection.  

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Attributed to Puligo by Berenson. Not by Puligo, but rather one of his numerous imitators.

**Lit:** Berenson, 1932, 475; 1936, 408; 1963, 1: 183.
Florence, Corsini Gallery, no. 70.

Apollo and Daphne.

Panel; 29 x 42 cm.

Prov: Untraced.


Freedberg (1961) initially attributed this painting to Puligo until Zeri convincingly placed it with a group of paintings now given to Antonio di Donnino. Those who agree with Zeri's attribution include the following: Shearman (in McKillop, verbally 1962); Freedberg, 1963, 1972; McKillop; the 1980 Florentine exhibition catalogue (Silvia Meloni Trkulja); and Monti.

The painting was attributed by some (Fantozzi, Medici, Guinness, Knapp, Lafenestre and Richtenberger, Crowe and Cavalcaselle, Stechow, and Berenson) to Andrea del Sarto, and by others (Forlani and Shearman, 1962) to Franciabigio. Bacchiacca was also suggested by Sinibaldi, Salvini, and A. Venturi, but Nikolenko does not consider the painting an authentic work by this master. Given to Foschi at the Gallery.

As a small scale narrative, the painting fits most comfortably in the oeuvre of Antonio di Donnino.


Florence, Corsini Gallery, no. 79.
Holy Family.
Panel; 88 × 64 cm.

Given to Puligo by Lockhart, and to Chimenti (Jacopo da Empoli) at the Gallery. I only know of this painting through a poor photograph.

Florence, Corsini Gallery, no. 140.
Holy Family.
Panel; 94 × 75 cm.

Attributed to Puligo by Medici and at the Gallery. I am not familiar with this work.
Lit: Medici, 1886, 41.

Florence, Corsini Gallery.
Magdalen.
Panel; 53 × 38 cm.

Given to Puligo by Fantozzi, followed by Berenson (in an oral communication to Principe Tomaso Corsini) and Lockhart. Not in Medici's 1886 Catalogue of the collection. I do not know this work.
Formerly Florence, Corsini Gallery.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; 100 x 78 cm.

**Prov:** Sold Corsini Gallery, Florence, 20-21 November 1970.

Given to Puligo at the sale. Not at all related to Puligo, not in drawing, facial types, color, or landscape treatment. By an anonymous Tuscan painter of the sixteenth century.

**Lit:** Gazzette antiquaria, August, 1970.

---

Florence, Palazzo Pitti, nos. 87 and 88.

**Story of Joseph (The Borgherini Panels).**

Panel; 99 x 135 cm. Inscribed: Both panels are inscribed with Sarto's monogram. Pitti no. 87 also bears Sarto's signature.


**Exhib:** Florence, SS. Annunziata, 1729.

Florence, Palazzo Strozzi, "Mostra del Cinquecento Toscano," 1940, 34, nos. 9 and 10.


These are inscribed works by Andrea del Sarto in which Reumont and Freedberg (1961) saw evidence of Puligo's assistance. Sinibaldi gave the panels to Bacchiacca, and Fraenckel attributed them to Sarto's shop with some intervention by the Master. All other writers on the paintings give them solely to Sarto, including Freedberg (1963, 1972), who revised his previous opinion. Shearman states,
"there is little pretext for introducing the names of Bacchiacca and Puligo, who by this date (1515-16) have identifiable styles that do not correspond." I agree with Shearman.


Florence, Spedale delgi Innocenti, Pinacoteca, no. 101.

Madonna and Child with Infant St. John.

Panel; 78 x 65 cm.


Berenson listed a Madonna and Child with Infant St. John, no. 107, in the Spedale degli Innocenti as a work by Puligo. The inventories of the museum, however, do not list a no. 107. Berenson may have been referring to the Madonna and Child with Infant St. John, no. 101, and thus the discrepancy is due to a misprint.

Given to Pier Francesco di Jacopo Foschi by Von Holst and with question by Bellosi.

Florence, Uffizi, no. 1480.

**Portrait of a Woman with a Basket of Spindles.**

Panel; 54 x 76 cm.

**Prov:** Recorded at the Palazzo Pitti since 1773, (on the back of the painting: 1773. 8 Luglio. D'all Archivo Segreto del Palazzo dei Pitti).

**Exhib:** Florence, Palazzo Strozzi, "Mostra del Pontormo e del primo manierismo fiorentino," 1956, 21-22, no. 34.

Mistakenly attributed to Puligo by Berenson. Crowe and Cavalcaselle suggested the name of Bacchiacca, and Guinness gave the work to a copyist of Andrea del Sarto. Freedberg suggests the possibility that the portrait may be an early work by Vasari and compares it with the *Portrait of a Young Man*, Palazzo Bianco, Genoa, which has been variously attributed to Vasari and Pontormo. The majority of scholars writing on the portrait place it in the oeuvre of Pontormo.

The attribution to Pontormo is correct. The portrait is comparable in its lighting effect and sensitive psychological study of the sitter to the artist's other early portraits such as the *Portrait of a Musician*, Florence, Uffizi, no. 743, and the *Portrait of an Engraver*, Paris, Louvre, no. 233. Freedberg's suggestion that Vasari is the artist does not seem plausible, considering Vasari's more hard edged, sculpturesque style that is unlike Pontormo's early portrait style.

Florence, Uffizi, no. 1556.

Leda.

Panel; 55 x 40 cm.


Traditionally attributed to Pontormo. An attribution challenged by Berti, who initially called the painting a Bacchiacca or youthful Puligo (1956 exhibition and Pontormo, 1966). Berti ("Precisazioni...," 1966 and 1973) is convinced that the painting belongs to Puligo, observing that the color, sfumato, and figural borrowings from Pontormo and Andrea del Sarto are typical of his style. The painting originally appeared in the 1589 Uffizi inventory without precise attribution as either Pontormo, Sarto, or Perino del Vaga, and in the 1635-38 inventory as a Pontormo. Clapp did not attribute the painting to Pontormo in his monograph on the artist, although he did see Pontormo's influence in the work. The latest Uffizi catalogue and the Naples exhibition catalogue, Leonardo e il Leonardismo..., give the painting to Pontormo with question.

I am staying with the traditional attribution to Pontormo. The slender tapered legs and arms of the figure of Leda are closely associable to figures in Pontormo's early works, such as the Ospedale di San Matteo, Florence, Accademia, no. 9385 and the scenes for the Carro della Zecca, Florence, Palazzo Vecchio. A painting, stylistically comparable to the Leda, does not exist in Puligo's accepted oeuvre; not in color, composition, or figural style.
Portrait of a Woman.

Attributed to Puligo in the Fototeca Berenson. Palluchini (in Huyghe) illustrates the portrait as an example of a sixteenth-century Mannerist painting by a Florentine who was influenced by Andrea del Sarto.

The painting is actually a poor copy of the Portrait of a Woman, Muncie, (Indiana), Ball State University, Art Gallery (cat.no. 44, fig. 60).

Lit: Huyghe, 1964, 197.

Madonna and Child with SS. Domenico and Catherine.

Panel; 47 x 35 cm.


Given to Puligo by Venturi. Giovanni Paolo Rossetti was proposed with question by Voss, and Rosso Fiorentino was suggested by Garnieri. The Uffizi Catalogue gave the painting to the sixteenth-century Tuscan School and indicated a relationship to the style of Pietro Candido. By an unidentified painter from the Tuscan region of the sixteenth century.
Florence, San Salvi, Museo del Cenacolo di Andrea del Sarto.

**Portrait of a Woman.**

Panel; 87.5 x 66.5 cm.


Formerly attributed to Andrea del Sarto (or his school) as a portrait of his wife (Uffizi inventory, 1890), Berenson gave this portrait to Puligo. This attribution was followed by Venturi and the 1979 Uffizi Catalogue, and was exhibited as such at the 1980 exhibition. Richter was the first to identify the portrait as a copy of a painting formerly in the William H. Thompson Collection and presently at the Ball State University Art Gallery, Muncie, Indiana (cat. no. 44, fig. 60). Freedberg and Padovani and Meloni Trkulja likewise call the painting a copy of the Muncie work.

The closeness of this copy to the original suggests that the work might be a contemporary duplication. The linear quality, however, does not resemble Puligo's style.

Florence, Sta. Barnaba.

Madonna and Child with SS. Bernard and Benedict.

Panel; 212 x 118 cm.


Given to Puligo by Paatz and to Pontormo by Gargiolli and Formigli. Now given to Pier Francesco di Jacopo Foschi by Shearman, Pinelli, and Silvia Meloni Trkulja in the 1980 Florentine exhibition.


Florence, S. Tommaso d'Aquino.

Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.

Panel; 61 x 78 cm.

Prov: Stored at the Gab. Restauri, Uffizi (1983); to be restored.

Given to Puligo with question by Paatz. Fantozzi regarded the work as being in the style of Andrea del Sarto. A weak copy of the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist, sold Sotheby's, London, 1970.


Variant: Madonna and Child, Paoletti Collection, Florence.
Florence, Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi (Cestello).

**Two Angels.**

Fresco(?); Probably destroyed.

Vasari, followed by Borghini, ascribed a fresco depicting two angels located over the wall tabernacle that contained the sacrament at Cestello to Puligo. The Two Angels, however, are a documented work by Domenico and Davide Ghirlandaio dating 1484 (see Luchs for documents). The documents do not state the medium of the painting, and if we can rely on Vasari's judgment on this matter, despite his misattribution, then the work was a fresco that was destroyed during some renovations of the seventeenth century. Everett Fahy suggests that the missing work may be a panel painting depicting two angels and a baldachin which has a provenance from Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi, attributed to Biagio d'Antonio of the workshop of Ghirlandaio (Luchs, 107). Alison Luchs is rather confident that the work was a fresco that is no longer extant, but concedes that some doubt remains.


---

Florence, Santa Trinita, Sernigi Chapel.

**Resurrection of Christ with SS. Dionisio Areopagita and Sebastian (Bastiano?).**

Panel; 240 x 158 cm.

The first attribution of the Sernigi Chapel altarpiece was given in 1677 by Bocchi and Cinelli who wrote that according to some, the painting was by Puligo. Richa ascribed the painting to Maso da San
Friano (1532–1571), and almost all subsequent attributions have been in agreement. Pace is the only exception, who places the work in the circle of Tosini-Brina. The attribution to Maso seems correct, and the painting should remain in his oeuvre.


Florence, Contini Bonacossi Collection.

Portrait of a Young Woman.

A photograph of this portrait appears among Puligo's works in Berenson's photographic archives. The painting is an unlikely candidate for Puligo's oeuvre. The small head is placed oddly off center upon an extremely elongated neck; very different from Puligo's more robust feminine types.

Lit: Unpublished.

Florence, Merini Collection.

Portrait of a Man.

Attributed to Puligo in Berenson's photographic archives. Not by Puligo, based on morphological observations, such as the square shape of the sitter's head and the wavy line that demarcates the left side of the face.

Lit: Unpublished.
Florence, Paoletti Collection.

**Madonna and Child.**

Attributed to Puligo in the Fototeca Berenson. Not by Puligo, but an adaptation of his style. Compare the Christ Child with the **Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist**, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 145 (cat.no. 25, fig. 33).

**Lit:** Unpublished.

**Variants:** **Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist**, sold Sotheby's, London, 1970.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist**, S. Tommaso d'Aquino, Florence.

Florence, Palazzo Ricasoli, Collection of the Barone Ricasoli.

**Portrait of a Man.**

Panel; 93 x 67 cm.

**Prov:** In the collection of the Barone Ricasoli since the eighteenth century.

A variant of Puligo's portrait, **Il Fattore di San Marco**, located at Firle Place near Lewes, East Sussex. The strongly contrasting light and dark and linear way of painting indicates that the artist is someone other than Puligo. Gamba and Clapp noted this variant without suggesting an attribution.

**Lit:** Gamba, 1909, 280. Clapp, 1916, 166.

Madonna and Child.

Panel; 70 x 48 cm.


Given to Puligo at Giulio Frascione's, 1965, and to Bescianino in Berenson's photographic archives. The painting is by the same hand as the Budapest Holy Family, no. 54, and its variants the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist in a private collection in Madrid and the Musée Thomas Henry in Cherbourg (see Attributed Paintings). It belongs to the Florentine school of the second decade of the sixteenth century.

Lit: Unpublished.

Formerly Florence, Paoletti Collection.

Madonna and Child.

Attributed to Puligo in the Fototeca Berenson.

The painting is a free copy of a work in the Buccleuch Collection, Boughton House with a slightly different background (see Attributed Paintings).

Lit: Unpublished.
Formerly Florence, Rudolf Ergas Collection.

Portrait of a Man in a Black Beret.

Panel; 60 x 50 cm.


Shearman feels that this portrait, formerly attributed to Andrea del Sarto by Tinti and Gronau (as reported by Tinti), should be added to Puligo's list of portraits. Fraenckel rejected it as a Sarto without additional explanation. Freedberg suggests that the portrait may be from Ridolfo Ghirlandaio's studio, dating from the fourth decade of the sixteenth century.

The placement of the half-length figure against a horizontally molded wall is uncharacteristic of Puligo's preferred deep landscape vistas or nondescript dark backgrounds. The awkwardly skew formation of the sitter's face is likewise atypical of the ovoid shape usually found in portraits by Puligo. Freedberg's suggested attribution of the circle of Ridolfo would appear to be reasonable.

Sold Florence, Sotheby's, 25-26 March 1985, no. 189.

**Cleopatra.**

Panel; 82.5 x 63 cm.

Labeled as "attributed to Puligo" at the Sotheby's sale. The painting is a copy of Puligo's *Cleopatra* at the Museum of Fine Arts in Budapest, no. 71.23 (cat. no. 61, fig. 77). The figure stands before a curtain rather than in a niche as in the original. Not by Puligo, but an imitator with capabilities of some interest, dating perhaps later in the sixteenth century.

**Lit:** Unpublished.

---

**Florence, Art Market, 1969.**

**Madonna and Child with Donor.**

Panel.

Borgo attributed this painting to Puligo in the preface of the Garland Edition of his dissertation, after initially attributing it to Albertinelli. Von Holst correctly places it in the workshop of Sogliani.

Glasgow, Corporation Art Gallery, no. 165.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Canvas; 83.5 x 66.4 cm.

**Prov:** McLellan Bequest, 1854.

Given to Puligo in the Fototeca Berenson. Now given to Michele di Ridolfo in the Gallery's catalogue and by Wright.


---

Grenoble, Musée de Peinture et de Sculpture, no. 516.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

57 x 46 cm.

**Prov:** From Vienna.

Given to Puligo with question by Berenson, and according to the 1892 Grenoble Catalogue, the painting was formerly attributed to Sarto. Considered by the writers of the 1977 Liverpool Catalogue to be a superior version of the Liverpool copy. By an anonymous hand of the early sixteenth century.


**Copy:** Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool, no. 2868.
The Hague, Dr. G. Rademacher Collection.

St. Catherine.

A photograph of this painting is located under Puligo's name at the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence. It is an imitation of the Magdalen at the National Gallery in Ottawa (cat.no. 64, fig. 80), repeating the dress and drapery at the right. The hands are positioned as the St. Barbara at the Hermitage (cat.no. 65, fig. 81). Overall the drapery is crudely handled and cannot be identified as a work by Puligo. It belongs to a later imitator. Not an autograph work in Lockhart's opinion.


The Hague, J.H.M. van Rooy Collection.

Madonna and Child with the Little St. John.

Panel; 62 x 49.5cm.


Attributed to Puligo at the Witt Library, but cross-referenced with Bacchiacca. The painting was correctly given to Bacchiacca in the Doetsch Catalogue of the Christie's sale and by all subsequent scholars who have given an opinion on the work.

Halsingborg, A. Hyberg Collection.

Holy Family.

Given to Puligo by Siren, but rejected by Lockhart.

The painting is a free variant of the Holy Family with St. John the Baptist at the Musée des Beaux-Arts in Nantes (see Attributed Paintings).

The attribution to Puligo possibly is correct. The facial type of the Virgin compares with early versions by Puligo, such as the Madonna and Child, London, c. 1517-18 (cat.no. 13, fig. 20), and is especially close to the woman portrayed in two portraits of c.1514-15 (cat.no. 42, fig. 58; cat.no. 43, fig. 59). The element which causes by hesitation in attributing the work to Puligo is the treatment of the drapery. The small creases of the sleeve and the twisted folds of the upper sleeve is not compatible with his early work but is more common in works of the mid-1520s (cat.no. 33, fig. 48; cat.no. 35, 50).

The presence of a variant in Nantes, also with questionable attribution to Puligo, suggests that the works may be copied from an original by Puligo that is no longer extant.

Lit: Siren, 1933, 113.

Hampton Court, Collection of H.M. the Queen, no. 139.

Madonna and Child.

Panel; 56.2 x 42.7 cm.

Prov: Hampton Court inventory of 1835, no. 117 (see Shearman, 1983, 9 for further details).

Crowe and Cavalcaselle considered the painting as possibly attributable to Puligo. Guinness, Collins Baker, and the Hampton Court Palace List gave the painting to Andrea del Sarto. Law attributed it to Sarto with question. Clapp considered the work to be mistakenly ascribed to Pontormo, but did not suggest an alternative attribution. Freedberg gives the painting to Salviati with reserve. Cheney considers it to be an autograph Salviati probably dating from the late 1520s when he was in Sarto's shop. Originally, Shearman (1965) thought the Hampton Court painting was a copy deriving from Sarto's lost Madonna of Marchese Botti. He now believes the painting is an autograph Sarto (1983), but can not verify the connection with Marchese Botti. Shearman, based upon evidence gathered by a recent and thorough examination of this painting (1983), places the picture among the late works by Sarto. His argument is persuasive, and the Hampton Court painting may very well be the newest addition to Sarto's oeuvre.

Four versions of the Hampton Court painting exist. These are located at Alnwick Castle, Duke of Northumberland; formerly London, Earl of Northbrook, (purchased by Stevens at Christie's, London, 11 June 1937, no. 18); Jacksonville (Florida), Art Museum; and Stockholm, Eric Johnson-Stampe Collection. Among these only the painting formerly in the Northbrook Collection was attributed to Puligo (see Attributed Paintings, Formerly London, Baring and Northbrook Collections).
Hampton Court, Collection of H.M. the Queen, no. 1450.

Madonna and Child with the St. John the Baptist.

Panel; 100.2 x 74.8 cm.

Prov: Noted in the Leicester House of Frederick, Prince of Wales in 1749. At Buckingham House (George III inventory and 1819 inventory, no. 682). Moved to Windsor in 1835. Transferred to Hampton Court in 1947.

London, Royal Academy, 1946, no. 214.

Crowe and Cavalcaselle thought that this painting was perhaps by Puligo, imitating the work of Andrea del Sarto. Freedberg suggests that the painting may have been underdrawn by Sarto, but brought to completion by an assistant, with finishing touches applied by the master. He suggests that Puligo may have been the assistant who was the main executant of the work. Freedberg sees Puligo's use of Andrea's style in the painting and compares it to the presence of Puligo's hand that he perceives in the Holy Family, London, National Gallery, no. 17. Berenson (1932) originally attributed it to Sarto's school. He later, however, considered the painting an authentic work by Sarto, as did Guinness. Waagen and Collins Baker attributed the painting to Sarto's imitators, and the Hampton Court Palace List placed it among the works of his studio. Shearman lists the work as a variant of the Holy Family in the Alte Pinakothek,
Munich, no. 501, and attributes it to the workshop of Sarto.

The Hampton Court painting is one of numerous variations and copies of Sarto's Holy Family, Paris, Louvre, no. 1515 and/or the Holy Family, Munich, Alte Pinakothek, no. 501. Like many other copies of paintings by Sarto, scholars have attempted to place this work in the oeuvre of Puligo. The Hampton Court painting, however, fails to exhibit characteristics, such as facial types, that can be identified with Puligo's style. For the present, the painting must remain in the category of anonymous Sarto imitators.


1I disagree with Freedberg's opinion regarding the National Gallery Holy Family, see Attributed Paintings.


Knole, Sackville Collection (on loan to Knole, National Trust).

Portrait of a Man.


A photograph of this portrait is found under Puligo's name at the Frick and Witt Libraries. Attributed to Franciabigio in the 1932 exhibition. McKillop suggests that the portrait may be by the same hand that painted the Portrait of a Young Man, Philadelphia, Johnson Collection, no. 81 and Portrait of a Lady, Cleveland Museum of Art, no. 44.92.
Although I can not suggest an alternative attribution, the hard linear quality of this painting makes it unacceptable as a Puligo.


Kreuzlingen (Switzerland), Art Market.

Magdalen.

Panel; 76 x 58.5 cm.

Given to Sarto by the vendor, but believed by Freedberg to be close to Puligo, or perhaps by him.

The painting is related to Puligo's Magdalen at the National Gallery of Canada at Ottawa (cat.no. 64, fig. 80), but has the appearance of being by an imitator.

Sold Lago di Como, Villa d'Este.

Madonna of the Lilies.
Panel; 102 x 74 cm.

Prov: Christie's, Lago di Como, Villa d'Este, 31 May - 1 June 1971.

Given to Puligo at the sale. Not by the painter, but imitative of his style. A free variant of Sarto's Wallace Madonna, Wallace Collection, London, no. 9.

Lit: Unpublished.

Liverpool, Walker Art Gallery.

Panels from the San Leonardo Altarpiece, Mussomeli.

St. Leonard, no. 2748.
Panel; 150 x 62.7 cm.

St. Catherine of Alexandria, no. 2749.
Panel; 150 x 63.5 cm.

Madonna and Child in Glory, no. 2750.
Panel; 150 x 86.5 cm.

Prov: The Confraternity of San Leonardo, Mussomeli commissioned Vincenzo da Pavia in 1541 to paint this polyptych containing the Madonna, Christ Child, and SS. Leonard and Catherine. Transferred in the nineteenth century to the Chiesa della Matrice, San Lodovico. Sold in 1840. Believed to have been in a religious establishment in Palermo and taken to England by an agent of Pope Pius VIII. Appeared in the William Brett collection. Purchased from Brett by the Liverpool Royal Institute, 1842. Deposited at the Walker Art Gallery in 1893 and presented to the Gallery in 1948.

Exhib: Leeds, St. Leonard, no. 102 and St. Catherine, no. 87; belonging to the Liverpool Royal Institution, 1868.

Given to Puligo in the Roscoe Collection catalogues and the 1868 Leeds exhibition. The three panels are part of a documented polyptych by Vincenzo degli Azani da Pavia, commissioned in 1541 by the Confraternity of San Leonardo, Mussomeli.
Liverpool, Walker Art Gallery, no. 2868.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; 62.2 x 59.5 cm.

**Prov:** Inscribed on the back are the following names: Geri Bocchineri and Tom. Bondini, 22 May 1621. Possibly purchased in 1832 by Rev. John Sanford; sold Christie's, London, 9 March 1839, no. 82; bought by Norton. In the Liverpool Royal Institution by 1843. Deposited at the Walker Art Gallery, 1893; presented to the Walker Art Gallery, 1948.

Given to Puligo by Valentino Pace on the photograph at the Witt Library. The painting was attributed to Sarto in the 1843 Liverpool Catalogue, and to his school in the 1928 and 1977 Catalogue. Berenson gave the painting to Sogliani with question. Freedberg believes the painting is more dependent upon Puligo than Sarto, and Wright places it in the Florentine School of the sixteenth century.

By an anonymous painter of the Florentine milieu, early sixteenth century.

**Lit:** Liverpool, Walker Art Gallery Catalogue, 1843, 27; 1859, nos. 75-77; 1893, 25-26; 1915, nos. 70-72; 1928, 54-55; 1977, 221-23. Wright, 1976, 215.


**Copy:** Grenoble, Musée, 1892, no. 516.
Longford Castle, Lord Radnor Collection.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Panel.

A derivation of Andrea del Sarto's *Wallace Madonna*, London, Wallace Collection, no. 9, that was considered by Crowe and Cavalcaselle to be by Puligo. Hazlitt called the painting an autograph Sarto, but all other references simply list it as a copy of the Wallace painting without making an attribution.

I have not seen this painting, nor a photograph of it, and therefore refrain from making a statement regarding its attribution.


Longniddry (Scotland), Gosford House, Earl of Wemyss.

**Madonna Enthroned with Six Saints.**

Berenson in his photographic archives attributed this painting to Puligo and noted the work was "close to Rosso." Not by Puligo, and if it is Rosso, it would be at his very earliest, with slight suggestions of Piero di Cosimo.

Lit: Unpublished.

London, National Gallery, no. 17.

**Holy Family.**

Panel; 106 x 81 cm.
Prov: From the Aldobrandini Collection, Rome; Aldobrandini inventory, 1603, 1626, 1682 (see Pergola, "Aldobrandini," 1960, 432, no. 112; 1963, 78, no. 380. Onofrio, 1964, 8: 206, no. 233). Bought from Aldobrandini Collection by Irvine for Buchanan, who sold it to the Rev. William Holwell Carr; bequeathed by the latter to the National Gallery in 1831.

Exhib: London, British Institution, 1816, no. 3.

This painting was first ascribed to Puligo by Waagen (1837, 1854). It is also given to Puligo by Freedberg and in the Florentine exhibition catalogue, _Il Primato del disegno_. Monti assigns the painting to Puligo with question. The painting was considered by some to be an autograph Sarto; see Buchanan, Reisett, Guinness, Farington, the 1929 National Gallery Catalogue, and Gould in the 1975 National Gallery Catalogue. Others placed the painting in the studio of Sarto or considered it to be by a follower or imitator of Sarto; see Waagen (1870, who had previously attributed it to Puligo); Berenson, Shearman, Viardot, Richter, and Crowe and Cavalcaselle. Ramdohr and Hazlitt doubted the attribution to Sarto, and Fraenckel stated it was not by Sarto without suggesting an alternative attribution. The possibility of Bugiardini as the author was suggested by Jacobeen.

The Holy Family is a variant of the Tallard Madonna at the Hermitage in Leningrad. While it is considered by most to be an autograph Sarto, there are nearly an equal number who place the painting in the shop of Sarto. I am in agreement with the latter, but find the painting to show evidence of Sarto's hand. I concur
with Shearman (1965, 2: 215) who notes:

The *fattura* generally is more energetic than that of any known early work by Puligo, and I see no reason to associate it with his name... (Freedberg) suggested Puligo's execution, using Sarto's cartoon for the Tallard *Madonna* (this hypothesis should be discarded, since the cartoon for the latter, if there was one, could not have been used here where the figures are larger in scale.


London, Dowdeswell Collection.

**Madonna and Child.**

Attributed to Puligo at the Witt Library. By an imitator of Michele di Ridolfo. The painting is copied from the *Madonna and Child* in the Holy Family, Museo Bandini, Fiesole, attributed to Michele di Ridolfo by Berenson (1963, 2: fig. 1300).

**Lit:** Unpublished.

London, Dowdeswell Collection.

**Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi.**

49.5 x 27.5 cm. Inscribed: Niccolò di Taddeo di Agnolo Gaddi.

Given to Puligo at the Witt Library. Lockhart considered it a copy, possibly nineteenth century, of the Bowood, *Portrait of Carnesecchi*. Freedberg (1963, 2: 234n.3) cites a portrait of Carnesecchi with the same inscription but different dimensions (49.5
x 41 cm.), formerly in the Methuen Collection at Corsham Court and exhibited at Burlington House, 1877, as a bust-length copy of Puligo's Portrait of Carnesecchi, Palazzo Pitti, Florence.

The Dowdeswell picture is a variant of the Bowood portrait, not by Puligo.


London, J.P. Heseltine Collection.

Portrait of a Young Woman.

Panel; 52 x 42 cm.

A photograph of this painting appears under Puligo's name at the Witt Library. There, the portrait is also cross referenced with Bacchiacca and Salaio as his self-portrait. The Heseltine Catalogue was the first to attribute the painting to Salaino. A. Venturi included it among Andrea del Brescianino's oeuvre, calling it a female portrait and stating that it had been erroneously attributed to Puligo. Lloyd calls the painting a variant of the Ashmolean Museum's Portrait of a Young Woman, no. A370, attributable to Brescianino.

The painting is indeed a portrait of a woman by Brescianino or his copyist. I do not agree with Lloyd who calls the portrait a variant of the Ashmolean work. The Heseltine painting repeats the pose of the Ashmolean portrait, but is very different in every other detail. The Heseltine portrait is actually a copy (or the original) of Brescianino's Portrait of a Young Woman, no. 205, in the Musée Fesch in Ajaccio.

London, J. Leger Collection.

**Madonna and Child with St John the Baptist.**

81 x 63.5 cm.


Attributed to Puligo with cross reference to Fra Bartolommeo at the Witt Library.

The painting is almost assuredly a candidate for the Master of Volterra, a painter newly identified by Zeri (see Torriti, 1978, 202 and my discussion under Attributed Paintings, Siena, Pinacoteca Nazionale, no. 562).

This particular work is analogous to the Siena Madonna and Child, no. 562, and shows a similar drawing of the eyes and mouth of the figures. Comparison with the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist at the Convento delle Oblate, Florence (GfS di F, no. 119858), attributed to this same master by Torriti (202), is also informative; the pose and drawing of the Madonna's faces are nearly identical.

Lit: Unpublished.
London, G. Morant Collection.

Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.

Panel.

Attributed to Puligo at the Witt Library. Perhaps by Michele di Ridolfo. The facial type of the Virgin is closely associable to those attributed to Michele (see Berenson, 1963, 2: figs. 1300-03).

Lit: Unpublished.

London, S. Pollak Ltd.

Madonna and Child.

Attributed to Puligo at the Witt Library. By a Tuscan painter of the early sixteenth century.

Lit: Unpublished.


Story of Narcissus.

Panel; 28 x 40.6 cm.


The attribution to Puligo first appeared in Berenson's Lists of 1932 and 1936, and with question in 1963. Gilbert also considered the panel to be by Puligo and noted it as one of the artist's few secular works. The painting was attributed by most to Franciabigio;
see the Burlington House Exhibition, Cust, the Benson Catalogue, A. Venturi, Freedberg (1961), and Shearman. Zeri has convincingly attributed the painting to Antonio di Donnino del Mazziere. Freedberg (1963, 1972) and the writer of the catalogue entry for the Palazzo Strozzi Exhibition (Silvia Meloni Trkulja) are in agreement with Zeri. McKillop takes exception to the attribution to Antonio. She states the painting resembles the Apollo and Daphne in the Galleria Corsini in Florence, [now given by most to Antonio], but that they are not by the same hand.

Judging from the photograph, the painting appears to have a number of qualities closely associable with Antonio di Donnino, such as the drawing of the trees, treatment of the figures, and the placement in a landscape setting, making the attribution highly plausible.


Formerly(?) London, H. C. Erhardt Collection.

**Portrait of a Woman.**

Panel; 47 x 33 cm.

**Prov:** Cited in the Erhardt Collection at the Witt Library. May be the Puligo Female Saint that has the same dimensions and was sold under "Various Properties" at Sotheby's, London, 3 March 1965; bought by Pottaci.

The portrait is attributed to Puligo and cross referenced with Piero della Francesca at the Witt Library. Definitely not Puligo in
composition, handling of paint, or costume of the sitter.

Lit: Unpublished.

Formerly London, Baring and Northbrook Collections.

Madonna and Child.
Panel; 60.9 x 45.7 cm.


Attributed to Puligo by Crowe and Cavalcaselle and with reservations by Guinness. Wagen and Richter gave the painting to Andrea del Sarto. Clapp noted that the painting was not satisfactorily attributed to either Pontormo, Andrea del Sarto, or Puligo, but did not offer an alternative attribution. Freedberg considers the work a copy, without attribution, of the Madonna and Child, Hampton Court, no. 139 (see Attributed Paintings), and Cheney and Shearman think the painting derives from Sarto's shop.

There are several versions of this painting, among which Clapp considered this one to be the original. The others are found at the following locations: Alnwick Castle, Duke of Northumberland Collection; Hampton Court, no. 139; Jacksonville, (Florida), Art Museum; and Stockholm, Eric Johnson-Stampe Collection. Among these paintings only the Hampton Court Madonna and the former Northbrook Madonna have been attributed to Puligo in the past.

Shearman (1983, 9-11) has persuasively argued that the Hampton Court painting is an autograph Sarto. I am inclined to agree with his judgment, thus making this painting a Sarto school-piece.
Formerly London, Farrer Collection.

**Madonna and Child.**

Panel; 75 x 57.5 cm.


Attributed to Puligo by Ffoulkes and Berenson. Previously identified as a work by Fra Bartolommeo at the London exhibition and the Christie's sale.

Judging from the photograph, this painting is not by Puligo, but rather by a minor artist recently christened the "Master of Volterra" by Zeri (see Torriti, 1978, 202). Torriti states that Zeri, in an oral communication, named the artist of a Volterra altarpiece, the Madonna and Child with Saints, at the Conservatorio dei Santi Pietro e Lino, the "Master of Volterra". Torriti has added five other paintings to the oeuvre of this newly labelled artist that bear a similar style to the Volterra altarpiece.

The Farrer painting, not mentioned by Torriti, illustrates specific characteristics that are similar to the paintings now given to the Master of Volterra. For example, the eyelids of the Madonna and Child are shaded with an upward sweep at the corners in a way that closely resembles the two paintings identified as by the Master
of Volterra by Torriti at the Siena museum, the Madonna and Child, no. 562 and the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist, no. 563, (illustrated in Torriti, 1978, 202). The pose of the Farrer Christ Child is nearly the same as the two examples from the Siena museum and the tilt of the Virgin's head is essentially a repetition of the Virgin in the Madonna and Child, no. 562, at the Pinacoteca in Siena.


Formerly London, Henry Harris Collection.

St. John the Baptist Preaching in the Wilderness.

Canvas; 71 x 61 cm.


Traditionally given to Puligo, until Zeri signaled the painting as a work by Antonio di Donnino del Mazziere. Shearman and Freedberg (1972) are in agreement with Zeri. Salvini was the only exception who attributed the work to Bacchiacca. Definitely Antonio di Donnino, in the treatment of landscape and drapery style.

Formerly London, Hon. Mrs. Donel Post Collection.

"Graham" Madonna and Child.

Prov: William Graham Collection. Possibly the Virgin and Child attributed to Fra Bartolommeo, Graham sale, Christie's, London, 8 April 1886, no. 248; bought in for the family and passed to Mrs. Donnel Post by descent. The painting is perhaps the same as the Sogliani, Madonna and Child in Front of a Cloth of Honor, sold at Mrs. Post's death, Christie's, London, 15 July 1960, no. 83; panel, 25 x 18 1/2 inches.¹

Attributed to Puligo by Berenson. I have no knowledge of this painting.

Lit: Berenson, 1936, 408; 1963, 1: 184.

¹My thanks to Oliver Garnett for the information regarding the provenance.

Sold London, Christie's, 1895, Doetsch Sale.

Holy Family.

Panel; 95.5 x 75.5 cm.


Attributed to Puligo at the Doetsch sale. Perhaps a copy of a lost original by Puligo; another copy is at Würzburg.


Copy: Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum der Universität, no. 93.


Madonna and Child with SS. Catherine and John the Baptist.

Panel; 92.8 x 72.4 cm.

Prov: Miss Bridgeman Simpson, Pilton Hall; sold Christie's, London, 20 July 1984, no. 188.
Called an "attributed" work by Puligo at the sale.

An imitation of Puligo's standard type of the Madonna and Child with a saint and the little Baptist peering over the Virgin's shoulder. The upward gaze of the Christ Child and the facial type of the Baptist suggest to some degree the Columbus Holy Family (cat.no. 32, fig. 47) as a model.

Not by Puligo, but rather an unknown painter of persuasive abilities.

Lit: Unpublished.


**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**


Given to Puligo at the Frick Art Reference Library, and to Sarto at the London sale. By a painter of the second decade of the sixteenth century. The softly focused forms are imitative of Puligo's style, but by a less skillful painter.

Lit: Unpublished.

Sold London, Sotheby's, 1970.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; 63.5 x 49.5 cm.

Given to Puligo at Sotheby's. The painting is perhaps a later sixteenth-century adaptation of a Puligo original. The Christ Child is comparable to Puligo's type, such as in the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, no. 145 (cat.no. 25, fig. 33).

Lit: Unpublished.

Variants: Madonna and Child, Paoletti Collection, Florence.

Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist, S. Tommaso d'Aquino, Florence.


Pieta.

Panel; 51 x 43.5 cm.

Prov: Charles Loeser Collection; sold 9 December 1959, Sotheby's, London; bought by Dauphine.

Given to Puligo at the sale. The attribution is understandable, particularly in the handling of the background. Trees are drawn as thin wispy lines with branches painted in an upward sweep. The figures, however, are small and frail and do not reflect the volumetric forms that Puligo executed throughout his entire career (compare with cat.no. 3, fig. 4; cat.no. 18, fig. 25; cat.no. 38, fig. 53).

More compatible with the small-scale narratives executed by Antonio di Donnino (compare figures and landscape with St. John the Baptist Preaching in the Wilderness, formerly London, Henry Harris Collection, or the Deposition, Seminario Patriaccale Manfredini;
discussed in Attributed Paintings).

Lit: Unpublished.

Sold Lucerne, Galerie Fischer, 1958.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; 137 x 110.5 cm.

Attributed to Sarto in the sales catalogue. Freedberg suggests that the painting belongs to Puligo's late style. Close to Puligo's style, but not actually by him. By a capable painter of considerable interest of the late sixteenth century.

Madrid, Prado, no. 294.

Holy Family with Three Figures (Angels?).
Panel; 130 x 98 cm.

Attributed to Puligo at the Prado and by Bénézit. Judging from the photograph the painting appears to be in rather poor condition. The work is extremely dark and has two prominent vertical fissures in the middle section of the panel.

While a reliable attribution is difficult to make because of the condition of the painting, various aspects of the style reveal an artist who is familiar with the Florentine milieu. The Madonna, for example, is depicted holding the Christ Child’s foot in a manner typical of Raphael, and the cluster of heads in the upper right hand corner and pinwheel pose of the Infant recall Puligo’s figure arrangements and poses. The small folds of the drapery and facial types, however, eliminate the possibility of an attribution to either Raphael or Puligo. For the present, the artist can only be described as a Florentine painter of the sixteenth century.


Madrid, Prado, no. 333.

Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.
Panel; 107 x 81 cm.

One of the numerous copies of Andrea del Sarto’s Wallace Madonna, Wallace Collection, London, no. 9. Crowe and Cavalcaselle attributed a Madrid copy, no. 911 (either this work or Prado, no. 338) to
Puligo. Guinness noted a Madrid replica of a painting in the Church of St. Giacome degli Spagnoli in Naples that he considered the original by Sarto. The Wallace Collection Catalogue suggests that this Madrid painting is perhaps a second version by Sarto of the Wallace Madonna. The work is otherwise considered by scholars to be a copy of the London painting by an anonymous hand.


Madrid, Prado, no. 338.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; 106 x 79 cm.

_Prov:_ From the Collection of Doña Isabel Faresio.

A copy of Sarto's Wallace Madonna, Wallace Collection, London, no. 9. Crowe and Cavalcaselle attributed a Madrid copy, no. 911 (either this work or Prado, no. 333) to Puligo. Guinness noted a Madrid replica of a painting in the Church of St. Giacome degli Spagnoli that he considered the original by Sarto. Onieva gave the work to Sarto, while the other writers include it among the paintings by anonymous copyists of Sarto.


Madrid, Private Collection.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; tondo; 74 cm.

Given to Puligo by Zeri at the Frick Art Reference Library. The painting was sold at Christie's as a Raphael and given to Sogliani by Agnew's (Burlington Magazine) and Shipp. The work is a variant of the Holy Family at Budapest and Cherbourg as noted by Holst. None of the paintings are by Puligo. Closer to the school of Fra Bartolommeo, dating from the second decade of the sixteenth century.


Memphis, (Tennessee), Brooks Museum of Art, no. 64.19.

Adoration of the Magi.

Prov: Habich Collection, Cassel, Germany; sold in Cologne, 9 May 1892, no. 5; bought by Nicole. Benigno Crespi Collection, Milan. Gift to the Brooks Museum of Art, 1964, from Mrs. Elisha Gee, Jr., Memphis, Tennessee.


This painting was attributed to Puligo by Freedberg (1961) who saw the work as the first example of Puligo's so-called "small scale narratives." In the second edition of his 1961 Painting of the High Renaissance... (1972), Freedberg illustrated the Adoration with the caption reading "Puligo or the Master of the Kress Landscapes(?)." In the notes to this later edition, however, he stated that the painting was closer to Antonio di Donnino del Mazziere than to Puligo.
The painting has been attributed by most to Bacchiacca; see A. Venturi, Berenson, Nicolle, Cartwright, Schubring, Valentiner, Salvini, Art Quarterly, Museum News, and Sixty Paintings. McComb could not attribute the painting to Bacchiacca, and Nikolenko, in her monograph on Bacchiacca, attributed it to any of the minor followers of Andrea del Sarto and Fra Bartolommeo. Suida suggested Franciabigio as the artist, and Merritt hesitantly called it a youthful work of Vasari based on a drawing by Fra Bartolommeo.

Shearman did not give an attribution but noted that the source of the composition partly derives from Sarto's Journey of the Magi in the Chiostriano of SS. Annunziata in Florence. Zeri (1962) initially attributed the painting to Sogliani, an opinion repeated by Fahy. Later, Zeri with Fredericksen (1972) gave the work to an unspecified Florentine artist of the sixteenth century. Presently, Zeri (1982) attributes the Adoration to Antonio di Donnino, concurring with Freedberg's latest opinion. The painting is also given to Antonio di Donnino in the Memphis Museum's catalogue.

Antonio di Donnino is the correct attribution.

Milan, Museo Poldi-Pezzoli, no. 557.

**Portrait of a Youth.**

Canvas; 57 x 45 cm.

**Prov:** In the Poldi-Pezzoli Collection since at least 1860. Earlier inventory records were destroyed in 1943.

**Exhib:** Florence, Palazzo Strozzi, *Mostra del Cinquecento Toscano*, 1940, 76, no. 12.

Attributed to Puligo by Bertini. Given to Salviati in the 1911 Poldi-Pezzoli Catalogue, an attribution followed by all other scholars.


Milan, Giulio Ferrario Collection.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Attributed to Puligo with question by Berenson. The painting is based on Albertinelli's *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist* of 1509 in the collection of the Earl of Harewood, Harewood House, Yorks (see Borgo, fig. 31) and probably belongs to a painter of his circle.

**Lit:** Berenson, 1963, 1: 184.

Montepulciano, Pinacoteca.

**Baptism of a Youth.**

Canvas; 103 x 150 cm.
Brogi first attributed the painting to Puligo, an attribution that was followed by Venturi and Gronau.

The style of the painting has very little to do with Puligo's work. The canvas support upon which the work was painted also makes the attribution suspect; Puligo always painted on panel (with the one exception being a fresco).

I can not suggest an attribution for this work, except to point out that the painter was familiar with the Roman milieu of the early sixteenth century. The figure on the left rushing into the scene, for example, is taken from Raphael's *School of Athens*. Almost assuredly by a painter of the Roman school of the mid-sixteenth century.


Munich, Alte Pinakothek, no. 509.

*Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.*

Panel; 127 x 97 cm.

Prov: Bought by F. Muller in Rome, 1808.

A copy of Andrea del Sarto's *Wallace Madonna*, Wallace Collection, London, no. 9. Mistakenly given to Puligo by Hirth and Muther, the 189[?] Munich Catalogue, and Böttinger. Listed by Reumont as an original work by Sarto. Freedberg and Shearman simply include the painting, without attribution, among the numerous copies and derivations of the *Wallace Madonna*.

Munich, Gebhardt Gallery, 1964.

Holy Family.

Given to Puligo at the Gallery. A very close imitation of Puligo's style, but the facial types are somewhat removed from Puligo's specific brand.

Lit: Gebhardt Gallery, Pantheon, 1964, xxii.

Munich, Heinemann Gallery.

Portrait of a Man.

Incorrectly given to Puligo in a 1931 Heinemann Gallery advertisement. The linear handling of the paint is not similar to Puligo's style.


Sold Munich, Helbing, Goeschl sale, 28 March 1897, no. 898.

Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Two Angels.

Panel; 86 x 72 cm.

Mistakenly attributed to Puligo at the Goeschl sale. The work is a copy of Sarto's Wallace Madonna, Wallace Collection, London, no. 9 as noted by Freedberg and Shearman; of rather poor quality.

Nantes, Musée des Beaux-Arts, no. 381.

Holy Family with St. John the Baptist.

Panel; 103 x 79 cm.

Prov: Campana Collection. Musée Napoleon III. Given by the French government to the Nantes Museum in 1863.

Given to Andrea del Sarto in the Campana Collection Catalogue of 1858, the Musée Napoleon III Catalogue of 1862, and the Nantes Catalogue of 1903. Merson was the first to attribute the painting to Puligo, an attribution that was repeated in the rest of the sources listed below.

The painting does have qualities that strongly suggest Puligo's hand, such as the curtains parted at the side, the hand of Joseph (i.e., cat.no. 37, fig. 52), and the Virgin's face (i.e., cat.no. 65, fig. 81). The facial type of the Christ Child, however, appears incompatible with Puligo's traits. The eyes are large and darkly shaded, and the mouth is unusually wide.

The presence of a free variant, the Holy Family in the A. Hyberg Collection at Halsingborg (see Attributed Paintings), also with questionable attribution to Puligo, suggests that the works may have been based on a version by Puligo that is no longer extant.


Variant: Holy Family, A. Hyberg Collection, Halsingborg.
Nantes, Musée des Beaux-Arts.

Madonna and Child.

Panel; 86 x 70 cm.

**Prov:** Cacault Collection.

Considered possibly a Puligo by the 1903 Nantes Catalogue. Given to the school of Andrea del Sarto by Merson. I have not seen this painting or a reproduction of it.

**Lit:** Merson, 1887, 99. Nantes, Musée Catalogue, 1903, 117, no. 383.

Naples, Capodimonte; no. 753, Inv. 84187.

**Christ the Redeemer.**

Panel; 59 x 43 cm. On the verso: the Farnese stamp and no. 259.

**Prov:** May be the Sarto painting described in Palazzo Giardino, Parma (see Barri, 1679, 129); in the inventory of c.1680 (see Campori, 1870, 215); and in the inventory of c.1710, no. 62 (see di Candida, 1902, 285). Shearman also notes a painting of the same subject attributed to Sarto that was bought by the Farnese in 1713 (di Candida, 1902, 288) and another that was sent from the Palazzo Farnese, Rome, to Naples in 1759 (di Candida, 1902, 297).

The painting is attributed to the "Scuola toscano sec. XVI—Domenico Puligo?" at the Naples Museum. The work is one of the numerous copies of Sarto's **Christ the Redeemer**, SS. Annunziata, Florence.

There is no suggestion of Puligo's hand in this painting, and there is no evidence in Puligo's career that he worked in Sarto's shop as a copyist. The painting is most likely a studio copy by an anonymous hand as indicated by Shearman.

Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 91.

**Portrait of a Prelate.**

Panel; 50 x 39 cm.

*Prov:* Inventory of the Palazzo del Giardino, Parma, c.1680 (see Campori, 1870, 302). Transferred to the Capodimonte, Naples. Taken to Palermo in 1806.

Given to Puligo by Alazard and A. Venturi. Recorded in the seventeenth-century inventory as a work by Andrea del Sarto. Freedberg rejects both of these attributions. Berenson was confident that the portrait was by Lotto. Rinaldi correctly, I think, attributed the painting to the North Italian school.


---

Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 739.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; 115 x 87 cm.

Attributed to Puligo by Molajoli in the 1960 Naples Museum Catalogue. The painting is a copy, which Freedberg attributes to an anonymous copyist of the sixteenth century, of Andrea del Sarto's Wallace Madonna, Wallace Collection, London, no. 9,


---

New Haven, Yale University, Museum of Fine Arts, no. 81.

**Adoration of the Magi.**

Panel; 94.5 x 83.8 cm.

*Prov:* Brought to America in 1860 by James Jarves. Deposited at the Yale Art School, 1867. Bought by the Yale Corporation, Jarves Collection sale, 9 November 1871.
Berenson attributed this painting to Puligo in 1932 and 1936 and
with question in 1963. Sturgis gave the painting to Franciabigio and
Siren and Clapp (reported by Sirén) named Naldini as the author.
Fredericksen and Zeri place the work in the Florentine School of the
sixteenth century, and McKillop correctly notes that the painting is
reminiscent of Antonio di Donnino.

Lit: Sturgis, 1868, no. 91. Sirén, 1916, 203-04, no. 81. Berenson,
1932, 475; 1936, 409; 1963, 1: 184. Fredericksen and Zeri, 1972,
223.

New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, no. 32.100.89.

The Giustiniani Madonna.

Prov: Collection of Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani, Rome, 1631
(Galleria Giustiniani del Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani, 1631, 2:
Supplement, pl. 8) and 1639 Inventory, no. 23 (see Salerno, 1960,
136). Morisey Collection, Paris; to the collection of Michael
Friedsam, New York, by 1924-31. Bequeathed by Friedsam to the
Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1931.

Engr: Cornelis Bloemart, Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist
in Galleria Giustiniani del Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani, 1631, 2:
Supplement, no. 8.

A photograph of this fragment is found under Puligo's name in the
Berenson photographic archives. Berenson also gave the painting to
Franciabigio in his Lists. In a letter of 1924 and in an unpublished
and undated catalogue of the Freidsam Collection, Berenson, while
attributing the painting to Franciabigio, noted a style analogous to
that of Puligo's (see Zeri and Gardner). The fragment was also
attributed to Franciabigio by A. Venturi and Wehle. All other
scholars have rejected the attribution to Franciabigio and have
correctly returned the painting to the oeuvre of Andrea del Sarto,
thus agreeing with the attribution found in the seventeenth-century
Giustiniani inventories.

Venturi, 1925, 9/1: 430, 432. Wehle, 1940, 64. Freedberg, 1963, 2: 

Formerly New York, Nicholas M. Acquavella Gallery.

Madonna and Child.

67 x 50.5 cm.

Prov: George A. Hearn Collection, New York. Nicholas M. Acquavella 

Exhib: New York, Nicholas M. Aquavella Galleries, "Paintings by Old 
Masters," 14 April - 14 May 1945, no. 10.

Zeri at the Frick Art Reference Library attributed this work to 
Puligo. It was given to Brescianino in the Hearn Collection and at 
the Acquavella Gallery. By an unidentified personality of the 
Florentine School.

Lit: Hearn Catalogue, 1908, 145, no. 184.

Sold New York, Sotheby's, 1986.

Madonna and Child.

Panel; 60.5 x 65 cm.

Prov: Robert Dawson Evans Collection. Bequest from Mrs. Robert 
Dawson Evans, November, 1917, to the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, no. 

Mistakenly considered to be attributable to Puligo by 
Fredericksen and Zeri. The Boston Museum suggests that the painting 
is a copy after Sarto, perhaps nineteenth century, of the Wallace
Madonna, London, Wallace Collection, no. 9. Called "Attributed to Domenico Puligo" at Sotheby's sale. The work is a cut panel, containing only the Virgin and Child.


Ottawa, National Gallery of Canada, no. 4352.

Madonna and Child.
Panel; 85 x 62 cm.


Exhib: London, British Institution, 1853, no. 53.
Leeds, 1868, no. 258.
London, Royal Academy, 1883, no. 174.

Found under Puligo's name in the Fototecca Berenson. When in the Wenlock Collection during the nineteenth century the painting was exhibited as by Andrea del Sarto. The work is now rightly considered to be a school piece of Sarto's dating from the second decade of the sixteenth century.


Palermo, Galleria Nazionale della Sicilia, no. 82 (old Inv. 49).

Portrait of a Man as S. Miniato.
Canvas; 69.5 x 55 cm. Dated 1563.

Prov: Given to the Museum by Principe de Belmonte.
Mistakenly attributed to Puligo by Berenson in his photographic archives. The painting is dated 1563, well after Puligo's death in 1527. Given to an anonymous Tuscan painter of the mid-sixteenth century by Delogu; a reasonable attribution.

Lit: Delogu, 1962, 48, 57.

Paris, Louvre, no. 233.

Portrait of an Engraver.

Panel; 70 x 53 cm.

Prov: Jabach Collection. Acquired by Louis XIV in 1671 (see Le Brun inventory, 1683, no. 285).


The attribution to Puligo was given by Berenson in his Lists of 1932, 1936, and 1963, and by Siren. All other writers, including the 1683 Le Brun inventory, and Berenson in 1907, give the painting to Pontormo. The attribution to Pontormo is justified considering the psychologically troubled expression of the sitter that distinguishes it from Puligo's more emotionally restrained portrait types.

Paris, Louvre, no. 297.

**Visitation.**

Panel; 165 x 172 cm.

**Prov:** From the Chapel of Lorenzo di Giovanni Tornabuoni at Santa Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi.

Ascribed to Puligo by Bocchi-Cinelli and Biadi. All other writers give the painting to Domenico Ghirlandaio; Vasari added that the work was completed by Davide and Benedetto Ghirlandaio. The altarpiece is a documented work by Domenico Ghirlandaio (see Luchs).


Paris, Benedict Collection.

**Madonna of Humility with St. John the Baptist.**

Medium and dimensions unavailable.

**Prov:** Untraced.

Attributed to Puligo by Longhi (see Quintavalle) and by Quintavalle.

The painting imitates Puligo's *Madonna of Humility* works (e.g., cat.no. 8, fig. 13; cat.no. 10, fig. 15) but appears to be intensely Sienese. It recalls not only Sodoma, but Beccafumi, and even Peruzzi in types, in textures, and even in the trees.

The painting is rather unique in that it was copied in a composition executed, according to Quintavalle, by three painters: Parmigianino, Bedoli, and Anselmi. The copy is located at the
Galleria Estense in Modena, no. 224. Quintavalle suggests that the Paris picture, which he attributes to Puligo, may have been taken from Tuscany to Parma by Anselmi around 1520. Quintavalle's theory on the authorship of the Modena painting seems convincing.


Philadelphia, Johnson Collection, no. 82.

Magdalen.

Panel; 56 x 39.3 cm.

Prov: Panciatichi, Florence, sold 3 April 1902. Purchased in 1905 by Johnson through L. de B. Spiridon from a Florentine.

Sold from the Panciatichi Collection as Andrea del Sarto in 1902; writers thereafter give the painting to Puligo. In comparison with Puligo's depictions of female saints and heroines, or even portraits of women, however, the painting far exceeds the stylized types that he created. The drawing of the hands, for example, is much more carefully worked than Puligo's standard production of two extended fingers of the right hand holding an object (i.e., cat.no. 60, fig. 76, cat.no. 61, fig. 77). The face is gracefully idealized with tumbling golden hair that is Leonardesque in style, rather than Sodomesque as Puligo preferred.

Berenson (Johnson Catalogue, 1913) wrote that the painting contained a touch of Franciabigio's influence, revealing perhaps the key to the attribution of the painting. The transparent white scarf with vertical lines wrapped about the Magdalen's shoulders is comparable to Franciabigio's Madonnas in the Madonna Enthroned with
SS. John the Baptist and Job, 1516, Depositi of the Galleries, Florence and the Madonna del Pozzo, c. 1517-18, Accademia, Florence, (see McKillop, figs. 55, 73). The careful modeling of the flesh tones without evidence of the brushstrokes also reflects Francia bigio's style rather than Puligo's. Datable in Franciabigio's oeuvre to the second half of the second decade of the sixteenth century.


Philadelphia, Johnson Collection, no. 86.

Cleopatra.

Panel; 71 x 57 cm.

Prov: Purchased by Johnson in 1903 from L. de B. Spiridon, Florence.

Cheney suggested this painting is closer to Puligo than Salviati to whom it was attributed in the Johnson Catalogue and by Venturi. Fredericksen and Zeri generally place the painting in the Sienese school of the sixteenth century.

The painting is close to Puligo, but not actually by him. The work is based on his Cleopatra at the Budapest Museum of Fine Arts (cat. no. 61, fig. 77) and repeats the pose of the right hand and the twisted fabric that partially clothes the figure. The drawing of the face and the color does not suggest Puligo's hand; the Sienese school may in fact be the correct assessment.
Pisa, Museo Civico.

Cleopatra.

Attributed to Puligo with question at the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence. A derivative of Puligo's Cleopatra at the Museum of Fine Arts in Budapest, no. 71.23 (cat.no. 61, fig. 77).

Perhaps seventeenth century.

Lit: Unpublished.

Pittsburgh, Museum of Art, Carnegie Institute, no. 64.11.13.

Portrait of a Man.

Panel; 51 x 38.7 cm.


London, British Institutions, 1840, no. 68.

Pittsburgh, Museum of Art, Carnegie Institute, "Exhibition of Paintings from the Collection of Howard A. Noble," 13 April - 21 May 1944, no. 11.

This painting has received a variety of attributions. It was engraved in the early nineteenth century as a work by Raphael, an attribution that was followed by Buchanan and Waagen (1838). Viardot and Richter gave the portrait to Andrea del Sarto. Passavant thought the painting probably belonged to Sarto or one of Raphael's pupils. Franciabigio was suggested by the following: Berenson (1907), Cartwright, Venturi, Freedberg with question, and in the Gazette des Beaux-Arts. McKillop rejected the portrait as a work by Franciabigio but gave no alternative suggestion. Waagen (1854), after initially giving the work to Raphael, changed his attribution to Pontormo. Crowe and Cavalcaselle believed it was by either Pontormo or Puligo, but Clapp said it was neither of these artists. Guinness considered the work to probably be by Puligo, an attribution that was affirmed by Berenson (1963) and the Museum. The most recent opinion was given by Federicksen and Zeri who state the work was "like Brescianino."

The style of the work suggests in part the hand of Puligo. The choice of color is particularly reminiscent of his style; the background is bottle green, the coat is black brought up with white to make gray highlights, and the hair and fur is dark umber. The pentimenti on the left side of the hat also suggests Puligo's touch. On the other hand, the sharply defined features of the sitter makes the attribution to Puligo tentative. There is a significant amount of paint loss in the area of the coat and the right side of the sitter's hair to warrant a cautious attribution regardless of the artist named. Unlike Federicksen and Zeri, I do not find the painting remotely close to the style of Brescianino. I can only
suggest the general Florentine milieu of the sixteenth century.

Mckillop calls the Portrait of a Man attributed to Franciabigio, (sold Parke Bernet, New York, 24 June 1944, no. 74), a variant of the Pittsburgh portrait. They appear to me to be quite separate and individual works.


Rome, Accademia Nazionale di San Luca.

St. Andrew.

Panel.

Attributed to Puligo in Berenson's photographic archives. The St. Andrew, and its companion piece, St. Bartolomeo, also in the Accademia, are signed and dated (1565) works for an altarpiece from Monte di Pieta by Alessandro Allori.


Rome, Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini, no. 1439.

Madonna of the Goldfinch.

Panel; 77 x 60 cm.

Given to Puligo by Berenson. The painting appears in old inventories of Cardinal Antonio Barberini (1644) and Principe Maffeo Barberini Colonna di Sciarra (1896) as by Andrea del Sarto. A. Venturi suggested the work was probably by Bugiardini. Shearman says that Franciabigio's name has been put forward, but he does not specify by whom. Shearman, Sricchia, Monti and McKillop have correctly returned the painting to the oeuvre of Sarto.


Rome, Galleria Borghese, no. 64.

Holy Family.

Canvas; 67 x 56 cm.

Prov: Borghese inventory, 1833, 8.

Attributed to Puligo in the 1833 Borghese inventory. Given to Ludovico Carracci by Venturi and to the workshop of Ludovico by Bodmer. Pergola gave the painting to Annibale Carracci. The painting belongs to the Carracci school.

Rome, Galleria Borghese, no. 324.

Venus and Two Amorini.

Panel; 168 x 67 cm.


Mistakenly attributed to Puligo by Voss and A. Venturi (1932).

Given to Andrea del Sarto in all the antiquarian Borghese inventories that date from the seventeenth to the early nineteenth centuries and by Manilli and Manazzale. Platner suggested Beccafumi as an alternative to Sarto. A. Venturi attributed the panel to Franciabigio in 1893 and to both Puligo and Franciabigio in 1932. Lafenestre and Richtenerberger, Rusconi, and Schubring, following Venturi, gave the painting to Franciabigio. Frizzoni was the first to name Brescianino as the artist. All others listed below are in accord with the attribution to Brescianino.

Rome, Galleria Borghese, no. 331.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Two Angels.**

Panel; 94 x 77 cm.

*Prov:* Perhaps the painting attributed to Pontormo in the 1626 and 1682 inventories of the collection of Olimpia Aldobrandini (see Pergola, "Aldobrandini," 1960, 432, 442; 1963, 82, 87n.453). In the Aldobrandini inventories of 1693 and 1694 as Andrea del Sarto.

A copy of Andrea del Sarto's Wallace Madonna, Wallace Collection, London, no. 9. Given to Puligo by Berenson in his 1936 and 1963 Lists, and possibly in the 1932 List mistakenly as Borghese Gallery, no. 334. Attributed to Sarto and perhaps Pontormo in seventeenth century inventories. Longhi suggested Brescianino as the author of this painting, and Freedberg feels that this may be the correct attribution. Other writers on the painting simply label it as a copy of the Wallace Madonna by a nondescript hand; the most reasonable evaluation for the present.


---

Rome, Galleria Borghese, no. 336.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; 80 x 60 cm.


Freedberg (1961) mistakenly considered a major portion of this painting to be by Puligo based on a design by Andrea del Sarto. He
has since retracted this attribution (1963, 1972), and now places the painting among Sarto's autograph works, stating that the painting is unrelated to Puligo. Berenson attributed no. 336 to Puligo in 1932, but also listed it under Sarto's name. Berenson placed the painting most frequently, however, in prior and subsequent years, with Sarto. In addition to Berenson and Freedberg (1963, 1972), the painting has been given to Sarto in the old Aldobrandini and Borghese inventories and by Longhi, Rinaldis, and Pergola. A. Venturi, Morelli, Jacobsen, Lafenestre and Richtenberger, and Guisti attributed the painting to Bugiardini. Shearman places it among the studio works of Sarto, not finding any evidence of Puligo's assistance. Monti returns to Freedberg's first attribution and gives the work to Sarto with assistance from Puligo.

Shearman's observation is correct; the painting does not show evidence of Puligo's assistance. By a nondescript painter in the Sarto shop.


Rome, Galleria Borghese, no. 375.

Pieta with Four Saints.

Panel; 22 x 168 cm.

Berenson attributed the predella to Puligo with question in his early Lists, but later in the 1963 edition gave it to Andrea del Sarto. The Pieta first appeared in the 1693 inventory as by Perugino. A. Venturi and Fraenkel placed the work with an anonymous painter of the Umbrian School. All other writers correctly attribute the predella to Sarto, calling it an early work dating from the first decade of the sixteenth century.


Rome, Galleria Borghese, no. 463.

Story of Joseph.

Panel; 78 x 173 cm.

Prov: The first reference appeared in the Borghese Collection, Elenchi Fidecomissio, 1833, 20, by an unknown artist.

Exhib: Florence, Palazzo Strozzi, Mostra del Pontormo e del primo manierismo fiorentino, 1956, 114, no. 144.

This painting was initially attributed by most scholars to Bacchiacca, except Camba, who gave it to Sogliani, and Freedberg (1961), who gave it to Puligo. Zeri has since convincingly attributed the painting to Antonio di Donnino del Mazziere. This is the present opinion of Freedberg (1972), who in the second edition of his 1961 text, illustrated the work with the caption "Puligo or Master of the Kress Landscapes," but in a note in that same edition gave the painting to Antonio di Donnino, based on Zeri's
attribution. Also included among Antonio's oeuvre by McKillop and
the catalogue, *Il Primato del disegno*, for the exhibition at the
Palazzo Strozzi in Florence in 1980.

**Lit:** Morelli, 1892, 101, 108, 1897, 95. A. Venturi, 1893, 213;
Pigler, 1956, 70. Pergola, 1959, 2: 15-16, no. 12. Freedberg, 1961,

Rome, Galleria Colonna.

*Maddonna Crowned by Two Angels with Infants Christ and St. John the
Baptist.*

Panel; 77 x 61 cm.

**Prov:** Filippo I Colonna.

Given to Puligo by all writers, except Safarik who gave the
painting to Sarto with question. The painting is not by Puligo, but
by a Sartesque imitator. The work is variation on probably a lost
Sarto original (see Shearman, 1: figs. 30c, 34a, 2: 210, 289). A
copy of the painting, attributed to Rosso, was exhibited at
Colnaghi's ("Discoveries from the Cinquecento," 17 June - 7 August
1982, no. 31).

**Lit:** Morelli, 1892, 1: 128. Rome, Galleria Colonna Catalogue, 1902,
Rome, Galleria Doria, no. 280 (510).

**Holy Family with St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; 80 x 64 cm.

Mistakenly given to Puligo in the Galleria's 1925 Catalogue and by Venturi and Bénézit. Appears as Girolamo da Carpi since the 1942 Galleria Catalogue.


Sold Rotterdam, Van Marie, De Silla, and Baan Sale, 1942.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

**Prov:** Sold Rotterdam, Van Marie, De Silla, and Baan Sale, 15-16 July 1942, no. 168.

A copy of the **Holy Family** at the Palazzo Pitti, no. 486 in Florence. Attributed to Sarto at the Rotterdam sale. Signaled as a copy after Puligo by Freedberg.

**Lit:** Freedberg, 1963, 2: 219.
San Francisco, De Young Memorial Museum, no. 1956,22.

Infant St. John the Baptist.

Panel; 47 x 39.4 cm.

Prov: Collection of Andrew Caldow, Berkeley; gift to the Museum in 1956.

A photograph of this painting is found under Puligo's name at the Fototeca Berenson. The painting was given to the De Young Museum as a work by Andrea del Sarto. Fredericksen and Zeri correctly place the painting in the seventeenth century in Italy. The tenebristic lighting and thick impasto confirm their attribution.


Schleissheim, Gallery, no. 3560.

Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.

Canvas; 100 x 74 cm.

Prov: Dusseldorf Gallery.

Given to Puligo in the 1914 Schleissheim Catalogue and by Venturi and Gronau in Thieme-Becker. D'Argenville attributed the painting to Andrea del Sarto. Freedberg disagrees with the attributions to Sarto and Puligo and identifies the painting as a partial copy of a work by Jacopino del Conte at the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge. He placed the painting in the Florentine milieu of Michelangelo, c.1550, suggesting the style of Macchietti. The Schleissheim Gallery and Holst attribute the painting to Jacopino del Conte.

Sestri Levante, Ferdinando Rizzi Collection (?).

**Madonna and Child with SS. John the Baptist and Catherine.**

A photograph of this painting appears under Puligo's name at the Frick Art Reference Library. The painting, however, is not listed in the inventories of Ferdinando (d.1959) or Marcello Rizzi (d.1960), and the Rizzi Foundation has no knowledge of it.

The work is not by Puligo. Perhaps of the late sixteenth century.

*Lit:* Unpublished.

Formerly Seville, Museo.

**Portrait of a Young Man.**

*Prov:* Rafael González Abreu Bequest.

This painting, noted in the Seville Museum by Berenson, is not today a part of their collection and its whereabouts is unknown.

Berenson gave the painting to Puligo and observed (1938) that the work was inspired by Pontormo's *Study of Ippolito de' Medici*, Uffizi, Florence, no. 452F. This citation was repeated by Cox Rearick. In his 1963 *List*, Berenson questioned the attribution.

The photograph of the painting in the Berenson Fototeca does not permit an accurate attribution.

Siena, Pinacoteca Nazionale, no. 562.

**Madonna and Child.**

Panel; 77.5 x 58.5 cm.

_Prov:_ From the Palazzo Reale (Palazzo del Governo), Siena, 1868. The Palazzo Reale was a Medici residence, so the painting probably had a Florentine provenance prior to being in Siena.

After initially listed as by an unknown painter in an 1895 Siena Catalogue, this painting was attributed to Puligo with question by Perkins and Brandi. Dami called the painting an original work by Puligo, and Carli found the painting to be in the manner of the same artist. Torriti recently has attributed the painting to the "Master of Volterra."

This painting is among a group of works that Torriti gives to the so-called Master of Volterra, an artist named by Zeri (in an oral communication to Torriti, q.v.), after an altarpiece, the **Madonna and Child with Saints**, located in Volterra at the Conservatorio dei Santi Pietro e Lino. Two of these paintings, the Siena, no. 562, discussed here, and the Volterra altarpiece itself, have been attributed to Puligo.

The Siena painting is not by Puligo, and I follow Torriti's attribution.

Siena, Pinacoteca Nazionale, no. 609.

Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.
Panel; 128.5 x 91.5 cm.

Prov: From the Ospedale di S. Maria della Scala, Siena—Magazine no. 67.

Attributed to Puligo with question by Brandi. Grohn doubts whether the painting is by Puligo, and Carli simply calls the painting a replica of Puligo. Lockhart states that the painting is an early copy, not by Puligo. Torriti, in his recent Siena Catalogue, attributes it to the circle of the artist.

The painting is a copy of Puligo's Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist, Alte Pinakothek, Munich, no. 13188. The sharply focused forms and coppery colors of the flesh indicate that the painting is not by Puligo, and furthermore there is no evidence to suggest that the painting derives from Puligo's studio as suggested by Torriti.


Stalybridge, Astley Cheetham Art Gallery.

Madonna and Child.
Panel; 56.8 x 49.6 cm.

Prov: Possibly the Virgin and Child attributed to the School of Fra Bartolommeo that was purchased by John Frederick Cheetham at the William Graham sale, Christie's, April, 1886, no. 288. Given to the Stalybridge Art Gallery in 1931 by the bequest of John Frederick Cheetham.

The attribution to Puligo may have been given by Thomas Agnew and Sons prior to the opening of the Astley Cheetham Art Gallery in the
1930s. Pace convincingly attributes the painting to Sicolante da Sermoneta. Wright agrees with this attribution, and the painting is exhibited at the Gallery under the same name.


1My thanks to Mr. Oliver Garnett for supplying this information.

Staten Island, Staten Island Institute of Arts and Sciences, Study Collection, no. 61-17.1 (Kress 596).

**Portrait of a Woman.**

Panel; 57.8 x 46.4 cm.


Attributed to Puligo in the Fototeca Berenson. Shapley notes the ms. opinion of F.M. Perkins who attributed the portrait to a Florentine influenced by Raphael and Andrea del Sarto and related to Pontormo. Shapley attributes the portrait to a follower of Pontormo, datable about 1540.


**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; 103 x 79.5 cm.

Authenticated by Osvald Siren in 1936 as a Puligo and attributed to the same at the sale. The painting is a copy of a work that recently appeared at Christie's, New York, 15 January 1985, no. 91 (cat. no. 33, fig. 48). Judging from the photograph, the Bukowski
painting is not by Puligo but by a close imitator. The drapery
appears too hard edged to be by Puligo.

Lit: Unpublished.

Tempe, Arizona State University, Matthews Gallery.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Canvas; 84 x 113 cm.

Prov: Given to Arizona State University by Lewis J. Rusk in 1958.

The Tempe painting appeared in Seile Arte in 1959 as attributed to
Puligo. It is given to Puligo at the Tempe Museum and in the
Museum's 1966 publication.

The foreground figures of this painting closely copy the Madonna,
Christ Child, and Infant St. John of Sarto's Holy Family, Louvre,
Paris, no. 1516 (Freedberg, 1963, 2: 82-85) or Sarto's lost Barbadori
Holy Family from which Shearman (1965, 2: 240) considers the Louvre
version to be a copy. The decaying architecture in the background of
the Tempe painting is copied from Franciabigio's Madonna del Pozzo,
Accademia, Florence, no. 1445. The composition appears in several
editions, all of which place the Madonna and two Children in a
landscape setting (see Shearman, 1965, 2: 240, xv-xix).

The painting is not close to Puligo's style, as exemplified in
its sharply delineated forms, facial types, and angular zig-zag
pattern of the Virgin's sleeve. The attribution to this artist
demonstrates, however, the tendency in the past to ascribe to Puligo
works not attributable to Sarto but marginally resembling the older
master's style. This painting can be considered a pastiche based on
the assemblage of borrowings from the oeuvre of Sarto and Franciabigio. Fredericksen and Zeri list the work as the school of Andrea del Sarto. This is a reasonable attribution.


Toronto, Art Gallery of Ontario, no. 50/40.

_Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Three Angels._

_Panel; 125 x 92 cm._

_Prov:_ According to Bottari, the Corsini _Madonna_, cited by Vasari, was replaced by a copy. The copy may be the Toronto painting that presumably was taken to England by John Udney in the last years of the eighteenth century. In the collection of Lady Proctor-Beauchamp, Langley, Norwich supposedly before 1800. Remained in the family until the 1946 sale. E. L. Paget sale, London, Christie's, 31 May 1946, no. 59. Bought by Agnew and Sons, London. Gift of R. W. Leonard estate to the Toronto Art Gallery, 1951.

This painting is a version of the Corsini _Madonna_ (the _Madonna of Humility with the Infant St. John the Baptist and Three Angels_, Petworth House, no. 333) that Guinness called "a poor copy [of Andrea del Sarto] of charming composition...more like Puligo's work."

Cochin and Gonse considered the painting to be the original Corsini _Madonna_, and Freedberg and Shearman call it a copy of the Corsini painting.

The painting does not exhibit characteristics of Puligo's style. The numerous folds of the Virgin's sleeve, for example, are far more elaborate than Puligo's simplified brand of execution.

Toulon, Musee (Campana 464).

**Portrait of a Man.**

Panel; 59 x 48 cm.

Mistakenly attributed to Puligo by Perdrizet and Jean and Berenson. The Campana catalogue called it a self-portrait of Andrea del Sarto. Although I can not suggest an alternative attribution, the portrait has no connection with Puligo.

**Lit:** Campana Catalogue, 1858, 9/7: no. 464. Perdrizet and Jean, 1907, 39, no. 464. Berenson, 1932, 476; 1936, 409; 1963, 1: 185.

Turin, Galleria dell'Accademia Albertina.

**Holy Family.**

Given to Puligo by Gabrielli. The painting is a copy from a Sartesque design (see Freedberg, 1963, 2: 187; Shearman, 1965, 2: 290-91). No connection with Puligo's style; by an anonymous Sarto imitator.

**Lit:** Gabrielli, 1933, 13, no. 149.

Turin, Galleria dell'Accademia Albertina.

**Magdalen.**

Given to Puligo by Berenson and Gabrielli. Morelli, Guinness, and Pergola (repeating Guinness) called the work an old copy of the Borghese Magdalen (cat.no. 66, fig. 82).

The painting is a good candidate for a Puligo and does, in fact, appear to be an expanded version of the Borghese Magdalen. Characteristics of Puligo's hand are present, such as the treatment
of hair, the cast shadow on the wall and the rather awkward drawing of her right hand. Nevertheless, the careful modeling and detailed handling of the folds of the drapery are so unlike Puligo's style that the attribution is extremely suspect. Also, the painting lacks the sketchy, hazy quality prevalent in a great number of works. Almost assuredly by a close imitator of Puligo of the sixteenth century.


Turin, Galleria Sabauda, no. 121.

Madonna and Child with Four Angels.

Panel, tondo; 68 cm. diam.

Prov: From the Sabauda Collection.

Pergola considered this painting to be by the same painter as the Madonna and Child with Two Angels at the Galleria Borghese in Rome, no. 468 (cat.no. 3, fig. 4) which he attributed to Puligo. Crowe and Cavalcaselle and Berenson give the painting to Brescianino.

Gabrielli correctly places it with Pacchia.

Venice, Seminario Patriarcale, Pinacoteca Manfredini.

Deposition.

Panel; c. 76 x 58 cm.

Prov: Untraced.

Berenson was the first writer to accredit this painting to Puligo. The work had initially been identified as a Bacchiacca by A. Venturi, followed by McComb and Moschini. Nikolenko, in her monograph on Bacchiacca, states that the painting is mistakenly ascribed to the artist, but does not make an alternative attribution. Merritt attributed the work to Visino, a pupil of Franciabigio. Middledorf, Freedberg (1961), Pope-Hennessy, and the 1980 Florentine exhibition catalogue, *Il Primato del disegno*, all follow Berenson's attribution and give the painting to Puligo. Freedberg (1972), in a note in the second edition of his 1961 text, has since joined this painting with a series of small narratives now assigned to Antonio di Donnino del Mazziere.

The attribution to Puligo is not entirely convincing. While the soft modeling of the figures and feather-like tree in the background resemble Puligo's manner, the small scale of the figures in relationship to the landscape does not correspond to typical trends evidenced in his work. For example, the Venice *Deposition* sharply contrasts with a painting at the Collegiata di Santa Maria delle Grazie in Anghiari (cat.no. 38, fig. 53) of the same subject that is securely given to Puligo and cited by Vasari. Here the monumental figures almost fill the entire picture plane, thus limiting the view into the background. The effect is very different from the Seminario
painting where small active figures busily carry out their task of lowering the body of Christ from the Cross.

Freedberg is closer to being correct in ascribing the work to Antonio di Donnino, a painter known for his narratives with small figures deployed in deep landscapes.


Venice, Seminario Patriarcale, Pinacoteca Manfredini.

**Madonna and Child with the St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; 32 x 29 cm.

**Prov:** Removed from the Palazzo Pitti by the Grand Duke Leopold I (1765-80) and given to the Manfredini Pincoteca.

Berenson attributed this painting to Puligo with question in his 1963 *List*, after initially calling it a Bacchiacca. The painting was attributed to Raphael when it was given to the Pinacoteca by the Grand Duke. Most writers give the painting to Bacchiacca, except Nikolenko who places it in the "attributed" category of Bacchiacca's *oeuvre*, rather than among the authentic works by the artist.

The attribution to Bacchiacca appears to be the most reasonable of choices. The profile head and elaborate headdress of the Virgin resemble other feminine types by him, such as the *Portrait of a Lady*, in the Springfield Museum of Fine Arts, Springfield, Massachusetts. The compositional arrangement with the seated Virgin in the right foreground, the two Holy Children on the left, and a landscape view
in the distant left, likewise is a design frequently used by Bacchiacca as in the *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist*, Wiesbaden, Gemaldegalerie.


Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, no. 42 (no. 409).

**Madonna and Child with Elizabeth, St. John the Baptist, and Two Angels.**

Panel; 135 x 97 cm.

**Prov:** Probably from 1553 inventories of Palazzo Vecchio. Palazzo Vecchio inventory, 1560. Tribuna inventory, 1589. Transferred to Vienna in 1792.

Believed by Crowe and Cavalcaselle to be by Puligo. One of the numerous copies and derivations of the Louvre, no. 1515 or Munich, Alte Pinakothek, no. 501.


Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, no. 650.

**Tobias Altar.**

Panel; 178 x 153 cm.

**Prov:** From the Medici Collection. Pitti inventories, 1637 (G.525, c. 43v) and 1663 (G.725, c.53r). Poggio Imperiale inventory, 1695 (G.1017, c.42). In the Tribuna of the Uffizi in 1783. Transferred to Vienna by exchange in 1792.

Assigned to Puligo by Waagen, but otherwise given by most to Andrea del Sarto since its early recordings in seventeenth-century inventories. Fraenckel was an exception who attributed the painting
to a follower of Sarto. Also, Freedberg (1961) originally ascribed a large portion of the painting to Puligo. He now discounts this observation and correctly considers the painting an autograph Sarto.


Vienna, Liechtenstein Collection.

**Head of St. John the Baptist.**

Panel; 48 x 59 cm.

Thought by Kronfeld and by A. Venturi to be by Puligo as a production of Sarto's shop. Crowe and Cavalcaselle considered the painting to be late sixteenth-century Italian. Freedberg states the work is not necessarily Italian.

No connection with Puligo. The use of thick impasto around the border of the salver upon which St. John's head lies suggests an artist of the seventeenth century.


Formerly Vienna, Harrach Gallery, no. 364.

**Madonna and Child.**

Panel; 45 x 41 cm.

_Prov:_ Sold by the Gallery during World War II.
I have seen neither the painting, nor a photograph of this work.

The Gallery states that, although the painting was attributed to Puligo in the past, it has nothing to do with the artist but dates from a later time.


Sold Vienna, Politzer Collection. Gluchselig and Warndorfer, 7-9 December 1920, no. 111.

**Madonna and Child.**

Panel; 79 x 90 cm.

Attributed to Puligo in the sales catalogue. A variant of Sarto's *Madonna del Sacco*, SS. Annunziata, Florence, without Joseph.

Not by Puligo.

Lit: Unpublished.

Volterra, Conservatorio dei Santi Pietro e Lino.

**Madonna and Saints.**

Given to Puligo by Ricci. Identified by Zeri (oral communication to Torriti, q.v.) as a work by the Master of Volterra.


**Portrait of Lucrezia Sommaria.**

Panel; 63 x 46 cm. Inscribed on the parapet: . LVCRETIAE . SVMARIAE . EFFIGIES.


Attributed to Puligo by L. Venturi, who later preferred Ridolfo Ghirlandaio. The painting is also attributed to Puligo at the Witt Library, but cross referenced with Franciabigio. The majority of attributions place the painting in the oeuvre of Ridolfo Ghirlandio. Besides L. Venturi already mentioned, attributions to Ridolfo were made by Berenson, the 1923 Widener Catalogue, the Washington National Widener Catalogue, Fredericksen and Zeri, Walker, and the National Gallery itself. Franciabigio was also suggested at the 1899 Agnew's exhibition. A. Venturi considered the portrait by Michele di Ridolfo. In written communications, E. Pillsbury and E. Waterhouse suggest Andrea del Brescianino. The attribution to Brescianino is supported by Shapley, who dates the painting c. 1520 based on the costume of the sitter.

The attribution to Brescianino is correct. Shapley notes the stylistic similarity of the Washington portrait with the following portraits of women attributed to Brescianino: Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, no. A370; Rome, Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini; Berlin, Schweitzer Collection; and Sarasota, Ringling Museum, no. SN 25. To this list one can also add as comparisons two other works attributed to Brescianino: a drawing, Portrait of a Woman, Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Paris, no. 364 (Freedberg, 1963, 2: fig. 183) and the Venus with Two Amorini, Borghese Gallery, Rome, no. 324 (Pergola, 1959, 2: 19, no. 17). Both of these examples contain, as does the
Washington portrait, a sculpturesque quality that sharply defines the planes of the face, a bridgeless nose that appears as a flat unmodelled continuous plane extending to the forehead, and almond shaped eyes that look off to the side.


Windsor Castle.

**Holy Family.**

Panel; 107 x 81.2 cm.

**Prov:** From the collection of Frederick Prince of Wales.

A copy of Sarto's *Tallard Madonna*, Hermitage, Leningrad, no. 62 that was attributed to Puligo by Waagen. Crowe and Cavalcaselle, Freedberg, and Shearman rightfully place the work one of Sarto's imitators.


Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum der Universität, no. 93.

**Holy Family.**

Panel; 82 x 58.5 cm.

**Prov:** Untraced.

Attributed to Puligo by Offner in 1928 (ms. opinion, Kunsthistorisches Institut, Florence) and by Venturi. Lockhart also believes the painting is autograph, but extensively repainted.
Attributed to Sarto in an old inventory at the Museum. Francesco Brina was suggested by Stechow (ms. opinion) and Ragaller in the Würzburg Catalogue.

By an imitator of Puligo; based perhaps on a lost original.


*Copy:* Henry Doetsch sale, Christie's, London, 22, 24-25 June 1895.

York, City Art Gallery, no. 794.

**Portrait of a Youth.**

Panel; 49.7 x 38.1 cm.


Found under the name of Puligo in the Berenson photographic archives. The York Catalogue, which gives the portrait to Sarto with conjecture, states that the work has also been attributed to Bacchiacca, but it does not specify by whom. The Rothermere Catalogue bears an attribution made by Toesca who authenticates the work as a self-portrait by Andrea del Sarto. Other writers on the portrait would attribute it to Sarto, but they find the condition of the portrait in too ruinous of a state to be able to make a confident judgement. The painting is indeed closer to Sarto than Puligo.

Formerly Joseph Dabissi Collection.

**Madonna and Child.**

Panel; 85 x 62 cm.

*Prov:* Joseph Dabissi Collection; sold New York, American Art Association, 28-29 March 1924, no. 384.

Attributed to Puligo at the sale. The angular pose of the Christ Child, the curtain at the right, and the landscape at the left are imitative of Puligo's style. By a painter of the mid-sixteenth century.

*Lit:* Unpublished.

Location Unknown.

**Portrait of a Woman.**

Attributed to Puligo in the Fototeca Berenson. The photograph does not permit an attribution.

*Lit:* Unpublished.

Location Unknown.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist.**

Tondo.

Attributed to Puligo in the Fototeca Berenson. While the painting quite possibly could be by Puligo, the condition of the photograph does not allow an accurate attribution.

*Lit:* Unpublished.
APPENDICES

A. Documents

Document 1.

Florence, Archivio di Stato, Compagnie Religiose Soppresse C.XVIII (Cisterciensi) 428, no. 96, fol. 30r.

"Libro dei Benefattori del Monasterio di Cestello in Pinti," 1480ff.

Ricordo come questo di ante detto Pagolo antedetto di Ser Giovanni da Romena compro la sopradetto capella ducati 56 larghi et la dedicorno in honore di S Giovanni batista et fece impianellare et rifare il tecto et voltare tutta detta cappella et fare la sepultura di messer Bernardo suo fratello et sua et per sui heredi et comprola lapide dello altare quale non ve era et quello tutto fini cioe trovaglie tre un paliotto et pianeta con stola et manippulo di domasco biancho a fiori et un paliotto et cuio doro per idi privati et telaio et le banche atorno alla cappella et la predella dello altare et anco fece rifare la finestra di vetro et rethe di rame et una bella tavola con dua candellieri di ferro tutte cose honorevole et belle siche grandemente siamo obligati pregare dio per lana sti di messer Bernardo suo fratello et Ser Giovanni suo padre et suo padre et per yllarcho et piero sui fratelli et per il sopradetto pagholo et mona chaterina del Nero sua dona che iddio questo et ogni altro bene a presenti alle anime loro. et tutte le sopradette cose excepto la tavola sono finite questo ultimo de marzo 1526.

Published by:

Alison Luchs, Cestello, a Cistercian Church of the Florentine Renaissance (New York: Garland, 1977) 243, 276.
Document 2.

Florence, Archivio di Stato, Notarile Antecosimiano B 228 (Raffaello di Miniato Baldesi, 1523-25), fols. 432r-433r.

The contract between the Cistercians and Paolo di Ser Giovanni da Romena, 22 April 1525 for the purchase of a chapel for a tomb for his brother Bernardo in Cestello.

fol. 432r

Die xxii mensis aprilis MDXXV

Cum sit quod quondam Dominus Bernardus Ser Johannis de Romena civis florentinus suum nuncupatium quod dicitur sine scriptis condidit testamentum per quod inter alia disposit et ordinavit quod quadringenti ducati auri in auro larghi exponerentur in constructione unius capelle et eius ornamentis prout R(everendissi)m domino suo domino electo firmano videretur et placet. Et assignavit pro dote ipsius capellanie unam suam domum quam asseruit habere in Urbe, prope sanctam marian de populo intra suos confines, cum certo onore prout plenius et elatius constat in instrumento dicti testamenti rogato manu domini Jacobi apocelli notarii publici curie romane sub die xxiii decembris 1523. Et cum in dicto suo testamento prefatus Dominus bernardus suum heredem universalem instituit paulum suum fratrem carnalem, et cum dictus Paulus proposuerit dictam capellam erigi facere in cathedrali ecclesia florentina et eadem pro suis dotibus dictam domum applicare, et cum supersunt pecunie que exponi debuissent in constructione et hedificio dictae capellanie quia in dicta ecclesia cathedrali florentina non est locus in quo possit fieri huiusmodi constructio, hinc est quod prefatus paullus de consenso et voluntate prefati R(everend) di Domino electi firmani executoris dicti testamenti, proposuit id totum quod superest ex eo quia dictam cappellaniam non construirur de novo expendere in alia capellania in ecclesia S(ancte) marie magdalene de cistello ordinis cisterciensis. Et propterea R(everend) di patres Domnus Romulus francisci de rutinias et Domnus Johannes de benozis monaci S(ancti) Salvatoris de Septimo cuius abbatie prefatum monasterium beate marie magdalene membro existit, tanquam sindice et procuratores abbatis et monacorum dicti mon(a)stii de Septimo

fol. 432v

prout de mandato constat instrumentum rogatum manu mei notarii infrascripti sub die [blank] dictis modis et nominibus et vice et nomine heredum quondam Borghini [blank] de chochis civis et mercatoris florentinus pro quibus promiserunt dicto paulo presenti etc. de rato etc. aut quod saltim non contravent, alias de eorum, dictis nominibus et dicti monasterii proprio solvere et satisfacere dicto Paulo omnes expenses presentes et quas in futurum facerent in cappellania infrascripta omni modo etc. dederunt, vendiderunt etc.
dicto paulo presenti etc. Structuras et hedificium unius capellanie posite in (dicta) ecclesia sancte marie magdalene a latere dextero in ingressu dicte ecclesie inter capellam de pepis et capellam de Jacobis, cum omnibus suis pertinentiis, ad habendum et spiritualiter fruendum arbitrio boni christiani. Cum pacto quod dictus paulus pro dicti structuris capellanie prefate teneatur solvere dicto monasterio sancte marie magdalene et eius prelibatis ministria et dictis procuratoribus dicti nominibus, ducatos quinquagintasex largos in auro de pecuniis depositis penes heredes Taddei de ghaddis et socios de florentia ad omnem dictorum sindicorum, dictis nominibus, voluntatem et quos ducatos quinquagintasex largos in auro prefati sindici dictis nominibus, teneantur expendere in conficiendis spalleriis circum circa capellaniam sacrarii dicte ecclesie sancte marie magdalene. Et ulterius teneatur dictus Paulus teneatur infra duos annos proxime futuros dieri facere tabulam pro altria dicti capellanie et alia sua ornamenta ut alie capellanie dicte ecclesie. Et cum pacto quod caso quo dictus paulus vel sui heredes molestarentur in dicta capellania quominus posseent in ea arma et insignia apposita immutare et sua apponere et dictam capellam pro sua propria habere, tenere et nominare, quod prefati abbas et monaci teneantur eidem paulo vel sui heredibus restituere dictoc quinquagintasex ducatos et omnes alias expensas quas in futurum facerent pro dicta capella vel suis ornamentis et ad aliiis consuetis. Que omnia etc. promiserunt etc. attendere etc. pena dupli etc.

433r

Que etc. qua etc. pro quibus etc. obligaverunt etc. in forma camera cum iuramento, constitutione procuratorum et aliiis reuntiationibus debitis consuetis quibus pro guarantia etc.

Actum florentie in domibus dicti mon(aste)rii sancte marie magdalene presentibus ibidem providis viris Michaelangelo Johannis hieronimi pesciaiuolo p(opu)li s(anct)i ambrosii et Raphaele dominicistephani de Brucianese testibus.

Published by:

Luchs 405-08.
Document 3.

Florence, Archivio di Stato, Compagnie Religiose Soppresse C.XVIII (Cisterciensi) 396, no. 18 (T), fol. 61v.

"Memorie del Monasterio di Settimo del tempo che vi entrorno li Monaci Cisterciensi, che fu l'anno 1236, raccolte da vari fragmenti di più scritture antiche per me Don Ignatio Signorini fiorentino Monaco di detto Monasterio," mid-seventeenth century.

Addì 20 Marzo Stefano di Jacopi Boni fece fare la 3.a Cappella dalla parte del Giardino, e spese ducati 65, la qual cappella per l'anno 1525 l'hebbero quei da Romena, ove e una Tavola di mano del Puligo pittore.

Published by:


Luchs 350.

Document 4.


Commission for altarpieces for Santa Caterina and San Benigo in Genoa, 21 December 1525, from Battista di Cristofano Grasso and Agostino di Marsiano Calvo of Genoa.

Anno 1525, die xxj mensis decembris. Actum in Archiepiscopali curia Florentina presentibus ibidem providis viris Bernardino olim Iacobi del Camello pictore florentino, et Iohanne olim Casparis Bartholi dicto Civanza de Florentia nuncio dicte Curie, testibus etc.

Cum sit quod magister Baptista quondam Christophori Grasso de Ianua et magister Augustinus quondam Marsiani Calvo de Ianua, pictores Ianuenses intendant et velit perficere dua quadri d' altare in civitate Ianuensi pro usu ecclesie Sancte Caterine de Ianua et pro ecclesia sancti Benigni sita extra Ianuam: Unde hodie hac presenti suprascripta die in presentia mei notarii—personaliter constitutus honorabilis vir Magister Dominicus olim Bartholomei de Ubaldinis civis et pictor florentinus nomine suo proprio et omni meliore modo locavit operas suas in pingendo incipiendo et finiendo dictas tabulas in civitate Ianue in locis et ecclesias predictas dicto magistro Baptiste quondam Christophori et dicto magistro Augustino quondam
Marsianius presentibus et conducentibus et acceptantibus, pro tempore et termino quatuor mensium incipiendorum die prima qua ipsi locatores et conductores communi concordia egrediantur de civitate Florentiae et proficiscantur et ibunt versus cives Ianuam pro huiusmodi effectu, et ut sequitur finiantur; pro mercede et salario quolibet mense florenorum quindecim auri in auro latorum, solvendo per dictos conductores quolibet mense ratham, et cum pacto quod ultra dictos florenos 15 dicti conductores teneantur impendere, dare et subministare per dictos menses dicto magistro Dominico quotidias expensas victus prout qualitatem graduant statum dicti magistri Dominici; et cum pacto quod si finitis et completis dictis quatuor mensibus dicti duo quadri non fuisent et non essent ut dictur finiti et completi, quod dictus magister teneatur dicta duo quadra et suo tabulas ut dicitur perficere ad arbitrium boni viri; et ipsi conductores teneantur prout promiserunt dare et solvere eodem magistro Dominico et paghere illud idem stipendium et salarium, videlicet florenos quindecim auri in auro largos una cum expensis victus quolibet mense, et dicitus magister Dominicus promisit dictas tabulas laborare, pingere bene et diligenter secundum posse suum et scire suum; et e converso dicti conductores promiserunt dictos florinuos xv auri in auro latos quolibet mense solvere et expensis eodem pro dicto tempore summiniistare prout qualitatem et statum dicti magnifici Dominici ad arbitrium boni viri. Que omnia dicte partes promiserunt actendere sub pena florenorum 100 auri in auro latorum: que pena etc, etc.

Published by:


Cited by:

Milanesi in Vasari 1568 (1906) 4: 472.

Dominic Colnaghi, A Dictionary of Florentine Painters from the 13th to the 17th Centuries (London: John Lane the Bodley Head Ltd., 1928) 223.
Document 5.

Florence, Archivio di Stato, Bigallo, no. 18.

Libri de' Partiti e Stanziamenti de' Capitani della Compagnia di Santa Maria del Bigallo, 14 October 1525 - 13 November 1530.

Milanesi stated the commission was given by the Captiani of the Bigallo for 12 gold florins in 1526. Lockhart states that this particular document was destroyed in the 1966 flood.

Cited by:

Milanesi in Vasari 1568 (1906) 4: 467n.2.


Florence, Archivio di Stato, Bigallo, 661.

Entrata e Uscita, 1525-27.

On 24 December 1526 a payment of 31 lire, 11 soldi is made to Puligo.

Cited by:

Lockhart n. pag., no. 20.

Document 7.


Cappella de Martiri.

1526.

Franco, di Barto. del Giocodo Coduce la 4 Cappella in ordine a mano destra e fece in far' la tavola dipintovi S. Franc. la quale tavola dipinse Domenico Puligo dipinto Fior.no., le quali figur a giuditiiosi dell'Arte piace assai, qo.Franco nello dato qa.Cappella, me vi fece arme della sua casata. Barto. poi suo figlio trovado un pittor di buo mercato vi fece fipigner (La Chompagnia Santissima?) de martiri da Anto. Di Donino Mazzieri, io usero le parole formali di M. Giorgio
Vasari de Libri della Vita de Pittori, dice, la quale e mala cosa qo.
Barto. vi fece far larme a. sonon ne pilastri.

Published by:
Lockhart n. pag., note 67.
Cited by:
Colnaghi 224.

Document 8.

Florence, Archivio del Conservatorio di S. Maria degli Angiolini.

Payments made to Filippo di Salvestro di Francesco on behalf of his
wife, Apollonia, Puligo's daughter, 1538-39.

         il filipo o riceuto da madono [da madonna} di sa[n]ta maria
deglanoli [degli Agnoli] y 21 ac[o]to duna tavola adi ix dice[m]ber
pe pa[r]te e' resta[n]te f[r]a mesi t[r]ene p[r]osimi a vinire e
pe[r] fede de vero o fati clu]esti ve[r]si di mio popo [propria] mano
io filipo sa[r]to marito di deta apolonia y 21
io filipo o riceuto y 7 da madona pe[r] co[n]to di deta tavola di
dicinaove di ma[r]zo 1538
         y 7
io filipo o riceuto y 7 da madono questo di 27 daprire 1539 a
co[n]to di deta tavola y 7
io filipo di sa[1]vestro di f[r]a[ns]ce[so sarto popolo di
sa[n]lorenzo in via moza da sa[n]ta caterina dove abitan e f[r]ati
di sa[n]to f[r]a[n]cesco me c[hi]amo co[n]te[n]to e pagato duni
calu[n]c[u]le cosa [d'ogni e qualunque cosa] avesi avere dale
la redita apa[r]tene[n]te de l'Apolonia figlola di domenico deto e[l]
questo utimo di mag[gi]o 1539 e pe[r] fede de vero io filipo deto di
sopra o fatto questi ve[r]se di mio propo [propria] mano ad u[l]timo
di mag[gi]o 1539 e a di deto o riceuto y 7 picoli per uni [per ogni]
mio resto c[h]e io avesi avere d'olgni cosa c[i]oe di deta tavola e
sa[n]ta ,area deg;ag[n]oli in deta [?] via popolo di sa[m]pi[e]ro

A tergo del secondo foglio: Di Filippo sarto per chonto della
tavola di chiesa.

Published by:
F. Lorenzoni, "Documento su una tavola di Domenico Puligo nella
Document 9.

The substance of the will drawn by Puligo on 12 September 1527.

"...Nel qual testamento dispone di esser seppellito in San Lorenzo di Firenze. Lascia a titolo di dote alla Margherita ed alla Apollonia sue figliuoli, nategli da madonna Felice di Francesco Silvani sua moglie, dugento fiorini di suggello per ciascuna. E morendo l'una delle due figliuole prima di maritarsi, vuole che all'altra sopravvivente sieno dati de' dugento fiorini della dote della sorella morta 100 fiorini. Dichiara che la dote della sua moglie, qualora i suoi figliuoli così maschi come femmine morissero senza figliuoli legittimi e naturali, tanto maschi, quanto femmine, ritorni a Francesco di ser Silvano suo suocero; il quale in tal caso istituisce suo erede universale con questo carico, che ricadendo i detti diritti dotali nel sopradetto Francesco, esso e i suoi eredi sieno tenuti a far celebrare ogni anno in perpetuo, nella chiesa dove Domenico sara seppellito, un uffizio da morti per l'anima sua, spendendovi un fiorino d'oro largo. Erede universale chiama Bartolommeo suo figliuolo e della detta madonna Felice; al quale, morendo, sostituisce le sorelle, e morte queste, i parenti più prossimi nella quantità di fiorini 100 d'oro larghi e non più, col'obbligo di far celebrare ogni anno in perpetuo un uffizio da morti nella festa dello Spirito Santo per l'anima di Marco di Lorenzo suo cugino. Lascia a titolo di legato il residuo de' suoi beni, diritti e ragioni, allo Spedale degli Innocenti della città di Firenze, con questo che lo Spedale faccia ogni anno in perpetuo celebrare nella Pasqua di Resurrezione un uffizio per l'anima del testatore. Vuole che tutore e curatore di Bartolommeo suo figliuolo pupillo sia il detto Francesco suo suocero, e che i suoi figliuoli pupilli non possano dimorare ne stare sotto la custodia e guardia d'altro, perché conosce che esso Francesco e uomo di buoni costumi, e temente Dio. Al qual Francesco, morendo, sostituisce nella tutela e a suo tempo nella cura Giovanni d'Antonio orato, zio materno del testatore, Giovanni di Domenico tessitore di brocchi, Giovanni Gualberto del Giocondo e Cristoforo da Soci cancelliere de'Dieci. I quali tutori, confidando nella bonta e lealtà loro, e nella fede e benevolenza ch'ebbe sempre in loro, libera ed assolve dal fare inventario, e dal render conto della loro amministrazione."

Quoted from:

B. LOST WORKS

Paintings in the Collection of Giuliano Scala.

Vasari, 1550: "...come ancora ne fanno fede alcune teste di suo in casa Giuliano Scala." This citation was altered and expanded in Vasari's 1568 edition to read: "...alcuni ritratti di naturale e quadri molto belli alla Porta a Pinti in casa di Giulio Scala." One should note that the rather ambiguous word "teste" was more clearly specified in the second edition as "ritratti." Borghini's account of Puligo's life is essentially a repetition of Vasari's 1568 edition. Milanesi stated that the Scala house was owned by the Conti della Gherardesca.


Stigmata of St. Francis, Florence, SS. Annunziata (Chiesa dei Servi).

Vasari, 1550: "...e lavoro una tavola a Francesco del Giocondo a una sua cappella nella tribuna dello altare maggiore de' Servi in Fiorenza, dentrovi quando San Francesco riceve le stimate." The same citation is essentially repeated by Vasari in 1568. One of the few documented paintings by Puligo (Document 7). Milanesi in Vasari 1568 notes that in the Memorie mas. della chiesa de' Servi, written by Father Eliseo Biffoli, the altarpiece is dated 1526. Paatz specifies
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that the painting was located in the fourth tribune chapel of SS. Annunziata, but that it was removed from its site in 1723 during the restoration of the chapel by the Anforti family. It has been lost since that time. He also claims that Tonini's statement that the painting was found in S. Martino dei Buonomini is incorrect.


The Visions of Count Ugo, Badia a Settimo.

Vasari, 1550: following the entry regarding Puligo's Cestello altarpiece, "Gli fu da detti monaci fatto allogazione di lavorare alla Badia di Settimo, in un chiostro, tutte le storie dei sogni del conte Ugo delle sette Badie." The 1568 edition of Vasari reads rather similarly, and Borghini and Carlieri repeat the same information.

There is no other evidence that Puligo painted the cloister of this abbey. Milanesi conjectured that as Vasari had mistakenly attributed the tabernacle by Domenico and Davide Ghirlandaio at Cestello in Florence to Puligo, likewise the cloister at the Badia may have been painted by Domenico Ghirlandaio and not Puligo.

The Madonna of Agnolo della Stufa.

Vasari, 1568: "Fece fra le prime cose Domenico un bellissimo quadro di Nostra Donna a messer Agnolo della Stufa, che l'ha alla sua badia di Capolona nel contado d'Arezzo, e lo tiene carissimo per essere stato condotto con molta diligenza e bellissimo colorito." If the sequence in which Vasari's lists Puligo's work has any credence, then this Madonna painting would have made at the beginning of his career and dated during the first years of the second decade of the sixteenth century.


The Madonna of Agnolo Niccolini.

Vasari, 1568: following the above entry: "un altro quadro di Nostra Donna, non meno bello che questo, a messer Agnolo Niccolini, oggi arcivescovo di Pisa e cardinale, il quale l'ha nelle sue case a Fiorenza al canto de' Pazzi . . ." This is most likely the Madonna and Child with St. Catherine of Siena by Puligo cited by Bocchi-Cinelli in the Collection of Giovanni Niccolini (1544-1611), son of Cardinal Agnolo di Matteo Niccolini (1502-67).

One may also note that Richa (1754-62, 8: 48) listed two paintings, a Madonna and Child with St. Catherine of Siena and a St. Catherine, at SS. Annunziata by Puligo; (see Untraceable Paintings, Florence, SS. Annunziata). While it can not yet be proven that the Madonna painting cited by Richa is the same as the one in the Niccolini Collection, it should be noted that the Niccolini house is
located on the Via de' Servi, just down the street from SS. Annunziata. This church was not, however, patronized by the family, but rather Santa Croce. (See Ginori Lisci, I Palazzi di Firenze, Florence, 1972, 1: 443-49, regarding the history of the Niccolini family and palazzo.)


The Madonna of Filippo dell'Antella of Florence.

Vasari, 1568: following the previous citation, lists another Madonna painting "... di simile grandezza e bonta, che è oggi appresso Filippo dell'Antella in Fiorenza."


The Madonna of Filippo Spini.

Vasari, 1568: next is listed "... In un altro, che è grande circa tre braccia, fece Domenico una Nostra Donna intera col putto fra le ginocchia, un San Giovannino, e un'altra testa; ... e oggi appresso messer Filippo Spini tesauriere dell'illustrissimo principe di Fiorenza, ..." Milanesi thought that the Spini Madonna may be a painting by Puligo in the Palazzo Pitti, no. 145. This painting, however, has only three figures, and not four as Vasari described. Milanesi may have been referring to Puligo's Madonna and Child with Infant St. John and a Saint, no. 146, also in the Palazzo Pitti. Here, though, the Virgin is not depicted "intera" but rather three-quarter length, cut just below the knees.
Vasari's description of the painting is too general to be able to specifically identify it with an existing work. The composition that he described resembles numerous paintings by Puligo, especially his paintings of the Holy Family.


Cleopatra.

Vasari, 1568: "... la testa di Cleopatra che si fa mordere da un aspide la poppa." Milanesi noted Puccini's annotated manuscript of Vasari which stated that a Cleopatra by Puligo was in the collection of Senator Bartolommei. The painting could possibly be the Cleopatra by Puligo in the Museum of Fine Arts in Budapest (cat.no. 62, fig. 78).


Lucretia.

Vasari, 1568: "... ed altri, dove è Lucrezia Romana che si uccide con un pugnale." Milanesi noted Puccini's annotated manuscript of Vasari which stated that a Lucretia by Puligo was in the Aldobrandini collection. There is a Lucretia Romana listed without attribution in the 1682 Aldobrandini inventory (see Pergola, 1963, 68, no. 206). The entry reads: "un quadro di Lucrezia Romana in tavola, alto palmi tre, et un terzo di buona mano scrostato, come detto Inventario a Carte 240 No. 432 et a quello del Signor Cardinale Ca 110."
The painting could possibly be the Lucretia that was sold at Sotheby's, New York, 4 November 1982, no. 100 (cat. no. 59, fig. 75).


Holy Family with Infant St. John in the Collection of Francesco Borghini.

Borghini, 1584: followed Vasari's account of Puligo's life closely but added an additional work not previously mentioned; "... una Nostradonna a sedere col figliuolo in grembo, e un S. Giovannino, che siede, e un san Giuseppe de maniera dolcissima... in casa M. Francesco Borghini Auditore di S. A. S."

Lit: Borghini, 1584, 1: 397.

Painting(s) in the Collection of Ridolfo Sirigatti.

Borghini noted that there were paintings in the Sirigatti house by numerous artists among whom Puligo is specifically named.


Lit: Borghini, 1584, 1: 20.
Altarpieces, Santa Caterina and San Benigno, Genoa, 1525.

Records survive for two commissions that Puligo received on 21 December 1525 for altarpieces in two Genoese churches, Santa Caterina and San Benigno (see Document 4). It is not known whether the works are lost or if Puligo actually fulfilled the commission; the paintings do not appear in antiquarian guidebooks of the churches.


Madonna and Child with Saints, Florence, Uffizi.

Recorded in the inventory of the Tribuna of the Uffizi in 1589 and 1638.

Lit: Berti, Rudolph, and Biancalani, 1971, 37.

Crucifixion in the Collection of Maffeo Barberini.

Rome, Inventory of Maffeo Barberini, 1623 (I. inv. 23, no. 79):
"Un Crucifisso in tela del Pulico Fior. con la Maddalena a piedi con le Cornice tocch' d'oro."


Madonna with Five Figures in the Collection of Maffeo Barberini.

Rome, Inventory of Maffeo Barberini, 1623 (I. inv. 23, no. 152):
"Un Mad.a in tavola con le Cornice tutto dorate con 4 rose nelle Cantonate fie.e 5 del Pulico."

Lit: Lavin, 1975, 69.
C. UNTRACEABLE PAINTINGS

Berlin, Royal Museum, no. 320.

Holy Family with SS. Elizabeth and Young St. John.

Lit: Waagen, 1834, 90. no. 320.

Formerly Berlin, Weber Collection.

Holy Family.

Prov: Sold in 1912.

Lit: Schaeffer, 1912, 74.

Near Bristol, Leigh Court, Sir William Miles Collection.

Madonna and Child.

Crowe and Cavalcaselle believed the painting to be by Puligo.
Attributed to Fra Bartolommeo in the collection, and to one of his imitators by Waagen.


Florence, Badia, Via del Proconsolo.

Madonna.

Puccinelli noted this painting as dating 1522–23.

Florence, Corsini Gallery, no. 8.

**Madonna and Child with Four Angels.**

Considered to be like Puligo's style by Crowe and Cavalcaselle.


Florence, Corsini Gallery, no. 181.

**Madonna and Child.**

Panel; 65 x 50 cm.

Medici described the painting as "figura fino al ginocchino due terzi del vero."

*Lit:* Medici, 1886, 57.

Florence, Corsini Gallery.

**Holy Family(s).**

A couple of *Holy Family* paintings by Puligo are recorded in the Corsini Collection by Fantozzi and Crowe and Cavalcaselle. Medici cited a *Holy Family*, no. 170, panel, 48 x 40 cm., which according to the family is not in their collection.


Florence, SS. Annunziata.

**Virgin and Child with St. Catherine of Siena.**

This painting, cited by Richa, has the same subject matter as a work by Puligo that Bocchi-Cinelli (1677, 407) listed in the house of Giovanni Niccolini (see Lost Paintings, *The Madonna of Agnolo*).
Niccolini). It is not known whether these citations refer to the same painting. While the Niccolini family patronized Santa Croce, SS. Annunziata is in very close proximity to the Palazzo Niccolini on the Via de' Servi, suggesting that the references may be referring to the same painting.


Florence, SS. Annunziata.

St. Catherine.

A work cited by Richa that may be the same as the St. Catherine that Bocchi-Cinelli listed in the house of Giovanni Niccolini (see Lost Paintings, The Madonna of Agnolo Niccolini, for a more detailed discussion of the relationship between SS. Annunziata and the Palazzo Niccolini).


Florence, Collection of March. Ottaviano Acciaioli.

Madonna.

Exhibited at SS. Annunziata in Florence, 1706.

Lit: Borroni Salvadori, 1974, 113.

Florence, Collection of Cav. Luigi Bartolini Baldelli.

Portrait of a Woman.

Exhibited at SS. Annunziata in Florence in 1767.

Lit: Borroni Salvadori, 1974, 113.
Florence, Collection of Marchese Covoni.

**Portrait of a Woman.**

Morelli cited Puligo's *Magdalen*, Rome, Borghese Gallery, no. 328, (cat. no. 66, fig. 82) as deriving from the same period as this portrait by Puligo.

*Lit:* Morelli, 1892, 1: 128n.7.

Florence, Collection Giovanni Niccolini.

**St. Catherine.**

After citing a *Madonna and Child with St. Catherine of Siena in* the house of Giovanni Niccolini (see Lost Paintings, The *Madonna of Agnolo Niccolini*), Bocchi-Cinelli listed a painting of *St. Catherine* by Puligo. Richa (8: 48) also cited a *St. Catherine* by Puligo at SS. Annunziata. While it is only speculative whether the authors are referring to the same work, one may note that the Palazzo Niccolini on Via de' Servi was in close proximity to SS. Annunziata, which suggests that the paintings may be the same.

*Lit:* Bocchi-Cinelli, 1677, 408.

Florence, Collection of Cav. Giovanni Andrea del Rosso.

**Madonna with Angels.**

Exhibited at SS. Annunziata in Florence in 1767.

*Lit:* Borroni Salvadori, 1974, 113.
Florence (environs), Certosa di Val d'Ema.

Madonna.

Cited in the chapter house as by Andrea del Sarto or Puligo.

Lit: Moreni, 1791, 2: 151.

Hamburg, Weber Gallery.

Madonna and Child with SS. Elizabeth and little St. John the Baptist.

Lit: Harck, 1891, 82.

Mainz, Collection of Dr. Guthmann.

Madonna and Child with Infant St. John the Baptist.

Lit: A. Venturi, 1932, 9/5: 249.


Madonna and Child Blessing the St. John the Baptist and Two Angels.

Lit: Benezit, 1976, 8: 523.

Miserden Park, Cirencester, England, W. A. Leatham Collection.

Portrait of a Woman.

Berenson described a portrait by Puligo of a woman who is wearing a fantastic headdress.

Lit: Berenson, 1904, 158.
Munich, J. Böhler Collection, 1928.

**Virgin Enthroned Between Two Saints.**

Cited by Venturi, and possibly the same as the *Enthroned Virgin with Two Saints* at the Ringling Museum in Sarasota (cat.no. 28, fig. 36) as concluded by Suida. The Böhler painting is otherwise untraceable.


Naples, Museo Nazionale.

**Portrait of a Young Woman.**

The Museum has no knowledge of this work.

*Lit:* Berenson, 1904, 158. A. Venturi, 1932, 9/5: 249.

Perugia, Meniconi Collection.

**Holy Family with another Figure.**

Panel.

Cited by Campori in the Meniconi inventory of 1651.

*Lit:* Campori, 1870, 168-69.

St. Petersburg, Collection of Prince Gortschakoff.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Two Female Saints.**

Panel.

Crowe and Cavalcaselle gave this painting to Puligo. It had been attributed to Albertinelli, and according to the authors, the
composition was derived from Fra Bartolommeo and the forms and faces were reminiscent of Raphael.


St. Petersburg, Princess Kotchoubey.

**Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist and Two Angels.**

Listed under Andrea del Sarto in Crowe and Cavalcaselle, but thought to be by Puligo when he imitated Raphael and Fra Bartolommeo. It was noted that the left angel was completely repainted.

Lit: Crowe and Cavalcaselle, 1909, 3: 512.

St. Petersburg, Princess Kotchoubey.

**Judith with the Head of Holofernes.**

Panel.

A painting listed under Andrea del Sarto in Crowe and Cavalcaselle, but considered by the authors to be by Puligo in imitation of Sarto.

Lit: Crowe and Cavalcaselle, 1909, 3: 512.

Zurich, Heidegger Collection.

**Madonna and Child.**

Lit: Ganz, 1921-24, 309.
Collection of Charles Faton de Favernay.

**Holy Family.**

Exhibited at Amiens, 1860.

**Lit:** Darcel, 1860, 37-38.


**Portrait of Pietro Carnesecchi.**

**Lit:** Siren, 1933, 111n.1.

Collection of G. C. Somervell.

"Lady and Christ".

Exhibited in Edinburgh, 1883, no. 241 as by Puligo.

**Lit:** Graves, 1913, 4: 2136.
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