Zofia Herman

Jakob Beinhart's *Saint Luke Painting the Virgin* in the Collection of the National Museum in Warsaw. Artistic Self-Reflection versus the Cult Function[1]

The limewood relief depicting Saint Luke painting the Virgin (measuring 138.5 × 113.5 cm)[2] originates from the chapel of the painters' guild in the Church of Saint Mary Magdalene in Wrocław, where it most likely formed the central part of the altarpiece (**fig. 1**). It remained in the chapel until 1824, when it was transferred to the wall of the church's northern aisle. In 1946 it became part of the medieval art collection of the National Museum in Warsaw.

The relief was most likely executed by Jakob Beinhart, a master who came to Wrocław from Geislingen in Swabia. In 1483 he became a citizen of Wrocław and he repeatedly served as the senior of the painters' guild. He was the owner of the largest woodcarving and sculpture workshop in Silesia, which produced a number of altarpieces for churches in Silesia, Bohemia and Lusatia.

The work is characterized by a masterful finish of the surface, realism as well as a genre-specific and intimate depiction of the scene. The existing sources on the work mostly focus on matters of style and form. My article, in turn, is devoted to these aspects, which have hitherto been but rarely mentioned, i.e., the iconography and the recently discovered monochrome finish. I was also interested in the question of realism and the modern artistic aspirations visible in Beinhart's work.

The relief invites to pose the following questions: does the presence of artistic self-reflection, manifested both in the iconography and the lack of polychrome, signify a new function of art? What role did the artist envision for himself in contemporary society? In what way can the reflection on art complement and co-exist with the sacral message of the work?

Existing Research

The relief depicting Saint Luke painting the Virgin has not been the subject of many separate monographs, even though it is featured in numerous publications on Silesian art

[2] Inv. no. Śr.15 MNW; see Władysław Łoś, *Galeria Sztuki Średniowiecznej. Przewodnik* (Warsaw: Muzeum Narodowe w Warszawie, 1993), n.p., cat. no. 16; *Muzeum Narodowe w Warszawie. Przewodnik po galeriach stałych i zbiorach studyjnych*, Katarzyna Murawska-Muthesius, Dorota Folga-Januszewska, eds (Warsaw: Muzeum Narodowe w Warszawie, 1998), pp. 111–2, cat. no. III.32; Małgorzata Kochanowska, *Mistyczne średniowiecze. Skarby Muzeum. Muzeum Narodowe w Warszawie* (Lesko: Bosz, 2003), pp. 22–3.

– inventories, catalogues and synthetic descriptions of the region's art history alike.[3] Most researchers focused first and foremost on the attribution of the work to Jakob Beinhart.[4] The subject was taken up anew following the restoration work performed between 1997 and 2002: the important discoveries made on that occasion laid the cornerstone for further research. First of all, the initial lack of polychrome was established. Moreover, a fragment of a date was found on the the frame of Saint Luke's easel: a gothic number six, which allowed the researchers to date the reredos at 1506.[5]

The unusual iconography and form of the work have generally been set down to the artist's innovative interests. Scholars regarded the relief as unique on account of its realist, genre,

[3] Ernst Förster, *Denkmale deutscher Baukunst, Bildnerei und Malerei* (Leipzig: Weigel, 1860); Alwin Schultz, *Urkundliche Geschichte der Breslauer Maler-Innung in Jahren 1345 bis 1532* (Breslau: Kern, 1866), p. 120; id., *Schlesiens Kunstleben im Fünfzehnten bis Achtzehnten Jahrhundert* (Breslau: Max u. Comp, 1872), p. 8; Hans Lutsch, *Verzeichnis der Kunstdenkmäler der Provinz Schlesien, I. Die Stadt Breslau, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Breslau* (Breslau: Korn, 1886), p. 199; Bernhard Patzak, "Beiträge zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Mittelalterlichen Holz und Steinplastik in Schlesien," *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst*, no. 29 (1916), pp. 35–42; Franz Landsberger, *Breslau* (Leipzig: Seemann, 1926), p. 93; Erich Wiese, "Der Lukasaltar in der Maria-Magdalenakirche und verwandte Werke," *Schlesiens Vorzeit*, no. 9 (1928), pp. 73–8; Wilhelm Pinder, *Die deutsche Plastik vom ausgehenden Mittelalter bis zum Ende der Renaissance*, vol. 2 (Wildpark–Potsdam: Athenaion, 1929), p. 422; Heinz Braune, Erich Wiese, *Schlesische Malerei und Plastik des Mittelalters, Kritischer Katalog der Ausstellung in Breslau 1926* (Leipzig: Kröner, 1929), p. 61; Ludwig Burgermeister, Günther Grundmann, *Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Breslau* (Breslau: Korn, 1933), p. 30; Kurt Bimler, *Quellen zur schlesische Kunstgeschichte* (Breslau: Kommissionsverlag Maruschke & Berendt, 1941), p. 49; Jan Białostocki, *Sztuka gotycka w Muzeum Narodowym w Warszawie* (Warsaw: Muzeum Narodowe w Warszawie, 1947), p. 10; Tadeusz Dobrowolski, *Sztuka na Śląsku* (Katowice-Wrocław: Instytut Śląski, 1948), p. 122; Mieczysław Zlat, "Sztuki śląskiej drogi od gotyku," in *Późny gotyk. Studia nad sztuką przełomu średniowiecza i czasów nowych. Materiały sesji Stowarzyszenia Historyków Sztuki* (Wrocław: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1962), pp. 180–8; Janusz Kębłowski, *Renesansowa rzeźba na Śląsku 1500-1560* (Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1967), pp. 13–6; Anna Ziomecka, "Śląskie retabula szafowe w drugiej połowie XV wieku i na początku XVI wieku," *Roczniki Sztuki Śląskiej*, vol. 10 (1976), pp. 56–7.

[4] Tadeusz Dobrowolski left the question of attributing the work to Beinhart open (*Rzeźba i malarstwo gotyckie w województwie śląskim*, Katowice: Muzeum Śląskie, 1937, pp. 38-47); Günther Meinert includes the relief depicting Luke in Beinhart's oeuvre ("Jakob Beinhart, ein schlesischer Bildhauer und Maler der Spätgotik," *Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, no. 60 (1939), pp. 217-36).

[5] 1496 would have been too early; Beinhart became a citizen of Wrocław in 1483 and it is highly unlikely that he would have received such a prestigious order after but a short stay in the city. It would seem more convincing that Beinhart executed the altar for the painters' chapel already as a master of reputable standing, which he earned i.a., by funding and executing the stone votive figure of *The Virgin and Child* for the Church of Saint Mary Magdalene, signed and dated at 1499 (date next to the signature on the console). Dating the altar at 1506 is also confirmed by the source information about a newly-funded altar in the painters' chapel from 1510. See Ewa Kołodziejska-Młynarczyk, documentation related to the conservation of the relief depicting Saint Luke painting the Virgin stored at the Conservation Workshop of Sculpture and Painting on Wooden Supports of the National Museum in Warsaw, MS, September 2002; Jakob Kostowski, "Sięgając do bezpośrednich źródeł: o dwóch datach wyznaczających czas działalności wrocławskiej pracowni Beinhartów," in Ad fontes. *O naturze źródła historycznego*, Stanisław Rosik, Przemysław Wiszewski, eds (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2004), pp. 135-68; id., "Malowidła kruchty północnej kościoła św. Elżbiety. Ostatnie dzieło wrocławskiej pracowni Beinhartów (1585 r.). Przyczynek do monografii warsztatu," *Rocznik Wrocławski*, no. 9 (2004), pp. 65-82; *Wokół Wita Stwosza*, Dobrosława Horzela, Adam Organisty, eds, exh. cat., The National Museum in Krakow, March–May 2005 (Krakow: Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie, 2005), pp. 215-8, cat. no. VII/2; Wojciech Marcinkowski, *Retabulum ze Ścinawy (1514) w kościele klasztornym w Mogile* (Krakow: Wydawnictwo i Drukarnia Secesja, 2006); *Meisterwerke mittelalterlicher Kunst aus dem Nationalmuseum Warschau*, hrsg. von Art Centre Basel: Suzanne Greub, Thierry Greub und dem Nationalmuseum Warschau: Małgorzata Kochanowska, exh. cat., Seedamm Kulturzentrum Pfäffikon, November 2006 – February 2007, Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga, Lisbon, March–May 2007, Belvedere, Vienna, July–September 2007, Museum Catharijneconvent, Utrecht, November 2007 – January 2008 (Munich: Hirmer, 2006), pp. 132-3, cat. no. 24; Jakub Kostowski, "'(...) mit allem fleis Schneider und bereiten,' czyli słów parę o monochromatycznych ołtarzach ze Śląska i Czech oraz ostatniej konserwacji," in Artifex doctus. *Studia ofiarowane profesorowi Jerzemu Gadomskiemu w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, Wojciech Bałus, Wojciech Walanus, Marek Walczak, eds (Krakow: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2007), pp. 427-41.

secularized and lyrical character.[6] The untypical position of the work in Beinhart's oeuvre was also emphasized, as the artist's altarpieces depicting the Virgin followed the traditional idealized conventions. The realistic depiction has been interpreted in various ways: some researchers referred to it as late medieval, while others regarded it as Renaissance. The work has been included in the "bourgeois realism" movement on account of presenting the figures of saints in contemporary scenery and attire. It has been stressed that the depiction, devoid of any pathos, represented the artist's personal attitude to the theme. On the other hand, anatomical correctness, an attempt at employing perspective in reconstructing the space as well as the harmonious and static composition were regarded as elements of the Renaissance.[7] Researchers situate the work at hand at the turn of the artistic periods, as represented by the realistic rendition of the surroundings and the lack of polychrome.[8]

Iconography

The relief of Saint Luke painting the Virgin depicts both figures in a Gothic chamber covered by a vault sustained on a column. The column divides the interior in two equal parts enclosed by a double crown-glass window. The side walls and the floor create a shallow space. Shelves depicted in a perspective foreshortening are visible on both walls. The interior creates a peculiar niche, filled with almost three-dimensional figures and furnishings.

The Virgin, sitting on a decorative, carved chair, is weaving a robe for Christ, which is spread on a cross stand. Her head is round, with a high, prominent forehead, fine lips and slightly squinting eyes. The intricately carved curly hair falls on to her chest and back in tresses. She is wearing a loose dress with appliqué designs at the edges and near the trim of the bateau neckline.

Saint Luke is depicted on the right: he is at his easel, working on a portrait of the Virgin. He is sitting on a carved chair, whose backrest is covered with an embossed fabric. The easel obscures a large part of the column and the right-hand side of the stand with the robe. Luke's face, with expressive features, is framed by thick hair, falling on to his neck. He too is dressed in contemporary attire: a draped robe with a type of a hood or mantle. Luke is also wearing a characteristic artist's hat. The Evangelist's attribute – a small ox – is depicted beneath his chair. In the bottom part of the relief, at the feet of the figures on Luke's side, there is the Christ Child sitting on the floor. Next to Him is a ball of yarn. The Child, directed slightly downwards towards the Virgin, is visibly leaning out of the relief. The figures of Mary and Luke are depicted in similar poses, facing each other and turned with their half-profile to the viewer. The gestures of both saints are also very much alike: they are raising their hands, in which they most likely used to hold the instruments of their work. They seem to have established eye contact; Luke is leaning out from behind his easel.

The iconography of the scene raises a few questions. First of all, the depiction of the Evangelist painting the Virgin from nature, in contemporary attire and scenery, is unique for Silesia. The loose, genre character of the scene sets it apart from the traditional hieratic representations created at the time in Silesian workshops, including the workshop of Beinhart himself.

---

[6] Zlat, op. cit., p. 184.

[7] Ibid.; Wiese, op. cit., pp. 74–5; *Wokół Wita Stwosza...*, op. cit., p. 216; Kębłowski, *Renesansowa rzeźba...*, op. cit., p. 14.

[8] Kostowski, "'(...) mit allem fleis...," op. cit.

What is unusual in representations of Saint Luke painting the Virgin, the work at hand features a motif of Our Lady weaving the miraculous seamless robe for her son, which the artist borrowed from an engraving by Veit Stoss (Stoß) depicting the *Holy Family* (**fig. 2**).[9] This poses the question of how the introduction of this motif alters the interpretation of the entire scene. The juxtaposition of the two artists – the painting Luke and the weaving Mary, and the pair of items – the painting and the robe, seems meaningful. The painting itself, placed at the easel, is another story. In all likelihood it was moveable, but its initial form is unknown.

Saint Luke Painting the Virgin

The motif of Saint Luke in contemporary costume of an artist, painting the Virgin, who is posing for him, did not emerge until the fifteenth century.[10] Prior to that, the Evangelist was depicted painting on his own, like in the scenes which show him writing. The legend of Luke the painter legitimized the creation of Christian representations as well as the cult of numerous icons attributed to him, which had the status of "true images" (*vera effigies, vera imago*) and depicted both the Virgin and Christ. An image of Christ allegedly created by Saint Luke may be seen at the Santa Sanctorum chapel in the Lateran Palace. One of the first known versions of the legend of Saint Luke as painter is associated with this work – the 1145 treatise by Nicolaus Maniacutius devoted to the Sancta Sanctorum image of Christ: *Historia Imaginis Salvatoris*.[11] According to Maniacutius, Luke is not painting Christ from nature, but attempts to reconstruct his image from memory. One example of such rendition of the subject is the earliest representation of the painting Evangelist preserved in the West: the miniature by Johannes von Troppau, which forms part of a series of illustrations depicting the saint's life (Österreichisches Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Cod. 1182, fol. 91r).[12] In this work he is depicted alone, in the process of painting a crucifix at his easel. In the late Middle Ages, the *Legenda Aurea* representation of Saint Luke as painter became more popular: with the Virgin and Child posing in his workshop.[13]

Such representations of the scene of painting the Virgin may be associated with the fifteenth-century popularity of realistic devotional images, which – according to priestly

[9]   See Stanisława Sawicka, *Ryciny Wita Stwosza* (Warsaw: Sztuka, 1957), pp. 9, 16-7, fig. 4; Anna Ziomecka, "Wit Stwosz a późnogotycka rzeźba na Śląsku," in *Wit Stosz. Studia o sztuce i recepcji*, Adam Stanisław Labuda, ed. (Warsaw–Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1986), pp. 125-45; Andrzej Olszewski, "Wpływy sztuki Wita Stwosza w Polsce i na Słowacji," in *Wit Stwosz w Krakowie*, Lech Kalinowski, Franciszek Stolot, eds (Krakow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1986), p. 71.

[10]   For more information on the iconography of Saint Luke painting the Virgin see Dorothee Klein, *St. Lukas als Maler der Maria. Ikonographie der Lukas-Madonna* (Berlin: Oskar Schloss, 1933); Gisela Kraut, *Lukas malt die Madonna. Zeugnisse zum künstlerischen Selbstverständnis in der Malerei* (Worms: Wernersche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1986).

[11]   See Gerhard Wolf, *Salus Populi Romani. Die Geschichte römischer Kultbilder im Mittelalter* (Weinheim: VCH, Acta Humaniora, 1990), pp. 60-8, 321-5.

[12]   Christiane Kruse, *Wozu Menschen malen* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2003), p. 235; Till Holger Borchert, "Rogier's St. Luke: The Case of Corporate Identification," in *Rogier van der Weyden St. Luke Drawing the Virgin Selected Essays in Context*, Carol Jean Purtle, ed. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997), p. 65. For miniatures by Johannes von Troppau see Max Dvořák, "Die Illuminationen des Johannes von Neumarkt," *Jahrbuch des Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen der Allerhöchsten Kaisershauses*, no. 22 (1901), pp. 82-91.

[13]   For more information on the literary sources of the legend of Saint Luke the painter see Ernst von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899); Clemens M. Henze, *Lukas der Muttergottesmaler. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis des christlichen Orients* (Leuven: Bibliotheca Alfonsiana, 1948); Hans Belting, *Bild und Kult. Eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst* (Munich: Beck, 1990); Wolf, op. cit.

recommendations – were to aid the faithful in their prayers. In *Vita Iesu Christi*, Ludolph of Saxony writes that during contemplation one should imagine the figures of Christ and the saints as if they had really stood before the believer's eyes: "Pone ante oculos gesta praeteritia tanquam praesentia, et sic magnis sapida senties et jucunda."[14] Jan van Eyck's painting *Madonna of Chancellor Rolin* (the Louvre, Paris) may be interpreted in this vein. The chancellor is contemplating the Virgin, imagining that she is standing before him in reality.

Representations of Luke in contemporary costume, which show him in the process of painting the Virgin who is present in his workshop, may be construed accordingly. Following Luke's example, a contemporary painter may execute his depiction of the Virgin – so realistic as if she was standing before him. One such example is the painting by the Master of the Augustinian Altar from Nuremberg (Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg). In the work, the Virgin is depicted in another room, so that she is invisible to the painter: the created image is therefore his own image of Our Lady. The painting acts as an intermediary between the Virgin, who in reality is absent, and the viewer, as a result of which what is absent becomes present.[15]

Saint Luke Drawing the Virgin by Rogier van der Weyden (The Museum of Fine Arts, Boston), which was most likely created in 1435 or c. 1435–40, is regarded as the first example of the representation of Saint Luke as a contemporary painter working on a portrait of the Virgin. In Van der Weyden's work, Saint Luke is kneeling and drawing the Virgin with a metal point. Van der Weyden himself executed several versions of this painting (**fig. 3**),[16] and further works were created as more or less accurate copies of his composition. The depiction of the scene in Beinhart's relief is closer to the rendition of this subject in the paintings of Colijn de Coter[17] from Brussels (c. 1493, parish church in Vieure, **fig. 4**) and Derick Baegert,[18] who was active in Wesel (1480–85, Westfälisches Landesmuseum, Münster, **fig. 5**). Both of these works depict the Evangelist sat on a chair and painting an image of the Virgin at his easel. In the paintings Luke is holding a palette and a paintbrush; even though in the relief the saint's hands are empty, their arrangement and gestures indicate that he originally held those items. In both the paintings and Beinhart's relief, the figures of Mary and Luke are situated close to each other and clearly separated by the easels – as opposed to Van der Weyden's painting, where the space between them is devoid of such a barrier.

Contrary to the aforementioned examples, the Wrocław relief is a sculpture rather than a painting. A further example of a sculpture of the same subject is the altarpiece of the painters' guild in Lübeck (1484, St.-Annen-Museum, Lübeck, **fig. 6**). It has often been compared to Beinhart's relief, even though there are significant differences between both works. In its

[14] Ludolphus de Saxonia, *Vita Jesu Christi*, Louis Marie Rigollot, ed. (Rome: Palme, 1870), vol. 1, pp. 3, 9, cited in: Kruse, op. cit., p. 229.

[15] Kruse, op. cit., pp. 227–30.

[16] For Rogier's painting and its replicas see *Der Meister von Flémalle und Rogier van der Weyden*, Stephan Kemperdick, Jochen Sander, eds, Katalog zur Ausstellung im Städel Museum, Frankfurt am Main, 2008/2009 und in der Gemäldegalerie der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, 2009 (Ostfildern: Hatie Cantz Verlag, 2008), pp. 386–9, cat. no. 48 (J. Sander) – includes a list of the most important bibliography.

[17] See Jeanne Maquet-Tombu, *Colyn de Coter, peintre bruxellois* (Brussels: Nouvelle société d'éditions, 1937), pp. 17–9, 100; Catheline Perier-d'Ieteren, *Colyn de Coter et la technique picturale des peintres flamands du XVe siècle* (Brussels: Lefebvre & Gillet, 1985), pp. 55–9.

[18] See Paul Pieper, *Die deutschen, niederländischen und italienischen Tafelbilder bis um 1530. Westfälisches Landesmuseum Münster* (Munich: Aschendorff, 1986), pp. 333–8.

central part, the Lübeck altar depicts figures of saints against a golden background and surrounded by halos, while the Virgin is additionally wearing a crown. This gives the work a more traditional character in comparison to the loose, "private" representation of Beinhart. In the Lübeck altar, the saints are placed on two symmetrically separated parts of the composition. Only the representation of the floor would suggest the intention to create an illusion of real space. In the Wrocław work, on the other hand, thanks to the figure of the Child, fragments of draperies and the easel placed against the column which divides the space, a similar division is softened in favour of an illusion of a real interior. The scene visible in the Lübeck altar is not as realistic and contemporary as in Beinhart's relief or the aforementioned paintings by de Coter and Baegert. However, Saint Luke from Lübeck is also depicted in fifteenth-century painter's attire: he is wearing the characteristic hat. The Evangelist in said outfit is also found in another sculpture devoted to the same subject matter, *Saint Luke Painting the Virgin* from the Hamburg cathedral (Saint James's Church, Hamburg, **fig. 7**).[19] The altar depicts the scene of painting the Virgin in a different way to the above-mentioned works, as Luke and the Virgin with Child are depicted among a crowd of saints. In terms of its composition and rendition of the motif of Saint Luke painting the Virgin, the Wrocław altar is decidedly closer to the aforementioned paintings than to the sculptures, with which it shares a similar technique.

As the author of the first "true image" of Christ and the Virgin, Saint Luke was the patron of all artists who created their "copies," be it paintings or sculptures. The tradition of his patronage over painters' guilds dates back to the fourteenth century. Sources refer to the (unpreserved) altar of Saint Luke funded in 1348 by the Prague guild.[20] Still, it is worth to quote this information on account of the close artistic ties between Prague and Wrocław. The Wrocław painters' guild must have existed in 1390, when it was granted a statute from the emperor, but in all likelihood it was established earlier,[21] possibly also under the patronage of Saint Luke. He had his chapel at the Church of Saint Mary Magdalene, with the right of patronage confirmed in 1482. Funding an altarpiece of Saint Luke for the chapel would seem to be in line with the tradition existent in Europe (Central Europe too). Representations of Saint Luke painting the Virgin associated with Van der Weyden's model are generally thought to have been funded by painters' guilds, like the aforementioned Lübeck altarpiece. Most researchers assume that Van der Weyden's painting was designated for the painters' chapel in Brussels.[22] However, this hypothesis is not confirmed in the sources. In the community of townsmen, the patron represented craftsmen guilds or fraternities in the symbolic sphere. Saint Luke acted as an intermediary between the craftsmen and God and represented their community in front of the public. Paintings showing the saint may also be construed as self-referential representations, presenting a peculiar idea of art and image.

When interpreting the painting of Van der Weyden and other renditions of the subject, characterized by attention to detail and illusionistic effects, one may assume that the works presented in painters' chapels were designated for closed artistic communities. Their main

---

[19] Manya Brunzema, *Der Lukasaltar in St. Jacobi zu Hamburg. Ein Kunstwerk der Renaissance* (Hamburg: Christians Verlag, 1997).

[20] Borchert, op. cit.

[21] Schultz, *Urkundliche Geschichte...*, op. cit., p. 15.

[22] See Elisabeth Dhanens, *Rogier van der Weyden. Revisie van der Documenten* (Brussels: AWLSK, 1995), p. 98; Borchert, op. cit.; James Marrow, "Artistic Identity in Early Netherlandish Painting: The Place of Rogier van der Weyden's St. Luke Drawing the Virgin," in *Rogier van der Weyden...*, op. cit., pp. 53–9.

function could have been to demonstrate the possibilities and objectives of art, i.e., the mimetic reconstruction of reality. Erwin Panofsky claimed that artistic self-awareness was forming in parallel in Italy and the Netherlands. He thought that *en grisaille* in fifteenth-century Netherlandish painting was a vivid depiction of the *paragone* subject which was discussed in Italian literature at the time.[23] By the same token, the aforementioned paintings of Saint Luke as painter could have functioned as pictorial explanations of the theory of painting, which had not existed in fifteenth-century written Northern European sources.[24] According to Till Holger Borchert, Van der Weyden's painting is a lesson in the theory of painting formulated in response to the unpreserved work by Campin, which may have served as a model for de Coter's painting.[25] The researcher attempts to reconstruct the artists' dialogue on art by interpreting the display of their skills contained in their paintings. In his opinion, for example, the depiction of figures admiring the landscape in Van der Weyden's work is meant to emphasize the skill of painting a realistic view. Compositional changes, in turn, serve as a clearer indication of perspective than in the alleged painting by Campin. By introducing drawing instead of painting to the scene, Van der Weyden elevates the artist, underlining the significance of the artistic idea transferred in a sketch onto paper, thus pictorially teaching the theory of *disegno*.[26]

Christiane Kruse, according to whom Saint Luke or an artist identifying with him sketches his representation of the Virgin on the sheet of paper, interprets Van der Weyden's work in a similar vein. In her opinion, what is crucial is the depiction of the drawing on a clean white sheet, as it reveals the manner of creating paintings, which are based on sketches. The researcher compares the message of this painting with the representation of chancellor Rolin and arrives at the conclusion that Van Eyck's painting depicts the process of creating a mental image, while Van der Weyden reveals the process of creating the material image, Kruse notes that the theory of painting and art he proposes, denying the miraculous creation of the image, heralds the end of the cult image and the beginning of the artistic image.[27]

However, the fifteenth century is a time of particularly strong devotion, on-going pilgrimages to miraculous images and numerous indulgences for saying prayers established by popes before said images, i.e., representations of the Veil of Veronica. The faithful would be granted such indulgences irrespective of whether they had been praying before paintings, relics or their artistic copies. Van der Weyden's painting does not have to signify the end of the cult image, but a change in how it was viewed in the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance.[28] The essence of this change was that the holiness of an image was no longer dependent on its miraculous origin. The main message of this work is the suggestion that it is created "here and now," as symbolized by the contemporary attire, drawing technique used by artists of the

---

[23] Erwin Panofsky, *Early Netherlandish Painting* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 162.

[24] Borchert, op. cit.; Marrow, op. cit., pp. 53–9.

[25] There is a hypothesis, according to which paintings by de Coter and Baegert are based on a non-existent representation of Luke painting the Virgin by Robert Campin. If it were true, Campin's painting would be a model – prior to Van der Weyden's painting – for representations of Saint Luke in contemporary costume of a painter executing a portrait of the Virgin. See Grete Ring, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der niderländischen Bildnismalerei im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig: Seemann, 1913), p. 105, n. 1; see also: Felix Thürlemann, *Robert Campin* (Munich: Beck, 2002), pp. 101–8.

[26] Borchert, op. cit., p. 79.

[27] Kruse, op. cit., pp. 239–45; see also Belting, *Bild...*, op. cit.

[28] Robert Maniura, "The Icon Is Dead, Long Live the Icon. The Holy Image in Renaissance," in *Icon and Word. The Power of Images in Byzantium*, Anthony Eastmond, Liz James, eds (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 87–105.

time and individualized features of Luke's face. The question is not so much whether these are in fact Van der Weyden's features, but that the face gives the impression of belonging to a specific person alive at the time. The painter is depicted as the author of a general cult image, thus taking the place of Luke, since – like him – he can paint holy images. *Saint Luke Drawing the Virgin* depicts the artist who is working, but also worshipping the breast-feeding Virgin. Placing her underneath a canopy refers to an altar, thanks to which the image is associated with the mystery of the Eucharist. Needless to say, Van der Weyden's workshop produced numerous devotional images of *Maria Lactans*.[29]

Underlining the status of the painting created by Saint Luke in religious life of the time seems equally important in the context of Beinhart's relief. Apart from orders for large altarpieces, sculpture and painting workshops in cities such as Wrocław executed numerous smaller worship images, such as crucifixes or Marian paintings, on account of large demand among contemporary townspeople.[30] Highlighting the painting of the Virgin in this representation – surrounded by a narrative relief depicting contemporary scenery and attire – may be interpreted as a legitimization of the artist's own status and that of other members of the guild, who no longer were merely the recreators of the holy prototype, but the creators of holy images.

We do not know whether the image originally placed on Luke's easel was painted or sculpted. In the 1926 photograph (**fig. 8**), there is a painted image of the Virgin and Child, but this was not an original element. Originally, it could have been a relief, like in the depiction of Saint Luke on the pulpit of the Merseburg cathedral. However, I suppose that it was a painting, since – as I have mentioned – it should represent a popular image which served as the object of worship, i.e., a painting of the Virgin and Child.

The Virgin Weaving the Seamless Robe

The worship function of the painting is further emphasized by another object of worship present in Beinhart's relief, which is analogous to the painting, i.e., the seamless robe woven by the Virgin for Jesus. This motif has been borrowed from Veit Stoss's engraving *Holy Family*. It depicts the Virgin weaving a robe placed on a cross-shaped stand. The robe is mentioned in the Gospel according to Saint John (19: 23–24): soldiers are gambling for it in the description of the Passion. The scene of weaving the robe is based on legendary accounts, e.g. by Rupert of Deutz,[31] and the *Vitae beate Virginis Mariae et Salvatoris rhythmica* poem of c. 1230. It features the most widespread version of the legend, according to which the Virgin weaved the robe for Christ when he was still an infant, and as he grew up, the robe miraculously grew with him. This piece exerted a strong influence on German religious poetry; in late thirteenth century it was paraphrased by Walther von Rheinau, whose poem *Marienleben* is indicated by scholars as

---

[29] Diane Apostolos-Cappadona, "Picturing Devotion. Rogier's Saint Luke Drawing the Virgin," in *Rogier van der Weyden...*, op. cit., pp. 5–14.

[30] See Michael Baxandall, *The Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany. Images and Circumstances* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1980), p. 102.

[31] Rupertus Tuitiensis, "Commemoratia in Evangelium Sancti Joannis," in *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina*, Jacques Paul Migne, ed., vol. 169, Paris 1844–64, col. 789: "tunica vero inconsutilis, et desuper contexta per totum, videlicet qualem dilecta ejus Maria, sorte diligenter contexuerat [...]", cited in: Wojciech Walanus, "Przedstawienie Marii tkającej nieszytą suknię Jezusa na rycinie Wita Stwosza," in *Wokół Wita Stwosza. Materiały z międzynarodowej konferencji naukowej w Muzeum Narodowym w Krakowie 19–22 maja 2005*, Dobrosława Horzela, Adam Organisty, eds (Krakow: Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie, 2006), pp. 140–9.

a possible literary source of the scene from Stoss's engraving.[32] This motif may be interpreted in various ways: as a prefiguration of the Passion of Christ and the allegory of the unity of the Church, employed since early Christianity, as well as a metaphor of the Incarnation.[33]

What is most noticeable in Stoss's engraving is the unique placement of the robe hanging on the cross-shaped stand. Such representation of the robe may refer to the true relic of *tunica inconsutilis.* In the description of the treasures of the Basilica of Saint John Lateran in Rome, deacon John mentions "tunicam inconsutilem quam fecit virgo Maria filio suo."[34] This relic was worshipped in various places, but the most famous one is located in Trier.[35] In the 1513 woodcut commemorating its public showcase, the manner of its presentation resembles that of Stoss's engraving and Beinhart's relief.[36] One may assume that Beinhart's representation of the robe refers to the relic of the Body of Christ, an object of worship and destination of pilgrimages, such as the numerous paintings of Luke. It may also be associated with the relics of the Passion of Christ worshipped in the Wrocław church of Saint Mary Magdalene. In 1365, the church received relics of the True Cross and the Crown of Thorns from Charles IV.

Beinhart's relief thus depicts both the relic and the painting and – what is especially noteworthy – the process of their creation. Juxtaposing the relic with the painting is understandable in the context of late medieval religiosity. On account of the dogma of the real presence of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist as well as the popularization of the Corpus Christi, the significance of images of worship increased. They began to be worshipped almost on a par with relics and the Host, as they too manifested the Body. The seamless robe is a contact relic which manifests the earthly trace of the Body in heaven, while the painting serves a similar function, showing images of Christ and the Virgin to the faithful.[37]

Apart from juxtaposing the objects of worship, Beinhart's work also clearly demonstrated the analogy between the figures and their actions. The Virgin and Luke are sitting opposite each other, both engrossed in the process of creation. Both of them are creating objects of worship: the relic and the painting, which – by indicating persons existing in heaven – is viewed in a similar way to the relic. At the same time, if the action of weaving the robe by the Virgin is treated as a metaphor of the Incarnation,[38] Luke's activity could be understood in a similar vein: he is painting an image in an act of artistic creation, thanks to which he manifests the saints.

[32] Walanus, op. cit.

[33] Ewald Vetter, "Überlegungen zur Ikonographie des Schwabacher Hochaltars," in *Der Schwabacher Hochaltar. Internationales Kolloquium anlässlich der Restaurierung Schwabach 30 Juni – 2 Juli 1981* (Munich: Bayerisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege, 1982), p. 75.

[34] As cited in Walanus, op. cit.

[35] For more information on the Trier relic of the seamless robe see *Der Heilige Rock zu Trier. Studien zur Geschichte und Verehrung der Tunika Christi* (Trier: Erich Aretz, Paulinus, 1996).

[36] See Walanus, op. cit., s. 146, fig. 6.

[37] The most important example of a contact relic and a painting at the same time are paintings depicting the Veil of Veronica.

[38] For weaving as a metaphor of the Incarnation see Kathryn M. Rudy, "Miraculous Textiles in Exempla and Image from the Low Countries," in *Weaving, Veiling and Dressing. Textiles and their Metaphors in the Late Middle Ages*, Kathryn M. Rudy, Barbara Baert, eds (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), p. 3. Medieval Church Studies, 12.

Image versus the Mystery of Incarnation

Even in the above-cited legend of Saint Luke the painter written by Maniacutius, the creation of the painting is compared to the Incarnation. This question has been analysed by many researchers, such as Louis Marin and Daniel Arasse, who considered it to be a problem of representation.[39] According to them, from the perspective of figurative art, the Incarnation of God in Christianity is understood as the image of God personified through Christ. Georges Didi-Huberman also states that the act of becoming flesh – the fundamental doctrine of Christianity – means becoming the image of the invisible God.[40]

In Beinhart's relief the seamless robe can be interpreted as a metaphor of the Body. Just like the robe, it serves as representation and cover at the same time – the Body of Christ makes His divine nature present and at the same time conceals it. The allegory of Virgin Mary as the veil of Christ appears in the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux. In his sermon for the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, he describes her using the metaphor of the veil and claims that the act of shrouding the Son of God by His Mother is the essence of Incarnation.[41]

The seamless robe may be compared to another fabric woven by Our Lady, namely the veil of the Temple in Jerusalem. She was weaving it – according to Pseudo-Matthew's version of the Annunciation – when the Archangel appeared before her.[42] This motif is known, e.g., from the painting from Melchior Broederlam's altarpiece (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Dijon), where the Virgin is depicted seated, with a prayer book and a piece of red yarn in her hand.[43] This motif later disappeared from Annunciation scenes and was featured in separate studies of Mary at the loom.[44] The fact that she is weaving the veil during the Annunciation connects this activity with the mystery of Incarnation. It seems important that the veil was associated with the Body of Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews (10: 19–20): "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh."[45]

In the Temple in Jerusalem, the veil separated the faithful from the Sanctum Sanctorum – the place where the Ark of the Covenant was kept, and which could be entered only once a year by the High Priest. The Gospel According to Saint Matthew (27: 51) features a description of its tearing at the very moment when Jesus died on the cross. "And, behold, the veil of the temple

---

[39] See Louis Marin, "Annociations toscanes," in *Opacité de la peinture. Essais sur la représentation au Quattrocento* (Paris: Usher, 1989); Daniel Arasse, *L'Annonciation italienne. Une histoire de perspective* (Paris: Hazan, 1999).

[40] Georges Didi-Huberman, *Fra Angelico. Dissemblance et figuration* (Paris: Flammarion, 1990); id., *Confronting Images. Questioning the ends of a certain history of art*, John Goodman, trans. (Pennsylvania: University Park, 2005), pp. 183–209.

[41] Bernard de Clairvaux, "In nativitate Beate Mariae Sermo. De aquaeductu," in *Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina*, Jacques-Paul Migne, ed., vol. 183, Paris 1844–64, col. 448.

[42] For more information on the iconography of the so-called needlework of the Virgin see Robert L. Wyss, "Die Handarbeiten der Maria. Eine ikonographische Studie unter Berücksichtigung der textilen Techniken," in *Artes Minores. Dank an Werner Abegg*, Michael Stettler, Meehthild Lemberg, eds (Bern: Stämpfli, 1973), pp. 113–88; see also *Weaving...*, op. cit.

[43] Erwin Panofsky, "Rzeczywistość i symbol w malarstwie niderlandzkim XV wieku," Krystyna Kamińska, trans., in id., *Studia z historii sztuki*, Jan Białostocki, ed. (Warsaw: PIW, 1971), pp. 122–3.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Quotes from the King James Version of the Holy Bible.

was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent." This signifies that at the moment of his death, Christ becomes the way to the Sanctum Sanctorum, i.e., the house of God, and his body becomes the new veil, through which the faithful can enter the holy place. However, it is still a carnal and visible veil, which covers God.[46] It is worth remembering that according to theologians, from Saint Augustine to Nicholas of Cusa, the highest – and closest to God – level of contemplation was imageless, which is best exemplified by the constantly recurring maxim: *per visibilia ad invisibilia.* Thus, the robe as a metaphor of the Body can be considered to be the new veil replacing the old one from the Temple. Because it is compared to the robe, the image painted by Saint Luke gains the status of the veil.

Therefore, Beinhart's relief portrays the Virgin and Saint Luke in the act of creating material veils of divinity. The image, like the body given to Christ by his mother, personifies the word, at the same time replacing and concealing the imageless divine nature. In his explanation of the Christian function of image as veil covering the invisible, Klaus Krüger compares the Old-Testament Sanctum Sanctorum to the tabernacle in the Christian church – the place which hides the mystery of Incarnation.[47] Krüger mentions two illustrations of Heinrich Seuse's mystic vision. The first one was created circa 1360–70 (Bibliothéque Universitaire et Nationale, Strasburg, inv. no. MS 2929, vol. 82r), while the second one – in late fifteenth century (it is featured in a prayer book from Konstanz: Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, inv. no. Codex 790, vol. 106r). Both include representations of an open door through which the souls pass in order to unite with God. The first drawing depicts a tabernacle door with a veil hung above the threshold, while in the second one, a winged altar with figural representations is in place of the tabernacle. The sculptures replace the veil, and become the veil at the same time. Commenting on the transition from veil to image, Krüger refers to the above-mentioned exegesis of Christ's Body symbolizing the veil, featured in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The medieval works of art, which present their own status of veils concealing the invisible, may be said to embody the unwritten theory of art. An artist acting out of God's inspiration portrays His Incarnation, illustrates the Gospel and completes the vision of the real Body present in the Eucharist. On the other hand, such autotelic works indicate the absence of God whom the faithful would like to see and touch.[48] In the Wrocław circles of the turn of the sixteenth century, the problem of artistic representation of the real Body of Christ in the Eucharist seems strongly present, not least because of the Corpus Christi cult, which was widespread in Silesia.[49] The motifs of Saint Luke the painter and of the seamless robe from Beinhart's relief combine the theme of artistic self-reflection with the theme of the Incarnation. The role of the Evangelist is likened to the role of the Virgin – they both create veils covering the divine nature and mediate between the visible and the invisible. The medium chosen by the artist plays a key role in this process. While the Netherlandish artists

[46] See Herbert L. Kessler, *Spiritual Seeing. Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000).

[47] Klaus Krüger, *Das Bild als Schleier des Unsichtbaren. Ästhetische Illusion in der Kunst der frühen Neuzeit in Italien* (Munich: W. Fink, 2001), pp. 11–26.

[48] Jeffrey F. Hamburger, "The Medieval Work of Art. Wherein the 'Work'? Wherein the 'Art'?" in *The Mind's Eye. Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages*, Jeffrey F. Hamburger, Anne-Marie Bouché, eds (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2006), s. 375–411.

[49] See Zbigniew Zalewski, "Święto Bożego Ciała w Polsce," in *Studia z dziejów liturgii w Polsce. Praca zbiorowa*, vol. 1, Maria Rechowicz, Wacław Schenk, eds (Lublin: KUL, 1973), pp. 95–161.

used the *en grisaille* technique to show the power of painting,[50] the sculptural mastery of the relief is accentuated by the lack of polychromy.

Monochromy

Terminology

In the literature of the subject, late medieval wooden sculpture which is not decorated with traditional polychromy (i.e., applied on ground) is defined by different, interchangeable terms: unpolychromed sculpture, monochrome sculpture, *ungefasste Holzplastik*[51] (unfinished wooden sculpture) and *Holzsichtige Skulptur* (sculpture revealing the texture of wood). The term *ungefasste Holzplastik* (sometimes used alternately with the term *Holzsichtigkeit*) suggests that the lack of polychromy was not deliberate and that such works are in fact not finished. Most scholars have excluded this term due to the results of conservation research proving that in many cases we are dealing with deliberate resignation from polychromy and with different kinds of finish, therefore they cannot be called "unfinished."[52]

The term "unpolychromed sculpture" describes the works at hand in terms of negation and appears to be the most neutral and safe one, while the terms "monochrome sculpture"[53] and *Holzsichtigkeit*[54] emphasize two different aspects of the lack of polychromy. The term *Holzsichtigkeit*, kept in its original form in English and Polish literature, can be translated as "visibility of wood." The researchers who use it claim that the most characteristic feature of unpolychromed sculptures was revealing the wood (the material it was made of) to the spectator, whereas the term "monochromy" is more frequently used by those scholars, who claim that the artistic effect of the unpolychromed sculpture was not determined by the visibility of the material, but by the monochrome finishing layer of coating applied onto it.

The fact that unpolychromed sculptures were covered with coating is not called into question, mainly thanks to restoration research. The monochrome finish is also confirmed by written sources, for example the preserved contract of Tilman Riemenschneider with the Rothenburg city council from the year 1501, commissioning him to make sculptures for an

[50]   For the recapitulation of this discussion see Antoni Ziemba, *Sztuka Burgundii i Niderlandów 1380–1500*, vol. 1, chapter 10: "Niderlandzkie malarstwo XV wieku a rzeźba burgundzko-niderlandzka" (Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2009), pp. 373-90.

[51]   Johannes Taubert, "Zur Oberflächengestalt der sog. ungefassten spätgotischen Holzplastik," *Städel – Jahrbuch Neue Folge*, vol 1 (1967), pp. 119-39.

[52]   Georg Habenicht, *Die ungefaßten Altarwerke des ausgehenden Mittelalters und der Dürerzeit* [online], Dissertation, Göttingen, 1999 [retrieved: 4 May 2009], at: <http://webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/diss/2002/habenicht/index.html>.

[53]   Baxandall, op. cit.; Christa Schulze-Senger, "Die spätgotische Altarausstattung der St. Nicolaikirche in Kalkar-Aspekte einer Entwicklung zur monochromen Fassung der Spätgotik am Niederrhein," in *Flügelaltäre des Späten Mittelalters,* Hartmut Krohm, Eike Oellermann, eds (Berlin: Reimer, 1992).

[54]   Eike Oellermann, "Die spätgotische Skulptur und ihre Bemalung," in *Tilman Riemenschneider. Frühe Werke, Ausstellung im Mainfränkischen Museum Würzburg 1981* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1981), pp. 275-83; Hans Westhoff, "Holzsichtige Skulptur aus der Werkstatt des Nikolaus Weckmann," in *Meisterwerke massenhaft. Die Bildhauerwerkstatt des Nikolaus Weckmann und die Malerei in Ulm um 1500. Katalog zur Ausstellung im Würtembergisches Landesmuseum Stuttgart,* 11 May – 1 August 1993 (Stuttgart: Württembergisches Landesmuseum, 1993), pp. 135-45; Heribert Meurer, "Zum Verständnis den holzsichtigen Skulptur," in *Meisterwerke massenhaft...,* op. cit., pp. 147-51; Jakub Kostowski, "'Holzsichtigkeit' w niemieckiej rzeźbie ołtarzowej późnego średniowiecza jako wyraz dążeń reformatorskich," in *Sztuka i dialog wyznań w XVI i XVII wieku. Materiały sesji Stowarzyszenia Historyków Sztuki,* Jan Harasimowicz, ed. (Warsaw: SHS, 2000), pp. 103-16.

altarpiece in the church of Saint James. The contract stated that the master was to apply monochrome coating onto the wood.[55] The essential difference between the traditional polychromy and the monochrome finish is that the former required a thick layer of ground, while the monochrome coating was applied directly onto unprimed wood and deeply penetrated its structure.[56] Hence the basic question in the discussion concerning the appropriate terminology – whether the coating applied onto unprimed wood was transparent in order to show its structure, or did it cover it, giving a specific texture and colour to the surface of the sculpture? Riemenschneider's unpolychromed sculptures were the subject of most thorough conservation research.[57] It proved that the coating usually contained enough pigments and tinctures to be almost opaque and not to reveal the material, but it unified the colour of the sculpted wood. For instance, the *Holy Blood Altar* in Rothenburg ob der Tauber (**fig. 9**) was covered with honey-coloured coating and Veit Stoss' crucifix from Lorenzkirche in Nuremberg – with a dark-brown layer.[58] Even the first examinations confirming that the Münnerstadt altarpiece was not polychromed showed that it was covered with coating made up of oil and tinctures containing iron oxide, black pigment and white lead.[59] A later chromatographic examination of one of the altarpiece's panels demonstrated that the coating was yellowish, and this colour was obtained not with the use of tinctures, but with pigments made of mulberry or fisetin from tanner's sumach. Those tinctures must have been imported from Southern Europe, which means that they were very expensive.[60] This may prove that artists set much store by the hues of monochrome finish which concealed the natural colour and texture of wood. However, due to numerous repaintings and previous conservation interventions, one cannot be certain whether the layer in question was indeed the original primary finish of the sculpture. It is virtually impossible to give a definite answer to the question regarding the transparency of coating applied to unpolychromed sculptures.[61]

Research conducted on the coating applied to Niklaus Weckmann's unpolychromed sculptures, showing lack of pigments (or minimal quantities thereof), raises even more doubts.[62] Therefore, experts specializing in his work have decided to use the word *Holzsichtigkeit*. This term, however, seems to be inappropriate even if it pertains to almost transparent finish. Coating, be it almost transparent or coloured, always gives a certain gloss to the sculpture and smooths its surface – so it does not reveal the structure of wood, which the term *Holzsichtigkeit* seems to imply.

[55] Eike Oellermann, "Erkenntnisse zur ursprünglichen Oberflächengestalt des Münnerstadter Magdalena-Altares – Möglichkeiten eine Rekonstruktion," in *Riemenschneider. Frühe Werke...*, op. cit., pp. 318–21.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Barbara Rommé, "Holzsichtigkeit und Fassung. Zwei nebeneinander bestehende Phänomene in der Skulptur des ausgehenden Mittelalters und frühen Neuzeit," in *Gegen den Strom. Meisterwerke niederrhenischer Skulptur in Zeiten der Reformation (1500–1550). Katalog zur Ausstellung im Suermondt-Ludwig-Museum zu Aachen* (Berlin: D. Reimer, 1996); Eike Oellermann, "Polychrome Or Not? That Is the Question," in *Tilman Riemenschneider, c. 1460–1531. Symposium, 3–4 December 1999 in Washington*, Julien Chapuis, ed. (Washington: Yale University Press, 2004), pp. 113–23; Rudolf Göbel, Christian-Herbert Fischer, "New Findings on the Original Surface Treatment of the Münnerstadt Altarpiece," in ibid., pp. 125–9; Manfred Schürmann, "Gefasst oder holzsichtig? Zum Problem der Fassung im Werk Tilman Riemenschneider," in *Tilman Riemenschneider. Werke seiner Blütezeit. Katalog zur Ausstellung im Mainfränkischen Museum Würzburg 24. März bis 13. Juni 2004* (Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2004), pp. 167–73.

[58] Oellermann, "Polychrome Or Not?...," op. cit.

[59] Id., "Erkenntnisse...," op. cit.

[60] Göbel, Fischer, op. cit.

[61] Schürmann, op. cit.

[62] Westhoff, op. cit.; Meurer, op. cit.

In the light of the above, it seems most likely that it was the monochrome finish (which gave a homogeneous colour, smoothness and shine to the sculpture) that determined the final form of works not decorated with traditional polychromy. Therefore, the term *monochromy* appears to be the most appropriate one, although it can be used alternately with *unpolychromed sculpture*, which is a more neutral expression.

Beinhart's Monochrome Relief

The monochrome finish of the relief depicting Saint Luke painting the Virgin was discovered during conservation works conducted by Agnieszka Czubak and Ewa Kołodziejska-Młynarczyk in the Workshop of Sculpture and Painting on Wooden Supports of the National Museum in Warsaw in the years 1997–2002.[63] After removing the remains of the second layer of ground, polychromy and gilt, they discovered traces of a layer painted directly on the wood. Such finish is characteristic of works which were not decorated with traditional polychromy. The elements of the sculpture covered with paint are: eyes and pupils of the human figures and of the ox, fragments of the animal's snout, cabochons on Mary's robe and decorations on the box lying on the top shelf of the cabinet over Saint Luke.[64] Traces of paint applied directly onto the wood were also discovered on the Infant's leg, but it is not certain whether it was used at the same time as the finish in question. If it transpires that the polychrome layers on the eyes, ornaments and the Infant's leg are all from the same period, one would have to assume that the primary finish covered larger parts of the relief, including the skin of the depicted figures.[65] This would confirm the above-cited statement that the difference between traditional polychrome works and unpolychromed ones does not lie in the lack of colour, but most of all in the lack of ground underneath the layer of paint. What confirms the primary monochrome finish of the altar, is the precise execution of details, as well as changes in the structure of wood and discolourations typical of such sculptures and reliefs.[66]

Unpolychromed sculptures appeared at the turn of the sixteenth century mainly in south Germany, Bavaria, Franconia and Swabia. The relief depicting Saint Luke is the only preserved monochrome work from Silesia. Beinhart might have encountered such sculptures in Swabia where many examples of works decorated in that manner could be found. In the years 1518–20, Daniel Mauch created a monochrome altarpiece in Geislingen, Beinhart's native town. The work is several years older than the relief at hand, but the sculptor remained in contact with Swabia during his stay in Wrocław and the monochrome altarpiece from Geislingen follows the general trend with which his own work might be consistent.[67] He could also have seen monochrome sculptures in Franconia, where he used to travel.[68]

Searching for answers to the question regarding the lack of polychromy in Beinhart's relief, one ought to consider the possible explanation of this phenomenon in south German sculpture. One may distinguish two trends of interpretation in current research. Some scholars, basing

---

[63] Kołodziejska-Młynarczyk, op. cit.

[64] Ibid., p. 14.

[65] Ibid., p. 38.

[66] Ibid., p. 23.

[67] Kostowski, "'(...) mit allem fleis...," op. cit., pp. 431–2.

[68] Meinert, op. cit., pp. 218–9, 230.

on ideological premises, regard the lack of polychromy as a symptom of religious changes,[69] while others describe the issue of monochromy in aesthetic and artistic categories.[70] In both interpretations, monochrome sculpture is considered opposite to polychrome sculpture and regarded as an innovative phenomenon typical of the turn of the Renaissance.

Jakob Kostowski represents the group of scholars who explain the resignation from polychrome finish in *Saint Luke Painting the Virgin* as a manifestation of religious change. He analyses it in the context of unpolychromed Czech sculptures, which were also unique in that region.[71] Basing on the research on German sculpture,[72] he sees the origin of monochromy in the criticism of idolatry.[73] He remains under the influence of Jörg Rosenfeld's interpretation,[74] according to which unpolychromed sculptures express the criticism of representation, which heralded the Reformation. Kostowski emphasizes the significance of Hussitism, the late echoes of which were to have impacted the austere monochrome finish of Czech sculptures and of the one from Wrocław.[75] Such interpretation does not seem convincing. The criticism of idolatry, present both in Czech Reformation ideas and in the period before Reformation, was neither powerful nor innovative enough to influence formal changes in sculpture. To confirm the connection between the *Saint Luke Altarpiece* and the proto-Protestant ideas, the scholar quotes records of the first Protestant sermon in Wrocław, delivered by Jan Heß in 1523 precisely in the church of Saint Mary Magdalene.[76] However, the 1523 appearance of a

---

[69] Oellermann, *Die spätgotische...*, op. cit., p. 275; Bernhard Decker, "Reform within the Cult Image. The German Winged Altarpiece before Reformation," in *The Altarpiece in the Renaissance*, Peter Humfrey, Martin Kemp, eds (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 98; Jörg Rosenfeld, *Die nichtpolychromierte Retabelskulptur als bildreformerisches Phänomen im ausgehenden Mittelalter und in der beginnenden Neuzeit* (Ammersbeck bei Hamburg: Verlag an der Lottbek, 1990), pp. 11–2.

[70] Hans Huth, *Künstler und Werkstatt der Spätgotik*, Augsburg: Dr. Filser Verlag, 1923; Janusz Kębłowski, "Tylmana Riemenschneidera dzieła wczesne (na marginesie wystawy w Würzburgu)," *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*, 45, no. 2 (1983), pp. 204–6; Westhoff, op. cit.; Baxandall, op. cit.; Fritz Koreny, "Riemenschneider and the Graphic Arts," in *Tilman Riemenschneider, c. 1460–1531...*, op. cit., pp. 99–111; Schürmann, op. cit.; H. Krohm, "Der Schongauersche Bildgedanke des 'Noli me tangere' aus Münnerstadt – Druckgraphik und Bildgestalt des nichtpolychromierten Flügelaltars," in *Flügelaltäre...*, op. cit., pp. 84–102; Karin Wörner, Alexander Markschies, "Bericht über die Diskussion zu den Beiträgen zum Phänomen des nichtpolychromierten Flügelretabels," in ibid., p. 260; Hartmut Boockmann, "Bemerkungen zu den nicht polychromierten Holzbildwerken des ausgehenden Mittelalters," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 57 (1994), pp. 330–5.

[71] Kostowski uses the term *Holzsichtigkeit* in the belief that showing the wood was decisive for the meaning of unpolychromed sculpture.

[72] Oellermann, *Die spätgotische...*, op. cit., p. 275; Decker, "Reform within the Cult Image...," op. cit., p. 98; Rosenfeld, *Die nichtpolychromierte...*, op. cit.; "*Die nichtpolychromierte Retabelskulptur als bildreformerisches Phänomen im ausgehenden Mittelalter und in der beginnenden Neuzeit*," in *Flügelaltäre...*, op. cit., pp. 65–83.

[73] Kostowski, "(...) mit allem fleis...," op. cit.; id., "'Holzsichtigkeit'...," op. cit., pp. 103–16.

[74] Rosenfeld, "Die nichtpolychromierte Retabelskulptur...," op. cit.

[75] He associates the altar of Saint Luke and the altar of Saint John the Baptist from the Church of Our Lady before Týn in Prague with the ideas of Prague reformer Matthew of Janow. Over a century before the sculptures were created, he spoke critically of the cult of images of saints, claiming that "the simple folk sees God's power in dead blocks of wood." Kostowski believes that this view directly influenced the monochrome execution of the *Virgin Enthroned* by the Master of the Crucifixion from the Dumlose Family from c. 1420, also located at the Church of Our Lady before Týn. In his opinion, this sculpture was to literally demonstrate that it was but a block of wood and that the depicted figure rather than the sculpture should be the object of worship. He suggests that the Czech Reformation ideas and the said sculpture were a prologue heralding the reformative tendencies in sculpture which flourished a century later, as exemplified by the monochrome works from Prague and Wrocław.

[76] Bogusław Czechowicz, "Wratislavia – caput regni Bohemiae? Praga i Wrocław w artystycznym dialogu w XV wieku," in *Śląsk i Czechy. Wspólne drogi sztuki* (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2007), p. 431.

Protestant priest in the church in which the relief depicting Saint Luke was placed does not imply that at the time of the work's creation – twenty years earlier – proto-Protestant ideas had been propagated in circles associated with the temple.

The artistic reasons for which Beinhart might have resigned from polychromy in this work seem much more plausible. Kostowski bases his interpretation on associations with poverty and simplicity, which – in his opinion – are suggested by the term *Holzsichtigkeit*,[77] thereby disregarding the question of the coating which determined the work's final form and the impact it had on the audience. The aforementioned analysis of the coating applied to Riemenschneider's sculptures proves that thanks to its shine and colour it gave the sculpture a homogeneous hue and smoothness, thus exposing the mastery of execution of the work's surface, rather than the austerity of the material. During the restoration of the *Altar of Saint Luke*, traces of yellow-brown paint vehicle (which might have been the original protective substance) were found in the folds of the drapery, under a secondary layer of ground.[78] Therefore, the relief was most probably decorated with a tinted coating, like Riemenschneider's sculptures. Consequently, it seems that the lack of polychromed decoration in the *Altar of Saint Luke* was caused by the desire to expose the sculptor's mastery, and not the material itself. Monochromy did not serve the purpose of diverting the attention from the material aspect of the representation in order to exclude idolatry[79] – on the contrary, it accentuated the subtle and elaborate forms rendered in wood with a mastery which, according to Michael Baxandall, sublimates the austere material.[80]

As a work of art designed for the painters' guild chapel[81] – executed by a senior of the guild and owner of a large woodcarving workshop – the altarpiece, by displaying the sculptor's skill, could have served the purpose of popularizing the virtuosity of the master who represented his studio as well as of the other members of the guild. The relief of Saint Luke is executed with great attention to detail. The artist diversifies the texture of the depicted surfaces, replacing painting techniques with sculptural effects. He imitates crown-glass windows, fabrics and locks of hair with exceptional skill. Such displays of artistic mastery could have been a way of attracting burgeois clients who desired to display their social status by commissioning first-rate works of art.

In the research on monochrome sculpture, there recurs the question of whether it was the artist or the commissioner who decided about the lack of polychrome finish.[82] *Saint Luke Painting the Virgin* was funded by the artists themselves for the chapel of their guild, so there was no outside patron who could have influenced the form of the work. This indicates that the concept of monochrome finish was the artists' own decision.[83] In Silesia, works of art commissioned by the bourgeoisie were traditionally polychromed. The lack of polychromy

---

[77]   Rosenfeld, whose conviction of the link between unpolychromed sculpture and reformative thought was shared by Kostowski, does not use the term *Holzsichtigkeit*; this term is used by Westhoff and Maurer, who explain the lack of polychromed decoration in Weckmann's sculpture with artistic reasons.

[78]   Kołodziejska-Młynarczyk, op. cit., p. 38.

[79]   Kostowski describes monochromy as "spiritualist." See Kostowski, "'Holzsichtigkeit'...,' op. cit., pp. 104–5.

[80]   Baxandall, op. cit., p. 93.

[81]   For more information on the chapel see Małgorzata Niemczyk, "Kaplice mieszczańskie na Śląsku w okresie późnego gotyku," *Roczniki Sztuki Śląskiej*, no. 13 (1983), pp. 29, 52–3.

[82]   Ziomecka assumes that the altar may have been funded by an altarist from the painters' chapel, Beinhart's relative, but this is a rather isolated opinion; even the researcher herself does not reiterate it in other publications.

[83]   Boockmann, op. cit., pp. 330–5.

in the altarpiece of the chapel of the painters' guild could have been an artistic experiment, impossible for Beinhart to venture in his other realisations.

While describing the artistic qualities of monochrome sculpture, one should be especially attentive to the light and shade effects.[84] The elimination of colour and the glossy coating exposed the play of light on the surface of monochrome sculptures, which intensified the aesthetic experience. What is especially noteworthy is the example of Riemenschneider's *Holy Blood Altar* in Rothenburg (**fig. 9**). Thanks to glass panes fitted into the back panel, the sculptures could be exposed to light, which is more intense and diverse during the day. It is the interest in chiaroscuro that might have underlain the new aesthetic approach, a manifestation of which was the monochrome sculpture.[85] At the turn of the sixteenth century, monochromy in sculpture was similar to the *en grisaille* technique used in painting and drawing. In Dürer's or Schongauer's brown ink drawings, like in monochrome sculpture, eyes, mouth, skin and ornaments were accentuated with colour. Around 1500 *grisailles* with delicately coloured skin were also popular. Drawings from late fifteenth century seem to imitate three-dimensional monochrome reliefs and small statuettes from the late Middle Ages. On the other hand, the authors of monumental unpolychromed sculptures might have been inspired by black-and-white graphic prints which they used as models. This is very well exemplified by the comparison of Riemenschneider's relief *Noli me tangere* (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Bode Museum, **fig. 10**) with Schongauer's engraving of the same title (**fig. 11**). One can hardly resist the impression that the print was not only an iconographic and compositional model for the sculptor, but also a formal one.[86] What the monochrome relief and the engraving have in common, is the interest in chiaroscuro effects on the elaborate and texturally diverse surfaces. Both works reveal the artists' mutual aspirations in terms of the artistic interpretation of form.

The fact that the late medieval graphic art and monochrome sculpture prove the artists' similar approach to chiaroscuro and spatial relations between objects can be also confirmed by the case of Veit Stoss, who created works in both techniques. As is well known, Beinhart's motif of the Virgin was inspired by Stoss's engraving entitled *The Holy Family*. Therefore, is one allowed to ask whether the relief and the engraving have the artists' broader interests in common as well? Is the connection between them comparable to the one between Schongauer's print and Riemenschneider's sculpture? An interest in the light and shade effects is clearly visible in the engraving by Stoss. It shows reflections of light on the rich folds of the drapery.[87] Similar effects, achieved with graphic means of expression, can be noticed on the drapery from Beinhart's relief. The perspective of the depiction and chiaroscuro effects, which show the spatial arrangement of objects, are also the same in both works. Stoss and Beinhart both depict interior scenes in vaulted chambers with windows in the background serving as sources of light.

The aesthetics of monochromy as well as the interest in chiaroscuro and space it entailed were also influenced by private audiences, by the developing phenomenon of art collecting as well as by the connoisseur-like approach to art.[88] The modest size of the retable of Saint Luke and the genre-specific depiction of the scene evoke associations with works intended for the

---

84   Oellermann, "Erkenntnisse...," op. cit., p. 321; Habenicht, op. cit., pp. 27–32.

85   Krohm, op. cit., pp. 84–102; Koreny, op. cit., pp. 103–10; Habenicht, op. cit., pp. 47–57.

86   Krohm, op. cit., pp. 84–102.

87   Sawicka calls Stoß's engravings "relief-like." See Sawicka, op. cit., p. 9.

88   Taubert, op. cit., p. 135; Koreny, op. cit., pp. 103–10; Habenicht, op. cit., pp. 56–7.

private sphere. The use of perspective creates the illusion of a space shared with the spectator, and contemporary clothing makes it easier to experience the scene as if it were happening "here and now." However, this sculpture is a part of an altarpiece, so its form should be considered in the context of the retable's function. The monochrome relief was positioned in a place where the faithful were accustomed to seeing polychromed figures – as in other chapels of guilds or in the Marian altar from 1507, attributed to Beinhart and placed in the same church. Therefore, was the relief of Saint Luke perceived differently to traditional altarpieces?

Experts specializing in Silesian art had regarded Beinhart's work as innovative even before the original monochromy was discovered. As I have already mentioned, many authors, while referring to the then stage of research on the *Altarpiece of Saint Luke*, noticed the relief's realism, exceptional in Silesian art, as well as its compositional and formal characteristics, which heralded the Renaissance.[89] Monochrome works were also considered in the context of the changes in the role of art, happening "on the threshold of modernity."[90] The discovery of the monochrome finish of Beinhart's altarpiece confirms its position among the works of the "turn of the new era." But can it be analysed in opposition to polychromed altarpieces? Did the different form really have to be connected with the new role of art which prevailed over the cult function of the altarpiece in general? Bernhart Decker writes: "The altar is undeniably the central place of cult and I refer to works directly connected with it as to *cult images*."[91] If a work which reveals the artist's mastery is placed in an altarpiece, does it deprive the altarpiece of its status of an object of cult?

The main function of a winged retable is the opening and closing of its wings, in accordance with the liturgical calendar – thus, the altarpiece controlled and limited the access to its most spectacular central part. In the late Middle Ages, there developed a type of retable with painted reverses of the wings and with three-dimensional sculptures or high reliefs in the central part. Scholars have stressed the significance of positioning the sculptures in the central part, as it is the most "real" as well as the least often seen representation of the holy figures.[92] However, the opening and closing of the wings was not regulated by liturgical law, especially in case of the side-altars, which did not play any role in the rituals related to the liturgical year.[93] In his analysis of the relationship between altarpieces and liturgy, Kees van der Ploeg comes to the conclusion that "[...] retables are not liturgical objects but only refer to the central issue of the liturgy, which is to reenact the history of salvation in the Eucharistic sacrifice."[94] He emphasizes the frequent Marian motifs which refer to the mystery of the Incarnation, and thereby transubstantiation, as exemplified by Beinhart's work at hand. "The liturgy does not need such images, but devotional practice does: at times when no mass was

---

[89] Zlat, op. cit., p. 182; Kębłowski, "Renesansowa rzeźba...," op. cit., p. 14; Ziomecka, "Wit Stwosz...," op. cit., p. 137; *Wokół Wita Stwosza...*, op. cit., p. 216.

[90] See Meurer, op. cit.

[91] Bernhard Decker, "Die spätgotische Plastik als Kultbild. Ein Diskussionsbeitrag," *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde*, no. 8 (1985), p. 95.

[92] Id., *Das Ende des mittelalterlichen Kultbildes und die Plastik Hans Leinbergers* (Bamberg: Lehrstuhl für Kunstgeschichte und Aufbaustudium Denkmalpflege an der Universität, 1985), p. 80; Annegret Laabs, "Das Retabel als „Schaufenster" zum göttlichen Heil. Ein Beitrag zur Stellung des Flügelretabels im sakralen Zeremoniell des Kirchenjahres," *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, no. 24 (1997), pp. 71–86.

[93] Kees van der Ploeg, "How Liturgical Is a Medieval Altarpiece?" in *Italian Panel Painting in the Duecento and Trecento*, Victor M. Schmidt, ed. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002), pp. 113–5.

[94] Ibid., p. 115.

celebrated, these depictions would eloquently simulate contemplation on the mystery of the Eucharist."[95] If one were to assume that, apart from illustrating the liturgy, the function of the retables – especially in the side-altars – was to support the devotion concentrated on the mystery of the Incarnation and the Eucharist, one may ask whether the altar of Saint Luke could have had such a function.

Hans Belting claims that late medieval realism was a consequence of the competition between the representation and the Real Body in the Eucharist. He believes that once the notion of art was established, and once art itself became visible in the representations, the late medieval realism of carnal imagery came into decline. He states that if the mastery of execution and the category of art are accentuated in an image, it ceases to refer to the reality it is supposed to depict – that is, to the Body of Christ.[96] Therefore, does Beinhart's skill, revealed by the monochrome finish of his altarpiece, indeed reduce the realism of the work? Yet it does not seem that the lack of polychromy renders the sculpture unreal, on the contrary: it intensifies the realistic depiction of details and textures.[97] The lack of colour in the monochrome work, replaced by more expressive textural effects, might have induced an urge to touch it, thus making the relief more present, in a sensual meaning. It is also worth remembering that in the relief at hand, like in other monochrome works, the mouths and pupils of the depicted figures were colourful – which gave them a life-like gaze and appearance. This effect intensifies the realistic representation of the body, and due to the lack of polychromy, the masterfully carved details become visible: the facial features or the skin and veins on Saint Luke's hand. The history of Veit Stoss's crucifix from Saint Mary's Basilica in Krakow, which was funded by Henryk Slacker, proves that mastery does not contradict cult, on the contrary – it supports it. Originally unpolychromed, it portrayed the body so realistically that the work seemed to be alive and Christ was believed to speak miraculously. It was precisely the exposure of haptic qualities that caused this belief.[98] As a monochrome work, Beinhart's relief was not an artistic opposite of the realistic polychrome sculptures. It related to the question of Incarnation and real presence, so it fulfilled the role of a retable, but it was through different means of expression that it achieved the illusion of reality which encouraged devotion.

Beinhart's workshop produced traditional monumental altarpieces, which were polychromed and gilded. By choosing monochromy to display his mastery, the artist reveals himself not as a creator of artistic objects which are perceived only in terms of their aesthetic value, but first of all as the one, who – by means of his art – shows the Body of Christ present in the Eucharist. His skills enable him to portray the story of Salvation so realistically that it appears to be happening right in front of the church-goer's eyes. Therefore, it seems more probable that monochromy was not the antithesis of polychromy, but one of the available means of artistic expression. Consequently, the display of mastery, albeit formally innovative, should not be regarded as revolutionary in terms of the function of art.

---

[95] Ibid., p. 114.

[96] Hans Belting, *Das echte Bild* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2005), pp. 91–2.

[97] Kębłowski, "Tylmana Riemenschneidera dzieła…," op. cit., p. 206.

[98] The crucifix was polychromed in early sixteenth century, after which the polychromy was not restored until the nineteenth century, as it was believed that the miraculous figure of Christ should not be altered; for more information see Grażyna Jurkowlaniec, "The Slacker Crucifix in St. Mary's Church in Cracow. Cult and Craft," in *Wokół Wita Stwosza. Materiały…*, op. cit., pp. 348–58.

Conclusions

Artistic self-reflection can be found not only in the relief's iconography, but also in its form. By depicting Saint Luke as a contemporary artist painting the Virgin from life, Beinhart could have presented himself as an author of naturalistic mimetic representations. The demonstration of sculptural mastery through the rejection of polychromy can be understood as ennoblement and emancipation of the sculptor who is displaying the power of his medium. Such interpretation allows its supporters to regard the relief at hand as a harbinger of modern art. The authors who comment on Netherlandish paintings depicting Saint Luke painting the Virgin and experts specializing in unpolychromed sculpture have also suggested interpreting these phenomena as portents of the modern function of artist and art. If one accepts such categories of periodization of the arts, one should agree that this altarpiece represents the transition from "cult image" to "artistic image."

However, the relief of Saint Luke appears to elude such classifications. First of all, as an altarpiece it fulfilled the cult function, like other artworks without autotelic motifs created in Beinhart's workshop. Artistic self-reflection seems not so much to introduce a new function of art, as to confirm and justify its traditional sacred function. In the depiction of Saint Luke, the artist presents himself as the author of cult images. Such function of the portrait painted by the Evangelist is confirmed by the comparison to the relic of the seamless robe woven by the Virgin. The monochromy does not change the function of this representation either. It does not imply a reform of image which becomes nothing but an artistic object. It seems more probable that the monochrome finish of Beinhart's relief is supposed to demonstrate the author's skills which still serve the same purpose – showing the presence of the *sacrum.*

As an altarpiece, Beinhart's work refers to the question of Incarnation and to the Eucharist. The said ideas accompany the reflection on artistic activity – not only are they not mutually exclusive, but they complement one another, thereby creating a comprehensible theory of image. Drawing an analogy between the Virgin and Saint Luke allows to see them as authors of the material representation of God. The Real Body is present thanks to Mary, while the depicted one – thanks to the artist's mastery. Anatomical correctness, illusive representation of the interior and sophisticated execution of details are not an end in itself, but a means of describing the sacred ideas to the faithful.

The Virgin creates the carnal form of the invisible God – this act is symbolized by the weaving of the robe. The robe covers the Body, which in turn shrouds the divine nature of Christ; and the image painted by Saint Luke portrays the holy figures. However, the painting itself can be compared to a veil. It does not fully reveal the presence of God, but it links the visible with the invisible. The awareness of this function of art can be observed in many medieval works.[99] Self-reflection is by no means a new phenomenon – it only assumes a new form in the late Middle Ages and at the turn of the Renaissance. In Beinhart's work it can be understood as a focus on the artist's function as an intermediary who, thanks to his mastery and ability to show reality as it is, makes it easier for the faithful to contact the unreachable, invisible God.

---

[99]   Hamburger, op. cit.; Corine Schleif, "The Making and Talking of Self-Portraits. Interfaces Craved between Riemenschneider and His Audiences," in *Tilman Riemenschneider, c. 1460–1531...*, op. cit., p. 224; see also: ead., "Nicodemus and Sculptors. Self-Reflexivity in Works by Adam Kraft and Tilman Riemenschneider," *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 75 (1993), pp. 599–626.