TREASURES OF HEAVEN

SAINTS, RELICS, AND DEVOTION IN MEDIEVAL EUROPE

EDITED BY MARTINA BAGNOLI, HOLGER A. KLEIN, C. GRIFFITH MANN, AND JAMES ROBINSON

Front cover: Reliquary with the *Man of Sorrows*,
detail (cat no. 122)

Back cover: Panel-Shaped Reliquary of the True Cross,
detail (cat. no. 49)

Contents

13

The Afterlife of the Reliquary

ALEXANDER NAGEL

The Relic as *Vanitas*

The early sixteenth-century Dutch reformer Erasmus found the cult of relics highly distasteful, but being a naturally moderate man he counseled against orgies of destruction. He wanted Christians to see the piece of bone and the fragment of clothing not as magical talismans but rather as remnants of a life, prompts to remember the exemplary virtues of a model Christian. For Erasmus, the most important relics were the writings left behind by the Evangelists and apostles.[1] A physical artifact was, by contrast, little more than a *memento mori*, a form of *vanitas*. Indeed, *any* mortal remains, not necessarily those of a saint, could serve as a reminder that the life of the body is brief and as a powerful incentive to concentrate on concerns of the spirit while we are alive. One need only think of the anonymous skull contemplated by St. Jerome, Erasmus's hero, in so many paintings of the saint.

Such a conceptual reorientation was one way to allay the concerns about deception that always surrounded the cult of relics.[2] John Calvin, less patient than Erasmus, put the matter bluntly: "How do we know that we are venerating the bone of a saint and not the bone of some thief, or of an ass, or of a dog, or of a horse? How do we know that we are venerating the ring and the comb of the Virgin Mary rather than the baubles of some harlot?"[3] To worship a mere ordinary thing was to succumb to the worst idolatrous delusion. Calvin saw the reliquary, which dressed the relic up in jewels and gold, often shielding it from view, as a device designed precisely

to suppress these questions: dazzled by these ritual objects, Calvin says, the devotees do not consider what is truly at the basis of the cult and even close their eyes in the presence of the reliquary "out of superstition," not daring to gaze upon what is there. Apparently a festival for the eyes, the cult of relics, all elaborate housings and pompous ritual, in fact imposes and promotes blind patterns of behavior.[4]

Catholic theologians countered that the reliquary was a form of protection—protection against mishandling and theft of the relics that it contained but also protection against misidentification. But now, in the face of the Protestant challenge, Catholic authorities were prolific in laying out guidelines. Carlo Borromeo, the prominent late sixteenth-century bishop of Milan, gave some of the most thorough instructions on how relics should be securely labeled: an engraved or parchment inscription should document the names and bodies of the saints, the date when they were deposited, and the places from which they had been translated. Relics should be hermetically sealed in reliquaries and kept safe from tampering.[5] These affirmations are in fact the corollary of Calvin's critique. The relic, indistinguishable from ordinary detritus, cannot speak for itself, and thus requires the reliquary, which is really a label expanded into a more elaborate physical form. The reliquary provides authentication and thus a guarantee that one is not mistakenly venerating a thief, or a prostitute.

Both the Reformist critic and the Counter-Reformation apologist were clear-eyed about the interdependence of the relic and the reliquary. If the compound of sacred substance and precious container are prised apart,

as happened with increasing frequency under the impact of the Reformation, each element undergoes a fundamental change. Unprotected, the relic became indistinct matter; emptied, the reliquary became a work of human art to be appreciated on its own or repurposed as material of some monetary value. In 1545, Heinrich von Pflummern, an unreformed and unhappy clergyman of the reformed city of Biberach, tallied the destruction wrought by the reformers: church funds appropriated by the city amounted to 49,600 pounds, the objects appropriated for secular use equaled 5,915 pounds, and the objects destroyed came to 7,275 pounds. Grand total: 62,790 pounds.[6]

The distribution is interesting. Almost as many objects were saved and repurposed as were destroyed. Without further information it is impossible to know what protocols governed the triage, but it is likely that the objects with inherent material value, those composed of precious metals and gems, were slated for preservation, while paintings and sculptures not in precious metal were discarded or destroyed. Often precious metal reliquaries were simply melted down and their jewels pilfered.[7] When works of religious painting or sculpture were salvaged, they were recontextualized and thus assigned a new function as cabinet or gallery pieces (see cat. no. 132).[8]

When were the reliquaries that are now museum pieces emptied of their contents and reclassified as works of art? How many were saved in this way by the reformers of the sixteenth century?[9] Certainly the great majority that we now have were the ones that were kept safe in Catholic hands through the storm of the Reformation and entered museums only later, when Catholic foundations were suppressed in the period around 1800. Museological commemoration was thus layered over the cult of relics, sometimes even on the very sites of religious foundations. During the French invasion of Italy, the Venetian priest Guglielmo Wambel scrambled to save the sacred objects in Venice, amassing a collection of close to ten thousand items, including thousands of reliquaries, which shortly after his death were installed in a newly built rotunda attached to the Church of San Tomà.[10] Although still in a cult setting, this new construction was just as importantly a proto-museum of religious art. In Paris, the connoisseur Alexandre du Sommerard took over the late-Gothic townhouse of the abbots of Cluny in 1832 and turned it into a historical museum, known as the Musée de Cluny after it became the responsibility of the French state in 1843. Classes of objects were arrayed in period-specific ensembles: the salle François I contained Renaissance furniture; the "chapel" contained liturgical books and reliquaries of various kinds (cat. nos. 75, 79, 124, and 137).[11]

Relic and Reliquary

Reformation and Enlightenment iconoclasm certainly exerted acute pressure, but fairly radical shifts in the relationship between relic and reliquary were already part of the dynamic of the cult of relics. A relic is, in principle, a meaningful object characterized by its irreplaceability. As we have seen, it was not acceptable to replace a saint's bone with a pig's bone, or to replace a saint's bone with the bone of an ordinary, non-saintly mortal. An image or any work of human art was, by contrast, eminently replaceable. Even the most revered images (indeed, those in particular) were copied in different media, propagating their power through replication.[12] The relic thus marks a limit point in the system of signs used in medieval religious culture. It was defined as the unsubstitutable sign, a sign whose physical relationship to its origin was a necessary part of its meaning. Reliquaries, on the other hand, were secondary fabrications. Their *raison d'être* was the relic.

And yet this also meant that reliquaries often shared in the aura of the relic. Although often made centuries after the time of the reputed relic they contained, reliquaries were commonly assumed to be of more ancient date, especially when the packages arrived from exotic lands. More than one True Cross relic from Constantinople turned up in Italy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries already encased in their gold settings. It was only logical to imagine that these mountings were contemporaneous with the fourth-century emperor Constantine, the first Christian emperor; Constantine's mother, Helena, had reputedly found the True Cross, after all. In 1359, the Ospedale Sta. Maria della Scala purchased a True Cross relic contained in a small gold reliquary executed in the thirteenth or fourteenth century in Constantinople. Despite its relatively recent manufacture, a 1359 document in the Ospedale's archives describes the reliquary and not merely the relic as "anticam" and as having belonged to Constantine. In the Louvre, a reliquary of the True Cross of Byzantine provenance is held up by two angels of French manufacture: the Greek reliquary is handled like a relic in its own right; it has become fused with the relic and partakes in its venerability.[14]

The display of relics typically assumed a nested structure: reliquaries were kept inside larger housings, and these were placed in structures that functioned both as buildings and as macro-reliquaries. The governing model for these nested encasings is the Jewish Ark of the Covenant, a box for relics eventually enshrined in the Holy of Holies of the Jewish Temple (Exodus 25).[15] When King Louis IX (r. 1226–70) assembled signal relics from Constantinople in the thirteenth century, he put them in the Grande Châsse—a container in turn housed in the great oversized reliquary that is the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris. This embedded arrangement was itself a sort of reconstruction of the Pharos Chapel, an architectural reliquary that had housed these relics (and reliquaries) in the imperial palace in Constantinople.[16] Such framings are the pre-condition for depictions of the Grande Châsse, such as a miniature from the Morgan Library (cat. no. 138), which offers us a view of the assembly of reliquaries inside the Grande Châsse, almost as if the limits of the picture corresponded to the limits of the container. The Sancta Sanctorum in Rome, as the name itself suggests, also had a nested structure. It began as a Carolingian relic-chest, containing, among other things, a box of stones from the Holy Land (cat. no. 13 and fig. 74). The collection was then housed in the

macro-reliquary of Nicholas III's thirteenth-century chapel near the Basilica of St. John Lateran.[17]

The Morgan miniature and others like it made the contents of the Grande Châsse available "virtually" to a wider public, but they are really portraits of the reliquaries rather than documentation of the relics themselves. If a reliquary on its own directs our attention to its contents, in embedded structures such as these, the emphasis is shifted one level up, with the reliquaries now becoming the object of focus. Varied in shape and each with its own personality, the reliquaries become protagonists in their own right. That attention after the sixteenth century drifted from the relic to the reliquary was not so much a symptom of secularization as an extension of an established pattern of installation and display, where containers become displays in larger containers.

There were other good reasons why it was natural for reliquaries to acquire something like the status of relics. Christian relics were never strictly separated from curiosities of various kinds, including impressive works of human art, and features of out-and-out tourism were never absent from the cult of relics.[18] The renowned treasury of Saint-Denis in France contained the relics of Christian saints, but also an array of precious liturgical objects, coronation regalia, and insignia of the kings of France, as well as various other secular marvels, such as the horn of Roland, a griffin's claw (see cat. no. 132), and the abbey's famous unicorn horn.[19] In Erasmus's dialogue "A Pilgrimage for Religion's Sake," written in the early 1520s, one of the interlocutors suggests that his friend is going on pilgrimage simply "out of curiosity, I dare say." But the friend insists that he is going "on the contrary, out of devotion."[20] This alternative, out of curiosity/out of devotion, already internal to the relic cult, was to structure larger patterns of collecting objects in the centuries following the Reformation.[21] The line between the potent relic, the miraculous natural object, and the wondrous artifact was never a strict one.

The Gualdo collection, assembled in Venice in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, contained an impressive collection of relics, including a piece of the True Cross, saints' body parts, fragments of the tombs of Lazarus, Jesus, and the Virgin Mary, as well as stones from Mount Sinai and from the spring of Cedron—a collection of stones presumably like those in the box from the Sancta Sanctorum. These mingled with "profane" relics such as the turtle from the Vendramin collection and the claw of a great beast given by the king of Poland, and also with examples of ancient epigraphy, paintings, and antiquities.[22] Sometimes the reliquary itself consisted of natural marvels, such as ostrich eggs or nautilus shells, which were duly adorned with settings in silver and gold.[23] More than simple containers for the sacred, reliquaries were multiple structures worthy of attention as *curiosa* in their own right.

The culture of curiosity that arose in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was, therefore, not merely the successor to the cult of relics but an adapted version of it.[24] Certain collections played a key transitional role, such as the famous and vast assembly of relics and curiosities amassed in

Fig. 69. Bamberg Relic-book, 1493. Library of Congress, Washington, DC, Rare Book and Special Collections Division (Incun. 1498.H46 Rosenwald Coll. no. 162), fol. 11v

Wittenberg by the Elector Frederick of Saxony (1463–1525), who became the protector of Martin Luther at the end of his life.[25] The catalogues describing and illustrating these objects were called *Heiltumsbücher*. Examples, such as the *Hallesches Heiltumsbuch* describing the relic collection of Frederick's greatest competitor, Cardinal Albrecht of Brandenburg, or the *Heiltumsbücher* from Bamberg and Nuremberg (fig. 69 and cat. nos. 125, 126), lavish attention on the features of the reliquary itself, its materials, and its workmanship. Once again, the reliquary seems as much the object of attention as the relic, even before the Reformation forced the issue.

"Reliques," Antiques, and Works of Art

"Now one reason I tender so little Devotion unto Reliques is, I think, the slender and doubtful respect I have always held unto Antiquities."[26] This offhand critique of relics offered by the English doctor and amateur

metaphysician Thomas Browne around 1635 comes from a new seventeenth-century position. Added to the now-traditional Reformist view of relics is a new impatience with the antiquarian enthusiasms that had grown up in the preceding century. From Browne's vantage, it was clear that relic hounds and antiquarians were really members of the same species, preoccupied with material things and overly attached to a literalist conception of history.

As relics were demoted, works of art were raised to relic-status. In the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, in part due to the importation of precious images with hoary Eastern provenances, it became increasingly common to treat works of sacred art with the same reverence as relics. That is, they were valued as the result of a specific production history, and their value was bound up with their status as originals. Icons reputed to have been made by the hand of St. Luke were nothing less than contact relics of the Evangelist.[27] The Mandylion, the towel on which Christ reputedly impressed his own features (see cat no. 113), was a contact relic of Christ, free even of the agency of an artist. The Man of Sorrows mosaic in the Church of Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme (cat. no. 116) was presented as the very work of art that was commissioned by Gregory the Great in the sixth century in commemoration of the miraculous appearance of Christ to him while he said Mass. Nonetheless, the arrival of works with such reputations did not prevent them from being copied hundreds of times over. The idea that powerful originals were somehow effective through their copies never died away.[28]

Yet the idea of the relic-image established by St. Luke icons and Mandylion/Veronica images took hold, becoming nothing less than an alternative model for thinking about works of art of all kinds, both antiquities and modern productions. Alongside the substitutable image now appeared the relic-image, which was not to be restored or repainted.[29] After the fourteenth century especially, the norm of overpainting or simply replacing older works was countered by a new commitment to preserving the work of art in a condition as close as possible to that of the time of its production. With increasing frequency, old works were preserved as they were, despite the fact that they violated current aesthetic norms; the modern additions were confined to new frameworks that were built up around the artifact-image.[30] The notion of conservation espoused by every modern museum is an adapted version of the novel approaches to conservation developed in the later Middle Ages, and in particular for images that made claim to being relics. Museum pictures in their frames are not only the modern descendants of religious cult images; they are, more precisely, one consequence of the momentous application of a relic status to images, a status that became widespread in the early modern period.

This was no simple application, for often enough, as we have seen, relics became reliquaries and reliquaries acquired the status of relics. Evidence is mounting that many paintings and sculptures of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries also served as containers for relics. Often this function is patently visible, as in the case of the panel by Naddo Ceccarelli (active

Fig. 70. A lock of Albrecht Dürer's hair (1528) and "reliquary" box（1871). Akademie der bildenden Künste, Vienna

ca. 1347) in the Walters Art Museum (cat no. 120), where the central image is surrounded by relic cavities. But often relics were embedded in images in an unadvertised way and have been discovered only much later, as in the case of the Virgin by Coppo di Marcovaldo (ca. 1220–after 1276) in Sta. Maria Maggiore in Florence.[31] In cases such as this, preserving the panel intact was a continuation and not a transposition of values associated with relics and reliquaries.

The new forms of preservation developed for old artifacts and venerable icons also came to be applied to the productions of living artists. Pietro Aretino expressed a fairly widespread sensibility among art lovers of his time when, writing to Michelangelo in 1544, he asked for "a relic from among those sheets of paper that are least important to you;" indeed, he would value even "two chalk marks on a piece of paper" more highly than the most precious cups and necklaces he has received from princes."[32] Aretino also was for some time in possession of Parmigianino's *Self-Portrait in a Convex Mirror*, now in Vienna, which he kept in his home, according to Vasari, "as if it were a relic."[33] Only infrequently did Vasari use the word "reliquia" in this way to refer to a work of art; when he did, it was in cases involving extraordinary works kept by extraordinary people. When given a small painting of Christ praying in the garden by Raphael, the Venetian noblemen and Camaldolese monks Paolo Giustinian and Pietro Querini, kept it, according to Vasari, "like a relic and a most rare thing."[34] In 1515, Albrecht

Dürer received from Raphael a drawing, on which he, Dürer, wrote that it had been sent to him by Raphael as evidence of his hand ("sein Hand zw weisen").[35]

From collecting examples of the artist's work (now understood as an artistic *corpus*) it was a short step to collecting nonartistic traces or samples of the artist's body, in exactly the fashion formerly applied to saints. We learn from a sixteenth-century annotation of Vasari's *Lives* that the hands of the Florentine monk-painter Lorenzo Monaco were kept "as relics" by the members of his religious order.[36] A lock of Dürer's hair, reportedly snipped from the artist's head by his pupil Hans Baldung, survives to this day in Vienna (fig. 70).[37] Secular reliquaries had become an established category by the eighteenth century. A fifteenth-century West African ivory salt cellar, the sort of object kept in European curiosity cabinets in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Dürer, in fact, owned more than one, believing them to be of Indian origin), was converted into a reliquary of the poet Jean-Baptiste Rousseau after his death in 1741; upended, its concave base was filled with bits of the skull and its body inscribed with the poet's name.[38] Dominique Vivant Denon, director of French museums under Napoleon, made a reliquary that included the beard of Henry IV, a tooth of Voltaire's, and a lock of Napoleon's hair.[39] The entire mode of the secular reliquary came in for commentary in Alexander Pope's *Rape of the Lock*, in which the fateful lock of hair, around which much drama and scandal arises, fails ever to make an appearance. In a hostile response to the poem by one Esdras Barnivelt (in fact Pope himself), a "key" is provided to the *Lock*, imputing to the poem a "Papist" subtext and pointing out the various allusions to "Romish worship" and to the invocation of saints throughout the poem. A parody of overinterpretation, *A Key to the Lock* makes a point of the obvious parallel between this fetishized (and never seen) lady's lock and the prehistory of Christian relic worship.

Fig. 71. Piero Manzoni (Italian, 1933–63), *Merda d'artista*, 1961

If the Dürer reliquary stands at the beginning of a history of sanctifying artists, Piero Manzoni's series *Merda d'artista*, sealed cans of the artist's feces now kept in many major museum collections around the world, is the highly successful ironic commentary from the other end, as it were, of that history (fig. 71). The work makes the point emphatically that the cult of the artist is a version of the saint's cult, which involved the veneration of even the most abject remains of the holy man. Like those of the saints, Manzoni's product relics are housed in hermetically sealed containers that carry labels identifying and guaranteeing the authenticity, even the date of production, of the contents. The protocols of relic worship are restaged, but now under the management of the artist.

Presentations of the Ordinary and the Abject

Manzoni's provocations return us to a basic feature of the relic cult that had been lost during the early modern afterlife of the reliquary. Curiosities, natural marvels, antiquities, works of art—all of these in some sense substituted for the relic in the new world of the curiosity cabinets and proto-museums, attracting similar kinds of awed attention. But these were all notable items: samples of precious materials, works finely wrought, and, in the case of natural specimens, instructive anomalies or singularities or samples of things rarely seen in parts of the world familiar to Europeans. This interest in the unusual, the curious, and the remarkable presents a fundamental difference from the attitude at work in the cult of relics. The saint's relic acquires its value not because it is intrinsically precious, or interesting for its physical qualities, or because it is a rare example of its kind, or because it belongs to no kind yet known. Relics, whether pieces of bodies or the results of human manufacture, such as clothing, are typically unremarkable in and of themselves. One man's bones are very much like another's, and one monk's habit is in principle indistinguishable from another's. What makes the relic unique and valuable is its provenance: one keeps it and reveres it because it is the index or sample of a specific history, of an individual's life. This is the basis of its efficacy, real or perceived.

The stones in the sixth-century Palestine box (fig. 74 and cat. no. 13), for example, were not collected and wondered at for their beauty or curiosity, but because they were samples of very important places, places that had become the object of a topographical cult after the building of architectural commemorations on those sites by Constantine in the fourth century.[40] It is possible that their unremarkable appearance served as tacit confirmation of the unimpeachable authenticity of their provenance. The Veronese nobleman Ludovico Moscardo (1611–81), dedicated a chapter of a description of his collection to the stones brought from various places in the Holy Land, carefully correlating the traditional designation with exact topographical location. There is the stone from the place of the Virgin's sepulcher, "which is outside the city of Jerusalem in the valley of Josaphat;" there is the stone from the place where St. Stephen was

Fig. 72. Kurt Schwitters (German, 1887–1948), Untitled (*Inlaid wooden box, SK or P for Sophie and Paul Erich Küppers*), 1921, fabricated by Albert Schulze. Wood inlaid with ivory and mother of pearl, Museum August Kestner, Hannover (L 1996,001)

stoned, which is "just outside of the gate of the city near the river Cedron;" there is the stone from Calvary, "which is a rocky mount of middling height . . . , and close to the city;" and so on.[41] In a separate part of the book he treated the other minerals in his collection, which were intrinsically valuable either for their rarity, or because of their magical/medicinal virtues, or because of certain remarkable properties such as their seeming capacity to carry depictions of trees, houses, and landscapes, instances of nature parodying human art.[42]

Something closer to the principles of the relic cult appeared toward the end of the eighteenth century, when works of medieval art were collected because they were deemed worthy documents of their time, and despite the fact that they were acknowledged to be of inferior quality. The eighteenth-century Friulian numismatist Giangiuseppe Liruti collected coins from the Lombard period that he acknowledged to be of extreme "grossness and barbarity," yet he saw in them distinct historical value.[43]

But it was with the stagings of the found object proposed throughout twentieth-century art that the logic of the relic returned with real force. Duchamp's readymades were a revival of the relic idea and a logical extension of his effort to set himself "as far as possible from 'pleasing' and 'attractive' physical paintings"—that is, from the art of the bourgeois era. Before this period, he said, art "had been literary or religious: it had all been at the service of the mind."[44] In the case of the readymade, as in that

of the relic, an ordinary object, indistinguishable from many others like it, is consecrated as something extraordinary. Of course, the system of consecration was now different, no longer provided by religious ritual but instead by a culture of art. If the medieval relic drew its significance from its link to sanctity and from its provenance, as argued above, both categories established by the Church, Duchamp used the art system as a readily available (in fact readymade) consecrating mechanism. The process of consecration is thus accelerated: the object does not live through a history linked to a saint, but is arbitrarily designated, as it were, retroactively, by the artist and consecrated by the art gallery. Of course, this willful manipulation of a prevailing system carried different consequences; here the primary effect is to prompt reflection on the mechanisms of consecration themselves. This kind of critical reflection was not, typically, what reliquaries were designed to promote. But they were subjected to this kind of critique during periods of iconoclasm. Thus, if there is a parallel to Duchamp's gesture it is not the medieval relic cult as a whole but those moments when its modalities came under scrutiny. The Reformation dismantling of the relic cult is the mirror image of the Duchampian intervention.

A more redemptive approach to the found object was proposed by Kurt Schwitters, who abandoned painting in 1919 and thereafter (with the exception of a return to landscape painting at the end of his life) worked with found materials, photographs, and typography. "What the material signified before its use in the work of art is a matter of indifference," he said, "so long as it is properly evaluated and given meaning in the work of art. And so I began to construct pictures out of materials I happened to have at hand, such as streetcar tickets, cloakroom checks, bits of wood, wire, twine, bent wheels, tissue paper, tin cans, chips of glass, etc." But in their reconfiguration in the work of art they are transformed, losing their individual character and even becoming dematerialized *(entmaterialisiert)*.[45] As novel as Schwitters's methods were, he was acutely aware of the relic cult as a primary model for his practice. Schwitters collaborated with a Hannover craftsman to produce a series of inlaid wood boxes based on his collages. Various woods with different colors and grains approximate the pasted scraps of paper. Made to safeguard souvenirs and mementos, the boxes bear a similarity in shape to reliquary chasses—now empty and dedicated to significant people in his life. The initials inlaid into the box illustrated here (fig. 72) are those of Paul Erich Küppers, president of a progressive Hannover art association, and his wife, Sophie. After Paul's death in 1922, Sophie married the artist El Lissitzky and moved to his native Russia, where she eventually was imprisoned in a gulag, carrying with her the treasured box filled with mementos.[46]

The process of installing and consecrating relics was a guiding principle of the work that became Schwitters's primary preoccupation in the 1920s and early 1930s, and in various iterations throughout his life: the *Kathedrale des erotischen Elends* (Cathedral of Erotic Misery) or what he later called the *Merzbau*. The work began with a three-dimensional collage and then grew into an architectural web of grottoes, shrines, treasures, commemorations, reliquaries, and so on. Here is part of Schwitters's 1931 description of the *Merzbau*:

> There is the Nibelungen hoard with its gleaming treasure; the Kyffhäuser mountain range with the stone table; the Goethe grotto with one of Goethe's legs as a relic with the many pencils worn to their stubs by poetry; . . . the sadistic murder cavern with the sorely mutilated body of a pitiful young girl stained with tomatoes and many Christmas gifts; the Ruhr region with genuine anthracite and genuine coke; the art-exhibition with paintings and sculptures by Michelangelo and myself, the only visitor to which is a dog with a bride's train . . . . [47]

The display of found materials in reliquary-like boxes is a powerful strain in twentieth-century art. One need only think of Joseph Cornell's and Lucas Samaras's boxes, Robert Rauschenberg's early *Feticci* and *Scatole Personali*, Paul Thek's *Technological reliquaries*, Daniel Spoerri's *Trap Paintings*, and Joseph Beuys's and Jeff Koons's vitrines, to name a few instances. To conclude, I will concentrate on one case.

Robert Smithson and the Logic of the Medieval Reliquary

On 14 June 1968, Robert Smithson, together with his wife Nancy Holt and his friend Michael Heizer, took a trip to Franklin, New Jersey, to collect mineral deposits and bring them back to New York City, where Smithson would display them in bins in the now-famous *Earthworks* show at the Dwan Gallery in October 1968.[48] The installation (now reinstalled in the Chicago Museum of Contemporary Art) involves bins occupying the space of the gallery and, on the walls, visual documentation of the site in the form of aerial photographs (fig. 73). Smithson referred to this type of installation as a Non-site. In other "Non-sites" Smithson exhibited maps pinpointing the exact locations from which the minerals were drawn.

"If one visits the site," Smithson wrote, "he will see nothing resembling a 'pure object.'"[49] It is matter that has been scattered, as he puts it, in heaps, lava flows, ash pits, etc. by unknown agents. The delimited Nonsite, putting the samples into bins, brings the entropic site into artificial focus, and yet neither one stands independent of the other: the Non-site is determined but displaced, whereas the so called real site is undifferentiated but now designated and determined by the portion of earth that it has lost to the Non-site. As Smithson put it, in an unpublished note from 1968, "both sides are present and absent at the same time."[50]

The Franklin site is still a magnet for geology enthusiasts because of its exceptionally rich array of ore deposits. In his 1968 notes, Smithson took great delight in describing the enthusiasms and paraphernalia of this

Fig. 73. Robert Smithson (American, 1938–73), *A Non-Site, Franklin, New Jersey*. Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago. Photo courtesy James Cohan Gallery, New York / Art © Estate of Robert Smithson/Licensed by VAGA, New York

world of rock hounds. He was not the only one carting away large quantities of material from the site for display elsewhere; as Smithson mirthfully noted, at the end of the day "the caretaker said he had seen the springs break before on other cars" loaded with rocks.[51]

In fact, taking rocks away as souvenirs and samples of a place has been going on for a long time, as we have seen. The Palestine box discussed above was assembled in the sixth century (fig. 74). Measuring 28 by 18 centimeters, it contains rocks and some splinters of wood. These are materials from different locations within the general region of Palestine. Rather than texts on the wall in the mode of Smithson, these stones and the wood bear inscriptions on their surfaces. Some stones have fallen out, leaving their impress in the plaster holding the assemblage together. The Greek inscriptions tell us that the piece of wood comes from Bethlehem, that the rock just above it comes from Mount of Olives, that the rock in the center of the box comes from the place of the Resurrection (the Holy Sepulcher),

and that the one just underneath the piece of wood comes from Zion, which may mean Jerusalem as a whole but probably refers to the citadel of Mount Zion, where, among other things, the room of the Last Supper is located.

Rather than suggest that Smithson's work was influenced or informed by the tradition of the topographical reliquary, this comparison instead challenges us to understand one in terms of the other. The logic of the pilgrim's box corresponds fairly precisely to the logic of the Smithson Non-site, and Smithson's writings on the Non-sites are helpful in coming to terms with the reliquary. The Palestine box collects stone samples from different, clearly designated locations, assembled here and displayed at a distance from their original site. The box lid carries paintings that are more famous than the contents of the box, since art historians have traditionally given more importance to paintings than to rocks. From a "Smithsonian" perspective, however, it is not the paintings alone but their relation to the "logical picture" of assembled rocks beneath that matters.

The shape and slotted structure of the lid and the box's inner edges indicate that the lid fits into the box with the paintings facing down, almost touching the stones. The paintings are, one might say, the graphic transcriptions of the inscriptions on the stones. Stones are mute, and thus, as Smithson understood, once they are displaced and made to function as signs they require an extra apparatus of text and images. Smithson, in 1968, used photographs and maps. In the sixth century, the preferred means was to use paint to represent scenes set in important Holy Land sites—memory images of sorts. At the bottom left is the *Nativity of Christ*, which occurred in Bethlehem. To its right we have the *Baptism*, in the River Jordan. The centrally positioned *Crucifixion* happened outside the walls of Jerusalem, and nearby was the tomb, which is represented at upper left. Christ finally ascended to heaven, not far from the Jerusalem, shown in the upper right.

Abbreviated as they are, the paintings pay particular attention to site. Beyond the topographical markers indicated by the iconography, there is a structural movement upward, corresponding to the narrative progression. In the bottom register's *Nativity*, we are underground in a cave, and in the *Baptism* we are underwater, sunk between two land masses. In the middle register we are in the landscape, the horizon just at the level of the crosses. At the bottom of the cross is a conspicuous mound of earth (more on that later). In the top register there is almost no landscape at all: we have the empty tomb, and in the *Ascension* Christ leaves the earth behind. Thus, the lid paintings figure, in compressed form, the passage from birth to ascension, which is also an allegory of pilgrimage, travel, and conversion. That which was of the earth gets taken up and carried away.

To return to the box's interior, here in their new location the stones are displaced, but their real connection to their sites is proclaimed by a system of inscriptions and pictures. We thus have one site existing in two different locations. We might call this an effect of topographical destabilization, which Smithson described in terms of metaphor. "Between the

Fig. 6. Reliquary box with stones from the Holy Land (cat. no. 13), Syria or Palestine, 6th century. Museo Sacro, Musei Vaticani (61883)

actual site in the Pine Barrens and *The Non-Site* itself," Smithson wrote, "exists a space of metaphoric significance. It could be that 'travel' in this space is a vast metaphor. . . . Let us say that one goes on a fictitious trip, if one decides to go to the site of the *Non-Site*. The 'trip' becomes invented, devised, artificial; therefore, one might call it a non-trip to a site from a Non-site."[52]

In Smithson's rethinking of the conditions of exhibition and viewing, the work of art is an occasion for radical displacement—a displacement of the art work, which is both here and elsewhere, but also a displacement of the viewer, who is here but confronted with an elsewhere, and with the fact that implied travel (or fictitious travel, or as he also called it, anti-travel) to that other place is built into the work. In this effort, Smithson was returning to premodern modalities for thinking about art in its relation to space and time. A primary alternative to the modern art gallery was the Christian chapel, whose spatio-temporal logic was much more amenable to Smithson's thinking.[53]

Throughout the Middle Ages there was a site that was popularly known as "Jerusalem" despite the fact that it was located in Rome. It is a chapel in the Church of Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme to which one accedes by descending a ramp off the right aisle of the church. A long ceramic inscription along the wall of this ramp, installed in about 1510, informs us that this was the chapel where St. Helena placed the relics she had brought back from the Holy Land in the early fourth century: two thorns from the Crown of Thorns, a nail from the Crucifixion, pieces of the True Cross, and the tablet of the *titulus* from the Cross. (In the fourteenth century the recently imported mosaic panel Man of Sorrows [cat. no. 116], was installed in this chapel.)

These relics came very close to Christ's body, but the ground at the foot of the Cross, soaked with the blood of Christ, was also sacred. According to legend, this too was transported, in enormous quantities, and installed in the flooring of this chapel.[54] An ancient "earthworks" project, this site was a piece of transplanted territory, a bit of Jerusalem reinstalled in Rome.

Fig. 75. View of glass flooring covering the earth of Golgotha. Jerusalem Chapel, Church of Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme, Rome. Photo Alexander Nagel

The effect is somewhat hard to appreciate now. The relics on display in this chapel during the Middle Ages are now on view in a chapel/display room built in 1930 on the other side of the church. The only relic remaining in the Jerusalem chapel is the earth from Golgotha, some of which can still be seen under glass, embedded in the floor (fig. 75). However, there was once much more earth there: one sixteenth-century commentator claimed that originally the earth reached the springing of the vaults![55]

Smithson visited Rome in 1961, at a time when he was making overtly Christian paintings. He said on several occasions that he much preferred the medieval objects to the works of Renaissance art he had seen there. He later remembered that when he was in Rome he was "exposed to all the church architecture and enjoyed all the labyrinthine passageways."[58] We will probably never know whether Smithson saw the Jerusalem chapel and admired its earthwork. But I find it interesting that at some unknown date he felt it necessary to excerpt and carefully transcribe onto a piece of paper a few lines from Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, which read:

Vladimir: Do you remember the Gospels?
Estragon: I remember the maps of the Holy Land. Coloured they were. Very pretty. The Dead Sea was pale blue. The very look of it made me thirsty. That's where we'll go, I used to say, that's where we'll go for our honeymoon. We'll swim. We'll be happy.[57]

Notes

I would like to thank Martina Bagnoli, Charles Dibble, Cynthia Hahn, Herbert Kessler, Holger Klein, and C. Griffith Mann for their many helpful suggestions and criticisms during the writing of this essay.

1. Some of Erasmus's most trenchant comments appear in his spiritual handbook of 1503, the *Enchiridion Militis Christiani* [Handbook of a Christian Soldier], especially the fourth and fifth rules (chaps. 12 and 13).

2. For the longstanding concerns about questions of authenticity, see Bagnoli herein, pp. 142–43.

3. John Calvin, *Traité des reliques*, ed. A. Autin (Paris, 1921), 196.

4. Calvin, *Traité des reliques*, 97: "Car plusieurs, en regardant un reliquaire, ferment les yeux par superstition ; afin, en voyant, de ne voir goutte, c'est-à-dire qu'ils n'osent pas jeter l'œil à bon escient pour considérer ce que c'est. Ainsi que plusieurs qui se vantent d'avoir vu le corps de saint Claude tout entier, ou d'un autre saint, n'ont jamais eu cette hardiesse de lever la vue pour regarder que c'était." Beyond the question of whether reliquaries allowed for the visibility of their relics, Calvin's observation introduces a behavioral dimension that is much more difficult to trace. On the problem in general, see C. Diedrichs, *Die Sichtbarkeit der Reliquie im Reliquiar: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Sehens* (Berlin, 2001).

5. E. C. Voelker, *Charles Borromeo's* Instructiones fabricae et supellectilis ecclesiatica, 1577: *A Translation with Commentary and Analysis*, Ph.D. diss., Syracuse University, 1977 (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1977), chap. 16.

6. C. S. Wood, "In Defense of Images: Two Local Rejoinders to the Zwinglian Iconoclasm," *Sixteenth-Century Journal* 19 (1988), 25–44. The Pfund Heller was equivalent to 1.25 or 1.5 Gulden.

7. Claude de Sainctes, bishop of Évreux, describes how the Protestants who took over the city of Orléans in 1562 destroyed everything in the Church of Saint-Euverte—books, images, tombs, glassware, furniture, even much of the church masonry—with the exception of the reliquaries. Those they commandeered, though "without the sacred bones, which they burned." Whether the reliquaries were kept or simply melted down is not certain. Claude de Sainctes, *Discours sur le saccagement des Églises Catholiques par les Hérétiques anciens, et nouveaux calvinistes, en l'an 1562* (Paris, 1563), in *Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France depuis Louis XI jusqu'à Louis XVIII*, ed. L. Cimber and F. Danjou, series 1, vol. 4 (Paris, 1835), 357–400, esp. 381.

8. See M. Warnke, "Durchbrochene Geschichte? Die Bilderstürme der Wiedertäufer in Münster 1534/35," in *Bildersturm: Die Zerstörung des Kunstwerks*, ed. M. Warnke (Munich, 1973), 73; and H. Belting, *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image in the Era before Art* (Chicago, 1994), chap. 20.

9. Some examples are discussed in Johann Michael Fritz, *Die bewahrende Kraft des Luthertums. Mittelalterliche Kunstwerke in evangelischen Kirchen* (Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 1997). My thanks to Hoger Klein for this reference.

10. P. Selvatico and V. Lazari, *Guida artistica e storica di Venezia e delle isole circonvicine* (Venice: Carpano, 1852), 191; *Menzioni onorifiche de' defunti scritte nel nostro secolo, parte seconda*, ed. G. B. Contarini (Venice: Ancora, 1846), 46–47; and R. Gallo, "Reliquie e reliquiari veneziani", *Rivista mensile della città di Venezia* 13 (1934): 187–214, at 193.

11. See S. Bann, *The Clothing of Clio: A Study of the Representation of History in Nineteenth-Century Britain and France* (Cambridge, 1984), 86.

12. H. Bredekamp, "Der simulierte Benjamin: Mittelalterliche Bemerkungen zu seiner Aktualität," in A. Berndt et al., eds. *Frankfurter Schule und Kunstgeschichte* (Berlin, 1992), 125–33.

13. The 1359 letter documenting the sale of the reliquaries to the Ospedale describes the gold reliquary of the True Cross as "unam crucem auri incassatam anticam plenam de ligno vere crucis fuit sancti Constantini" (G. Derenzini, "Le reliquie da Costantinopoli a Siena," in *L'oro di Siena: il tesoro di Santa Maria della Scala*, ed. L. Bellosi (Milan, 1996), 67–78, at 75). Since *lignum* is not feminine, it must be the *crucem auri incassatam* that is qualified as *anticam* and as having belonged to Constantine. (A research paper by my student Melissa Greenberg on reliquaries as antiquities greatly clarified these matters for me.) None of this is unreasonable as early Church histories and pilgrims' accounts speak of a fragment of the True Cross in a reliquary of precious metal in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem from the fourth century on: Theodoret, the early fifth-century bishop of Cyrrhus (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, 1.17), mentions a silver casement for the relic ordered by Helena and left in the care of the bishop of Jerusalem, and the fourth-century pilgrim Egeria (*Peregrinatio*, chap. 37), describes it as a silver-gilt casket. It would have been natural to think that these Byzantine True Cross reliquaries, too, dated to these times.

14. The Byzantine work, known as the Jaucourt reliquary, dates to the eleventh or twelfth century, and the angels and external mounting date from ca. 1340. See K. M. Holbert, "Relics and Reliquaries of the True Cross," in *Art and Architecture of Late Medieval Pilgrimage in Northern Europe and the British Isles*, ed. S. Blick and R. Tekippe, 2 vols. (Leiden, 2005), 1:337–64, at 360.

15. This point is made by Cynthia Hahn, in the introduction to her forthcoming study *Strange Beauty: Issues in the Making of Reliquaries from the Fourth Century to 1204*. My thanks to Professor Hahn for her helpful comments on this and other topics.

16. See Krueger and Klein herein, pp. 13 and 59.

17. See Cornini herein, pp. 69–78. My thanks to Herbert Kessler for sharing his thoughts on this and related matters.

18. Sarah Benson, "Reproduction, Fragmentation, and Collection: Rome and the Origin of Souvenirs," in *Architecture and Tourism: Perception, Performance, Place*, ed. D. M. Lasanki (New York, 2004), 15-36. Maria Macioti, "Pilgrimages of Yesterday, Jubilees of Today," in *From Medieval Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism*, ed. W. H. Swatos (Westport, 2002), 75–91.

19. Although it is true that the unicorn horn is first mentioned only in 1505. See *Le trésor de Saint-Denis*, exh. cat., Paris: Musée du Louvre (Paris, 1991), 310–11, and see also the discussion in L. Daston and K. Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature* (New York, 2001), chap. 2. See also P. A. Mariaux, "Collecting (and Display), in *A Companion to Medieval Art: Romanesque and Gothic in Northern Europe*, ed. C. Rudolph (Oxford, 2006), 213–32, esp. 219–20, who offers resistance to the idea that the medieval treasury is a *Wunderkammer* in nuce.

20. Erasmus, "A Pilgrimage for Religion's Sake" (1526), in *Collected Works of Erasmus* vol. 40, *Colloquies*, ed. C.R. Thompson (Toronto, 1997), 623.

21. A point made by S. Bann, "Shrines, Curiosities, and the Rhetoric of Display," in *Visual Display: Culture Beyond Appearances*, ed. L. Cooke and P. Wallen (New York, 1998), 15–29.

22. K. Pomian, *Collectionneurs, amateurs et curieux: Paris-Venise, XVIe–XVIIe siècles* (Paris, 1987), 90–91.

23. J. Braun discusses some examples in *Die Reliquiare des christlichen Kultes und ihre Entwicklung* (Freiburg, 1940), 227–29.

24. Bann, "Shrines, Curiosities, and the Rhetoric of Display" (1998, cited in n. 23), proposes that what had been lost as a result of Reformation iconoclasm—lost not only materially but conceptually—was recuperated in the curiosity cabinets of Europe in the early modern period.

25. S. Laube, "Zwischen Hybris und Hybridität: Kurfürst Friedrich der Weise und seine Reliquiensammlung," in *"Ich armer sundiger mensch": Heiligen- und Reliquienkult am Übergang zum konfessionellen Zeitalter*, ed. A. Tacke (Göttingen, 2006), 170–207.

26. Sir Thomas Browne, *Religio Medici*, part 1, section 28.

27. The Venetian chronicler Marin Sanudo (1466–1536) noted about two hundred relics of supreme importance in Venice—arms, hands, heads, whole bodies, and True Cross fragments; among them was listed one image, presumably because it was an image that was also a relic, the handiwork of St. Luke: "La imagine della Beata Verzene, di musaico, fatta per man di San Luca." See Marin Sanudo il Giovane, *De origine, situ et magistratibus urbis Venetiae ovvero la città di Venetia (1493–1530)*, ed. A. Caracciolo Aricò (Milan, 1980), 157–65, at 164. On St. Luke as portraitist of the Virgin see above all M. Bacci, *Il Pennello dell'Evangelista: storia delle immagini sacre attribuite a san Luca* (Pisa, 1998).

28. For one signal example, see K. Noreen, "Replicating the Icon of Santa Maria Maggiore: The *Mater ter admirabilis* and the Jesuits of Ingolstadt," *Visual Resources* 24 (2008): 19–37. My thanks to Holger Klein for bringing this article to my attention.

29. The trend is clearly illustrated by the reception history of the famous Virgin icons of Rome. Most scholars agree that the latest interventions on the St. Luke icon in Sta. Maria Maggiore date to the thirteenth century. Gerhard Wolf convincingly disproved Joseph Wilpert's dating of the panel to ca. 1250, arguing that the original painting was done in the sixth century, shortly after the founding of the church. See G. Wolf, *Salus Populi Romani: Die Geschichte römischer Kultbilder im Mittelalter* (Weinheim, 1990), 24–28. The early eighth-century Madonna della Clemenza in Sta. Maria in Trastevere was also not overpainted after the thirteenth century; see C. Bertelli, *La Madonna di Santa Maria in Trastevere: Storia, iconografia, stile di un dipinto romano del ottavo secolo* (Rome, 1961). The Madonna of San Sisto in Sta. Maria del Rosario, too, was apparently also last retouched in the thirteenth century, to judge from the prerestoration photos. Unfortunately, the main study on the work does not consider this question; see C. Bertelli, "L'immagine del 'Monasterium Tempuli' dopo il Restauro," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 31 (1961): 82–111. Besides some nineteenth-century overpainting removed in 1950, the latest layer of repainting on the seventh-century icon from Sta. Maria Antiqua, now in Sta. Francesca Romana, was a layer of tempera paint dating to the thirteenth century; see E. Kitzinger, "On Some Icons of the Seventh Century," in *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of Albert Mathias Friend, Jr.*, ed. K. Weitzmann, (Princeton, 1955), 132–50. In this case, the thirteenth-century restoration also involved the preservation and insertion of the faces of the Virgin and Child in their original state, as relics, thus signaling a move

toward a more modern approach to restoration already at that stage; see P. Cellini, "Una Madonna molto antica," *Proporzioni* 3 (1950): 1–6. The Madonna of the Pantheon is the exception, as it was repainted several times up to the eighteenth century; see C. Bertelli, "La Madonna del Pantheon," *Bollettino d'Arte* 46 (1961): 24–32 and 30 n. 3.

30. M. Warnke, "Italienische Bildtabernakel bis zum Frühbarock," *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* 19 (1968): 61–102

32. A silk bag of relics was recently found in the Virgin's head and a little packet of red silk in the child's head, containing Christ's blood in a tin seal, a piece of the True Cross, some fragments of thread, possibly belonging to a Virgin's veil. See M. Ciatti, "The Typology, Meaning, and Use of Some Panel Paintings of the Duecento and Trecento," in *Italian Panel Paintings of the Duecento and Trecento*, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, Studies in the History of Art, Symposium Papers 28, ed. V.M. Schmidt (Washington, DC, 2002), 15–29, at 26.

32. *Il carteggio di Michelangelo*, ed. G. Poggi, P. Barocchi, and R. Ristori, 5 vols. (Florence, 1965–83), 4:181.

33. Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite*, ed. R. Bettarini, 8 vols. (Florence, 1966–84), 4:535–36.

34. Ibid., 4:161.

35. See J. Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources (1483–1602)*, 2 vols. (New Haven, 2003), 1: 216–20; and C. Wood, "Eine Nachricht von Raffael," in *Öffnungen: Zur Theorie und Geschichte der Zeichnung*, ed. F.T. Bach and W. Pichler, (Munich, 2009), 109–37.

36. M. Ruffini, "Sixteenth-century Paduan Annotations to the First Edition of Vasari's Lives," *Renaissance Quarterly* 62 (2009): 748–808, at 793: "Mani di fra' Lorenzo tenute commo reliquie."

37. See J. Koerner, *The Moment of Self-Portraiture in German Renaissance Art* (Chicago, 1993), 249–51; and L. Schmitt, "Dürers Locke," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 66 (2003): 261–72.

38. See S. P. Blier, "Capricious Arts: Idols in Renaissance-era Africa and Europe (The Case of Sapi and Kongo)," in *The Idol in the Age of Art*, ed. M.W. Cole and R. Zorach (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 11–29, at 11–13, with further references.

39. B. Foulon, ed., *Dominique-Vivant Denon: L'oeil de Napoléon,* exh. cat., Paris: Musée du Louvre (Paris, 2000), 480.

40. See B. Breudenbach, "Reliquien von Orten. Ein frühchristliches Reliquiar als Gedächtnisort," in *Reliquiare im Mittelalter*, ed. B. Breudenbach and G. Toussaint (Berlin, 2005), 21–41. See also J. Elsner, "Replicating Palestine and Reversing the Reformation: Pilgrimage and Collecting at Bobbio, Monza, and Walsinghan," *Journal of the History of Collections* 9 (1997): 117-30.

41. Ludovico Moscardo, *Note ovvero memorie del Museo Lodovico Moscardo, Nobile Veronese Accademico Filharmonico* (Padua, 1656), part 2, 445–48.

42. Ibid., part 1, 148.

43. Giangiuseppe Liruti, *Della moneta propria, e forastiera ch' ebbe corso nel ducato di Friuli dalla decadenza dell' imperio romano sino al secolo XV* (Venice, 1749), 137 (quoted in Pomian, *Collectionneurs, Amateurs, et Curieux*, 287).

44. M. Duchamp, interview with James Johnson Sweeney, in "Eleven Europeans in America," *Bulletin of the Museum of Modern Art* 13 (1946): 19–21.

45. K. Schwitters, "Die Bedeutung des Merzgedankens in der Welt," in *Das literarische Werk*, 5 vols. (Cologne, 1973–81) 4:134; translation from W. Schmalenbach, *Kurt Schwitters* (New York, 1967), 84.

46. My thanks to Leah Dickerman for providing information and confirming facts about Schwitters's boxes. Paul Erich Küppers was an art historian who, apart from championing modern artists, was also a scholar of earlier art and the author of a monograph on the Renaissance artist Domenico Ghirlandaio.

47. K. Schwitters, "Ich und meine Ziele," in *Das literarische Werk*, 5:344.

48. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, Archives of American Art, Robert Smithson and Nancy Holt Papers, reel 3834, frame 176.

49. Ibid., frame 405.

50. Ibid., frame 407.

51. Ibid., frame 177.

52. Robert Smithson, *The Collected Writings*, ed. J. Flam (Berkeley, 1996), 364.

53. In this connection it is interesting that the Dia Art Foundation, founded by Heiner Friedrich in 1974 precisely to respond to the challenges of the new art of Smithson's generation, was inspired in no small part by the experience of Christian chapels. Giotto's Arena Chapel in Padua was an especially powerful model; for Friedrich, it yielded "the true insight for the unfolding and development of Dia." Quoted in an interview with M. Kimmelman, "The Dia Generation," *New York Times Magazine*, April 6, 2003, 34-35.

54. The majolica inscription mentioned above speaks of "terraque sancti montis Calvariae navi inde advecta supra quam Christi sanguis effusus fuit." See I. Toesca, "A Majolica Inscription in Santa Croce in Gerusalemme," in *Essays in the History of Art Presented to Rudolf Wittkower*, eds. Douglas Fraser, Howard Hibbard, and Milton J. Lewine (London, 1967), 102–105, at 105. The Spanish traveller Pero Tafur, visiting Rome in 1436, heard a somewhat different story: "All this church, with the floor and the walls and everything else, was made from earth of Jerusalem brought as ballast in ships, when St. Helena sent the holy relics to Rome." P. Tafur, *Travels and Adventures, 1435–1439* (London, 1926), 41.

55. Onofrio Panvinio, *Le sette chiese Romane … trans. Da Marco Antonio Lanfranchi* (Rome, 1570), 274.

56. Robert Smithson, interview with Paul Cummings, in *Collected Writings*, 286. Earlier in the interview, 282, he says, "I was very interested in the Byzantine. As a result I remember wandering around through these old baroque churches and going through these labyrinthine vaults."

57. Archives of American Art, Robert Smithson and Nancy Holt Papers, reel 3834, frame 165.