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as mere bozzetti, attractive, but still to be elaborated. The distinction that Baudelaire applied to similar criticism of Corot was the difference between a 'marecchio fato' and a 'marecchio fatto'. For Signorini the macchia was a method of breaking away from the academic traditions of the 'macchie floricole'. Signorini was not only the Macchiaiolo who doubled as an art critic, Adriano Cecioni combined his activities as painter and sculptor with regular contributions to the Florentine Giornale Artistico. Most prominent, however, was the art critic Diego Martelli who founded with Signorini in 1867 the weekly Gazzetta delle arti del disegno. He had started to publish in Florence in 1862, when he was already a friend of Abbati, Signorini and Borrani. His country house near Leghorn became the centre of the so-called Scuola di Castiglioncello. Piero Dini's biography of Martelli details his later contacts with the Parisian artistic avant-garde via introductions from his old friends Boldini and De Nittis. Degas painted his portrait twice in 1879 (National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh; Cleveland Museum of Art) in appreciation of his early defence of the Impressionists. Martelli had fought with Garibaldi, was an anti-clericalist, adhered to the socialism of Proudhon, and tried to convince his compatriots that the impressionists were fighting a battle for the renewal of the art of painting, as had the Macchiaioli a few decades before. However, he was misunderstood and after his death his texts were deliberately or unwittingly misinterpreted.

Within the framework of this article it would be impossible to give a survey of all the recent monographs and monographic exhibitions of Macchiaiolo painters and sculptors, but two deserve to be singled out. One is Piero Dini's Giuseppe Abbati, l'opera completa (Turin, 1987), in the well produced series Archivi dell'Ottocento, a richly documented volume with excellent colour illustrations that do justice to the unmistakable qualities of macchia painting. Giuliano Matteucci, Raffaele Monti and Ettore Spalletti organised in 1987 at the Palazzo Pitti an exhibition of the caposcuola, Giovanni Fattori, with a hundred and forty-five paintings, an exhaustive survey of his works from 1854 until 1906, which took in all the plein-air paintings on panels that look like cigar box lids, including the study of Silvestro Lega painting on the rocks near Leghorn, and the sunny and splendidly relaxed portrait of Diego Martelli at Castiglioncello (1867). The exhibition also included many works from private collections, and they were all reproduced in colour. The reproductions are sometimes so good that one experiences not only the surface of the paint, but also the texture and ground colour of the panels.

In 1988 two more general exhibitions were held in which the Macchiaiolo movement played a significant rôle. The city of Milan organised Il secondo '800 italiano, le poesie del vero, which was shown at the Palazzo Reale in the summer of 1988. Here the macchia as the 'espressione della realtà moderna' was shown in the context of northern-Italian and Neapolitan verismo. Unfortunately the catalogue items are not numbered and have no entries, which renders the publication unpractical. This large show coincided with the exhibition Ottocento/novaentec, Italiani na kunst 1870-1910 at the Rijksmuseum Vincent van Gogh in Amsterdam. The selection for the latter was made difficult since most of the important works were already on loan to the Palazzo Reale. In Amsterdam the Macchiaioli were represented only by three artists, Lega, Signorini and Fattori. Because of the starting year of 1870, the emphasis had to be on Neapolitan social verismo and Milanese scapigliatura. But the best part of this exhibition was devoted to the art of the twentieth century: Italian divisionism and pre-futurism were represented with some of the best works of Morbelli, Pellizza da Volpedo and Segantini, and with striking pictures by Balla and Bocconi, which completely ousted the exhibition's thin beginnings. Unfortunately, this unintentional climax may have led some visitors to draw unfavourable conclusions about the quality of Italian nineteenth-century art. The catalogue contained some interesting essays, such as Ammie-Paule Quinsac on Vittore Grubicy, the Hague School, the introduction of divisionism to Italy and the significance of 'ideism'.

Ottocento painting is no longer terra incognita: some explorers have been more intrepid than others, and surprising discoveries are still to be expected. JOHN SILLEVIS


The volume under review includes 14 articles, one book review and a lecture by Ludwig Heydenreich (1939-78) on various Leonardo topics. All contributions but one, the Mellon Lecture on Leonardo's drawings given in 1972 at the National Gallery in Washington D.C., had been published before between 1932 and 1977. The original languages of first publication (French, Italian, English and German) have been maintained.

The major drawback of the collection is its total lack of up-to-date bibliographical references and some attempt to remedy that is made below. This is the more frustrating because most articles focus on two major topics, both related to each other and still topical today: the union of art and science in Leonardo's thought and the importance of drawings. The other main subjects discussed in this volume are Leonardo's letter to Sultan Bajezid II, the Treatise on Painting, the Salvador Mundi, Dutertre's copy of the Last Supper, the monument for Gian Giacomo Trivulzio, the rediscovery of the Madrid manuscripts, and landscape drawings.

Heydenreich's strong interest in drawings and in the relation of art and science is emphasised by his editor's preface and in the first contribution reprinted, Heydenreich's review of Bodmer's monograph on Leonardo da Vinci (1931). However, the editor has omitted the major part of this review, where Heydenreich not only discussed problems of style, attribution and the chronology of Leonardo's drawings but also revealed aspects of his own ideas on art historical method.

Heydenreich took his doctoral degree at Hamburg University in 1928 and he was also associated with the Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliothek Warburg in the same city. But his teachers of those days, scholars such as Erwin Panofsky, Fritz Saxl, Ernst Cassirer and Aby Warburg himself, seem to have had only limited impact on Heydenreich's understanding of method. In the Bodmer review he uses Warburgian terminology ('schmückendes Beiwerk'), and again in his St Anne (first published in 1933) he refers to Warburg's notion of 'demonic antiquity' ('dämonische Antike'). In his analysis of Leonardo's St Anne he utilises Warburg's ideas on 'classical unquietness' ('klassische Unruhe') to support Walter Friedländer's
idea that anti-classicism and mannerism were not brought into being by an artistic revolution, but rather developed from artistic ideas of the fourteenth century. Thus Heydenreich began his argument with ideas of the so-called Warburgian school but, in the end, Walter Friedländer's discussion became his major point of reference.

The next essay, Arte e scienza, first published in 1945, also shows a shift in methodological sympathies. Heydenreich interprets some Leonardo paintings as symbols beyond the sphere of the image or as unexplained symbolic allegories. This is a far cry from Panofsky, to whom symbol and symbolic form signified a much more profound intellectual notion.

Instead of pursuing the methods of his teachers, Heydenreich concentrated on the traditional strengths of art history, such as the observation of style and technique, the search for historical facts and the presentation of iconographical typology. Most of the results he obtained by these methods have not — as far as I am aware — challenged, but a few suggestions and corrections should be added. In his article on St Anne, Heydenreich established a new chronology, proposing that Leonardo started his composition with the upper left sketch of the British Museum drawing and then proceeded to other variations including the one described by Novellara. In the discussions of Leonardo's various compositions for St Anne, Heydenreich's proposals have always been a major point of reference (see Berduschi). But some of the arguments will have to be revised because of a drawing published recently, that seems to be Leonardo's first cartoon for St Anne as described by Novellara (Leonardo e il Leonar- dismo, 1983).

To Heydenreich's introduction to Philip McMahon's edition of the Treatise on Painting, one should add that Carlo Pedretti (1965) has suggested Francesco Melzi as the compiler of Leonardo's treatise, a hypothesis anticipated by Heydenreich and mostly agreed upon today. Pedretti (1965) also confirmed Heydenreich's assumption that the Treatise on Painting circulated widely in the sixteenth century.

In another essay reprinted in this volume under review, Heydenreich discusses André Dutertre's copy of The Last Supper (1789-94, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum); the importance of this copy for the reconstruction of Leonardo's Last Supper has been confirmed by the latest restoration (Heydenreich/Bertelli, 1982).

A few years later, in his analysis of Leonardo's designs for the Trivulzio Monument Heydenreich incidentally follows earlier arguments (e.g. Clark, 1939) but he also provides a new chronology with a date around winter 1506-07 for the drawings 1233x and 1235x at Windsor Castle. Pedretti (I cavalli, 1984) now suggests the year 1509.

The only contribution hitherto unpub- lished of Heydenreich's lecture on Leonardo's drawings (1952), suffers particularly from the lack of bibliographical references. One should add that Leonardo's 'kinetische Skizze' and his 'komposition insulato' (a kind of crude sketch) have been analysed by E. Panofsky (1940) and E.H. Gombrich (1952). Also worth pointing out is the long tradition of scholarship on Leonardo's drawings (see Gould, 1932) from the nineteenth century up to the most recent editions of Leonardo's drawings at Windsor Castle.

Finally, one should note that the discussion of art and science in Leonardo has its limits. The relation between these subjects can be discussed successfully as long as the drawings are concerned, but in the analysis of the Leonardo reference to the Madonnas of the Arti, the Madonna with the carnation, the André Dutertre copy of the Last Supper and the Trivulzio Monument, that is, in the discussion of works of art, Heydenreich found it much harder or almost impossible to establish a significant link between art and science.

The following selection of references may give the opportunity for further reading:

Most arguments about Leonardo's St Anne are summarised in: BURGIO: The Sequence of Leonardo's Sketches for the Virgin of the Virgin of St Anne and St John the Baptist 1. The Art Bulletin, LXV (1983), pp.34-50; the drawing after the cartoon described by Novellara is published in Leonardo and il Leonardismo, 1974, Catalogo a cura di M. Vegazzoni, Florence (1985).


