**The ‘Mystery’ of Michelangelo’s Manchester Madonna and its Influence**

Fig. 1 Michelangelo, *Manchester Madonna.* c.1494. Tempera on panel, 104.5 x 77 cm. (National Gallery, London).

Fig. 2 *Rest on the Flight into Egypt with the Infant Saint John*, by Francesco Granacci. Here dated 1504-7. Tempera and oil on panel, 100 x 71 cm. (National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin).

Fig 3 *The Virgin and Child with St Anne*, by Leonardo da Vinci. c.1502-13. Oil on panel, 168 x 130 cm. (Louvre, Paris).

Fig. 4 *Painted wooden box enclosing stones from the Holy Land,* Palestine. c.6th C. Carved wood, engraved and partially gilded; encaustic painting on wood, 24 x 18.4 x 4.1 cm. (Museo Sacro, Vatican).61883 a-b

Fig. 5 *The Virgin and Child with St Anne*, after Leonardo. 16th C (?). Black chalk on paper, measurements unknown. Private Collection.

Fig. 6 *After Leonardo’s Virgin and Child with St Anne*, by Andrea del Brescianino. c. 1515. Oil on panel. (formerly Kaiser Friedrich Museum, Berlin; destroyed 1945).

Fig. 7 *Holy Family with the Lamb*, by Raphael. c.1507. Oil on panel, 32 x 22 cm. (Prado, Madrid).

Fig. 8 *Scenes from the Life of John the Baptist*, by Francesco Granacci. c.1507. Tempera, oil and gold on panel, 77.6 x 151.1 cm. (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York).

Fig. 9. Michelangelo, *Bruges Madonna.* Marble, 128 cm. H. (Notre Dame, Bruges).

Fig. 10 Michelangelo, *A Group of Three Nude Men; the Virgin and Child.* c. 1504-5. Black chalk (nude men); pen and brown ink over leadpoint (the Virgin and Child), 31.5 x 27.8 cm. (British Museum, London).

Fig. 11 Michelangelo, Detail of *A Male Nude; Studies of Apostles; the Virgin and Child; and a Capital*, c.1504-5. Black chalk; pen and brown ink; pen and brown ink over leadpoint (the Virgin and Child), 27.2 x 26.2 cm. (Uffizi, Florence).

Fig. 12 *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, Hellenistic (3rd-1st centuries BC), base by Bernini (1620). Marble, 169 x 89 cm. (Louvre, Paris).

Fig. 14 *A Group of Four Warriors,* by Raphael. c. 1504-05. Pen and ink, over rubbed black chalk and pricking holes, 27.1 x 21.6 cm. (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford).

Fig. 15 *Virgin and Child with Saint John (La Belle Jardinière),* by Raphael. 1507. Oil on panel, 122 x 80 cm. (Louvre, Paris).

Fig. 16 *Studies for the Madonna and Child*, by Raphael. c.1505. Pen and ink, 19,7 x 25,1 cm. (Albertina, Vienna).

Fig. 17 *The Virgin and Child with the Infant St John*, by Raphael. c.1505. Metalpoint and white heightening on pink-buff prepared paper, 13.9 x 12.1 cm. (Royal Collection, Windsor Castle).

*The Young Michelangelo*, held at London’s National Gallery in 1994-5, was one of the most significant exhibitions dedicated to the artist. Curated by Jill Dunkerton, Michael Hirst and Nicholas Penny, the display and its meticulous catalogue convinced most scholars that two unfinished panel paintings, the *Manchester Madonna* and *The Entombment*, both in the National Gallery collection, were autograph works. The attribution of the former especially had see-sawed since its arrival in London in 1833 and its inclusion in the *Manchester Art Treasures* exhibition of 1857 (hence its name); it had most recently been credited to the so-called Master of the Manchester Madonna.[[1]](#footnote-1) (Fig.1)

 There was, however, a big elephant in the room, in the shape of Francesco Granacci’s *Rest on the Flight into Egypt with the Infant Saint John the Baptist* (Fig.2). The mise-en-scène of Granacci’s main grouping shows obvious affinities (in reverse) with the *Manchester Madonna*. The similarity is perhaps not so surprising since Granacci (1469/70-1543) was an apprentice with Michelangelo in Domenico Ghirlandaio’s studio and the Medici sculpture garden; they would become lifelong friends and occasional associates.[[2]](#footnote-2) Vasari claimed that Granacci, who was five or six years older than Michelangelo, was his most loyal friend, and that ‘there was no one on whom he was more willing to bestow things or to share all that he knew of art’.[[3]](#footnote-3)

 What is far more surprising is that every scholar, including Hirst, dates Granacci’s panel to c.1494. This is prior to the usual datings for the *Manchester Madonna,* which currently mostly range from 1495-8 when Michelangelo was successively in Bologna, Florence and Rome. Hirst dated it to 1497, when Michelangelo was in Rome.[[4]](#footnote-4) Some have squared the circle by claiming that Granacci, a largely pedestrian and conservative painter, must have been given a helping hand by Michelangelo in 1494, providing him with a drawing for what is an uncharacteristically impressive and even revolutionary work.[[5]](#footnote-5)

 The early dating of Granacci’s panel created insuperable problems for Hirst. He denied in a long, perplexed footnote that Granacci’s masterpiece was itself based on a drawing provided by Michelangelo. He proposed instead that Domenico Ghirlandaio might have aided Granacci. Yet by dating the *Manchester Madonna* to 1497 he implied Michelangelo was influenced by the Dublin panel rather than vice versa. Hirst went on to say that the Ghirlandaio/Granacci panel ‘remains something of a mystery for its evident fame led both to autograph replicas and copies’, while the *Manchester Madonna* ‘seems to have left no trace or influence at all’.[[6]](#footnote-6) Because of its oft perceived dependence on Granacci, the *Manchester Madonna’s* importance and originality has yet to be fully appreciated.

 What I propose to do in this essay is to dispel these ‘mysteries’ by re-examining the visual and written evidence. I will argue that the *Manchester Madonna* was most likely painted in Florence by 1494, when Michelangelo fled the city at the downfall of Piero de’ Medici. Granacci closely studied the panel in Michelangelo’s Florentine workshop over a decade later in c.1504-7, and it was then that he painted his own very distinctive interpretation, which was also informed by the recent Florentine work of Leonardo da Vinci and Raphael. I will further show that Granacci was not the only painter to see Michelangelo’s panel and to be impressed by it: its most original motif - the Christ-child who climbs up from the ground and reaches for a book - appears in the Florentine work of the young Raphael. This new sequence of events not only gives further support to Michelangelo’s authorship of the *Manchester Madonna*, it demonstrates that his unfinished panel was very influential, and as crucial for Raphael’s development as Michelangelo’s *Entombment*.

 In his catalogue essay, Michael Hirst connected the *Manchester Madonna* with Michelangelo’s purchase of a small panel for an unspecified purpose in Rome in 1497. He would later concede, in his 2011 biography, that this payment may have been for a painting of the *Stigmatisation of St Francis*, probably executed by Michelangelo’s assistant Piero d’Argenta using his employer’s cartoon. However, rather than opting for a significantly earlier dating for the *Manchester Madonna*, Hirst left it as a straight choice between his own dating of 1497, and that of Nicholas Penny and Kathleen Weil-Garris Brandt, who in 1999 had proposed a date around the time of his stay in Bologna in 1495.[[7]](#footnote-7) Hirst had already, nonetheless, highlighted stylistic features that suggested it could have been made prior to his move to Rome in the summer of 1496. He noted close affinities between the feathers dabbed onto the shoulder of the angel at far right with those of the kneeling angel carved by Michelangelo for the *Arca di San Domenico* in Bologna, and showed similarities between the four angels and those in Luca della Robbia’s *cantoria* in Florence cathedral. One might equally compare them with Botticelli’s angels in recent Florentine works like the *Madonna of the Pomegranate* (1487).[[8]](#footnote-8) Hirst and Dunkerton also showed many technical and stylistic parallels with Ghirlandaio’s work, including the *Visitation* (1491).**[[9]](#footnote-9)**

 Paul Joannides has since dated the *Manchester Madonna* to 1490 (without explanation), while persisting with the accepted mid-1490s dating for Granacci’s panel which he believes Michelangelo helped design.[[10]](#footnote-10) The idea that Michelangelo painted the *Manchester Madonna* at fifteen years old, when he had just left the Ghirlandaio workshop for the Medici sculpture garden at San Marco, does not yet seem to have found favour but cannot be ruled out. Its unfinished state could mean Michelangelo abandoned his painting either on the death of Lorenzo de’ Medici in 1492, or at his own flight from Florence in 1494. The National Gallery currently hedges its bets, displaying Michelangelo’s panel with the date ‘about 1497, possibly as early as 1494’.[[11]](#footnote-11)

 Granacci is a workmanlike eclectic painter, essentially a stolid perpetuator of Ghirlandaio’s style with some more modern features bolted on which allow his pictures to be dated; his conservatism is manifested technically in his drawings where he persisted in using metalpoint long after other artists were using chalk.[[12]](#footnote-12) The Dublin panel is Granacci’s most impressive and innovative work by far, and his most popular - several autograph replicas and copies survive.[[13]](#footnote-13) The Infant Baptist emulates (in reverse) the pose of Michelangelo’s Christ: he stands between the Virgin’s legs and reaches up to the Christ child perched on her thigh, with one foot standing on the dress which drapes the rocky base. The tips of his fingers interlace with those of Christ, almost as if this were a mystic marriage. The two background figures of Joseph and a long necked Donkeyturn towards each other in a manner that bathetically echoes the two angels on the left of Michelangelo’s panel.

 The Granacci expert Christian von Holtz, followed by Weil-Garris Brandt and several others including Joannides, have argued that Granacci’s panel prophesies the Florentine work of Leonardo and Raphael from the first decade of the sixteenth century.[[14]](#footnote-14) This view was endorsed by Vincent Delieuven in the catalogue of *Saint Anne: Leonardo da Vinci’s Ultimate Masterpiece* (Paris, Louvre, 2012).[[15]](#footnote-15) Yet Granacci is otherwise a *pasticheur*, not a prophet, and it is clear the influence goes the other way. Granacci’s panel must date from much later - c.1504-7 - when he was looking closely at Leonardo and Raphael in addition to Michelangelo; indeed, there are important features of the main group that are alien to Michelangelo - but typical of Leonardo and Raphael - which make it inconceivable that his friend provided a cartoon for all of the main group.[[16]](#footnote-16)

 Granacci’s *Rest on the Flight into Egypt* is disconcertingly eclectic, with a Ghirlandaio-style background, obtrusive Quattrocento haloes, and Michelangelesque boys; one of its most striking features is its rich colour and high-keyed light. Crucially for dating, several other aspects derive from Leonardo’s compositions for the *Virgin and Child with St Anne* made after his return to Florence in 1500.[[17]](#footnote-17) (Fig. 3) We have the enveloping concave monumentality of the stooping Virgin; the slightly softer and more diffuse lighting and contours of the main group; the merging of a transparent veil and loose hair (as manifested in Leonardo’s St Anne and the *Mona Lisa*, begun c.1503); the outsized female feet, one thrust out to the side like a flying buttress; the large female hands; the broad half smile. The interaction between Joseph and the donkey may have been partly licensed by that between Leonardo’s Christ child and the lamb. The interlaced fingers echo the chin tuck given by the Christ child to the Infant Baptist in Leonardo’s London cartoon.

 Even the scattered rock fragments in the foreground and the layered fissiparousness of the rocky base suggest Leonardo’s post-1500 work. There had been a vogue in Florence in the 1470s for rocky outcrops inspired by the layered rock formations in the van Eyckian *Stigmatisation of St Francis*, the highpoint being Verrocchio and Leonardo’s *Baptism of Christ* (c.1475).[[18]](#footnote-18) But Leonardo’s St Anne compositions - the cartoon in London and the painting in Paris - foreground as never before the fissiparousness and instability of rock, and render it treacherous to the foot. Granacci may also have seen in Leonardo’s Florence workshop the still unfinished *St Jerome* (begun c. 1483) with its rock debris sketched out in the foreground. Granacci’s stones are equally an allusion to the collecting of rocks and pebbles from the Holy Land as relics - the most famous being those in the Pope’s private chapel in Rome, the Sancta Sanctorum in the Lateran Palace, gathered by a sixth century pilgrim. (fig. 4) There are stones from Bethlehem, the Jordan River, Golgotha, the Mount of Olives, Zion and elsewhere.[[19]](#footnote-19)

 The lighting of the shot silk in the Virgin’s rose pink dress is softer and hazier than in Michelangelo’s *Manchester Madonna* or *Doni Tondo* (c.1504-6). That the inspiration must be Leonardo is confirmed by the Virgin’s left sleeve where Granacci, in a rudimentary manner, has tried to emulate with pure white paint the ribbed bracelet effect of the Louvre Virgin’s shimmering sleeve. He may have seen something similar to Leonardo’s famous drawing at Windsor of the Virgin’s sleeve heightened with white,[[20]](#footnote-20) or a sleeve by Leonardo’s Florentine interpreter, Fra Bartolomeo.[[21]](#footnote-21)

 Granacci’s ‘stooping’ seated Virgin is especially Leonardesque. This dynamic and emotive pose is a key innovative feature of Leonardo’s post-1500 Florentine works. The principle inspiration for Granacci’s version was probably a lost cartoon, similar to that described by Fra Pietro da Novellara in a letter to Isabella d’Este of 1501.[[22]](#footnote-22) Its basic appearance can be gauged from a sketch drawing by an unknown artist, two paintings by the Brescianino brothers (c.1515-17), and Raphael’s *Holy Family with the Lamb* (1507) (Fig. 5,6,7).[[23]](#footnote-23) No one before Leonardo had depicted the Virgin bending so far across and down while in a seated position.[[24]](#footnote-24) The leaning and stretching of Granacci’s Virgin (and Christ child) is ingeniously echoed by the anthropomorphic ‘stick-figure’ bow of her silk belt.[[25]](#footnote-25)

 In traditional Virgin and Child images it is just the Virgin’s head and/or neck that tilts, even in cramped tondos. At most, there might be a slight incline of her upper back. Her torso is kept upright for reasons of decorum and to underpin her symbolic role as an impregnable tower and the one true column of the church.[[26]](#footnote-26) Michelangelo would always respect this architectonic tradition in his early paintings and sculptures of the Virgin and Child, as had Domenico Ghirlandaio. The straight backed *Madonna of the Stairs* is seated on a stone cube (c.1492); the *Manchester Madonna* sits on a rocky ‘throne’ that remains integral despite being fissured. There is no debris to indicate current or future weakness in the rock.[[27]](#footnote-27) This all makes it very unlikely that Granacci’s panel is based on a cartoon supplied by Michelangelo (let alone Ghirlandaio). A further objection to the ‘supplied cartoon’ thesis is the fact that the gazes of Granacci’s Virgin and the two children are effortlessly and charmingly synchronised / triangulated. Michelangelo typically eschews eye contact between the Virgin, Child and St John to intensify psychological drama and dissonance.[[28]](#footnote-28)

 Leonardo did not necessarily expect us to approve of his stooping seated Virgins. Rather, they should be considered overemotional and unduly protective of the Christ child. As Fra Pietro explained:

The mother, half rising from St Anne’s lap, is taking the Child to draw it from the lamb, that sacrificial animal, which signifies the Passion. While St Anne, rising slightly from her seat, seems as if she would hold back her daughter, so that she would not separate the Child from the lamb, which perhaps signifies that the Church did not wish to prevent the Passion of Christ. These figures are life-size, but they are in a small cartoon because all are seated or bent over…[[29]](#footnote-29)

Leonardo’s disapproval of stooping Virgins would seem to be confirmed by his scathing comments concerning melodramatic Annunciations depicting the Virgin’s initial shock at the angel’s news - he criticised a painter (probably Botticelli) who made the Virgin so agitated it looked as if she was about to throw herself out of a window.[[30]](#footnote-30)

 It is likely, however, that Leonardo wanted the Virgin’s stooping pose to enrich the narrative by forecasting the Virgin’s deportment during the passion.[[31]](#footnote-31) Just as a sleeping Christ child prophesies his death, Leonardo seems to have partly used the Virgin’s stooping pose to prophesy her eventual prostration: in Fra Pietro’s account, the Virgin leans down to separate Christ from the lamb, symbol of his passion. To this end, the ‘lean’ of Granacci’s Virgin recurs in his own *Pietà* of the 1520s.[[32]](#footnote-32) However, in the Dublin panel he neutralised much of the emotional drama of Leonardo’s stooping pose by having the Virgin embrace John the Baptist, bringer of ‘fatal’ portentous news, rather than the Christ child.

 The later dating of Granacci’s panel is also confirmed by comparison with his own work. A Virgin very similar to that in Granacci’s Dublin panel can be found in his *Scenes from the Life of John the Baptist* (Fig. 8) in New York.[[33]](#footnote-33) Espousing an unprecedented stooping pose with her trailing foot on a lower step, the Virgin almost falls into the arms of a kneeling St Elizabeth, the Baptist’s elderly mother. The highlighting of the sleeves is similarly Leonardesque (as are the sleeves of the woman crouching before the bed and especially the maid bringing sweetmeats). The panel is part of a series painted by various artists, possibly commissioned to celebrate a wedding between the Tornabuoni and Salviati families in 1507.[[34]](#footnote-34) This dating gains credence from the bronze statue of David mounted on the roof of the tabernacle. It closely echoes Michelangelo’s only surviving drawing for his lost bronze David, commissioned in 1502.[[35]](#footnote-35)

 But why would a painter suddenly be struck by the *Manchester Madonna*, a decade after it had been left unfinished? Michelangelo was almost certainly looking at his early work again when planning the *Bruges Madonna* (1504-6)which - as Hirst pointed out - reprises the earlier painting in several ways.[[36]](#footnote-36) (Fig. 9) The latter has a Christ child positioned between the Virgin’s knees, climbing down a rocky base, his feet standing on her robes, snagging them. Michelangelo seems to have given the *Manchester Madonna* a prominent position in his workshop, using it as a visual prompt. He often adapted motifs from earlier work, and was under huge pressure from patrons. He was contracted to carve twelve *Apostles* for Florence Cathedral; a bronze *David* for the French royal treasurer; eleven statues for Cardinal Piccolomini’s tomb in Siena; the fresco of *The Battle of Cascina*…

 At the outset, Michelangelo considered making the sculpture even more similar to the *Manchester Madonna.* Two of the small ink sketches for the *Bruges Madonna* have the Christ child standing/climbing on a sling-like fold in the Madonna’s dress. In one, the child turns to breast feed (Fig. 10, 11).[[37]](#footnote-37) The climbing Christ child with outstretched arm is also closely related to an unused study for the *Battle of Cascina* in which a figure with raised arm is held aloft by two others who support his right foot with a cloth sling; the elevated soldier resembles the Christ child in reverse (Fig. 10).[[38]](#footnote-38) The Christ child’s pose is closely related to sculptures such as Verrocchio’s outstretching fountain figure *Putto Poised on a Globe* (c.1480), and a *putto* reaching up to gather grapes on the base of Donatello’s statue of *Judith and Holofernes* (fig. 12).[[39]](#footnote-39)

 Michelangelo’s extraordinary motif of Christ’s foot pushing against unsupported fabric ultimately derives from the antique sculpture of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, whose discovery in a drain in Rome was described so memorably by Lorenzo Ghiberti in his autobiographical *Commentari* (c.1450): ‘One of the legs was stretched out and the big toe had caught the cloth, and the pulling of the cloth was shown with wonderful skill’ (Fig. 13).[[40]](#footnote-40) Ghiberti says the sculpture (with its head missing) was sent to Florence. There is no written record of it in Florence, and the version seen by Ghiberti has not been identified (the four surviving antique copies were discovered or recorded after 1600, with intact heads).[[41]](#footnote-41) However, Botticelli demonstrates awareness of it by twice depicting reclining male nudes - the dead Holofernes and slumbering Mars - stretching a sheet with an extended leg.[[42]](#footnote-42) Michelangelo must have seenGhiberti’s sculpture or a copy - very likely in Lorenzo de’ Medici’s sculpture garden. The sheet wound tight around the restless sleeper’s leg, body and forearm, seemingly unconsciously, taught Michelangelo much about the expressive potential of stretched and wound fabric. Indeed, the *Manchester Madonna* is a tour-de-force of draperies winding and looping round bodies - not least, the goat skin spiralling round St John (whose feet are enveloped by the Virgin’s dress). The drama of stretched drapery would be of abiding interest to Michelangelo, and already features in the *Madonna of the Stairs* and the *Entombment;* several of the Sistine ceiling *ignudi* push cloth bands with their feet.[[43]](#footnote-43) Michelangelo’s early interest in the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* probably informed his now lost *Sleeping Cupid* (c.1495-6), which he passed off as an antiquity.[[44]](#footnote-44) Giulio Romano’s sleeping baby Jupiter - *The Infancy of Jupiter* (late 1530s) - is often said to be a quotation of the latter.[[45]](#footnote-45) What makes this even more likely is that the child’s legs and arms are tangled up in a white sheet and veil.

 Granacci rejected Michelangelo’s motif of the pulled cloth. Rather than placing the climbing child’s highest foot in a cloth ‘sling’, he made the Baptist stand on a draped rock. This more decorous, less presumptuous solution is similar to the *Bruges Madonna,* except that Granacci’s drapery is slack. His Christ child depends on another Michelangelo invention: half squatting on his mother’s thigh with a leg tucked under, he recalls the Christ child of the *Doni Tondo* (c.1504-6).[[46]](#footnote-46) No doubt Granacci was one of those eclectic plagiarisers about whom Michelangelo would later quip: when on Judgment Day bodies retake their members, there will be nothing left of these artists’ work.[[47]](#footnote-47)

Granacci and Michelangelo were particularly intimate at this time. When in 1507 Michelangelo stayed for a second time in Bologna to make a colossal bronze statue of Pope Julius II, he regularly told his brother Buonarroto and his father in letters to send his greetings to Granacci, or else he mentions him.[[48]](#footnote-48) In 1508 Granacci became foreman of a team of assistants which he had assembled in Florence for the Sistine Ceiling; in his only surviving letter to Michelangelo, of April 1508, Granacci called him *Charissimo*.[[49]](#footnote-49) Michelangelo quickly sent Granacci and his other assistants packing, however. Vasari says Granacci started painting the fresco (presumably *The Flood*) following Michelangelo’s cartoons, but his execution was of poor quality.[[50]](#footnote-50) This doesn’t seem to have damaged the relationship: Vasari says Michelangelo later supplied him with a cartoon for an altarpiece, and Michelangelo credited him - in Condivi’s biography of 1553 - with having shown him Schongauer’s print of the *Temptation of St Anthony* while they were in Ghirlandaio’s workshop.[[51]](#footnote-51)

 The popularity of Granacci’s panel was doubtless due to the fact that he was pastiching the work of the most fashionable artists in Florence - not just Leonardo and Michelangelo, but also the young Raphael. For it was Raphael who made Michelangelo’s dynamic motif canonical of the child reaching up to the Virgin from the ground, while keeping the Christ child and Infant Baptist cocooned within the Madonna’s tautly capacious contours and benevolent gaze.[[52]](#footnote-52) The effortlessness with which the gazes are synchronised in Granacci’s panel is very Raphaelesque. Raphael would himself exploit the Leonardesque motif of outsized, buttressing female feet. It is likely that Raphael’s re-workings made Michelangelo’s panel easier to assimilate for the pedestrian Granacci. Raphael could have first encountered Granacci (and Michelangelo) in the workplace of the Florentine architect Baccio di Angelo, where - according to Vasari - they and other artists met for discussions about art.[[53]](#footnote-53) Both painters had a shared liking for drawing in metalpoint, which was by then rather old fashioned.

 The revelatory impact of Leonardo and Michelangelo on Raphael during the younger artist’s intermittent residence in Florence from 1504-8 is an art historical *locus classicus*.[[54]](#footnote-54) According to Vasari Raphael came to the city “for the love of art” having heard that Leonardo and Michelangelo were doing amazing things with their battle murals for the Sala del Consiglio.[[55]](#footnote-55) Condivi’s claim that Raphael “often had occasion to say that he thanked God that he was born in Michelangelo’s time” can only be true.[[56]](#footnote-56) From Raphael’s surviving drawings and paintings, it is clear he had a comprehensive knowledge of the work Michelangelo made after his return to Florence in 1501. Although the influence on Raphael of Michelangelo’s *Entombment* has been duly acknowledged, that of the *Manchester Madonna* remains overlooked. Raphael seems to have been on good terms with Michelangelo at this time, and to have had access to his workshop: a drawing survives which shows he knew the unfinished marble relief the *Battle of Centaurs* (c.1492) which had remained in Michelangelo’s possession.[[57]](#footnote-57) That Raphael saw the *Manchester Madonna* in Florence lends further support to its Florentine origin. Michelangelo’s four angels seem to have inspired Raphael’s ink drawing *A Group of Four Warriors* (c1504-5), sometimes considered a study for a decorative scheme (Fig. 14).[[58]](#footnote-58) The figure to the left of the soldier modelled on Donatello’s *St George* closely matches the (outlined) angel on the far left of Michelangelo’s panel, whose hand is placed on his neighbour’s shoulder. The equal heights of the figures and their conspiratorial conviviality are very similar.

 But the motif from the *Manchester Madonna* that excited Raphael above all others is the most radical: that of the Christ child reaching up from the ground to either take his mother’s book or point to a passage. In order to do so, Michelangelo had him climb up onto the edge of the rock and onto a precarious sling-like fold in her dress, which increases the sense of urgency (as does the fact that he is far more interested in her book than her nipple). The bibliophile Christ child is a theme that came to the fore during the fifteenth century. The text is likely to be a Jewish Bible, with Christ pin-pointing one of the Old Testament passages interpreted by Christians as a prophesy of his Passion and Crucifixion; the background angels are looking at scrolls given them by the Baptist, that also prophesy Christ’s fate. According to an apocryphal story, Christ was told about his future Passion by his cousin John the Baptist, who here stands conspiratorially behind him, goading him on by pushing his fist into the small of his back. Christ’s outstretched right arm with the hand ‘pinioned’ between the pages of the book, seems to foretell the nailing to the cross, while his foot caught in the fold foretells the cloth bands that support and cover his body after his death - as seen in the *Entombment*. The outstretched arm and the open thumb and fingers would be reprised in a later study for the *Descent from the Cross* (1522-4).[[59]](#footnote-59)

 The Christ child’s climb and stretch is Michelangelo’s innovation, and nothing like this urgent ‘action’ pose is found in Leonardo or earlier art,[[60]](#footnote-60) though children do reach up to figures of Caritas, and the latter sometimes reaches up to the Christ child or God.[[61]](#footnote-61) A tondo by Luca Signorelli which has recently been dated to c.1494-6 has the Christ child standing frontally by his mother resting his upraised arm on her thigh. But this is quiescent and static.[[62]](#footnote-62) The late fifteenth century Florentine convention was to have the Infant Baptist standing on the ground reverentially, with arms crossed or in prayer, below the Christ child who sits or stands on his mother’s lap. Granacci largely respects this hierarchy when he puts the Baptist in the inferior position occupied by Michelangelo’s Christ child.

 Raphael made the Christ child’s up reaching arm and hand into his own leitmotif, with variants appearing in numerous drawings[[63]](#footnote-63) and paintings (Fig. 15). In *The Madonna del Cardellino* (c1505) he reaches up for an ominous goldfinch held by the Infant Baptist, and ‘climbs’ up on his mother’s foot. Raphael may have assumed the Virgin’s foot was underneath the robes on which Michelangelo’s Christ stands. Standing on his mother’s bare foot is a (literally) touching trope, as well as suggesting she is - from head to toe - the foundation of Christianity.[[64]](#footnote-64) In *The Madonna of the Meadow* (c.1505-6) he reaches up for the top of the cross which the infant Baptist is holding; and in *La Belle Jardini*è*re* (1508) the Christ Child reaches up with his left arm for a book, and his mother solicitously tries to restrain him (the lower part of his body is modelled on the Christ child in the *Bruges Madonna*). In all three pictures the Madonna is sitting on a rock.

 Raphael clearly understood the implications of Christ’s outstretched arm and ‘pinioned’ hand in the *Manchester Madonna*: on the verso of a drawing for a roundel of *Charity,* in which a standing child reaches up for the breast, is a study for a print of the *Deposition* which shows Christ’s right arm raised in the same way as in the *Manchester Madonna*.[[65]](#footnote-65) It is still nailed to the cross. The Christ child is at his most spectacularly overstretched in a Raphael drawing in Vienna in which he reaches up to the book that his mother is reading (Fig. 16).[[66]](#footnote-66) It is usually singled out for the vigour of the sketching, and for the influence of the *Doni Tondo* on the pose of the Madonna, with her legs tucked underneath. But there are even more echoes of the *Manchester Madonna:*

1. The motif of a standing Christ child reaching from proper left to right for an open book held by his mother.
2. Christ’s left hand resting on his mother’s right thigh just above the knee.

3) The straggly looseness of the Madonna’s hair - uncharacteristic for Raphael; for Leonardo, who preferred more disciplined waves; and for Michelangelo in this period.

4) The Madonna’s clenched left hand pressing into the small of Christ’s back echoes the Baptist’s left fist in the small of Christ’s back.

5) A horizontal line drawn just below the Christ child’s feet suggests a plinth analogous to the rocky base of Michelangelo’s *Manchester Madonna*.

6) Raphael’s Madonna is flanked by a pair (?) of angels on each side.[[67]](#footnote-67)

 The drawing is usually dated to early in Raphael’s Roman period because a study for the *Disputà* is found on the other side of the sheet, together with a draft of a poem. But the likelihood is that the Madonna and Child drawing, which is on the recto, was made first, in Florence, then taken to Rome, where Raphael sketched on the verso. This motif of the Christ child reaching for a book held by his mother is first found in studies for the *Madonna del Cardellino*(c1505); in the painting, Raphael ultimately opted for a goldfinch held by the Infant Baptist.[[68]](#footnote-68) The Vienna sketch is likely to be a concurrent or later variant.[[69]](#footnote-69)

 A faded drawing by Raphael in metalpoint and white heightening shows a very similar scenario to Granacci’s panel: the Infant baptist reaches up to pass an inscribed scroll to the Christ child, standing on his mother’s lap [Fig. 17].[[70]](#footnote-70) It evolves out of the more conventional *Madonna Terranuova* (c1505; Berlin, Gemäldegalerie), where the Infant Baptist keeps his hands to his chest reverentially, and the Christ child sits on his mother’s lap. Until the twentieth century, the drawing was ascribed to Raphael but then it was given to Granacci by Popham and Wilde, followed by Berenson.[[71]](#footnote-71) Recent scholars have returned it to Raphael. What this attributional confusion goes to show is that if anyone provided Granacci with a drawing, Raphael is a more likely candidate than Michelangelo. Raphael was already collaborating with other artists in the Ghirlandaio circle.Vasari tells us that when Raphael was in Florence he got Ridolfo Ghirlandaio, son of Domenico, to complete a painting of the Virgin and Child.[[72]](#footnote-72) Raphael, more than anyone, was able to see the potential of Michelangelo’s *Manchester Madonna*, and it was he who stopped it being a sleeping beauty.
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