

5. The Carthusians of 'Genadedal' near Bruges

Unlike all religious institutions in Bruges discussed thus far, the Carthusian Monastery 'Genadedal' was situated outside the city walls, in the territory situated between the parish church of the community of Sint-Kruis and the Bruges-Damme canal (Pl. 94).⁹³ It was founded in 1318 under the auspices and with the financial support of Jan van Koekelare, a priest attached to the parish of Our Lady. The first stone of the monastery buildings was laid by Count Robert III of Bethune (ruled 1305-22), one of the great benefactors of the foundation.⁹⁴ The Bruges city magistrature also helped the new foundation, for which the general chapter of the order expressed its gratitude.

The premises of the Carthusian monastery consisted of fifteen separate cells each with its own little garden, centered around an inner courtyard, a modest church with one aisle only, and stables and storage facilities. These buildings were demolished by the iconoclasts in 1578, and the monks evicted. After the Calvinistic time, they returned to Bruges and established a new monastery in the city itself.

The fifteenth century stands out as an important era in the history of the order. Since the Carthusians observed their rule severely, the dukes of Burgundy had always generously endowed the order.⁹⁵ Philip the Bold's foundation of the Carthusian monastery of Champmol near Dijon, and the important role of this house as the funeral site of the Burgundian dukes, are well known.⁹⁶ The

⁹³ On the Carthusian cloister Genadedal, see Duclos (as in n. 2), 566; H.J.J. Scholtens, "Het Kartuiserklooster Dal van Graciën buiten Brugge," *Handelingen van het Genootschap voor Geschiedenis, gesticht onder de benaming Société d'Emulation te Brugge*, LXXXIII (1940-46), 133-201; J. de Grauwe, "Chartreuse du Val-de-Grâce à Bruges," *Monasticon belge*, III/4: *Province de la Flandre Occidentale*, Liège, 1978, 1191-1230; J.-P. Esther, J. De Grauwe, V. Desmet, *Het Karthuiserklooster binnen Brugge, verleden en toekomst*, Bruges, 1980.

⁹⁴ Scholtens (as in n. 93), 150.

⁹⁵ The rule of the Carthusians had been recorded by Guigo I, prior general of the order (1109-1136); see J.P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CLIII, 1854, col. 631-760; A. de Meyer, J.-M. De Smet, *Guigo's 'Consuetudines' van de eerste Kartuisers (Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten, Klasse der Letteren, XIII/6)*, Brussels, 1951.

⁹⁶ The main study on the Chartreuse of Champmol is still C. Monget, *La Chartreuse de Dijon d'après les documents des archives de Bourgogne*, 3 vols., Montreuil-sur-Mer, 1898-1905.

Charterhouses in the Low Countries had also received substantial ducal support.⁹⁷ Notable members of the order, Dionysius of Louvain (1402-71), and Jacob Ruebs, prior of the Carthusians at Ghent, were both councillors of Philip the Good.

Many charterhouses developed as important centers of manuscript production. The Carthusian rule required that the monks live their days of manual labor in solitary contemplation.⁹⁸ Copying manuscripts offered ample opportunity to follow this rule faithfully.

Genadedal, like many other Carthusian monasteries, had a remarkable collection of manuscripts, most of which were unfortunately lost.⁹⁹ One of the most prominent bibliophiles was Dom Otto Amelisz van Moerdrecht, prior of the monastery between 1433 and 1438. Before he was appointed to this position, he headed the monastery Nieuwlicht at Utrecht. In 1423, the year of his novitiate, he had some books copied and illuminated for the library at Utrecht.¹⁰⁰ Some monks of Genadedal gained recognition as authors of spiritual treatises. Willem Apsele, prior of the monastery between 1462 to 1465, was known as an excellent bookbinder.¹⁰¹ He also wrote at least six treatises.¹⁰² His successor, Dom

⁹⁷ Scholtens (as in n. 93), 147-148.

⁹⁸ F. Hendrickx, "De handschriften van de Kartuis Genadedal bij Brugge (1318-1580)," *Ons Geestelijk Erf*, XLVII (1973), 3-11.

⁹⁹ For the manuscript collection of Genadedal, see A. Derolez, *Corpus Catalogorum Belgii. De Middeleeuwse bibliotheekscatalogi der Zuidelijke Nederlanden. I Provincie West-Vlaanderen (Verhandelingen Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten, Klasse der Letteren, XXVIII/61)*, Brussels, 1966, 11-13; Hendrickx (as in n. 98), 3-63, 241-290; XLVIII (1974), 143-169. The latter article includes a thorough study of four manuscripts that belonged to Genadedal. None of these was produced during the period under consideration here.

¹⁰⁰ Some of these are still preserved; see Scholtens (as in n. 93), 1940-46, 174. On manuscripts produced for Otto Amelisz van Moerdrecht at Utrecht, on the anonymous illuminator called after him and his influence, see also A. W. Byvanck, G.J. Hoogewerff, *Noord-Nederlandsche Miniaturen in handschriften der 14e, 15e en 16e eeuwen*, I, The Hague, 1925, xiii; A.W. Byvanck, "Aanteekeningen over handschriften met miniaturen, VIII. Het atelier der Utrechtse miniaturen," *Oudheidkundig Jaarboek*, IX (1929), 136-145; H.L.L. Defoer, et al., *The Golden Age of Dutch Manuscript Painting*, [exh.cat.] Utrecht, 1989, 75-88, cat. nos. 21-27.

¹⁰¹ Scholtens (as in n. 93), 1940-46, 179.

Hendrik Jansz de Vroede (1465-77), was another respected author of theological works. In a charter dated 4 November 1457, Hendrik's brother, Dirk de Vroede, made an endowment. He had stained glass windows made with portraits of his parents for the walkway of the cloister.¹⁰³

The most prominent figure for artistic patronage in the Bruges Charterhouse is doubtlessly Dom Jan Vos. He originated from Delft, and first belonged to the Teutonic order, of which he was a procurator. In 1431, he was professed in the Carthusian order in the Nieuwlicht monastery, where he also became procurator. After heading Genadedal from 1441 to 1450, he returned to Nieuwlicht, and was prior of the monastery there until 1462.¹⁰⁴

In art history, Dom Jan Vos is best known as the patron of the famous Eyckian *Madonna and Child with St. Elisabeth and St. Barbara presenting Jan Vos* (New York, Frick Collection)(Pl. 95),¹⁰⁵ and its variant, the so-called *Exeter*

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 181-182. These works were listed by A. Bostius, *Liber de viris aliquot illustribus, sive praecipuis Patribus Ordinis Cartusianorum*, Cologne, 1609, cap. 30.

¹⁰³ "Een glas yn groet pant ende dair sellen yn staen Dircs vader ende moeder met alzulken beelden als daer toe dienen sellen" (a window in the large cloister, and in which will be represented Dirk's father and mother with al such images as will be necessary); see RAB, *Fonds Carthuziers*, charters no. 4965; cf. also nos. 3485 and 5000. This fragment was published by Scholtens (as in n. 93), 1940-46, 182.

¹⁰⁴ Scholtens (as in n. 93), 1940-46, 175-177; J.-P. Esther, J. De Grauwe, V. Desmet (as in n. 93), 20.

¹⁰⁵ *Madonna and Child with St. Elisabeth and St. Barbara presenting Jan Vos*, New York, The Frick Collection, no. 54.1.161; tempera and oil on panel, 47.5 x 61.3 cm (painted surface); see H. von Tschudi, "Die Madonna mit dem Kartäuser von Jan Van Eyck," *Jahrbuch der Königliche preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, X (1889), 154-165; *Id.*, "Die Madonna mit dem Kartäuser und Heiligen von Jan van Eyck," *Jahrbuch der Königlichen preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, XV (1894), 65 ff.; L. Kämmerer, *Hubert und Jan van Eyck*, Leipzig, 1898, 93 ff.; Weale, Brockwell (as in n. 45), 76 ff.; Friedländer (as in n. 16), I, 1924, 61, 94; W. Burger, *Die Malerei in den Niederlanden von 1400 - 1500*, Munich, 1925, 35; C. de Tolnay, *Le Maître de Flémalle et les frères Van Eyck*, Brussels, 1938, 33; H.J.J. Scholtens, "Jan Van Eyck's H.Maagd met den Kartuizer en de Exeter-Madonna te Berlijn," *Oud Holland*, LV (1938), 49-62; L. von Baldass, *Jan Van Eyck*, London, New York, 1952, 61, 280, no.18; Panofsky (as in n. 16), 187-191, 312 ff., 413 (137, n.2), 432-433 (193, n.1), 437 (199, n.3), (266, n.2); F.M. Biebel, "The Virgin and Child with Saints and a Carthusian Donor by Jan van Eyck and Petrus Christus," *Art Quarterly*, XVII (1954), 422-425; J. Lejeune, "Le premier des Petrus Christus et La Vierge au Chartreux," *Bulletin van de Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België*,

Madonna (Berlin, Gemäldegalerie) by Petrus Christus (Pl. 97).¹⁰⁶ The first painting shows a scene set in a portico, with a Madonna and Child in the middle, standing under a brocaded canopy. At the left, St. Barbara presents a kneeling Carthusian. At the right stands St. Elisabeth of Hungary, dressed as a grey sister and holding her triple crown. A wide landscape spreads out in the background of the painting, and is visible through the half-open arcade of the portico.

In the *Exeter Madonna*, the composition is reduced to the left half of the picture in the Frick Collection. The figures stand in the corner of an open porch. St. Barbara holds her right hand on the shoulder of Jan Vos, and leans with her left hand on a miniature tower. Jan Vos, who is kneeling in adoration of the Virgin and Child, is noticeably older than in the previous painting. The porch is high above the town, but the openings at the left and the rounded arches in the back, allow a much fuller view of the city and landscape background.

The identification of the patron, the earliest provenance of both paintings, the date, and the relationship between the two pictures was firmly established by

IV (1955), 151-170; J. Bruyn, *Van Eyck Problemen*, Utrecht, 1957, 131-134; J. Philippe, *Van Eyck et la genèse mosane de la peinture des anciens Pays-Bas*, Liège, 1960, 155 ff.; Friedländer (as in n. 16), I, 1967, 61-62, 86, 94; *The Frick Collection. An Illustrated Catalogue, vol. I: Paintings: American, British, Dutch, Flemish and German*, New York, 1968, 198-208; C.D. Cutler, *Northern Painting from Pucelle to Bruegel, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Centuries*, New York, 1968, 104; Schabacker (as in n. 16), 1974, 52-54, 123-124, cat. 23; C. Sterling, "Jan van Eyck avant 1432," *Revue de l'Art*, XXXIII (1976), 64-66; E. Dhanens, *Hubert en Jan Van Eyck*, Antwerp, 1980, 367-370, pl. 228; J. Snyder, *Northern Renaissance Art. Painting, Sculpture, the Graphic Arts from 1350 to 1575*, Englewood Cliffs (NJ), New York, 1984, 116; J. Upton, *Petrus Christus. His Place in Fifteenth-Century Flemish Painting*, University Park, London, 1990, 11-19.

¹⁰⁶ *Exeter Madonna (Madonna and Child with kneeling Carthusian donor presented by St.Barbara)*; Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, inv. 253B; tempera and oil on panel, 21.3 x 15.4 cm; see J.A. Crowe, G.B. Cavalcaselle, *The Early Flemish Painters: Notices of their Lives and Works*, London, 1857, 341 ff.; Von Tschudi (as in n. 105), 1889, 154 ff.; *Id.* (as in n. 105), 1894, 65 ff.; Kaemmerer (as in n. 105), 1898, 95 ff.; G.J. Kern, *Die Grundzüge der linearperspektivischen Darstellung in der Kunst der Gebrüder van Eyck und ihre Schule*, Leipzig, 1904, 15, 20; W.H.J. Weale, "Peintres Brugeois : les Christus," *Annales de la Société d'Emulation de Bruges*, 2e série, LIX (1909), 116, no. 2; Weale, Brockwell (as in n. 45), 1912, 169 ff.; Friedländer (as in n. 16), I, 1924, 86, 95; O. Pächt, "Die Datierung des Brüsseler Beweinung des Petrus Christus," *Belvedere*, IX (1926), 156, 158; Scholtens (as in n. 105), 1938, 49 ff.; W. Schöne, *Dieric Bouis und seine Schule*, Berlin, Leipzig, 1938, 57, no. 26; Panofsky (as in n. 16), 311, 489 (311, n.5); Lejeune (as in n. 105), 1955, 151-170; Bruyn (as in n. 105), 119 ff.; Cutler (as in n. 105), 129; Schabacker (as in n. 16), 1974, cat. 8; E. Dhanens (as in n. 105), 367-370, pl. 227; Snyder (as in n. 105), 1984, 151; Upton (as in n. 105), 14-19.

Scholtens in 1938.¹⁰⁷ Usually, the Frick Madonna is considered one of the last works by Jan van Eyck, believed to be finished by Petrus Christus.¹⁰⁸ Panofsky confronted the rich documentation presented by Scholtens with the biography of Jan van Eyck.¹⁰⁹ Based on chronology, he concluded that Jan's part in this work must have been very restricted. These data can also be confronted with Petrus Christus's biography. Through the historical critique of these sources, one can determine more precisely to what extent both artists may have been involved in this commission. First I will summarize Scholtens's arguments, before going into the problem of attribution.

On 3 September 1443, the Irish bishop Martinus of Mayo, visited Genadedal, where he consecrated and attached indulgences to three paintings in the church of the monastery. This was recorded in a *necrologium*, the list of deceased monks of the Nieuwlicht monastery at Utrecht.¹¹⁰ The original charter stipulating the conditions for the indulgence is lost. Fortunately a copy has been preserved in the State Archives of Antwerp.¹¹¹

From these documents we learn that the paintings that the Bishop of Mayo consecrated had been donated to the church by Prior Jan Vos. The largest painting represented *the Virgin with Saints Barbara and Elisabeth*.¹¹² In the *necrologium*, this painting is said to have been placed on the altar of St. Barbara in the church of Nieuwlicht, at the time the chronicler made his note, namely in

¹⁰⁷ Scholtens (as in n. 105), 1938, 49-62. Only Sterling (as in n. 105), 64-66, dated the painting early, c. 1433-34, but did not take the documentary evidence sufficiently into consideration.

¹⁰⁸ See, amongst others, Panofsky (as in n. 16), 187-191; Schabacker (as in n. 16), 1974, 52-54.

¹⁰⁹ Panofsky (as in n. 16), 187-191.

¹¹⁰ This document was first published by L. van Hasselt in *Bijdragen en Mededeelingen van het Historisch Genootschap gevestigd te Utrecht*, IX (1886), 202-202; and also by Scholtens (as in n. 105), 1938, 51.

¹¹¹ State Archives of Antwerp, *Fonds Kartuizers*, no. 35, fol. 272; also published by Scholtens (as in n. 105), 1938, 52.

¹¹² The second painting, possibly a diptych, represented the *Resurrection* and a *Madonna with Child*, and the third one showed the *Virgin Carrying her Child* (a *Pieta?*).

or shortly after 1450.¹¹³ The letter of indulgence explicitly stated that indulgence would be granted to anyone who venerated the saints represented on this altarpiece. This indulgence would be valid only if the painting remained on the altar in the church of Genadedal.¹¹⁴ It cannot be doubted that these documents refer to the picture now in the Frick Collection. The presence of the Carthusian monk and the description fit this painting perfectly.¹¹⁵ The stipulation that the indulgence would be granted only as long as the painting stayed at Genadedal, explains why a variant copy of the painting was made.

When Dom Jan Vos left Genadedal in 1450 to become the prior of Nieuwlicht at Utrecht, where he had been professed, he took his precious altarpiece with him. Indeed, we learn from the chronicler that it was placed on the altar of St. Barbara in the Utrecht church. Vos also provided the Bruges monastery with a copy, which he commissioned from Petrus Christus, now known as the *Exeter Madonna*.¹¹⁶

It is obvious why Jan Vos turned to Petrus Christus for this commission. This artist was not only the most prolific painter in Bruges at that time, but he must have been also known as a devoted follower of the Eyckian style. Thus, he was well suited to copy a work that had originated in the workshop of the great master. Earlier in this chapter, we have seen that the practice of making a substitute painting to replace an altarpiece was not uncommon. The indulgences

¹¹³ "Erat insignita ymaginibus beatissime Dei genetricis Marie, sanctarum Barbare et Elyzabeth, que impresenciarum pertinet ad dictam domum nostram et habetur in altari beate Barbare virginis et martiris, super ioxale in ecclesia nostra;" see Scholtens (as in n. 105), 1938, 51.

¹¹⁴ "Dummode extra ordinem predictae tabule non devenirent;" see *Ibid.*, 52, 57.

¹¹⁵ Only Lejeune (as in n. 105), 151-170, questioned this identification on highly debatable grounds, and clearly with biased intentions, trying to prove that the Frick Madonna was painted in Liège.

¹¹⁶ The course of events was differently interpreted by Upton (as in n. 105), 16-17. He hypothesized that both the painting in the Frick collection and the *Exeter Madonna* reflect a lost common prototype, which Jan Vos would have commissioned from Jan van Eyck when he was still in Utrecht during the first half of the 1430s. When he became prior at Genadedal, he donated the painting to this institution, and when he returned to Utrecht in 1450, it would have been also this lost original that Vos took with him, replacing it by the painting now in the Frick collection. According to the same author, the *Exeter Madonna* is to be considered as a "private devotional piece commissioned by Jan Vos for his personal use" (*Ibid.*, 17). Although this interpretation is possible, the existence of a lost prototype cannot be proven.

connected to the altarpiece of Jan Vos made the need for an estimable copy even more compelling.

Jan Vos succeeded Gerard van Hamone as prior of the Charterhouse of Genadedal. The exact date of his appointment as head of the monastery is not known, but can be established as shortly after the death of Van Hamone on 30 March 1441. It also establishes the *terminus post quem* for the commission of the Frick Madonna. The altarpiece was certainly finished before 3 September 1443, when it was solemnly consecrated by the Bishop of Mayo. Jan van Eyck died on 9 July 1441, so he could have worked on it only during the fourteen weeks between 30 March and 9 July 1441.¹¹⁷ He probably had even less time because there must have been some delay between the death of Gerard van Hamone and the appointment of his successor, and further delay between Jan Vos's appointment and his commission of the painting. Finally, it is possible that Jan van Eyck was inactive for some time prior to his death. In other words, Jan van Eyck had very probably only some ten weeks or less to work on the painting, which would have been just enough time to fix the composition into its most rudimentary form.¹¹⁸

These historical factors make clear that someone else must have had a larger hand in the painting. This assumption can be confirmed stylistically by comparing the picture to the *Madonna with Nicolas Rolin* (Paris, Louvre), on which it was largely based. The figures have a doll-like character, and lack the *esprit de corps* of Van Eyck's works, as do the unanimated faces and the hands devoid of any expression. The painting also lacks the impressive material suggestion typical for Van Eyck. Elisabeth's crown, for instance, does not have the sparkling luster of the jewels that are so celebrated in the Ghent Altarpiece. The landscape behind this saint, is a sterile copy of the lively background of the *Madonna with Rolin*. The tower behind St. Barbara is not well integrated into the background.¹¹⁹

For these reasons many authors believed that the *Frick Madonna* was only conceived in its earliest stage by Jan van Eyck, and that it was finished by a dedicated, but less talented collaborator. Petrus Christus has often been named as the most likely candidate for this. Panofsky formulated the proposition as follows:

¹¹⁷ Panofsky (as in n. 16), 187-191, pointed this out.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 188.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 187.

*The elaboration of the design, and certainly the actual execution of the picture, must have been left to a man whom he (i.e., Jan van Eyck) had trained; who was entitled and able to wind up unfinished business, so to speak; and who had access to whatever was left of personal sketches and workshop drawings... This man could have been none other than Petrus Christus whom tradition has always regarded as Jan van Eyck's disciple and successor and whose stylistic peculiarities have been recognized in the 'Rothschild Madonna' even before it was known to have been commissioned too late for Jan to have carried it out.*¹²⁰

Is this rather authoritative statement correct? Could it really have been "none other than Petrus Christus" who was responsible for the *Altarpiece of Jan Vos*?

The attribution of the *Exeter Madonna* to Petrus Christus has never been doubted. When this painting is compared to its model, notable differences can be discerned. Take the figure of St. Barbara, for instance. The modelling of her facial features and hair are far more delicate in the Frick painting. The drapery style in both pictures is monumental. The folds fall more convincingly in the Frick version, while they are simplified in the Berlin painting, a practice is very characteristic of Christus's style, so both paintings cannot be attributed to the same artist.¹²¹

A more general question should be raised as to the precise relationship between Petrus Christus and Jan van Eyck. Was Petrus indeed the pupil who completed the paintings left unfinished in the workshop by Van Eyck, as it has been suggested, or was he simply a successful follower of the Eyckian style?

Once again, the historical data offer a way out of this entangled problem. On 6 July 1444, Petrus Christus became a free citizen of Bruges in order to practice his profession as a painter. This event is recorded in the *Poorterboeken*

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 188. The underline is mine. Panofsky referred to the painting as 'Rothschild Madonna,' as the painting was bought only in 1954 by the trustees of the Frick estate from Baron Robert de Rothschild in Paris for \$ 750,000.

¹²¹ Also Bruyn (as in n. 105), 133-135, and Upton (as in n. 105), 14-15, came to this conclusion. Bruyn stated that "the pupil who was responsible for the completion ... shows no resemblance with the hand of Petrus Christus." (*Ibid.*, 133, my translation).

(i.e., the annual lists of newly accepted citizens).¹²² His financial contribution of £3 gr is also noted in the municipal accounts for that year.¹²³

Some scholars have been struck by the fact that the date Petrus Christus acquired his citizenship was almost exactly three years after Jan van Eyck's death.¹²⁴ They hypothesized that Petrus managed Van Eyck's workshop for those three years before finally beginning to work independently. It would have been at that point that he became a free citizen, in order to be accepted into the Bruges corporation of the image-makers, also known as the Guild of St. Luke. This hypothesis implies that some kind of grace period of three years would have existed for employees of court painters, after which they were to comply with the legal regulations of the town. Not even the slightest piece of evidence corroborates this presumption, on which this whole theory depends.

It is useful to recall the circumstances under which individuals were enrolled in the *Poorterboeken*. There were three ways of becoming a *poorter*: by marrying a Bruges citizen; by living in the city for a year and a day; or by buying the right of citizenship.¹²⁵

Individuals like Petrus Christus, who wanted to become a member of a professional corporation could not wait for a year. They had to acquire citizenship immediately in order to start working. Indeed, Petrus Christus *bought* his citizenship.¹²⁶ Probably he had been in Bruges less than a year before he applied for citizenship and subsequently paid £3 gr for it. This sum represents the equivalent of about three months wages for the average trained laborer. It is highly unlikely that he was professionally active in the city before 1444. This assumption does not exclude the possibility of any contact with Van Eyck or his

¹²² SAB, *Poorterboeken*, no. 130, 1434-1449, fols. 72v; published by Weale (as in n. 17), 236.

¹²³ SAB, *Stadsrekeningen*, no. 216, 1443-44, fol. 12; published by Weale (as in n. 17), 236.

¹²⁴ Schabacker (as in n. 16), 20-21; J. M. Collier, "The Kansas City Petrus Christus: Its Importance and Dating," *The Nelson Gallery and Atkins Museum Bulletin*, V (1979), 26.

¹²⁵ R.A. Parmentier, *Indices op de Brugsche Poorterboeken*, I, Bruges, 1938, viii; Upton (as in n. 105), 8-9, n.9. Citizenship was also occasionally granted for special merit. I am grateful to Noël Geirmaert, archivist of the Bruges Stadsarchief, for discussing this issue with me.

¹²⁶ SAB, *Poorterboeken*, no. 130, fols. 72v: "cochte zijn poorterscip."

workshop after Jan's death, but it certainly cannot be inferred from the available source material in the archives. The argument that Petrus Christus could have been exempted from mandatory citizenship or membership in the corporation of St. Luke because he allegedly worked for Van Eyck, who was a court painter and thus not subject to the local professional regulations, should be rejected. If Petrus were indeed exempted from having to buy his citizenship, he would have received it in any case once he had been resident in the city for more than a year and a day.¹²⁷

In other words, the theory that Petrus Christus would have taken care of unfinished business in Van Eyck's workshop after the master's death, is unfounded, at least provided that Petrus Christus did not work illegally within the territory of jurisdiction of the Bruges Magistrature.

As for the completion of the Frick Madonna, the earliest possible date that Petrus Christus could have begun to work in Bruges, and thus have started to complete a work in Van Eyck's workshop, is 6 July 1443. However, it is unreasonable to assume that he did so. Why would he have paid £3 gr exactly one year later, if he would have received his citizenship gratis the next day? Moreover, if he had started to complete the *Altarpiece of Jan Vos* on this theoretically earliest possible date, he would have had only two months to complete it before its consecration on 3 September 1443. This chronology is impossible. No one would have been able to complete this work in two months, especially since Jan van Eyck had only barely begun it.

The chronology of the events is summarized in the following time-table:

30 March 1441:	death of Gerard van Hamone
	: appointment of Jan Vos
	: earliest possible commission of the Frick panel
	: Jan van Eyck presumably inactive
9 July 1441	: death of Jan van Eyck

6 July 1443 : earliest possible presence of

¹²⁷ Upton (as in n. 105), 9, came to the same conclusion independently from me.

Petrus Christus in Bruges
3 September 1443: dedication of the Frick panel

6 July 1444 : registration of Petrus Christus
as citizen

Thus the interpretation of the historical data confirms the observed stylistic differences between the *Madonna with Jan Vos* in the Frick Collection, and the version in Berlin. Petrus Christus almost certainly had no hand in the former painting, but only made a variant copy after it about 1450.

Petrus Christus's first contacts with the Carthusian monastery Genadedal must be situated a couple of years earlier. In 1446, he painted the *Portrait of a Carthusian* (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art) (Pl. 98).¹²⁸ The identity of the man who sat for this portrait is unknown. The fine golden halo around his head, suggesting he was a saint, is probably a later addition.¹²⁹ He was a Carthusian lay brother, and not a monk. The *monachi*, or monks, of whom there were about fifteen per monastery, wore a white habit with a hood and white strips at the hips. They were clean-shaven and had a tonsure. The portraits of Jan Vos show very clearly this hairstyle and outfit. Lay brethren were dressed in a white habit, that was shorter than that of the monks, and without the strips.¹³⁰ They had

¹²⁸ New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Jules S. Bache Collection, inv. L442319; tempera and oil on panel, 29.2 x 18.7; signed and dated on bottom of original frame: *PETRVS . XPI . ME . FECIT . A^o 1446*; see Friedländer (as in n. 16), I, 1924, 82; A. Burroughs, *Art Criticism from a Laboratory*, Boston, 1938, 249; Schöne (as in n. 106), 1938, 56, no.4; H.B. Wehle, M. Salinger, *The Metropolitan Museum of Art. A Catalogue of Early Flemish, Dutch and German Paintings*, New York, 1947, 17-19; Panofsky (as in n. 16), 310, 312, 488 (310, n.5); H.J.J. Scholtens, "Petrus Christus en zijn portret van een Kartuizer," *Oud Holland*, LXXV/2 (1960), 59-72.; J. Folie, "Les oeuvres authentifiées des primitifs flamands," *Koninklijk Instituut voor het Kunstpatrimonium Bulletin*, VI (1963), 204-205, pl. 13; Friedländer (as in n. 16), I, 1967, 82; Schabacker (as in n. 16), 81-83, cat. 3; Snyder (as in n. 105), 152; G. Bauman, *Early Flemish Portraits, 1425-1525*, (reprint from *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, Spring 1986), New York, 1986; J. Snyder (intro.), *The Metropolitan Museum of Art: The Renaissance in the North*, New York, 1987, 26-27.

¹²⁹ Schabacker (as in n. 16), 82.

no tonsure, wore a beard, and shaved the upper and lower lip. There was only one lay brother for each three monks in a charterhouse.

Scholtens pointed out that among the lay brethren of Genadedal, only four qualify as likely candidates for this portrait.¹³¹ However, none of them can be positively identified as the sitter. Still he suggested, the work may have been commissioned by the family of the lay brother at the time of his profession.¹³²

Three important surviving paintings relate to the Carthusian monastery Genadedal. It would be inaccurate to conclude on this basis only, that this institution was more important as a cultural center than any other convent in the city. Nevertheless, the paintings and manuscript production at Genadedal, as well as the fact that some of its priors became respected writers, and the interest it attracted of the ducal family, indicate that it did achieve considerable cultural stature.

6. The Cistercians of the Duinen Abbey

Strictly speaking, the Cistercian Abbeys of De Duinen and Ter Doest fall outside the boundaries of this study, since they were located well outside the city walls of Bruges. De Duinen ('the Dunes') was situated near the coast in Koksijde some 27 miles from Bruges; its daughter abbey of Ter Doest in Lissewege about 7 miles away. Nevertheless, these abbeys were the main cultural centers of

¹³⁰ Scholtens (as in n. 93), 1940-46, 139-141. In the fifteenth century, charterhouses were populated by five different groups of people, all differentiated by their dress and hairstyle. Beside monks and lay brethren, there were also *clerici redditii*, *laici redditii*, and *prebendarii*. The *clerici redditii* wore the same habit as monks, but without the strips. They were subject to a less strict rule. Only very exceptional people were allowed to the status of *clericus redditus*. Pieter II Adomes was one. *Laici redditii* were uncommon at the monastery. Their rule was less severe than that of lay brethren, although they were lay brethren too. They dressed in a brown habit, and wore no beard. The *prebendarii* were lay persons, who lived in the monastery after having made endowments. They wore regular lay clothing.

¹³¹ Scholtens (as in n. 128), 69. He suggested the names of Adam Mullinc, Jacob Deynart, Jan de Pape, and Jan Collarits.

¹³² *Ibid.*