

Rose Davey

Identifying the Artist’s Subject Matter in Fifteenth Century European Painting

March 2017

Identifying the Artist’s Subject Matter in Fifteenth Century European Painting

March 2017

The experience of art is perhaps best described as a sensory search for understanding and meaning, often aided through the identification of a works subject matter. The logic being that if one can recognise the subject, one can begin to comprehend the art object that is encountered. But how useful is the identification of depicted subject matter in aiding our access to the image? If we know what something is, does this mean we know why the artist painted it?

Symbolic meaning is often assigned to painted objects to explain their existence, and a works greatness can somehow become aligned with what it depicts. Vermeer’s masterpiece ‘The Milkmaid,’ c.1657-8 if often discussed in terms of the significance of the figure, her steadfast wholesomeness in conflict with her potential sexual availability. An assertion supported by the symbolic value placed on the Cupid illustrated on the Delft Tile, and the possible sexual connotations of an unlit foot warmer on the floor; both possible allusions to her status as an object of discreet desire.¹

Whilst the symbolic importance of a work of art is, of course, of great historical and cultural importance, this only explores one set of criteria used by the artist to construct an image. If merit is acquired solely through the remote identification and analysis of depicted subject matter, the inherent quality present in a work through process of paint to canvas is surely ignored. The viewer must also consider why the artist might want to include an object within a painting in accordance with the artist’s pictorial priorities and the role it plays within the artist’s overall design and intention. Do you think it chance that the model for ‘The Milkmaid’ happened to arrive to be painted wearing from top to bottom, light to dark; white, yellow, green, blue, and red? Vermeer, like all great painters, has complete control of his composition; conducting all elements into place, he makes the design look effortless.

It is colour that drives Vermeer, and not an ambition to uncover an elicit narrative. He instructs only the milk to move. The stillness of the figure and the resting objects within the room are held in a light that reveals Vermeer’s intentions. The blue fabric that spills over the green tablecloth does just enough to soften his formal arrangement of colour; relieving the impact of the blue apron, which would become overpowering if not close to another swathe of blue. The pink shadow cast by the broken window pane is a beautiful moment of the natural phenomenon of light creating colour. The foot warmer on the floor, highly likely to be of symbolic significance, but also expertly placed to lead the eye down to the tiles and to formally justify the expanse of wall behind the figure, which reveals her shape through the collision of light and dark.

These are the decisions that make works great. They reflect the visual dialogue that occurs when arranging colour, shape and tone on a two-dimensional surface; a conceptual process that employs a visual language still used by artists today, and only recognised through the act of looking, and not through isolated study.

The historical context of a painting undoubtedly dictates what is depicted, but the intention of the artist surely remains the same; to communicate one’s ideas within the framework of one’s time. Artists have continually sought inspiration and guidance from works of the past. The struggles and solutions engineered by the past masters are continually returned to by painters of the present, as they too attempt to communicate with colour and form on a contained two-dimensional surface. These observations may be obvious, but I do think there is value in revisiting paintings from the past from the point of view of the artist; to better understand what makes a work of art great, and to reduce the space in time between painting of the past and present.

This paper will explore these ideas by assessing the work of five fifteenth-century European Painters, paying particular attention to Carlo Crivelli. All the works discussed are housed within the collection of The National Gallery, London, and most are included as part of the guide that appears on the back of this paper. The paper is intended to be read before visiting The National Gallery, and the guide to be read in the gallery, recalling the ideas outlined in the text. Rather than focus on the historical context of the works, analysis will be led by the visual evidence present within the paintings. Although this is delivered as text, my intention is to focus on the act of looking. This research concludes a four-term post as Honorary Research Associate in the Discourse Project within Graduate Painting at the Slade School of Fine Art UCL, and is also the result of frequent visits to the National Gallery, which has been the source of inspiration to my own art practice for many years. Some say the best examples of conceptual painting to be found in London are in The National Gallery; a statement I intend to support in pursuit of the artist’s subject matter.

*In the collection of the The National Gallery, London

Jan van Eyck’s ‘**Arnolfini Portrait**’* of 1434 facilitates our exit from the frame via a mirror, located on the back wall which reflects the back of Italian Merchant, Arnolfini, and his wife. Two more figures are seen in a doorway that exists within the conceptual space in which we stand whilst viewing the painting. This is not a religious subject, but unusually a painting of a contemporary couple in an interior; constructed into a composition that is a masterclass in the organisation of form. However, before we attempt to unravel van Eyck’s pictorial intentions we must not ignore the various symbolic implications embedded within the painting.

Arnolfini, who presumably commissioned the piece, appears on the left, connected to the industry of life outside. His wife is aligned with the domesticity of the home, further emphasised by the inclusion of the dusting brush and a wood carving of a woman praying above a dragon, which could represent Saint Margaret, patron Saint of Childbirth or Saint Martha, patron Saint of Housewives. The prayer beads to the left of the mirror, a typical wedding present from a husband to his wife, symbolize the requirement that women remain quiet and devout.² The dog represents fidelity, the single candle in the chandelier the presence of God, or perhaps life, and the wax residue from the burning of a pre-existing candle could signify death. The fruits on the window ledge allude to fertility or the fall from paradise, as well as describing the couple’s wealth, also exemplified through the quality of their fur lined garments.

The accurate and consistent description of light, spilling in from the window to the left, tempts us to believe what we look at is real. Edges soften and harden as light reaches form at different intensities. The forehead of Arnolfini dissolves into the shadow of his hat, dark in contrast to the crisp white headdress of his wife. The beams of the ceiling visible on the left, descend into darkness on the right, yet without seeing them, we know they are there. Suggestion; an important progression of Renaissance painting, is expertly demonstrated by van Eyck.

The complexity of form is arranged into a series of vertical rhythms that streak across the painting; repeated in the window frame, shutter edge, fur line trim of Arnolfini’s robe, his hand, the beads, the candle, the floorboard, the carpet edge, the couch frame, the folds of the dress, the white fur trim of the sleeve, the hanging decor of the bed post, and of course the edge of the frame. The horizontal joining of hands is paramount to the success of the painting; framed in the lines of the couch and echoed in the shape of the red slippers, they contain an energy that would spill out of the painting if dropped to the floor. The hands also contribute to a central line of vertical activity, beginning with the chandelier and concluding with the dog, which is flanked by the discarded muddy shoes and folds of the dress, which both in an arrow like manner, confront the edges of the frame. The raised hand of Arnolfini is perhaps a symbolic greeting to those reflected in the doorway, but without it, the composition flounders. The hand as a light shape against dark is vital in aiding the movement of the eye across the faces of the figures, and breaks up what would be a large area of dark expanse.

The colour is also orchestrated in the most eloquent manner. It is a painting of complimentary configurations. The soft orange glow of the fruits, in quiet conversation with the blue of the sleeves, the green dress more obviously framed by the red fabric of the bedroom furniture, the contrasting black and white adornments that cover the heads, and the subtle pairing of the yellowed metal of the chandelier against the deep purple tones of Arnolfini’s robe. These articulations of colour are not accidents or coincidences. This is what great artists do, they possess the ability to arrange a perceived reality into a formation that seems effortless and naturally occurring, and van Eyck, aware of his achievement, is intent on emphasising the authorship of his masterful construction. The inscription above the mirror reads ‘Jan van Eyck was here 1434’. This addition to the image places van Eyck as present within this depicted moment of time, heightening the sense of the real, whilst simultaneously confirming the paintings artifice by identifying himself as both author and inhabitant of the constructed image.

In Italy, contemporaries of van Eyck were also intent on organising form to give the impression of three-dimensional space, however without the accurate orchestration of light and under-standing of perspective achieved by van Eyck, their results were very different, but by no means inferior.

‘**The Battle of San Romano**’*, c1438–40, is one of three paintings by Paolo Uccello depicting a bloody conflict between Florence and Siena in 1432. The victorious leader of the Florentine Army Niccolò da Mauruzi da Tolentino is depicted in the centre upon a white horse, wearing an elaborate fabric hat, offering little protection from such a violent clash. But known for his reckless courage, it reflects his reputation and without the obscuring quality of a helmet, identifies him as the hero of the hour.

Uccello was an artist intent on understanding and implementing linear perspective, but was yet to access and instruct the science necessary to represent three-dimensional space on a two-dimensional surface. But his lack of technical knowledge does nothing to dispel his enthusiasm and if anything, it forces him to find other more inventive and visually stimulating solutions, since problems produce progress.

The organisation of action contained with ‘The Battle of San Romano’ is likened to a scene played upon a stage in front of a painted back drop.³ The frenzied action of the battle achieves an unusually serene quality. The delicate fruits and flowers populating the hedge like barrier between foreground and background would normally seem out of place within the context of war, but here they are welcomed into the composition by the formal relationship they share with the many circles present upon the harnesses of the horses. A line of shape, formed from the reins, extends across the surface of the panel. The interchange of the horses from black to white combined with the distribution of the primary colours across their tack makes a bold statement of colour and shape, emphasised through the lack of shadow. Just two tones describe the contours of the equine forms, yet Uccello describes the chain mail of the knights in minute detail, the straps of their armour curled through use.

The right side of the painting is a coordinated confusion of form. The oranges seem impossibly held between the erect lances, the flag a dramatic flourish framed between a lance and its pole. The magnificent assemblage of legs, the most striking, the mustard coloured back legs of a horse that has lost the rest of its anatomy. But who cares? This painting is dealing in much more interesting pictorial solutions than ones we think might better reflect ‘reality’. Uccello clearly wants to get to grips with the perspective of space, signalled by the orthogonals created by the broken lances, and the fallen knight, shown foreshortened in reverse; his feet too small, his torso too big. The fallen shield and scattered parts of armour also convey an understanding of objects in space, but the real revelation is what Uccello has chosen to show these upon; a startling pink ground reminiscent of a light up dance floor, which brilliantly displays the objects he has chosen to include. Uccello has cut a rectangle of grass from the earth to reveal his design, leaving two smaller grass rectangles to accommodate Niccolò’s horse and the shield of Siena.

Uccello is an artist aroused by shape. This is further confirmed in his later work ‘**Saint George and the Dragon**’*, 1470. The geometric patches of grass reoccur, and the composition divides into two types of form. Pointed and spiky on the right, echoed in the princess’s hair, crown, shoes, dragon’s teeth, claws, wings, and architecture of the cave, and on the left Saint George and his steed are a collaboration of curves, so satisfying to draw. The clouds swirl into a circle above the roundels of trees. Circles are also thrown across to the right, upon the wings of the dragon, reminiscent of a 20th century Spitfire. The dynamic diagonal of the lance, softens into the leash held by the princess, unifying all three figures.

The arrangement of shape under a blank light is also beautifully executed by Piero della Francesca, in ‘**The Baptism of Christ**’*. c1455. This painting is simultaneously challenging and greatly rewarding. It seems somewhat out of reach, yet invites you to private meditation. It is a work that encourages silence. One holds their breath, a mirror of the figures depicted; static and suspended in a moment that is both infinite and temporary. The dove of the holy spirit hovers above the hand of Saint John the Baptist as he performs a momentous event in Christ’s life. Another, also preparing for his Baptism is undressing behind, and four figures in

oriental dress are seen further back on the banks of the river Jordan, which snakes toward the foreground. Three angels are sandwiched between two trees, which spread their leaves across much of the upper limits of the painting, and a landscape of consistent design occupies the foreground and background.

‘The Baptism’ is a painting that has not a hair out of place. Piero’s design relies on a logic governed by his interest in mathematics. Without fully recounting the extensive research that outlines the various geometric divisions employed, one is readily able to witness the combination of circle and square that dictate the shape of the panel, a triangle formed from the bottom of Christ’s left foot to the edges of the square in line with the wings of the dove, and a golden section rectangle created by the edge of the tree within the square.

The even light and geometric rigour readily reveal the pictorial connections to the eye. To make a drawing from this work is a revelation. One feels achievement in replicating the orchestration of form and spaces between, which, as Philip Guston points out, are as charged as the volumes themselves,⁴ four centuries before Cezanne instructed that colour equals form.

The three marble like columns of the central angel, tree and Christ are quoted within the colour of John the Baptist’s ochre ragged tunic and the pastel and primary hues of the far angel. The chalk white translucent bodies are replicated in the disrobing figure, whose shrouded head continues the shape of the circle, carried on by the Baptist’s left arm. The shades of the four figures in the back repeat the striped pattern of colour that covers the angels. The shape of the dove mimics the shape of the clouds in a sky which is reflected in the water below. The lower parts of the painting, closest to us, are also integrated into the distance by the small plants sprouting from the banks which appear similar in size as the trees in the distance, whilst belonging to the same system of scale. The four larger trees perhaps give the greatest feeling of depth, forming a triangle which begins with the tree closest to us and then stretches back towards those behind. We are moved not through an emotion of figure, but emotion of form. As Guston concedes, trying to write about these things or articulate them in a verbal manner, is as difficult as painting.⁵

Uccello and Piero place emphasis on the mechanics of their design, in part through their use of light. In contrast van Eyck conceals areas of his design in shadow; a consequence of his close observation of light which allows for greater imaginative entry, also achieved by da Vinci in ‘**The Virgin of the Rocks**’*, 1508. Like van Eyck, da Vinci’s accurate handling of light tempts us to believe that what we witness is real, but this is not a contemporary or familiar scene. The identity of the figures would have been immediately understood, but da Vinci’s audience must have been astounded by what they saw. He presents a setting of silhouetted jagged rocks that continue into the distance. These unearthly formations are reminiscent of a backdrop to a science fiction film, but are possibly inspired by the Dolomites, a mountain range north east of Milan.

There is no evidence of civilisation and no indication as to how this location was accessed or could be exited. Precarious and ominous, the landscape rises behind, supporting small shrubs and prickly plants, and opens below as Christ appears tantalisingly close to a crevasse, where we the viewer hover. The unsettling personality of the scenery is off set by the serene calm of the figures. They are intimately connected through gesture and touch. The angel reassuringly supports Christ who offers a blessing, the Virgin protectively holds John who replies in prayer, a slither of light revealed by her bent index finger on his back. Her other arm is outstretched. Her hand masterfully foreshortened over Christ’s head. The energy between is astonishingly tangible.

The light, accurately observed from nature, descends from the left, spotlighting the figures. That which is not perceived at the chosen light level retreats into darkness, a confidence shared by van Eyck and recently acquired by da Vinci. He wrote “When you transfer to your work shadows, which you discern with difficulty and whose edges you cannot distinguish, so that you perceive them confusedly, you must not make them definite or clear lest your work wooden as a result.”⁶

The ambition to trust your vision is one all artists aim to achieve. It requires the abstraction of sight, by silencing your brain from telling you what is there, and instead allowing your eyes to dictate the hand, producing the results of perception rather than deception. Great artists can paint objects convincingly without knowing what they are.

The colour is also obscured by the light. The complimentary hues of the orange and blue recede into shadow, and do not retain the saturated colour many other Renaissance painters chose to keep. This restraint allows for moments of sensation; the sculpted flash of orange at the Virgin’s waist, and the triangle of blue at her shoulder that leads you to the translucent turquoise waters behind, possess a quality that would be diluted if the palette completed the spectrum.

The monochrome faces of the figures form a sort of trapezoid that contains a space alive with communication. The zigzag pose of the Virgin is a dynamic expression of weight. The shifting of her body and position of her hands allows the spread of form as her garments fill the spaces created by her body, filling much of the central composition. The consistency of light, and repetition of shape and colour combine to create a unified whole that encourages quiet contemplation; a dazzling achievement when considering da Vinci’s ambition to house the holy family in such an unconventional and hostile setting. It is these alternative solutions which reflect the curiosity of the artist, and qualify works as great. The fifteenth-century is dominated by religious subject matter, and yet the artist continues to trial their own ideas in pursuit of a pictorial truth.

Carlo Crivelli’s ‘**The Annunciation, with Saint Emidius**’*, 1486, commemorates news of the town of Ascoli’s freedom from papal rule, which arrived on the feast day of the Annunciation. Angel Gabriel arrives to inform the Virgin she will bear the son of God. Alongside him is St Emidius, the patron Saint of Ascoli, who holds a model of the town. Crivelli reveals the Virgin to the viewer, encased within the building; her privacy emphasised by the barred window. Her delicately crossed hands echo the wings of the dove as she kneels whilst reading or in prayer. Only ourselves and the Holy Spirit achieve access, we being the more privileged as we take pleasure marvelling at the Virgin in her private chamber, whilst the Holy Spirit enters through a hole in the wall.

A sense of conscious design as opposed to the careful observation of nature is evident in Crivelli’s deployment of one point perspective. The composition is sucked backwards as figures zigzag towards the vanishing point, stiff and in tableau; dispersed to perhaps break up the design, but in practice enhancing its rigidity. Only the Holy Spirit’s line of light crosses the diagonals that race towards the vanishing point, which highlights the event we are witnessing.

Crivelli keeps the lights on. Everything is available to the eye in crisp, clear focus, conveyed through graphic brush marks so unlike the soft, sfumato renderings of da Vinci which convey the reality of light. Crivelli’s colour palette suggests the artificial. Take away the blue sky and you are left with a pronounced terracotta toned surface; glistening with a synthetic, stifled warmth that lacks much air or atmosphere. But Crivelli is not interested in conducting paint into a format that evokes drama or emotion. His intentions are more cerebral.

The Corinthian pilasters that enclose the Virgin replicate the frames used by many contemporary artists, including Crivelli, and the composition bears a striking resemblance to a painting of the same subject by Fra Carnevale, c.1445/50, through its organisation of the architecture, figures and vanishing point. If we are to accept this credit, Crivelli has also translated Carnevale’s frame from physical structure to painted depiction; placed around the Virgin and extended into a building. The concept of transforming a physical frame into a painted frame that houses a picture within a picture, begins to reveal Crivelli’s interest in the artificial nature of painting, which can never replicate reality, since it is a visual construct dictated by the artist.

Crivelli’s scheme does not adhere to one set of pictorial rules that preserves the integrity of the picture plane. A gourd and an apple advance from the frame towards the viewer’s space. Religious symbols of Christ and the Resurrection, these two fruits seem left for us. They somehow belong

more to our reality than the one portrayed in the picture, blurring the divisions between the sacred scene envisioned in the painting and the temporal space inhabited by the viewer.’ It’s as though Crivelli is making a distinction between the depicted scene, which is clearly unreal, and the fruits, which are real. Even though we are fully aware the whole image is artifice, he has seemingly managed to depict multiple levels of reality that exist within the one image. Like a magician who reveals the mechanics behind their trick, Crivelli begins to point out the flaws in a pictorial system that viewers have begun to accept and imagine is real, and it is Crivelli’s exposure of illusion that makes him such a conceptual painter.

In ‘**The Demidoff Altarpiece**’*, 1476, Crivelli includes stucco relief to describe numerous details of the altarpiece, such as the key’s held by Saint Peter. The decision to include three dimensional objects on the surface of a painting at first seems rather naive.⁸ But perhaps Crivelli’s intention was to highlight the illusionistic failings of painting, which as a medium can never compete in the presence of physical three dimensional forms when in the pursuit of portraying three dimensional objects. These are not mistakes; they are carefully thought out manoeuvres by an artist who fully understands and interrogates the medium he deploys. Whereas other painters of the Renaissance, such as Raphael and Bellini, continue the lesson of Massacio by depicting a reality through the construction of illusionistic space, Crivelli brings us closer to reality by exposing, rather than maintaining illusion.

Crivelli’s small painting of ‘**Saint Catherine**’*, c.1491–4, is a revelation. She appears within a niche, one hand rests upon the wheel on which she was tortured, and in the other she pinches a palm, a symbol of her martyrdom. Crivelli also includes a fly, which belongs to a system of scale outside the one that depicts the subject. This must indicate that the fly belongs to another reality, or another world. The fly is life sized. Its scale is in relation to our own, and not the scale present within the rest of the image. Its parallel position to the picture plane also suggests it resides on top of the painting and not within the represented space.⁹ Is this in fact an object that exists in Crivelli’s world as he is making the work, referencing those moments of process? Or is this a painting of St Catherine and a fly, or a painting of a painting of Saint Catherine with a fly on it?

The barriers between painting and illusion are again being tested; a demonstration of arts ability to deceive. These layers of perceived reality are also present in Crivelli’s ‘**The Vision of the Blessed Gabriele**’*, from the late 1480’s. The slightly grotesque bulging eyes of Gabriele, and the crude window that appears in the sky does not seduce the eye, but there is much to observe within this peculiar painting. Here we see Saint Gabriele on his knees praying to a vision of the Virgin and Child, surrounded by cherubs. Behind is a landscape that snakes away into the distance along a path scattered with figures that leads to distant mountains behind. Buildings are depicted using perspective, yet the scale of objects is wholly inaccurate. If Saint Gabriele were to stand he would tower above the buildings. The tree stumps on the right seem very close to him, yet portray the scale of distance. The tree included on the left appears to have grown into a crucifix. The head, perhaps of another Franciscan, floats to the right of St Gabriele’s left elbow and does not have any convincing relationship to the space in which, presumably, the body resides. Two ducks are crammed into a pond in the bottom left hand corner below Gabriele’s large bent back toe. Here we are also able to observe Crivelli’s technique that accentuates the edges of form. Appearing as fine hair, delicate lines work in units to describe the folds of the fabric and the shadows on the feet and sandals.

Crivelli incorporates his signature in perspective as if etched into the dirt on the ground. As is the standard function of artist signatures, it identifies the painting as his own, and himself as the author of this fictional scene. However, if we accept that the signature is written in the dirt, then who wrote the words in the soil with such precision? There are no likely candidates located in the painting, so the artist must be present as the creator of the work and imaginatively present in the past of this fictional landscape.¹⁰ Such questions may stray too far from the realms of the painting, but to arrive at them at all must indicate Crivelli’s intention to highlight the artist as innovator, not imitator; a sophisticated mechanic of design that calls into question the nature of painting.

Crivelli’s experimental investigation into the contained painted image, is perhaps most explicit in his use of shadow. The garlands of fruit, which bear little relationship to the rest of the composition, cast shadows on the sky. It is difficult to not let this downgrade the rest of the painting to deflated illusion. This is no longer sky, but a representation of sky that ceases to be taken seriously.¹¹ It has been upstaged or demoted from illusion to surface by the addition of shadow, which makes the fruits impossibly close to the sky and entrusts them with a greater pictorial authority. As stated by Jonathan Watkins, Crivelli undermines the painted illusion to assert the materiality of the art object on which they occur.¹²

Crivelli confidently plays artifice and illusion off against one another. His cool, rigid arrangements celebrate the hallmarks of their design, rather than conceal their method of creation by appearing miraculous in their conception. Crivelli’s work possesses an awareness and honesty that clearly states that what we encounter is a product of the artist’s making. He exploits his position as author and the control it delivers him, continually conducting tests that prod at the limits of painted illusion. Crivelli breaks down the fourth wall, a device used in film and theatre that refers to the audience’s position as a viewer facing one way, looking through a "missing fourth wall" at a rectangle of light within which the action takes place. The fourth wall is broken down when the actors directly address the audience, acknowledging our presence as viewer. In a similar way Crivelli recognises our presence by letting us in on what occurs behind the scenes of painting. Crivelli disrupts and exposes the deceit of illusion by including multiple illusions within one work which reveal each other as artifice. His insistence on referring us back to the picture plane and to the limits of what it contains is where we find his subject matter, and what makes his work highly relevant.

When strolling through the rooms of the Salisbury Wing of the National Gallery, one could be lulled into thinking many of the artists share a common interest due to the religious subject matter on display. But the repetition of depicted subject matter is of course the product of historical context, and not an indication that these artists shared the same pictorial interests or priorities. A little further investigation reveals that many of these works are attempting to do very different things. We as viewers should be encouraged to uncover the pictorial problems artists sought to resolve within familiar frameworks if we are to appreciate the revolutionary solutions they reached.

Although many fifteenth-century works choose to depict the illusion of space, the wonderful thing about painting is its ability to reflect upon the world without being enslaved by the physics of reality. Great artists have always designed pictorial spaces that above all accommodate their own ideas.

To access the quality of an image we should aim to identify the intentions of the artist, available to the eye in the presence of the painting. Our observations can of course be focussed and enhanced by the knowledge of a works historical context. However, if we can acquire the confidence to analyse our own vision, the art of looking will reveal the brilliance of these paintings.

^[1] Walter Liedtke, Vermeer: The Complete Paintings (Thames and Hudson: London, 2008), p. 76.

^[2] Craig Harbison, Jan van Eyck: The Play of Realism (Reaction Books LTD: London, 1991), p. 36.

^[3] John Pope – Hennessy, The Complete Works of Paolo Uccello (Phaidon: New York, 1950), p. 21.

^[4] Philip Guston: Collected writings, lectures and conversations, ed. by Clark Coolridge (University of California Press: London, 2011), p. 141.

^[5] Clark Coolridge, Philip Guston, p. 142.

^[6] Luke Syson with Larry Keith, ‘In Pursuit of Perfection: Leonardo’s Painting Technique’, in Leonardo Da Vinci: Painter at the court of Milan (London: National Gallery Company Ltd, 2011), p. 69.

^[7] Alasdair Flint, ‘Carlo Crivelli, ‘The Annunciation, with Saint Emidius’, nationalgallery.org.uk.

^[8] Jonathan Watkins, ‘Untricking the Eye: The Uncomfortable legacy of Carlo Crivelli’, Art International, Winter 1988 (p. 56).

^[9] Normand Land, ‘Giotto’s Fly, Cimabue’s Gesture and a Madonna and Child by Carlo Crivelli, in Notes in the History of Art xv iv (1996) p. 13.

^[10] Normand Land, ‘Carlo Crivelli, Giovanni Bellini, and the Fictional Viewer’,

^[11] in Notes in the History of Art xviii i (Fall 1998) p. 19.

^[12] Jonathan Watkins, p. 50.

^[13] Jonathan Watkins, p. 50.