3-24-2013

The Genealogical Series in the Late Middle Ages: A Survey of the Importance of Lineage for Dynastic Power

Skye Cornelia
Trinity University, scorneli@trinity.edu

The Genealogical Series in the Late Middle Ages:

A Survey of the Importance of Lineage for Dynastic Power

Skye Cornelia

ARTH 3390 - Independent Study in Art History:

Metalwork Tomb Sculpture in the Late Middle Ages

December 18, 2013

Introduction

      The funerary monuments of nobility in the Late Middle Ages are distinctive for the use of lineage to convey dynastic legitimacy. Many function as an explicit display of power on the part of the ruler who commissioned the monument. However, this type of dynastic imagery is not found solely on the tombs of rulers but can also be traced in other forms of art patronage. This project aims to connect the imagery of royal funerary monuments with similar iconography on other types of monuments in order to explore the importance of reinforcing lineage and dynastic authority in the Late Middle Ages. We will see that rulers in this time period identified similar ideological problems and sought out similar solutions to those concerns. Rulers expressed genealogy through a variety of media including painting, free-standing sculpture, print and, finally, funerary monuments. The theme can be traced among patronages of the courts of France, Bohemia, Burgundy and the Holy Roman Empire from the late 14th to early 16th centuries. It is a trend that developed through different channels that ultimately culminated in the colossal cenotaph of Maximilian I of Austria, Holy Roman Emperor.

      Fear of eternal damnation was undoubtedly the impetus behind much of the art patronage of the late Middle Ages. But as Carol Richardson points out there is more to death and dying than religious concern for the soul. Death, she says, raises the issues of reputation.[1] This secular concern for creating a lasting reputation is inseparably linked with aspirations to salvation. The two often combine in commissions of art by nobility who, while thinking about Heaven, think also about the legacy they will leave behind and the stability of the dominion they leave to their successors.

---

[1] Richardson 2007, p. 209.

Royal tombs along with other forms of art functioned as important symbols of political and dynastic ambitions and as statements of lineage.[2] Tombs of nobility from the Middle Ages stand in partial obscurity within the history of art as the result of a number of factors. Chief among these is the widespread destruction of many in Northern Europe. For example, the tomb in Lille of Louis de Mâle (d. 1384), Count of Flanders and father-in-law of Philip the Bold, is known today only from drawings and the modeling of later tombs on its imagery. It is difficult to assemble a complete and logical chronology for the development of such tombs when one cannot be sure of what has been lost.

Anne McGee Morganstern identifies a more fundamental problem in the complex relationship between piety and politics that is characteristic of this era. Amidst the claims of religious and familial piety implied with the erection of tombs there is often a sometimes concealed, dynastic concern underlying the commission. The two counterparts are sometimes inextricable from one another, with some ceremonial tombs performing the dual function of resolving long-standing genealogical issues.[3] It is thus quite easy to conflate the two types of tombs. This is especially true when family members are represented on a funerary monument. While sculpted figures around tombs are regularly assumed to be mourners there are attributes that are overlooked which suggest a dynastic function instead. Family members are sometimes recognizable by their costumes or hierarchical position. However, it is likewise true that costume or position can indicate social standing rather than the person's literal relationship to the deceased.[4] Furthermore, when family members are named or presented with their coats of arms the tomb is clearly more concerned with genealogy and dynastic legitimacy. This is even more

---

2 Richardson 2007, p. 236.
3 Morganstern 2000a, p. 7; see: p. 204, n. 44.
4 Morganstern 2000a, p. 8.

expressively shown on tombs which construct a historical genealogy rather than a purely biological lineage. Such monuments reflect attention to personal relationships, political awareness and historical consciousness on the part of the patron.[5] While Morganstern's project provides a useful analysis, her concern is mainly with early tombs of kinship. The project at hand expands Morganstern's work to examine later genealogical tombs and non-tomb commissions which also use the genealogical series to assert dynastic legitimacy.

Early Genealogical Series

The earliest genealogical tomb was that of Thibaud III, Count of Champagne, in the collegiate church of Saint-Etienne in Troyes erected in 1201. This tomb featured four arches that framed statuettes of family members identified by inscriptions. Thibaud's tomb was positioned close to that of his deceased father, Henry the Liberal, and was inscribed with an epitaph relating Thibaud's vow to go on a crusade and his endorsement of his father. This was a display of the family's solidarity with the intention of facilitating a transfer of the loyalty of the people to his son, Thibaud IV.[6]

Early tombs of kinship continued to be associated with liturgical functions but gradually became intermingled with notions of family continuity and ultimately dynastic authority. Subjects were appealed to for prayers and loyalty to their benefactors through the imagery of such tombs. This sense of obligation and gratitude would eventually be solidified through the use of explicit imagery of the noble lineage. Already in the thirteenth century, tombs illustrating kinship were developing. At this stage, the conventions for identifying individual family members on tombs were beginning. A tomb might represent several generations of a family, with

---

[5] Morganstern 2000a, p. 7; see: p. 204.
[6] Morganstern 2000b, pp. 11-13.

emphasis placed on illustrious lineage and the line of succession. As the practice became more prominent, the position of figures came to mirror successive generations. In some cases tombs represented different sides or branches of the family of the deceased. While identifying inscriptions continued to be used sporadically, the use of armorial shields and armorial dress became the norms for labelling figures.[7]

Evidence of the early stages of the genealogical element of tombs in France can be found as far back as the 1260s when a series of sixteen tombs were constructed in the Abbey of Saint-Denis in Paris. The funerary monuments were erected in memory of the Carolingian and Capetian ancestors of the reigning monarch, King Louis IX of France (d. 1270), better known as St. Louis. The effigies of the kings and queens were grouped by dynasty; however, historians have noted that if the ensemble is considered from west to east, the kings are arranged in genealogical order. It is also hypothesized that the king's enlargement of the transept to accommodate the tomb series is correlated to political struggles. The massive display of lineage may be a direct result of the threatened circumstances of Louis IX's early reign, during which his mother, Blanche of Castile, ruled as regent. The order in which the tombs were placed emphasizes the link between the Capetian line and the Carolingian line before it, so as to negate a prophesy stating the Capetian line would only reign for seven generations. The tombs are distinctive in their lack of an animal statue at the feet, an absence which created the impression that the kings and queens might be marching in columns. The tombs were designed to evoke the continuity of the generations of kings.[8] It is important to note that some historians, including Georgia Sommers Wright, believe that the Abbey was responsible for the commission of these tombs and not Louis IX. Wright believes the Abbey had internal motives: they wanted to induce

---

[7] Morganstern 2000b, pp. 27-31.
[8] Wright 1974, p. 242.

future kings to be buried there and thus devised a setting which emphasized political and dynastic significance rather than care for the eternal soul.[9] This necropolis vividly reflected the growing concern with genealogy and while no other funerary monuments of the time would surpass it, Louis IX's commission can be linked to other smaller tombs. [10]

Among these, male tombs dominate but there were a number of noteworthy tombs erected for women in the last half of the thirteenth century. These ladies had close ties to the French monarch which may suggest that they were inspired by the art of Louis's court. A rendering of the tomb of Marie of Bourbon (d. 1274), Countess of Dreux, shows that it had figures accompanying the heraldic program. Statuettes of family members filled an arcade of arches. Each was identified by a shield bearing their coats-of-arms as well as by inscriptions. The assembly included Marie's parents, her siblings, their spouses, their illustrious children and grandchildren as well as Marie's own family. The generations were carefully ordered in hierarchical succession.[11] The tomb of Blanche of Sicily (d. 1269?), daughter of Charles of France, is the earliest documented example of a tomb program that is exclusively devoted to the ancestry of its tenant, unlike that of Marie of Bourbon which depicted only immediate family. Displays of ancestry on tombs became more widely employed in later years.[12] Tombs of ancestry highlight the value placed on distinguished lineage. Morganstern notes that this was an important aspect of tombs of kinship and especially for women.[13]

The expanded genealogies of the tombs from the thirteenth century indicate an ever increasing preoccupation with political circumstances and the potency of the noble family line.

---

[9] Wright 1974, p. 224.
[10] Morganstern 2000c, p. 32.
[11] Morganstern 2000c, pp. 37-47.
[12] Morganstern 2000c, p. 49.
[13] Morganstern 2000c, pp. 47-50.

By this time tomb imagery has been extricated from theological context and firmly positioned in the context of familial consciousness. Furthermore, it is important to note the early incorporation of females in tombs of kinship in order to trace the imperative role of women rulers in the territories. The adoption of heraldry to exhibit family identity on woman's tombs in this time period can be viewed as a precursor to the tomb of Mary of Burgundy (d. 1482) in Bruges, which was erected by her husband Maximilian I, Holy Roman Emperor (d. 1519).[14] Maximilian built the tomb for his wife between 1488 and 1502, before beginning his own, very different, funerary monument. The cenotaph, now in Innsbruck, was built between 1502 and 1584. The two funerary monuments commissioned by Maximilian I are useful case studies to examine the importance of tomb iconography. We must examine why the two monuments look so different from one another when they were commissioned by the same person and thus what function Maximilian intended for each.

Morganstern recognizes the need to differentiate between, as she calls them, tombs of kinship and ceremonial tombs to fully realize the potential of such tombs as conduits by which political and dynastic power were asserted. The project at hand is to utilize this distinction and consider those characteristics of dynastic tombs in relation to non-funerary monuments commissioned by nobility in the Late Middle Ages. Genealogical representations were a widespread trend that applied to a much wider set of monuments than tombs alone; most prominently in sculpture and painting.

Maximilian I of Austria, Holy Roman Emperor, was a ruler for whom family lineage was a particularly disconcerting problem and one with which he was preoccupied throughout his reign. This anxiety over legitimating his right to rule is one that we can recognize as troubling

---

[14] Morganstern 2000c, pp. 51-2.

other Holy Roman Emperors. It is as though these rulers were perpetually afraid of being challenged. This likely arises from the difficulty of justifying a right to the use of the title "Holy Roman Emperor" by persons who are not connected to the original line in any authentic or verifiable way. Instead, a new line of emperors who resumed the title, such as Maximilian I and Charles IV of Bohemia, Holy Roman Emperor (d. 1378), devised their own fictive lineages to suggest that they indeed had an inherited right to that throne. Both of these Holy Roman Emperors employed their artistic commissions to convey their forged family trees and thus their dynastic claims. A similar concept was used by King Charles V of France (d. 1380) as well as Louis de Mâle, though both of these rulers used only real members of their lineages, not fictive. This project aims to show the connections among the familial imagery of these monuments. In doing so it will become clear that while the family line was prominently used on funerary monuments there were also occasions in which rulers used this imagery in other projects.

The earliest monument to clearly set out the standard from which we will work is the Luxembourg Genealogy, a series of mural paintings contracted by Charles IV, c. 1356-1357. This is closely followed by the statue series from the Louvre Staircase, commissioned by Charles V, c. 1364. Another is the series of portraits of the Counts of Flanders, begun by Louis de Mâle c. 1372 and added onto for generations. These are non-funerary monuments which utilize portraits of family lineage to convey power. The tombs which do this are those of Louis de Mâle, c. 1453-1455, and Mary of Burgundy started in 1488. Finally we come to the patronage of Maximilian of Austria, Holy Roman Emperor. This includes his *Triumphal* print series, started c. 1508. The cenotaph Maximilian ordered is one of true opulence; it surpasses any other dynastic monument of its era in both scale and imagery. The memorial was constructed between the years 1502-1584. In some of these cases the patron looks far back to their ancient predecessors, fictive

as well as real, when they commission a monument, while in other cases the patron depicts only their close relations and their progeny.

The Luxembourg Genealogy for Charles IV, Holy Roman Emperor

The Bohemian King and Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV built Karlštejn Castle outside of Prague in 1348.[15] It was erected as a place for the safekeeping of royal treasures, especially Charles IV's collection of holy relics and the coronation jewels of the Holy Roman Empire. Some critics believe, however, this was not the original reason for the founding of the castle and that the transformation of the palace into a safe for the most sacred relics of the Holy Roman Empire and the Bohemian kingdom alike was decided at a later date.[16] The construction was complete in 1365 when the Chapel of the Holy Cross in the Great Tower was consecrated.[17] The castle itself is thought to represent a convergence of Charles IV's ideological conception of spiritual and secular power.[18]

Charles IV was crowned Holy Roman Emperor in 1355. From this point on in his reign, Charles IV was represented in all official portraits as a wise ruler. He was convinced that he was chosen by God to rule and saw himself as the successor of such biblical figures as Solomon, David and the Three Magi.[19] Charles IV spent much of his adolescence at the court of his uncle, King Charles IV of France.[20] He was also the maternal uncle of Charles V of France. This close connection may in part explain the genealogical themes used by both Charles IV at Karlštejn and Charles V of France at the Louvre. Though the Karlštejn series includes fictive relatives and the

---

[15] Fajt and Royt 1997, p. 11.
[16] Fajt and Royt 1997, p. 11.
[17] "History of the Castle," http://www.hradkarlstejn.cz/history/ , accessed 16 December 2013.
[18] Fajt and Royt 1997, p. 11.
[19] Boehm and Fajt 2005, p. 15.
[20] Fajt and Royt 1997, p. 7.

Louvre staircase does not, both projects reflect a shared concern by similar rulers who were both brought up at the French court.

Charles IV commissioned one of the most ambitious genealogical series for the great hall of Karlštejn, the Luxembourg Genealogy.[21] The wall-paintings are only known from sixteenth-century manuscript volumes of painted copies from which we can fairly reliably reconstruct the family tree.[22] They represented over sixty of Charles IV's real, putative or totally fictive ancestors and relatives. The figures were depicted in full length, standing, or seated in thrones.[23] The wall-paintings represented the Luxembourg family tree. The series was created to support the legitimacy of the Luxembourg claim to the imperial throne – claiming a lineage "from Old Testament patriarchs, through ancient gods and heroes, the Merovingians and Carolingians to Charles's close relatives."[24] Among these were portraits of Charles IV's Luxembourg and Brabantine real ancestors juxtaposed with his alleged progenitors from Noah to the Trojans to Charlemagne.[25] A tempera paint copy after the figure of Noah in the Luxembourg Genealogy shows the standing figure of the biblical character, resting on a staff and positioned in a dynamic stance as though about to walk off his pedestal.[26] The manifestation of Charles IV's genealogy continued with his direct relations including: his grandfather, Emperor Henry VII, his father, John of Luxembourg, and finally a likeness of the Emperor Charles IV himself and his wife Blanche de Valois.[27]

The Luxembourg family tree was probably painted in the years 1356-1357 by a French-trained painter who has been called Master of the Luxembourg Family Tree, though sometimes

---

[21] Campbell 1990, p. 43.
[22] Fajt and Royt 1997, p. 13.
[23] Campbell 1990, p. 43.
[24] Fajt and Royt 1997, p. 13.
[25] Boehm and Fajt 2005, p. 10.
[26] Fajt and Royt 1997, p. 51; see: fig. 20.
[27] Fajt and Royt 1997, pp. 135-36; see also: p. 53, figs. 22 and 23.

identified with Nicolas Wurmser of Strasbourg who was Charles IV's court painter. Another theory identifies the artist as a painter from Brussels.[28] Previously, the Holy Roman Emperor had Johann de Klerk create a genealogy of his dynasty, which became the basis for the painted version in Karlštejn.[29] There is a corporeality to the figures that is distinctive of western European artists as well as their life-like gestures and individualized faces.[30]

The archrivals of the Luxembourg family were the Habsburgs, in part because of similar family histories. While both families belonged to the high aristocracy, they were originally only minor counts. This became an important point for the council of electors who chose the monarch, as the council did not want a powerful prince to be the Emperor. In lieu of a venerable lineage, both Habsburgs and Luxembourgs created fictitious genealogies or falsified evidence. The Habsburgs presented documents supposedly authorized by Julius Caesar and Nero as proofs of privilege. The Luxembourg line on the other hand created a family tree in which biblical patriarchs and Roman emperors alike were claimed as ancestors.[31]

There was a deliberate goal to represent Charles IV as part of an eternal history of monarchs through the artistic commissions at Karlštejn Castle. Charles IV was adamant about confirming the ancientness of his house.[32] Past, present and anticipated future, are linked together in the program of paintings at Karlštejn that serve to place Charles IV in his rightful place as Holy Roman Emperor. The genealogical cycle of the Luxembourgs in the palace represented Charles IV's ancestors and thus the past. Murals of Charles IV as a Christian world ruler decorated the Marian Tower – representations of the present monarchy. And, representing

---

[28] Fajt and Royt 1997, p. 13.
[29] Boehm and Fajt 2005, p. 19, n. 84.
[30] Boehm and Fajt 2005, p. 10.
[31] Boehm and Fajt 2005, p. 47.
[32] Fajt and Royt 1997, p. 8.

the future or eternal time of the Holy Roman Empire, panels depicting saints were created for the Chapel of the Holy Cross in the Great Tower. A visitor would have followed a processional route leading him or her in chronological order through each tower. This program highlighted the continuity of the Luxembourg lineage, an idea that preoccupied Charles IV throughout his reign.

Statues on the Louvre Staircase under Charles V, King of France

The obsession with proving one's pedigree carried over to the French court where, around the same time that Charles IV commissioned the paintings at Karlštejn, Charles V was following his uncle's example and commissioning a genealogical series of his own. The reign of King Charles V of France (d. 1380) was heralded by political stability and provided a royal court centered in Paris. An increased emphasis on the strength and continuity of the dynasty provided an important motive for the development of individualized portraiture in sculpture. Stable conditions allowed for a major building program as well as consistency in the palace design.[33] In 1364, Charles V transferred his residence from the Palais de la Cité to the Louvre. During his reign, the old fortress of Philippe Auguste was transformed into the magnificent Louvre palace. It was extensively rebuilt as a commanding symbol of the monarch's status.[34]

A new type of staircase called the *grande vis* was built to provide the entrance.[35] The large spiral staircase was to the west of a passage leading to the Great Tower.[36] The staircase was an exterior structure, placed within the courtyard.[37] Its inclusion in a tower that was opened by bays and richly decorated with sculpture gave eminence to the royal entrance that distinguished it

---

[33] Whiteley 1994, p. 47.
[34] Whiteley 1994, p. 49.
[35] Whiteley 1994, p. 49.
[36] Sherman 1969, p. 58; see: n. 7.
[37] Whiteley 1994, p. 59; see: n. 5 for Plans of the Louvre (1364-1380), including the *grande vis*.

from the other entrances leading from the courtyard.[38] The stair reached four stories in height,

comprising a large flight of eight-three steps leading to another smaller flight of about half that

number, which culminated in a terrace.[39] The stairway was designed by court architect and

sculptor Raymond du Temple. It was created to connect the various stories of the wing housing

the royal couple and the princes.[40] The staircase led a path through a series of three rooms that

were for the King's daytime use; first, to the largest room, the *chamber à parer*, then to the

chamber de retrait, and finally to the *chamber du roi*.[41] This new stair was adorned with statues

that created a genealogical ensemble.

Representations of the monarchy during this period encouraged a greater interest in

costume and physical appearance. Charles V produced two major groups of dynastic portraits

during his reign: the Louvre stairway group, begun in 1364, and the La Grange buttress figures at

Amiens cathedral, dating from 1375 to 1378. Only the latter group survives. Valid stylistic

analysis for the Louvre group is impossible because of the lack of visual records; however,

literary descriptions provide a good idea of what the statues' iconography and composition might

have been. Although much of the ensemble was destroyed by the renovations done by Francis I

and Louis XIII, the decorative scheme was fully described by the eighteenth-century historian of

Paris, Henri Sauval.[42]

Sauval writes that famous sculptors were commissioned to adorn the staircase with ten

large statues, each with its own canopy and base. Two figures sculpted by Jean de Saint-Romain

depicted sergeants-at-arms; these guarded the entrance to the royal apartment on the *piano*

---

[38] Whiteley 1994, p. 49.
[39] Sherman 1969, p. 58; see: n. 8.
[40] Sherman 1969, p. 59.
[41] Whiteley 1994, p. 49.
[42] Sherman 1969, p. 50; see: n. 10, *Antiquites de Paris.*

nobile. Saint-Romain also carved images of the Virgin Mary and Saint John the Baptist on the gable of the staircase. Three of the four secular male portraits represented the king's brothers: Jean, Duke of Berry by Jacques de Chartres; Philip, Duke of Burgundy by Guy de Dammartin; and Louis, Duke of Anjou by Jean de Launay. Jean de Liège received the commission to sculpt the portraits of King Charles V and Queen Jeanne de Bourbon. The employment of so many talented artists suggests that individualized, realistic portraits of the royal family were intended.[43]

The figures were arranged by hieratic importance. Highest were the sacred figures on the gable. Lowest were the sergeants-at-arms at the apartment entrance. According to Sauval the royal couple was placed high up on the stairway.[44] It is thought that the newly crowned king wanted this collection of figures to demonstrate the stability of the succession to the throne.[45] The marriage between Charles V and Jeanne de Bourbon did not produce an heir to the French throne until the end of 1368, and so, as Sherman notes, "As only the third ruler of the Valois line, the king pointed to his brothers to indicate the dynasty's present strength, while the queen [through her womb] represented hope for the future."[46] The staircase belonged to an ambitious program of artistic patronage rich in dynastic implications.[47] Furthermore, the visual spectacle of his daily descent of the *grande vis*, flanked by impressive images of the royal family, must have proved awe inspiring for any onlookers. The king reinforced his reputation for wisdom by constructing a conscious cultural program that exploited the visual arts in order to revive the power and prestige of the monarchy after the disastrous first phase of the Hundred Years' War.[48]

---

[43] Sherman 1969, p. 59.
[44] Sherman 1969, p. 60; see: n. 13.
[45] Sherman 1969, p. 60; see: n. 16, Pradel's "Art et Politique", p. 90.
[46] Sherman 1969, p. 60.
[47] Sherman 1969, p. 64.
[48] Sherman 1971, p. 83; see: n. 2, p. 93.

Portraits of the Counts of Flanders at Courtrai

Around the same time in the Low Countries, the genealogical theme was taking prominence. Early genealogical monuments in this region took the form of paintings as with those at Karlštejn, while later the genealogical theme was expressed in sculptural commissions. A series of murals depicting the Counts and Countesses of Flanders and their consorts was located at Ypres in the magistrate's chamber. The portraits dated at least as early as 1323 when Louis of Nevers, Count of Flanders, d. 1346, commissioned portraits of him and his wife. The couples were shown in pairs, identified by their coats of arms and inscriptions. These murals were destroyed along with the building itself in World War I.[49] Louis de Mâle, son of Louis of Nevers, later commissioned a similar series of portraits of the Counts of Flanders at Courtrai, in the Chapel of the Counts at the Collegiate Church of our Lady. These were being worked on by Louis de Mâle's painter, Jan van Hasselt by 1372. The murals decorated the walls of the chapel in which Louis de Mâle planned to be buried. Louis de Mâle's objective in the commission of the portraits at the chapel of Courtrai was to preserve the likenesses of the heads of the House of Flanders. Though the portraiture project was executed first at Louis de Mâle's orders, the line of portraits continued at the command of the heads of the House of Burgundy who succeeded him.[50] By the mid-nineteenth century the heads of all the figures were destroyed; the legs, arms, torso and the heraldic arms of each person remained.[51] At that time the fragments of the murals were considered too damaged to be restored. Copies were made of the originals before they were covered over with new portraits.[52]

---

[49] Campbell 1990, p. 41.
[50] Kugler, Waagen and Crowe 1889, p. 36.
[51] Kugler, Waagen and Crowe 1889, p. 36.
[52] Campbell 1990, p. 41.

The Counts of Flanders were depicted in full length, standing in niches. They were identified by their coats of arms and by inscriptions which recorded their names, dates and burial places. The only women included in the program were those who were countesses in their own right. For example, Joanna of Constantinople (1182-1244) was depicted standing within the same niche as her husband. As mentioned above, the portrait series was continued after the reign of Louis de Mâle. Portraits of Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy (d. 1404), and his wife, Louis de Mâle's daughter and heir, Margaret of Flanders (d. 1405), were apparently added to the Courtrai series by Melchior Broederlam in 1406.[53] In 1467, the figures of John the Fearless (d.1419) and Philip the Good (d. 1467) were to be included in the series at Courtrai. Authorities were sent to Brussels to obtain cartoons of the figures.[54] From this point onwards, the genealogical series became a recurrent form of decoration in the Burgundian Netherlands.[55] As we will see, the genealogical series manifests in new forms in successive generations, especially in funerary monuments and eventually Maximilian I's monumental cenotaph.

The Tomb of Louis de Mâle

During the mid-1400s in Netherlandish funerary practices there was a distinct shift in favor of including figures of the deceased's progeny to demonstrate the continuity between the patron's rule and that of his predecessors and descendants. This trend is exemplified on the tomb that Philip the Good commissioned for his great grand-father, Louis de Mâle, which was adapted to underscore the identity of family members. Five generations of rulers were depicted on the tomb, spanning the period from the death of Louis de Mâle to Philip the Good and his heir,

---

[53] Campbell 1990, p. 41.
[54] Campbell 1990, p. 43.
[55] Campbell 1990, p. 41.

Charles the Bold.[56] This may seem incongruous with the earlier trend of incorporating ancestral

figures in the tomb program. However, the function of Louis de Mâle's tomb was in fact to

legitimate the rule of Philip the Good by linking him to past rulers, rather than suggesting the

importance of de Mâle's progeny.[57] The commission for the tomb of Louis de Mâle, Count of

Flanders and father-in-law of Philip the Bold, was originally given to Andre Beauneveu in 1374.

Work on the tomb stopped in 1382 because of a rebellion in Ghent.[58] The funerary monument

was incomplete upon Louis's death in 1384. Parts of Beauneveu's tomb were left in storage in

the castle at Lille with instructions in Louis de Mâle's will that it be completed by his

executors.[59]

The project was not taken up again until 1453 by Philip the Good who commissioned an

entirely new tomb. There is no evidence that the finished tomb followed in any form that which

was commissioned by Louis de Mâle to Beauneveu.[60] The bronze tomb was completed in 1455

and destroyed in its entirety at the end of the eighteenth century during the French Revolution.[61]

The new funerary monument was to include the effigies of Louis's wife, Margaret of

Brabant, and their daughter, Margaret of Flanders, Duchess of Burgundy. A detailed contract

specified that the base, sides and slab should be made of black Antoing stone.[62] On top of the

slab were to be three effigies of the deceased. The contract also dictated that an arcade surround

the tomb chest with twenty-four statuettes of the lords and ladies descended from the deceased.

The effigies and smaller statues were to be gilt copper, not alabaster like those on the tomb of

---

[56] Morganstern 2000, p. 143.
[57] Morganstern 2000, p. 143-4.
[58] Nash 2007, p. 28.
[59] Morganstern 2000, p. 140; see: n. 25, p. 227.
[60] Nash 2007, p. 38.
[61] Campbell 1990, p. 188, plate 204.
[62] Vaughan 1970, p. 154.

Philip the Bold (d. 1404) at Champmol.[63] Each was placed on a pedestal with a shield at their feet with their coat of arms. The statuettes represented the six grandchildren of Louis de Mâle and Margaret of Brabant, the children of their daughter Margret of Flanders, her grandchildren, and two of her great grandchildren.[64] This included the image of the patron himself, Philip the Good.[65] The generations were costumed in the clothes of their respective eras.[66] The base of the arcade was inscribed with the names of each family member. Another larger inscription around the tomb slab bore the titles of the three deceased and the dates of their respective deaths.[67] The figures of the extended family were sculpted in a variety of gestures to relate them to one another. Family groups were indicated by posture and gesture; the beginning and the end of a group turn inward to close off the line.

These figures were not cast as mourners so much as to strictly indicate the tradition of courtly kinship and preserve the idea of the family structure. Philip the Good understood the dynastic value of such tombs.[68] He commissioned this tomb simultaneously as a monument to his forebearers and a promotion of his own succession. The tomb demonstrated the link between Philip the Good's own reign and that of his ancestors in an act of legitimating his right to rule.[69] By literally encircling the previous dynasty with members of the house of Valois, Philip asserted his claims to the title of Count of Flanders.[70]

Louis de Mâle was the last male descendant of the old family of the counts of Flanders. After his death, the title and possessions passed to the Valois dukes of Burgundy with whom

---

[63] Nash 2007, p. 38.
[64] Morganstern 2000, p. 143.
[65] Campbell 1988, p. 167.
[66] Morganstern 2000, p. 145.
[67] Morganstern 2000, p. 142.
[68] Jugie 2010, p. 117.
[69] Morganstern 2000, p. 140.
[70] Roberts 1989, p. 390.

they were allied by marriage.[71] Margaret of Flanders, Louis's only child and heiress, married

Philip the Bold. Two years before his death in 1384, Louis de Mâle appealed to his son-in-law

for help to fight Flemish rebels. After Louis's death Philip the Bold was tasked with the

pacification of Flanders. It was in that same year that Flanders became Burgundian. The Duke's

son, John the Fearless, ruled Burgundy and Flanders after him. John was careful to maintain the

Burgundian state though he did little to expand the empire. Finally we come to Philip the Good,

the son of John the Fearless who "added so many territories to the Burgundian state that he has

often been regarded as its founder."[72]

When he became Duke of Burgundy in 1419, Philip was faced with the task of

solidifying ownership of the territories prepared by his grandfather, Philip the Bold.[73] During his

father's reign, he was concerned with keeping control of the French government; when Philip

took the duchy, it was put to him to deal with a divided France.[74] Ostensibly the most important

aspect of Philip's reign was warfare. The war against Ghent in 1453 was the first campaign in

which troops from all of the Burgundian territories took part. It is not coincidental that Philip

signed the contract for Louis's tomb just three months after the suppression of the Ghent revolt.[75]

The tomb of Louis de Mâle was probably cast in bronze to facilitate a speedy construction as

bronze casting is much faster than sculpting alabaster or any other stone. Furthermore, Richard

Vaughan suggests that Philip hoped to consolidate the Burgundian lands by acquiring a crown,

perhaps establishing a kingdom of Burgundy and thus increase his personal power.[76] Philip's

decision to commemorate his rather distant relative must have been influenced by political

---

[71] Koreny 2002, p. 96.
[72] Vaughan 1975, pp. 15-18.
[73] Vaughan 1975, pp. 18-22.
[74] Vaughan 1975, p. 51-5.
[75] Campbell 1988, p. 167.
[76] Vaughan 1975, pp. 28-9.

considerations. Foremost he desired to make a public display of his descent from the dynasties of

Flanders and Brabant; and thus, encourage the loyalty of his Flemish and Brabantine subjects.[77]

It is evident that the Duke made purposeful efforts at aggrandizement through shows of power

and wealth as well establishing the support and loyalty of his subjects.[78]

The commission of Louis de Mâle's tomb by his great grand-son, Philip the Good, Duke

of Burgundy, is thusly linked to the idea of the legitimation of power.[79] As a Burgundian Duke,

Philip wanted to reassert his claims to the seat through his descent from the dynasties of Flanders

and Brabant and thus his inherited entitlement to the loyalty of those subjects.[80] This is expressed

in the imagery of the tomb.[81]

It is thought that the figures of Louis de Male's family members were probably based on

portraits. However, their forms were later reused with new identities in other tombs. The form of

the genealogical tomb continued to be employed for ladies in this era though those for men

displayed only limited genealogies or simply their progeny.[82] This is undoubtedly a result of the

different means of legitimacy ascribed to the two sexes. Men produced tombs of kinship in the

context of contested inheritance in order to assert power, as in the case of Philip the Good.

Female nobility took recourse to displays of distinguished lineage and family connections.[83]

The Tomb of Mary of Burgundy at Bruges

This idea is explicitly expressed in the tomb of Mary of Burgundy (d. 1482), daughter of

Philip's heir, Charles the Bold and Isabella of Bourbon, which was erected between 1488 and

---

[77] Campbell 1988, p. 167.
[78] Vaughan 1975, p. 30.
[79] Koreny 2002, p. 96.
[80] Campbell 1988, p. 167.
[81] Koreny 2002, p. 96.
[82] Morganstern 2000, p. 145.
[83] Morganstern 2000, p. 155.

1502. The tomb of the last Valois ruler of Burgundy stands at its original site in the Church of Notre Dame of Bruges.[84]. This funerary monument is highly inventive and breaks from the established tomb iconography of her predecessors.[85] It makes the idea of the family tree even more explicit than the lineage depicted on the tomb of Louis de Mâle.[86] These techniques were not done at Mary's direction but rather that of her widower Maximilian I of Austria, Holy Roman Emperor.[87] While the sophisticated genealogies of this monument are seen as a legitimation of Mary of Burgundy's rightful status as heir to the Burgundian patrimony, it is important to note that the tomb was commissioned by her husband. Thus it is equally a maneuver on Maximilian's part to legitimate his own right to rule after his wife's death.

When Duke Charles the Bold died in 1477, he left no male heir and thus his territories passed to his daughter, twenty year old Mary of Burgundy.[88] The new Duchess married Maximilian I, then Archduke of Austria, just months after her father's death despite protestations from the Netherlandish states. This union laid the foundations for the Hapsburg family's assumption of the Burgundian seat of power, and consequently their future status as a world power.[89] Charles the Bold's death at the Battle of Nancy marked the beginning of a period of political upheaval with the king of France immediately invading the Low Countries to claim territory. The death of Mary of Burgundy in 1482 exacerbated the territorial turmoil. Upon her death, the territories passed to her young son, Philip the Fair (d.1506), for whom Mary's husband Maximilian I, archduke of Austria and later Holy Roman Emperor ruled as regent until 1494.

---

[84] Roberts 1989, p. 376.
[85] Nash 2008, pp. 263-4.
[86] Morganstern 2000, p. 149.
[87] Nash 2008, pp. 263-4.
[88] Kren and McKendrick 2003, p. 4.
[89] Marti, Borchert and Keck 2009, p. 177, cat. 5.

Flemish towns resisted Maximilian's reign, the result of which was his constant obsessive devotion to sustaining his rule.[90]

Maximilian began the project for Mary of Burgundy's tomb in 1488 with threats to his authority sharp in his mind.[91] Like Philip the Good, Maximilian chose to commission a bronze tomb in an astute move to have the project completed as quickly as possible. Both rulers understood the need to quickly ingratiate themselves within the autonomous state by establishing a definite link to the past. Mary's tomb used different forms to impress on the viewer the nature of her lineage, her ties to the Valois house, her right to rule and thus her husband's authority to rule as regent for their son. Their marriage is the factor that legitimates Maximilian's reign. Unlike France, in the Netherlands females were allowed to inherit and to be sovereign, though it did not occur often; thus Maximilian's marriage to Mary is the only reason he ever gained power. Male rulers wanted to honor their female relatives in recognition of this right. While this is clearly exhibited in Maximilian's commission of his wife's tomb, its precedent may lie in the commission of Margaret of Mâle's (d. 1405) tomb by her grandson Philip the Good. Margaret was the wife of Philip the Bold and daughter of Louis de Mâle. It was only through her that Philip the Bold controlled Flanders.[92]

Mary of Burgundy's funerary monument was placed at Bruges in a politically astute plan by Maximilian in light of various rebellions that began in that city. The sculpture of the tomb uses the device of a tree to represent Mary's ancestors. Each of the long sides of the monument is decorated with a gilt-bronze family tree. This is a departure from the Burgundian norm as seen on the tomb of Philip the Bold at Champmol, on which mourner figures process around the base

---

[90] Kren and McKendrick 2003, p. 4.
[91] Kren and McKendrick 2003, p. 344.
[92] Morganstern 2000, p. 140.

of the tomb in eternal prayer. From the branches hang enameled shields displaying the coats of

arms of Mary's ancestors, thirty-one on each side of the tomb. Angels link the escutcheons, their

gilt-bronze figures surrounded by leaf-and-tendril embellishments. The two trees each illustrate

the lineage of Mary's parents. Charles the Bold, on the side to the right of the effigy; Isabella of

Bourbon, to the effigy's left.[93] The maternal lineage of each is placed on the left of the tree and

the paternal to the right.[94]

At the head of the tomb on one short side is a large shield emblazoned with Mary's

personal coat of arms resting in the branches of a tree and flanked by two angels. A scroll

identifies the entombed: "Mary of Burgundy Archduchess of Austria daughter of Charles Duke

of Burgundy and Isabella of Bourbon."[95] An epitaph in Gothic lettering is at the foot of the tomb,

flanked by two angels holding branches.[96] This script which is used on all the scrolls on the tomb

is a *littera textualis formata*, an ornate form of writing often used for luxury manuscripts. Tiny

figures of the four Evangelists paired with their symbols stand in decorative consoles flanking

each of the corners of the tomb. Along the beveled edge of the lid are the arms of the estates of

the duchess.

The gilt-bronze effigy of the deceased was cast by Jan Borman while the sides were done

by Renier van Thienen.[97] Her recumbent effigy rests atop a rectangular *tumba* of black stone.[98]

Throughout the entirety of her effigy an extreme attention to detail is observable. The deceased's

head rests on a pillow, her hands clasped together in a gesture of prayer. The two dogs at her feet

symbolize her fidelity in marriage. Mary wears a coronet and rich garments. Her cloak is

---

[93] Roberts 1989, p. 376.
[94] Marti, Borchert and Keck 2009, pp. 342-43, cat. 154.
[95] Roberts 1989, pp. 376-77.
[96] Roberts 1989, p. 377; see: n. 4 for full text of the epitaph.
[97] Marti, Borchert and Keck 2009, p. 342, cat. 154.
[98] Roberts 1989, p. 376.

hemmed in an ornate pattern that incorporates her initial, "M". The dress is chased to imitate brocade while the borders of the sleeves and tunic imitate fur. The likeness of the duchess generally adheres to contemporary conventions of beauty at that time, but the features of the effigy correspond with remaining portraits of Mary and with evidence of her exhumed remains.[99]

While the black marble chest recalls the Burgundian tombs at Champmol, the use of bronze reflects local tradition. Certain familiar features are the pose of the effigy as in prayer, arrayed in full regalia and the inclusion of two dogs at her feet. Though the gesture of prayer is a common one, as seen on the tomb of Louis de Mâle, it is worth noting that the position of Mary's hands is different from the norm. Instead of the hands placed parallel or at an oblique angle to the torso, Mary's are placed perpendicular to her body.[100] They are rigid and arch unnaturally. Furthermore, Mary's short forearms and a lack of symmetry in the folds of her sleeves are incongruous with an otherwise symmetrical design. Ann Roberts suggests that this discrepancy is the solution to some formal problem the nature of which we cannot be clear.[101] The tomb further corresponds to the Burgundian tradition in the placement of the four Evangelists at the corners which were inspired by similar figures on Louis de Mâle's tomb.[102] The traditional aspects of the monument are set in contrast with certain new features; especially, the coats of arms adorning the vertical faces of the tomb, Mary's coat of arms and the detailed heraldic program on the sides. For the first time, depictions of the deceased's ancestors and descendants replaced figural representations with coats of arms. It is clear that much attention was given to the heraldic decoration of the monument, the significance of which will be discussed later.[103]

---

[99] Roberts 1989, p. 377; see: n. 6, Paul Janssens's essay on the paleo-pathological evidence provided by Mary's remains, pp. 141-175.
[100] Roberts 1989, p. 386.
[101] Roberts 1989, p. 386.
[102] Roberts 1989, p. 390.
[103] Marti, Borchert and Keck 2009, pp. 342-43, cat. 154.

Though the project was executed by her husband Mary herself expected a funerary monument to be made for her as designated by her will. On her deathbed, Mary specified her place of burial and specifics about her tomb.[104] She was perhaps wary of the danger of making no provision for a monument as at the time of her death neither her grandfather, Philip the Good, nor her father, Charles the Bold, was honored by a funerary monument. The remains of Charles the Bold would later be reinterred in a very similar tomb next to his daughter at Bruges, for which Mary's tomb was the model. [105] This was done by Charles's great-grandson, Emperor Charles V (d. 1558), in what may perhaps have been a familiar political move through the assertion of lineage.[106] Additionally, when Mary's son, Philip the Fair, died in 1506 his heart was buried with his mother in Bruges.[107] Mary of Burgundy's concern with proper burial is further exposed in her patronage of two tomb projects for her ancestors: the tomb of her mother, Isabella of Bourbon, at Antwerp, itself closely based on Louis de Mâle's tomb; and that of her uncle, Jacques de Bourbon, in the church of St. Donatia in Bruges. The completion of the latter was stipulated in Mary's will.[108] Thus it is evidently not only Maximilian of Austria who was interested in the visual commemoration of lineage but rather a theme espoused by both husband and wife.

Mary of Burgundy could not have been involved in designing the form her own tomb took though she instigated the project. It fell to her husband Maximilian and the administrative executor of her will, Thibault Barradot, to finance and ultimately execute her funerary monument.[109] The tomb was designed as a response to the particular political and cultural

---

[104] Marti, Borchert and Keck 2009, p. 342, cat. 154; see: p. 353, cat. 164 for her will.
[105] Roberts 1989, p. 376.
[106] Marti, Borchert and Keck 2009, p. 343, cat. 155.
[107] Richardson 2007, p. 241.
[108] Roberts 1989, p. 378.
[109] Roberts 1989, p. 380.

challenges to Mary's succession and, thereby, her husband's and their son's ascension to the Burgundian throne. Its unusual form handles the issue of her status as heir to Charles the Bold while both form and timing reflect the controversies concerning Maximilian's regency in Flanders. The multitude of coats of arms on this tomb expresses the extent of Maximilian's need to display the legitimacy of his succession. No previous dynastic display of genealogy had defined a lineage to such lengths.[110] The visual differences between Mary's tomb and the Burgundian monuments closest to it are indicative of the more significant conceptual differences. In the monument commissioned by Philip the Good for Louis de Mâle, the familial imagery focused not on the ancestors of the deceased but on the descendants who claimed their patrimony. It was a tomb that looked forward in order to assert Philip's claims to the title of Count of Flanders.[111] Mary's monument instead deals with the political and dynastic circumstances faced by her family upon her untimely death. Her marriage to Maximilian displaced the ruling line from the house of Valois now to the house of Habsburg. The genealogies on Mary's tomb trace bonds of kinship and inheritance through female as well as male ancestors. The cognatic system described through the genealogies promoted her right to inherit despite the typical patrilineal system.[112] The tomb manifests Maximilian's concern to express his wife's links to the Valois dukes, a tomb that looked backward five generations in order to assert Maximilian's rule. Furthermore, in the late fifteenth century, certain Habsburg commissions exhibited a taste for the use of heraldry which likely impacted the design of Mary's tomb through the influence of Maximilian's involvement in the project.[113]

---

[110] Roberts 1989, p. 392.
[111] Roberts 1989, p. 390.
[112] Roberts 1989, pp. 392-93.
[113] Roberts 1989, p 391.

Perhaps the most significant reason behind Maximilian's commission of his wife's tomb was the political upheaval in Burgundy around the period of her death. After the territorial dispute over inheritance because Mary was not a son, King Louis XI had seized the Duchy of Burgundy by force of arms. Mary's heirs continued to use the title "Duke of Burgundy". Mary's husband Maximilian, their son, Philip the Fair, and grandson, Charles V, all made efforts to regain the duchy.[114] The loss of that territory lingered at Maximilian's Flemish court as did the desire to reclaim the core of the Burgundian state. Maximilian's claim to the seat of Burgundy was based on his guardianship of Mary's children; thus by building a lavish monument for her Maximilian could demonstrate his commitment to protecting his son and likewise the land that rightfully belonged to him. It is this that resulted in the elaborate genealogical tomb of Mary of Burgundy, a dynastic monument which linked the Valois dukes of Burgundy with their Habsburg successors.

The Patronage of Maximilian I, Holy Roman Emperor: Woodcuts and Cenotaph

As we have seen genealogy was a preoccupation of rulers in the late Middle Ages in both France and Bohemia, an interest the Burgundian dukes shared as well. According to Roberts, the dukes were fascinated by factual and fictional lineages alike.[115] This point becomes particularly significant when we come to the personal commissions of Maximilian I of Austria during his reign as Holy Roman Emperor. A genealogy written by Oliver de la Marche for Mary and Maximilian's son, Philip the Fair, includes immediate ancestors, as well as historical and legendary rulers of Burgundy. In 1500, the young archduke commissioned a painted genealogy

---

[114] Roberts 1989, p. 393.
[115] Roberts 1989, p. 391; see: n. 60 For the Burgundian court's passion for genealogy, see G. Doutrpont, *La Litterature francaise a la cour des ducs de Bourgogne,* Paris 1909, 453-454.

to give to his father, Maximilian I. The painting, now lost, may have been used by the artist's responsible for Maximilian's commissions, such as the woodcut *Triumphal Arch* and his cenotaph, which further reflect the emperor's concern with dynastic lineage.[116]

Maximilian I was elected king of the Romans in 1486 but did not become Holy Roman Emperor until 1493, after the death of his father Frederick III.[117] Though Maximilian indeed became a great patron of the arts in the tradition of the dukes of Burgundy perhaps his most important patronage was of printing. Following his assumption of the imperial title, Maximilian returned to Germany where he commissioned German artists such as Albrecht Dürer, Lucas Cranach and Hans Burgkmair to meet the artistic needs of that throne.[118] The luxury volumes he commissioned late in his rule were intended to glorify his court. Having seen the magnificent manuscript collection of the Burgundian dukes, Maximilian sought to utilize print media for his own dynastic purposes. It was clear that Maximilian wanted to uphold the traditional appearance of manuscripts produced for other rulers while using the new printing press technology.[119] Thus he turned to woodcuts which had the advantages of being cheap as well as easily and widely distributed.

Maximilian I's Woodcut Prints

Keenly aware of the value of portraits as agents of propaganda, Emperor Maximilian I wrote: "He who during his lifetime provides no remembrance for himself has no remembrance after his death and the same is forgotten with his passing bell, and therefore the money that I

---

[116] Roberts 1989, p. 391.
[117] Kren and McKendrick 2003, p. 356.
[118] Kren and McKendrick 2003, pp. 314-15.
[119] Silver 1985, p. 12.

spend on my remembrance is not lost…".[120] While clearly no expense was spared in the erection

of his funerary monument, that commission was the culmination of Maximilian's dynastic

program and was supplemented by other cheaper commissions. Among these are the woodcuts

Maximilian I on Horseback, 1508; *Genealogy,* 1509-1512; the *Triumphal Procession*, 1512-

1516; *Triumphal Arch*, 1511-1518; and, the *Great Triumphal Chariot*, 1518. Only *Maximilian I*

on Horseback and the *Triumphal Arch* were completed during Maximilian's lifetime. As with the

plans for his funerary monument, Maximilian's reach often exceeded its grasp in both artistic

and political endeavors. It is owing to the realizations of print makers like Burgkmair and

Albrecht Dürer that Maximilian's aspirations for a universal Christian Holy Roman Empire did

not disappear entirely as fantasy.[121]

Emperor Maximilian I's principal ambition was to establish a dominant monarchy with

his acquired power as well as the hereditary power of his Habsburg successors in the imperial

office. He was the first major ruler who utilized the value of the printing press for the

propagation of his literary and visual propaganda. The series of woodcuts produced for

Maximilian visually expressed his ambitions and his assertions of an imperial ideal. The woodcut

Maximilian I on Horseback was designed for the emperor-elect in 1508. It was executed by Hans

Burgkmair the Elder, an Augsburg artist who in 1504 made another woodcut for the emperor,

The Battle of Bohemia.[122] *Maximilian I on Horseback* was the first in a series of woodcut images

of Emperor Maximilian commissioned in the following decade.[123]

Burgkmair represented Maximilian as the type of a warrior saint. *Maximilian I on*

Horseback is a portrayal that might easily be mistaken as an image of St. George, an association

---

[120] Campbell 1990, p. 201; see: p. 269, n. 47 for original text.
[121] Silver 1985, p. 24.
[122] Silver 1985, p. 14.
[123] Silver 1985, p. 9.

no doubt welcomed by the imperial minded emperor.[124] The saint held personal significance as the patron of Maximilian's first father-in-law, Duke Charles the Bold of Burgundy. His father, Emperor Frederick III, d. 1493, had also established a Saint George order of knights which Maximilian renewed and expanded. Larry Silver writes that his concerns were for the external politics of the Empire: "Maximilian wanted to emulate the earlier Burgundian calls for a crusade against the Turks with the Order of Saint George as the core of his forces." [125] *Maximilian I on Horseback* was printed on vellum, an expensive parchment made from lambskin and reserved for luxury manuscripts. Maximilian's counselor on legal as well as artistic matters, Conrad Peutinger, d. 1547, led the printing project.[126]

The figure of Emperor Maximilian I is seated on his horse in an upright, militant image of a strong leader. Maximilian's pose is both static and balanced. He is perceived as the regal, victorious crusader; his image conveys true imperial power. Burgkmair's *Maximilian I on Horseback* began the motif of the triumphal arch in woodcuts.[127] The Emperor was conscious of the precedents set up by his German predecessors as well as the Roman Emperors of antiquity. The triumphal arch in this woodcut print echoes the memorial constructed by Constantine on the Forum in Rome.[128] It is an image that suggests military victory. This is amplified by the tradition of the triumphal entrances made by ancient emperors through their arches, in martial parades.[129] The heraldic arms of the empire and of Austria appear on the trappings of the horse.[130] Maximilian's titles are inscribed in the arch above his head; the date of the woodcut's making is on a scroll at the bottom right. Conrad Celtis, the emperor's favorite contemporary Latin author,

---

[124] Campbell 1990, p. 101; see: p. 236, plate 257.
[125] Silver 1985, p. 22.
[126] Silver 1985, p. 9.
[127] Silver 1985, p. 11.
[128] Silver 1985, p. 18.
[129] Silver 1985, p. 19.
[130] Silver 1985, p. 15.

worked along with Peutinger to assist Burgkmair in integrating classical imagery into his woodcuts.[131]

The image of Maximilian on horseback was closely linked to his recent coronation and to the majesty of his imperial office. It is an image which has prototypes in Saint George but also in Germanic ancestors. A public monument to Emperor Otto the Great – considered the greatest German emperor after Charlemagne – the *Magdeburg Rider*, shows that ruler on horseback accompanied by two maidens, who were symbols of the city and its name. The form of the equestrian statue is one which had long been associated with the great rulers of antiquity, a precedent Maximilian indubitably wanted to evoke in his woodcut.[132] The program for Burgkmair's *Maximilian I on Horseback* suggests that Maximilian's coronation as emperor-elect at Trent was merely temporary before his proper investiture in Rome where he could assume the full throne of the Holy Roman Emperor.[133] The equestrian rider in *Maximilian I on Horseback* functions as a tribute to Maximilian's imperial past and his idea of a continuing Roman Empire in the Germanic lands. The commemoration of the past, memorialization of the present and a hope for the future, with a triumphal investiture in Rome, are all simultaneously embodied in this lasting monument. Maximilian's concerns with the continuity of his empire and the legitimacy of his rule were ones that permutated his iconography of kingship in woodcuts as well as his cenotaph.

Other works Burgkmair designed for the emperor included: *Genealogie*, 1510-12, illustrating the ancestry of Maximilian; and the *Triumphal Procession* (also with prints by Albrecht Dürer and Albrecht Altdorfer), 1507-18, a woodcut frieze with captions, encompassing

---

[131] Silver 1985, p 15
[132] Silver 1985, pp. 17-18.
[133] Silver 1985, p. 24.

court life, territories, marriages, wars, ancestors, imperial majesty.[134] A key feature of the

Triumphal Procession of Emperor Maximilian I were prints, *The Emperor's Ancestors*. Each

figure is presented with his or her coats of arms, standing in an architectural setting. The

ancestors are represented as golden statues. These reflect the monumental bronzes that were to

adorn Maximilian's cenotaph.[135]

In another work commissioned to commemorate triumph, *Triumphal Arch*, the emperor

further celebrated his renewal of the Order of St. George and his calls for a crusade.[136] Albrecht

Dürer is attributed with the design of the enormous multi-page woodcut, the *Triumphal Arch* of

the Emperor Maximilian, dated c. 1511-1518.[137] *Triumphal Arch* was printed from 192 woodcut

blocks each over eleven feet in height. It served as a vast exaltation of Maximilian's dynasty.[138]

The woodcut was decorated with scenes and texts representing the emperor's virtues,

achievements and his dynastic lineage. It was not printed until 1518 because Maximilian

continuously made changes to the details of his family tree, a fact that is unsurprising in light of

Maximilian's obsession with constructing the perfect lineage to legitimate his right to rule.[139]

Dürer's *Triumphal Arch* woodcut included a portrait of Emperor Maximilian I enthroned.[140] At

the top center of the arch is the vast family tree of Maximilian, which culminates in the portrait

of him enthroned. He is flanked by his first wife, Mary of Burgundy; their son, Philip the Fair,

and his wife, Joanna the Mad, are below Maximilian.[141] Philip the Fair is flanked by

---

[134] Silver 2008, pp. 37, 39.
[135] Michel and Sternath 2012, pp. 53-4; see figures 3a-3e.
[136] Silver 1985, p. 22.
[137] Richardson 2007, p. 244.
[138] Campbell 1990, p. 201.
[139] Richardson 2007, p. 244.
[140] Campbell 1990, p. 130.
[141] Silver 2008, p. 51.

Maximilian's six grandchildren, including the future emperors Charles V and Ferdinand I.[142]

Below them are the parents of Maximilian, Emperor Frederick III and Eleonore of Portugal.[143]

The family tree is expanded further than any of those commissioned by Maximilian's artistic

predecessors. And yet, the woodcut series is only a precursor to the fully realized, behemoth

figural group made for Maximilian's cenotaph.

A woodcut made by Dürer's student, Hans Springinklee, depicts Maximilian being

presented to God in Heaven by six patron saints along with the Virgin and Child.[144] The scene in

Emperor Maximilian Presented to Heaven by Patron exemplifies the emperor's efforts to

position himself among his ancestors, relatives and patron saints, a theme that is revisited and

magnified in his funerary monument.[145] Of the three huge prints commissioned for Maximilian –

Triumphal Arch, Triumphal Procession, and Great Triumphal Chariot – only the first was

completed before Maximilian's death in 1519. Durer developed a program specifically to

represent Maximilian as an allegorical image of the perfect prince.[146] The *Great Triumphal*

Chariot was designed by Dürer around 1518. It was originally intended to be the central part of

the *Triumphal Procession* print. In the left most frame of the *Chariot* woodcut, Maximilian sits

alone in a large carriage or chariot. He holds a scepter and a palm, wearing the imperial robes

and crown of the Holy Roman Empire. Maximilian is surrounded by the four cardinal virtues –

justice, fortitude, prudence and temperance. Victory holds a crown over his head, her wings

---

[142] Richardson 2007, pp. 244-45.

[143] Silver 2008, p. 51; see: pp. 52-3, fig. 21 for image of family tree; see also: p. 51 for extensive program of the tree.

[144] Silver 2008, p. 142; see: p. 142, fig. 51 for image of print.

[145] Ricardson 2007, p. 245.

[146] Silver 1985, p. 87.

decorated with the names of Maximilian's military victories. The massive chariot is pulled by six pairs of equally huge horses.[147]

Hans Burgkmair designed a series of small woodcut profiles of the heads of antique rulers for Peutinger's book surveying the history of the Roman emperors from Julius Caesar to Maximilian I. The images were based on the images on ancient coins collected by Peutinger. Though the book was never completed, it is feasible that the artists who worked on Maximilian's cenotaph may have used these images as models for the Roman emperors included in the funerary monument – either the images Burgkmair reproduced or the depictions on the coins themselves.[148]

Maximilian I's Cenotaph at Innsbruck

Maximilian's cenotaph has been referred to as the culmination of the Burgundian tomb tradition. Rightfully so; and yet, its scale is unprecedented by any earlier standards of comparison. His is a monument of grand, even absurd, proportions. Furthermore, while the monument has precedents in Burgundian tombs and paintings, as well as French sculpture and Bohemian murals, Maximilian's cenotaph represents the apex of the genealogical theme.

In 1502 he commissioned the elaborate tomb program which was intended to be placed in a church as yet unbuilt. Maximilian's will dictates that, "In Neustadt in St. George's church…the 134 cast statues be placed all around, however so far from the other that one may see the altar of the church and the same gallery still be filled."[149] However, this plan was not to be realized. The funerary monument is at Innsburck, Hofkirche having been erected there between 1553 and

---

[147] Silver 1985, pp. 87-8.
[148] Silver 1985, p. 15.
[149] Silver 2008, p. 71; see: p. 252, n. 116.

1563. The program consists of twenty-eight life-size bronze standing figures representing Maximilian's ancestors, of which forty were planned; twenty-two miniature busts of Roman Emperors, of which thirty-four were planned; and twenty-three miniature statues of Habsburg ancestors, of which one hundred were originally planned.[150] The two latter groups would have filled the balustrade of the church to complete the ensemble.[151]

Maximilian's direct ancestors and relatives from his extended family were presented full-sized with each accompanied by their coat of arms, an image embodying both the territories and the ancestry of the emperor.[152] The center of Maximilian's funerary monument is in the nave of the Hofkirche. A bronze kneeling figure of Maximilian tops the chest. The tomb chest itself is made of black marble decorated with reliefs depicting the emperor's deeds. Surrounding this are the twenty-eight life-size statues of his ancestors between the pillars of the nave and the beginning of the chancel. There were three principle clusters of figures in the planned ensemble of forty. We know the basic pattern from a list of figures drawn up in inventory for Maximilian's successor.[153]

In the first group (nos. 1-14) were Maximilian's distant relations in both time and actual kinship. This group began with Julius Caesar, King Theodoric the Ostrogoth, King Arthur of England, Clovis and Charlemagne through the fourteenth statue.[154] The second group (nos. 15-25) represented the critical succession of the Hapsburgs from Count Albrecht IV and his son Emperor Rudolf I through the ends of the collateral branches. Finally, the third group (nos. 26-40) depicted the immediate family of Maximilian. This includes his parents, his in-laws, his

---

[150] Silver 2008, p. 39; see: 10 for cenotaph.
[151] Silver 2008, p. 64.
[152] Silver 2008, p. 64.
[153] Silver 2008, p. 68.
[154] Silver 2008, p. 74, fig. 28, *King Arthur.*

children and grand-children. Female relatives fill an equal role in this category by virtue of their being agents of acquiring power and territory. In particular: Maximilian's first wife, Mary of Burgundy, and daughter-in-law, Joanna of Castile.[155] The latter is included in the ensemble as her marriage to Maximilian's son, Philip the Fair, brought the Spanish kingdoms under Habsburg rule.[156] The figures present Emperor Maximilian I as the culmination of all the dynasties represented - "a true descendant of the Roman emperors."[157] It is not known for certain how Maximilian wanted all the figures to be arranged.[158] However, in his last will the emperor dictates that the foremost figures in the St. George's Chapel were to have been Charlemagne, Frederick III, Maximilian himself, and two others not named:

> "But [of] the great twenty-eight [completed] statues, should our person, our father, Emperor Charles, and still two others near us be placed at the front…according to the order, be placed above the altar."

However, this design was never realized and in 1549, Ferdinand II, Maximilian's great-grandson, revised the location of the monument to the present Hofkirche in Innsbruck, Austria. The chapel of Saint George at Weiner Neustadt, where Maximilian had instructed the statues be placed, was too small for the number of figures in the ensemble.[159] Thus the construction for the new church site began in 1553.[160] Despite this, Maximilian's body remained buried in Wiener Neustadt, making the elaborate monument a cenotaph or empty tomb in honor of someone who is buried

---

[155] Michel and Sternath 2012, p. 362; see: cat. 120a for image of sculpture of Joanna from the cenotaph.
[156] Richardson 2007, p. 243.
[157] Richardson 2007, p. 243.
[158] Richardson 2007, p. 242.
[159] Richardson 2007, p. 242.
[160] Silver 2008, p. 72; see: p. 252, n. 119 for Oberhammer's transcription of the original German.

elsewhere.[161] The heart of Emperor Maximilian I was buried in the tomb of his wife, Mary of Burgundy, at Bruges.

The standing figures are arranged around the cenotaph in a recollection of the mourners flanking the sides of the tomb of Philip the Bold at Champmol, as the figures' poses suggest they were intended to hold candles. However, as with the tomb made for his wife, Maximilian's cenotaph is more at variance with traditional Burgundian tombs than it is similar. The statues represent prominent ancestors and descendants rather than an anonymous parade of people mourning for eternity. The family trees on Mary of Burgundy's tomb are here translated into a series of monumental three-dimensional figural forms. Maximilian's cenotaph represents both the ultimate apotheosis and the break from the use of the mourners theme. While Maximilian continued the use of representations of family lineage he also incorporates fictive characters in the series of statues, suggesting that they were not intended to form a family tree in the usual sense. The three sets of statues embody three themes that absorbed Maximilian in his pursuit of legitimated power: the genealogy of the Habsburgs, their blood relations to other ruling families throughout Europe and their imperial predecessors from antiquity. The inclusion of Charles the Bold and Philip the Good is intended to emphasize the link with Burgundy that was forged by Maximilian's marriage to Mary, the heir of Burgundy. For further emphasis, the two dukes were positioned at the front of the Hofkirche at the entrance to the choir.[162]

As regent over the Burgundian states and later the head of Christendom, Maximilian needed to reaffirm his own centrality and legitimacy. Like Philip the Good did through the tomb of Louis de Mâle, Maximilian reasserted his claims to the seat through his descent from the dynasties of Flanders and Brabant and thus his inherited entitlement to the loyalty of those

---

[161] Michel and Sternath 2012, p. 362.
[162] Marti, Borchert and Keck 2009, p. 343, cat. 156.

subjects. He did so by tracing his alliances through time; these extended, ancient genealogies allowed him to extend his kin to include most of the other ruling houses of Europe. His goal was to confirm his own status by linking himself with the genealogies of all the important ruling families throughout history. The cenotaph project summarizes Maximilian's family and his territorial aspirations.[163] Although the Habsburg line of descent can be postulated no further back than then the tenth century, Maximilian had no qualms declaring mythological figures such as Hercules, Jupiter, and Osiris, biblical or historical characters such as Noah, Julius Caesar, Charlemagne and, above all, the Christian saints as his actual forbearers.[164] In the use of these forged genealogical figures Maximilian has precedent in the Charles IV, Holy Roman Emperor. Both rulers claimed Noah, Caesar and Charlemagne, among others, as their true direct ancestors.

There is a clear distinction made between direct ancestors or relatives of the extended family and the less personal ties with imperial rank or family sanctity. The largest, full-size bronzes were made for those with whom Maximilian felt were the most illustrious in his presumed lineage. These were accompanied by their coats of arms to emphasize the ancestry as well as the territorial claims of Maximilian.[165] Maximilian's own coat of arms visualized not only the claims to rule that were not in dispute, but also those that had yet to be enforced.[166]

In his will, Maximilian stated his intention to have the ancestral statues placed in St. George's Chapel in Wiener Neustadt. This indicates a further reference to his family heritage as Wiener Neustadt was his birthplace, the burial site of his mother, and the site of the St. George Order which was founded by his father and renewed by Maximilian. Furthermore, he indicated

---

[163] Silver 2008, p. 63.
[164] Michel and Sternath 2012, p. 161.
[165] Silver 2008, p. 64.
[166] Michel and Sternath 2012, p. 161.

that the life-size ancestors should take precedence, placing them on the main floor of the sanctuary, while the lesser sculpture should ornament the gallery above the chapel.[167]

The inclusion of Charlemagne among the foremost figures, along with Maximilian himself as well as his father Frederick III, would have clearly named a distant, saintly relative as well as the first northern, Christian emperor and an ideal model of knightly virtue.[168] King Arthur and King Theodoric serve as examples of valorous leaders with whom Maximilian wanted to associate himself. Moreover, they were both heroes in the romantic literature of the later Middle Ages that was beloved by Maximilian.[169] Arthur on his own served symbolically as a strategic ploy for Maximilian to justify his pretensions to the crown of England. The bronze statue of the knight-king, presumably created after designs by Albrecht Dürer, is clad in detailed, historicizing armor. Arthur was the perfect exemplar for Maximilian who, as we know from his identification with Saint George in the print of *Maximilian I on Horseback*, wanted to be associated with good Christian knight-kings.[170] Maximilian used the stepmother of Mary of Burgundy, Margaret of York, wife of Charles the Bold, as his basis for claims to the throne of England. Maximilian also included the arms of England among the kingdoms that he proclaimed in his heraldic arms.[171]

The original figures were conceived as bearing long candles in a solemn procession. Later the design was modified to hold scepters and weapons in a move to transform the figures from mourners to guardians, "whose heraldic arms have become armor."[172] The collection of relatives, both distant and close, served to form an image of the fully realized House of Austria.

---

[167] Silver 2008, p. 71.
[168] Silver 2008, p. 72.
[169] Silver 2008, p. 74.
[170] Silver 2008, p. 74; see: fig. 28.
[171] Silver 2008, p. 75.
[172] Silver 2008, p. 73.

It portrayed an ongoing lineage founding itself upon names and titles that would construct a strong sense of kinship. The monument presented "figurated heraldry…with an embodied family history." These ancestral figures acted as both founders and guarantors of the legitimacy, power, prestige and history of Maximilian's line.[173]

It is interesting to consider the heterogeneity of the figures chosen for this display. Ranging from real to fictive, antique to present day, there is certainly no formal linkage among all the characters. Instead they are figures carefully selected to enhance Maximilian's dynastic claims. The historical, mythological, or entirely fictive interconnections allow infinite associations to be made among the individual statues. Each stands alone as the beginning of an infinitely continuing line while also relating to one another to assert Maximilian's claim over all the territories they represent.[174] Much of this imagery can be considered outlandish dreaming on the emperor's part. However, we do not necessarily have to assume that Maximilian hoped to gain all of the titles and territories presented within his own reign. Instead perhaps he began this monument in hopes that his progeny would realize his goals. This idea is further developed when we consider that it was Ferdinand I, Maximilian's grandson, who ensured the completion of this imperial funerary monument.

The tomb functions as a claim to power, an appeal to the descendants to bring to fruition Maximilian's aspirations, and perhaps also a declaration on Ferdinand's part to do so. Maximilian's dynastic aspirations were realized through Ferdinand's marriage to Anne of Bohemia and Hungary. This brought him to the throne of Hungary, Bohemia and Croatia, which thereupon became part of the multi-ethnic Habsburg Empire that would survive until 1918.[175]

---

[173] Silver 2008, p. 73.
[174] Schauerte 2012, p. 44.
[175] Michel and Sternath 2012, p. 131.

Emperor Maximilian I's funerary monument is also a visual reminder of the dynastic link between the Valois Dukes of Burgundy and their Hapsburg successors, beginning with Maximilian and his son who inherited the title from Mary of Burgundy.[176] Maximilian set up a foundation on which his grandson Ferdinand I could build a dynasty. The cenotaph envisions the rise of the Habsburgs that would be continued through Maximilian's progeny.[177]

Conclusion

The genealogical series in funerary monuments spread to the Iberian Peninsula as a result of the marriage of Maximilian's son, Philip the Fair, to Joanna, daughter of King Ferdinand II and Queen Isabella. The Spanish monarchs commissioned a tomb for Isabella's parents while they were negotiating the marriage of their daughter to Philip, c. 1489. They chose Gil de Siloé for the project, a goldsmith and sculptor who was thought to have come from the Netherlands. The resulting tomb was a reflection of the important links being forged between the two dynasties at that time.[178] Nonetheless, this tomb, along with Maximilian's cenotaph, marked a fading tradition. The advent of the Protestant Reformation around 1520, directly after Maximilian's death, brought about important changes that were reflected in commissions of art from then on. Richardson writes: "Fundamental belief structures were dismantled, among them the all-important continuity between the living and the dead that was the basis of Maximilian's vision."[179] Indeed, Maximilian's grandsons, Ferdinand I and Charles V, did not share the same sense of continuity with the dead as their grandfather and the inherited project of finishing his cenotaph quickly became a burden.

---

[176] Roberts 1989, pp. 394-5
[177] Hollegger 2012, p. 35.
[178] Richardson 2007, pp. 236-37.
[179] Richardson 2007, p. 245.

When once the demonstration of the continuity one's rule was the dominant function of royal commissions of art, that focus on genealogy climaxed and all but terminated directly following the cenotaph of Holy Roman Emperor, Maximilian I. The tradition Maximilian inherited from his Burgundian wife, and which dates far back throughout European history from France to the Holy Roman Empire to Flanders, reached the pinnacle of its capability to function as a display of dynastic power. With each generation the trend expanded and developed – from the paintings of Charles IV and Louis de Mâle and the statues on the Louvre staircase commissioned by Charles V, to the more sophisticated depictions of lineage on the tombs of Louis de Mâle and Mary of Burgundy, all converge in the colossal display made for Maximilian I. It is nearly impossible to imagine that the genealogical series could have advanced any further than what Maximilian achieved; with or without the change in belief structures after his death, the cenotaph is definitively a dynastic feat of fantastic, though not unprecedented, proportions.

References

___

Fajt 2005

Jiří Fajt, "Charles IV: Toward a New Imperial Style", in *Prague. The Crown of Bohemia 1347-1437,* eds. Barbara Drake Boehm and Jiří Fajt, New Haven and London 2005.

Campbell 1988

Lorne Campbell, "The Tomb of Joanna, Duchess of Brabant", in: *Renaissance Studies* Vol. 2, No. 2, Oxford 1988.

Campbell 1990

Lorne Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits : European Portrait Painting in the 14th, 15th, and 16th Centuries*, New Haven and London 1990.

Fajt and Royt 1997

Jiří Fajt and Jan Royt, *Magister Theodoricus. Court Painter of Emperor Charles IV. The Decorations of the Sacred Spaces at Castle Karlštejn*, Prague 1997.

Hollegger 2012

Manfred Hollegger, "Personality and Reign, The Biography of Emperor Maximilian I", in: *Emperor Maximilian I and the Age of Dürer*, eds. Eva Michel and Maria Luise Sternath, Munich 2012, pp. 23-35.

Jugie 2010

Sophie Jugie, *The mourners: tomb sculptures from the court of Burgundy*, New Haven and London 2010.

Koreny 2002

Fritz Koreny, *Early Netherlandish Drawing: from Jan van Eyck to Hieronymous Bosch*, Antwerp 2002.

Kren and McKendrick 2003

Illuminating the Renaissance: The Triumph of Flemish Manuscript Painting in Europe, eds.: Thomas Kren and Scot McKendrick, Los Angeles 2003.

Kugler, Waagen and Crow 1889

Franz Kugler, Gustav Friedirch Waagen and Joseph Archer Crowe, *Handbook of Painting: The German, Flemish, and Dutch Schools,* Vol. 1, London 1889.

Marti, Borchert and Keck 2009

Susan Marti, Till-Holger Borchert and Gabriele Keck, *Splendour of the Burgundian Court: Charles the Bold (1433-1477)*, eds.: Susan Marti, Till-Holger Borchert and Gabriele Keck, Brussels and Bruges 2009.

Michel and Sternath 2012

Emperor Maximilian I and the Age of Dürer, eds. Eva Michel and Maria Luise Sternath, Munich 2012.

Morganstern 2000

Anne McGee Morganstern, *Gothic Tombs of Kinship in France, The Low Countries, and England*, University Park, Pennsylvania 2000.

Nash 2007

Susie Nash, *Andre Beauneveu, "No equal in any land" – Artist to the courts of France and Flanders,* London 2007.

Nash 2008

Susie Nash, *Northern Renaissance Art*, New York 2008.

Richardson 2007

Carol M. Richardson, "Art and Death", in *Viewing Renaissance Art*, eds.: Kim Woods, Carol Richardson and Angeliki Lymberopoulou, New Haven and London 2007, pp. 209-245.

Roberts 1989

Ann M. Roberts, "The Chronology and Political Significance of the Tomb of Mary of Burgundy", in *The Art Bulletin* Vol. 71, No. 3, New York 1989, pp. 376-400.

Schauerte 2012

Thomas Schauerte, "The Emperor Never Dies: Transitory Aspects of the Maximilian *Memoria*", in: *Emperor Maximilian I and the Age of Dürer*, eds. Eva Michel and Maria Luise Sternath, Munich 2012, pp. 37-47.

Sherman 1969

Claire Richter Sherman, *The Portraits of Charles V of France (1338-1380)*, ed.: Anne Coffin Hanson, New York 1969.

Sherman 1971

Claire Richter Sherman, "Representations of Charles V of France (1338-1380) as a Wise Ruler", in *Medievalia et Humanistica*, new series no. 2, PLACE 1971, pp. 83-96.

Silver 1985

Larry Silver, "Shining Armor: Maximilian I as Holy Roman Emperor", in *Art Institute of Chicago Museum Studies* Vol. 12, No. 1, Chicago 1985, pp. 8-29.

Silver 2008

Larry Silver, *Marketing Maximilian: the Visual Ideology of a Holy Roman Emperor,* Princeton 2008.

Vaughan 1970

Richard Vaughan, *Philip the Good*, London 1970.

Vaughan 1975

Richard Vaughan, *Valois Burgundy*, London 1975.

Whiteley 1994

Mary Whiteley, "Royal and ducal palaces in France in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Interior, ceremony and function", in *Architecture et vie sociale. L'organisation intérieure des grandes demeures à la fin du Moyen Age et à la Renaissance. Actes du colloque tenu à Tours du 6 au 10 juin 1988*, ed.: J. Guillaume, Paris 1994, pp. 47-63.

Wright 1974

Georgia Sommers Wright, "A Royal Tomb Program in the Reign of St. Louis", in *The Art Bulletin* Vol. 56, No. 2, New York 1974, pp. 224-243.