

tion fertigten. Da solche Tafeln der privaten Andacht dienten, bestand offensichtlich ein reger Markt dafür. Besondere Aufmerksamkeit widmete Freuler der aus der Dreikönigskapelle des Sieneser Doms stammenden Anbetungstafel des Bartolo di Fredi (Siena).

Er identifizierte den Stifter mit Francesco di Tato Tolomei. Sein Familienzweig war 1360 aus Siena verbannt worden und hatte erst 1385 zurückkehren dürfen. F. sieht in der figurenreichen und prachtvollen Darstellung des Magierzuges im Bildhintergrund ein Echo der pompös gefeierten Rückkehr der Tolomei und datiert deshalb das Bild in die Jahre 1385/89.

Gail Solberg (Florenz) wies auf das Phänomen der Anpassung eines Künstlers an regionale Traditionen hin. Bei der Analyse von vergleichsweise gut dokumentierten Altarwerken des Taddeo di Bartolo stellte sich heraus, daß seine Auftraggeber zwischen Pisa und Orte offensichtlich in erster Linie an der Qualität

seiner Malerei interessiert waren. S. zeigte auf, daß Taddeo seine Altarbilder bezüglich äußerer Form und Ikonographie mit erstaunlicher Konsequenz den regionalen Traditionen anpaßt, ohne seinen persönlichen Malstil zu ändern. Als augenfälliges Beispiel nannte sie den in Fragmenten erhaltenen Altar für S. Francesco al Prato in Perugia, den Taddeo in – wie Dillian Gordon zuvor ausgeführt hatte – typisch umbrischer Manier doppelseitig gestaltet hatte.

Ergänzt wurde das Vortragsprogramm durch einen von Marco Ciatti geleiteten Besuch der Redner in der Restaurierungsstätte der Fortezza da Basso. Einziges Ärgernis bei diesem Kongreß: die vorgegebenen Redezeiten wurden nicht durchweg respektiert. Bei einer Überziehung bis zu 100% der anberaumten 30 Minuten beschleicht den Zuhörer manchmal der Verdacht, daß der gleiche Beitrag noch zu einer anderweitigen, vermutlich abendfüllenden Verwendung gedacht sein könnte.

Almut Stolte

Italian Panel Painting in the Dugento and Trecento

Symposium, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., October 16, 1998

Trecento panel painting has a long and distinguished history of brilliant stylistic analysis. In recent years, stylistic analysis has come to include scrutiny of not only the painted surface, but the structure and carpentry of individual panels as well as altarpiece ensembles. The one-day long symposium held on October 16, 1998, at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., under the auspices of the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, brought together a group of eight papers that – albeit somewhat tentatively – worked at moving beyond stylistic analysis and infusing the field with new approaches.

Hayden B. J. Maginnis, who has contributed to the assessment of Trecento painting in so many ways, spoke early in the day's

proceedings, delivering what might be considered – although it was not billed as such – a keynote address. Maginnis has for a long time eloquently urged a re-thinking of the terms with which scholars deal with Central Italian painting in its great formative period of the late 13th and 14th centuries. Here he carried his plea further. Under the title 'Everything in a Name?: The Classification of Sienese Dugento Painting,' Maginnis took up the discussion where discussions of Sienese painting have so often begun: with the partially repainted Guido da Siena Enthroned Virgin and Child from the high altar of the church of S. Domenico in Siena, now in the Palazzo Pubblico, with its misleading and much-discussed date of 1221. He considered the S. Domenico Madonna together with the

group of Guido-attributed works traditionally clustered around it. Using related works in the Siena Pinacoteca, Maginnis argued that in fact there was no reason to single out the works assigned to Guido — if the attribution was even in all cases correct — as ground-breaking works. For Maginnis, the poses and architectural enframements seen by art historians as the innovations of Guido belong instead to a common vocabulary used by Sienese painters of varying skills. In questioning the primacy given to Guido, Maginnis was, in fact, explicitly questioning the classification system used by the great doyen of Trecento painting studies, Richard Offner, in which the ‘name’ artist was presented as the source of new ideas, with related but weaker works given to assistants and followers in a rigorous hierarchical system. Offner’s orderly classification system, which rules over his great *Corpus*, was then replicated on a smaller scale, Maginnis argued, when Stubblebine — thoroughly within the Offner mode (Offner was his teacher) — came to deal with the problem of the S. Domenico Virgin and Child and associated works in his Guido da Siena monograph of 1958. Maginnis had a modest alternative to propose: a consortium of ‘essentially independent’ painters, who came together in partnership and distributed commissions among themselves — with the results being similarity of types combined with diversity of style. What was significant here was not so much the conclusions — which had a certain logic to them but did not command instant acceptance — but the courage and independence of approach that Maginnis demonstrated in going to the heart of a methodology that has long ruled Trecento painting. Or as Maginnis unequivocally put it: ‘The old categories are unhelpful.’ Audience reaction to Maginnis’ presentation was surprisingly low-key. One was left with the distinct impression that Trecento scholars are not quite ready yet to tackle the

historiography of their field in the trenchant way that Maginnis calls for.

The most ambitious, even if not entirely successful, presentation of the symposium was given by *Lars Jones*, a graduate student from Harvard University, entitled ‘*Visio Divina?* Donor Figures and Representations of Imagistic Devotion: The Case of Bernardo Daddi’s *Vergine da Bagnuolo*.’ The goal here was to enlarge the discourse of Trecento painting by examining one very provocative and mysterious panel, Bernardo Daddi’s (a number of scholars, following Offner, prefer to see it as a Daddi follower) half-length gesturing Virgin with donors and saints in the Museo dell’Opera del Duomo, Florence, dated by inscription to February 25, 1334 (modern style: 1335). Jones’ starting point was to establish an analogy to stages of contemplation as laid down in the *lectio divina*, where the visual image serves to spark a mystical experience that ultimately leads the devout beholder to transcendence of the material object.

Jones then argued for a reverse kind of mystical journey, where the devout meditation would not transcend the image but call the image into being. Instead of a *lectio divina* there would take place a *visio divina* — a ‘spiritual seeing.’

A holy presence — in this case the Virgin — would be brought into actual ‘physical presence’ by the intense contemplative efforts of the beholder. Of use here would have been consideration of the concept of divine presence in Byzantine and Byzantine replication pieces coming into Italy in rather large numbers from at least the 12th century on — material dealt with in quite full detail by Hans Belting. This quite daring effort to enter into new territory came across as a something of a high-wire act without a net. Jones’ courage in setting forth what was, ultimately, an unprovable thesis earned him some admiration among members of the audience, but there was also irritation at a presentation

that stood so completely in the realm of theory — and this in a field that has always given primacy to the object.

As a counter to Jones' ambitious but only partially developed effort to enlarge the field of inquiry of Trecento panel painting can be placed the thoughtful and suggestive paper, drawing many kinds of evidence into the argument, by *David Wilkins*, 'Transformations in Images for Domestic Devotion in Tuscany, 1250 to 1500.' Wilkins focused on one particular type of Trecento production, the triptych. There has been much important work done on 15th-century domestic settings, but surprisingly little attention has been devoted to this subject in the Trecento. Wilkins gave a fascinating picture of the extent of triptych production in Florence in the period 1320-1350. He then went on to discuss the ways in which the triptych, 'having to be opened to be activated,' established through the touching a special relationship between the sacred object and the viewer, and at the same time, opening out into the space in which it was displayed, created a defined holy space within the domestic setting.

Something of a companion piece to Wilkins in focusing on categories of production was provided by *Michel Laclotte*, 'Observations sur certains polyptyques et *'altaroli'* d'Ambrogio Lorenzetti.' Deliberately moving the discussion away from the issue of autograph production, Laclotte aimed at opening up our view of Ambrogio by taking into consideration works of partial autograph status as well as works in questionable condition. His goal was to bring attention to Ambrogio Lorenzetti's activity, in the first instance, in the area of small portable altarpieces — *'altaroli.'* Discussion of this type of production has usually focused on Duccio and his associates. Laclotte made a good case for the importance of Ambrogio. Extremely interesting, even if problematical, works were brought forward, works that are not usually discussed. These included a Crucifixion in a

private collection in Italy, and the strange and oddly compelling Crucifixion with Nativity and Saints in the Städelches Kunstinstitut in Frankfurt. The use of narrative *'altaroli'* as adjuncts to larger images was also broached. In the second part of his talk, Laclotte took up quite a different issue: Ambrogio Lorenzetti's activity in the production of monumental altarpieces with half-length figures. As no complete altarpieces by Ambrogio in this format survive, this part of the presentation also leaned heavily on isolated panels. But this section of the talk featured a sensation that riveted the audience, and for many may have been the high point of the proceedings: the first public presentation of an isolated half-length Virgin and Child panel acquired by the Louvre in 1998, shown to the audience in its unrestored state — 'still in its juice,' as Laclotte put it. The panel comes from a French private collection where it has been since the mid-19th century. The frame is partially modern, but the high gable above the Virgin and Child — showing a Crucifixion — is intact. Judging from the slides, this is a work of exceptional quality. The very active Christ child, with a wonderful head of classical curls, particularly commands attention. The work should clearly come early rather than later in Ambrogio's career; Laclotte would place it, tentatively at this point, in the mid-1330s. With this piece, Laclotte's proposal of Ambrogio's activity in altarpieces with half-length figures suddenly gained resounding authority.

Luciano Bellosi turned his attention to another of the touchstones of Trecento painting, Duccio's Rucellai Madonna from S. Maria Novella in Florence, since 1948 part of the Uffizi collections. Here the approach was to raise the question of where the work was originally located in the church — a question that much of the literature on the piece has conveniently sidestepped. Bellosi effectively detached the work from the space of the Confraternity of the Laudesi,

emphasizing that the Confraternity had paid for the work, but not necessarily for their own use. Bellosi endorsed the idea that the painting need not have been displayed at an altar as long as it had prominent display of a kind that would allow it to make a strong impact within the space of the church. This was a presentation that worked out of a generous art historical stance: the issues laid out, possibilities proposed, but no nailing down the lid of further discussion.

Julian Gardner offered a paper that had hints of the broad vision of Maginnis' presentation, in this case dealing with the methodology of analyzing individual works rather than with large systems of classification. The organization of his paper was somewhat discursive — which to a degree blunted the methodological impact of his presentation. It was eminently clear, nonetheless, that Gardner has thought long and hard about attributional approaches to Trecento painting, and sees the answer in a combination of approaches. Under the title 'Giotto in America (and Elsewhere),' Gardner aimed at providing a more solid basis for judging two controversial works in American public collections that, with varying degrees of acceptance, have been given to Giotto. The first was the five-part polyptych, in a rather off-putting modern frame, in the North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh, N. C. The work presents a blessing Christ as Saviour at the center, the raised blessing hand clearly showing stigmata, and among its saints, Francis at the far right. In dealing with the work, Gardner touched on the issue of original location (the inclusion of the Saint Francis giving strong indication of origin in a Franciscan church), the issue of cognate works, with an important discussion of carpentry (the key comparative example being the five-part polyptych in the Badia, which retains its original frame), and the issue of iconography. This last category of analysis has always been one of Gardner's strengths. In a tantalizingly condensed argument, he held

out to the audience the possibility that this altarpiece may represent an intriguing importation into the polyptych format of essential elements from such great apse compositions as the mystical Saviour in a Deësis context from the apse of S. Giovanni in Laterano. Gardner refrained from giving a definitive opinion regarding the autograph status of the Raleigh piece, but the tenor of his remarks indicated something close to full acceptance of the piece as, at least, Giotto workshop, with a dating of ca. 1315. The second American 'Giotto' tackled by Gardner was the single Virgin and Child panel, the Virgin as a half-length figure, on view in the National Gallery in Washington, almost certainly once part of a five-panel polyptych, and thus in format closely related to the Raleigh polyptych. Here Gardner was unequivocal in giving the work to Giotto and bestowing on it autograph status, with a date of about 1320 or shortly before — in other words, close in date to the Bardi Chapel. Gardner gave particular attention to the very beautiful motif of the Virgin rather delicately holding a white rose by its stem between her thumb and index finger, while the Christ child, reaching out to grasp it, pushes his fingers deep into the thorny leaves. Gardner emphasized the Northern, and particularly French, use of the Virgin-with-rose motif, and proposed this as another example of Giotto's close looking at what was being done on the other side of the Alps.

Miklós Boskovits was the single speaker of the day to ground his paper almost exclusively in the familiar territory of stylistic analysis. Entitled 'The Baptistry Mosaics and the Painters of Florence,' the paper had as one of its functions the announcement of the author's project to subject the mosaics of the Baptistry of Florence to a new and thorough-going stylistic analysis. In this preliminary presentation of his material he focused on making stylistic connections between sections of the mosaics and Florentine panel painting



Abb. 1 Paolo Veneziano, painted lunette from the tomb of Doge Francesco Dandolo (d. 1339), chapter House, S. Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice (lunette now located in Sacristy of Frari; O. Böhm, Venezia, 13823)

around the middle of the 13th century and slightly later. In contrast to scholars who have pointed to Coppo di Marcovaldo as the major artistic presence in the work, Boskovits gave prominence to the rather shadowy artistic personality of Meliore. Boskovits' announced aim was to use a network of comparison in order to establish a more precise chronological picture of the execution of the parts of the dome. The goal is an intriguing one; the material presented at the symposium should be considered as a preliminary stage to the full analysis.

Victor Schmidt had the interesting idea of bringing together a small but significant group of lunette-shaped panels, of Trecento manufacture, with a few 15th-century

examples included. Entitled 'The Lunette-shaped Panel and Some Characteristics of Panel Painting,' Schmidt's investigation of the type showed it to be used exclusively in architectural settings, in particular above doors or as part of a tomb complex. These are precisely the settings where a long tradition argues for the use of relief sculpture or — especially in Rome — mosaic. Schmidt made an extremely convincing case for the splendour of the 'material effect' that could be achieved in panel painting. In contrast to sculpture or even mosaic, the splashy, brilliantly vivid impact that could be obtained in panel painting recommended it to patrons who were particularly alert to coloristic effects (Abb. 1).

What was missing? One piece of the discourse that was missing from the day's proceedings was a report from the conservator's laboratory. While issues of restoration surfaced parenthetically in a number of presentations, there was no specialist on hand to demonstrate in detail the kinds of information that laboratory analysis has been providing. This seemed especially ironic in a symposium held at the National Gallery, where there is a premier conservation department, and where much work on early panel painting has been undertaken and carefully published in recent years.

Another missing piece: historiography. This area of inquiry was, apart from Maginnis, not very much in evidence. Almost all of the

speakers seemed to be highly conscious of the need to enlarge the nature of the discussion of Dugento and Trecento painting. This was admirable. Yet one would have welcomed a more direct confrontation at placing the contributions of the symposium within the larger scheme of the historical development of the field.

A question along these lines was raised towards the end of the conference, asking, essentially, for a defining of the present 'state of the art' of the field — a question that was left unanswered. One looks to the forthcoming publication of the papers and the introduction by the editor, Victor Schmidt, to put some of the issues of the individual contributions into a larger perspective.

Debra Pincus

THOMAS LUDWIG, OTTO MÜLLER, IRMGARD WIDDRA-SPIESS

Die Einhards-Basilika in Steinbach bei Michelstadt im Odenwald

Mit Beiträgen von Suzanne Beeh-Lustenberger, Holger Göldner, Wolfgang Heß und Friedrich Knöpp. Hrsg. vom Landesamt für Denkmalpflege Hessen unter Mitwirkung der Einhard-Arbeitsgemeinschaft e. V. Mainz, Philipp von Zabern 1996. Textbd. X und 287 S. mit 121 Abb., Tafelbd. 16 S. Text, 124 Fototaf., 34 meist gefaltete Tafeln mit Zeichnungen, 2 Beilagen. DM 380,—. ISBN 3-8053-1322-5

Eines der bedeutendsten Denkmäler der deutschen Baugeschichte hat eine groß angelegte und würdig ausgestattete Monographie erhalten. Ihren Kernbestand bildet die lebenslange Arbeit von Otto Müller, dem Kunsthistoriker und später in diesem Gebiet tätigen Denkmalpfleger, der bereits 1935 eine Dissertation über den Bau abschloß und in den seither vergangenen Jahrzehnten die Dokumentation und Forschung im Hinblick auf die umfassende Publikation weiterführte. Thomas Ludwig, von seiner Ausbildung her Architekt und Bauforscher, ist es zu verdanken, daß der in langer Zeit angewachsene Bestand von Manuskripten, Aufmessungen und z. T. hervorragenden Fotos für die Publikation durchgearbeitet und

ergänzt wurde. Irmgard Widdra-Spieß trug den Bericht über die 1968 bis 1973 durchgeführten Grabungen bei. Eine besondere Hervorhebung verdient die verlegerische Darbietung in zwei repräsentativen Bänden mit sorgfältigem Satz und Druck — fast ohne spürbare Druckfehler — und hervorragender Abbildungsqualität, beides in diesem für einen begrenzten Nutzerkreis bestimmten Buchgenre heutzutage eine Seltenheit.

Einleitend bettet Ludwig die Einhard-Gründung in das geographische und historische Umfeld seit den Tagen der Römerherrschaft ein und begründet seine Datierung des Baubeginns erst in die Jahre 823/24. Im folgenden Beitrag berichtet Friedrich Knöpp über die