

# THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE



Degas Manet Munch  
Italian etchings Leonardo in London

USA \$19.00

APRIL 1989

UK £7.00

as mere *bozzetti*, attractive, but still to be elaborated. The distinction that Baudelaire applied to similar criticism of Corot was the difference between a '*morceau fini*' and a '*morceau fait*'. For Signorini the *macchia* was a method of breaking away from the academic traditions of the '*vecchia scuola*'. Signorini was not the only Macchiaiolo who doubled as an art critic; Adriano Cecioni combined his activities as painter and sculptor with regular contributions to the Florentine *Giornale Artistico*.<sup>12</sup> Most prominent, however, was the art critic Diego Martelli who founded with Signorini in 1867 the weekly *Gazzettino delle arti del disegno*.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> 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 Macchiaioli 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.<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup>

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 poetiche 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/novecento, Italiaanse 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 that 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 Volpeda and Segantini, and with striking pictures by Balla and Boccioni, which completely outshone 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 Annie-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

<sup>12</sup>See P. SELVATICO: *Arte ed artisti*, Padova [1863]; cf. C. BAUDELAIRE: 'Salon de 1845', in *Charles Baudelaire, Critique d'Art*, tome 1, Paris [1965] p.61. The polemic between 'Luigi' and 'X' is reprinted in E. CECCHI and M. BORGOTTI: *Macchiaioli toscani d'Europa*, Florence [1963]; see also A. CECIONI: *Scritti e ricordi*, Florence [1905].

<sup>13</sup>A.M. FORTUNA: *Il Gazzettino delle arti del Disegno di Diego Martelli, 1867, edizione integrale con copiosi indici*, Florence [1968].

<sup>14</sup>P. DINI: *Diego Martelli*, Florence [1978]; see also A. BOSCHETTO: *Scritti d'arte di Diego Martelli*, Florence [1952]; A. MARABOTTINI and V. QUERCIOLE: *Diego Martelli, corrispondenza inedita*, Roma [1978]; P. DINI: *Diego Martelli e gli Impressionisti*, Florence [1979]; F. ERRICO: *Diego Martelli, les Impressionistes et l'Art Moderne*, Paris/Rome [1979].

<sup>15</sup>*Giuseppe Abbati*. By Piero Dini. 362 pp. + XLVI col. pls. + 178 b. & w. ills. + figs (Umberto Allemandi, Turin, 1987). Dini's previous book, also published in the series *Archivi dell'Ottocento*, was *Dal Caffè Michelangiolo al Caffè Nouvelle Athènes. I Macchiaioli tra Firenze e Parigi*, 248 pp. + 43 col. pls. + 307 b. & w. ills. (Umberto Allemandi, Turin, 1986). It coincided with an exhibition on the same theme at Montecatini Terme, August-October 1986.

<sup>16</sup>G. MATTEUCCI, R. MONTI, E. SPALETTI: *Giovanni Fattori Dipinti 1854-1906*, Palazzo Pitti, Florence [1987].

**Leonardo-Studien.** By Ludwig H. Heydenreich. Edited by Günther Passavant. 192 pp. 3 col. pls. + 131 b. & w. ills. (Prestel-Verlag, Munich, 1988), DM148. ISBN 3-7913-0764-9.

The volume under review includes 14 articles, one book review and a lecture by Ludwig Heydenreich (1903-78) 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 frus-

trating 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 Salvator 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 in the 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 article on Leonardo's 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 gradually 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 – been 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 Budny, 1983). But some of the arguments will have to be revised because of a drawing, published recently, that shows Leonardo's first cartoon for *St Anne* as described by Novellara (*Leonardo e il Leonardismo*, 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 (1977) also confirmed Heydenreich's assumption that the *Treatise on Painting* circulated widely in the sixteenth century.

In another essay reprinted in the 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).

In his analysis of Leonardo's designs for the Trivulzio Monument Heydenreich roughly follows earlier arguments (e.g. Clark, 1952) but he also provides a new chronology with a date around winter 1506/07 for the drawings 12353 and 12355 at Windsor Castle. Pedretti (*I cavalli*, 1984) now suggests the year 1509.

The only contribution hitherto unpublished, Heydenreich's lecture on Leonardo's drawings (1972), suffers particularly from the lack of bibliographical references. One should add that Leonardo's 'kinetic drawing' and his '*componimento inculco*' (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, 1952) 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 drawings are concerned, but in the analysis of the Louvre *St Anne*, the *Salvator Mundi*, 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 by v. BUDNY: 'The Sequence of Leonardo's Sketches for the "Virgin and the Child with Saint Anne and Saint John the Baptist"', *The Art Bulletin*, LXV [1983], pp.34-50; the drawing after the cartoon described by Novellara is published in *Leonardo e il Leonardismo a Napoli e a Roma. Catalogo a cura di Alessandro Vezzosi*, Florence [1983].

For the problem of art and science see: J. ACKERMAN: 'Concluding Remarks: Science and Art in the Work of Leonardo da Vinci', *Leonardo's Legacy. An International Symposium*. Edited by C.D. O'Malley, Berkeley/Los Angeles [1969], pp.205-25. For further references see M. KEMP: *Leonardo da Vinci. The Marvellous Works of Nature and Man*, London [1981]; K. VELTMAN: *Studies on Leonardo da Vinci I. Linear Perspective and the Visual Dimensions of Science and Art*, Munich [1986].

For the *Treatise on Painting* see: C. PEDRETTI: *Leonardo da Vinci on Painting. A Lost Book (Libro A)*, London [1965]; C. PEDRETTI: *The Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci. Commentary*, 2 Vols., Oxford [1977], I, pp.12-47. See the latter also for doubts on the authenticity of Leonardo's letter to Sultan Bajazet II, accepted by Heydenreich.

For Leonardo's drawings see: A.E. POPHAM: *The Drawings of Leonardo da Vinci*, London [1946]; C. GOULD: 'On the Critique of Leonardo's Drawings', *Leonardo. Saggi e Ricerche*, Rome [1954], pp.187-95; further references: K.D. KEELE and C. PEDRETTI: *Leonardo da Vinci. Corpus of the Anatomical Studies in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*, 3 Vols., New York/London [1979-83]. On landscape and miscellaneous drawings see Pedretti's new editions of Leonardo's drawings at Windsor Castle (see M. KEMP: 'Treasure Trove', *Art Book Review*, II [1983], pp.26-28) and: *Leonardo da Vinci. Natur und Landschaft. Naturstudien aus der Königlichen Bibliothek in Windsor Castle*, exh.cat., edited by C. PEDRETTI, Stuttgart/Zurich [1983] (English edition 1980).

For Leonardo's monument for Gian Giacomo Trivulzio see: *I Cavalli di Leonardo. Studi sul cavallo e altri animali di Leonardo da Vinci dalla Biblioteca Reale nel Castello di Windsor*, Florence [1984].

Since Heydenreich's contribution on the Codex Madrid the Codex itself has been published: *The Madrid Codices of Leonardo da Vinci. Translated from the Italian by Ladislao Reti*, New York [1974] (reviewed by J. ACKERMAN, *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, XXXVI [1977], pp.46-50).

For the *Salvator Mundi* see: J. SNOW-SMITH: *The Salvator Mundi of Leonardo da Vinci*, Seattle [1982]; for the *Last Supper* and its copies see L.H. HEYDENREICH and C. BERTELLI: *Invito a Leonardo. L'ultima cena*, Milan [1982]; J. SHELL and D.A. BROWN et al.: *Giampestrino e una copia cinquecentesca dell'ultima cena di Leonardo*, n.p. [1988]. General references may be found in: A. LORENZI and P. MARANI: *Bibliografia vinciana 1964-1979*, Florence [1982]; H. LADENDORF: *Leonardo da Vinci und die Wissenschaften. Eine Literaturübersicht*, Cologne [1984]. *Raccolta Vinciana*, XII [1987], pp.387-573.

Other writings referred to in my text are: H. BODMER: *Leonardo. Des Meisters Gemälde und Zeichnungen (Klassiker der Kunst XXXVII)*, Stuttgart/Berlin [1931] (reviewed by L.H. HEYDENREICH, *Kritische Berichte*, IV [1931/32], pp.161-79); A. WARBURG: 'Der Eintritt des antiklassierenden Idealstils in die Malerei der Frührenaissance' [1914], in *A. Warburg, Gesammelte Schriften*, Leipzig/Berlin [1932], I, pp.173-76; H. WÖLFFLIN: *Die Klassische Kunst*, Munich [1899]; W. FRIEDLÄNDER: 'Die Entstehung des antiklassischen Stils in der italienischen Malerei um 1520', *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, XVII [1925], pp.49-86; E. PANOFSKY: *The Codex Huygens and Leonardo da Vinci's Art Theory*, London [1940], pp.122-28; K. CLARK: *Leonardo da Vinci*, Harmondsworth [1967]; E.H. GOMBRICH: 'Leonardo's Method for Working out Compositions' (1952) in E.H. GOMBRICH: *Norm and Form*, London [1966], pp.58-63.

The quotations from Leonardo's *Treatise on Painting*, included in this volume but not identified, are p.61 (Codex Urbinas fols.7v and 24v); p.159 (Codex Urbinas fols.113v and 161v-62r). The quotation on p.158 does not derive from the *Treatise on Painting* (or at least I could not identify it), but there is a similar remark on fol.34r.

FRANK ZÖLLNER  
*Bibliotheca Hertziana, Rome*

**Painting Politics for Louis-Philippe. Art and Ideology in Orleanist France, 1830-48.** By Michael Marrinan. 310 pp. + 8 col. pls. + 239 b. & w. ills. (Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1988), £35. ISBN 0-300-03853-4.

Within the history of nineteenth-century French art, the twenty years broadly corresponding to the reign of the Orleanist monarch Louis-Philippe, bounded by the revolutions of 1830 and 1848, have received remarkably little scholarly attention. Falling between the apparently more dynamic decades marked for traditional historiography by the emergence of such dominating figures as Delacroix and Courbet, the 1830s and 40s are generally dismissed as an era of eclecticism and drift, a hiatus encapsulated in the essentially negative title chosen by Léon Rosenthal for his classic account of the period – *Du Romantisme au Réalisme*. In both historical and cultural terms, however, France's brief flirtation with Orleanism is of crucial importance. The consolidation of power by the *haute-bourgeoisie*, the gradual expansion of large-scale industrial activity and the growth of popular political consciousness facilitated by an increasingly powerful press, all played a decisive part in the transformation of France into a modern capitalist economy. In artistic terms, too, the period was one of intense activity and considerable complexity, witnessing a dramatic inflation in production, an explosion in journalistic commentary on the arts and the intervention of new social groupings in the cultural market place. For Michael Marrinan, in his important study of royal patronage under the July Monarchy, *Painting Politics for Louis-Philippe*, the king's personal rôle in formulating an ideological agenda for official commissions was crucial in moulding the artistic vocabulary employed in what remained the most prestigious of genres, that of history painting. Challenging received characterisations of the