

derbücher einmal mehr schmerzlich bewußt macht. Es bleibt zu hoffen, daß Richards Arbeit ungeachtet dessen über den englischen Sprachraum hinaus – für den der Autor sie ausdrücklich geschrieben haben will – zu einem Standardwerk wird, dessen nicht immer pointiert vorgebrachter methodischer Ansatz sich durch überzeugende Ergebnisse selbst rechtfertigt.

MICHAELA KRIEGER
Institut für Kunstgeschichte
Universität Wien

Wilhelm Koehler und Florentine Mütherich: Die karolingischen Miniaturen; Bd. 6: Die Schule von Reims; Teil 2: Von der Mitte bis zum Ende des 9. Jahrhunderts (*Denkmäler Deutscher Kunst*); Berlin: Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft 1999; 243 S.; Bildtafeln 222–300 (als Beilage); ISBN 3-87157-158-X; € 299,-

Commissioned by the Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, Wilhelm Koehler began to collect material for a corpus of Carolingian manuscript illumination nearly a century ago. The First World War interrupted his work; the first installment of *Die karolingischen Miniaturen* appeared only in the early 1930s. Because of its ambition and holistic approach to illuminated books, it is one of the monuments of medieval art history. Comprising 785 pages of text in two volumes and a portfolio of 123 plates measuring 49 X 38 cms., *Die Schule von Tours* assembles sixty decorated manuscripts on the basis of layout, palaeography, ornament, text variants, and style, describes them in detail, and relates them to the unfolding histories of the monasteries of St. Martin's and Maursmünster/Marmoutier. It also studies in detail the artistic and literary sources of the Touronian books. *Die Schule von Tours* remained the sole volume of the corpus published for a quarter century; its cover is embossed with the swastika and, by the time it was finished, Koehler had already departed Germany to assume a position at Harvard University. Volume II, devoted to Charlemagne's „Hofschule“, appeared only in 1958, half a century after Koehler had begun his work; and Volume III, which treats a second group of illuminated manuscripts from Charlemagne's orbit (the „Palace School“) and books produced at Metz, was published posthumously two years later. Despite the centrality of the subjects of these volumes, they mark a radical diminution of the project. The format adheres to the original conception, but the analytical texts are reduced and the descriptive catalogues and plates, rather than detailed contextual analyses, are their cores. When Florentine Mütherich, who had assisted Koehler prepare these volumes, took over the corpus, she adhered to the more modest plan. The text of Volume IV (1971), devoted to manuscripts associated with Lothar's domain and three isolated books, is but 100 pages; and Volume V (1982), dedicated to the court school of Charles the Bald, is only twice that long.

At first glance, Volume VI would seem to return to Koehler's original concept.

Two volumes (1994 and 1999) comprise 400 pages of text; and the portfolio, divided into three enormous fascicles, contains three hundred plates. In fact, however, *Die Schule von Reims* adheres to the schema adopted since 1958; its magnitude reflects the exceptional success and survival of its subject material rather than a resumption of Koehler's initial expansive approach. Indeed, it would have to, for unlike the scriptoria at Tours, which flourished for only half a century (as a center of book illumination, half that long), and in contrast to the court workshops which depended on royal patronage, the monasteries in Rheims were productive throughout the Carolingian period and were responsible for many of the most remarkable illustrated books of the period, not only the magnificent Ebbo Gospels (Epernay, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS. 1) and Bern Physiologus (Burgerbibliothek, MS. 318), but also the Utrecht Psalter (Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS. 32) and the San Paolo Bible (Rome, Monastery of San Paolo f. l. m.).

As Koehler had already done in his study of the Touronian books, Florentine Mütterich organizes Volume VI around the dominant ecclesiastic figures in Rheims. In the first part, she divides the manuscripts between those linked to Ebbo (816–835, 840–41) and those associated with his predecessors; in Part 2, Hincmar (845–882) is taken to be the dominant force. Several manuscripts can, in fact, be directly associated with each of the central figures; but, as both men were archbishops and the manuscripts certainly the products of monastic scriptoria, the relationship between the ornamented books and Ebbo and Hincmar is not necessarily direct. A dedicatory poem in the key Gospel book in Epernay leaves no doubt that it was commissioned by Ebbo for use at the abbey of Hautvillers where a certain Peter was abbot. Hincmar, on the other hand, was not only archbishop but also the abbot of two local monasteries, St. Thierry and St. Remi; and it is not surprising that manuscripts associated with him fall into distinct groups which Mütterich assigns to the several monastic centers. Even in the case of the Gospels of St. Thierry (Rheims, Bib. Municipale, Ms. 7), precise localization must remain open; an inscription assures that Hincmar commissioned the book *for* the monastery, not necessarily *at* it.

Filling in the gaps between the few well-anchored books is even more complicated. Whereas, Koehler-Mütterich's comprehensive approach to manuscript study greatly clarifies the history of Rheims illustration, it leaves open numerous questions. First, given the close demonstrable connections between the earlier „Ebbo“ manuscripts and the later „Hincmar“ books, how are the roles of patronage and workshop continuity to be assessed? Second, is the idea of artistic „development“ that underlies Mütterich's chronology really sustainable? Celia Chazelle's recent ascription of the Utrecht Psalter to Hincmar's archiepiscopacy¹ signals that the datings set forth in *Die Schule von Reims*, though meticulous and well-reasoned, remain fluid. Third, if the chronology is less certain than Mütterich proposes, what happens to the relationships she suggests between the artistic products of Rheims and other Carolingian

1 CELIA CHAZELLE: Archbishop Ebo and Hincmar of Reims and the Utrecht Psalter, in: *Speculum* 72, 1997, pp. 105 ff.

works? Florentine Mutherich maintains that Rheims became the fountainhead of Carolingian classicism following the disbandment of Charlemagne's and Lothar's scriptoria; in fact, it was the animated, sometimes frenetic, *reinterpretation* of the Late Antique models that seems to have attracted illuminators and ivory carvers in other Carolingian centers to Rheims works. (Because the essentially anti-classical Rheims style conforms to modern ideas of medieval spiritualization and ornamentation, it is consistently given priority in histories of Carolingian art.) The publication of *Die Schule von Reims* will enable scholars to reassess Rheims's impact during the ninth-century and later. Finally, and most important, what were the intellectual contexts of the Rheims production? The long debate over the extent to which the Utrecht Psalter is or is not a facsimile of a Late Antique manuscript has, in recent years, yielded to a discussion of the contemporary theological concepts embodied in this, the most famous of all Carolingian works.² And, in the work of William Diebold³, Joachim Gaehde⁴, Peter Low⁵, Archer St. Clair⁶, and Nikolaus Staubach⁷, the San Paolo Bible has emerged, not only as the culmination of Carolingian illumination, but also as a sophisticated document of political and exegetic invention in images.

Happily, by setting out the evidence in a clear, lean, and reliable fashion, Volume VI of *Die karolingischen Miniaturen* provides the foundation for further interpretive studies, avoiding the risk inherent in any corpus project that its very comprehensiveness will close down, rather than stimulate, discussion.

Presumably, the publication of *Die karolingischen Miniaturen* will continue. Treatment of one of the least-known and most problematic groups of ornamented ninth-century manuscripts, the so-called Franco-Saxon school, is planned; and many other manuscripts still need comprehensive publication. Nonetheless, the volume devoted to Rheims raises a fundamental question: is the project outmoded, a relic of early twentieth-century positivism and technology? Clearly, it was only to satisfy the structural imperative of the corpus that the illustrations of the Utrecht Psalter were included; not only were they already published in facsimiles in 1875, 1932, and (in full color) 1984⁸,

2 For instance, ROBERT DESHMAN: *The Benedictional of Aethelwold*; Princeton 1995; MIDORI TSUZUMI: *Reflection of the Utrecht Psalter in Carolingian Art*, in: *Studies in Aesthetics and Art History* 16, 1998, pp. 1 ff.; CELIA CHAZELLE: *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Art. Theology and Art of Christ's Passion*; Cambridge 2001.

3 WILLIAM DIEBOLD: *The Ruler Portrait of Charles the Bald in the S. Paolo Bible*, in: *Art Bulletin* 76, 1994, pp. 16 ff.

4 JOACHIM GAEBDE: *Bibbia di San Paolo fuori le mura*; Rome 1993.

5 PETER LOW: *The City Refigured. A Pentacostal Jerusalem in the San Paolo Bible*, in: *The Real and Ideal Jerusalem in Jewish, Christian and Islamic Art. Studies in Honor of Bezalel Narkiss on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*; ed. Bianca Kühnel; Jerusalem 1998, pp. 265 ff.

6 ARCHER ST. CLAIR: *Narrative Exegesis in the Exodus Illustrations of the San Paolo Bible: Aspects of Byzantine Influence*, in: *Byzantine East, Latin West: Art Historical Studies in Honor of Kurt Weitzmann*; Princeton 1995, pp. 193 ff.

7 NIKOLAUS STAUBACH: *Rex Christianus. Hofkultur und Herrschaftspropaganda im Reich Karls des Kahlen*; Köln 1993.

8 KOERT VAN DER HORST (Comm.): *Der Utrecht-Psalter. Vollständige Faksimile-Ausgabe im Originalformat der Handschrift 32 aus dem Besitz der Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht*; 2 voll. Graz 1984.

but it is now available on a CD-Rom⁹. The same question can be asked about the three other major manuscripts included in these tomes. A facsimile of the Bern Physiologus was issued in 1964¹⁰; the miniatures of the Paris Terence have long been available¹¹; and the entire San Paolo Bible been made accessible in a spectacular facsimile with and important accompanying commentary¹². To be sure, very few libraries have the resources to acquire the latter; but any serious student of the Rheims illumination, even those with access to the Koehler/Mütherich corpus, will want to consult its color reproductions. This is not to question the value of Koehler and Mütherich's truly extraordinary achievement. It is only to ask, at the beginning of a new century, whether the photographic revolution that enabled the construction of *Die karolingischen Miniaturen* should not now yield, at least to some extent, to forms of publication and technologies that render the texts and adornment available in color and that provide developed ways for comparing and indexing the materials.

HERBERT L. KESSLER

*The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore*

-
- 9 The Utrecht Psalter. Picturing the Psalms of David; CD-Rom Utrecht 1996.
 10 Physiologus Bernensis. Voll-Faksimile-Ausgabe des Codex Bongarsianus 318 der Burgerbibliothek Bern, ed. Chr. von Steiger and O. Homburger; Basel 1964.
 11 LESLIE W. JONES and CHARLES R. MOREY: The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence; Princeton 1931.
 12 ALESSANDRO PRATESI (ed.): *Bibbia di San Paolo fuori le mura*; 2 voll. Rome 1993.

Karin-Edis Barzman: The Florentine Academy and the Early Modern State.
 The Discipline of *Disegno*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2000; xii + 377 S., 24 SW-Abb.; ISBN 0-521-64162-4; \$ 75.–

During the period from its very earliest conception until the late eighteenth century, the Florentine Academy del Disegno has been an institution that wanted to be at the same time a place for proper artistic education, as well as an expression of Florentine political and cultural hegemony. It is the relation between these two aspects that Karin-Edis Barzman has sought to clarify by means of an in-depth study of the Accademia through its archives. It has brought her, and will surely bring the reader, a new understanding of the general phenomenon of early modern academies – not least of all, because the Florentine institution was taken in 1648 as an example for the newly opened Académie Royale in Paris, and others to follow throughout Europe. The complex structure of the Università, Compagnia et Accademia del Disegno – its official title after 1584 – and its changing relations with Florentine government partially resist the approach chosen by the author. Projecting the Accademia within early modern power-relations between the individual and the state, as expressed in the theory on discourse by Michel Foucault, it runs the risk of being flattened to a mere organ of the secular Tuscan state. Although the book certainly makes this point, and thus adjusts