



Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Martin Weinberger

Reviewed work(s): Le Sculture del Duomo di Orvieto by Enzo Carli

Source: *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 34, No. 1, (Mar., 1952), pp. 60-63

Published by: College Art Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3047396>

Accessed: 26/04/2008 15:48

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=caa>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We enable the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

to obtain—of Puig i Cadafalch, Gómez-Moreno, Kingsley Porter, and Gaillard for the full picture of Romanesque Spain, Sr. Gudiol and Sr. Gaya Nuño have given a broad view of the subject that cannot be obtained from any single work of their illustrious predecessors. Consequently they have performed a useful service in bringing within the covers of a single volume so admirably chosen a series of photographs of Spanish Romanesque monuments and so much that will be of interest to the general reader.

In Sr. Gaya Nuño's other book the rôles of text and illustrations are reversed, for he offers a detailed study of Sorian Romanesque that would satisfy the most exacting specialist. During the Romanesque period Soria was not far from the Moorish frontier. The interlaced arches of the cloister of San Juan de Duero and the two curious *templetes* within the church itself have long attracted attention, and there is a certain majesty to the façade of the church of Santo Domingo. Socially and artistically, however, Soria has been a somewhat backward region, and the Romanesque churches of the province are predominantly single-aisled buildings of slight distinction. In the region of San Esteban de Gormaz are found arcaded porticoes along the south walls of certain churches, similar to those that are so characteristic of the Romanesque of Segovia. The sculpture of the province is generally not outstanding, for the genius of Santo Domingo de Silos, Fromista, Léon, and Santiago did not touch this frontier region. Nevertheless, for a just appraisal of Spanish mediaeval art it is well that the plains as well as the heights should be known. Twenty years ago, when I first went to Soria, there was no such reliable guide to the region as this, and one explored village after village, hoping that the next might contain a building of the interest of Iguácel or Quintanilla de las Viñas. Agreeable as are the pleasures of exploration, it is of real benefit to have so sound a study as Sr. Gaya Nuño has now offered of the Romanesque of Soria.

WALTER MUIR WHITEHILL  
*Boston Athenaeum*

ENZO CARLI, *Le Sculture del Duomo di Orvieto*,  
Istituto Italiano d'Arti Grafiche, Bergamo, 1947.  
Pp. 53; 70 pls.

This is not the kind of picture book for the general reader to which we have become accustomed. Complete pictorial editions of important monuments are too often nothing but a cheaper substitute for a set of the photographs from which such illustrations are produced. The text, even if interspersed with occasional critical remarks for which no substantiation can be offered in this type of publication, satisfies neither the scholar nor the general reader, as Richard Krautheimer has pointed out in a recent review.<sup>1</sup> If we add that

in many of these "editions" statues and even reliefs are photographed from perverse angles and swamped in floodlight, that the plates are drowned in printer's ink and cruelly trimmed according to the fashion of the day, then we have enumerated at least the most important grievances against this type of publication.

It is revealing to see that an Italian publisher can keep his production free of most of these blemishes without fear of losing the interest of a wide reading public. This volume on the façade of the Cathedral of Orvieto contains a long and learned introduction which probably will appeal to the scholar rather than to the general reader, but the following description of the sculptures will satisfy both. The plates cover the entire sculptural decoration of the four pilasters and the statues in bronze and marble placed on the façade. With few exceptions, a separate plate is accorded to every single slab of the pilasters; in numerous cases excellent details of individual figures and heads are given. These illustrations reproduce the photographs of Signor Raffaelli Armoni, the local photographer who brought to his task the loving understanding of an enthusiastic admirer. I have always considered these photographs among the world's best; it is a pity that they have not come out quite so well in the printing as they deserve.

Professor Enzo Carli's introduction starts out with a very fair survey of the theories developed by older writers on the authorship of the two famous drawings for the façade preserved in the Opera del Duomo. Luigi Fumi, to whom we owe the monumental publication of the Cathedral documents,<sup>2</sup> recognized that the drawing with only one pediment must have preceded the one which shows three and undoubtedly presupposes the existence of the earlier plan. Attracted by hardly more valid arguments than the glamour of a great name, Fumi gave the earlier drawing to Arnolfo di Cambio, while he correctly connected the second plan and, again on slim evidence, a large portion of the sculpture with the architect Lorenzo Maitani who was in charge of the building from 1310 to his death in 1330. It was August Schmarsow<sup>3</sup> who pointed out that the earlier drawing was decisively influenced by French cathedral architecture and is, in fact, an ingenious adaptation of the transepts of Notre Dame in Paris. He attributed this plan to Ramo di Paganello who is mentioned in the Cathedral archives in 1293, but appears earlier in Siennese documents as "one of the best sculptors in the world who has recently returned from foreign [*ultramontanis*] parts."

Italian scholars have on the whole been reluctant to accept this very plausible theory. The urge toward hero-worship which has created so many myths, art-historical and otherwise, induced several writers to heap almost everything, the planning, building, and even to a considerable extent the execution of the sculpture, on the shoulders of Lorenzo Maitani. Both drawings were now given to Maitani.

1. Of Goldscheider's *Ghiberti*, *Burlington Magazine*, xciii, 1951, p. 96.

2. *Il Duomo di Orvieto e i suoi restauri*, Rome, 1891.

3. "Das Fassadenproblem am Dom von Orvieto," *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, XLVII, 1926, pp. 119ff.

Professor Carli makes a valiant stand against this tendency, asking with a cautious pun "se la gloria del Maitani non fosse tutta Fumi" (poor Fumi, who had not been nearly as radical as his successors!). Carli separates the two drawings, giving the later one, as everybody who ever wrote on the façade problem has done, to Maitani. I have shown elsewhere<sup>4</sup> that the Maitani plan is a compromise between the earlier drawing and Arnolfo di Cambio's plan for the façade of S. Maria del Fiore in Florence and am glad to see that in a postscript Professor Carli accepts this observation as further proof of the entirely different character of the two drawings.

Carli rejects Schmarsow's attribution of the earlier drawing on the ground that Ramo di Paganello is only mentioned as a sculptor. Instead, he proposes, tentatively and somewhat hesitantly, the Fra Bevignate (or Benvegnate) mentioned in 1295 and again in 1300 as *operaio*. But if Ramo is described only as a sculptor, not as an architect, all we know about Fra Bevignate is that in the seventies of the thirteenth century he was well known as an hydraulic engineer. For this reason, Fumi had already assumed that Fra Bevignate might have been responsible for the technical construction of the building but not for the designing of the façade. The terms under which his contract was renewed in 1300 suggest that he exercised the function of an administrator and supervisor rather than that of the leading architect.<sup>5</sup> In one of the reliefs on the fourth pilaster (pl. 59), a man with a square over his shoulder, followed by two younger men, appears among the saints. It is very likely that these three figures, obviously inserted into the relief at a later date, represent the architect Lorenzo Maitani and his two sons and that they were added after Maitani's death in 1330. Before them kneels a praying monk cut from the same slab as the other figures of the relief and the only one who kneels. If the three figures behind him represent the later architects, it is very possible that we have here a portrait of Fra Bevignate in his function as *operaio*. Unfortunately this does not prove that he drew the early plan for the façade of Orvieto. And where should

this Benedictine monk and hydraulic engineer have acquired the intricate knowledge of Notre Dame of Paris which characterizes the drawing as the work not, of course, of a Frenchman, but of an Italian "recently returned from abroad"?

The matter does not end there. As I have pointed out,<sup>6</sup> the drawing shows a seated Madonna in the lunette which is identical in composition with the wooden statue of the seated Madonna and Child in the Opera del Duomo. Drawing and statue are connected beyond this superficial relationship. Both are profoundly influenced by French art, the Madonna not only in the iconographic type which is here imported from France to Italy for the first time, but also in style as is evident in the drapery system, the cutting of eyes and eyebrows, and so forth. Yet both are unquestionably the work of an Italian, in the case of the Madonna, even of a Tuscan master. It would be strange, indeed, if twin masters had worked in Orvieto simultaneously, for both the statue and the drawing can be dated shortly before 1300. One may be sceptical with regard to the name of the artist, but if one accepts the attribution of the statue to Ramo di Paganello, as Professor Carli does, one cannot, in my opinion, withhold that name from the designer of the façade.

It is one of the few gaps in the illustrative material of the book that this wooden group of the *Madonna and Child* is not reproduced. Although not part of the sculptural decoration of the façade, it is of eminent importance for its development. Professor Carli attributes the three lower registers of the two inner pilasters with Messianic prophecies and New Testament stories to this master, i.e., to Ramo di Paganello. Comparing some of these compositions with their prototypes on the pulpits of Giovanni Pisano, he argues that this group of reliefs may have been and probably was completed before 1310 when Lorenzo Maitani took over.<sup>7</sup> To the *terminus post quem* of ca. 1305 supplied for the *Visitation* by this comparison (p. 16) might be added the only *terminus ante* we have been able to find—the year 1316, in or before which Andrea di Jacopo Ognabene copied the same scene on the silver altar

4. "The First Façade of the Cathedral of Florence," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, IV, 1940-41, p. 79 n. 1.

5. In fact, the documents clearly distinguish the office of *operarius* which he held (Fumi, *op.cit.*, p. 177), and which in Pisa, for instance, was purely administrative, from the title of *magister operis* given to the leading architects and sculptors (*ibid.*: "nominamus ipsum fratrem Benvegnatem qui debeat continuo residere in dicto Opere cum magistris ipsius Operis et facere sollicito laborare eosdem").

6. "Eine Madonna von Giovanni Pisano," *Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, LI, 1930, p. 168. I should like to use this opportunity to correct a slight error in Carli's text, p. 16: Schmarsow did not recognize the connection between the wooden group and the Madonna in the drawing. The wooden statue which he attributed to Ramo di Paganello (*op.cit.*, p. 138) is a *standing* Madonna in the Opera del Duomo from the church of S. Lucia (the Child is lost). There can be no doubt that this statue is the work of a French sculptor, as I have pointed out (*op.cit.*, p. 168 n. 2). If it were not so dangerous to draw conclusions from the scanty remarks in the documents, it would be tempting to attribute

this figure to Roland de Bruges, mentioned in 1293 (Fumi, *op.cit.*, p. 309, quoting Della Valle, *Storia del Duomo di Orvieto*, Rome, 1781). The seated Madonna was considered by Schmarsow as the work of a late follower of Ramo, evidently not distant in time from the marble group in the lunette by the sculptors working in 1325 under Lorenzo Maitani (A. Schmarsow, *Italienische Kunst im Zeitalter Dantes*, Augsburg, 1928, pp. 145-147; see also p. 127).

7. In my opinion, this disposes of the later date assigned to the four famous reliefs of the *Annunciation*, *Visitation*, *Nativity*, and *Adoration* on the third pilaster by Geza de Francovich ("Lorenzo Maitani e i bassorilievi della facciata del Duomo di Orvieto," *Bollettino d'Arte*, N. S. VII, 1927-28, pp. 339ff.) who attributes this group to a "fourth collaborator of Maitani." He sees the same master at work in the tomb of Pope Benedict XI in S. Domenico in Perugia. I cannot distinguish here the hand of a master working in Orvieto, although the tomb is related to the group under discussion through its Sienese character. There is no reason why this tomb should not have been executed shortly after the pope's death in 1304. This date indirectly supports an early dating of the Orvieto reliefs.

in Pistoja. One notices that the dates run close to 1310 and, in the second pilaster, where some of the figures are heavier, perhaps even beyond that date.<sup>8</sup>

While the lasting influence of the wooden statue of the Madonna on this whole group is clear, I am not so sure as Professor Carli is that these reliefs are the work of Ramo di Paganello himself. A comparison of the Virgin in the *Adoration* with the wooden group shows surprising differences: for one thing, the French style so prominent in the heads and draperies of the earlier work has disappeared completely. Must we assume that Ramo, if he still was working as a sculptor at Orvieto, had changed his style to this extent? Nor does the master of the second and third pilasters impress one as being easily deflected by outside influences. Though he follows the compositions of Giovanni Pisano, there is not a trace of the Pisan master's style in his work. I find it hard, therefore, to believe that this could be Ramo who has cast off the French elements of his style under the pressure of his Sieneſe surroundings. It seems safer to see in this great sculptor an ingenious continuator of Ramo's work who is thoroughly Sieneſe in style.

So far as I can observe, there are in these two pilasters only two figures in which the French influence seen in the wooden group survives: the first two kings, David and Solomon, of the *Tree of Jesse* on the second pilaster.<sup>9</sup> They may well be by the hand of Ramo, done a little earlier than the surrounding figures from which they differ considerably in style; they must, however, have been placed on the façade together with the others, when the first three registers were ready for installation.<sup>10</sup>

The lower parts of the two outside pilasters with the incomparable reliefs illustrating the first chapters of Genesis and the Last Judgment are, according to Professor Carli, the work of Lorenzo Maitani. This has been said many times before; but Dr. Carli gives a new meaning to the statement by making Maitani the pupil of the master of the two inner pilasters. He is led to this conclusion by the observation that this Sieneſe sculpture outside Siena has little in common with sculpture in Siena itself, though it is, if anything, more

Sieneſe in character than the work of Tino di Camaino, Gano, or others. The solution to this perplexing problem, it seems, may be found in the fact that the sculptors working at Orvieto were not exposed to the influence of Giovanni Pisano's style. This observation is indeed in favor of Dr. Carli's assumption that the master or masters of the *Genesis* and the *Last Judgment* grew from the school of the leading master of the two inner pilasters. And, in fact, the young King in the *Adoration of the Magi* (pl. 26) might be called the prototype of God in the first scene of the *Creation* (pl. 36). Similarly, the new style appears immediately above the four great reliefs of the third pilaster, particularly in the head of the Virgin in the *Flight into Egypt* (pl. 27), where it is still mixed with elements of the older style. The transition is almost too smooth to allow for the assumption that Maitani, apart from his obligations as the leading architect, began to devote himself to sculpture immediately after his arrival in Orvieto. That would have been possible only if he had taken up the study of sculpture at Orvieto a considerable time before 1310 under the direction of the older master. But the otherwise so effusive document which appoints him *capomaestro* on September 16, 1310, mentions no other previous activity of his in Orvieto save the erection of the buttresses that were to prevent the collapse of transept and apse. For this work he had to come from Siena. In fact, no reference appears from which we may deduce that he was a sculptor.<sup>11</sup> The bronze angels in the central lunette associated with his name were modeled by a whole group of sculptors, as we know from the documents; and so it is quite possible that he assumed little more than the ultimate responsibility for the sculptural work done by this group.

One of these sculptors, who continued the tradition of the older master, now took the lead. The "Hellenistic" character of his style has been emphasized. So far as the classical and Byzantine rock landscape which was just being revived by Duccio is concerned, the beginnings of such an arrangement of the figures within space are already found on the second and third pilasters. What is more surprising is that these devices are used with a full understanding of the relationship be-

8. From a document still existing in Della Valle's time, he concluded (*op.cit.*, p. 263, quoted by Fumi, pp. 3 and 135) that in 1310 Maitani placed Ramo di Paganello at the head of a gang of stonemasons working in the quarries. This may have been a way of getting rid of a rival, as Carli suggests. If that is true, Maitani's character appears in a rather unfavorable light. I feel that if Ramo really had been the master who had just completed the reliefs of the *Youth of Christ*, no intrigue could have brought him to such degradation.

9. Photographers have not been kind to them. They appear, partly cut off by the margin, in the Alinari photo 4949. The *David*, at least, has suffered the same fate in Plates 6-9 of this book which are not among its most successfully printed reproductions.

10. In 1930 ("Eine Madonna von Giovanni Pisano," p. 168 n. 4) I believed that I detected a connection between the heads of these two kings and a head high up in the arch of the left portal of the Cathedral of Siena. I have long since recognized this as an error and H. Keller ("Die Bauplastik des Sieneſer Doms," *Kunstgeschichtliches Jahrbuch der Bib-*

*liotheca Hertziana*, 1, 1937) and Dr. Carli (*Sculture del Duomo di Siena*, Turin, 1941, p. 36) have arrived at the same conclusion. Nor can I accept as by Ramo the four busts on the inside of the lateral portals in Siena published by Carli (*ibid.*, pp. 33ff., and figs. 45-50) and now attributed to the master in the book under review, p. 18. They are the work of a Sieneſe follower of Giovanni Pisano and cannot therefore be by the hand of the highly independent master of the wooden group.

11. The document referred to above (Fumi, *op.cit.*, p. 21) says: "Et quod possit etiam discipulos quos voluerit expensis dicte fabricae retinere ad designandum, figurandum et faciendum lapides pro pariete supradicto." This passage cannot, in my opinion, be construed as implying that Maitani brought to Orvieto sculptors who were his pupils (Carli, p. 19). He was given permission to retain certain men who therefore must have been there before him and thus could not very well have been his pupils (why is "suos" missing?) but only those of the workshop which had previously been directed by the older master.

tween neutral background and landscape such as is found on the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius and that quotations from Roman monuments related in style to the master's own are not infrequent (the angels on pl. 44, the famous head of one of the *Damned*, pl. 57, which goes back to a Meleager sarcophagus). Compared with these sculptures which run the full gamut from fiery expression to lyrical sentiment, Maitani's drawing for the façade, a compromise between the first drawing and Arnolfo's façade, seems to betray a very different temperament.

But there is no need to quarrel about names since they do not affect the course of the development as it is clearly and, in my opinion, correctly drawn by Professor Carli. This is a most stimulating book, written lucidly and with great fairness to opposing views and, all in all, a worthy tribute to a great cycle of monumental sculpture.

MARTIN WEINBERGER  
New York University

PAOLA BAROCCHI, *Rosso Fiorentino*, Rome, Gismondi, 1950. Pp. 285; 236 illus.

For the Cinquecento scholar the appearance of a new and richly illustrated monograph on Rosso Fiorentino is a real event. The non-specialist, to whom the most important aspect of any volume on art is the photographs, will gain from Miss Barocchi's book a new insight into Rosso's style. The only existing monograph on the painter was Kusenberg's study which appeared two decades ago,<sup>1</sup> with eighty plates. The present work rejoices in nearly three times that number. Furthermore, instead of the generally black and hazy reproductions of paintings offered by Kusenberg, this book contains an excellent series including many unpublished details. The quality of the reproduction is not always equal to the beauty of the photographs (the drawings, for example, can be better appreciated in Kusenberg's large plates), but despite these defects no previous study has been able to illustrate the paintings of Rosso with anything like this force. The details of his most exalted work, the Volterra *Deposition*, show every head individually. They reveal the quality of Rosso's surface and his astonishingly abstract modeling as never before and allow the observer to penetrate in the faces and glances the disturbed inner life of the painter's fantastic personages. Although I have known the original of this altarpiece for years, and physically moved the panel during World War II, I am afraid I would not have identified fig. 21, reproducing five Callot-like soldiers in the background, sharp as hornets in their airy landscape.

The author is deeply absorbed in Rosso's style. She devotes herself to the poetic essence of each work, from the poignancy of the Volterra altarpiece to the refined lyricism of the Florentine Madonnas and the sharper

fantasy of the Fontainebleau frescoes, everywhere lightened by the painter's macabre wit. She analyzes Rosso's line and his colorism with care and delicacy. But a kind of aesthetic mysticism seems at times to lead her own literary style to ritualistic elaboration. Certain sentences are so laden with interlocking systems of modifiers that the movement of the thought is arrested. On reaching the end of a sentence the reader sometimes finds difficulty in remembering what the beginning was about. Sentences like this appear on almost every page: "But for the unprecedentedly stretched and hallucinated phantoms of the *Deposition* of Volterra and of the *Daughters of Jethro*, for the refined magnificence of the *Sposalizio* in San Lorenzo and for the unilateral and unitonal anti-Roman polemic of the *Deposition* of Borgo is now substituted a more mature language, which affirms an abstraction not so absolute and extreme, more pointed and at the same time serene, and articulates the linear and luministic conquests of the Aretine drawings and of the saints in the *Transfiguration* into an ample psychological and stylistic scale, modulated on the fundamental notes of abstract beauty and good-humored irony, often intoned in an enchanted detachment."<sup>2</sup> Such phrases reveal a rich understanding of Rosso's art. It is a pity they were not stated with less forbidding density.

The author has "sought to analyze minutely all" the artist's "works, to evaluate them in the figurative environment in which they were born, and to capture their most subtle shadings and meanings, in order to fix and define in the various directions assumed by the aspirations and the stylistic solutions of the painter that coherency and unity of vision which constitute his artistic individuality" (p. 13). Lyrical descriptions of works of art are bound to find themselves in a losing competition with the artist. Nor can they be really accurate. As an example of the impossibility of "defining" an artist's style in words, take this characteristic passage: "[Rosso] is indeed a hallucinated man who uses color masterfully, but accompanies it with a refined linear sensibility; a sometimes impetuous genius, but for the most part extremely self-conscious and reflective" (p. 12). Could such a characterization not apply equally well to Botticelli, to Lorenzo Monaco, to Coppo di Marcovaldo? Or to Matisse?

According to this Pateresque aestheticism, "the artist" tends to become a fiat creation of the author's sensibility. A picture is no longer the product of a human personality, the vehicle of human needs. The circumstances of Rosso's existence are relegated to a two-page biographical note, and no attempt is made to relate them to his style or to his artistic development. Nowhere is a document produced, and seldom is one even mentioned. There is no catalogue, either of paintings or drawings. Remarks on the preservation and repainting of the pictures are categorical but sketchy. In spite of the voluminous critical writing which makes up the bulk of the study, there is no systematic attempt

1. K. Kusenberg, *Le Rosso*, Paris, 1931.

2. This paragraph naturally sounds more clumsy in my literal translation, but the original is labored enough.