

Otherwise, the thirteen scenes on the north wall would have had to have been accommodated in fields that would have been uncharacteristically tall and narrow.

The contextual method adopted by Brown is subject to at least two potential dangers. One is that a reader not already familiar with the works and their chronology may lose his bearings, since different aspects of the same work may be discussed in a number of widely separated places. The other is that the parallels drawn between the paintings and the various other aspects of contemporary culture may seem undemonstrable and far-fetched. Brown successfully counters both dangers. A chronological arrangement of the material would in any case be awkward, given the fact that the book is concerned with cycles of paintings, the execution of which sometimes extended over several decades; further, an idea of the appearance of earlier lost works must often be inferred from the study of later, surviving ones. In short, the very nature the material presents difficult problems of organisation, and the author deserves full credit for the skill and clarity with which she handles it. Similarly, her investigation of the broader cultural resonances of her narrative cycles is marked by imagination tempered by admirable good sense. The result is a model of art-historical research and a major contribution to our understanding of Venetian Renaissance art.

Peter Humfrey

CHRISTIAN HORNIG. *Giorgiones Spätwerk*. München, Wilhelm Fink Verlag 1987, pp. 263 + 258 b & w. illus. DM 240,—. ISBN 3-7705-2335-0.

The title of Christian Hornig's monograph, 'Giorgiones Spätwerk', suggests a study of an artist in old age, such as Michelangelo or Rembrandt, who developed a radically different risk taking style in his last years; but Giorgione's life spans only some 33 years (1477/8—1510), and his late style encompasses a very short period from the time of his frescoes on the German customs house in Venice of 1508 until his death shortly before 25 October 1510. Despite Hornig's title his monograph attempts a reconstruction of Giorgione's entire oeuvre as a preamble and justification for a series of polemical attributions to the late Giorgione. For the most part they are all problematical paintings which are usually though not exclusively given to other artists known to have collaborated with Giorgione, such as the *Concert Champêtre* in the Louvre (usually given to Titian), the newly cleaned *Judgement of Solomon* at Kingston Lacy, Dorset (almost always attributed to Sebastiano del Piombo), *Christ and the Adulteress* in the Glasgow City Art Gallery (usually attributed to Titian), the turning portrait of a youth in a fur coat in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich (usually attributed to Palma Vecchio), and the much restored *Storm at Sea* in the Biblioteca della Scuola di San Marco, Venice (usually attributed to Palma with later interventions by Paris Bordone and other restorers). Of a less polemical nature is his attribution to Giorgione of the late self-portrait as David in the Herzog-Anton-Ulrich Museum, Braunschweig, which Professor Pignatti unwisely declined to give autograph status to in his catalogue of Giorgione's works (Pignatti, *Giorgione* 1969). In his lengthy entry on the painting, Hornig fails to mention the excellent account of the portrait by Dr Sabine Jacob in her recent exhibition

catalogue, *Selbstbildnisse und Künstlerporträts von Lucas van Leyden bis Anton Raphael Mengs*, Braunschweig 1980, pp. 38—42. Similarly his recognition of the sadly ruined fragment of the *Portrait of Girolamo Marcello* in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, as an autograph work is much to be welcomed. Another problematical work that deserves fuller consideration is the romantic portrait of a long-haired youth in the Museum of Fine Arts at Budapest, which Hornig refers to in a brief footnote on page 53 as a 'probable' Giorgione, but does not discuss at all in his lengthy catalogue, although recent examination of the emblems and inscription on the parapet suggest they are later additions, thus denying that the sitter is the poet Antonio Broccardo, and re-opening the question of Giorgione's authorship.

In the literature on Giorgione after the 1960's scholars were unwilling to attribute anything of significance after the extraordinary Fondaco frescoes on the German customs house to the enigmatic master from Castelfranco. Hornig has the courage to ask the question, what did Giorgione paint after the Fondaco, though few scholars would agree with all, if any, of his answers. Despite the importance of the Fondaco frescoes for his stylistic arguments he ignores the most recent literature on the Zanetti copies after the frescoes, for example David Alan Brown's publication of Zanetti's preparatory drawings for the etchings ('A Drawing by Zanetti after a fresco on the Fondaco dei Tedeschi', *Master Drawings*, 1977, pp. 31—44, and related correspondence in later issues), as well as my own article on Zanetti's hand-coloured copies, the closest records we have of some of the originals ('La contribution de Giorgione au génie de Venise', *Revue de l'art*, 1984, LXVI, pp. 59 ff.).

Hornig's account of the critical literature on Giorgione is told for the most part in terms of attribution history. Iconography it would appear is of no interest to him, although it has been of importance for almost any other scholar who has studied Giorgione. Even in the recent literature on the *Tempesta*, different authors have claimed that this too, unbelievably in view of the style, is a very late work for iconographic rather than stylistic reasons (cf. for example, D. Howard, *Art History*, 1985, and P. Kaplan, *Art History*, 1986). Hornig takes a strictly Vasarian position based on the first edition of the *Lives* of 1550 and seems disinterested in other contemporary evidence. He presents no new documents, or gleanings from the archives, though it must be admitted these are notoriously difficult to find. More surprisingly he does not even mention the most recent painstaking study on the subject by Donata Battilotti and Maria Teresa Franco, 'Regesti di Committenti e dei primi collezionisti di Giorgione', *Antichità viva*, 1978, pp. 58 ff., which succinctly presents all the known documentation concerning Giorgione's patrons or collectors listed by Marcantonio Michiel from an impressive number of archival sources. Nor does he mention the article in the same issue of *Antichità viva* by S. Carezzolo and others, which convincingly identifies the subject of Giorgione's only drawing (Rotterdam) as the Castle of San Zeno at Montagnana, not of his home town Castelfranco, as has always been supposed. The results of these studies should have been integrated into the critical catalogue even if Hornig's prime concern is the thorny problem of attribution.

After Vasari the heroes of Giorgione scholarship are in Hornig's opinion, Crowe and Cavalcaselle, who are praised as the greatest investigators of the nineteenth century, and

later Ludwig Justi, whom he claims wrote the most important modern monograph on Giorgione. Despite Crowe and Cavalcaselle's great industry, and no one who works in the field of Renaissance studies can fail to be indebted to them, they made some notoriously bad errors in the field of Giorgione studies. They resented their rival, Giovanni Morelli, and refused to take into consideration his attribution of the Dresden Venus to Giorgione. They attributed the *Concert Champêtre* to Morto da Feltre, the Leningrad *Judith* to Catena and so on. As I have argued elsewhere ('Mito e Realtà di Giorgione nella storiografia artistica: Da Marcantonio Michiel ad oggi', *Giorgione e l'umanesimo veneziano*, Florence 1981, II, pp. 615—653), Morelli presented the first accurate account of Giorgione's works, strictly based on the notes of the Anonimo Morelliano, and on his morphological method of attribution, which allowed him to distinguish between the early works of Titian and Giorgione, for he was the first to ascribe the *The Concert* in the Pitti to Titian. Morelli appears primarily in Hornig's monograph as an unsubtle author, who made the distinction between the 'lyrical Giorgione and the dramatic Titian', a characterization which Hornig spends a great deal of time attempting to disprove.

Nineteenth-century connoisseurs worked in an age when the number of mistaken attributions to Giorgione was legendary, as has been shown by Francis Haskell in his lecture, 'La Sfortuna di Giorgione', (also in *Giorgione e l'umanesimo veneziano*). In his study Haskell delineates with clarity the numerous bizarre attributions that were made in the seventeenth century and later in Giorgione's name, partly exemplified by Ridolfi, an author whom Hornig does not examine critically enough. Hornig has integrated into his monograph the seventeenth century inventory drawings of the collection of Andrea Vendramin (not to be confused with Gabriel Vendramin) from the manuscript in the British Library, first published by Tancred Borenius, as though they were authentic copies of known works by Giorgione. Although a reconsideration of these copies of lost works by Giorgione is very much to be welcomed, each one should be studied with care, and given an uncertain status as they do not relate to surviving works and our only knowledge of them are these anonymous inventory drawings. Another interesting possible sixteenth-century copy of a lost work by Giorgione, a figure of St Jerome, initially proposed by A. Venturi (Sotheby's 8 July 1981), is ignored. In the recent Washington exhibition catalogue, *Places of Delight. The Pastoral Landscape*, Robert Cafritz, Lawrence Gowing and David Rosand, examined the whole tradition of pastoral landscape which began with Giorgione, including many furniture paintings, drawings and prints, which were Giorgionesque in inspiration but in the main wisely declined to make firm attributions in the names of great masters. One exception was the recently discovered little panel, *Saint John the Baptist Preaching in the Wilderness* (Piero Corsini, New York), which in the pastoral catalogue is 'attributed to Giorgione'. Although a delightful painting of unusual iconography, and from Giorgione's lifetime, it cannot plausibly be attributed to him.

Although unacknowledged in his critical account of Giorgione literature Hornig is much indebted to the new scientific approach to attribution which was taken at the time of the Giorgione celebrations for his quincentenary at Castelfranco in 1978, as is attested by the numerous x-radiographs and reflectograms which are lavishly reproduced among

the photographs in his monograph. Whatever the mistakes that may have been made then, an attempt was made to look at whatever evidence was available in terms of X-radiographs in a publication by L. Mucchi, *Caratteri radiografici della pittura di Giorgione* (Florence 1978), and Hornig should perhaps have considered this in his account of the critical literature. Mucchi's analysis presented few surprises and completely endorsed the earlier catalogue by his colleague Pignatti. He claimed, however, that there are radiographic characteristics peculiar to Giorgione's paintings and which allow us to distinguish them from those of his contemporaries, for throughout one constantly observes the use of low density pigments and grounds, and light ordered strokes of the brush. As a further refinement Mucchi further suggested that there are three periods in Giorgione's development each with their own peculiar radiographic characteristics. Yet the principal constant characteristic, low density, could depend, as Mucchi admits on whether one or another white pigment has been used, and such minimal variations could result in quite different appearances on the radiograph. It should be noted, however, that the characteristics of the X-radiograph of one of Giorgione's generally accepted works, the *Laura portrait*, breaks Mucchi's rule. Ironically one of the few references that Hornig makes to Mucchi's analysis is in connection with this portrait. In the radiographs of paintings only those brushstrokes that were made in X-ray opaque pigments are shown, and, while, as a consequence this makes the connoisseur's task of comparing brushstrokes easier, the comparison of brushstrokes on the surface of the painting is basically no different. One complement to the reading of X-radiographs is provided by the pioneering work by Lorenzo Lazzarini and Joyce Plesters, their analyses of pigment samples from Venetian paintings, which tell us a great deal about the chromatic habits of Venetian artists. These are ignored by Hornig, and similarly there is no mention of the most interesting recent analysis of the *Tempesta*, where the area of the landscape has been studied by computer-processed infra-red reflectography, to reveal a substantial square tower beneath the cupola in the middle distance in the underpainting. Joyce Plesters discusses this discovery and other developments in her review "Scienza e Restauro": recent Italian publications on conservation' (*The Burlington Magazine*, 1987).

Connoisseurship aided by the latest means of scientific analysis is a complex subject and not without dangers. An ideal subject for an article would be the myths that have been created by the mis-reading of scientific evidence by art historians and conservators alike. Giorgione's paintings were among the earliest to be analyzed by such means and more than one cautionary example from their mis-analysis can be given. When Johannes Wilde, one of the earliest art historians to use radiographic evidence, published the X-ray of Giorgione's *Three Philosophers* he argued, on his reading of the X-ray alone, that the face of the turbaned philosopher was originally black, and consequently that the subject was the three Magi, an interpretation that has become almost canonical in recent literature. X-rays cannot be interpreted to give indications of colour beneath the surface, only pigment samples read in conjunction with X-rays can. Another classic mis-interpretation of such material is provided by an early X-radiograph taken by the National Gallery of Art in Washington of Giovanni Bellini's *Feast of the Gods*, published by John Walker in the 1950's. At a recent colloquy in Washington, David

Bull, who has recently restored the painting, and Joyce Plesters, who has analysed numerous pigment samples, presented a substantially new analysis of the surface of the painting and the intervention of different artists who had worked upon it from the same X-ray. Their results will be published in the September issue of the journal of the National Gallery of Washington.

Scientific evidence is at its most useful when used as an adjunct to other evidence, as part of that complex interplay of facts that is necessary in the history of art, but not as the sole criteria for attribution. Hornig's formalistic monograph gives us a very lopsided view of Giorgione. His constant assertion, again taken from Vasari, that the definitive characteristics of Giorgione's style are certain clumsinesses, is essentially a negative stance. His adaptation of Vasari's criteria allows him to disregard both questions of iconography and those more hidden morphological and psychological characteristics of style that Morelli did discover. It is perhaps not accidental, that despite its innumerable faults, the author of the most interesting modern monograph on Giorgione, remains George Martin Richter, who was the son of one of Morelli's closest students Jean Paul Richter.

Jaynie Anderson

MICHAEL LEVEY, *Giambattista Tiepolo. His Life and Art*. New Haven und London, Yale University Press 1986; 302 Seiten, 238 Abbildungen.

Die Tiepolo-Forschung ist in den vergangenen zwanzig Jahren ausgesprochen rege gewesen. Nachdem mit den Werkverzeichnissen von Antonio Morassi (1962) und Anna Pallucchini (1968) eine gute Grundlage gelegt worden war, wurde unsere Kenntnis in vieler Hinsicht durch Ausstellungen und Einzelveröffentlichungen vertieft. Die älteren Tiepolo-Monographien von Molmenti (1909), Sack (1910) und auch von Morassi (1955) mußten mittlerweile als hoffnungslos überholt gelten. Es war also an der Zeit, eine zusammenfassende Monographie über diesen Künstler vorzulegen, der im Italien des 18. Jahrhunderts alle anderen in den Schatten stellte. Diese Arbeit hat nun Michael Levey, Direktor der National Gallery in London, unternommen, der durch seine zahlreichen Publikationen zur Malerei des 18. Jahrhunderts bestens bekannt ist. Der von ihm vorgelegte Band fällt sogleich durch seine hervorragende Ausstattung, insbesondere durch seine teilweise exzellenten Farbabbildungen auf. Der Autor legt keine umfassende Monographie mit Werkkatalog vor, sondern führt den Leser durch alle wichtigen Stationen von Tiepolos Leben und Werk, wobei er in der Kapiteleinteilung den wohlbekanntesten Schaffensphasen des Malers folgt. Die besondere Stärke des Buches liegt in seinem Stil. Es ist höchst lebendig geschrieben und ausgesprochen angenehm zu lesen. Die Lektüre ist vor allem dort ein Vergnügen, wo der Autor eindringlich und mit oft sehr originellen Formulierungen einzelne Werke beschreibt und analysiert. So wird der Leser einfühlsam und nachdrücklich zugleich zu einem Verständnis der künstlerischen Form Tiepolos hingeführt. In gewisser Absetzung von früheren Urteilen betont Levey dabei das zeichnerische Element bei Tiepolo. Aufs Ganze gesehen jedoch behandelt er vorwiegend den Maler.