



Sir George Gilbert Scott, Albert Memorial, London, 1863-72. From Henry-Russell Hitchcock, *Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, Baltimore, Penguin Books, 1963, p. 90.

Masters among English collectors, especially for Titian and for Giovanni Bellini. Enthusiasm for the Italian masters was further fired by the high-class plunder which had begun flowing into Paris from Italy. Following in the wake of Napoleon's armies, agents for the great central museum in Paris carefully made their selections and packed them off. The result was a 'rediscovery' of early Italian art among Frenchmen.

Pursuing the phenomenon of changing tastes from another angle, Haskell points out that in England following the Revolutionary Wars there was a revival of interest in the Italian painters of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, especially for Giotto and Cimabue. Yet in the space of a few years a 180° turnabout took place with Giotto, Cimabue, and their followers now berated as 'primitives,' ignorant of even the fundamentals of drawing.

This change in attitude was due, Haskell believes, in part to the increasing numbers of forgeries of Old Masters. Because of this, collectors were being warned away from adding the painters of this age to their holdings. Also contributing to this change in attitude was the feeling that modern art, specifically the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, needed to be protected and insulated from the degrading and

retardataire tendencies of a Giotto or a Cimabue. It was, as Haskell notes, 'a desperate attempt, made in the interests of modern art, to preserve traditional and absolute standards of "beauty" from barbarian contamination' (p. 102).

Besides the influence of leading art dealers, critics and historians, another important factor in the shaping of tastes was the art exhibition. One of the largest and most influential of these was held in Manchester in 1857. Called the Art Treasures Exhibition, Old Masters from every period and school were shown. But because so many of the established collectors had refused to lend their works to this 'provincial' exhibition, many heretofore 'minor' masters were shown like Hans Memling and Andrea Mantegna. Most popular of all, it was generally agreed, was Annibale Caracci's *Three Marias*.

Implicit in this study, which incidentally throws much new light on a period which saw the growth of an art industry parallel with the industrial revolution, is the conclusion that artistic values are relative to an age or point of view. This conclusion holds that artistic values are the product of a web of social, economic and cultural factors. Moreover, the implication is clear that our own artistic and art-historical values are similarly determined and subject to similar changes.

The opposite point of view – that there are artistic values or measures of quality as timeless and as enduring as art itself – is not so often or so ably represented in our times. Kenneth Clark, nevertheless, has for years acted the loyal opposition. In his recent book, *What is a Masterpiece?*, he argues for the existence and utility of such canons of quality as originality, the ability to synthesize the spirit of a time, and the insight that allows one to make one's own personal experiences universal. It must be conceded, though, that Lord Clark's vision is loftier and more abstract than that of the average collector or museum curator whose motives are more usually conditioned by prevailing trends and fashions.

In fact, *Rediscoveries in Art* might have been subtitled: *The Taste of Collectors and Curators in England and France with Respect to the Old Masters*. Conceived of in this way, the topic contributes to our in-

creased understanding of that era which saw, for instance, the debate over the purchase of the Elgin marbles for the British Museum, the organization of England's National Gallery, and the rapid growth of the Louvre as a treasure house of European culture. In a sense, *Rediscoveries* has more to do with how we think about the history of art and it should cause more historians to think harder about the central facts of art history, namely the art itself.

RAYMOND L. WILSON
California State College at Stanislaus

IRVING LAVIN and JOHN PLUMMER, ed. *Studies in Late Medieval and Renaissance Paintings in Honor of Millard Meiss*. New York, New York University Press, 1977. Volume 1: text, 463 + xx pp.; Volume 2: plates, 164 pp., \$75.

WENDY STEDMAN SHEARD and JOHN T. PAOLETTI, ed. *Collaboration in Italian Renaissance Art*. New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1978. 268 + xxi pp., illus. \$20.

The essays under review here honour two art historians, Millard Meiss and Charles Seymour, Jr., who have made highly significant contributions to the development of art history in the United States – and thus, by extension, in Canada – and who represent two of the most important establishment training grounds for scholars in the discipline: Princeton and Yale. These two universities were among the first in North America to make art history a respected component of the undergraduate curriculum, and in the 1930s – as foreign scholars began coming to America – were developing graduate departments equipped with superb libraries and excellent associated art collections. It is only very recently, in fact, that the character given to art history in North America by that small group of predominantly Eastern schools, with Princeton and Yale in the forefront, has begun to be seriously questioned. Taken as a whole, the essays may be said to function as a tribute to Establishment art history as practiced in the New World.

The work of both scholars focused on the Italian Renaissance in its early phases, an area that has traditionally attracted many of the

best minds working in the field. Meiss was the more visible of the two. He began his teaching career in the early 1930s, and up until his death in 1975 worked with great skill to bring European methodologies to American students and to represent the American viewpoint abroad: 'the roving ambassador of American good will in the realm of scholarship and beyond,' as he was characterized in one memorial essay. Seymour, who died in 1977, combined the careers of museum curator and teacher-scholar. Educated in large part at Yale – his father was president of the university – he was the first curator of sculpture at the National Gallery in Washington and returned to Yale in the late 1940s to assist in the development of the art history department and the art gallery. He may have been at his best in the classroom, one of those inspiring teachers who lead students to ask useful questions and to work imaginatively.

The *Meiss Studies in Late Medieval and Renaissance Painting* is altogether the more ambitious publication: 45 essays from a well-known, international group of scholars, the handsome two-volume format closely following the prestigious *De Artibus Opuscula XL, Essays in Honor of Erwin Panofsky*, edited by Meiss himself in 1961. Meiss' writings tend to divide up into distinct methodologies. In spite of suggestive asides that hint at issues lurking beneath the fabric of the discussion, the focus in his works is on a single problem, be it iconographical, technical or formal. The important exception to this is his venture into social art history, *Painting in Florence and Siena After the Black Death*, published in 1951, in which a notable shift in style and iconography is put within a context of economic and social upheaval. It is, interestingly, the aspect of his work least fully represented in this collection, and by two essays that are meant primarily to suggest directions for future research. Creighton Gilbert's 'The Patron of Starnina's Frescoes,' addresses itself to the question of classes of patronage in the early fifteenth century, and by close analysis of documents and source material maintains that a major fresco cycle painted by Starnina in the church of the Carmine in Florence was commissioned

by a patron not even sufficiently established in Florentine society to have a surname. However any further mining of this particular vein is stopped short by the fact that the cycle itself has not survived. Hendrik W. Van Os, in 'Vecchietta and the Persona of the Renaissance Artist,' goes in a different direction, back to the personality of the artist, and argues that in certain instances – his case in point is the Siennese artist Vecchietta – style and iconography may be the result of personal pressures experienced by the Renaissance artist breaking into the upper levels of society.

Meiss' iconographical studies – brilliant as they often are – do not attempt the integration of his post-Black Death investigations. But they did much to convince American scholars of the importance of moving beyond formal analysis and of the possibilities of the Panofsky type of motif analysis. It is appropriate that some of the most substantial essays published in his honour should come under the general rubric of iconography. Herbert von Einem, in a very useful essay, 'Bemerkungen zu Raffaels *Madonna di Foligno*,' shows that Raphael's painting was planned from the outset as part of a tomb chapel ensemble, and that it must be read and its sources understood with this function as the major directing factor. Marilyn Aronberg Lavin's note on Campin's Mérode Altarpiece finally solves the problem of how to read the featured bit of carpentry being prepared by Joseph in the right-hand panel of the triptych: it will be, when finished, the centre board of the strainer of a wine press – or, rather, of a Mystic Wine Press, an image used by Isaiah and later popularized by Augustine in connection with the blood sacrifice of Christ – and thereby becomes another piece of the Passion/Sacrifice imagery that overlays and intersects with the nominal Annunciation theme of the altarpiece. In 1945 Meiss argued definitively for the mystical reading of light in fifteenth-century painting; in an analysis of the Annunciation theme, Samuel Y. Edgerton presents what is, in effect, a companion study that argues for the mystical reading of perspective construction in fifteenth-century painting, a transforming agent that draws the physical world into a multi-level

scheme of spiritual interpretation. I cannot be as positive about the results of Mirella Levi D'Ancona's multi-level reading of Mantegna's Vienna *St. Sebastian* panel, which is a sobering example of where highly imaginative iconographical analysis can lead – in this case to an interpretation of Sebastian as, simultaneously, 'Janus, Apollo, Diana, and Christ,' with built-in references to Albertian theory and Paduan philosophy adding to the provocative mix.

Meiss was also a pioneer in making American art history aware of the assistance that could be provided by technical analysis, in particular of frescoes, and by close physical analysis of both frescoes and panels. This is an area in which Italian scholarship has been extremely active. Leonetto Tintori presents an almost novelistic saga on the history of the use of white lead in the fresco cycles of S. Francesco in Assisi, with Simone Martini and his astonishing technical facility coming across as the hero of the day. Ugo Procacci and Umberto Baldini deal with the gradual supplanting of the sinopia stage in fresco design in about the middle of the fifteenth century by the use of small preparatory sketches and full-scale cartoons, the latter pricked for direct transfer to the top layer of wet plaster. There is clearly much to be absorbed from this kind of technical exploration and the mysteries still abound – e.g., the very complete and one-point perspective construction underlying an undistinguished and unadventurous mid-fifteenth-century fresco in the Spedale di Santa Maria della Scala in Siena, brought to our attention by Enzo Carli; or the exact interpretation to place on the elaborate and multi-colour layers of sinopia – combined with a mixed-media fresco technique – used by Pisanello in the newly discovered cycle at Mantua, as discussed by Giovanni Paccagnini. A related series of articles, by James H. Stubblebine, Marvin Eisenberg, and Giuseppe Marchini, apply physical and iconographic analysis to the problem of the reconstruction of dispersed Trecento panel ensembles.

The center of attention is Italy, and above all Tuscany, but there are a number of articles which touch on Meiss' secondary interest

of Northern painting and manuscript illumination. Charles Sterling, Marie-Madeleine Gauthier, and François Avril show various aspects of Italian influence in Northern production; to be particularly noted is Federico Zeri's publication of an important Bohemian *Madonna of Humility* panel of ca. 1360, where the Christ child, assisted by the Virgin to rise from her lap, offers his open palm for her inspection – a work that draws innovatively on both Italian style and iconography. Venice, which attracted Meiss towards the end of his career, is given some play, and there are several useful articles on Renaissance architecture.

The plate volume is well laid out with clear captions, and the reproduction of photographs is excellent. Included in Volume 1 is a bibliography of Meiss' writings – numbering 132 items.

When one stands back from the separate pieces, one is struck by the shadow of authority that hangs over the collection. The names of the Masters who have established the terms for handling Renaissance art occur again and again in the essays: Berenson and Panofsky; Alberti and Vasari. The received tradition that implicitly informs the book has it that Florence is far and away the vital centre of Renaissance art; that the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are working – in the Vasarian scenario – towards the sixteenth century standard of excellence; and that the foremost task of art history is to illuminate individual achievement. The press of authority is something that has characterized the developing phase of art history in America to which both Meiss and Seymour belong, a phase that may now be ending. On the negative side, the respect for authority has had the result of fixing art historical discussion within a pre-established schema and suppressing individual voice. In its positive aspects, it has meant an energy in collecting many kinds of evidence – hence the interest in multiple methodologies that is a notable feature of the work of Meiss and Seymour and that is evident in their respective honorary volumes. It is not surprising that Charles Seymour, in an article relating use of X-ray analysis to search for the presence of Titian in a small *Circumcision* panel, chose to pay

explicit homage to his fellow scholar's involvement in the special methodology of technical examination. James S. Ackerman's long contribution to the Meiss *Studies*, 'Alberti's Light' – an article that spells out Alberti's brilliant pulling together of material from different sources to achieve a picture of the act of seeing directly applicable to the painter's work – perhaps can also stand as a model for the next stage of art history in North America: the absorption of information from a variety of sources in the production of a synthesis that is inherently new.

The Seymour memorial volume offers some encouraging thoughts in that direction. *Collaboration in Italian Renaissance Art* is not the elaborate, official affair of the Meiss *Studies* but rather a single volume of 14 generally short essays, the majority by Seymour's former students and immediate colleagues at Yale. The organization in terms of five Italian artistic centres appears to be designed to de-emphasize Florence, although that city still gets the lion's share of articles, and sculpture (traditionally less attended to in Renaissance scholarship, and not a medium that engaged Meiss) is dealt with extensively. Rome gets two contributions. André Chastel touches on the political significance of archaizing style in post-Reformation Rome, where a monumental and deliberately Quattrocento Saint Peter is carved by Lorenzetto in the 1530s to accompany a fifteenth-century Saint Paul by Paolo Romano hauled out of storage. John R. Spencer draws attention to artistic activity in Quattrocento Rome, and through new photographs* and physical analysis helps our understanding of that major fifteenth-century commission, the centre doors of S. Peter's, done by Filarete and co-workers in the period 1433-1445. North Italy is generously attended to. David Alan Brown attempts a de-mystification of the Leonardo *Madonna of the Rocks* problem by going to adaptations found in Milanese painting, in the process arguing for the London version as a reflection of Leonardo's mature artistic thinking of the 1490s. We are given two major essays on trends observable in Venetian art as it moved into the sixteenth century. Using a small

Orpheus panel of disputed authorship as her case study, Wendy Stedman Sheard examines in detail the new kind of non-narrative painting, characterized by an original use of classical source material, that comes to the fore in Venice ca. 1490-1500. Douglas Lewis adds – convincingly, in my opinion – a much needed piece to the Antonio Lombardo oeuvre in the form of a handsome bronze relief datable to the year 1512, a piece that clarifies Antonio's skill at vivid translations of emblematic concepts. A smaller-scaled study by Paul F. Watson has some things to say about Titian's response, and non-response, to Michelangelo.

Another important aspect of this collection is its concern with the artist as part of a working situation with very real economic and organizational pressures. No less than five essays concentrate on conditions of production in the period from the fourteenth through the sixteenth century, ranging from James H. Stubblebine's discussion of tabernacle production of a size suitable for private devotion in the Duccio workshop, to George Kubler's glimpse into the kinds of data a late sixteenth-century architect would carry around in his portfolio. Client-architect problems are treated with refreshing directness by Edmund P. Pillsbury in his analysis of the Vasari/Cosimo I interaction in the interior staircase project for the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence. The catering to popular taste in fifteenth-century Florence through the production of low-cost replicas in clay, stucco, and papier-mâché of famous Virgin and Child reliefs – sometimes imitating in their colouring the more de luxe bronze or marble versions and sometimes decorated as if they were paintings – is handled by Ulrich Middeldorf. John T. Paoletti reviews procedures in the sculptor's workshop and questions whether Donatello's bronze *David* may not be a late, post-Donatello casting from an abandoned Donatello model; the argument stretches the evidence but usefully calls attention to problematical aspects of the bronze *David*.

*Spencer reports that these photographs are now available through Foto Vasari, Rome.

I also find of interest the reaching, open approach to Renaissance art theory seen here in two essays. David Summers, who has been working fruitfully in this area for a number of years, explores the Renaissance understanding of physiognomy as one of the outward manifestations of the soul, and finds the reflection in Michelangelo's *David* of what appears to have been almost a stereotype in Renaissance body theory: the leonine type – 'the male type in its perfect form' as a late antique text, known to the Renaissance, put it – signifying courage and daring. George L. Hersey shows how Renaissance thinkers such as Marsilio Ficino could be stimulated by the growing discipline of architectural theory to conceive of a 'cosmic temple': the building as a memory image of the Universe in three-dimensional projection.

The Editors are to be commended for providing an index to the book, a rarity in *Festschrift* productions.

The word *Collaboration* in the title of the Seymour volume stands for a network of meanings. On one obvious level, it means the co-operation between artists, or between artist and patron; on another level, as alluded to by Sheard in her introduction, it refers to the work of the scholar, a creative collaborator with a past moment in history. There is also the collaboration of approaches. Meiss and Seymour taught that a range of methodologies exist in order to make the historical moment come alive. More and more clearly it emerges that the task of their followers is to fuse the methodologies in what may be not so much collaboration as a charting of new territory.

DEBRA PINCUS

The University of British Columbia

CHARLES HOPE *Titian*. New York, Harper and Row; Toronto, Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1980. 170 pp., 86 illus., 32 col. pls., \$39.95.

For the past four hundred years Titian has been held in the highest esteem as one of the greatest and most influential of all European painters, so that it is surely paradoxical that art historians of today sometimes still refer to Crowe and Cavalcaselle's 1877 monograph as

the best account of this artist available in English.

During the last twelve years there has been a considerable amount of activity in Titian studies which has produced such significant publications as the multi-volume monographs of Pallucchini and Wethey as well as Panofsky's *Problems in Titian*. Among the most important studies of the documentary sources of the artist have been those of Charles Hope. Consequently, the appearance of a one-volume monograph on the great Venetian painter by this scholar is of considerable importance to the specialist in the art of the Italian Renaissance and of concern to anyone interested in the general development of European painting.

The author states in his Preface that he has chosen not only to concentrate upon the larger works (which is understandable with an artist whose extant paintings number over three hundred), but to 'examine the basic issues on which there is still disagreement among art historians ...' In general he not only examines such issues, but takes a definite position, which, *ipso facto*, must frequently be a controversial one. This makes for lively reading, even though non-specialists will perhaps be distracted by the fact that the art historians with whom the author disagrees are almost never named and the contentious publications seldom cited.

True to his stated aims, the author pays little attention to the social and political background of Titian's artistic development, but despite other remarks to the effect that he has tried to place the artist within the wider context of Venetian painting, there is little consideration of the influence of Giovanni Bellini or Giorgione and none of Titian's relationship to Palma il Vecchio. Nor is his mature work ever really compared with that of his rivals Pordenone and Tintoretto. The most frequently mentioned of Titian's contemporaries is the rather unimpressive Andrea Schiavone. However, Hope is concerned with the influence of the great High Renaissance masters of Florence and Rome and his argument concerning the influence of Fra Bartolommeo upon the *Assunta* in the Frari, which he appears to have made independently of Creighton Gilbert (*Art Bulletin*, LXII,

1980, pp. 56-62) is quite convincing.

The reader will not find any new attributions to the artist in this monograph which is mercifully free of reattributed Giorgione and Giorgionesque works and of the ascription of early sixteenth-century Venetian furniture panels to the young Titian. Such a severe and welcome pruning of works of doubtful authenticity enables Hope to offer a new chronology of the artist's earliest undisputed paintings. *Jacopo Pesaro Presented to St. Peter* (Antwerp), *The Baptism of Christ* (Rome), *Christ of San Rocco* (Venice), *Noli Me Tangere* (London), and *The Three Ages of Man and Holy Family with St. John the Baptist and a Donor* in Edinburgh are all considered to have been completed before Giorgione's death in 1510. This is done on the apparent assumption (p. 26) that Titian was born about 1485, rather than about 1488-90 as favoured by most modern scholars. In itself this is possibly acceptable, but when one adds the Fondaco frescoes and even one or two other paintings according to one's own reconstruction of this stage of Titian's career, then, even allowing for a high rate of survival of the early works, it constitutes a very busy and productive beginning for an artist who is known throughout the rest of his life to have worked very slowly. Another reason why these works are all dated before 1510 is the belief that Titian painted in a Giorgionesque manner only during that painter's lifetime. This is more difficult to accept, especially when one is later presented with a proposal to move forward by about ten years – (to c. 1516) – the Louvre *Entombment*, because of its supposed Giorgionesque qualities.

Among the works of Titian's maturity there are also some re-datings. The Prado *St. Margaret* is brought forward to c. 1554-58 from an usually accepted date in the mid-1560s (as determined by style), because of the presumption that it was done for Margaret of Hungary who died in 1558. It should be noted that Wethey (*The Paintings of Titian*, 1, London, 1969, p. 142) was aware of this possibility, but did not re-date the work. Another controversial re-dating which is contrary to the usual stylistically determined chronology of