

gnomie, Gestik, Kleidung und Accessoire zum Forschungsgegenstand geworden. Fotografie ist von ihren ersten Anfängen an ein unerschöpflicher Spiegel individueller wie öffentlicher Selbstdarstellung und Selbstwahrnehmung des modernen Menschen, so daß eine Wissenschaft der menschlichen Verhaltens- und Empfindungsformen, soweit diese kulturell verbindlich geworden sind, hier zu beginnen hätte. Letztlich (die hier aufgezählten Gesichtspunkte sind zwangsläufig sehr unvollständig) ist Kunstgeschichte zumindest ihrer Erfahrung nach wohl zuständig für das Wissen über die Geschichte der ästhetischen Rezeption und des sozialen Gebrauchs des Phänomens „Bild“ — bis hin zu seiner Funktion als Sammel-, Schmuck-, Geschenks- oder Verehrungsgegenstand. Sollten sich daher die auf den „Frankfurter Fotogesprächen“ fruchtbar entwickelten Bemühungen um Definition einer neuen „Fotowissenschaft“ verdichten, so wäre die Kunstgeschichte aufgerufen, Beiträge zu leisten. Sie dürften nicht ohne Rückgewinn bleiben.

Andreas Haus

REZENSIONEN

SUZY DUFRENNE, *Les illustrations du Psautier d'Utrecht. Sources et apport carolingien*, Paris, Ed. Ophrys 1978 (Association des Publications près les Universités de Strasbourg, Facs. 161)

This book opens an important new chapter in the historiography of the famous illustrated Carolingian psalter manuscript in the University Library at Utrecht (Ms. 32), last reviewed by J. H. A. Engelbrecht in 1965 (*Het Utrechts Psalterium, Een eeuw wetenschappelijke Bestudering [1860—1960]*, Utrecht, 1965. See also the review of this book by R. Hausserr in *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 1966, pp. 173—175). Mlle. Dufrenne's is the most systematic and exhaustive study ever devoted to the fundamental questions which have vexed generations of scholars: to what extent are the manuscript's 166 pen drawings independent achievements of the artists working at the abbey of Hautvillers near Reims between 816 and 835 ? ; to what extent are they copies from an earlier source or sources ? ; and what was the date and provenance of these sources?

The book is divided into three parts. The first part, entitled *L'Illustration du Texte* (pp. 25—68), deals with the relationship between text and image in early medieval psalter illustration in general and the Utrecht Psalter in particular. A separately published concordance of fifteen psalters, two Latin, ten Greek and three Slavic, each of their images briefly described and juxtaposed to the text they illustrate, provides the basis for the study by revealing patterns in the choice, nature and frequency of subject matter in early psalter illustration (S. Dufrenne, *Tableaux Synoptiques de 15 Psautiers médiévaux à Illustrations intégrales issues du Texte*, Paris, Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique, 1978).



*Abb. 1 Bryn Athyn, Glencairn Museum
Gewändefigur aus Saint-Thibaut in
Provins. 3. Viertel 12. Jh.*



Abb. 2 Pisces. Rundscheibe. Frühes 13. Jh.? Deutscher Privatbesitz



Abb. 3 Bryn Athyn, Glencairn Museum. Stehende Muttergottes. Spätes 13. Jh.



Abb. 4 Bryn Athyn, Glencairn Museum. Apostel. Im Stil des 13. Jhs.

Numerous parallels between the imagery of the psalters testify to their relationship and to a common origin for many of their illustrations while also disclosing specific traditions beyond the marked individuality of each manuscript. Confirming the earlier observations of F. Mütterich that the translation of the text into „literal“ pictures is the oldest tradition („Die verschiedenen Bedeutungsschichten in der frühmittelalterlichen Psalterillustration“, *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 1972, pp. 232—244), Mlle. Dufrenne's analysis of this method of illustration in which figures of speech are turned into images, shows that the frequent repetition of motifs, particularly in the Utrecht Psalter, are due to a relative dearth of available pictorial formulae rather than to the constant reiteration of themes in the rich verbal poetry of the psalms.

The predominant use of „literal“ imagery in the Utrecht Psalter distinguishes this manuscript from the Byzantine psalters where much more frequent hagiographic and christological interpretations link psalm passages to specific events in the history of salvation. As one example among many, psalm 8,3 „Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength“ is in the Utrecht Psalter depicted by a group of children praising God, whereas the eastern psalters represent this verse by an illustration of Christ entering Jerusalem, a shift owed to the influence of patristic exegesis.

Some traces of the „literal“ approach to illustration are preserved in the Carolingian psalter in Stuttgart (Landesbibl., Bibl. 23) and some eastern psalters, most notable the 12th century psalter in the Vatican (gr. 1927), the only extant work which, despite iconographical differences, shares with the Utrecht Psalter the assembly of multiple verse illustrations in one picture at the head of each psalm. Despite this relationship which seems to reflect a common archetype, Mlle. Dufrenne discards the hypothesis that the model of the Utrecht Psalter could have been a Byzantine manuscript (A. Goldschmidt, *Der Albani Psalter in Hildesheim*, Berlin, 1895, pp. 11—13; H. Graeven, „Die Vorlage des Utrecht Psalters,“ *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 1898, pp. 28—35) or, according to D. T. Tselos, a 7th to 8th century byzantinizing revision of a late antique work (D. T. Tselos, „Defensive Addenda to the Problem of the Utrecht Psalter,“ *The Art Bulletin* 1967, pp. 334—349).

These initial conclusions are re-enforced by a study of terms illustrated in the Utrecht Psalter alone (In a lengthy footnote on pp. 41—44, the author corrects and amends the text quotations of E. T. DeWald, *The Illustrations of the Utrecht Psalter*, Princeton, 1932. On pp. 57, 66 f. she reduces the number of illustrations dependent on the Hebrew version of the psalter to five from the fifteen adduced by D. Panofsky, „The Textual Basis of the Utrecht Psalter Illustrations,“ *The Art Bulletin* 1943, pp. 50—58).

Whether the terms evoke moral, cosmic or religious meanings or convey more concrete contents, they are all shown to correspond to notions current in late Roman culture and imagery, thus presenting still more evidence for the late antique origin of the model. Furthermore, the author's concordance tables reveal instances of

omissions, abbreviations and condensations of psalm content in the Utrecht Psalter which indicate that the model may have contained an even richer cycle of illustrations.

There are, however, some illustrations which deviate from the norm and suggest Carolingian intervention to the author. The picture to psalm 50, for instance, takes its narrative theme of David's penitence not from the text of the psalm but from its title, a procedure quite common elsewhere, while the drawings to psalm 77, also unique to the Utrecht Psalter, uneasily join images derived from various models to illustrate only the beginning and the end of the psalm. Moreover, pictures to eight psalms contain christological scenes. Mlle. Dufrenne proposes that these were also interpolations by the Carolingian artists just as are some of the illustrations to the canticles at the end of the manuscript. F. Wormald was the first to draw attention to this fact (*The Utrecht Psalter*, Utrecht, 1953) but his arguments are refined by Mlle. Dufrenne who points out that the illustrations of nine canticles take up the „literal“ approach of the manuscript and were part of the psalter model while the pictures to the *Te Deum*, *Gloria*, *Pater Noster*, *Credo* and *Fides Catholica* do, indeed, digress from the general mode of illustration. No doubt remains that these were added by the Carolingian artists who drew on pictorial sources not present in the psalter model while yet maintaining a style of drawing entirely in keeping with the main body of the illustrations. The apocryphal psalm 151, finally, is also shown to be a Carolingian composite derived from a narrative cycle to the Book of Kings. See also S. Dufrenne, „L'Importance des ‚Cantica‘ dans l'étude des sources de l'illustration du psautier d'Utrecht, „*Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France*“ 1976, pp. 149—159.

The second part, entitled *L'Iconographie* (pp. 69—192), confirms the conclusions reached in the first. Greatly enlarging and deepening the iconographical studies of J. J. Tikkanen (*Die Psalterillustration im Mittelalter*, Helsingfors, 1895, pp. 180—297), G. R. Benson and D. T. Tselos „New Light on the Origin of the Utrecht Psalter,“ *The Art Bulletin* 1931, pp. 13—79; D. T. Tselos, „Addenda.“ (see above), Mlle. Dufrenne traces with admirable thoroughness nearly every pictorial formula and motif in the huge repertory of the Utrecht Psalter to earlier art. She intelligently groups the subject matter into a number of categories: iconographical formulae which encompass cosmic and natural elements as well as scenes of daily, public and religious life and into what she terms „iconographic archeology“ consisting of representations of buildings, fortifications, ships, weapons, agricultural tools, vegetation, furniture, musical instruments, etc., down to the minutiae of the figures' garments and hairdress. Each of these categories is fully illustrated in 290 plates which contain 1731 details isolated from the totality of the drawings. In addition, comparative materials are supplied by 119 figures.

The enormous amount of information amassed in this study shows abundantly that many of the Utrecht Psalter's formulae and motifs have no parallel in Carolingian art and that their overwhelming majority directly derives from 4th to 5th century imagery. This should lay to rest, once and for all, the Romantic notion, last

put forward by J. H. A. Engelbrecht, that many of the details in the drawings are eye-witness sketches of contemporary Carolingian life. The renderings of landscapes and of architectural motifs, large or small, clearly reflect antique art while numerous scenes recall Roman representations of family life, of intellectual and pastoral occupations, of crafts, of the pleasures of the hunt — here, in Christian context, turned into images of *vanitas* —and of war, of imperial ceremony and triumph. Animals, depicted with particular acumen, have their counterparts in ancient art as well as in the Carolingian Physiologus manuscript in Berne (Burgerbibl., Cod. 318) which is also a Reimsian production and also indebted to a 4th to 5th century Latin example.

In some instances, images of obvious antique origin are unique to the Utrecht Psalter but cannot be traced to specific pictorial precedents. Such are, for example, the „atlantes“ supporting the *orbis terrae* in the pictures to psalms 81,5; 92,1; 95,10; 98,1;. They certainly illustrate these verses in a „literal“ fashion but this reviewer cannot help wonder why they only occur in a group of drawings he believes to be by one hand while similar passages referring to the „foundations of the earth“, for instance in psalms 17, 8,16; 59,4; 101,26; 103,5, are not illustrated. This raises the question whether at least some of the Carolingian artists were not occasionally apt to introduce pictorial interpretations of verses, not illustrated in the basic psalter model, by drawing on motifs and scenes taken from other sources. As Mlle. Dufrenne contends herself, they were certainly capable of doing so by contributing, without discernible variations of style, christological scenes to the illustrations of psalms 15, 21, 33, 40, 73, 86, 88 and 115, scenes which she suggests to have been taken from an illustrated Gospels of the 6th to the 7th century and, in the case of psalm 33, depicting the martyrdoms of SS. Peter, Paul and Lawrence, perhaps motivated by the intent to emphasize a connection with the Roman devotion accorded these saints.

Part three, *La Forme* (pp. 193—218), is devoted to analyses of the compositions, renderings of space, landscape and figures in the Utrecht Psalter. They support the major conclusion of the first two parts of the book. This reader is persuaded by the arguments for a 4th to 5th century model, similar in style to the famous Vergil manuscript in the Vatican (lat. 3225), although the images of this model will have looked quite different from those of the Utrecht Psalter. In this chapter, however, the author's discussion of the specific problem of the extent of the Carolingian contribution does not penetrate to the core of the problem.

Mlle. Dufrenne admits to a „creative force“ on the part of the Carolingian draftsmen, most evident in the drawings' seeming spontaneity which is the result of a deft and rapid handling of the pen. It is, however, hardly sufficient to explain this phenomenon simply as a „Zeitstil carolingien“ which is superimposed on the model's pictorial structures. This contention bypasses the fundamental problem of the dynamics of creation and ignores the historical question of the origin of the Carolingian style of Reims. One cannot assume that the Utrecht Psalter artists or the painter of the Ebo Gospels (Épernay, Bibl. Mun., Ms. 1) created their vibrant

translations of late antique modes from the models they were „copying“ just then. Their particular idiom must have been formed by the discipline of long training. It can, in fact, be demonstrated that this particular Reimsian language was already nascent in the miniatures of the Gospels preserved at Aachen (Schatzkammer des Münsters) and Brussels (Bibl. Royale, Ms. 18723) produced at the court of Aachen before the death of Charlemagne in 814. Ebo seems to have invited one or more of the court artists to form the nucleus of his „school“ after he became archbishop of Reims in 816.

Nevertheless, there is evidence in the Utrecht Psalter which exposes the artists' different attitudes toward their models. Mlle. Dufrenne rightly considers the illustrations at the beginning of the manuscript, especially from psalm 2 onward, to be more „classical“ in the rendering of figures while most later ones exhibit freer variants of drawing which she characterizes as „baroque“. It is very likely, therefore, that the illustrations in the first gathering of leaves reflect the model's style somewhat better than the rest. Since this „classical“ mode also entails a more „painterly“ approach to drawing, one may well agree with the author that the model contained painted images. Why they were translated into drawings is a question which still needs to be discussed.

Other attempts to reconstruct the physical appearance of the psalter model remain inconclusive although it is perfectly possible that its pictures were on occasion higher in format than in the Utrecht Psalter and that they were framed as the author believes. What is missing from her arguments, however, is a thorough consideration of the practical circumstances of the manuscript's production. There is no doubt that the scribe or scribes were the first to be handed the folio gatherings to lay out and to write the text. The triple columns of rustic script do not repeat the design of the model as R. W. Scheller has confirmed to the reviewer some time ago. The artists had to contend with the spaces left free by the scribes, a situation that led to instances of drawings crowding the text or intruding into spaces reserved for but unoccupied by script. Mlle. Dufrenne believes to have found additional evidence proving the artists' difficulties and insecurities in transposing the compositions of their model to their own pages. She cites instances of light „trial“ sketches on several pages, especially at the beginning of the manuscript. Some of these, however, for instance on fol. 64r, occur between the text columns, or, as on fols. 10v and 11r, they appear on the lower margins defined by the scribes and generally fully respected by the artists. This evidence would contradict the priority of the text and certainly needs to be re-examined in this regard.

Indeed, how is one to envisage the use of the model manuscript in the scriptorium of Hautvillers? Since the artists — whatever their number — seem to have worked more or less simultaneously on the folios assigned to them, must one assume that their precious late antique manuscript was taken apart to supply each of them with the needed number of exemplars or was it displayed in a convenient place for consultation and, perhaps, some preparatory sketches on scrap? As there is no mark of images being traced onto the parchment, either possibility, but the

latter more so, would imply some practical and psychological distance between model picture and Carolingian drawing and this distance would surely have encouraged a more or less free approach to „copying“ according to the general idiom of the „school“ as well as to individual bias. What is at issue is the meaning of the term „copy“ in early medieval art (See H. Swarzenski, „The Role of Copies in the Formation of the Styles of the Eleventh Century“, *Studies in Western Art* [Acts of the Twentieth International Congress of the History of Art], Princeton, 1963, I, pp. 7—18).

Questions of this kind are not raised by Mlle. Dufrenne who also despairs of the feasibility of allocating drawings to individual hands and casts doubt on the divisions suggested by J. J. Tikkanen, *Psalterillustration*, pp. 316—320. Except for some adjustments, this reviewer tends to agree with the Finnish scholar's observations. The judicious use of formal criteria transcending the vagaries of „connoisseurship“ may well allow for attributions which may cast further light on the originality of the Utrecht Psalter draftmen.

However, such study as well as any further research on the Utrecht Psalter will have to contend with Mlle. Dufrenne's formidable book. Her „vue globale“, embracing all the images of the Utrecht Psalter and those of fourteen other psalters as well, has set a standard of scholarship which no longer permits to draw general conclusions from isolated observations.

Joachim E. Gaehde

HANS KÖRNER, *Der früheste deutsche Einblattholzschnitt*. *Studia Iconologica*, hrsg. v. Hermann Bauer und Friedrich Piel, Bd. 3, Mäander Kunstverlag (Mittewald 1979). 188 S., 78 Abb. auf 78 Taf., broschiert.

Die Arbeit ist als Münchner Dissertation bei Hermann Bauer entstanden und von diesem herausgegeben worden. Der Verf. behandelt den „frühesten Holzschnitt“ nach der von Paul Kristeller 1905 vorgenommenen und seitdem als herrschende Meinung übernommenen Einteilung, nach der die Periode des „frühesten Holzschnittes“ in die Zeit zwischen 1400 und 1430 falle und durch eine breite Zeichnung charakterisiert sei. Ihr folge, so die traditionelle Darstellung, eine zweite Periode mit schmalen, von der Feder gezeichneten Strichen und bereits ersten Parallelschraffuren, die gewöhnlich und auch vom Verf. in das 2. Viertel des 15. Jahrhunderts datiert wird. Der Verf. hat, unter dieser Einschränkung, alle wichtigen Holzschnitte der „frühesten“ Periode erfaßt, auch entlegene publizierte und selten genannte. Der überwiegende Teil der 49 von ihm namhaft gemachten Blätter gehört zu den am meisten in der Forschung diskutierten, wie die Literaturlisten im Katalogteil der Arbeit zu erkennen geben. An dem vorzüglichen Abbildungsteil kann man seine Beobachtungen, Urteile und Behauptungen leicht nachprüfen, ein unschätzbare Vorteil, da das Material bisher nicht griffbereit vorlag.