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The idea for this book took shape several years ago, and not without knowing that Ernő Marosi—member and former vice-president of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, former head of the Academy's Research Institute for Art History and professor at Eötvös Loránd University—did not wish a Festchrift in his honour. In fact, we have acted against his wishes by expressing, in a potentially lasting form, our respect, admiration and affection for him as an outstanding member of our profession.

The Latin title of the book refers to the medieval interpretation of the relationship between the good and the beautiful, and so to Ernő Marosi's inquiries into art history and theory. It derives from a sentence by St Thomas Aquinas, quoting Pseudo-Dionysius: "... bonum laudatur ut pulchrum" (Summa theologiae I q. 5 a. 4 arg. 1). The choice was guided by the significance of the 13th-century philosopher's work, which summed up major currents of medieval thinking, and by the realisation that "aesthetic" characteristics of perceptible qualities are essentially inseparable from the abstract concept of "good".

Before the first three introductory studies, Ernő Marosi's substantial and so far complete bibliography has been published in the volume. The introductory studies cover various aspects of Professor Marosi's work. The rest deal with the products and problems of medieval art (from the 9th to the first half of the 16th century), one of his principal areas of interest. Most of the authors are Ernő Marosi's former students, colleagues and friends. Here we remember that Sándor Tóth, his contemporary and university colleague, despite being one of the first to accept, was prevented from meeting our request. Professor Tóth proposed to elaborate on a paper he delivered in 2003 about the making of the Hungarian coronation mantle. That paper was a laudation, presented at a ceremony held in the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, where Professor Marosi's own study of the mantle received the Opus Mirabile award. Sándor Tóth's talk was concerned with a gold-embroidered chasuble, part of a prelate's vestment completed in 1031 and bearing an inscription that shows it to have been made for the Provostal Church of the Virgin Mary in Székesfehérvár. It was commissioned by the royal couple most likely for the coronation ceremony planned for that year. Later, and possibly related to its
original intended use, but in altered form, it did indeed become one of the regalia of Hungarian kings. The *Chronicum Pictum*, quoted in the talk, states that when King Stephen “…the holy father wished to pass to his holy son the duties of government and burdens of state, Prince Emeric died an early death”. Just as the coronation fell victim to Emeric’s death in 1031, so the essay reassessing the making of the chasuble was impeded by the untimely death of Sándor Tóth in late 2007. No trace of his lecture, delivered without notes, has been found in his manuscripts. It is to be hoped, nonetheless, that *verba manent*.

Ernő Marosi’s broad field of interest, and many of his works, also embrace later eras. Had it been within our means to produce a multi-volume Festschrift we would have liked to have included contributions by specialists in these areas as well. They are recognized in the *tabula gratulatoria*.

In the planning of this book and in various stages of its production, most valuable advice was provided by Géza Galavics and Katalin Granasztói-Györffy, and assistance by István Bardoly and Attila Mudrák. Ágnes Körber placed her great editing experience at our disposal.

The book would not have seen the light of day without the personal intervention of József Hámori and Miklós Maróth, the past and present vice-presidents of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, or without the Academy’s financial support. The Research Institute for Art History provided the administrative background for our venture, relieving us of all the associated complexities.

On behalf of the hundreds of friends, colleagues and present and former students of Ernő Marosi, we wish him many Happy Returns on the occasion of his seventieth Birthday.

*Livia Varga, László Beke, Anna Jávor, Pál Lővei, Imre Takács*
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Having been compiled to celebrate the work of Ernő Marosi, this collection of studies belongs to a category which lies somewhere between historical analysis and laudation. The laudation is a well-defined prose form, whose rhetorical traditions require in the introduction (exordium) a declaration of the author’s relationship with the person being honoured, and a proper allusion to the community which commissioned it.¹ No laudation really confines itself to a single person; the deeds being praised are those which have served the glory of the community.

The present author thus declares herself a pupil, one of the hundreds taught by Marosi during their university studies. This is nothing rare, or special: Marosi gave his first lectures in 1964, and even after he stopped teaching students directly, he continued, through his book Bevezetés a művészettörténetbe… (“Introduction to the History of Art”), to exert his influence on everyone “headed that way”, or to use Simone Weil’s expression, gently ushering inward those poised at the “mouth of the labyrinth”.² Marosi’s admirers, more numerous even than his students, form a kind of community linked not by mutual acquaintance, but by shared appreciation of his work and, when they have had the chance, through the channels of academic discourse.

This brings us to Marosi’s contributions to that academic discourse. One of the ubiquitous accessories of scholarly work nowadays is the computer folder, where we store away information for our future research, or just out of interest. The Marosi files on my computer are scattered among many sub-folders, some very old, and like most folders, somewhat disordered. Whenever I open them, the word “folder” comes back to me in its former sense, bringing back homely feelings that go back to my childhood. Before the computer age, a “folder” was something for storing drawings and notes; the Hungarian word for it, mappa, also carries an association with maps. Maps were a favourite feature of our childhood, the object of imaginary travels at a time when real travel was somewhat restricted. So we looked at the maps, learning the names of towns in unknown worlds, the hills and the rivers, looking for landmarks. We tried to imagine the height of the mountains and the length of the rivers. Now I realise that my discovery of the world through maps, with their coordinates and towering mountain peaks, is not
so far removed from exploration of my mappas—folders—today. The data in my Marosi mappa has long been gathering into mountain regions and towering peaks on my intellectual map. The folder is not a closed structure, and does not represent a closed oeuvre; Marosi folders, which must exist on many people’s computers on many desks, are like inquisitive creatures, always on the lookout for new Marosi material, and open to receive new arrivals.

In the spirit of these mappas, what is discussed here is not Marosi the person, but his work as it appears in the academic discourse. In discussing Marosi’s work, we somehow also say something about the path so many of us have taken, and about our own thinking. Staying with the map analogy: on the pretext of Marosi himself, this is an attempt to survey the changing viewpoints of art-historiography in Hungary, to look at how far he—and we—have come relative to the coordinates we have set ourselves.

In an article he wrote in the 1990s, Marosi played with the idea of what kind of history would emerge if the history of art was presented not in the chronology of events and production of art works, but in the chronology of the emergence of problems and the finding of answers. He saw potential in the idea that “history might be written the other way round: in the order of the discovery of art eras and phenomena”, letting us understand “how and why the hitherto apparently blind eyes opened to the sight and perception of certain qualities.”

Our sad legacy: “progressive” traditions

First comes the question: what were the circumstances in which Marosi started his university studies in 1958, and how did they develop in the period up to his graduation in 1963? And what was the general situation when he was emerging as a scholar? Not having been a direct witness of these years, the present author can get an idea of the university and scholarly world of that time only through a veil of sources and reminiscences. The beginning of his studies coincided with the darkest period of reprisals following the 1956 Revolution. Art historians were also experiencing a crisis at that time. Talented and productive people abandoned the field, or went abroad. Lajos Fülep’s gradual withdrawal from academic and university life had an unsettling effect on the profession. Details of certain stages of that process have come to light recently with the publication of Fülep’s correspondence. His retreat was the last stage in a power game being played by others, the grabbing of positions by a small group of Marxist historians in the committees of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Magyar Tudományos Akadémia or MTA) and key areas of universities, ministries and museums.

Conflicts had bubbled up in the slightly freer atmosphere of 1956, when the Art History Committee of the Academy committed the “scandal” of holding secret
voting on committee members, departing from the ways of the one-party state. A warning was duly delivered, but the committee refused to budge, and the MTA’s Second Section of Philosophy and Historical Sciences ordered a re-election without the knowledge or consent of the chairman, Lajos Fülep. The committee was filled with nominees: Nóra Aradi and Ilona Berkovits remained, and Aladár Dobrovits was brought in (May 1957). Klára Garas became the secretary. In January 1960, they were joined by the newly-appointed Director of the Hungarian National Gallery (Magyar Nemzeti Galéria), Gábor Ö. Pogány. The official line was that they were appointed *ex officio* because of their other, government positions. Fülep did not believe this, or pretended not to believe it. In his farewell letter, he sharply attacked firstly Pogány, and secondly the methods themselves. Setting aside personal feelings and antipathies, the official explanation was in fact probably correct. The Academy had lost its organisational autonomy in 1949, and operated as a Soviet-type super-institution, a veritable “Planning Office” under tight state, and above all Party, control. Fülep made as if he was unaware of this dependence, and saw no obstacle to a secret ballot. The experiment was certainly proved a failure by events: no action hinting at the autonomy of the old Academy could be tolerated. The only possible candidates for academic positions were those in the Party *nomenklature*. The Party’s view of the situation is best understood from a private letter by Pogány in 1960. Although unofficial, it gives a good insight into the opinions of some conservative-left wing Party members, the influential circle which Tibor Huszár has identified as having carried out “clandestine” Party activity within the Academy. Pogány wrote in his letter that after 1949, unlike other Academy committees (philosophy, history, literature) the old bourgeois art historians were not removed, enabling them to “stifle every endeavour which smelled of Marxism”. Pogány finished his letter to the Director of the Academy’s Publishers with the words, “What is saddest is that this situation has especially had a detrimental effect on young aspiring academics, most of whom have become half-educated snobs, bourgeois [...] activists, ministers to Western culture.” These lines applied to those who were currently pursuing their studies, i.e. Marosi’s generation.

The situation in the Department of Art History at that time could have been little different. Indeed, its personnel included some of the protagonists from the drama on the Academy’s Art History Committee: Lajos Fülep, Lajos Vayer, Anna Zádor, Gábor Ö. Pogány as external lecturer, and soon also Nóra Aradi. It was perhaps subject to rather less ideological pressure than other departments, as Fülep’s authority secured a large degree of protection. Nonetheless, some people retain memories of strict ideological constraints at that time.

*The sixties*

The general situation started to consolidate in 1962. The boundaries of post-Revolution intellectual life suddenly seemed to crystallise. As Mihály Vajda so
nicely put it, “everything, be it nice or nasty, was so straightforward”, or at least became so. These are not just the nostalgic words of a man looking back on his youth, but the view of a cultural philosopher. Vajda went so far as to state that it was the beginning of a new era in political affairs and—what we might see as most important—in everyday life and the world of historical ideas. The nineteen sixties put an end to the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. This was the start of the postmodern age, said Vajda, which also meant that “there is no longer just one truth!” These are weighty words, full of pathos. So much so, they demand a more detailed explanation that may be given here; the reader is referred to the above essay by Mihály Vajda and the burgeoning literature on postmodernism. “The end of the Enlightenment” was not an anti-Enlightenment statement on Vajda’s part. Quite the reverse: both that and the “postmodern” were the off-springs of modernisation. Postmodernism is definitely NOT an “anti-modern” development. This was no burst of nostalgia, nor was it a revival of the conservative outlook in which history has an “ultimate aim”. What was at issue was still “modernism”, but of a new kind which, unlike its predecessors, takes account of “where we stand in the light of what went before”. Central to these explanations is a premise which became the deepest conviction of the entire generation: THERE IS NO LONGER ONLY ONE TRUTH. The significance of this thesis becomes truly manifest only in the specifics, in historical dimensions. The clarions of the Sole Truth, heard so loudly in the single-party world of the fifties and sixties, had also been hearkened to by many souls in the thirties and forties. Only the ideological tune was different. The historical narrative of “single cause and purpose” merely shed the ideals of national autonomy, ethnic character and race, and took up the cause of the class war. This was propagated through everyday ideological indoctrination at every level. After the “either-or” worlds which defined the lives of the majority of a generation—the Fathers—the longed-for “and” / “also” interpretation of postmodernism which broke through the clouds after 1956 was a crucial change.

Introduction to the Hungarian history of art 1951–1967

Marosi started teaching as soon as he graduated, in 1964. His subject, following on from his degree dissertation, was the introduction to the history of art, reading sources and history of scholarship. He had chosen a subject from the history of scholarship for his dissertation: he explored and assessed the Gothic school of older art history. Two publications resulted from it: one an introductory study on the 19th century art historiography era known as “Romanticism”, Das romantische Zeitalter der ungarischen Kunstgeschichtsschreibung, 1965, which was published in the university’s journal in 1965. This was really the first thorough historiographical work to address the beginnings of the discipline. One of its central characters was Imre Henszlmann, whose work dominated the field in these years, partly
through the studies of Anna Zádor and partly by tradition: in the department headed by Antal Hekler during the interwar period, Henszlmann's memory was preserved with the esteem due to the founder. Later, Marosi wrote a study of the period for Lajos Vayer, and Árpád Timár wrote a dissertation on Imre Henszlmann's art criticism and its precedents for Anna Zádor in 1964.20

The most politically-sensitive chapters of Marosi's dissertation concerned the literature of the interwar period. He called this period the “second era” of Hungarian art historiography. (The “third era” was his own time).21 The extent to which this second era might be regarded as a continuation of the first era—that of romantic-national art historiography—was for him a historical question. Considering Marosi's later work on the previously little-explored field of historiography of art in Hungary, work in which he was to develop the modern form of the subject, it does not go too far to say that as regards his basic outlook, this youthful work laid the foundations for his entire career.

We get a real appreciation of the relevance of that dissertation, the novelty of its approach, and the changing situation, when we compare it with Anna Zádor's outline of the subject written more than ten years previously. Zádor's essay (1952) was the first proper overview of the historiography of art history. By 1963, her pupil Marosi set himself—was able to set himself—different objectives from those of his professor. His study was also prompted by different considerations: as a medievist,22 he was seeking the foundations of the Gothic outlook by an examination, through the sources, of the romantic historicism of the first generation of art historians and Christian archaeologists, Imre Henszlmann, Arnold Ipolyi and Flóris Rómer. While recognising their pioneering role in the foundation of art history and archaeology in Hungary, he bracketed their “national-romantic” view in parentheses. But he also bracketed the outlook of the Gothic scholars of the interwar period, especially their construction of history on the precarious foundation of the “national character”.

Zádor's 1952 paper, "Outline of the Development of History of Art in Hungary up to 1945" was, despite all efforts on the author's part, stamped with the ideological atmosphere of the early 1950s.23 It was published in the first book of essays produced by the Művészettörténeti Munkaközösség (Art History Working Group), formed in 1951. It is not surprising that Zádor mentions in her essay the...
“need for realism” in research and the duality of investigation and interpretation of sources. She particularly referred to the relationship with living art, the basic goal of the profession. These were issues on the agenda of the official public debate at that time. Despite the use of Marxist formulas, Zádor’s paper did not satisfy the political establishment, which demanded that historiography be regarded purely as part of the class struggle, a means of demolishing the bourgeois view of history. The extent to which these ambitions were alive and pressing is clear from the preface to the book and one of its chapters, an unsigned report on the Art History Working Group. These stated that the prime aim was to “collect the art historical material of the previous 150 years”. By “exposing and solving the erroneous theories, views and schools of the recent past”, research into the history of art “can provide effective assistance to solving the current problems of art”. “The most important reason for investigating the recent past is the need to develop a combative theoretical method.” This would soon result in “Hungarian Marxist art history”, “the presentation by materialist principles of the history of the arts in Hungary in the 19th and 20th centuries”, etc. The word “combative” here came from the militant political phrasology of the time, and was aimed at discrediting and diabolising the enemy, the representatives of “bourgeois historiography”.

These demands were not just words. Enquiries were held on the contributions to the book. Anna Zádor’s paper went through this procedure, which is not surprising considering her obvious exertions to give as little space as possible to militant Party demands in her wording. Her account of the development of art history incorporated some current slogans, but was in fact very restrained in its criticism. The greater part of the paper covered the oeuvre of the 19th century “founding fathers”, Imre Henszlmann, Flóris Rómer and Ferenc Pulszky. The section on the historiography...
of art history between the two world wars presented many more positive developments than negative. This particularly applied to the work of her living colleagues—Dezső Dercsényi, Antal Kampis, László Gerevich, István Genthon, Sándor Mihalik, Endre Csatkai, Géza Entz, Mária Aggházy, Lajos Vayer, Jenő Kopp, Imre Oltványi-Artinger, József Bíró, Elemér Révhelyi, Pál Voit, Andor Píglér, Jolán Balogh, Iván Fenyo, Ervin Ybl and others.

The most important feature of Zádor's paper was not in fact the indulgent, superficial presentation, but the emphasis on the continuity in the writing of art history, its links with the present. At the beginning of the paper she puts the questions, "how did the history of art develop?" and "what are the useful and valuable achievements of our branch of scholarship, and what are its progressive traditions?"27 (My italics.) Considering that the phantom requirement of "collective scholarly work" headed the list of demands on work at that time, we might have doubts on the authorship of Zádor's text. How much were these questions her own, and how much the additions of the Working Group's editors? Feeding this suspicion is the fact that the concept of "progressive traditions" appeared simultaneously, as if by magic, in the history of literature, history of philosophy and other disciplines. It became a kind of basic category after 1948, and especially from 1950 onwards. Having already been in use by the Hungarian Communist Party in 1945, it had become a "topos" through the works of György Lukács and József Révai. This meant no more than the proposal and demand for development of fundamentally new (and Marxist) canons in literature, history, ethnography, architecture, linguistics, philosophy, art history, etc.28

At first sight, Marosi's dissertation, which he completed in 1963, seems also to have been produced with the intention of
creating new canons. His basic standpoint, however, fundamentally departed from the critical texts of the 1950s. It was not underpinned by some new kind of ideology. His historical review was not a search for his own views, but possibly, in the name of a “new age”, the historical precedents of the current view; for him, it was as if the category of “progressive traditions”, with its uncomfortable memories, did not exist. Neither were the great figures of art history those designated as “heroes” for the present. Their achievements had furthered their branch of scholarship not by their views, but chiefly by the body of knowledge they had contributed. In his first reviews of the history of the field, Marosi, like Zádor, did not go beyond the 1945 era. Reading between the lines, however, few of his comments touch on some of the cardinal theses of the two-volume reference work entitled *The History of Art in Hungary*, first published in 1956 with Lajos Fülep as editor-in-chief. Such are the ideas of the persistence of Hungarian Conquest-era artifacts and ornamentation in the Romanesque Era. Such were the issues of the French and Italian connections of Romanesque architecture, and the international relationships of Hungarian art. The very kind of problem on which Marosi and many others worked so intensively in later decades. The final sentences of his dissertation come as a surprise. In his view, the outlook bequeathed by interwar art historiography was not to be corrected by new ideological arguments; rather “the local historical approach to the problems of the era may be a shorter route to a critical assessment of its achievements”.29

*The Church of St Elizabeth in Kassa (Košice, SK)*

This was where the survey of art historiography linked up with the subject of Marosi’s doctoral thesis, an extensive study of the Church of St Elizabeth in Kassa. The introduction to the latter is an account not only of past research into the subject, but also of wider historiography. These two categories—history of research and history of art history—may be distinguished by their horizons. The former is concerned with previous scholarship on a particular art work, and the latter with the wider background and the presuppositions of history of ideas and history of culture. Marosi treated them in parallel. He published papers on the subject several years before producing the thesis.30 He made a separate treatment of older literature on the building. What was most important, however, was a highly de-
tiled description of the current state of the building, which very accurately revealed the changes made on it since the 1850s. Behind the dispassionate, descriptive style, there is a hint of the author’s deep moral disturbance. St Elizabeth’s in Kassa retained its original late medieval forms until the last third of the 19th century when it fell victim to the purist restoration methods of two generations of architects. It was Imre Henszlmann, foremost among the three founders of the art history discipline in Hungary, who first propounded the cause of purist restoration and elaborated its theory.

Direct analysis of the building and investigation of the history of research came to the same conclusions. Marosi was of the view that the misunderstanding arose from the ideological presupposition inherent in the earlier eras of art historiography. In extreme cases, like Kassa Cathedral, this can result in the destruction of a work of art. His criticism was thus directed not at one or the other, but all ideologies, the network of presuppositions, and he equated this to the lack of independent and impartial art history research. In that paper, Marosi confined his comment on these moral dimensions to a single footnote quoting a letter by Henszlmann, but the importance he ascribed to them was borne out by his frequent returns to the theme in his studies on Henszlmann he wrote in the following decades. In a letter he composed before 1847, Henszlmann set out the relationship between his own theories and the research to be carried out on the church: “Although it is not possible to prove the age of some parts of the building through charters, the absence of these is more than made up for by recent discoveries in Germany concerning the development and execution of the old German (Gothic) style; these make up for the absence of charters so well that even where there is no charter at all, we can hardly be out by more than half a century if we rely on style alone to determine the date of a section of an old German building”. The outcome of this was the restoration which the architect Károly Gerster commenced in 1846 under Henszlmann’s advice, or as Marosi puts it, “the first blow”, which led to the disappearance of the original building between 1857 and 1863: “the aspect presented by the church is closer to the restorers’ romantic visions of the Gothic style rather than the church’s original appearance”.

The controversial findings of the architectural research into the Church of St Elizabeth in Kassa arose from a misunderstanding of the building’s function. Marosi pointed out that the surviving medieval
Arnold Ipolyi (1823-1886)

churches in Hungary included “not a single cathedral, and only a few monastic churches. Most of what we have are town and village parish churches and their affiliate churches”. The importance of this statement lies in his identification of function as a factor in defining the type of a building. The function, and the changes in function, can ultimately be linked to the extent, acceptance and alteration of the plans. The Church of St Elizabeth was the parish church of a free royal town, and not a cathedral until 1804, a title conferred when it became a bishop’s seat. This goes some way to explain what prompted Imre Steindl’s post-1880 reconstruction: it was partly the misunderstanding of the building’s historical function and type, and partly the need to adapt it to its new role. The historical preconceptions attaching to certain stylistic periods also played a part. Both Henszlmann and Steindl wanted to reconstruct the church in the spirit of classical Gothic. They linked its foundation to King Louis I (the Great), a king for which the Hungarian national consciousness holds a special reverence, and never imagined that its patron might have been King and Emperor Sigismund, traditionally regarded by Hungarian historiography as anti-national and as having reigned over a period of decline.

It should be noted at this point that Marosi’s writing during the sixties and seventies maintained a kind of traditional and judgemental attitude to 19th-century historicism. This derived from Lajos Fülep’s ideas concerning historicism and the related notions of academism and eclecticism. In Fülep’s morally-based position, which undoubtedly bore the traces of Nietzsche’s view of history, artistic originality was the highest value. For Fülep, academism meant the absence of this, “non-art”. Marosi was to return to the issues of 19th-century historicism in later decades. This was essential to his historiographical studies, because the historicism was the dominant outlook in the early writing of Hungarian art history.

Flóris Rómer (1815–1889)
As a medieval scholar, Marosi also tackled the issues of medieval “historicism”, a term which carries a substantially different meaning from its 19th-century counterpart. This was to be the subject of his inaugural address as an academician several decades later. We will return later to his work on the historiography of art history, which he pursued with a consistency rare in the discipline in Hungary.

As already mentioned, the problem of St Elizabeth’s in Kassa, in the research of Marosi led to the issue of the Gothic era in Hungary. New research was called for into the beginnings of the Gothic style in Hungary, its relationship to the Romanesque, and the occurrences in the country of various types of Late Gothic. Substantial groundwork in this field had already been done by Géza Entz and László Gerevich. As Marosi noted, these two scholars had earned lasting credit through their investigation of the coexistence of Romanesque and Early Gothic.

Regional and historical parallels

The early 1960s brought a cautious opening in political and intellectual life. There were also changes in the Department of Art History. Professor Lajos Vayer attempted, where possible, to rebuild broken foreign contacts. In 1963, he managed to set up some academic research posts. These were first filled by Miklós Boskovits, Ilona Berkovits, Sándor Kontha and László Molnár. The first two were concerned with Renaissance art and book illumination. In 1967, Marosi reviewed the department’s post-1960 work in the university journal. This contained the still-striking comment that it was the firm intention of the department’s medieval and Renaissance researchers to view the art history of Hungary within the context of general art history. Vayer’s researches into Italian art and Miklós Boskovits’ many essays and book reviews on the subject were consistent with this. The same aim was pursued by a conference held by the MTA, with the involvement of the department, in 1965. The title of the conference, and the subjects of its papers, do indeed attest to endeavours towards unity, mainly in the Central European, rather than the pan-European, context: “Les problèmes du gothique et de la renaissance et l’art de l’Europe Centrale”. “Central European art” was at that time an apparently novel geography-of-art framework, although it had been in use before the Second World War. A French-language bibliography of the
subject in Hungary was published for the occasion, under Boskovits’ leadership, with background work being done by the staff and students of the department.41

The influence of the Central European Gothic workshops in Bohemian, Austrian and South Polish lands on developments in Hungary was dealt with at that 1965 conference. It is true, however, that research in Hungary both before the war and in the following decades had already taken into account art works from these cultural regions. The regional view and the development of art geography considerations after 1945 has a pre-history which would require a separate study, and developed very slowly over several generations. Marosi’s studies in this subject expanded on the approach to the geography of art taken by his predecessors Lajos Vayer, Anna Zádor, László Gerevich and Dezső Dercsényi. As an example, only László Gerevich’s essay on Central European Gothic is mentioned here.42 For the new generation of medieval and Renaissance art historians who started to publish in the 1970s, the aim was not just to treat Central European influences, but also to integrate the results of current research on art works.43

It should be noted that the concept of “Central European art” as the basis of categories in the medieval and modern-era history of art was a striking phenomenon in 1965. It laid out the ground for historical and literary discourses on the existence of a Central European region, discourses which only started in the seventies and mostly played out in unofficial circles—in “secondary publication”. The most important event in this respect was the publication of Jenő Szűcs’ article, Vázlat Európa három történeti régiójáról (“An Outline of Three Historical Regions of Europe”), which pointed out the historical continuity of the lands along the Danube going back to ancient times.44 In the Hungarian context, the emergence of this cultural-geographic concept had an importance which can hardly be overestimated. The notion of Central Europeanness not only confronted the fundamental political division of the time, it also challenged Western Europe’s established post-war cultural-geographic view. The latter, in which negative connotations became associated with the “East”, completely monopolised the concept of Europeanness until the 1970s. Changes of historical viewpoint in the region, the “becoming aware of Central Europeanness”, constituted an important feature of the process of Central European integration at that time, and long preceded political moves. According to Erhard Busek, this happened at a time when Central Europe did not even exist in the eyes of the political establishment. “What had at one time been central,” was now definitely a border region. The continent had been divided semantically as well as politically: the “central” function no longer existed.45

The political pressure in the Institute of History relaxed in the early seventies. Until then, however, ideologically committed leaders kept a firm hand on the affairs of institutions where historians worked. Pál Engel remembers that, “Marxism was still a very strong requirement in the early seventies, of which I have definite memories and personal experience. But by around 1980, anyone referring to Lenin or Marx in a footnote would simply be laughed at. There was a complete turnaround.”46 In medieval research, links were sought, for example, with French
historical schools. The first sign of this was a two-venue conference of French and Hungarian historians in 1968. One of the main protagonists was a prominent representative of the French Annales circle, Fernand Braudel. This fact in itself shows up the rising foreign appreciation of Hungarian medievalists. The further development of contacts is also clear in some chapters of Georges Duby's *Hommes et structures du moyen-âge*, which was published in Hungarian in 1973, the first of several major works by Duby over the following ten years. Gábor Klaniczay's essays also make clear that in addition to Hungarians, German, Czech, Polish and Slovak medievalists were also instrumental in the process of “finding Central Europe”.49

Efforts to transcend historicism in the medieval and 19th-century history took on increasing momentum in the early 1970s. Jenő Szűcs' *A nemzet historikuma és a történelemszemlélet nemzeti látószöge* (“The History of the Nation and the National Perspective on History”) exerted a considerable influence on historians' outlook and on interpretation of the art historical concept in relation to historical issues.50 The same may be said of Szűcs' theories of “gentilism”: how identity and ethnic-tribal awareness connects to the concept of the nation, national awareness and its medieval concepts.51

The public activities of the institutions of art history also played a part in the rediscovery, or imaginary construction, of “Central Europeanness”. One major event was a conference held in Budapest by the Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art (CIHA) in 1969. It was presided over by Vayer, who delivered a paper entitled “Allgemeine Entwicklung und regionale Entwicklungen in der Kunstgeschichte – Situation des Problems in ‘Mitteleuropa’”. Vayer asserted that “Mitteleuropa” was an artistic-cultural region with its own relationships. It was both a research programme and a horizon. Vayer's message was essentially, “we regard the universal and the regional not as isolated, inward-looking ‘poles’, but as mutually-complementary, correlative categories. The ‘regional’ is related to the universal, but is a separate category of art history with its own set of value relationships.52 The notion of Central European art had a dual role in the following decades, at least at the level of academic discourse. Firstly, it seemed to offer a way through the problems in the Hungarian national consciousness following the Trianon Treaty. Put another way, it alleviated the sense of grievance and fear of separation associated with the country's borders, the anxieties forming the background to distorted narratives of national history. The “Central European cultural landscape”
gave rise to viewpoints incorporating parallel and regional developments in the history of art. This is not to say that there the development of the regional outlook discussed below had direct political causes. What chiefly drove the changes in the research world was an opening to European—Western European—“universal” academic ideas. This was particularly true for the research horizon of pre-1800 Hungarian art, but similar movements took place in other academic areas.

The discovery of parallel development and diverse stylistic links generated new art geographical relationships. Marosi devoted a separate study to these issues in 1979. He claimed that “the territory of medieval Hungary cannot be treated as a single unit as regards art history, where each stylistic tendency spread from the same centre at the same time.” He proposed that research should take into account artistic regions, “regional schools”, more distant relationships extending beyond the borders of the kingdom. This proved a very fertile idea. By the early seventies, a “Central European style” category for Gothic art had reached general acceptance. It should also be mentioned that similar integrative developments took place in Renaissance and Baroque research.

Periodisation disputes—considerations of universality

The above developments in the Department of Art History, including the establishment of new academic posts, offered the hope that the department would form the research basis for a synthesis of the history of art in Hungary. It did not turn out that way. In 1969, a rearrangement elsewhere led to the formation of the Art History Research Group, which was entrusted with the production of an eight-volume reference book on the history of art in Hungary. The material to be included in this had already been the subject of many debates and lectures, and the options for periodisation of Hungarian art history had also come up several times. The periodisation disputes in the early seventies went beyond arguments about specifics and became a battleground of sharply divergent historical outlooks. The basic point of division, to put it most simply and concisely, remained Marxist ideology. By that time, Marxist social-development clichés made only scattered and superficial appearances in the work of most art historians studying the pre-1800 period, but were still ubiquitous features of essays, books and conferences on 19th-century and modern art. The viewpoints were therefore strongly polarised.

Marosi’s basic premises took a major change in his writing of the early seventies. He started to base his arguments on more than just local art works and the premise of separate Hungarian development. Indeed, he very often examined stylistic development, architectural types and iconography in Hungary from a general, pan-European standpoint. This subsequently became an outlook, or method, which he consistently applied. He set out his reasons for doing so in his 1967 paper on the situation of research into the medieval period. His words were relevant not
only to medieval art but to the writing of Hungarian art history as a whole: “One of the greatest problems of research into late medieval architecture in Hungary is the difficulty of relating the buildings to the general artistic development of the time. This is primarily due to the almost immeasurable dimensional distances between buildings in Hungary and the well-researched architecture of foreign countries”. The task for him—and his entire generation—was clear: to reduce the “immeasurable dimensional distances”, to integrate the parameters and results of Hungarian and European research:

From 1969 onwards, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences’ Art History Research Group became instrumental in reducing these distances. Its first conference on periodisation of art history, in May 1970, demonstrated the depth of the change. Several speakers directly challenged the meaning and necessity of prefabricated ideological statements in the study of history and art. In his talk introducing one of the discussions, László Beke pointed out the unviability of the “linear and one-dimensional” view of history. He prompted a lively reaction from internal and external researchers. The synopsis for the reference book, published in 1972, also attested to diverging viewpoints among the editors. For example, Dezső Dercsényi, whose period was the 13th century, stated that an agreement must be reached as to whether “the artistic region to which Hungary belonged should in geographic terms be called Eastern Europe, and in artistic terms Central Europe”. Marosi was assigned a substantial part of the medieval section of the planned reference book, and he wrote the synopsis for the volume covering the 14th and 15th centuries. In this, he again brought up the cardinal questions in writing Hungarian art history, particularly the relationship between universal and Hungarian art. “As we write the art history of Hungary, we must be sure to assess our concepts and art works from the points of view of the general history of art. We might add: the call to assess the subject matter of Hungarian art history in the framework of universal history meant no less than the “de-Marxisation” of the viewpoint to be taken in the planned series of books. Although no reference is made to “de-Marxisation” in the plans for the books, it may nonetheless be identified as being present in the synopsis of the medieval volumes. A different outlook—or more accurately ideological fetters—applied to the editors responsible for the modern art sections. By means of comparison, it may be mentioned that—although much later—Pál Engel implemented Marosi’s ideal in the field of medieval history in his book Beilleszkedés Európába... (“Integration into Europe from Early Times to 1440”). Engel’s critic Gábor Klaniczay rightly identified the author’s intention in selection of his theme—de-Marxisation through looking at Hungarian history in the European context. Marosi’s analysis of Engel’s history of medieval Hungary, which was written from the European viewpoint, illustrates the many parallels between the two of them right from the start, and demonstrates also that the art historical viewpoint was to a certain extent part of that of the historical one.

In the synopsis for the periodisation of Gothic Era, Marosi discussed art works from the 1350–1390 period as belonging to the era of the “Central European
style”. In the following years, he started to address the periodisation problems of the Romanesque and Gothic eras, building on his earlier studies. In his introduction, covering the history of research, Marosi was also critical of the traditional historical view that saw a proto-Renaissance era in 14th- and 15th-century art, a transitional era that led directly to the art of the King Matthias Era, i.e. to the Hungarian Renaissance, that great historical “climax”. He objected that earlier phases of Hungarian historiography had never actually proved the hypothesis that the Hungarian Renaissance survived through unbroken local traditions up to the 17th century. By raising the problem of the Matthias-era Renaissance, and thus the continuity of Hungarian art, Marosi was entering an area full of national sensitivities. It was a problem to which answers only emerged after the 1980s, and mostly in the 1990s in art history. However, work-groups organized by Tibor Klaniczay made previously research on Renaissance literature.

The tasks were clear: to incorporate the results of historical research which medieval studies in Hungary—if not completely ignoring them—had not made proper use of at the time of publication, i.e. the 1930s and 1940s; and to connect into the current of contemporary international research. The place of Hungarian art in Europe had been mapped out in previous decades, in fact it had always been an important part of Hungarian historiography. But Marosi took a substantially different starting point from his predecessors. The great figure of the previous generation, Tibor Gerevich, in a study entitled “The Place of Early Hungarian Art in Europe” (1938) had mainly dwelt on the assimilative capabilities of the Hungarian national character. Marosi criticised these theories, with their focus on national traits and based on the view that “the story of Hungarian art in the Middle Ages is one of isolation and unity, like the Hungarian language”. He proposed that this linguistic analogy was not applicable to the medieval period, unless we are thinking of the universal language of the time, Latin.

Romanesque, Gothic, style pluralism

Marosi’s thesis for his candidate’s degree also involved the adoption of previously unknown European analogies, analysis of art by micro-philological techniques, and as-yet unrecognised features of east-west artistic links. Submitted in 1975, the thesis offered a completely novel picture of the appearance of the Gothic style in Hungary. Another radical departure from the norm was his method, which presented the history of styles—in this case Gothic and Romanesque—not as consecutive eras but as coexistent, parallel phenomena, within certain time limits. Following his established pattern of publication, Marosi preceded this comprehensive study of the period with papers analysing certain specific issues. Standing out among these is the architectural history of St Adalbert’s Cathedral in Esztergom, which had long been a prominent subject of research. He devoted a paper to clarifying the place in art history of the “Porta Speciosa”, a form linked to that church, where the only
surviving remains were incrusted marble fragments and a painting. Marosi’s study, perceptively characterising each fragment and by linking them to a wide range of analogues, almost completely altered the historical picture built up by previous studies. He showed that the modern, Early Gothic style of around 1210 was present in the construction of the royal castle of Esztergom. The reactions of the opponents of his candidate degree thesis, Dezső Dercşényi and Mihály Zádor, were very interesting to his novel conclusions on the beginnings of Gothic. Dercşényi’s pre- and postwar studies on the Árpád Age, Esztergom architecture, the Porta Speciosa itself and the era of King Louis I (the Great), were of fundamental significance. With his characteristic elegance, but some resignation, he noted that Marosi’s views repudiated his own earlier findings in nearly every respect. He considered this “a sign of the development of the subject, proof of the abilities and erudition of the upcoming generation”. He found Marosi’s results to be backed up by “broad knowledge of Hungarian and foreign subject matter, a novel approach to the sources, and a versatile application of the comprehensive art history methods”. These comments are quoted here not for their allusion to the acclaim Marosi received from his elders, but because of Dercşényi’s reference to his methods. The basis of his novel results was the “complex method”. What exactly was meant by this “complex” method was elaborated by Marosi in a later study. It meant the exploration of the historical background to the production of the art work, and the analysis of sources. It also extended to iconographic observations and the identification of formal characteristics and stylistic links, and not least to a deep knowledge and penetrating critique of secondary literature related to the subject. His other opponent, Mihály Zádor, noted that the parallel existence of styles could be observed in other periods, such as Gothic and Renaissance. It may be added that the thesis of parallel presence of styles in one period has a strong bearing on the traditional linear historical view of artistic development. We could go so far as to say that this view fundamentally challenged the ideas of social progress that stood as canons, even as ideology, at that time. It also challenged the then-fashionable theories of the sociology of art. The latter started from the viewpoint of historical materialism, and linked stylistic phenomena to the historical forms of class society. The primary references here were the art-sociological work of Arnold Hauser and Frigyes Antal. The latter, which attracted much support in Hungary in the seventies, contained many oversimplified statements which had been around in the literature for some time. For example: “The art of Gothic cathedrals is an urban bourgeois art, in contrast to the monastic and aristocratic Romanesque...” Marosi went further than disputing these viewpoints between the lines; in many places he clearly set out the opposite view. He stated that Gothic was not at all urban, although it was perhaps connected with commoners. The relationship between patrons and art was defined not by class considerations, but by the function of the object, the intellectual content behind it, awaiting expression, and the desire to put these on display.

As for the parallel existence of Early Gothic tendencies and the Romanesque, Marosi devoted a whole book to the subject. It was published, in German, by
Akadémiai Publishers, opening it up to reflection in the foreign literature. In another book, *A román kor művészete* ("The Art of the Romanesque Era"), published in 1972, Marosi discussed the European precursors to Hungarian Romanesque in a broader framework than hitherto. In the introduction, dealing with the history of concepts, he drew attention to the wider framework of the era, the precursors in European medieval art of up to a hundred years previously. He discussed the divergent nomenclature and appraisal of different eras in the historiography of art at different times. He followed this by stating the view that instead of style eras, it may be more appropriate to research the forms by which "broad currents and mutually divergent, sometimes mutually antagonistic, style tendencies" manifest themselves. "Specific historical phenomena should not be sacrificed for the sake of generality."

**Catalogues**

By the late 1970s, the classified exhibition catalogue had established itself in Europe as a productive new channel for the publication of research by art historians. In 1982, Marosi stated, that art historians can no longer close themselves to the task of introducing it in Hungary, too. Classified catalogues then started to appear in Hungary, modelled on the catalogues of major European dynasty exhibitions such as those on the eras of the Staufs, the Babenbergs and King Charles IV of Bohemia. By the early eighties, affairs in Hungary had reached the stage where a series of exhibitions on Hungarian rulers could be held. The first classified catalogue was produced in 1978, for an exhibition on Árpád-era stone carvings, a Romanesque era subject. It was produced by the Art History Research Group and the István Király Museum in Székesfehérvár. Marosi, in association with Melinda Tóth, contributed a novel analysis of the art works themselves. This was the first Western-type classified catalogue for a temporary exhibition in Hungary.

In the second half of the seventies, medieval art historians started to collaborate with historians of the period. Marosi made contact with the Szeged Medievalist Workshop, led by Gyula Kristó, and subsequently contributed several many major papers to its publications. A few years later, he was also involved in a book about King Charles Robert of Hungary. In the nineties, he worked on Kristó’s large-scale project, the *Korai magyar történeti lexikon*... ("Encyclopaedia of Early Hungarian History"). He expressed his esteem for Kristó in a contri-
bution to a book dedicated to him. Here, he sought an answer to his own doubt, and perhaps those of his colleagues: "Does 'history of medieval art in Central-Eastern Europe' have any meaning or foundation?"81

The exhibitions concerned with the medieval, and indeed, the modern period usually involved collaboration between historians and art historians. These exhibitions, and their related publications, brought to the public a new perspective on the period in question, with a thorough treatment of the exhibits. The first one in the field was held in Székesfehérvár, in 1982, on the arts in the time of King Louis I, curated by Dezső Dercsényi, András Kubinyi and György Rózsa.82 Marosi contributed the section of the catalogue on Hungarian court art in the 14th century. He described the display of royal grandeur which linked the Hungarian court with other royal courts of Europe. Court art had an international character. Court culture was not exclusively connected with the king's personal display of grandeur. The functioning of court dignitaries and the chancellery were also involved. "At the centre of court art was the sovereignty of the kingdom embodied in the person of the king".83 According to Marosi, the internationalism of court culture was not to be understood in the modern sense, but meant diplomatic and dynastic links straddling the whole of Europe, and a system of norms applying to the ethos of monarchy. Later, this was certainly true of the display of power in Hungary by Sigismund of Luxemburg, and the internationalism of the court of Matthias Corvinus, discussed below. The exhibition on the era of King and Emperor Sigismund of Luxemburg and his Buda court in 1987 confirmed these international features of court life. The exhibition and its two-volume catalogue commemorated the 600th anniversary of Sigismund's coronation and the 550th of his death.84 This exhibition was also accompanied by an international conference. The catalogue brought many new results, a good example being Pál Engel's study of the itinerary of King and Emperor Sigismund.85 Marosi reviewed the older art historical literature on Sigismund of Luxemburg.86 The 1987 Sigismund exhibition in Hungary and the epochal significance of its associated international conference was particularly highlighted in a 1998 historiographical survey by Jörg K. Hoensch, professor of history at Tübingen. The upsurge in European Sigismund research is understandable from a historical point of view, because he was a ruler who for several decades
carried on the struggle to unify the “minor” lands of Central Europe with the territory of the Holy Roman Empire. In the 1980s, a time of great efforts towards European unity, Sigismund was often held up as a historic hero. The upsurge of historical interest into the problems of European unity gave rise to a new image of Sigismund in Europe, and maintained the person of Sigismund as a constant topic of research in later decades. By 1996, research had effectively laid the foundations for a new Sigismund exhibition. At that time, together with Roland Recht, Director of the Institute of Art History of the University of Strasbourg, and member of the French Academy, Marosi drew up plans for a joint Hungarian–Luxemburgian exhibition on Sigismund.

The actual work on this started only in 2001, taking advantage of new exhibition opportunities which had opened up with the fall of the Berlin Wall. Before the opening of the exhibition—under the title *Sigismundus – Rex et Imperator*—an international conference on history and art history was held in Neumünster Abbey under the joint auspices of the Musée national d’histoire et d’art of Luxembourg, the University of Luxembourg and the Luxembourg Centre of Culture (CCRA), between 8 and 10 June 2005. The exhibition was first put on in the Budapest Museum of Fine Arts (Szépművészeti Múzeum), curated by Imre Takács. The objective was to present Sigismund’s royal seat in Buda and his display of royal grandeur. The introduction to the catalogue of *Sigismundus Rex et Imperator* stated that it “primarily set out to present the art of Central Europe, particularly of Hungary,” and to identify its international context. Marosi reviewed the main features of Sigismund’s court display and art for the catalogue. His account was greatly influenced by the statuary find from the excavations of Buda Castle in 1974. An exhibition catalog about the medieval cities of Buda and Pest was also published in Braunschweig, with contributions by András Kubinyi and Ernő Marosi, a further sign of the heightening interest in Buda. Buda emerged in this context not only as an ideal of an imaginary Central Europe, but as the centre of a European region. During these years, Marosi published several studies of the life and times of Sigismund. Central to this was that the art of portraiture had its beginnings with Sigismund. The exploration of his iconography had been a fertile area of art historiography for several decades, especially in studies by Lajos Vayer.

Relationships identified in art geographical studies had already redrawn the map of Renaissance development in Hungary. The era of Matthias Corvinus could no longer be fully identified with the Renaissance style. The changes in this field of research mainly started to happen in the 1980s, or precisely in 1982, when a large scale synthesis of research into the Matthias Era was displayed in an exhibition in Schallaburg, *Matthias Corvinus und die Renaissance in Ungarn 1458–1541*. This brought together older research and many public and church collections in Hungary, as well as European and American collections, lent an as-yet unseen wealth of artifacts from the age of King Matthias Corvinus. It was arranged according to a conception by Tibor Klaniczay, and selection of the art works relied
largely on the researches of Jólan Balogh. This exhibition synthesised results of earlier research, but it also marked the start of a new wave of Renaissance studies in Hungary.

By 1990, a new, wide-ranging account of the art of the Matthias era had emerged, based on criticism of traditional theories of development in the writing of Hungarian art history. It was the five hundredth anniversary of King Matthias’ death. A commemorative book to King Matthias, and several books of essays as well as thematic journal issues were produced. The historical picture of the times of Matthias Corvinus which emerged from these studies substantially departed from that of previous decades. Certain schools of Central European Late Gothic, in coexistence with the “all’antica” style of the “Matthias-era Renaissance” fitted into the new picture. Marosi wrote in 1990 that in the years around 1500 there was a distinctive "Late Gothic style, whose tendency and rhythm of propagation corresponded to the general development of Hungary and of broader Central Europe”. The other phenomenon, Renaissance art, belonged instead to a special category, which could be clearly distinguished from Gothic not only in extent but in its centres of gravity.

Marosi’s part in the process of modernising the Matthias era historiography, which involved a great many researchers, chiefly surrounded issues of court display. As in so many other cases, his starting point was a criticism of previous research. He traced the continuity of the background to King Matthias historiography from the Age of Reform up to Jólan Balogh’s monograph. He stressed the parallel presence in the royal court and patronage of the Late Gothic and Renaissance styles in the period following 1470. To describe the Renaissance style which developed in King Matthias’ court, he used a new expression, “all’antica”, in the sense of a model-following tendency rather than just a style concept. The traditional although still modern Gothic taste remained in general circulation, with Renaissance style elements appearing through King Matthias’ personal choice, based on his experiences. Marosi held that what was happening was not “the patrons being able to decide whether they wanted Gothic or all’antica Renaissance art, but that the choice of all’antica taste gave birth to the modern patron-type”. Several of Marosi’s publications after 1990 also discussed the humanist sources of King Matthias’ patronage. His historiography-based investigations took the Buda court as a model and examined the problems of its relationship with the Central-Eastern European Renaissance.

The propagation of the Renaissance through Central-Eastern Europe is traditionally linked to the court of Matthias Corvinus. Jan Bialostocki presented this view in a book published in London in 1976. More documentation of this was provided by the large-scale Polish exhibition (and catalogue) in Schallaburg in 1986, which covered the era of the Jagiello dynasty (1366–1572). In this, Bialostocki not only dealt with issues of the Polish “golden age” but, linking up with the Matthias Corvinus exhibition in Schallaburg a few years previously, set out the whole story of the “Jagiello-era Renaissance.” The history of the propagation of
Central European humanism and Renaissance through several countries was the subject of a book published in 1996 by Böhlau Verlag, in which Marosi gave a broader presentation of the interconnections of the all'antica style north of the Alps. This comprehensive synthesis extended to Renaissance developments in the entire region. An important feature of the syntheses put forward for the system of interrelationships was the duality of general and regional structures: in the Middle-Ages, this meant the broader reach of urban and ecclesiastical networks set against the more closed world of rural areas. In Central Europe, there was an additional phenomenon: the resistance of groups of local nobles against the centralisation of royal and imperial power, assertions of autonomous power which in later historiography were generally portrayed as assertions of national autonomy. These intersecting structures formed the subject of the Pannonia Regia exhibition in the Hungarian National Gallery, and the exhibition on the links between Mariazell and Hungary in the Budapest History Museum (Budapesti Történeti Múzeum). The articles Marosi wrote for these catalogues show that the most important feature of his approach to art history was the examination and analysis of the art objects themselves, the “specific phenomena”. Although he made perceptive insights into theoretical issues and the history of ideas, he always started out with the art works. In this context, the study of art history often acts as an auxiliary to the study of history, elucidating the physical environment in which people lived their lives, and establishing the intellectual background to life in the past.

**Historiography: beginnings and continuation**

From the very beginning, in addition to investigations of specific areas of style history, studies in the medieval and early modern eras, and analysis of specific art works, a very large number of Marosi's enquiries have been directed at methods of interpretation in art history and the historical foundations of these methods. His studies in this area have primarily concerned interpretations of medieval art. He has also turned his attention to the development of ideas in the 19th and 20th centuries which influenced earlier interpretations of the age, and has particularly dealt with historicism. One particular issue was the relationship between earlier research and national identity, and the effect of related hypotheses. Many of his publications on medieval topics have taken account of these issues, and in historiographical studies, he has considered how changing
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historical approach and conceptions of art have affected the writing of art history.

One item of his work on the historiography of general art history was a medieval sourcebook, A középkori művészet világa ("The World of Medieval Art"), published in 1969. This small-format book honoured an art history tradition that places considerable emphasis on the systematic study of simultaneous sources. In the foreword to the book, Marosi alluded to the example of the Viennese school of art history, the source researches being connected to Julius von Schlosser. The actual purpose of the book was to explore the systems of concepts involved in the interpretation of medieval art in the past. The book did not mark the end of the undertaking, and his study of how concepts are shaped by history, as already mentioned, turned into a decade-long programme. The issues of “conceptual apparatus” and “quality” constituted the foundations of his study of historiography. As he later put it, “there is a justifiable demand that art historiography should treat the concepts and criteria drawn from other disciplines by confronting them with its own traditions: this gives the historiographical approach its significance and currency.

In 1973, Marosi was commissioned to write an introductory university textbook on art history. This was not a standard compilation of material to be ingested, as is customary on other courses, but an introduction to the literature and viewpoints of the discipline, and its areas of research, a prolegomenon demanding autonomous work from the student or the reader. Looking back, the novelty of this “textbook” in its own time came from its diversity of viewpoints. The conclusion of the volume was that art objects and phenomena can and should be approached not from some favoured standpoint, far less an ideology, but in many different ways. Marosi brought into the scope of this not just literature on art history, but the links between the discipline and other branches of scholarship. Although the introduction promised further editions, it is unfortunate that it did not become more widely known.

The antecedents and textual tradition behind the writing of art history were the subjects of a sourcebook he published in 1976. In the preface, Marosi first drew together in Hungarian the narratives that have been associated with the concepts and literature of art over five centuries. For the title, he chose an extract from Goethe, an allusion to the differences between southern and northern architecture: Emlek márványból vagy homokkóból... ("A Monument of Marble or Sandstone"). This followed the development of modern-era concepts of art from the
Renaissance up to 1920. More precisely, until the time when art history became a branch of scholarship in its own right, i.e. up to the great figure of the school of iconology, Erwin Panofsky.

The book provided an insight into how the study of the history of art developed in Hungary, gathering together all of the works which set out the programme of the discipline. It is an analytical survey of these, really the first comprehensive synthesis of Hungarian art historiography. The account he lays out there was strongly built on his criticism of historicism over previous decades.

**Criticism of historicist approaches to art history**

Marosi used the term “historicism” in a broader sense than in 19th–20th-century positivist model of the development of history. In his interpretation, historicism was a general attitude which cited things of the past. The reuse of parts of demolished buildings as “spoils”, or the placing of cultic pictures in new frames could only be called “historicism” in the hypothetical sense. The concept was, however, in general use in relation to the medieval period. It was used as a label for retrospective tendencies, for example in a paper on the Prague court of Emperor Charles IV delivered by Karel Stejskal to an art history congress in Budapest in 1969. Others call such ties to earlier times as “archaism”, “retrospective tendencies”, “traditionalism” or “style form revivals”. Marosi also talked about historicism in this sense in his inaugural address to the Academy.

Further aspects of “historicism” as a historical approach became the target of criticism in German historiography in the early nineteen seventies. The left-wing political movements of 1968 prompted a challenge to the concepts and value judgements then widely applied in German art history writing, and identified a continuity in the use of certain text elements. Papers on this subject delivered to the 12th German Art History Congress in Cologne in 1970 prompted a lively reaction. In the “Kunsthistoriker im Dritten Reich” section, chaired by Martin Warnke, speakers including Warnke himself, Berthold Hinz and Lutz Heussinger drew attention to the ideological background, to the use of language by contemporary authors. Analyses showed that many retained the language of political cults. In a string of examples taken from recent literature, Warnke demonstrated—without naming the authors—the use of Nazi-era terminology. Berthold Hinz analysed the continuous elements of the interpretation of the “Knight of Bamberg”, chiefly interpretations alluding to the “thousand-year Germanic national character”. Their studies clearly revealed that German nationalist value judgements and even the terminology of the Nazi era still lived on unrevised in the postwar period.

The effect of these German-language criticisms is clearly manifest in the Hungarian literature. The prevailing outlook in the writing of Hungarian art history thus changed in parallel with events in Western Europe which were linked to 1968. Although the changes here had a different political background from those
in Germany, the attention they directed towards art history presented an opportunity for the historical community to reflect on its own outlook. Marosi later looked back on these years as a time when great thinkers in the fields of the history and philosophy of art attracted intense interest. A series of translations into Hungarian became, as Marosi wrote in a memoir, “tools for taking possession of classical texts and adopting them into the language”.

Analysis of the discipline of art history was encouraged by the Fülep-inspired approach of correlating the “national” to the universal, and by the inclusion of the basic notions of historiography in the university art history education. An important stage in this process was a book published by Lajos Németh in 1973. *Minerva baglya* (“Minerva’s owl”) brought a new turn in the oeuvre of a researcher who was also sensitive to the philosophy of art and other theoretical issues. His book also had a major influence on the art history discourse in Hungary. Németh set out a programme which departed from the 19th-century concept of art and normative aesthetics. He rejected the influence of ideological value systems and phraseology in art historiography. It should be added that his ideas were not independent of the German criticisms of the discipline which, as already mentioned, were going on at the same time. Németh reacted perceptively to the papers delivered to the 1970 Cologne art history congress by Leopold Ettlinger and Hans Heinz Holz, who detected and criticised the influence of political and national ideologies in art history literature. Németh returned to these reflections on ideological determination in his later surveys of historiography, particularly in his book *Törvény és kétély*... (“Laws and Uncertainties”), originally written as an introductory university textbook on art history and published posthumously in 1991. There, Németh touched on all of the issues which were moving the discipline towards reform, including Hans Belting’s 1983 *The End of Art History*, discussed below.

Marosi referred to statements in Warnke’s 1970 book several times. In connection with these, for example, he mentioned the publication of Hans Sedlmayr’s writing during the socialist era. Sedlmayr’s *Revolution der modernen Kunst*, published in Hungarian in 1960, provided support for the official hostility to abstraction in art. Marosi saw the radical attack on the past by the youthful critics of 1970 as effectively extending to Sedlmayr’s entire generation. He noted that the objections mainly concerned the tone of the writing, echoes of the *lingua tertii imperii* tradition. In evidence, Marosi cited Hans Belting’s criticism of Sedlmayr: “When we discovered that older representatives of the discipline, so pleased to present themselves as free of ideology, retained in their use of language the residual cadences of an unspoken past, the confrontation between the generations became complete”.

Marosi’s lively reaction to what on the surface might seem no more than generational disputes about language use, but were in fact fundamental issues of outlook in art history, must have stemmed from his own experience. Antipathy to ideology was something that pervaded an entire generation. This of course did not mean that the Communist Party had relinquished its leading political role in
Hungary in the 1970s. Most of the dominant figures in artistic institutions were still ideologically committed. By the 1980s, however, partly through the generational change within the Party, the language of control had changed. Decision makers might be said to have “adopted the intellectuals’ language”. The Party leadership no longer took the initiative, and just followed events. In any case, it was developments in modern art the cultural authorities were interested in, not the history of the arts, far less the Middle Ages.

After 1970, art historians in Hungary started to address 19th-century styles, the Romantic and various historicist tendencies. It was a member of the older generation, Anna Zádor, who took the initiative in this field. After the 1960s, historicism had grown into an independent field of research throughout Europe, and the reception in Hungary was greatly inspired by new works of art history in Austria. Particularly influential was a series of books on historicism by Renate Wagner-Rieger, covering the history of the Vienna Ring. Wagner-Rieger started her career in Gothic research, and started writing on Austrian historicism in the 1960s. A moving spirit in the change of attitude towards the terminology of 19th-century styles was Géza Hajós, whose historiographical survey of the subject appeared in 1978. Hajós was almost the first in the region to review the history of the emergence and usage of the terminology of style in the 19th-century. His paper investigated the changes in meaning of the terms classicism, romanticism and historicism in the 19th century. It covered their original value-denotation meanings, their correlations with each other and their adoption as style concepts. Issues in the history of ideas cannot be extricated from theories on these eras which were formulated at the same time. Hajós' modern view of historicism undoubtedly drew on the results of historicism research by German historians and art historians. His study echoes the conclusions of a seminal study of historicism by Wolfgang Götz, published in 1970. He also used Reinhart Koselleck’s assertion that there is a “multiplicity of time structures” in each era “which are simultaneously linked to various style phenomena of completely different time content”. These developments ultimately resulted in the adoption in Hungary of “style pluralism” concepts even for 19th-century art. Most influential in this respect were the criteria developed for 19th-century styles—although capable of broader interpretation—by Schmoll gen. Eisenwerth. His study, “Stilpluralismus statt Einheitszwang” (1977) influenced concepts relating the Gothic and Renaissance styles as well as to the history of style in the 19th century. A book by Sándor Radnóti and Péter Pór placed the tradition of the “art historiography of style eras,” going back to Winckelmann, into a coherent context, setting them against the idea of the progress of era-theories. Schmoll gen. Eisenwerth had a key role in the latter.

Marosi also took up the 19th-century research line. As with his medieval studies, he showed through clear examples how public attitudes to art and history at a particular time were closely linked to art works. He focused mainly on 19th-century neo-Gothic art works and their ideological background. To commemorate the centenary of the death of Imre Henszlmann, at the initiative of
Anna Zádor, a conference was held on his art theory and the emergence of the “Gothic outlook”. It also covered the merger process of Hungarian institutions of archeology and art history.\textsuperscript{136} Géza Hajós discussed how modern theories of protection of historic monuments emerged in the Vienna school of art history. This also had a Hungarian dimension, because until 1867, the Austrian and Hungarian institutions for the preservation of historic monuments had a close relationship.\textsuperscript{137} Neither then nor since, however, has a monograph on Imre Henszlmann been produced.\textsuperscript{138} Several scholars have treated his work and influence, but Marosi’s studies have placed him in a broader context.

\textit{Vienna–Budapest}

The increasing interest in historicism as a historical outlook also prompted research into the historiography of art history. Marosi’s historiographical reviews often touched on the links between the Hungarian and Viennese “schools” of art history. There were two distinct Viennese historical traditions, of which one stemmed from the positivism of the “founding fathers” of the discipline. In the second half of the 19th century, the university departments in Vienna and Budapest, and the wider circle of art scholars, were held together by the network of contacts among the founding generation. For example, the founder of the Vienna department, Rudolf Eitelberger von Edelberg, was personally acquainted with the first professor of the Budapest department, Imre Henszlmann, and also with Ferenc Pulszky, Henszlmann’s friend since youth. Their approach to art owed much to the milieu of their youth, above all to the art collector Joseph Daniel Böhm.\textsuperscript{139}

There were also several points of connection, sometimes even parallel viewpoints, between the two departments around the turn of the century and in the early decades of the 20th century. The two institutions, the art history departments of Vienna and Budapest, for a long time retained a mutual openness. Although the term “Vienna school of art history” referred to a 19th-century phenomenon, it was actually coined in 1920, by Otto Benesch, and became widespread through a study by Julius von Schlosser in 1934.\textsuperscript{140} After the 1980s, a string of studies by various authors also appeared in Hungary on the effects of the intellectual legacy of Moritz Thausing, Franz Wickhoff, Alois Riegl and Max Dvořák, i.e. the Vienna School.\textsuperscript{141}

According to Marosi, the parallels between history of art studies in Vienna and Budapest did not imply any kind of dependence, and are to be regarded only a means of comparison. He wrote, “we cannot set the objective of constructing some kind of Hungarian school on the Vienna model or in relation to it,” because the term “Vienna school” is itself “a strongly historicist-nostalgic construction”.\textsuperscript{142} It arose against a background of Julius von Schlosser’s wish to distance himself from the other Vienna department, headed by Josef Strzygowski. In a contribution
to the volume in honour of Lajos Németh, Marosi examined the influence of the Viennese school on the study of art history in Budapest in the early 20th century. He argued that contacts with Vienna did not imply some kind of constraint imposed by a Viennese intellectual approach. His analysis of movements in the two cities drew on the notion of national art put forward by Tibor Gerevich and Antal Hekler, representatives of the autochthonic national culture approach, as well as on the less easily categorisable works by Lajos Fülep. The leading figure of the “second” Viennese department, Josef Strzygowski, exercised a major influence on Hungarian art writers, historians and archaeologists. Strzygowski’s theories were based on the geographical spread of peoples and their fundamental character. Like other authors at the turn of the century, Strzygowski proposed the determining influence of racial characteristics—the “ethno-psychology”—on the artistic sphere. This was largely drawn from the anthropo-geographic notions made popular by Friedrich Ratzel’s works leaning to social Darwinism, and the milieu-theory of Hyppolite-Adolphe Taine.143

The influence of Strzygowski’s outlook, involving timeless value relations, on Hungarian art history was a recurring theme in Marosi’s studies.144 The debate between the “Strzygowskians” and the followers of Riegl (“evolutionists”) cropped up in several areas of study between the two world wars, particularly in questions of national origin, convergence and national art.145 Strzygowski’s views were based on the European influence of the culture of steppe peoples, and on his ideas of different mentalities of eastern and western art determined by “geo-psychology”. In Hungary, the theories “fertilised” by his concept of art were mainly those of archaeology and ethnography. A critical understanding of these theories only emerged in later decades.146 Marosi’s historical analyses of “orientalism” in Hungary, and his investigations of archaeological and ethnographic objects, undoubtedly played a part in the criticism of Strzygowskian ideas.147

This issue was also the subject of several contributions to a conference on Central European art history research at Humboldt University in Berlin in 2001. The conference set out to reflect on post-1989 moves towards a unified European approach to art history, set against the traditional national-based approaches of Central European countries.148 The introduction to the conference proceedings surveyed developments which, prior to the unified approach, had paved the way for the synthesis of Central-European art history in a pan-European context. Most
of the speakers to the conference considered criticism of ideologies to be an essential task for the small-nation historiographies of Central Europe. There was a need to adopt a reflexive attitude to ideological factors, and to dispense with exclusive national autarchies even in the field of art history. Papers by János Végő, Ivan Gerát, Béla Zsolt Szakács and János Jernyei Kiss covered the traditions of Hungarian historiography. Marosi dealt with the historiography of the medieval decorative sculptures of Pécs Cathedral.

Because the narratives of history written by Central European nations were based on concepts of national uniqueness and thus mutually isolated, they had never found a substantial reception in histories of Europe as a whole. Experiments directed at changing this situation only started after 1989, although some integrative work, endeavours towards broader horizons, had long preceded this. The introductory essay in the proceedings of the conference in Humboldt University on Central-Eastern European art history mentioned some earlier work preparatory to integration, including Lajos Vayer’s 1969 conference paper and especially the studies published in the catalogue (edited by Marosi) of the exhibition Die ungarische Kunstgeschichte und die Wiener Schule in Vienna in 1983. Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, perhaps the first to address the integration of Central European art historiographies, declared that integration was demanded by the historical processes themselves, what Habermas calls the “postnational constellation”.

The divergent narratives of Central European medieval art history, a central issue at the Berlin congress, had been the subject of a review by Marosi some years earlier. He wrote it for Ferdinand Seibt’s Festschrift, and included a polemic against some terms coined by Seibt. The latter asserted that Mitteleuropa could be divided into two areas of divergent development, West- and Ost-Mitteleuropa. Marosi drew attention to the variability and historicism of such geographische Hilfskonstruktion (“auxiliary geographical constructions”). Divisions of Europe into different areas during history were first based on the distinction of northern and southern characteristics, and the east-west division was another historicist product. Taking a coherent viewpoint, he surveyed works on the historiography of medieval art history by Rudolf Chadraba (Czech), Ján Bakoš (Slovak), France Stele (Croatian), Christoph Machat (Transylvanian), Adam Małkiewicz and Jan Białostocki (Polish) and Willibald Sauerländer (German).
Art scholarship and art history

Lajos Fülep's fragmentary pre-Second World War oeuvre is only known from a few texts published in separate books. It would take a large-scale history-of-ideas analysis to explain why Fülep's reception broadened after the 1970s. In the eyes of his direct students, Fülep was a mythical teacher, a father-figure, and their later reminiscences often refer to the meetings in his home (after 1951) as "Lajos Fülep's Széher Street Department" or the "imaginary Fülep Department". For later generations, it was not his charismatic personality but his gradually-revealed intellectual legacy which attracted their interest. Fülep's observations on the arts, which can rightly be called a philosophy, offered a kind of basis in principle for the acceptance of modernisms which had been publicly suppressed during the socialist era. The new generation, which rejected the autarchic nationalism of the pre-war generations, could identify with his theses on the correlation of national and general art. This can be seen in the writing of his direct pupils Lajos Németh, Éva Körner and Géza Perneczky. Then there was the generation which followed them, to which Marosi also belonged. There is insufficient space here to convey the dimensions of Fülep’s influence. It is a fact that Fülep’s great written legacy only started to integrate into Hungarian art history literature in the 1970s, through the philological and analytical work of the generation which started publishing then. The delayed effect of Fülep’s writing is clear in the basic narratives of art historiography, and also in the discourses of history of philosophy and history of literature. Some analyses of Fülep’s work appeared as early as 1965, and a bibliography came out soon after that. Nonetheless, the Fülep reception is regarded as having started in 1974, with the publication of a collection of articles and studies edited by Árpád Tímár. The title of the book, A művészet forradalmától a nagy forradalomig ("From the Revolution of Art to the Great Revolution"), was undoubtedly suggested by the rhetoric of that era. It is possible to trace Fülep’s influence on the historiography of various disciplines from then on. This is a curious phenomenon considering that he developed his outlook on art in relation to progressive movements at the turn of the century, far removed from events of the 1970s. He was an associate of the young György Lukács, and shared an outlook with those involved in the Vasámpápi Iskola ("Sunday school"), and the Szellentudományi Szabadiskola ("Free School of the Humanities"). Leó Popper has used the words "anti-psychologist, anti-positiv-
ist and metaphysical” to describe their novel epistemological approach.156 Marosi discussed the place of Fülep’s early writing in Hungarian art historiography in connection with the first publication of Fülep’s articles (1975). He wrote that the foreword to the short-lived journal A Szellem (1911) demonstrated a connection to the great synthases of art scholarship rather than the turn-of-the-century traditions of art historiography.157

In a later article, Marosi also dealt with Fülep’s metaphysical outlook. In addition to the introduction to the first issue of A Szellem, the list of contributors lucidly attests to his basic metaphysical standpoint: Émile Boutroux, Sándor Hevesi, Plotinos, Gilbert K. Chesterton, György Lukács. The latter’s contribution to that first issue carried the title A tragédia metafizikája (“The Metaphysics of Tragedy”), and Fülep’s, Az emlékezés a művészeti alkotásban (“Memory in Artistic Creation”). Fülep claimed that art adds the world of eternal forms to the world of eternal ideals. “Art thus complements philosophy and religion, and it is in this trinity that the world of the human intellect becomes complete.” Fülep’s theory was a “unique intellectual product” which lay in parallel with the universal achievements of art scholarship of that time. Marosi discovered that the theory had a precursor in the historical views of Wilhelm Dilthey.159 An important stage in the Fülep reception was a conference held in 1985 to mark the centenary of his birth. People from various disciplines analysed Fülep’s role in the intellectual life of the turn of the century.160 On this occasion, Marosi examined Fülep’s interpretation of national art. After the passage of two decades, he had returned to Fülep’s train of thought: the categories of the universal and the national.

Marosi discussed parallel movements in art science in connection with Fülep. He set out his doubts concerning art history, stressing the need for concreteness. Early 20th-century art scholars had made comparative studies of various arts in a way that retained the perceptual concreteness of art. He cited a work called “The reciprocal illumination (or explanation) of the arts” by Oskar Walzel, a contemporary of Fülep.161 Marosi also discussed how the purpose or outlook of art history formulated in the
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early 20th century recurred from time to time in the most diverse forms. It was taken up in the history of ideas, iconology, structuralism, history of mentality as well as cultural and visual anthropology. More recently, the methods of visual studies and hermeneutics draw on the art history outlook. Marosi posed the question: “Is it possible, is it worthwhile talking about works of art in any other way than in their historical concreteness, their determinateness at one time?”162 Like his colleague Horst Bredekamp, Marosi looked with some doubt on the new “visual science” in which the historic nature of works appears almost negligible.163 In his view, the historical outlook was fundamental in every dimension of the existence of an art work. It was fundamental in the context of its creation, and also in its reception. It was at least that fundamental in the historical context of time of the person who analyses the work, the historian.

The hermeneutic principle of the historical nature of understanding

Marosi did not write on art history for the purpose of making some kind of critique of ideology. He was rather concerned to create a narrative of Hungarian art historiography and connect this narrative into the stories of universal, or more precisely European, art historiography. In his view, the need to criticise past and present interpretations and to investigate their backgrounds arose not just because of the obsolescence of their content or the ideologies. His criteria rather derive from what Hans-Georg Gadamer called the “hermeneutic principle of the historically effected consciousness”. In connection with the “Knight of Bamberg”, Marosi refers to Gadamer’s interpretation, especially the “principle of historical effect”.164 This implies that historical enquiry must be directed at more than the historic phenomenon or surviving work. As Gadamer wrote, “in a secondary thematisation it must also look at their effect on history (which also includes history of research)…” Gadamer put forward this demand as a novelty not as regards research itself, but the conscious methodology of research. The latter is a necessary consequence of “the self-reflection of historical consciousness…”165

This Gadamerian requirement, reflection on the discipline, was the basic viewpoint of Marosi’s book Kép és hasonmás... (“Image and Likeness. Art and Reality in 14th—15th-Century Hungary”).166 Although the subject of the book was Hungarian art in a single era, Marosi approached it from a declaredly universal viewpoint. The introductory chapters systematically discuss the pre-conditions of interpretation with a validity going beyond the eras. He stated, “universality is not a quality of the art works but a characteristic of the art-historical approach”. In explanation, he added: “All medieval art historiography necessarily starts with the search for,… and correction of, correspondences between modern viewpoints and the motivations behind the art of the period.” The methodological issues of this corrective procedure, the “historisation of interpretation”, form the real subject of the thesis. This viewpoint follows directly from Gadamer’s requirement of “his-
The history of concepts

Following from this is the question, “how realistic are the concepts we use to discuss all kinds of art in art history today?” Marosi had already ascribed a major role to the historicism of the conceptual apparatus in his earlier works. He cited Ernst Gombrich, that “the categories of European art historiography can without exception be retraced to a continuity which consists of ancient norms, the value categories of humanism and elements of academic theory.”

The medievalist Jenő Szűcs, in the investigations mentioned above, also saw the linguistic categories traditionally used in the writing of history in Hungary as a central issue. His influential study, “Nemzeti-ség” és “nemzeti öntudat” a középkorban, Szemportok egy egységes fogalmi nyelv kialakításához (“‘Nation’ and ‘National Consciousness’ in the Middle Ages. Criteria for Developing a Coherent Conceptual Language”) was written in 1971 but only became widely known after the appearance of a collected edition in 1974. Szűcs could not draw on the “linguistic turn” in history which occurred after 1973. The “discovery” of the linguistic dimension in historiography has been in progress ever since the 1970s. One of the most significant lines of enquiry is narrative research, which essentially applies criteria from literary theory. In his previous articles on the conceptual apparatus of medieval history, Marosi could only draw on literature prior to the “linguistic turn”, chiefly analogies with literary history. He counted among such terms, for example, utilitas, dispositio and decus, originating in Vitruvius. The latter term applied to the “decent” form of an artistic or architectural work. In the context of 12th-century Neoplatonic thinking, he also demonstrated the splitting of the forms of fábula, which goes back to classical times, and historia. He surveyed the relationship between these forms and their historical changes in his book Kép és hasonmás, mentioned above. Here he also made use of aspects of new schools of historiography.

An important theme of the book Kép és hasonmás was a unique interpretation of medieval repraesentatio. This expression, just like the terms “reproduction” and “originality”, had a different meaning in the Middle Ages. The historical outlook to concepts in art affected the analysis of history itself, i.e. the visual narrative..
of histories. Particularly instructive for the reconstruction of concepts was his presentation of the medieval meaning of “imago” and “historia”. Lucid examples of the contemporary interpretation of these concepts are offered by images in the *Chronicon Pictum*. Recent literature has also closely scrutinised these pictures. Marosi mostly expanded on the observations of Tünde Wehli. Another collection of Marosi’s work on history of concepts, a medieval art reader, was published in 1997. Here, Marosi reviewed the literature subsequent to the “linguistic turn”, including work on the subject of historicism by Reinhard Koselleck.

As demonstrated by the book *Kép és hasonmás*, Marosi’s purpose went beyond purely philological research to the historical interpretation of concepts. The central focus of his enquiries, however, was always occupied by specific art works. The historic situation of art works was revealed through a fine interpretive net, woven out of sources and stylistic analyses. One of his basic criteria was the “reality-character” of medieval art works. That expression became widely applied to art works through a study by Dagobert Frey. In a secondary publication of his study *Der Realitätsscharakter des Kunstwerks*, Eva Frodl-Kraft pointed out the historiographical contexts of Frey’s work. Frey had originally written this paper for Heinrich Wölfflin’s Festschrift in 1935. Later he included it in his own collected essays (*Kunstwissenschaftlichen Grundfragen, Prolegomena zu einer Kunstphilosophie*, 1943). It examined aspects of the use of religious images and their “relic”-like character (“das Kunstwerk nicht als Abbild, sondern als Sinnbild”) from the late medieval to the Baroque eras. Frey drew on a 1931 paper by a representative of the Viennese “new art history school”, Otto Pächt, “Das Ende der Abbildtheorie”. Frodl-Kraft noted that Frey, as a representative of the history-of-ideas movement of the “new” Vienna art history school, had made a similar discovery as had the Warburg circle, under the influence of Cassirers, at almost the same time. Decades later, Hans Belting, in his wide-ranging book *Bild und Kult*, followed on from these traditions in his discussion of the “reality character” aspect of medieval works. In the sphere of Belting’s concepts, “reality character” applied to the works of the “age of the images” and not to those of the “age of art”.

The aim of the various interpretive methods employed by Marosi was to reveal the outlines of past “reality” in a very broad sense. They embraced investiga-
tion both of the history-of-ideas background to the use of art works (theological or liturgical qualities) and the use of specific techniques (e.g. bronze casting).

For the catalogue to an exhibition held in the Hungarian National Gallery in 2000, Marosi surveyed the relationship between history and art in the broadest sense. The exhibition was called Történelem – kép (“History–image”), with the subtitle “Some connections between Hungarian art and the past”. Marosi’s study took a broad time horizon and surveyed various methods of demonstrating historicism from antiquity to the present, from both the Hungarian and universal viewpoints. He presented possible links between narrative and representation, starting from allegories and going right up to happening-series. Marosi incorporated into the review of historical aspects ideas which the discipline of art history had itself created about the historical process.

The end of art history?

Belting’s reputation in Hungary derived from more than his book Bild und Kult. He made a considerable stir with his 1983 study Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte? There, he presented a vision of the end of the “age of art” or rather the era of modernism, and thus the end of traditional art history. His proposals provoked a substantial response in art philosophy throughout Europe in the nineteen eighties. Géza Perneczky transplanted some of these into Hungarian in his critical volume. Although many Hungarian reactions to Belting’s ideas were antagonistic to the theoretical questions and concentrated on the practice, Marosi later declared that the work had a major influence in the country. He stated, “Starting in the early 1980s, traditional art history went through one of its greatest upsets, prompted by Hans Belting’s question (The End of Art History?—First with a question mark, later, in 1995, as a statement). The starting point for the dilemma put forward by Belting was the diagnosis that the concept of art has irreversibly decayed. Nowadays, what we see as art in old objects is not what we see in the products of our contemporaries. Belting claimed to have resolved this dilemma by producing a new concept of art.” And he adds: his source of inspiration was Riegl’s conviction that examination of old values is based on present experience.

The art historian’s angle of view

Riegl’s oft-quoted statement, “…not even the art historian can escape from the desires of his contemporaries as regards art” recurs emphatically in Marosi’s writing. One of his fundamental insights is that interpretation is inevitably linked to the present culture of art. This link has to be examined in the framework of the investigative process, because the investigator’s reflection is undeniably linked to his own taste and the culture of his own time; the problem of how the generation
of art historical concepts interacts with artistic culture is an aspect of the objectivity of perception in the social sciences. The process of uncovering past reality is closely connected with “the Weberian requirement of concepts that go beyond ideal types”.186

Marosi did get beyond this requirement in his emphatic allusion to the basic paradox of historical cognition. The cognitions of art history, no matter what effort is made, cannot step out of the present, or rid itself of the effects of the present. This, he stated, was a paradox, because the interpretive process does not stop antiquities having an aesthetic effect in the present. “We therefore have to break through the framework of this aesthetic to get closer to the other ‘present’ of the work, in history. This approach, however, greatly depends on the extent we are able to eliminate from the aesthetic the ‘historic’ factor caused by its distance in time.”187

The central focus of art history investigation, he stated, was not the aesthetics of an art work, but its reality. This art work-centredness is expressed graphically in the discourse following Sándor Radnóti’s doctoral thesis in 1991. Also published as a book (Tisztelt közönség, külcsot te találj..., 1990), Radnóti examined classics of art historiography in the light of contemporary historical and art-philosophical
outlooks. His opponents included two art historians, Lajos Németh and Ernő Marosi. Although both were very positive about Radnóti’s work on art philosophy, they put forward contrasting views on art history. Lajos Németh disputed the currency of aesthetic approaches. He claimed that recent research had called into doubt “the competence of aesthetic approaches, however dialectic, relativistic and pluralistic”. For Radnóti, aesthetic quality was definitive for art works of any time. While recognising “the heroic struggle of art history for the objective reconstruction of the original creation of art works”, he considered that “the genesis of the aesthetic of the object takes priority over the genesis of the object itself, and this priority takes effect even where it is alienated from the aesthetic”. Reflecting on this, Németh admitted that reconstruction of the contemporary reception “is a practically impossible endeavour”. On the other hand, citing Günther Bandmann, he pointed out that “we must load our eyes with historical ballast” to be able to decode the message of a work from the past.

In his opponent’s criticism, Marosi traced Radnóti’s outlook to turn-of-the-century art history precedents. What he did find modern in Radnóti’s conception was an acceptance of the fundamental principle of “presumed plurality in every era”, in place of the style dominance assumed in earlier analyses of eras. But he disputed the priority of art scholarship, setting against it a quotation from Radnóti’s own study of Dvořák in the same book: “modern art history was born in the struggle against art-philosophical norms, the fight for their destruction or relativisation.” Radnóti had written that art historians have described the development of their discipline as liberation from the control of philosophy, and added, “this rather means rejection of historical values derived from great idealistic systems and the development of an autonomous historical methodology...”. Marosi agreed with these statements. We might add: he had good reason to agree, having been engaged in this struggle throughout his own career. As an opponent, however, he entered into “a gentle polemic” against some of Radnóti’s statements. “Can the empirical activity of ‘ordinary’ art history be identified with positivism, is it correct to separate this empirical work from the other, theoretical aspects of art history, and play the two off against the other?” He also puts forward the paradox of outlook and discourse in art history. He quotes Otto Pächt’s axiom: “in the beginning was the eye, not the word”. The beginning may have belonged to the eye, according to Marosi, but “perception does not in itself lead to historical understanding, the origin of which has to be sought in the discourse.” The discourse, however, most often builds on the traditions of historical narrative. This has filled art history with many “topos-like elements”. Marosi came to the conclusion that the interpretation and analysis of the traditions of the discipline “fundamentally has to wait for the writing of art history itself”. He had already formulated this view in 1985: “art historiography treats concepts and criteria drawn from other disciplines by confronting them with its own traditions: this gives the historiographical approach its significance and currency”.
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Marosi’s notion of the historiographical approach directly implies the potential multiplicity of approaches. In response to the proposition, arising from Belting’s question of 1983, that “there is in principle an unlimited number of methods”, he agreed with Lajos Németh’s view. He wrote, “we have no good reason to dispose of this discipline or break it into pieces.” It is true that the art work exists in the present, i.e. in the judgement of our contemporaries, “and what we call art is a kind of canon: the ensemble of works by our contemporaries together with those from older or ancient times.” Art history is therefore also “based on some canon, one of several existing side by side and competing with each other. It is therefore meaningful to talk about different kinds of art history: not about levels in a chronological or a historical development ranking, but mutually competing schools based on different conceptions of art.” These all have a common basic principle: “the recognition of an art work as a historical fact”.194

The intellectual portrait which emerges from Marosi’s writing appears most clearly in this last passage. Although some, viewing him through his academic rank, position and professorial activity, see him as the Zeus of the little Olympus of Hungarian art historiography, his figure is more Hermes, in the sense attributable to Károly Kerényi. Hermes, the unknown companion of travellers, the connecting agent of far-flung things, the finder of surprising correlations. The irony of Hermes also applies to him, not only by virtue of his personality, but also the place of his activity. This is the Danubian land, in the Claudio Magris sense, where a multiplicity of views is not just an individual invention but a requirement, the Hermes-like gift of having both distance and nearness.195
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Thus, for example, the period of late classical Gothic, up to about 1360, was followed by the “Central European style” (1350–1390). “It would be appropriate, following László Gerevich, who was the first to stress the Central European context, to introduce the term Central European style.” See E. Marosi, “Magyarországi művészet a 14. században és a 15. század első két harmadában (Synopsis),” in Az MTA Művészettörténeti Kutatócsoport tájékoztatója I. (Ms.) Budapest 1972, 19, 29–32.


The supervising bodies of the MTA occasionally examined the development of different branches of scholarship. Reports on art history were produced in 1971 and 1983. Both stressed progress: “most areas of work—the strengthening of the Marxist-Leninist worldview and method, the improved organisation of collaboration with the social sciences, the launch of Central-Eastern European comparative research, [...] collaboration with the socialist countries—show substantial progress.” The 1983 report highlights the debates, such as “Central-Eastern European applied arts in the Age of Enlightenment” (1973), “The genesis of socialist art” (1977, jointly with the Institute of Art History of the Soviet Ministry of Culture), and “Symbolism in Central Europe”. Agitprop themes were also mentioned under “The Hungarian art of 15 years,” and “Art and literature of 15 years,” and “Dissension, popular tendencies, realism,” etc. in A művészettörténet-tudomány helyzete. Elemzések, tanulmányok 9, Budapest 1983, 5, 10.

Marosi (n. 35 above), 565.

In his paper, Beke pointed out that every periodisation principle starts out from the proposal (or rejection) of a general law of development, but the laws of society only show up as tendencies. Thus any periodisation involving the predetermined division of the historical process into specific time segments (the word itself and traditional practice both implying a linear ‘one-dimensional’ conception) has no meaning”. See L. Beke, “Megjegyzések a magyarországi múvészet történetéhez értesítő 1973-ban,” in Művészettörténet – tudománytörténet, ed, N. Aradi–Á. Timár, Budapest 1973, 132–35, esp. 132.
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P. Engel, Bellelszékedés Európába a kezdetektől 1440-ig, Budapest 1990. It was the first volume in the series “Magyarsok Európában” (Hungarians in Europe) edited by Ferenc Glatz, which may be seen as an attempt to replace the set of major reference books, the only partially-realised “10-volume series” of previous decades. See G. Klanczy, “Kalandozás Európában,” BUKSZ Budapesti Könyvajánló 3, 1991, 416–17.


On the literature of the “proto-Renaissance” and the “Hungarian trecento” see Marosi (n. 53 above), 354.


The authors of the 1987 Sigismund exhibition catalogue dedicated their work to Elemér Mályusz, who for several decades, despite being kept in the background, was the leading figure in research into the period. A small circle of students and followers had grown up around him, although he was denied a chair at the university after the war. See Mályusz Elemér emlékezény. Társadalom- és művelődés történeti tanulmányok, ed. E. H. Balázs—E. Fügedi—F. Maksay, Budapest 1984; Pál Engel also declared himself his pupil, and contributed the study “Zsigmond bároí” to the 1987 catalogue. Mályusz’ archive source publications include the essential Zsigmondkori oklevél, vols. 1–2, Budapest 1951 and 1956–1958, and his book Zsigmond király uralmá Magyarországon, 1387–1437, Budapest 1984 (and in German: Kaiser Sigismund in Ungarn: 1387–1437, Budapest 1990), was an inspiration to the authors of the catalogue.

Agreements were signed at various levels between the governments of Luxemburg and Hungary between 2001 and 2003.


In connection with EU expansion, the conference devoted particular attention to Sigismund-era research in Central European countries (Croatia, Hungary, Slovenia, Slovakia and the Czech Republic). The conference organisers were: F. Reinert, coordinator, Musée national d’histoire et d’art; academic preparation: M. Pauly, Université du Luxembourg. The conference proceedings: Sigismund von Luxemburg. Ein Kaiser in Europa, Tagungsband des internationalen


97 L. Vayer, “Die Persönlichkeit Sigismunds in der Kunst,” in Sigismund von Luxemburg... (n. 87 above), 255–70.

98 More than eighty people in Hungary and Austria worked on the exhibits.


104 Ibid, 441.


110 Both include studies by Marosi and others.
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118 M. Warnke, “Weltanschauliche Motive in der kunstgeschichtlichen Populärliteratur”; B. Hinz, “Der Bamberger Reiter”; L. Heussinger, “Kritische Aspekte zum Kult des Kunstwerks,” all in *Das Kunstwerk zwischen Wissenschaft und Weltanschauung. XII. Deutscher Kunsthistoriker-Kongreß*, ed. M. Warnke, Gütersloh 1970. Berthold Hinz claimed that earlier interpretations had discussed the statue decorating Bamberg Cathedral as a “monument”, taken out of its original context, as an allusion to German national characteristics, self-sacrifice until victory, military virtues (26–44); Lutz Heussinger examined the cultic aspects of the work. Martin Warnke gathered together art clichés from popular literature. The “Knight of Bamberg” continually crops up in Hungarian art historiography too, as a representation of King St Stephen of Hungary. Willibald Sauerländer, expressed criticism about national-socialist historiography, too, in his study on the donator figures of the West choir of the Cathedral of Naumburg, see
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174 Chronicon Pictum (Illuminated Chronicle), Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Cod. Lat. 404. For the research background to the above mentioned manuscript, see Marosi (n. 117 above, 1995), 31–33.
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ERNŐ MAROSI AND THE PROTECTION OF HUNGARIAN HISTORIC MONUMENTS

A characteristic and integral part of Ernő Marosi’s extraordinary scholarly work are his publications and (especially after 1990) his considerable public efforts in the area of monument protection theory and practice—activities which, typical of conditions in Hungary, have passed almost unnoticed. When briefly surveying his many decades of work in this field, in many respects exceptional by Hungarian standards, two particular circumstances deserve special emphasis. One is Marosi’s professional method, which he has applied consistently since he devised it early in his career. He believes that a historiographical reflection and an approach to the object that combines perspectives from archeology, museology, and monument protection should always be a fundamental part of critical methodology. Moreover, as a university educator whose research focuses on concrete topics, he has regularly addressed related questions in the history of Hungarian and general art history, both in his more comprehensive works and in his studies of particular issues. Thus, the development of the concept of historical monument and the practice of monument protection as well as aspects of its art developed from that practice, fit naturally into Marosi’s approach. The other significant motivating factor that has led to Marosi’s extensive publications and statements on monument protection is the ever deepening crisis in Hungarian monument preservation, which began almost unnoticed three decades ago and whose effect has somewhat later come to bear on museum affairs, too. Cooperation between the three closely intertwined fields of monument protection, museum work, and art history was once thought and seemed to be solid, however, anyone familiar with the relationship between these interdependent and mutually enriching disciplines cannot ignore the increasingly serious troubles which now affect the very existence of the profession. Under such circumstances, the need to repeatedly explain and raise the public awareness of these connections, in as wide a circle as possible beyond the boundaries of the profession, is critical, even if, as Marosi has noted, the profession is limited by social forces which clearly have other interests. In Hungary the predicament is more pronounced than in Western Europe, likewise in the Czech Republic which has a similar communist past. This is because non-governmental cooperation, which could have a significant impact on the protection of Hungarian
cultural heritage, is unreliable thanks to a fundamental weakness of the civil structure. The challenge to protect cultural heritage became strikingly clear in the former "socialist" countries the moment changes took place in world politics in 1990. Because of the complex nature of the task, the boundaries of the profession—in this case primarily art history—must not give halt to the search for value-driven answers. Instead the message of the profession should be drafted within the context of general cultural politics. When the time was right to do this, Marosi did not hesitate to take action.

The crisis in question, of course, is not just a Hungarian phenomenon. The roots of the problem stretch as far back as monument preservation itself. The central dilemmas of monument protection arose amidst the tension between practice versus theory, that is, social profitability and representation value versus intellectualism and the universal approach of science. As bipolar world politics ended in the 1990s, the stable relationship established between the profession of monument protection and museums following World War II was shaken, and business concerns took significantly greater precedence over the preservation of national treasures. During this same period Eastern Europe has been gradually building a market economy, and a political structure very similar in theory to those found in the West emerged; thus the problems in both halves of the continent began increasingly to resemble each other. The 2005 statement briefly summarizing the essential components of the phenomenon by the board of the German Association of Art Historians expresses the situation well: "Those triumphs of civil society which have proven so vital to the foundation of civil national states—for example the creative acquisition of cultural products of the past in museums and collections, as well as subsidizing of art and the protection of architectural monuments—are not, as time has shown, requirements of the political sphere. The legitimization of power through the support of culture and art is an outdated model. Today’s politicians do not need to be legitimized—they are elected. And in general financial difficulties, every cultural and artistic institution is in the end retailed according to the needs of business management. Political administrations appear eager to shed their social charge of preserving cultural and artistic property as quickly as possible. But they are not authorized to do this! No political mandate gives them this power! If we take a narrow view, from the perspective of the national economy, they are acting uneco-

nomically, because cultural and human resources are being squandered." All this, down to the last detail, could be said about Hungary. Willibald Sauerlander’s concerns similarly relate to Hungarian problems: “… art history is just a mirror of the general state of a society in which the question of how much critical potential, how much reflexive civility will survive the absolute power of the economy remains open.”

The golden age of Hungarian monument protection was during the communist period. This fact, in addition to the peculiar history of Hungary’s national treasures, has given rise to a particular method of operation in Hungarian
monument preservation and an unusual set of problems that differ from those found in Western Europe or in other countries formerly under Soviet rule. At the same time, the effects of deeply rooted attitudes and social-historical antecedents can be felt in Hungarian history. When explaining Hungary's outstanding achievement in monument protection during the socialist period in comparison to Western European efforts at the same time, three important circumstances merit special attention. First, when the Soviet system was introduced, the majority of buildings, including residential buildings, became state property. Second, a concept of the people and nation as identified with the state was embraced. As a consequence, both the rigid communist system imposed in 1948–1949 and its 1956 version, with its bloody reprisals in response to the uprising, classified historical monuments as important elements of identity, in contrast to other people's democracies which promoted an ideology hostile to historical monuments. Finally the fact that a large number of well-qualified, well-educated professionals in fields related to monument preservation were available who were of varying ages and political persuasions, but were well-versed in international trends, also had a major role in the evolution of such a situation. The conscious Hungarian cultural politics of the inter-war period assured such a layer of society was disposable when the communist system was introduced. Many of these professionals, satisfying the system's demands and needs for legitimization, attained important decision-making posts in the sphere of cultural politics, and proved able to present fundamental bourgeois traditions using rhetoric appropriate to the changing requirements of party ideology, for example, expressing the financial needs of monument preservation in a way consistent with the logic of a planned economy. Conditions for employment of top experts were thus established. Later, during the period "thaw" during the so-called goulash communism, the system sought to increase its legitimacy abroad by highlighting its success in monument preservation. Therefore, though in Hungary after 1945 an unusual situation developed in which every essential element of bourgeois society was systematically eliminated in the course of a few years, the practice of preserving historic monuments, theoretically a foreign concept in the communist system, was able to maintain an intellectual and spiritual continuity with the pre-WW II period, incorporating many of the profession's values into the institutional structures and mechanisms of a system that operated on fundamentally different principles.

Among the most important achievements of Hungarian monument preservation before World War II were the expansion of the field's scholarly base, the education and employment of a well-trained set of researchers, at least the partial development of institutional requirements, a more extensive collection of topographical material, a rise in documentation activities, and the early treatment of Hungarian national treasures in corpuses and monographs, with the increasing inclusion of Baroque and neo-Classicist monuments. It should also be noted that restorations were carried out on ruins, the majority buried under ground, from Hungary's destroyed medieval period, the most important among them being the
Early Gothic palace chapel of Esztergom, which was first excavated in 1934 and reconstructed in 1938 using anastylosis. For decades this work was a starting point in methodology and remained a basis of reference for Hungarian monument protection which defined itself within the framework of the Athens Charter drafted in 1931 and the Venice Charter issued in 1964. A determinant figure in this period was the Budapest professor of art history Tibor Gerevich, who served as president of the National Commission for Historical Monuments, the central institution of Hungarian monument protection, from 1934 until the committee was abolished in 1949.

In the period following 1945, his student Dezső Dercsényi, a colleague at that same institution from 1935, gradually took over the leading role. Although always the second in command behind a politically appointed director, Dercsényi was the true head and strategic developer of the Hungarian organization of monument protection until 1977, a body that was solidified in an institutional framework in 1957. This new set of preservationists took advantage of the widespread nationalization carried out in 1949, and a new law on monument protection issued in the same year quickly declared some seven thousand buildings historic monuments. Until then, the 1881 law on historical monuments had been in effect, which allowed for scarcely four dozen buildings to be placed under official protection. A series of topographies on Hungarian historic monuments were launched the next year, based on an Austrian example and relying on the results of Gerevich’s initiatives a decade and a half earlier. During this process, material from four and a half of Hungary’s nineteen counties and the districts of Buda were successfully published in twelve volumes, although the speed of publication was drastically reduced over the years: six volumes appeared in the first decade and after that only two volumes per decade, with the last publication in 1987. In addition to the topographies, multi-leveled forums for regular publications on monument protection were formed, and results were announced at international conferences and in professional publications.

In the early 1950s, extensive research on seventy-four settlements with the rank of town was carried out with the assistance of architects and art historians. The goal was to record both historic treasures and monuments that added to the cityscape of each settlement at the time the development plans were drafted. Other important achievements of the period included: large-scale archeological excavations and conservation works; organization of urban-scale protection; comprehensive or detailed restoration of historical city centers; preparation of the necessary historic preservation documentation (including surveys of the castle district of Buda, and the historic centres of Sopron, Győr, Székesfehérvár); new methods of building research (Bauforschung, functional analysis, etc.); documentation of urban buildings from the second half of the 19th century primarily in Budapest; and the expansion of protection to folk architecture as well as technical and industrial monuments. These efforts resulted not only in the physical preservation of historic monuments, the development of related methodology, and the creation of
a broad professional spectrum, but also in the enrichment and nuancing of our view of the history of these settlements, our built heritage, and the integrally related branches of art. With this our understanding of the treasures to be preserved for posterity was similarly enhanced.

The National Board of Historic Monuments, founded in 1957 (its successor was known from 1992 as the National Office for the Protection of Historic Monuments and from 2001 as the National Office for the Protection of Cultural Heritage), served as the institutional background for this. From the perspective of financing and the effectiveness of official activities, it was critically significant that the office was placed under the supervision of the minister of architectural affairs. It was a peculiarity of the system that the office included divisions for scholarship, administration, and restoration, but also had the capacity to plan and execute, as it were part of the socialist building industry.

No monograph has yet examined the various periods in the history of Hungarian monument protection. There is a wealth of literature, however, on the socialist period, as the most important achievements were published more or less regularly in the institute’s yearbooks, which also included bibliographies for the years they covered—a project which continues with increasingly rich content.

In 1963, by the start of Ernő Marosi’s career, the institution had been fully developed and was in its days of glory. In the interview quoted above, Marosi, just like his classmates, spoke of his aspirations, of finding employment at the office of monument protection when he finished his studies. A conspiracy of circumstances, however, led him to a university career. Certainly Dezső Dercsényi’s lectures on Romanesque art in the Art History Department at the time played a role in this attraction. As Marosi wrote, “I think it’s scarcely an exaggeration to say that his elegant figure in many ways—including his smoking—provided some kind of model at ELTE [=Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest] in the 1960s.” In any case, concerns about monument protection as part of an important set of topics necessary for the development of his chosen field appear in many contexts throughout his
work. He examined the Church of St Elisabeth at Kassa (Košice, SK) in eight significant studies, as it provided him an opportunity to analyze the most important tendencies and key figures in Hungarian art history and the 19th-century history of monument protection using chiefly monuments as source material. He considers such a historical reckoning a part of “philological hygiene”, and finds its
significance in that “the works of art are not just objects, but intellectual phenomena that have been left to us together with their interpretation.” To better care for treasures, whether a museum piece or a monument, we need to consider the varying scholarly paradigms and all the intellectual responses to them, and the same is true when we wish to better understand the works. Thus, systematic scholarly surveys related to the object form an essential complement to Marosi’s research in architectural history. Consistent with this logic was an exhibition two decades later dedicated to the web of connections of the Viennese school of art history that had a profound impact for several generations on Hungarian art history and its development. The catalogue has been a fundamental point of reference for researchers interested in this question.

Marosi’s pioneering propaedeutic work in the teaching of Hungarian art history and his collection of texts on general art history, with its comprehensive introduction and comments, present a solid base for all further study. However, an
introduction to his extraordinarily rich work in architectural history, which sys-
tematically analyzes the key questions in the history of Hungarian medieval archi-
tecture, is beyond the scope of this essay. Nevertheless, before a short introdution
of his critical comments on monument protection, brief mention should be made
of a study outlining the possibilities for an art historical evaluation of 15th-century
castle architecture as a good example of what can result from a fruitful cooperation
between monument protection and art history.16

The 1960s and 1970s were favorable to Hungarian monument protection, but
in the 1980s, the situation began to erode. One of the obvious reasons for that was
the general crisis in the communist system which made economic performance
increasingly difficult. But perhaps even more important and what remains today a
crucial factor was increasing consumerism, which occurred despite economic
troubles, and the fact that the life style resulting from a consumerist attitude could
gain a decisive role. In this atmosphere, politics also began to place less value on
cultural display, and the steady financing of utopian ideological goals related to
culture was in danger of coming to an end. These conditions led to the slowing
down of previously well-functioning scholarly projects directed at the long-term
accumulation of knowledge and later to their gradual demise at the time of the
political changes in 1989. The creation of Hungarian topographies of historic
monuments suffered this same fate, as did the entire series of research projects de-
voted to the publication of more corpuses and monographs. Of course, there were
counterexamples, too (and still are,17 but we will return to that later, in another
context). The conditions for scholarly research developed by Tibor Gerevich and
his circle in the mid-1930s and applied as a national program in the socialist years,
have never been restored. In the following witty, yet bitter assertion, Marosi clear-
lly conveys the situation of his profession, although naturally it is not the cessation
of state monopoly that he mourns: “the state monopoly on art history writing
ended before it could complete its task, and thus rose Hungarian postmodernism
and its basic problem: often there is nothing to deconstruct, as the fundamentals
are missing.”18 It should be added that the generation of art historians and archi-
tects responsible for building the scholarly and institutional foundation of the pro-
tection of historical monuments in Hungary of the period in question and who
had struggled to the end were no longer active by the late 1970s. Thus, there is
little surprise that signs of a new era in the handling and practical restoration of
historic monuments became more prevalent. In 1990 Marosi published a study
entitled “Hungarian Monument Protection at the Crossroad!” in Kunstchronik,19
in which he analyzes the trends of the previous decades with a focus on changes in
the practice of monument restoration. His starting point was the rebuilding, in the
spirit of the Athens Charter, of parts of the palace chapel of Esztergom. One of the
essential and most important basic principles adhered to in this period of Hunga-
rarian monument preservation was the clear differentiation between the colours,
forms, and materials of the original structure and that of the modern reconstruc-
tion. Another principle observed was the free use of modern structural techniques
and reinforced concrete, so long as they did not affect the outer appearance of the monuments. In the 1960s changes in this approach became apparent, such as the reinforced concrete wall additions to the 13th-century keep in Visegrád or the castle of Diósgyőr, as well as the inclusion of the ruins of the former Dominican monastery in Buda into the Hilton hotel complex. Marosi saw this as a constructivist change in taste in which the architect-restorer's hand in the project is
obvious. In a lecture the previous year he warned of the associated dangers: “One of the most important endeavors in modern monument protection is to show respect for the unique history of each monument, in other words its life history, to trace the changes the monument has undergone and make them visible. The ultimate test of tolerance and respect for the individuality of the work, however, is the restraint shown by the restorer when he leaves the signature of his time on the monument, on the surroundings, or in the texture of the historical settlement or ensemble of structures. After all, this is generally the point at which the monument, in the hands of a generation convinced of its supremacy on the evolutionary scale, is converted from a historically significant work in need of conservation into a self-conscious memorial.” As Marosi often emphasizes, from the perspective of an art historian, this is not only problematic because it is a return to a historicist approach discredited a century ago, but also because in some cases the alterations in the texture of the monument are irreversible and the monument’s value as a primary source is damaged. What is left for posterity is thus an interpretation of the monument, but not the monument itself. The art historical concept of the monument lies at the theoretical center of the ethical problem. This position, expressed in terms of the universal mission of art history, was first expounded by Alois Riegl, a defining figure in the Vienna School of Art History at the turn of the 20th century, and in many respects Riegl’s point is still valid today. In addition to clarifying the various approaches to monument protection and their connections, his study draws conclusions about the theoretical methods of dealing with monuments. Riegl first published his thoughts in 1903 with the aim of providing a theoretical foundation for an intended Austrian law on monument protection. Since then his views have been a recurring subject of debate in international discourse on monument protection. Promoting awareness of Riegl’s ideas among art historians and others involved in monument preservation has been an important element of Marosi’s related work. Interestingly, in the history of Hungarian monument protection, openness to Riegl’s principles was greatest at the time they were drafted, whereas in German-speaking regions, Riegl’s work was for some time scarcely known. In Hungary in 1906, Baron Gyula Forster, vice-president and later president for thirty years of the National Committee for Historic Monuments, discussed at length Riegl’s ideas. Later, however, Riegl’s views rarely or only tangentially appeared in Hungarian discourse on monument protection, and not at all in public discussion until Marosi’s critical work in the field. The first complete Hungarian translation of the work came out in 1998, full of mistranslations typically caused by and leading to confusion over Riegl’s ideas. Marosi’s critique deals with the requirements of monument protection which have taken shape over time in connection with how individual monuments are treated, and he naturally uses medieval works as examples. Riegl explained the fundamental principles he wanted to emphasize and felt were lacking in the methods of preserving historic monuments from the perspective of historical value as commemorative value: “Signs of decay, which are most important for age value of
relics, should, by all means, be removed from works of historical value. However, this should not be performed on the object itself, but on a copy or merely in thought and word. Even for a work of historical value, the original relic should be viewed as fundamentally untouchable, although for completely different reasons than for works with age value. In the case of historical value, we are not talking about conserving the traces of time, the ravages of nature, which are at least indifferent, if not burdensome to the object; what is much more important is that the...
work be preserved in the most original form possible for future art historical re-
search. All human estimates and additions are prone to subjective errors; this is
why the original, the only certain point of reference, must be preserved untouched,
so that posterity can inspect our experiments in reconstruction and perhaps replace
them with better, more justified solutions.”

Marosi perceived the crisis in the concept of the monument as the basic ca-
teogy of art history, believing that the widely fashionable and unreflective use of
the concept of cultural heritage threatened to dilute the concept of the historic
monument and ultimately lessen its traditional respect. This fear is particularly
justified, since, as he writes, “the balance that has existed until now between pub-
lic interests and private impulses, between creativity and the need to conserve,
and between the need to maintain and the desire for profits has been upset.”

A monument, as he explains, is an integral part of cultural heritage, but only if it
has been interpreted intellectually. Of course, a prerequisite for this, as we can read
in Riegl, is that subsequent generations assure as best they can the preservation of
the material reality of the object. This was the basic principle of historic monu-
ment preservation throughout the entire 20th century, having become the norm
with the triumph of the maxim of conservation over historicist attempts at resto-
ration at the turn of the 20th century. In contrast, in the late 1990s, a period
when society was experiencing considerable uncertainty over its place in the world,
several representative restoration projects were undertaken which stand in stark opposition to this approach: historic monuments were handled in a way that essentially transformed them into **memorials.** The dramatic restorations of surviving ruins from the monuments of Székesfehérvár, Esztergom and Visegrád, the three royal centers of medieval Hungary in addition to Buda, represent an irreparable break in the tradition of Hungarian monument protection, once an example of exceptional intellectual continuity. The effect on the entire attitude toward historic monuments set the tone for Marosi's critique. Elsewhere, Marosi draws this final conclusion: “In the recent past—and consistently during the millennium restorations—not only have revitalization efforts been set against the cult of ruins, but the need for actual representation, too. This represents a throwback to a theoretical stance discredited a century ago. What a strange and unprecedented phenomenon in the practice of European monument protection!”

The debates that have cropped up alongside this phenomenon are presented as theoretical dilemmas centered on the slogan of **authenticity,** and Marosi sees them as a symptom of uncertainty. The main weakness of such discussions is the dispensation of the otherwise obligatory theoretical reflection, which reveals the emptiness of the arguments presented. This is not necessarily an innocent act, as the motivation is self-justification. In other words the arguments neglect to clarify the content and magnitude of the concepts used and the reasons for their use. Of course, this deficiency is easily lost, even on a public generally interested in historic monuments but without any expertise in the field. This is especially true if marketing techniques developed for the ferocious struggles for market shares or for political power are used and the worlds of business and politics are won over as allies.

The challenges faced in Hungarian monument protection are unique, since a significant portion of Hungary's national treasures were produced in the historical Hungary, geographically speaking the Carpathian Basin, during some one thousand years' period before the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in 1918. Today these works are found outside the borders of Hungary, scattered among countries mostly belonging to the European Union. It follows that the problems concerning the medieval period can

7. The reconstructed rondella at the Castle of Diósgyőr, 1963
(Photo Archives of the National Office for the Protection of Cultural Heritage, Budapest)
only be solved with international cooperation, and Hungary has its own share of international responsibilities in the area of monument protection. Professional dependence, however, is not one-sided. From 1860, when the establishment of Hungarian monument protection broke from the imperial framework, until the new state system was established in 1918, the protection of historical monuments throughout the Carpathian Basin (which included all of Slovakia) was part of the Hungarian institutional system, and thus a wealth of documentation is preserved in Budapest. Furthermore, the historical monuments in the Carpathian Basin can be characteristically divided into groups according to ethnic and religious-cultural associations (this is true of today's Hungary, too, but less so than elsewhere). Scholarly treatment of these works thus requires different methods of research and monument protection because of the special problems of language and historical experience, and satisfactory results can only be achieved through international cooperation. Another fundamental aspect is that art historical phenomena need to be interpreted within the historical and geographical context in which they arose. In this way Czech research, for example, in medieval and Baroque art has been beneficial to Hungarian monument preservation, and numerous other examples could be given. The European Union, seen as a community of shared values, needs to transform not only into a community of states, but one of nations, so that the most valuable parts of our historical heritage, our cultural diversity, can be preserved and systematically cultivated. In this respect, joint efforts to promote cultural heritage, and within this the legacy of Hungary's and other nations' historical monuments as a part of universal culture as well as national memory, should not be a source of conflict. Instead—to borrow Ernő Marosi's idea frequently mentioned lately—it could be the starting point for a new kind of regional consciousness, or even patriotism. This idealistic and utopian vision naturally does not reflect the real conditions, and the problem is not just Hungary's. Although different in certain fundamental ways, the question of how to jointly handle German-Polish and Polish-Ukrainian cultural heritage is comparable to the Hungarian problem in terms of the unshed burdens of history and the dangers of reviving the shadows of the past. Also similar is the problem of cultural heritage in Transylvania, in particular the large volume of historical monuments left behind by Transylvanian Saxons, who were exported to Germany as part of Ceausescu's politics. In the past two decades, the Germans and the Poles have taken serious, methodical and effective strides in this matter. Similar tendencies have been observed within Hungary in the two decades following the political changes, with positive developments occurring in all fields related to monument protection, including joint professional ventures, important exhibitions, and cooperative research carried out on major historic monuments. Following World War II, Hungarian art history became disenchanted with the theory of a prevailing Hungarian cultural supremacy in the Carpathian Basin, an idea which had played an important role in the political ideology of the inter-war period and in the historical sciences, too. Instead a pluralistic concept, as discussed above, was appropriated. With this, "the foundations of
a realistic approach to the cultivation of Hungarian art were set within a Central European framework.” Although a detailed discussion of these questions is beyond the scope of this paper, a quote from Marosi conveys the nature of the difficulties which in part still remain. Clearly in reference to the already-mentioned politics of Ceausescu and current forms of behavior that are more nuanced, but also more confrontational, Marosi made this slightly resigned statement: “The developments of recent times have taught us that efforts which lay claim to appropriate the historical tradition of monuments, but at least appreciate them, are our better chance. It is worse if monuments are not needed, are classified as foreign objects to be erased, if their decay is aggressively accelerated, or just passively anticipated, if distance is kept, and if those who keep tradition alive are persecuted.”

In 1989, as Hungary stood on the threshold of political change, Marosi described the necessary tasks: “It would be self-deceptive to talk of Hungarian monument protection, if it did not mean the protection of all the monuments that form the basis of Hungarian art history, and if the same standards were not applied and the same attention not devoted to these as to the fate of historical source material, literary-historical treasures and memorial places, and sites of ethnographic significance. Unfortunately, opportunities to take protective measures are limited at the most critical points. As long as the system of international scholarly and institutional connections fail to facilitate the promotion of national interests, to offer domestic financial support or labor to save even the most important or most endangered monuments, Hungary can only blame itself. The collection, treatment, and publication of documents covering all movable objects in Hungary’s collections, including the entire body of Hungarian art historical and archeological objects tied to places outside Hungary’s borders, present a challenge that if not met would prevent us from determining what kind of preservation is needed. The task, in all its complexity, shows how the universal mission of Hungarian monument protection can be served by fulfilling our national obligations.”

In this respect, there have been significant, if not systematic, accomplishments following 1990, which Marosi has recorded in the appropriate venues. Of central importance was the publication of a series of pre-World War I drawings and photographic documentary material collected by the National Commission for Historical Monuments (1872–1949), the predecessor of today’s National Office for the Protection of Cultural Heritage, in volumes with art historical commentary generally parallel to their exhibition. The Ethnographic Museum also participated in this series, using its own collection to support historical perspectives on monument protection. The results of the international conference organized jointly by the Bratislava Office of Historic Monuments (Pamiatkový ústav) and the Budapest National Office in 1998 was a survey of current developments in Slovak, Hungarian, Czech, Polish, Romanian, and Slovenian monument protection related to the widespread documentation activities of Viktor Myskovszky, a pioneer in Slovak monument protection, born in 1838 in Bárfá (Bardejov, SK).
cooperation of Hungarian and Romanian researchers has also brought about im­
portant and encouraging results in the protection of the only surviving medieval 
cathedral in the Carpathian Basin, the Cathedral of Gyulafehérvar (Alba Iulia, 
RO). Meanwhile, the corpus of medieval wall paintings in the region has in­
creased by nearly fifty percent thanks to previously unheard of joint efforts in re­
searching and conserving churches over the past decade and a half, which have 
enabled art historians to better interpret this form of art. Developments of similar 
magnitude have been made in the survey and conservation of wooden statues and 
other church furnishings from the medieval period to the Baroque. The list 
could be expanded with numerous examples of individual research efforts. 

Marosi’s activity in historical monument topography, an important area of 
research in monument protection, also deserves mention. Topography, or the 
systematic scholarly recording and continuous publication of any object in the 
category of historic monument, is indispensable to the protection and care of a 
country’s historic treasures. In Hungary, this genre of scholarship and publication 
has a long history extending back to the early days when monument preservation 
was institutionalized, and though few, its achievements are respectable. In this 
narrow field, the idea that no favorable changes in the situation are likely is now a 
century-old cliché. This is why Marosi’s decision to launch a German-Austrian 
Dehio-type small topography research program in the mid-1980s, when he was 
already vice-director of the Art History Research Group of the Hungarian Aca­
demy of Sciences, was so significant. At this time, the continuation of a series of 
handbooks on Hungarian art history, one of the larger projects in the state-di­
rected field was called into question. This topographical program could have pro­
vided significant compensation for approximately two decades of professional 
oversight. That this did not happen is not Marosi’s failing. Small achievements 
were made, however, and as was typical, ten years after the actual field work was 
carried out, one volume on Fejér County was published. Marosi had not only 
directed the work as head of the institution, but also participated in the explo­
ratation of several dozen settlements and the preparation of entries in the topo­
graphy. 

Finally, mention should be made of the fundamental changes that took place 
in universal culture in the last quarter of the 20th century, and which will cer­
tainly have a significant impact on further paths in monument protection. These 
developments, effectively analyzed by Hans Belting, and stemming from the fact 
that new art has dismantled old paradigms, impact the basic functions of the field 
of art history, too, and lead to a fundamentally pluralistic interpretation of its sub­
ject. Reflecting on these problems, Marosi clearly saw that from the aspects of 
monument protection that most interest us here satisfying answers to these ques­
tions can hardly be provided at the moment. 

A study by Gabi Dolff-Bonekämper, professor of art history and monument 
protection at the Technische Universität in Berlin, was presented at the 2008 
Budapest colloquium of the Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art (CIHA),
entitled “How to Write Art History—National, Regional or Global?”. Dolff-Bonekämper’s work summarizes some of the basic and urgent goals which Hungarian art history and monument protection needs to achieve, too.45 Her concluding remarks summarize well Ernő Marosi’s proposed approach as well, which was enhanced by the fact that parallel to the publication of the original German study, Marosi also published his own Hungarian translation in a critical journal.46 Dolff-Bonekämper summed up her answer to the main question of the conference as follows: “It is my personal conviction, that for the future of our discipline, the model of trans-national art history, present since the 18th century alongside various national constructions, is the most usable. It is this model which should be taken up, and developed in an international context, with the support of CIHA. Together with the concept of a common cultural heritage, as expressed by the Council of Europe’s Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro, 2005), this notion of trans-national art history writing, which recognizes borders but also transcends them, acknowledges the goals of current European policy, without denying the national conditions in which we all live. Whether and how this concept can be developed on a worldwide scale is for others to decide.”

Notes

1 Recalling the early years of his career, Marosi confesses: “... while researching my specialty, the architectural history of medieval Hungary, I became closely connected to the field of monument protection. My senior thesis was about the history of the Gothic approach, while my doctoral dissertation was on the medieval building history of the Kassa [Košice, SK] cathedral. The main basis for the latter—considering I had little more opportunity to examine the building than a tourist—were Steindl’s plans for reconstruction. During this work I discovered that learning about medieval architecture requires the study of the 19th century and a critical approach to efforts to preserve monuments.” See A. Harangi, “Ami az Athéni és Velencei Charta értelmezését, aktualizálását és felülrását jelenti a műemlékvédelemben, az a jelen.” Interjú dr. Marosi Ernő akadémikussal” [Interview with Dr. Erno Marosi, member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences], Műemlékvédelem XLVIII, 2004, 375–76.

2 “Criticism of restorations carried out in Hungarian museums is lacking, just as it is for monument protection, too.” E. Marosi, “A műemléki örökség,” Magyar Műemlékvédelem XI, Budapest 2002, 12.


4 The statement was entitled “On the cultural political situation”, and was published as preparatory material to the conference XXVIII. Deutscher Kunsthistorikertag (Universität Bonn, 17 March 2005) organized by the Verband Deutscher Kunsthistoriker, see „Mitteilungen des Verbandes Deutscher Kunsthistoriker – Zur kulturpolitischen Lage. Stellungnahme des Vorstands des Verbands Deutscher Kunsthistoriker,” Kunstchronik 58, 2005, 87.

6 See Kunstchronik 43, 7/1990, which gives an overview of the state of affairs in monument protection in the former socialist countries.


9 See Harangi (n. 1 above), 365.


11 The most important conclusions were published in German, too: idem, “Beiträge zur Baugeschichte der Páfríkirche St. Elisabeth von Kassa,” Acta Historiae Artium X, 1964, 229–45.

12 Idem, “Művészettörténet-írás, művészettörténetészek (Bevezetés),” in Emberek... (n. 10 above), Enigma XIII, 2006/47, 28.


17 A good example of this is the series Lapidarium Hungarianum, which, by publishing the continually increasing inventory of some seventy thousand carved stone fragments of Hungarian architecture (a large part of the history of medieval Hungarian architecture can be reconstructed from these), undertakes to fulfill an old desire of Hungarian monument protection and architectural history. In the period 1988 to 2009 seven volumes were published, and the project continues. The journal Műemlékvédelmi Szemle, published by the National Office for the Protection of Historic
Monuments (from 2001 National Office for the Protection of Cultural Heritage) from 1991 to 2004, allowed for the publication of more penetrating studies, from which the profession has benefitted greatly. In addition, the more than fifty-year-old journal Müemlekvédelem, with a modernized appearance, appears regularly every other month. Tracking current activities in monument protection, the publication is an indispensable tool and one of the most important sources of information on the past fifty years. (See E. Marosi, "A Müemlekvédelem fél évszázada," Müemlekvédelem LI, 2007, 2–4.) The 2005 yearbook of the Office was dedicated entirely to the bibliography of monument protection for the 1990s. With its broad collecting parameters, it contains more than eleven thousand entries touching on the literature of neighboring countries (I. Bardoly, "Műemléki bibliográfia 1991–2000," Magyar Müemlekvédelem XII, Budapest 2005, 536 pages). Even in the absence of deeper analysis, this state of affairs suggests that interest in the subject is significant even within the fundamentally changed circumstances; in fact, many initiatives have been considered, which earlier would never have gained attention. What will apparently be lacking for some time, however, is a uniform approach combining all of these and a comprehensive view of the problem.

18 Marosi (n. 12 above), 28.
20 Ibid, 577.
23 For more recent reflections on this, see A. Lehne, "Intentional and Unintentional Monuments: Various Aspects of the History and Theory Behind Monument Preservation in Austria," Centropa 7, 2007, 32–43.
26 Riegl (n. 22 above), 74.
27 Marosi (n. 2 above), 7.
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31 Marosi (n. 2 above), 9.
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In his writings on modern art over the last decade and a half, internationally respected medievalist Ernő Marosi has shown that his studies of issues and major works of the 20th century are not merely the forays of an enthusiastic hobbyist. It is no coincidence that he regularly opens contemporary art exhibits, listens to Kurtag concerts at the Music Academy and attends provocative theatre performances. His frequently heard acerbic comments on contemporary art and the latest happenings reveal an astonishing erudition topped with a sardonic smile. Only the uninformed outsider asks with wide eyes: What? Medieval and modern? But that's impossible! As the French poet Lautréamont wrote, this would be the “meeting of an umbrella and a sewing machine on the dissecting table”. The art history profession, however, has noted respectfully, yet fearfully, for some time that even though research does not deal with modern subjects, Ernő Marosi is attune to the artistic events and trends of the past hundred years, continually churning them through his mind. Then, on special or everyday occasions, in words or in writing, he is prepared to support his conviction that art history—even when divided into periods—is a single, unified process. An entry for Ernő Marosi in an imaginary biographical lexicon should thus read: his narrower area of expertise is medieval art, the subject of his thoughts and observations is Art.

"An art work is an autonomous structure, a microcosm in itself, but at the same time it mirrors a historical step in human thought. In one capacity, it begs to be identified with, and allows for interpretation only of its individuality; as a product of history, it has precursors and successors, it is an element in a queue”,1 wrote Marosi more than thirty years ago. This belief had already taken shape and matured during his university days. In his choice of thesis topic, Marosi clearly expressed his commitment to the study of medieval art, thus joining a group of fellow university students dedicated to the understanding of older monuments and processes. His scholarly lifework over the subsequent decades has been built on this foundation. At the same time, however, he was clearly infected by the feverish interest and insatiable desire for knowledge of those interested in modern, even contemporary art. In the early 1960s the lecture material of the art history department ended at the middle of the 19th century. Students would never have
acquainted themselves with the “continuation”, if enthusiasts for the modern periods, with their hungry curiosity, unstoppable momentum and diligent self-cultivation, had not swept aside the ideological elements in their education and the archaic barriers of the classical art historical approach. It was certainly no accident, and obviously thanks to the unavoidable duel between circumstances and opportunities, that this society produced scholars devoted to the research, elaboration and presentation of 19th—20th-century art (Éva Askercz, Eszter Gábor, Péter Kovács, Ildikó Nagy, Katalin Néray, Krisztina Passuth, Géza Perneczky, Júlia Szabó, and the author).²

Art historians of this type, who do not specialize exclusively in one topic or period, are rare, but not unknown in Hungarian art history. They treat art as a continuous unit, and one that continually changes throughout history, not only in their understanding of art, but also in their research, presentation and writing. In the first decade of the 20th century, young colleagues (now classic figures in the field both at home and abroad) at the Budapest Museum of Fine Arts were primarily inspired and motivated by research into questions of older art, while also enthusiastically exploring contemporary efforts. Simon Meller and Elek Petrovics eagerly studied and purchased artworks for the museum by the Nyolcak (Group of Eight) and other activist artists. Edith Hoffman willingly held lectures on the art of József Rippl Rónai, József Nemes Lampért and Béni Ferency. János Wilde and she belonged to a circle of friends who had formed around Nemes Lampért and Ferency. Kálmán Pogany was a particular fan of Rippl Rónai. It is scarcely surprising that this young society became inquisitive and ardent followers of avant-garde trends. Later, prominent scholars such as Máriusz Rabinovszky and István Genthon represented a type attentive and receptive to old as well as new art. Rabinovszky started as a modernist: early on he wrote an extensive study on the sculptures of Ferenc Medgyessy³ and later an independent volume examining the previous two centuries of painting.⁴ His interests covered a broad territory from the art of Tivadar Csontváry, László Moholy-Nagy and Gyula Derkovits through the activities of KUT, Lajos Vajda, to questions of abstract art. As he turned to problems of Trecento art,⁵ however, he saw that “everything that came after the Trecento is rough, extrinsic and boastful”.⁶ While his focus was modern art, his interest—and this is clearly discernible in his book on the Trecento—was tinged by a faint aloofness, an unsettling feeling he had that the previous two centuries of art resulted from some kind of crisis, and the true value was indeed born in the earlier great periods of art. Genthon studied developments in old and new art simultaneously, publishing in consecutive years articles on art in the century before the battle of Mohács (1526)⁷ and the contemporary painter Erzsébet Korb.⁸ Later, his volume on old Hungarian painting⁹ and an album introducing Aurél Bernáth¹⁰ appeared in the same year. He also published a study on the sculptures of Béni Ferency,¹¹ and a book about Károly Ferency,¹² among others. His writing was dominated by his knowledge, taste, judgment, and—regardless of the period—his hedonist enjoyment of the work. Finally, we should recall Charles de Tolnay, who
devoted his first study to Cézanne, although the great masters, such as Bosch, Brueghel and Michelangelo, stood at the centre of his research. He preserved his interest in 20th-century art in later years, too. He devoted a book to the art of his old friend Noémi Ferenczy.

Reading Marosi’s large-scale works on medieval art and his writings on modern topics, we are involuntarily reminded of his “predecessors”, although we may suspect how they differed. First, many of his predecessors dealt with art criticism. Marosi, however, is not a critic, although artists and art historians are both wary of his critical approach. Second, he arrived at modern art from an unusual starting point, as a scholar of the medieval period. Third (and the most important), the staggering knowledge of the medievist in his own field is accompanied by a command of history and art history from all periods as well as a thorough grounding in the history of science and art theory. Whoever claimed to discover in the entirety of Marosi’s activities and approach the legacy of the Viennese School is right. As Marosi himself expressed it: “With respect to the premise to which we ascribe, which essentially declares art history to be fundamentally a science of history, [...] the traditions of the Viennese School methodology are decisive.” But if we look for further examples, among representatives of more recent art historians, we will easily discover a relationship between Marosi and Hans Belting in their approaches and their ways of seeing and thinking. “The starting point of the dilemma formulated by Belting was his determination that the concept of art had forever come undone, and what we understand as art in old works is not what we see in the production of our contemporaries”, writes Marosi. He adds in both acknowledgment and agreement, “A proposal for resolving this dilemma pushed for the elaboration of a concept of art which was valid for both groups.”

In young Ernő Marosi’s articles on modern art, naturally we cannot feel his excited interest, the impressive scope of his knowledge, or his understanding of artistic phenomena as a unit, all of which would govern the character of his later writings. But after many years, in a foreword to a selection of texts embracing centuries of material, he wrote: “We do not consider works of art as exclusively a product of history today either [...] this method of approach is only one, and not even the most natural, of many [...] The basis of the historical outlook is not identification with the work, not the immediacy of the experience, but rather a separation from the pure sensory contact, a comparison to others, an outlining of conceptual analogies. The fundamental uniqueness of the aesthetic experience is above all the unconditional and exclusive contemplation of the object, the depth and totality of the sensation.” When he wrote this, long and prolific years of research and writing on old art stood behind him. Beyond his own narrowly defined field, medieval art, he was familiar with the activities of major figures in Hungarian art history and their scholarly ideals, and—which is crucial—he not only knew, but had experienced and understood the character of the artwork, its material and singular reality, just as well as its nature as a product of history. Whether it was the “yield” of the old or the new age did not matter for him.
In the early 1990s in his review of Sándor Radnóti’s book, he quoted Otto Pächt: “in the beginning it was the eye, not the word”, but he added with satisfaction, that the two do not preclude one another. As time passed since their university days, Marosi’s contemporaries certainly recognized that his deepening theoretical understanding and his tremendous knowledge of art history did not overshadow or enervate the artworks in question. Whether speaking of old or new artistic phenomena, processes or works, Marosi did not present artistic achievements as mere illustrations of the thought process. In fact, his thinking and his approach were formed jointly by the eye and the word, but at least as importantly were developed to that degree by experience and perspective, the results of his knowledge extended into space and time. When asked what the greatest discovery of 2004 was for him, he gave a typical answer: “… the medieval wall paintings of the Calvinist Church of Lónya […] and an early composition with a nude by Károly Kernstok at the Modell exhibition, a young artist’s memory of the last harmonious moment ‘before the roads diverged’.” One has the impression that Marosi digresses with superior virtuosity. His fingers run along the entire keyboard of art history, extending across centuries (millennia). One understands that for Marosi art history is a stream of interrelated periods of equal standing, an endless continuity rippling over time.

Taking stock of Marosi’s interests over the years, especially the last decade, is not easy. Even a quick and cursory calculation produces a long list encompassing a broad range of subjects from the problems of classical modern painting to a variety of phenomena in contemporary art. But Marosi’s thinking and his mindset as a historian do not limit him to pictures alone. He is happy to explore the inner roads of sculpture, graphic art and textiles, and is equally attracted by the possibilities of photography or other mediums. While his writings ostensibly deal with a certain artist, exhibit or art form, very often the subject is a pretext for examining a larger art historical question. In his study on the photography of Dóra Maurer, for example, he seizes the opportunity to dissect the connections between photography and painting. In examining how Alajos Ströbl’s sculpture breaks away from the Renaissance and Baroque tradition, he reveals the disintegration of the value system of naturalism and academicism, resulting in a new type of sculpture. Using similar methods, he demonstrates the relative freedom of Hungarian graphic art and the present-day objectives of the art form.

Among the many and varied phenomena and works that have captivated Marosi’s attention or provoked his interest, some appear closer to his understanding and his artistic ideal than others. Such is the art of Karoly Halász, Tamás Vígh and György Jovánovics.

Marosi closely followed the work of Halász, and has written and spoken on the subject several times. When he opened a Károly Halász exhibition in 1982, he said, “for me […] his works shed light on a seemingly mysterious phenomenon frequently experienced in medieval art: the capacity to not only represent, but to evoke entire realities, to create a world, with tiny, seemingly fragmentary elements
of reality, either alone or placed side by side.”27 The Workshop of Pécs, which from its inception included Halász as a member and spiritual offspring, dissolved in 1980. The “learning years” came to an end, the “apprentices” grew up, and each of the five artists embarked on his own journey. Halász was interested in geometric forms, structures built from these forms, and the alternation, the vibrating tension, of flat and spatial elements frolicking on the canvas. The taciturnity of simple structures, the use of a few pure colours—especially black and red—lend magnitude to his small-scale compositions. The artist at the same time preserved his connection to the “manual” life around him, the natural objects and material of small town days and circumstances; his objects and performances have their roots in this world. Marosi was quicker than many of his colleagues in contemporary art to notice in Halász’s paintings, in his objects reminiscent of canned goods stored in a country pantry, and in his seemingly home assembled performances, how an independent, serious and well-considered reality is taking form. Perhaps this was on his mind when he wrote about Halász’s so-called trampled paintings, “a true joy, products of the real experience and enjoyment of movement and material”.28 The character of the artist’s entire activity is determined by the modesty of nameless
masters. The medievalist clearly took pleasure in discovering what might be common features in the works of a contemporary and an old master. He derived satisfaction from the lively continuity linking the art of the past and the present, a connection rendered not by form, mode of depiction, or style, but by the affiliation of artistic thought and attitude. As such, Halász’s work “should be taken just as seriously as the inscription on the Arnolfini portrait in London: Johannes de Eyck fuit hic”.29

“A radical founder”30 was how he labelled Tamás Vigh in an article. At that time he had already been following the sculptor’s career, was well acquainted with his works, and had used his professional reputation to assist him in his struggle to carry out a memorial to the historian Zoltán I. Tóth, fatally wounded during the 1956 revolt, commissioned by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. What Marosi found important in the works of Tamás Vigh, as in those of Károly Halász, was the quiet and profound artistic thought, the penetrating, inner radicalism of his compositions, and the courage of his consistent mode of expression, defiant of stylistic fashions. The fundamentals of Vigh’s work were naturally acquired under the tutelage of his master, Béni Ferenczy, and it was from his classical ideals that Vigh diverged with loving affection. The projecting mass of his small sculptures, the monumental forms of his works of folded sheet metal, and the ideas of his noiselessly “crackling” sculptures reveal the great distance Vigh travelled from the starting point of his youth. Moving unnoticed along his own path, he encountered similar endeavours in 20th-century European sculpture on several occasions. Marosi even mentions those sculptors whose worlds resemble Vigh’s: Henry Moore, Max Ernst, Jacques Duchamp-Villon, Ossip Zadkine. But in Marosi’s mind, more important than these kinships are Tamás Vigh’s “struggle for sculptural form”31 and “the traces that reveal the genesis of sculptural thought in the shapes of [Vigh’s] small sculptures”.32 Marosi also has great respect for the sculptural approach which starts with the material and shows attention to inner energy and the development of form, while he appreciates the aspect that may represent the common value of old and new masters.

As a speaker at exhibition openings, the author of articles, and an art historian engaged in scholarly

2. Károly Halász: Object from the Mini-Museum series, Owned by the artist
discussions, Marosi had numerous occasions to express his opinion on the art of György Jovánovics. He provided the clearest and most thorough picture of this unusual body of sculptural work in a book review.33

Although Jovánovics' sculptures at first glance appear gentle and reserved, their radicalism represents a great achievement in Hungarian sculpture. The artist was a member of the neo-avant-garde generation appearing at the end of the 1960s. Through his reinterpretation of material, space, and the classical art forms, he called into doubt the thousand-year-old tradition of sculpture. When he chose plaster as the exclusive material for his works (artists until then had used this as an intermediary material in making casts), the consequences led to the questioning of classical values. At the same time, Jovánovics' works are profoundly faithful to the essence of sculpture; their intellectual weight is provided by the values and possibilities of space, depth, internal proportions, surface, and light, while the seemingly fragile surfaces are interwoven with faint references, a delicate web of hidden quotations from other works. We feel as if we are observing an archaeological dig from above: our imagination glimpses far and deep into the past, into a world built according to the principles of geometry, optics, culture, and fantasy. We understand that Jovánovics is at home in the same art-cultural world occupied by old masters, from medieval stone carvers to Francis Bacon. For him, "the architecture
4. Opening of the exhibition *Old and New Avantgarde*
Szekesfehérvár, István Csók Gallery, 1987

5. Opening of the exhibition *Our 20th Century*
Szekesfehérvár, István Csók Gallery, 1999
of Abbot Suger or the builders of the great French cathedrals did exactly as Schwitters or Kandinsky did when they completed a task." It is not surprising that the activities of Jovanovics have personal meaning for Marosi. "In my eyes György Jovanovics [...] is an academic artist. [...] Our appreciation for this artist, who deals with the key questions of his craft, the problems of the artistic idea, and who disputes with writers, poets and philosophers as their equals, should not be based on the knowledge of Hungarian art teachers but rather on studies focusing on the humanist philosophy of 16th and 17th-century Italian academies." In the works of this artist Marosi discovered a rare, exceptional phenomenon, a totality which weaves spirit, scholarship, history, culture and art into one. Perhaps we can risk stating that Marosi presents a mirror image of himself when he calls Jovanovics "unfortunately (?) a too attentive, cultivated artist who navigates art history with a scholarly assurance, who is educated, in fact trained in the field". He is the kind of contemporary sculptor who engages in continual conversation with the past and the monuments of universal culture and is himself a part of, a continuer of this.

At the opening of the exhibit Our 20th Century in Székesfehérvár, Marosi posed the question "considered by many today to be the most exciting [...], which reminds us of a statement by Pliny: namely that art no longer exists, the end has come". At that time Arthur C. Danto’s study was published in Hungarian, provoking lively debates in art history circles and intellectual societies, its mere title attracting the attention of tabloids and colourful magazines for a brief moment. Marosi refuses to flaunt his opinion before the public. "Whoever is interested should try to decide." We can surmise his answer from his writings over the past decade and a half. The internationally famed medievalist—whether researching Gothic phenomena, reconsidering classical modern achievements or tracking the works of up-to-date young artists with benevolent irony—steps into the same river: the current of art history flowing into the distant past, the unknown future.
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40. See Marosi (n. 21 above).
I.

The two letters written by Pope Gregory the Great to Serenus, bishop of Marseille, are generally regarded as the texts which are most frequently and in the most varied discursive contexts referred to in the medieval West in connection with the use of images. Since Gerhart Ladner's study was published in 1931, scholars of art history and the history of theology have viewed these letters as classical witnesses to—and as foundations for the later development of—a uniquely Western conception of the image, defined in contrast to the Byzantine theology of images. The letters' medieval citations as well as the modern interpretations stress the didactic function of images, the most compact formulation of which is in the second letter:

Aliud est enim picturam adorare, aliud per picturae historiam quid sit adorandum ad-discere. Nam quod legentibus scriptura, hoc idiotis praestat pictura cernentibus, quia in ipsa ignorantibus uident quod sequi debeant, in ipsa legunt qui litteras nesciunt ...

For it is one thing to adore a picture, another through a picture's story to learn what must be adored. For what writing offers to those who read it, a picture offers to the ignorant who look at it, since in it the ignorant see what they ought to follow, in it they read who do not know letters ...

Such a statement can be considered to have been generally binding in the High Middle Ages, in case its decisive impact can be discerned in the most varied literary genres, and if at least the rudiments of the doctrine on images in Scholastic theology can be traced back to it. After all, can a theological tradition be deemed fundamental in this era, unless it was acknowledged in the main Scholastic summas? Presumably this is what guided Ladner when he included St Thomas Aquinas among the adherents of the Gregorian dictum. In order to do so, Ladner referred to the three reasons which the Doctor Angelicus—in accordance with St Bonaventure's earlier text—puts to justify the use of images in churches. The first among them indeed concurs with the argument of the Church Father.
Fuit autem triplex ratio institutionis imaginum in Ecclesia. Primo ad instructionem rudium, qui eis quasi quibusdam libris edocentur. Secundo ut incarnationis mysterium et sanctorum exempla magis in memoria essent, dum quotidian oculis repraesentantur. Tertio ad excitandum deuotionis affectum qui ex uisis efficacius incitatur quam ex auditis.

There was a triple reason for instituting images in the church. First, for the instruction of simple people, who are taught by them as if by some books. Second, so that the mystery of the incarnation and the examples of the saints remain more in our memory, as they are represented to the eyes daily. Third, to excite devotional feeling, which is stimulated more effectively by things seen than those heard.

In 2001, Creighton Gilbert devoted an entire study to the subject of the *triplex ratio*, in which he demonstrates that these three reasons are contained in the chapter on image worship from St John Damascene’s *De fide orthodoxa*, known in the West since the mid-12th century. Much quoted in Scholastic theology, the text, however, does not present the arguments in the same systematic fashion and the Latin authors mentioned by Gilbert do not refer to it in this very context. The possible role of the Damascene presented no obstacles to Gilbert’s placing the cited Scholastic texts within the continuity of Western image theory from St Gregory to the Council of Trent, and including contemporaneous works from other literary genres, in particular William Durand’s liturgical treatise. In subsequent publications, the view that the letters attributed to Gregory the Great were the sole source of the *triplex ratio* gained dominance. However, there are some problems, however, with this last assertion. It is well-known that the role of images as writing for the illiterate was not Gregory’s invention. He, too, relied on a large tradition in Greek theological literature, later passed on by the Damascene. He actually alluded to this when he wrote: “the ancients reasonably permitted that stories of holy persons be depicted in venerable places.” More importantly, the other two arguments are missing from the letters to Serenus. If we postulate that medieval authors also connected these arguments with Gregory, then we need to turn to the 8th-century interpolated version of the letter to the recluse Secundinus. Here we find all in one sentence the sought-after three motifs, and appearing as stages in the process of contemplating the picture.

Et dum nos ipsa pictura quasi scriptura ad memoriam filium Dei reducimus, animum nostrum aut de resurrectione laetificat aut de passione emulcat.

And thus, like scripture, the image returns the Son of God to our memory and equally delights the soul concerning the resurrection and softens it concerning the passion.

It seems to have been overlooked in previous scholarship that the early medieval interpolation in the Secundinus letter was in all likelihood inspired by St John
Damascene, most probably by the chapter on images in his encyclopaedic work.\(^{16}\) In the current context, more critical is the question of how well-known, if at all, this interpolation—much quoted in the Early Middle Ages—was in the 12th and 13th centuries. I don’t know of any direct proof that either the authors of the *Summa Halensis*, or maybe Bonaventure or Aquinas were aware of this text. In the 11th and first half of the 12th centuries, however, in quotations of the second letter to Serenus (while always the same passage is quoted), the addressee is consistently referred to as “Secundinus seruus Dei reclusus”, which suggests no direct knowledge of either letter.\(^{17}\) The addressee’s name was first corrected by Gratian, who evidently read the second epistle to the Gallic bishop, but nothing suggests that he got acquainted with or at least knew about the text interpolated into the Secundinus letter.\(^{18}\)

II.

In the following, I will comment on the text which provides—according to our present knowledge—the first detailed account on the adoration of images in high Scholastic theology. This text, Philip the Chancellor’s *Summa de bono* from ca. 1225–28 seems also to be the source for later commentaries on the Sentences in enumerating the *triplex ratio*.\(^{19}\) The passage in question responds to the basic anxiety that “the cult of such images is a revival of idolatry”.\(^{20}\)

Unde tres causas assignat Damascenus quare fiunt imagines, quarum una est, ut iam dixi, propter habendam quorumdam memoriam, secunda est propter imitationem, et hee due cause sunt communes omnibus, tertia propter rudium simplicitatem. Unde ita dicit Damascenus quia “Deus ‘propter uiscera misericordie sue’ secundum ueritatem factus est homo propter nostram salutem, non ut Abrahe uisus est in specie hominis, non ut prophetis, sed secundum substantiam factus est homo, passus est, crucifixus est, surrexit, assumptus est et omnia secundum ueritatem facta sunt et uisa sunt ab hominibus, scripta autem sunt ad memoriam et doctrinam nostram. Quia non omnes nos-cunt litteras neque lectioni uacant, patres excogitauerunt uelud quosdam triumphos in imaginibus hec scribere ad memoriam uelocem, propter hoc quod multotiens, non secundum mentem habentes Domini passionem imaginis Christi crucifixionem uidentes et salutaris passionis in rememorationem uenientes, adoramus non materiam sed imaginem. Similiter et Dei genitricis imaginis non materiam, sed figuram adoramus. Honor enim qui est ad ipsam ad eum qui ex ipsa incarnatus est reductur. Similiter et sanctorum certamina erigentia nos ad fortitudinem et imitationem et zelum uirtutis eorum et gloriam Dei.”\(^{21}\)

Hence the Damascene assigns three causes why people make images, first—as I said before—for having a memory, second for imitation, and these two causes are common for all, third for the simplicity of the rude. Hence the Damascene alike tells that “God ‘through the tender mercy of Him’ became in truth human for our salvation, not
as He was seen by Abraham in the semblance of a man, nor as He was seen by the prophets, but according to substance He became human, suffered, was crucified, resurrected, was assumed, and all these things veritably took place and were seen by men, they were likewise written down for the memory and teaching of us. Seeing that not everyone has a knowledge of letters nor time for reading, the Fathers contrived to write these in images like as some triumphs for the swiftness of memory. Therefore often, when we have not the Lord's passion in mind, but we see the crucifixion of Christ's image and His saving passion is brought back to remembrance, then we adore not the material but the image. In a like manner, in the case of the image of the mother of God we adore not the material but the figure. For the honour which we give to her is referred to Him Who was made of her incarnate. Similarly, also the struggles and the encouraging of holy men lead us to endurance and to the imitation and emulation of their valour and to the glory of God."

The passage above consists in large part of a quotation from St John Damascene, namely the same quotation whose affinity to the later formulations of the *triplex ratio* was highlighted by Gilbert. The *Summa de bono* shows that this relation is more than a simple affinity. The authoritative source of the three reasons for the use of images in churches was *De fide orthodoxa*, and not St Gregory or what was attributed to him, and not even some of the triadic arguments in favour of images appearing in earlier Latin literature. That Philip refers to the Damascene suggests it was not clear to him that similar arguments were to be found in the letters of Gregory. Considering the argumentative structure of the Scholastic *questio*, it is implausible that a 13th-century university theologian, while being aware of the opportunity, would not have relied on an earlier Father of higher ecclesiastical rank, and consequently of higher authority—and this is worth pondering in regard to later formulations of the *triplex ratio*, too.

At the same time, there are some conspicuous differences between John's text and Philip's introduction to it. This regular arrangement, which enables at all to distinguish the three reasons in favour of images, is entirely foreign to John. It is even more foreign to the original text than to Philip's quotation, which contains omissions. John does not list and organize arguments, but rather describes a process. The prerequisite of this is the incarnation as the foundation of our ability to visualize God, and it proceeds from perception through memory to an ascent to worship, and this worship passes on—pursuant to the dictum of St Basil the Great—to what is imaged. Behind Philip's reinterpretation we can see simply the attraction of the high medieval Latin writer to regular, if possible, tripartite structures. The matter is actually more complicated and if we want to understand it, we need to consider the entire chapter of the *Summa de bono* devoted to images.

If we compare this chapter to the corresponding passages in later encyclopaedic works of Scholastic theology, then most striking is the apparent disorder of its presentation. While in the latter writings the individual questions of image worship are covered in separate textual units, which carefully follow the order of the
arguments, the counterarguments, conclusions and *ad objecta*, Philip devotes only one chapter to an unbroken series of—seemingly—loosely related questions and to a bunch of responses. One may be right in regarding this as a sign of the relative immaturity of the literary form of the *questio*. But at the same time it facilitated Philip to develop closer philosophical and theological ties between the various subtopics. When, for example, he asks if the word *adoratio* is said univocally or equivocally of the adoration to God and to the cross, and answers with “neither”, saying that the word is said *per prius et posterius*, i.e. according to analogy, thereby he offers a linguistic-philosophical preparation to the metaphysical interpretation of iconicity—and not just the iconicity of man as created in the image of God. This gives after all a metaphysical meaning to Basil’s statement “the honour paid to the image passes on to the prototype”, which in the West was known only isolated from its context, as transmitted by the Damascene. Among others, the striving for theoretical penetration is what makes the chapter on images in the *Summa de bono* so attractive. Nevertheless, this effort manifests itself at times only in implications, and forces the author into some contradictions. The later elaborations on the question can be read as stages in the gradual resolution of these contradictions, which however entailed cutting back on Philip’s theoretical ambitions, and ripened a couple of generations later more consistent, but rather practical answers to the question of image worship.

This general characterization applies also to the formulation Philip provided of the *triplex ratio*. The brief introduction to the Damascene’s quote is built around three terms: *memoria*, *imitatio* and *simplicitas rudium*. The easily identifiable equivalents of these same terms appear in another part of the chapter, too, in which Philip answers the question “whether God—inasmuch as He is adored in the image—is to be adored in the vestige”.

Ad illud quod queritur utrum Deus adorandus sit in uestigio sicut in imagine respondendum est quod cum de homine dicitur quod factus est ad imaginem Dei non intellegitur secundum corpus, sed secundum animam que est spiritualis substantia et expressissima imago Dei quantum possibile est fieri in creaturis secundum memoriam, notitiam et amorem. Uestigium autem pertinet ad res corporales, et ideo in uestigio non adoratur Deus ...

To the question whether God is to be adored in His vestige, just as in His image, shall be answered that when the man is said to be created in the image of God, this is not apprehended according to the body, but according to the soul, which is a spiritual substance; and the most distinct image of God is to be recognized according to memory, knowledge and love, as far as possible. But the vestige pertains to the corporal things and therefore God is not to be adored in the vestige ...

The question and the answer both derive from St Augustine’s anthropological doctrine of the Trinity; this latter defines the *uestigium* as the counter-concept of
the *imago Trinitatis*. Here we need to recall only a few basic tenets of the doctrine.\textsuperscript{30} In *De Trinitate*, Augustine treats the apprehension of the relationship between the persons of the Trinity as the means to reach illumination about God. This can proceed from the triads discernible in the created world: with their help, the vestige of the Trinity can be detected in all creatures, and contemplation of these vestiges pave the way for the contemplation of the image of the Trinity.\textsuperscript{31} The latter is based on the trinities of *mens*—*notitia*—*amor* and *memoria*—*intelligentia*—*voluntas*. Augustine correlated man's being created in the image of God only to the human spirit; man in the corporal sense—the "external" man—bears only a trace of the Trinity. Thus, when Philip bases his definition of the image of God on the difference between spiritual and corporal things, he is not contradicting Augustine, but slightly simplifies the hierarchy of the trinities established by him. For, according to Augustine, in the case of those ternions that the human soul can contemplate in itself, the system of relationships among the individual parts is what more faithfully and directly corresponds to the structure of the Trinity and thus images it.

The set of three terms which refers to this understanding of the image of God in Philip's text (*memoria*—*notitia*—*amor*) cannot be found in this form in Augustine's writing, and this is no accident. *Notitia* and *amor*, which form a triad with *mens* in the ninth book of *De Trinitate*, are mentioned explicitly as *notitia sui* and *amor sui*—as acts of self-reflection of the human soul. In contrast, *memoria*, *intelligentia*, and *voluntas*—which Augustine begins to refer to in the tenth book, in the next step in his reasoning—relate to the image of God in man in a more fundamental way, as the capacities of the soul.\textsuperscript{32} In the passages of *Summa de bono* where attention is expressly paid to this, Philip also closely follows Augustinian terminology.\textsuperscript{33} There must be a special, certainly contextual, reason for his not doing so in this chapter—presumably that in this way the ternion was congruent with the three supposedly Damascenian reasons for images in churches.

The appearance of *memoria* twice requires no comment. It is also easy to see how the *notitia* and not the *intelligentia* of the text and the image is what makes one inaccessible and the other accessible for *rudes*. *Imitatio* and *amor* demand a slightly more complex interpretation. At first reading, it is not clear to which statements by John the term *imitatio* in Philip's text refers. The word itself appears, but at a marginal point, in connection with the imitation of the saints' "valour". It is more likely that Philip summarized with this word the entire sequence which in the quotation closes with the exemplar of the saints: the adoration of Christ, whether it proceeds from his own depiction, from images of Mary, or from representations of the deeds of saints, belongs to the sphere of *imitatio*. If, however, the observer's ambition is none other than to pursue God along various routes, then in an obvious way this can be anchored in the Augustinian system much more readily with the term *amor* than with *voluntas*.

When Philip distinguished the three reasons for the ecclesiastical use of images in the quotation from St John, he interpreted it in the scope of Augustine's
theology of the Trinity. In doing so, he correlates the two traditions, upon which is built the ninth distinctio dealing with the adoration of Christ's humanity in the third book of Peter Lombard's Sentences. This distinctio became the starting point for the Scholastic discussion of the image question—in terms of content already for Philip, but for later authors from the literary point of view as well. In connection with pictures, Philip was the first who had to confront the divergence of the two traditions, the difficulty of reconciling them—and this primarily constitutes the theological achievement of the triplex ratio. For the Damascene the ascent toward the adoration of God is the point, and the imago, which is used as an aid to this, is understood primarily as image made by human hands. In contrast, for Augustine what is at stake is the ascent towards a conception of God, and the imago in an ontological sense, as a created image, may be the tool. As we have seen above, the chasm between the two concepts of image is not unbridgeable in Philip's view, and we have also seen that as a result of this reconciliation the Basleian dictum received a theoretical expounding which could be regarded by Scholastic thinkers as rational. From the combination of Greek and Augustinian traditions in the triplex ratio, the author does not unfold an explicit theory. Nevertheless, this mixing gains meaning only as the starting point of an implicit theorem that is explained by the intention of the Basleian dictum to rationalize. In this way, the question of the adoratio of the image—the principal topic of this chapter in Summa de bono—poses not just the textual context for the triplex ratio, but the theoretical framework, too. This framework, however, is foreign to the letters of St Gregory to Serenus, the most striking motif of which is the rejection of the adoratio of images—and, according to general interpretation, this is the very aspect in which the letters would have determined the specifically Western attitude of moderation between image worship and iconoclasm for a long time.

III.

Before drawing final conclusions, we should make a cross check with Durand, whom the literature frequently turns to—as we have seen—as the other end of the spectrum of literary forms, in order to demonstrate the general medieval validity of the Gregorian legacy. Regarding the foundations for the ecclesiastical use of images, Durand relies primarily on the letters to Serenus. His doing so fits well with the traditions of the genre of liturgical exegesis. The prominent role of St Gregory the Great in this literary tradition is quite natural, since in the High Middle Ages his person was intertwined—although largely ungrounded—above all with a long series of liturgical regulations. As with other authors, there is no proof that Durand had immediate knowledge of the letters to Serenus. What he quotes or uses from them would have been available to him in Gratian's transmission. Despite this, his work reveals an intense examination of Gregory's statements not seen in earlier liturgical treatises.

The Rationale divinorum officiorum was the first significant representative of its genre since the succeeding generations of Scholastic theologians worked out a
specifically theoretical system of arguments to justify images and their worship. The influence of Scholastic theology left its mark on the content of Durand's text just as it did on the structure and mode of argument. This influence explains above all how the question of adoratio became central to the discussion on the legitimacy of the image, and also how this question in part—in a cross-referenced chapter of the *Rationale*—was articulated in the dichotomy of latria and dulia. The answer, on the other hand, does not refer to this concepts. According to Durand any type of adoratio shown to images is idolatry; the correct use can be described with the words veneration and honor. Understandably, for him, who approached the images from a pragmatic perspective, the distinctions within the concept of adoratio might have appeared uselessly academic and he likewise refrained from distinguishing between the adoration of the depiction of God and the adoration of God in His depiction, or—in the spirit of St Basil's dictum—from considering the worship of an image as a path to the worship of God. Instead, not only did he consistently adhere to the arguments of didacticism and memory quoted from the letters to Serenus, but when he expanded on this by mentioning the depictability of the "evils to avoid," he implicitly distanced himself from the view that images, with their rememorative function, can be a stimulus for some kind of ascension. In Durand's text, the influence of Scholastic theology thus appears primarily as a challenge that prompted him to express the motifs, which were traditionally highlighted in liturgical exegesis to justify the images, with new, complex terminology and rich arguments. As a means to this end, he reads and uses the Serenus letters in a more nuanced way and as an authority against the Scholastic discourse on images—also enabled by the fact that the latter discourse have not incorporated the Gregorian tradition.

The confrontation of Philip the Chancellor and Durand reveals that in high medieval scholarship, the specific logic inherent in the traditions of the various literary genres led to the preservation not only of different methods of argument, but also of partly different sets of relevant authorities, and—not unrelatedly—in some cases fundamentally opposing positions, too. What art historians often call the Scholastic theology of the image was born from the intention to reconcile the Augustinian theology of the *imago* with the newly discovered Greek authors so exciting to early Scholastics: St John Damascene, and the Eastern Fathers quoted by him. This intention immediately lost its significance outside the framework of speculative theology, and likewise its results also became problematic. The theological summas and the commentaries on the Sentences are of just as little use as sources of a specific Western medieval conception of the image as the 11th–13th-century quotations from St Gregory's letters—for such a unified conception did not exist.
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images, two correspond to what appears in Philip's text, but the third is completely different, fitting with a tradition based on Ps. 25.8: "Ob tres autem causas fit pictura: primo, quia est laicorum litteratura; secundo, ut domus tali decore ornetur; tertio, ut priorum uita in memoriam reuocetur"; Gemma animae, c. 132 PL, vol. 172., col. 586C. The passage in fact has a complex early medieval prehistory, the detailed study of which—to my best knowledge—has yet to be done. As an example, see the Libellus synodalii compiled for the 825 Synod of Paris: Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Concilia, ed. A. Werminghoff, vol. 2:2., Hanover—Leipzig 1908, 526, lines 6–12. The affects roused by the image—which might seem to be the most significant innovation of Philip's compared to Honorius—also appears among the arguments during the Carolingian period; see Walafrid Strabo, Liber de exordiis, c. 8; Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Capitularia regum Francorum, ed. A. Boretius–V. Krause, vol. 2., 484, lines 5–8. Thus, it cannot be excluded that this tradition influenced the Chancellor in some way. But even if this is the case, it is not related to the question of the relationship to St Gregory the Great, the authoritative support for the triplex ratio, or its systematic place in Scholastic theology.


24 Summa de bono (n. 20 above), 972, lines 6–7.


26 The interpretation above relies primarily on Summa de bono (n. 20 above), 974 f., lines 65–95. Philip quotes Basil first in a question quite at the beginning of the chapter (ibid., 972, lines 14 f.) and a bit later (974, line 69) in the answer to it. The question, which originates basically with St John Damascene, asks on the one hand whether the dictum of Basil can be used for people as images of God, i.e. should they be adored, and on the other hand how the adoration of the tabernacle can be justified, if it is not the image of God, but the image of creatures. Philip first—quoting the Damascene—answers 'yes' to the first part of the question (65–70), but he makes a distinction not found in St John's text (see n. 39 below), which had considerable influence on later theology: a human can be adored with latria if God is adored in him as in an image, if however the human is adored because of his dignity as the image of God, then only the adoration of dulia applies (71–77). This can be used also for such creatures like the tabernacle (82–95). Here, Philip makes another differentiation, which again plays an important role in the works of later writers: between images apprehended as “in being” (in essendo), and “in signification and understanding” (in significando et cognoscendo). Here, too, the latter term has a simpler form (in significando), and later is simplified even further (ut signum). The definition has been embellished here for reasons of content. Philip gives the use of images as signs an ontological dimension by dividing the cognition of each thing into three levels, structured hierarchically according to their ontological aspect: "Est enim mundum tripliciter accipere, ut est in materia, scilicet mundum istum sensibilem, uel ut est in cognitione nostrae siue angelorum, uel ut est in cognitione Dei, et sic est mundus archetypus." Thus when we use the tabernacle as God's image ut signum, then we ascend actually to the archetype of the tabernacle in the cognition of God. The choice of the tabernacle as an example expands the argument in more than one respect, since in this case the divine institution guarantees the existence of the archetype and the legitimacy of the worship as well. Philip's argument is still not restricted to this example, since it is "the world" what is to be accepted in three ways. In the end, irrational creatures can be imbued with similar dignity by their being an image ut signum, like the human by their ontological iconicity; and this "semiotic" iconicity makes their adoration with latria as well as with dulia possible. More relevant in the present context, the veneration of the image...
as sign is also related to the analogy of being, which is why we say adoration of God and adoration of the cross *per prius et posterius* and why the statement “the honour paid to the image passes on to the prototype” can be generalized. The consonance of Basil’s prototype and Philip’s archetype is scarcely a coincidence.

27 The subquestion of the adoration of man discussed in the previous note offers a suitable example of this. Philip poses the question in a rather provocative way: “queritur, cum expressissima sit imago Dei homo, quod potius adorandus sit quam ceteje imagines”; *Summa de bono* (n. 20 above), 972, lines 12 f. The potential implicit in the objection was repeatedly exploited by iconophobic authors and movements at the end of the Middle Ages, when they appealed to the image of God in man while rejecting the worship of paintings and sculptures; see N. Schnitzler, *Ikonoklasmus – Bildersturm: Theologischer Bilderstreit und ikonoklastisches Handeln während des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts*, Munich 1996, 42, 45. This makes comprehensible in retrospect that Scholastic theologians after Philip cautiously dealt with the question, and gave more definite and at the same time more simple answers. The *Summa Halensis* continues Philip’s differentiation between the two concepts of image, but he strips the image as sign of its connection with the analogy of being, and thereby contrasts the adoration of the two kinds of images with each other instead of drawing a parallel between them: the adoration of an “image by participation” does not reach God directly or completely, and can thus only be *dulia*, as opposed to the case “ubi ergo est imago ut signum, totus honor refertur ad prototypon, id est exemplar”—here the image can be adored with *latría*; *Summa Halensis*, 4,303; see *Doctoris irrefragabilis Alexandri de Hales ordinis minorum Summa theologica seu sic ab origine dicta „Summa fratris Alexandri,”* ed. Collegium S. Bonaventurae, Quaracchi, vol. 4:1., 457 f. The *Summa Halensis* supports its statements about the ontological image with an expounding which is, however, still rather complicated, although in a different way. A human therefore can only be “material of *latría*” (4,298; ibid, 455), and that as an object of *dulia*, since the *Summa Halensis* traces the *dulia*—at the cost of a sharp reinterpretation of the traditional concept—back to participation from the divine dignities (4,288; ibid, 441–442). In this way, the analogical relationship observed by Philip between the adoration of God and that of his image here becomes transformed to an analogical relationship between the types of adoration. St Bonaventure’s argument rests on similar foundations but is much simpler and thus more effective: “cum talis homo sit creatura nobilis, offert se magis per modum rei quam per modum signi; et ideo honor, qui ei defertur, non omnino refertur ad primum exemplar, sicut honor, qui defertur imagini pictae uel sculptae”; *Commentary on the Sentences*, 3,9,1,2; *S. Bonaventurae opera omnia* (n. 6 above), vol. 3., p. 204.

28 “cum Deus adoretur in imagine, utrum adorandus sit in uestigio”; *Summa de bono* (n. 20 above), p. 973, line 29.


31 Ibid, 194 f.


33 *Summa de bono* (n. 20 above), 72–75, 103–05, 239–43.

34 *Magistri Petri Lombardi Parisiensis episcopi Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, vol. 2., Grottaferrata 1981, 68–71. The influence of Peter Lombard on Philip can best be apprehended by his selecting the discussion of *latría* and *dulia* as a framework for questions about image worship. See also n. 39 below.

36 See Johannes Beleth, *Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis*, c. 85; *PL*, vol. 202., col. 89B–C.


38 *Rationale diuinorum officiorum*, 4,39,2; *Guillelmi Duranti Rationale* (n. 35 above), 432, and 36, lines 59 f.; “De hoc etiam dicetur in quarta parte sub quarta particula canonis super uerbo ‘seruitutis’.”

39 See among others: “Sed nos illas non adoramus, nec deos appellamus, nec spem salutis in eis ponimus quia hoc esset idolatrare, sed ad memoriam et recordationem rerum olim gestarum eas ueneramur”; *Guillelmi Duranti Rationale* (n. 35 above), 35, lines 14–17. The literature frequently contains the mistake that the conceptual pair of *latrina* and *dulia* corresponded to the concepts of *adoratio* and *in honorem*—e.g. Kollwitz (n. 9 above), 111. In fact, both *latrina* and *dulia* are just a type of *adoratio*. The other mistake, in which the dichotomy is traced back to Greek theology of images, St John Damascene or the *horos* of the Second Council of Nicaea, is not at all unrelated—e.g. Schmitt (n. 5 above), 90; Camille (n. 9 above), 380, n. 25. Although the words themselves are clearly of Greek origin, this juxtaposition (and the concept of *douléia*) is unknown in the texts mentioned. Here, Scholastic theologians relied on an entirely different source, on St Augustine, and what they expressed with this pair of concepts is alien to the Greek texts they would have had access to; see A. Landgraf, “Der Kult der menschlichen Natur Christi nach der Lehre der Frühscholastik,” *Scholastik* 12, 1937, 361–77, 498–518; J. Pascher, “‘Servitus religiosa’ seit Augustinus,” in *Festschrift Eduard Eichmann zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. M. Grabmann–K. Hofmann, Paderborn 1940, 335–52. While *latrina* and *dulia* are mutually exclusive concepts, in the chapter on images in the Damascene’s *De fide orthodoxa* (unlike the *Logoi*, which was unknown in the medieval West), words belonging to the conceptual sphere of veneration, *προσκύνησις* and *τιμή* (which Burgundio translated as *adoratio* and *honor*) are used as synonyms, in the decrees of the Council, however, *λατρεία* is a subset of *τιμητική προσκύνησις* (translated by Anastasius Bibliothecarius as *honatoria adoratio*); see “Concilium Nicaenum II – 787,” ed. E. Lamberz–J. B. Uphus, in *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque: Editio critica*, ed. G. Alberigo, vol. 1., Turnhout 2006, 295–345, at 315.

40 “Moderate uero uti picturis ad representandum mala uitanda et bona imitanda reprehensible non est. Unde Dominus ad Ezechielcm: ’Ingridere et uiide abominationes pessimas quas isti faciunt. Et ingressus uidit omnem similitudinem reptilium et animalium abominationem et uniueria idola domus Israel depicta in pariete’,” in *Guillelmi Duranti Rationale* (n. 35 above), 36, lines 47–52.
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AN EARLY GOTHIC RIB VAULT IN HUNGARY AND THE QUESTION OF THE CERCE

One name is without question inseparable from the art historical concept of the Early Gothic and its appearance in Hungary around 1200: Emő Marosi. He was responsible for drawing attention to the role played by the Cistercian Abbey of Pilis, near to Esztergom, in this process over three or four decades. In 1978 the first comprehensive exhibition on Árpád-period architecture was organized. In the accompanying catalogue, Marosi emphasized the "structural purity", the "tendency toward puritan techniques", the "certain degree of acerbity in architectural ornamentation, favoured within cultivated circles", the "elegance", and the "modernity" of the change in style and the new artistic approach dating to the 1190s. Since then his students—including the author of this essay—have spent a significant amount of time adding their short or comprehensive comments to these observations. In the end, this essay, too, aims to do little more than briefly underline some of these same features that characterize the former system of vaulting of the Abbey Church in Pilis: modernity, or rather an innovative character, a tendency towards puritan techniques, and an elegant acerbity satisfying to sophisticated tastes. As Paul Crossley, adapting the thoughts of Michael Baxandall, expressed it: "We do not explain architecture, we explain remarks about architecture."

The almost 60-meter-long church uncovered in Pilis had three aisles, a transept and stepped up sanctuaries (fig. 1a). It was a perfect example of the basic architectural type found in Cistercian churches, an illustration of the so-called "St Bernard" type of ground plan based on the Fontenay example, the building of which began in 1139. In this case, the form was certainly transmitted by the mother abbey, Acey. In the 1180s, just as the Pilis abbey was established in Hungary, the building of a church in Acey with an identical ground plan to that later built in Pilis gained new momentum—after monks exiled by Frederick Barabossa were finally able to return in 1175. Pontigny and Chaalis are good examples of how filiations viewed the mother abbey as their model and attempted to copy the abbey church. The dominance of this type, however, did not mean a consistent conformity to either style or quality, and in the process of type affiliation these two often diverge. This is true in the case of Acey and its filiation of Pilis, too—in the
articulation and decoration of the building, Acey adheres to the Order’s ascetic approach to art, while the filiation of Pilis deviates from this considerably.

The Pilis church was first mentioned in 1213, when it was chosen as the burial place of the assassinated queen consort Gertrude. Since the grave of the queen was discovered in the western quarter of the crossing, from the perspective of architectural history, this part of the church was certainly “already suitable for burial” at that time. In other words, this part of the church was not only considered finished in the architectural sense, but had been consecrated, too. The remains of the building and the scant data from the sources, however, suggest that in 1213 other parts of the church were not entirely ready. Conclusions about the construction history may be drawn from the location of the burial site. Noticeably, the grave was not placed in the sanctuary, near the altar, or directly in front of the sanctuary, where the crossing and the monastic choir meet. After all, performing the memorial liturgy would have been problematic had a dividing wall between the finished section of the building and the construction area been located there, at the foot of the grave. When choosing the site for the grave, the space and the spiritual milieu of the monastic choir, which opened on the crossing, the latter occupying the first section of the nave, was taken into consideration, as it was when deciding the location of the grave of the founders of Ebrach in Germany.

The exact date of the abbey’s completion and consecration is unknown, although it was certainly before 1236, because Pope Gregory IX in this year confirmed the donation made by King Andrew II, to honour the dedication of Pilis. This event might have taken place ten years earlier, however. In 1225 the Hungarian king gave 20 Marks worth of silver to Acey for unknown reasons, although the act could be interpreted as a compensatory gesture in response to the consecration gift received by Pilis. To grasp
the magnitude of the section vaulted and in use in 1213, to understand what portion was under construction, and to ascertain the pace of the work, a look at the “glossary” of forms is necessary. At best, this will lead us to the true goal of art history: as Willibald Sauerländer put it, “to architectural content, which is in systematic and codified contact with the formal vocabulary”.

Excavations clearly showed that the foundation wall of the sanctuary, the northern transept wall and the wall enclosing the northern aisle were continuous. The perpendicular sections joining the foundation of the piers and that of the side walls, on the other hand, did not connect seamlessly to the latter. In other words, the piers were built later than the side walls. This relationship is most obvious at the north-western pier of the crossing, the most intact of the piers. Thus construction must have progressed from the sanctuary to the wall enclosing the northern aisle. The next reference point lies at the base of the north-western pier of the crossing, revealing an unusual change in profile and structure. Here, two different profiles appear in the base-moulding that runs around the top of the first stone layer above the floor level. On the side facing the sanctuary, the profile is composed of segments of grooved and bead mouldings, while on the western side, only a simple bevelled edge appears (fig. 1b). Archaeological documentation suggests, similar changes in the other pier of the crossing were at one time discernible. In the base of the remaining piers to the west a chamfer edged base-moulding was used.
The profile of the base moulding was not all that was changed at this location in the building. The pier's structure and the form of its ground plan were also redesigned—in fact, while the process of carving the stones of the base was underway. On the east side of the pier, in the corner of the cross-shaped base, a three-quarter column, serving as the springing for the ribs of the large vaulting of the crossing, exactly fills the place between the stems of the cross. This same configuration appears at the pier of the triumphal arch in the sanctuary. In contrast to this, the new form is less articulated, rather approaching a columnar shape, its body expanded with a lesene on the side of the nave. In the survey drawing of the crossing's piers, the width of the central vessel was also clearly widened at this point: the base of the embedded column on the west side of the pier is placed somewhat farther out than the similar base on the eastern side, which points to a more thorough revision of the plans for the building. One of the essential elements in the changes of the plan is the modification of the vaulting's support system. While the transverse ribs would have rested on perpendicularly placed supports according to the earlier plan, the new forms of the base—and certainly the capitals were changed to diagonally aligned elements. Therefore the entire structural unit was subjected to the diagonality dictated by the ribs of the vaulting. The expression "diagonality", memorably coined by Paul Frankl to describe the central principle of Gothic architecture, here is used not in reference to the optical perception of space, but rather to the diagonality that appears in the structure: the effort made with the individual architectural members to create a structural harmony in keeping with Frankl's idea of optical continuity, the "diagonal aesthetics" of the ribs. The process of achieving structural diagonality is especially interesting in a building such as the Pilis abbey church, where the need for it was realized while work was in process.

Why new bases for the piers in the crossing were not made following the adjustments to the earlier plan can be answered by the new architectural approach typical of the Early Gothic. According to Ernő Marosi the new method was "also technically simpler than its predecessor: work done from a drawing was increasingly more prevalent, 'prefabricated' building elements [...] that not only required fine workmanship, but promoted standardization". In other words, products of disciplined "prefabrication", a result of precise measuring, could be used in the construction of a building section continued according to a modified approach. But there may have been practical reasons for the decision, too. Obviously, time and money could be saved if the more complicated, but defunct base segments and the accompanying shafts were incorporated—if possible—according to their function. The bundled columns called for in the earlier plan were no longer of use, they were sacrificed and inserted into the stonework of the piers in the crossing just the same, as the ruins show.

The height of the completed vaulting and thus the inner proportions of the church space are unknown, but the appearance of the nave was almost certainly
defined by a sense of airiness. Above the 8.4-meter-wide nave arose the sequence of large, almost square, four-partite groin vaults with ribs, which sprung from alternating pairs of piers. The wide, cavernous sections of the vaulting produced an air of roominess similar to the effect felt in the earlier constructed nave of Eberbach or the later nave of Loccum, both in Germany.20

In addition to the rhythm created by the spaciousness and the alternation of arcade piers of different sizes and structures, the high corbels of the embedded columns supporting the transverse arches contributed to the aesthetic value of the space. The corbels were placed somewhere in the zone of the carefully crafted, Early Gothic leafy capitals of the arcade piers and performed the same decorative function. The only cubical corbel known so far, which was found next to the crossing's north-western pier, is decorated with budding leaves and bundles of leaves erupting from the surface, enclosed in a recessed field with profiled frame (fig. 2a-b).21 This carving has become, with good reason, one of the important reference points for the style and quality of Early Gothic ornaments in Hungary.22 An examination of other finds from this site only heightens our appreciation for the carving's sophistication (fig. 2c).23 Its ornamentation corresponds to the method of composition used in the leaf decoration on the base of the western pair of piers in the monastic choir.

The introduction of this spectacular ornamentation appears connected to the change in style experienced in the north-western pier of the crossing. Not only does it bear witness to constructional modifications, but also reflects the new approach to the decoration of the building. In the base segments facing east, delicately bending, thin spurs appear, which do not recur elsewhere. The new decorative solution that replaces them is a leafy corbel protruding from a recessed field in the bottom layer of the base. On the first pier to the west of the monastic choir, however, this framed leaf ornament in the fashion of a corbel relinquishes its place to the less sculptural, more angular leaf form. The mirror-like framing of the leaves also disappears—probably because the stone-carvers who employed the earlier, more complicated scheme were transferred to work on the Cathedral of Kalocsa. There, this distinctive leaf ornament enclosed in a field—and certainly connected to the first phase of the construction in Kalocsa—appears in the base of the piers, and offers clear evidence of a connection between the workshops involved in constructing the two buildings.

The simplification of the decoration, made possible by the introduction of diagonal supports, is the second detectable change in the construction history of the Pilis church. The presence of a framed leaf composition, missing from the western part of the nave, may be the indicator that helps us grasp the extent of the building to which the date 1213 applies as terminus ante quem. The style changes in the decoration suggest the transept and the first, eastern segment of the nave belonged to the same building campaign. These parts of the church along with the section of the sanctuary completed earlier naturally stood ready prior to the burial of the queen consort.
2. Nave corbel of the Abbey Church of Pilis at the time of the excavations (1976) in front of the north-western crossing pier (a), its present day condition (b) and the reconstruction of the fragments (c)

Not only is the completion of the wall enclosing the north side aisle most likely belonged to this phase of construction, but also—as a recent and important discovery suggests—the building of the western façade wall to a certain height: the characteristic leaf decoration observed on the piers in the choir and the corbel of the pier in the crossing (but absent from the western section of the nave) appears in the most varied combination of alternating bush-like plants and small trees, an
entire garden’s worth, on the base of the western portal, which was only recently identified.\textsuperscript{24} The masters of the portal were obviously the same as those who carved the corbel of the pier in the crossing, a long distance away, while half of the nave stood empty and uncovered.

As work progressed, the decoration of the building was simplified in the direction of “acerbic elegance” as can be traced not only in the remains of the base, but in the fashioning of the corbels in the nave. Recently another piece from the series of corbels has come to light, incorporated into the archiepiscopal cellar in Esztergom in 1826, where it still remains, after stones from Pilis were dragged away as building material (fig. 3).\textsuperscript{25} The stone carver’s decorative intentions for the surface of the carving are revealed solely by the lobed moulding which corresponds to the contours of the row of leaves on the upper part. Aside from the ends of the leaves, indicated with emphasized contours, and the triangular cuts well-known from stone carvings in Esztergom from ca. 1200, the surface is completely smooth, which follows a concept of minimalization, one that better fits with the notion of monastic simplicity, and emphasizes the structural role of the architectural element. This approach became even more entrenched in Pilis’s second filiation, in the church of Bélapátfalva (Tres Fontes, north-eastern Hungary) established in 1232, where the transverse arches are supported by austere corbels constructed from pure geometric shapes on piers and walls. This feature illustrates the connection between the establishment of Cistercian filiations and the spread of architectural types.\textsuperscript{26}

The appearance of diagonal supports and leafy corbels can also be linked to the change in the vaulting form. Two kinds of vault profiles are known from the main vaulting. One, consisting of three tightly bound ribs slightly peaked at the centre, was common before the middle of the 12th century in the area of Ile-de-France, while a descendent of the type appeared in Burgundy in the second half of the century.\textsuperscript{27} Presumably this profile was used in the choir in Pilis, as an example surfaced in its vicinity (although archaeological investigations of 1913 had already revealed scattered examples of it).\textsuperscript{28} The other profile has a triple structure, but the
details differ significantly. The proportions are more pronounced, with the considerably narrower side ribs placed farther from the strongly accentuated, large, pointed central member. Examples of this were found dispersed from the crossing all the way to the western end of the church, proving no further changes of any importance in the vaulting form. (In the vaulting of the side aisles, only the central rib with the pointed arch cross-section was borrowed from the nave.) The terminating boss of the vault of the crossing, a fragment of which was found in the centre of the bay with the later rib profile, serves as a reliable reference point for assessing the moment at which the change in the rib profile took place. The introduction of the second type profile probably occurred after this sanctuary section was finished and, at the latest, before work on the vaulting of the crossing began. In the first half of the 13th century this rib profile reappears in Hungarian buildings, attesting to its popularity.

It is much more difficult to determine the exact date at which the plans were made and construction began. Any supposition is based on speculation. Not only the choir, but the first bay of the nave and at least the northern aisle wall extending all the way to the western façade may have been built by 1213. If this is true, then well over fifty percent of the task had been completed at this point. Therefore, work on the church must have begun at the latest in the 1190s, and even more likely, the starting point, the preparation of the plan, can perhaps be traced to around 1190. This dating means the Abbey Church of Pilis was one of the first, if not the first such large-scale space to be covered with ribbed vault in the Kingdom of Hungary—a method considered the height of modernity in that period. The spacious vaulting of the nave must have caused a sensation even though ribbed vaulting was known in the region since the early 12th century and had been used most recently in rooms of the residential tower in the Esztergom palace, built by Béla III.

Twenty years ago, as part of the preparation for an exhibition, a thorough examination of the thin, red marble disc fragments decorated with foliage was carried out. The discs, discovered during excavation of the abbey, had a finely polished surface with a delineation of thick leafy vines in low relief. The free area between the plant forms were slightly more deeply carved, and the veins of the leaves were depicted with fine, engraved lines (fig. 4a). The technique used in these extraordinarily high quality, engraved disks is comparable to that used in the incrusted marble works of the Esztergom cathedral, including the plates of the marble throne decorated with plants and human figures. The fastening points recognizable along the edge of the disk fragments led to the realization that these were certainly not built-in wall decorations, but hanging elements attached to something on their smooth back side. Based on their diameter (58 cm) and traces revealing the method by which they were fastened, the structural elements to which these discs were appended were identified as the circular keystones of the nave (fig. 4b). The same polychrome effect appeared in the vaulting decorated with red marble disks as in the clustered piers assembled from stone materials of
different colour, although naturally with different architectural content. Was this a simple technical curiosity or an experiment contributing to the aesthetics of Early Gothic architecture? The answer is both. The unusual method of decoration on the vaulting and the delicate lines engraved in the stone reveal the brilliance of the stone carvers. Moreover, they attest to the superb sense the masters of the construction had for displaying the central points and the elegance of the built structure, assuming the points of intersection of the diagonal ribs, their static crowns, their painterly, decorative emphasis, and also the spatial divisions created by the ribs were meant to be interpreted, to a certain extent, as a series of units. According to Paul Frankl’s suggestive interpretation, the primary criterion of the Gothic style was the use of ribbed vaults, which was fundamentally an aesthetic, rather than a technical, development: “The original purpose of the rib was, therefore, not a financial one; nor was it to improve the statics of the vault, nor had it a specifically technical purpose, since it did not make the actual erection appreciably easier. The purpose was aesthetic [...] The architect must overcome all the technical and financial problems in order to achieve a satisfactory aesthetic result.” Frankl also adds, however, that static and aesthetic factors are not mutually exclusive. Viollet-le-Duc knew of only a much later example of appliqué...
decoration on the keystone in the lower area of the Sainte Chapelle, Paris, where this technical solution, however, has no aesthetic significance whatsoever.38

The vaulting fragments from Pilis allow for another interesting observation about medieval architectural practices. In his discussion of the construction of ribbed vaulting in the nave of Gothic churches, again Paul Frankl raises the issue of the mechanical tool dubbed a cerce by Viollet-le-Duc (in the entry Construction in volume IV of his Dictionnaire).39 The cerce is a curved plate composed of two sliding boards held together horizontally and was used to support each row under construction in a cell (fig. 5). Relying on Viollet-le-Duc’s convincing presentation, Frankl argued the cerce, which rested on the transverse and diagonal ribs with the help of a metal flange, remained under a course until the mortar hardened and the stones were joined. The moveable structure was then contracted and removed from under the row of stone. Because it could be expanded horizontally, it could be stretched into an increasingly wide span, allowing for more rows of stones to be added to each course of the concave web, and thus the expense of erecting an entire cradle could be spared. Viollet-le-Duc estimated that with this ingenious tool the number of workers needed to construct one web of vaulting could be reduced to two: a stonemason and his assistant. Furthermore he determined that in addition to the hand tools of the stone mason only a small axe would be needed.40

Around 1960, John Fitchen addressed the question in his book on the construction techniques of Gothic cathedrals, devoting an extensive,
critical passage in the chapter *Gothic formwork* to Viollet-le-Duc’s theory. Based on static calculations, he considered it doubtful that the tool illustrated in figure 58 of the *Dictionnaire* could have offered the necessary support near the crown of a course spanning 20 feet, and refers to the sceptical comments made by August Choisy, too, at the end of the 19th century. Viollet-le-Duc, however, made no similar engineering calculations. The drawing he published has no indication of scale and serves as nothing more than an illustration of a method, since, as we know, the ability to bear a load depends not only on the material and the structure, but on size, too. Fitchen furthermore makes ironic comments on arguments for the *cerce* based on its economy, in particular Arthur Kinglsey Porter’s notion that the primary motive for developing Gothic vaulting was the desire to find the cheapest possible method. Fitchen asks whether it is possible that the *cerce* was simply a useful aid in sawing the correct shape for support planks used in building the central arch of the vault web. He includes attractive drawings to illustrate his idea.

In Pilis, the ribs get higher as they approach the keystone, which suggests that the static notion of increasing load on the crown was present in the mind of the master builder. Apparently the publishers of the archaeological findings did not attribute much significance to this phenomenon, although—strangely enough—it was documented. Similarly, angular gaps cut at differing angles along the upper edge at the root in a significant portion of the ribs (fig. 6) were ignored. These holes, however, clearly bear witness to the technology used in building the vaulting. The consequences of this method of construction, which could only have been used for ribbed vaulting, were that completed arches were used to support the central arches when the vault web was built. The holes in the ribs in Pilis clearly served some purpose when the web was constructed. That they appear only in larger ribs can be explained by the near perpendicular positioning close to the vault springing, which rendered any kind of support unnecessary when building the vaulting at this stage; only at a certain height and curve did the need for a kind of support system arise. Other medieval buildings also bear technological traces similar to the holes observed in the Pilis ribs. In his article on English Gothic vaulting and the role of construction materials, Malcolm Thurlby published some photographs of vaulting with a series of similar holes, and during the restoration of the Cathedral of Regensburg comparable marks were found in the transverse arch of the vaulting.

The holes in the ribs in Pilis would have been completely unnecessary if the massive railed structure suggested by Fitchen had been used to shore up the web. Moreover, these holes would not have been made for boards supporting and spanning a continuous cradle, contrary to the interpretation given to similar remains by the restorers of the Cathedral of Regensburg. Wood slats with six- to eight-centimetre equilateral cross-sections could have fit into the holes in the stone courses of the maximum 4-meter-wide webs of the nave in Pilis. These slats could not have supported a structure without the danger of becoming deformed or more
likely snapping; thus Ficthen's calculations in this respect are sound. The distance between the holes on the side of the ribs in Pilis is about 25 centimetres, but sometimes less. In other words, the structure for which these were made was unlikely to have been a cradle with evenly spaced rails. The question, however, is whether a kind of tool similar to that described by Viollet-le-Duc could have been used by the builders of the Pilis vaulting. Were these holes carved for the reinforced ends of such a structure, and, in particular, placed in such a way as to allow the next row of regular or irregular sized stones to be added? The debate is far from being resolved—assuming such a result can ever be achieved. In any case, even if there had been a larger number of similar ribbed vaulting adorned with colourful appliqués in the late 12th century, it would be difficult to dispute the artistic sophistication, innovative character, and affinity for modern building techniques exemplified by the vaulting in the Abbey Church of Pilis.
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Le tympan de Szentkirály est un monument majeur de l'art roman de Hongrie. Il a été souvent incorporé à des études générales, a bénéficié d'études particulières et de deux synthèses par Imre Takács et Ernő Marosi. Le tympan, en marbre blanc très patiné (67 x 120 x 25 cm), est aujourd'hui conservé et présenté dans la section lapidaire de la Galerie Nationale Hongroise de Budapest (fig. 1).

C'est une pièce sans histoire médiévale connue. L'église dont il est censé provenir, dans le village de Szentkirály, en Hongrie occidentale (annexé à Szombathely en 1950), fut détruite vers 1875.

En 1842, le tympan avait été dessiné par János Varsányi (1808–1878) ; un ingénieur et cartographe qui habita à partir de 1836 à Szombathely (Sabaria), s'intéressant aux monuments antiques de la région. En 1871 il publia quelques résultats de ses recherches sur le Moyen Age de différents lieux et monuments comme ceux de Székesfehérvár et Pilis. Il est considéré comme le premier photographe archéologue hongrois, une activité qu'il entreprit avant 1850. Le dessin du tym-
2. János Varsányi : Dessin du tympan de Szentkirály dans son environnement monumental, 1842, Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár

Pan de Szentkirály appartient aux séries médiévales mentionnées ; il est intéressant comme document mais n'apporte aucune information pour notre connaissance de l'emplacement du tympan et de son environnement monumental dans une façade de l'église médiévale. Le dessin de Varsányi témoigne cependant de l'intérêt pionnier des érudits et amateurs hongrois pour les monuments du Moyen Age dès le milieu du XIXe siècle et même avant (fig. 2).

Aujourd'hui, le visiteur peut voir une copie du tympan intégrée dans un portail de l'église de Szentkirály reconstruite au XIXe siècle. Malheureusement aucun document médiéval ne permet d'identifier les personnages figurés sur le tympan ni de connaître la chronologie de celui-ci. Seule l'approche des historiens de l'art permet de situer cette œuvre majeure dans un contexte stylistique et iconographique médiéval.

Dans une composition parfaite de soumission au cadre architectural le sculpteur a disposé sur le tympan semi-circulaire trois personnages de format presque identique ; une composition tripartite qui montre, au centre, un personnage en position frontale flanqué de deux personnages disposés de profil et courbés de telle façon qu'ils adoptent la forme semi-circulaire du cadre. On a supposé qu'il s'agissait d'un bloc de marbre antique de remploi, ce qui semble confirmé par la cassure oblique de la pierre à droite ; cassure parfaitement suivie par le sculpteur dans la mise en place de la partie postérieure du personnage de droite.

Au centre, la Majesté divine dotée d'un nimbe crucifère est présentée de face, assise sur un trône, drapée dans un long manteau aux plis parallèles retombant sur le devant, bénissant de sa main droite controrsionnée et portant un livre de sa main gauche. Il s'agit de la représentation traditionnelle du Pantocrator. A droite, comme à gauche, un personnage dans une position inclinée ; celui de gauche pose un
seul genou à terre tandis que celui de droite adopte une genuflexion parfaite. Les deux personnages, dont le corps est porté vers le devant par l’inclinaison du torse, lèvent la tête dans un mouvement franc et regardent sans nuances vers la Majesté centrale. A notre gauche, c’est-à-dire à la droite du Christ, une figure masculine aux cheveux longs bouclés couverts d’un bonnet, porte un vêtement plié et ceint d’une ceinture non visible ; il présente une petite maquette architecturale posée sur sa main droite et fortement serrée sous son bras gauche. A notre droite, à la gauche du Christ, un personnage féminin est vêtu d’une longue robe aux plis dynamiques qui laissent l’avant bras et le cou découverts ; la femme est couverte d’une coiffe, qui protège et cache entièrement ses cheveux longs. Avec ses deux bras et les mains la femme serre fortement un objet lourd qu’elle porte avec peine et présente au Christ.

Le style des figures du tympan, pour les vêtements comme pour les visages, montre bien qu’il s’agit du travail d’un seul sculpteur. Le sens des influences nous porte vers l’Italie du nord et, comme cela a déjà été souligné, vers le cercle des sculpteurs émilien. À la suite des travaux majeurs réalisés par Antelami à Parme, cet art trouve des échos directs à Venise, dans les sculptures du portail central de la basilique Saint-Marc, avant d’exporter le prestige et la renommée en traversant les frontières vers d’autres réalités géographiques. Nous avons à Szentkirály, sur le plan stylistique, le résultat d’un phénomène de mobilité humaine et de diffusion d’un style analogue à celui que nous connaissions à Trogir, en Croatie, avec les œuvres du sculpteur Radovan (fig. 3).10

Si nous situons la sculpture de Szentkirály à une époque indéterminée au cours du deuxième quart du XIIIe siècle, nous pouvons l’intégrer dans un panorama de l’Europe centrale et méridionale dans lequel les caractéristiques de style et d’iconographie de l’art roman sont préférées par les commanditaires aux œuvres gothiques qui alors déjà, depuis trois quarts de siècle, se sont imposées partout.

A Trogir, en Dalmatie, sur la côte croate de l’Adriatique, le commanditaire et l’artiste qui ont dirigé la réalisation du portail roman de la cathédrale sont fiers d’avoir produit une œuvre romane un siècle après le début du gothique dans la France du nord. Une inscription qui donne la date de 1240 et le nom d’un maître, Radovan, en témoigne. Il s’agit d’un artiste venu d’Italie, qui vit et travaille dans le prestige de la sculpture italienne entre Benedetto Antelami et Nicola Pisano et qui nous éclaire sur la direction stylistique qu’il faut donner à la sculpture de Szentkirály.
Malheureusement, le tympan de Szentkirály ne nous a gardé ni le nom de l’artiste ni ceux des donateurs ou commanditaires. Nous sommes dans un contexte artistique qui se plait dans le souvenir des années 1200, avec un goût essentiel pour le retour à l’antique et un attachement déterminé aux données de l’art roman. L’apparition radicale du gothique en Ile-de-France au cours des années quarante du XIIe siècle ne semble pas avoir transformé ailleurs la volonté de prolonger le développement du style roman ; une attitude qui à toute autre période de l’histoire de l’art aurait été considérée comme retardataire.

Le sculpteur de Szentkirály a voulu figurer des personnages qui sont des êtres de leur temps, de son temps. On le voit dans le style des vêtements, très éloigné de celui qui marque le gothique des années 1140. L’artiste y a refusé les plis qui s’adoucissent en s’allongeant et les courbes qui dominent la statuaire gothique des régions septentrionales de l’Europe occidentale vers 1220 ou 1230, au moment de la mise en place des sculptures de la cathédrale de Reims et lorsqu’on commence l’activité du chantier d’Amiens. Le bouleversement stylistique qui s’impose à Paris entre 1230 et 1240, dans le vitrail, la sculpture, les objets d’art ou les manuscrits, ne correspond en rien à ce que le sculpteur de Szentkirály considérait utile pour plaire aux commanditaires dans cette région de Hongrie occidentale. Ce que nous pourrions considérer comme un retard du goût à Szentkirály, au cours du deuxième quart du XIIIe siècle, pourrait être rapproché de la persistance d’une sculpture romane tardive dans les régions germaniques de l’Empire, dont les traditions locales semblent avoir freiné pendant longtemps la pénétration des nouvelles valeurs plastiques en provenance des chantiers français.

Si nous acceptons de situer le pilier des anges et le portail du bras méridional du transept de la cathédrale de Strasbourg vers 1225—1235, on mesurera mieux toute la distance qui sépare à travers l’Europe, dans différentes régions, le style préféré des sculpteurs au cours de la décennie qui a vu la réalisation du tympan de Szentkirály. Dans cette œuvre, la manière de mettre les sculptures avec un relief accentué sur un fond uni est commune à un large secteur de la plastique germanique, à la cathédrale de Bamberg comme dans l’ensemble saxon de Naumburg. On a souvent signalé le rayonnement de ces programmes allemands (Bamberg, Naumburg, Meissen) sur les réalisations qui plaisaient en Hongrie au cours du XIIIe siècle, notamment à Ják, en opposition aux formes gothiques d’Esztergom.

Mais je ne pense pas qu’il faille regarder vers l’Europe germanique pour comprendre le style du tympan de Szentkirály. La carrière de Benedetto Antelami en Italie – l’art de Ferrare, Fidenza ou Parme – illustre mieux le difficile dialogue entre l’attachement au roman et les beautés stylistiques du nouveau gothique. Le poids de l’Antiquité y est au demeurant beaucoup plus fort que dans toutes les autres régions.

De la même manière que l’art du baptistère de Parme a précédé et a marqué celui du portail central de la façade de Saint-Marc de Venise, et que le reflet de ce dernier se trouve dans le travail de Radovan à Trogir, c’est dans une optique semblable, une même orientation artistique, qu’il convient de voir le tympan de Szent-
La composition tripartite du tympan de Szentkirály, structurée sur un grand triangle, parfaitement équilibrée, est caractéristique de l’art médiéval et particulièrement des tymans romans de petit et moyen format. Ce type de composition, très traditionnel, présente généralement la Majesté divine parfois dans une mandorle, flanquée des symboles des évangelistes, d’anges ou de saints ; une tripartition commune aux scènes de la Crucifixion entre la Vierge et saint Jean et de toute iconographie dans laquelle un personnage central devient le protagoniste grâce à l’attitude de deux personnages latéraux. On la trouve à Ravenne, sur les sarcophages de l’Antiquité tardive, ou sur les quatre faces du ciborium de Saint-Ambroise à Milan, au cours du haut Moyen Age, avec des couples qui expriment clairement des attitudes d’offrande. Pendant toute la période romane les sculpteurs ont utilisé ce schéma. Particulièrement proche de la structure et de l’esprit du tympan de Szentkirály est le groupe présenté sur le tympan de la porte de l’ancien monastère de Sainte-Justine à Padoue.

Plus encore que dans l’ordonnance de la composition ou les traits de style c’est dans les choix iconographiques que le tympan de Szentkirály se situe pleinement entre l’art roman et l’art gothique. Jamais plus tôt nous ne trouvons des donateurs ou des commanditaires – homme et femme – représentés ainsi, c’est-à-dire dominant la composition sur le plan monumental et imposant leur présence de telle manière que celle du Christ soit reléguée presque au deuxième plan.
Les deux donateurs ou commanditaires laïques de Szentkirály présentent au Christ des objets. Sur le plan iconographique ils se situent dans un contexte traditionnel d’offrandes faites au Christ ou à un saint, d’offrandes faites au Seigneur. L’homme porte dans ses bras une maquette d’église, ce qui correspond à une longue et ancienne tradition selon laquelle le fondateur ou donateur offre à Dieu l’édifice religieux qu’il a contribué à faire bâtir (fig. 4). A Szentkirály, la maquette ne représente pas la façade de l’église ni une quelconque vision de faste ou de richesse architecturale. Il s’agit d’un petit édifice de plan rectangulaire, à une ou trois nef, bien que celles-ci ne se traduisent pas à l’extérieur. De toute évidence, on a voulu mettre l’accent sur le sanctuaire, avec une absise unique allongée en hauteur et couronnée d’une petite coupole de forme hémisphérique comme si on avait voulu évoquer une tour sanctuaire du type de l’Anastasis. Ce type de maquette semble vouloir assimiler l’église à un reliquaire que le donateur présente au Christ. En réalité, sur le plan monumental, il s’agit du type d’église rurale très simple qui se développe en Hongrie à partir de la deuxième moitié du XIIe siècle.

Les représentations de donateurs sont fréquentes au cours du Moyen Âge, en Occident comme en Orient, et ces images sont souvent accompagnées d’inscriptions. Dans la plupart des cas il s’agit de vrais portraits des personnages représentés. C’est une question, celle des donateurs et du patronage artistique, très actuelle dans le domaine de l’histoire de l’art. On pense tout de suite à l’ensemble exceptionnel du cœur occidental de la cathédrale de Naumburg : quatre hommes en armes et quatre femmes richement vêtues, grandeur nature, sous des baldaquins, dont la réalisation est à peu près contemporaine de celle de Szentkirály ou légèrement plus tardive.

Parfois, des inscriptions évoquent le donateur mais, souvent, les donateurs sont représentés offrant au Seigneur la maquette de l’édifice religieux qu’ils ont parrainé, fait construire, dirigé, ou simplement financé. Il suffit de rappeler l’image de l’abside de Saint-Vital à Ravenne, du VIe siècle, celle de Porec, pour l’Antiquité Tardive, et la longue série de témoignages romains à Sainte-Praxède et Sainte-Cécile sous Pascal Ier (817-824), ou à Sainte-Marie-sur-le-Trastevere avec Innocent II qui apparaît entre 1140 et 1143, avec le modèle de l’église dans ses mains. Entre le VIe et le XIVe siècle les exemples sont en Occident très nombreux, de la Norvège à la Péninsule Ibérique, l’Italie, l’Angleterre ou la Pologne. Le plus souvent on trouve des ecclésiastiques, évêques ou abbés, comme à Ravenne, Galliano, Aquilée, dans le domaine byzantin, et jusqu’à la représentation d’Enrico Scrovegni présentant la maquette de la chapelle décorée par Giotto à Padoue.

La question que nous sommes en droit de nous poser par rapport au donateur masculin de Szentkirály est celle de l’exactitude de la maquette qu’il présente par rapport à la forme architecturale que pouvait offrir l’église romane aujourd’hui disparue. Il est probable que nous ayons là une représentation du monument tel qu’il était dans ses grandes lignes. Cette exactitude a été démontrée dans d’autres endroits comme à Sant’Angelo in Formis, dans la maquette qu’offre l’abbé Desi-
4. Tympan de Szentkirály, représentation du donateur

derius, ou encore à Saint-Michel de Ston, près de Dubrovnik, en Croatie, où les restaurations ont montré que la maquette du monument portée par le roi reproduit correctement le monument. Cependant, cette règle n'est pas absolue. Des observations faites sur les sceaux ont montré que parfois l'église, la ville ou le château représentés, n'ont aucun rapport avec la réalité et qu'ils correspondent à une représentation symbolique qui met en valeur plutôt un élément caractéristique du lieu. Dans d'autres cas, la représentation est très fidèle, jusque dans les détails ; par exemple, le sceau de la Sainte-Chapelle de Vincennes reproduit la chapelle avec beaucoup de exactitude.32 À Szentkirály, le donateur nous a peut-être gardé entre ses mains une image simplifiée de l'église disparue depuis, mais cela ne peut être affirmé de manière définitive en l'absence de fouilles archéologiques ou de documents graphiques.
Alors que les représentations masculines de donateurs présentant la maquette d’une église sont fréquentes, nous l’avons vu, depuis l’Antiquité Tardive et au cours de tout le Moyen Age, celles de donatrices femmes présentant un objet au Christ sont plus rares. Généralement, la femme donateur est représentée les mains jointes et souvent levées dans l’attitude de la prière. C’est ainsi qu’on la voit, par exemple, à Ják, en Hongrie, sur une peinture murale qui a été mise en relation, aussi bien par la disposition des personnages que par certains traits de style, avec le tympan de Szentkirály (fig. 5), ou à Wiślica en Pologne. Sur le pavement de cette collégiale, découvert en 1959–1961 dans la crypte, sont figurés, incisés et incrustés au mastic, entourés de larges bordures végétales ou animalières, les donateurs, dont une femme, dans l’attitude de la prière (fig. 6). Un tympan plus discret et de moindre qualité que celui que j’étudie, figurant deux donateurs, masculin et féminin, en prière devant le
Christ (fig. 7), provenant de l’abbaye de Bátmonostor se trouve aujourd’hui en Serbie, en Voivodina au musée de la ville de Zombor (Sombor).³⁶

Beaucoup plus difficile et intéressante est l’interprétation de l’objet que présente au Christ la donatrice du tympan de Szentkirály et qui n’a jamais été identifié avec certitude (fig. 8).³⁷ On a parfois suggéré d’y voir un calice ou la maquette d’une cuve baptismale.³⁸ Après une observation serrée du tympan que j’ai pu pratiquer à loisir, je voudrais proposer une interprétation iconographique nouvelle.

Je pense que la femme donatrice de Szentkirály présente au Christ la partie inférieure d’une colonne, composée de la base et d’un fragment du fût. La base est formée d’un socle, sur lequel s’appuie probablement un double tore dont le supérieur est clairement marqué. Le fût est aujourd’hui en mauvais état, cassé par l’effet des coups portés au tympan à un moment donné de son histoire. Ce type de base est parfaitement documenté dans la région et correspond bien à la première moitié du XIIIᵉ siècle, comme le montre par exemple un fragment provenant du Palais Royal d’Öbuda (fig. 9).³⁹

Sur le plan iconographique, la donatrice présentant la partie inférieure d’une colonne monumentale au Christ peut être interprétée de deux manières. La première, plus directe mais aussi symbolique, se réfère à la colonne en tant qu’élément porteur de l’architecture religieuse médiévale. La seconde, plus spirituelle, pourrait se référer à la colonne de la Flagellation du Christ et aux précieuses reliques importées en Occident à cette époque.

La colonne représente au cours du Moyen Age roman un symbole essentiel de l’importance de l’architecture.⁴⁰ Il s’agit souvent d’une sorte de résumé de la puissance architecturale. C’est ainsi que déjà Charlemagne fit porter de Ravenne et de Rome pour sa chapelle palatine d’Aix des colonnes de porphyre, associant ainsi l’aspect symbolique de l’autorité impériale attribué au porphyre à son rôle purement utilitaire.⁴¹ Au cours de tout le Moyen Age la recherche de fûts monolithiques de colonnes à remployer a été une vraie obsession pour les souverains et en général pour les donateurs d’un certain rang.⁴² Rappelons, par exemple, la volonté de partir à la recherche de colonnes que manifestent, Desiderius au Mont-

7. Tympan de Bátmonostor, Sombor, Musée
8. Tympan de Szentkirály, représentation de la donatrice

Cassin, Suger à Saint-Denis, ou les rois normands de Sicile. A Plaisance, les corporations médiévales offrent quelques colonnes pour la cathédrale marquant ainsi l'aspect à la fois symbolique et essentiel de la colonne dans l'édifice et accompagnent chaque colonne d'une inscription commémorative : « Haec est columna formariorum », « Haec est colona cerdonum », « Hec est colonna codonnanerionum ».

Les commentateurs encyclopédiques et leurs prédécesseurs insistent toujours sur la symbolique de la colonne, élément porteur de l'église associé aux apôtres dans la correspondance entre église matérielle et Eglise spirituelle. Suivant la tradition biblique, Raban Maur, parmi d'autres, reprend « columnae enim sunt apostoli et doctores evangelii ». Dans la symbolique sicardienne des parties de l'édifice le rôle de la colonne est souligné, comme il l'avait été auparavant par Honorius Augustodunensis.
Dans son Mitral, Sicard précise : « columna, que domum fulcunt, sunt episcopi, qui machinam ecclesiae verbo et vita sustentant ».

Ce rôle essentiel et symbolique de la colonne dans l'équilibre réel et spirituel à la fois de la structure de l'édifice est souligné par le théologien allemand Gerhoh de Reichersberg (1093–1169), qui dans son Liber de aedificio Dei précise : « si columna movetur, tota aedificatio ruinam minatur ».

Au-delà de ces implications théologiques, de la symbolique du pouvoir et du rôle architectural de la colonne, il y aurait une autre interprétation possible beaucoup plus originale pour le fragment de colonne que présente la donatrice de Szentkirály. La forme du fragment de colonne offerte par la donatrice peut être mise facilement en relation avec la colonne de la Flagellation de Christ. Je dois reconnaître que pour la proposition que j'avance je n'ai aucune preuve matérielle autre que le contexte historique de l'époque.

C'est pendant le XIIIe siècle que les reliques de la colonne de la Flagellation sont l'objet de convoitise en Occident. À ce moment serait arrivé, selon une tradition tardive, le célèbre morceau de colonne de la Flagellation conservé dans la chapelle Saint-Zénon de la basilique de Sainte-Praxède à Rome, qui aurait été apporté de Jérusalem en 1223 par le cardinal Giovanni Colonna (fig. 10).48

La colonne de la Flagellation, en tant que relique, était parmi les plus anciennes « acheiropoietai » de Jérusalem. Cette relique, la colonne, apparaît pour la première fois dans les sources historiques au cours du Ve siècle, mais c'est seulement au cours du siècle suivant que les pèlerins commencent à voir les traces du martyr sur la surface de la pierre.49 Au cours des siècles, la dévotion populaire a honoré une colonne tronquée et basse qui à la forme courante des colonnes auxquelles étaient attachés les condamnés à la flagellation. La position à laquelle ils étaient ainsi contraints expé-
sait davantage encore leur dos aux coups de fouet. Cet usage était répandu dans tout l'Empire romain. Il est évident et notoire que toutes les supposées colonnes de la Flagellation du Christ qui circulent au Moyen Age dans les sanctuaires religieux ne viennent pas toutes de Jérusalem. Mais elles demeurent des reliques émouvantes puisqu'elles rendent plus concret le récit évangélique.

Les reliques médiévales de la colonne de la Flagellation peuvent être divisées in deux grands groupes. Le premier comprend les morceaux supposés de la colonne proprement dite.50 Le second, de loin le plus diffusé, comprend les reliques constituées par de supposés petits éclats de la colonne originelle, de quelques millimètres de surface seulement, qui ont rejoint l'Occident à différents époques.

Parmi les premières figurent les célébres colonnes de Jérusalem51 et de Rome52 déjà mentionnées, ainsi que celle de Saint-Georges de Constantinople, qui aurait été ramenée à Jérusalem par l'impératrice Hélène. A Constantinople, la plus célébre relique de la colonne était conservée dans l'église de Saints-Apôtres, mais disparut lors du sac de la ville par les Croisés, en 1204.53 Après cet événement, pendant la première moitié du XIIIe siècle, c'est le grand moment de diffusion de vraies et fausses reliques des Lieux Saints en Occident.54 C'est proprement à cette date que s'amplifie la dispersion de petites reliques de la colonne accompagnées souvent de l'inscription « RELIQUIE DE COLOMNA UBI DOMINUSoster Jesus Christus Fuit Flagellatus ».55 On en connait de nombreux vestiges, depuis l'île de Gozzo, jusqu'à Venise, Westminster56, ou le pays mosan.57 Les récits concernant l'impact que produisait chez les voyageurs le lieu de la Flagellation en Palestine étaient au Moyen Age célébres58, et les reliques de la Passion de Christ les plus prestigieuses.59

Par ailleurs, les représentations de la Flagellation de Christ prennent également une diffusion considérable en Occident au cours du XIIIe siècle, avec des conséquences rapides dans les pratiques des flagellants.60

Mon interprétation serait plus vraisemblable si nous connaissions des reliques de la Flagellation ayant existé au cours du XIIIe siècle à Szentkirály ou en Hongrie. Mais, dans l'état actuel de nos connaissances, ceci ne semble pas être le cas. On sait cependant qu'un certain nombre de reliques importantes sont arrivées en Hongrie en provenance de Terre Sainte à l'occasion de la célèbre croisade de 1217-1218 ; une expédition sans conséquences militaires mais qui fut déterminante pour les relations entre la Hongrie et les Lieux Saints. Le Moyen Age hongrois en gardera longtemps le souvenir précisément grâce aux nombreuses reliques qui arrivèrent à ce moment. Malheureusement, les listes connues des reliques apportées ne nous donnent pas de mention de fragments de la colonne de la Flagellation, bien qu'elles mentionnent d'autres reliques de la vie de Christ comme, parmi d'autres, un des six récipients dans lesquels Jésus transforma l'eau en vin (« una de sex idriis illis, in quibus Christus mutavit aquam in vinum, et alie multe quas potuit tunc congregare »).61

Les listes connues ne concernent que les reliques apportées en Hongrie par l'entourage du roi et non pas celles qui firent l'objet d'une importation par les seigneurs qui l'accompagnaient.62 Rien ne nous interdit d'imaginer que l'une de ces
11. Strzelno (Grande-Pologne), tympan de l'église Sainte-Trinité-et-Notre-Dame

reliques ait été un fragment très petit de la colonne de la Flagellation. C'est cette relique dont le souvenir aurait été gardé par la volonté ecclésiastique ou laïque évoquée dans la représentation de la donatrice de Szentkirály la présentant au Christ sous sa forme monumentale. On doit préciser encore une fois que dans l'état actuel de nos connaissances documentaires nous ne pouvons pas le démontrer.

Pour cette raison, l'hypothèse que la donatrice de Szentkirály presente au Christ d'un élément architectural local, symbole principal de la construction d'un édifice religieux, la colonne, ne peut pas être abandonnée.

★

La solution iconographique adoptée par le concepteur du tympan de Szentkirály n'est pas unique. Dans l'église Saint-Procope de Strzelno, en Grande-Pologne, partiellement détruite à la fin de la Seconde Guerre mondiale, on voit la copie d'un tympan, très proche chronologiquement de celui de Szentkirály bien qu'éloigné stylistiquement, qui offre une composition analogue. A Strzelno, un autre tympan à l'iconographie proche est conservé dans l'église abbatiale des Prémontrés, Sainte-Trinité-et-Notre-Dame. Entouré d'une inscription, on reconnaît au centre Anne, la mère de Marie, debout, portant la très jeune Vierge Marie dans ses bras, flanquée de deux personnages (fig. 11). À sa droite, à notre gauche, un homme, le corps de profil et la tête de face, porte une maquette d'église facilement comparable à l'architecture de l'édifice qui nous est parvenu, avec sa rotonde, un chœur rectangulaire et une tour circulaire. De l'autre côté du personnage central du tympan, une femme dans une position analogue présente un livre ouvert. C'est la composition, associée à l'iconographie des deux personnages latéraux, qui rapproche les tympans de Strzelno de celui de Szentkirály. Ces tympans avec deux donateurs offrant, un homme et une femme, s'insèrent pleinement dans les courants iconographiques qui à partir de la façade occidentale de la cathédrale de Chartres consacrent une partie importante du récit à la vie de la Vierge Marie par elle-même.
Les deux donateurs de Szentkirály sont vraiment des personnages de leur temps. Ce qui permet d’embrée de l’affirmer c’est leur tenue vestimentaire et notamment le couvre-chef de la femme que nous trouvons dans la figure de la donatrice en prière à Ják, à la cathédrale de Reims vers 1230, à Naumburg, ou dans la verrière de Chartres qui représente Alix de Thouars, la femme du principal donateur, le duc de Bretagne, Pierre Mauclerc, vers 1225. Ils ont été mis justement en relation, sur le plan historique, avec la vogue de nouvelles fondations ecclésiastiques par des laïques qui interviennent en Hongrie occidentale à partir de la fin du XIIe siècle, et qui se manifeste également dans d’autres régions d’Europe.

Contrairement à ce qu’avait affirmé en 1956 Yolande Balogh, je pense que les portraits des deux personnages laïques figurés sur le tympan de Szentkirály sont de vrais portraits (comme ceux de Naumburg d’ailleurs), même s’ils ont été réalisés après la mort des personnages représentés et commandés par leur entourage.

Dès la première époque romane les artistes prêtaient goût à exécuter des portraits réels et à montrer leur capacité à représenter le corps humain dans des proportions justes, avec ses caractéristiques individuelles, et des traits qui devaient refléter la personnalité et le caractère de la personne.

Ce qui me paraît important de souligner en conclusion est le sens d’égalité entre l’homme et la femme qui est mis en avant sur le tympan de Szentkirály. Les deux personnages ont le même format, adoptent la même attitude et présentent sur un plan exactement égal des offrandes. Nous avons avec cette œuvre d’art un témoignage vraiment remarquable sur le rôle croissant de la femme dans les stratégies familiales et sociales au cours de la première moitié du XIIIe siècle.

Notes


9 I. Takács, "Szombathely–Szentkirály...", ouvr. cité, fig. 825.


13 A. Venturi, Storia dell’arte italiana, I, Milan 1901, fig. 199-200.


15 Par exemple, ibid., fig. 312 (Ely), 322 (Trèves).

16 A. Venturi, Storia dell’arte italiana, III, Milan 1904, fig. 326.


23 Je renvoie ici de forme anticipée au colloque qui doit se tenir sur cette question à Parme en septembre 2010, dirigé par A. C. Quintavalle, et qui sera publié dans la série I convegni di Parma, XII.


34 E. Marosi, dans On the stage of Europe …., ouvr. cité, p. 50-51.
38 I. Takács, dans Pannonia Regia, ouvr. cité.

Rabanus Maurus, De Universo, PL CXI, col. 404.

Sicardi Cremonensis episcopus Miralis de oficios, éd. par G. Sarbak, L. Weinrich, (Continuatio medievals, 228), Turnhout 2008, p. 17; E. Brocchieri, Sicardo di Cremona e la sua opera letteraria, Cremona 1958, p. 60 et suiv.

PL CXCIV, col. 1242–1243.


Ph. George, Reliques et arts précieux en pays mosan du haut Moyen Age, Liège 2002, p. 117.


62 Sur ce point, la non présence de mentions de reliques de la Flagellation en Hongrie m’a été confirmée aussi bien par Gábor Klaniczay que par Imre Takács.


65 Propyläen Kunstgeschichte. Das Mittelalter, II, éd. par O. von Simson, Berlin 1972, fig. 76.


68 E. Reiszig, Vás vármegye tisztkara a középkorban, Köszeg, 1940, p. 10–12.

69 Les donateurs de Szentkirály ne sont cependant pas des portraits; les têtes sont typiques, les visages sont ronds et les petits yeux ronds sont les mêmes que ceux de Christ. Le sculpteur a représenté non l’individualité des donateurs, mais leur personnalité, et ceci avec un réalisme excellent », Y. Balogh, ouvr. cité, p. 32.


182
In the 19th century, a romantic view arose as to what medieval buildings, particularly churches, should look like. The monumentality and venerability of these buildings and the handiwork of their medieval craftsmen were, it was thought, most perfectly conveyed by the sight of masonry and carved details in bare stone and brick. This attitude, grounded in Romanticism, pervaded cathedral restorations for a long time. The change started to come in the mid-20th century, prompted by revelatory finds during post-Second World War reconstruction, perhaps most intensively during the repair of bomb damage to medieval churches in towns and villages along the Rhine. Much experience has accumulated since then, and it is now a fundamental principle of restoration that even awkward features should not be adjusted if they are original, not even having the spectacularly impressive methods of 19th-century craftsmen. Architectural research cannot confine itself to the study of building features represented in line drawings (floor plan, sections, structural outline, spatial and elevation structure, internal connections, etc.)

The foundations of the Romanesque church with a nave, two aisles and twin western towers at Ják, on Hungary’s western border, were laid some time in the 1220s, and it was consecrated in 1256. It owes its current aspect—a pure Romanesque-style ashlar building—to the purist “great restoration” carried out between 1896 and 1904. Brick-built sections added (or thought to have been added) later than the 13th century were demolished and rebuilt with ashlars laid on the 13th-century pattern. The pillared south wall of the nave and the vaulting on each side are 19th century, as are the towers from the gallery level upwards. With the patina of a hundred and five years, even a close observer finds it hard to distinguish the original, 13th-century carvings and sections from those dating from the great restoration. This purist restoration—late even by Hungarian standards—resulted in an ashlar building richly adorned by carvings inside and out; the rain-washed stones of its walls are yellowish, warm brown, grey and occasionally reddish. The interior gives a greyish impression, and the viewer’s gaze easily passes by the traces of paint on its heavily soiled, dusty surface.

In late 1988, a new programme of research was launched in the former Benedictine monastery, now a parish church. New scientific methods were to be
used, in preparation for a new restoration based on the principles of conservation. Although it was intended to be comprehensive, the research programme did not place sufficient emphasis on exposing, documenting and analysing the former wall painting in the church, even though by that time the uncleaned stone carvings removed during the turn-of-the-century restoration and replaced with copies had already been subjected to a full study which included documentation of the colour residues. When the apostle gallery of the western portal was restored between 1991 and 1996, the colour residues, despite highly intensive research, were hardly in evidence. It was clear that elsewhere, for example on the south portal and the church interior, the stone surfaces could only be cleaned and restored after the surface paint residues had been exposed, documented and conserved (fig. 1a-b).

Wall faces

In the 1880s, before the great restoration the National Commission for Historical Monuments (MOB) commissioned an excellent series of photographs of the church at Ják. The black-and-white photographs of the west front shows that the ashlar surfaces of the church and the later brick additions were covered by a thinly-applied, and already-crumbling, layer of sgraffito-like rendering. The corner lesenes of the towers were marked out by an ashlar-imitation joint pattern, while the twin windows of the gallery by framing of a colour darker than the masonry surfaces. The most interesting detail of the rendering is a sgraffito architectural pattern on the south tower symmetrically imitating the great rose window of the north tower. The joint pattern and the pattern of the great rose window was formed by a groove cut out between two scored lines and filled with thick lime; the different colour tone on the rendering was achieved by additives producing various grades of darkening. The photographs show that the gallery windows of the west front and the first-floor windows of the south aisle were highlighted by
framing of the same design. If so, it means that the sgraffito design was applied in the period following the vaulting of the south aisle and the construction of the vaulted floor above it, some time after the middle of the 17th century. Some traces of the sgraffito decoration were still visible a few years ago on the northwest lesene of the north tower, as were some joint lines scored into the ashlars. It was in fact revived during the great restoration. The church restorers must have encountered it in many more places and on larger areas, and towards the end of their work, in pursuit of the "Steinsichtig" impression, they used the technique to cover up the remaining brick masonry and the new brick additions.

We have few sources of information on the wall faces as they were before the late 19th century. One is a "Soli Deo Gloria" inscription on the lintel under the south portal tympanum, still legible in the late 1870s, an indication that the portal and perhaps its immediate vicinity were refurbished when the inscription was made. Further information comes from the Visitatio Canonica Batthyanyana of 1756, whose detailed description of the west front of the church ends: "intra duas Turres autem in Frontispicio Ecclesiae Legitur: Renovatum est Anno 1735". Proceeding back in time, there is information associated with the inscribed year 1595, which the MOB architect István Möller, during his first stay at Ják, exposed on the formerly exterior surface of the south nave wall in a first floor room above the south aisle, and made a drawing of it in his sketchbook. During the great restoration, the masonry itself was demolished, so nothing more about its wall painting may be said.

A barely visible trace of paint remains on a piece of pointing mortar in the niche moulding of the seated Madonna statue of the west portal. The tiny traces of red paint visible on the embrasures of the south aisle windows where they turn into the outer wall plane, and on fragments of 13th-century arched cornice elements, may be remains of polychromy that once adorned the wall face. Finally, red paint traces on little, protected nooks of the outside of the north side-chapel were clearly there to emphasise the system and form of the architecture. There are red paint residues under the edge of the ring members of the three-quarters column capitals, on the row of globular shapes adorning the window frames and in the pointing mortar. Other colours were almost certainly used at these places, but have been destroyed.

1b. Ják, Abbey Church, system of wall painting on the north aisle's vault
(Reconstruction drawing: Ferenc Rády, 1998)
It is the area around the south portal where the greatest extent of interconnecting paint residues survive. This has yielded sufficient information to permit a theoretical reconstruction. Clearly visible in the protected (rustication) band under the horizontal drip stone of the portal, and in lesser traces on the side corner ashlar, are alternating red- and yellow-painted ashlar s framed with white joints outlined in black. In the view of the restorer who exposed it, this painting was produced by first applying a thin layer of whitewash to the stone surface, then applying the two colours, red and yellow, and finally framing each side of the row of ashlars and the top of the joints of the coloured ashlar s with a thin black line. This explains why the white joint line is indeed just one coat of whitewash on the bare stone surface, the colours being applied over this and the black outline forming a third coat in some places, depending on the undulation of the edge of the colour. There is a palm-sized green patch—too small, unfortunately, to determine its shape—at the top of each side of the portal. Colour traces on the relief of the portal tympanum can be identified relatively clearly, but those on the embrasure layers are barely visible. In the tympanum, the decoration was white on the lamb of the Agnus Dei relief, a little green on all of the leaves around it, and black undulating line on a white ground on the edge of the three lobes. It has not yet been possible to identify the base colour of the relief and the body colour of the dragons. The surface of the 13th-century stones of the embrasure layer are covered by the same colour in several coats, topped with pink. These seem to be traces of the multiple refurbishment of the base coat.

Research on the wall faces has established that the church was never in a "Steinsichtig" state before the great restoration. The first—polychromic—wall painting, in vivid earth colours, was of an architectural nature, and there are good grounds to suppose that the row of decorative arches under the cornice and the window embrasures were also decorated. During the six and a half centuries up to the great restoration, signs of damage were locally repaired, in the south and west sides, as far as is presently known, more often than the other two. The photographs and drawings suggest that in cases the roof and the floors burned down, the main cornices also had to be repaired several times. The repairs used brick, and the surfaces were rendered locally.

The church interior

There are a total of three black-and-white archive photographs of the church interior from before the great restoration. The first shows the nave facing east, the second, two pillars of the north row of pillars, and the third, the north aisle looking east. There is no painting visible on the walls in the pictures, only dusty whitewash. As far as can be told, the ashlar walls were not even plastered; the texture of the uneven ashlar surface showed up through the rather thin layers of whitewash on the north wall of the nave and elsewhere. There appears to be thick plaster,
of uneven surface, only on brick masonry—on the 17th-century barrel vault, south nave wall and south row of pillars.

On the photograph of the nave looking towards the apse, taken near the end of the great restoration in 1904, stencilled motif decoration is visible on the surface of the quarter-spherical cupola of the main apse and the band below the cornice.\textsuperscript{16}

Written information on the adornment of the church interior indicates a situation similar to that of the exterior wall surfaces. At the same time he documented the inscription of the year 1595 on the wall surface, István Möller sketched and described wrote in his notebook a running wave motif on the nave wall in the attic space above the 17th-century barrel vault of the nave.\textsuperscript{17} The decorative motif ran along the band under the former flat ceiling, now replaced with 19th-century masonry. Finally, the restorers found and fortunately preserved a dated inscription on the apex of the north archway opposite the south entrance. The inscription in the heart-shaped frame is “Theodosius Duchon A° 1637 Lypc”, with the initials R.S.D. underneath.\textsuperscript{18} This has been much quoted as evidence of the decoration of the church interior.

Two technically-distinct versions of the interior decoration of the church—the wall painting emphasising the architectural structure of the interior and the system of stencilled ornamentation—are discussed separately. Both were painted on a single thin layer of whitewash applied directly to the stone surface, and this was the key to their survival.\textsuperscript{19} In addition to demolishing historically important parts of the building, the 19th-century restorers painstakingly scraped away the 13th-century stone surfaces with sharp toothed chisels and removed the column capitals with special tools (fig. 2). The paint, however, had been absorbed by the stone surface, and the unevenness of the stone wall and the deep joints also made cleaning difficult. It is only due to the accidental inefficiencies of their work that any traces of paint have survived. Research is further inhibited by the fact that the
impressive quantity of drawings, and written documentation produced during the restoration does not consider the painted decoration worthy of mention.\textsuperscript{20}

The church's figural frescoes will only be mentioned in the strict context of the exterior painting where there is a clear link between them.\textsuperscript{21}

\textit{Interior architectural wall painting}

The polychromic wall painting of the church interior included the same red-yellow ashlar painting as found on the south portal. There are joints left white between the stones of various colours, and the joints and the edge of the row of stones are highlighted with a black line. The ashlar painting served to emphasize the structurally important architectural features of the church interior: the wall pillars, the wall arches, the archivolts and the edges of the archways. The same ashlar painting covers the ribs of the groined vaulting of the north aisle. It is very significant that on the west wall arch belonging to the fresco in the space under the south tower, the fresco was covered by ashlar painting, and the figural frescoes of the infilling by stencil painting. The paint has survived in the best condition on the north west corner column of the space under the south tower and next to it, around the door opening of the spiral staircase leading up to the gallery (fig. 3). There are black lines emphasising the joint under the ring member of the capital of the corner column and the nook formed on two sides of the column body, perhaps with the intention of giving a shading effect to enhance the modelling.

The alternate red and yellow covering on the three-quarter columns of the octagonal piers and the clustered columns of the nave wall may also have formed part of the architectural wall painting. This is also found under the corbels of the north aisle wall, where the painted columns were almost like a re-interpretation of the architectural structure. The columns here were also painted alternately in red and white, one edge being outlined in black and the other in white, a kind of representation of light and shade.

3. Ják. Abbey Church, ashlar painting detail in the space under the south tower (Photo: Ferenc Rády)
Similar colouration also covered the stone vault ribs under the gallery and under the north tower, but here the two colours change over at the boundary between the concave and convex surfaces of the groin member rib moulding.

**The polychromy of the column capitals**

The capitals of the columns in the church interior were also covered in splendid painting. Most of them retain residues of colouration applied directly to the stone surface. Some capitals bear traces of multiply-renewed colouration, and some have damaged carvings where the fracture surfaces have been covered over with vividly-coloured paint. Such is the three-quarter column on the northwest corner of the space under the south tower, whose bud has broken off, and there are traces of repair around the fractured surface. The layer next to the stone surface of the capital is yellow paint applied to a whitewash film, the second layer red painting upon another whitewash film, and on the top a simple black grain pattern. The latter layer is what also covers the fractured surface of the broken bud. The already rich forms of the finely-carved capitals were thus given further modelling with painted details. Elsewhere, veins were painted on leaves, the edges of half-palmettes were outlined in black, and the edge of a cup was decorated by a row of black dots on a white ground.

On one capital, the painting was found to have been applied to a chalk base rather than directly to the stone. This is the famous “dragon capital” at the top of the three-quarter column on the south side of the archway opening from the space under the north tower to the aisle (fig. 4). Its standard of craftsmanship surpasses
that of all of the other fine carvings in the church. The restorer cleaned half of the
capital so as to leave the other side as a “witness”, because the small fragments of
glass painting which survived the cleaning would have been imperceptible in small-
test windows. The astragal is grey, the indentation underneath it is yellow, and the
cylindrical moulding below is red. The rim of the cup forming the basic shape of
the dragon capital was decorated by a line of black dots on a white ground. There
is residue of red colour on a chalk ground on the cheek of the dragon, and yellow
on its right rear leg. The tendril was also yellow, and the half palmettes were red
outlined with black on their edges.

The paint residues on the similarly half-cleaned foliate capital opposite the
dragon capital display a completely different and less refined technique, much less
adapted to the features of the carving. This prompts the conclusion that the drag­
on capital, with its uniquely high standard of material, execution and painting, was
produced as a kind of model for the rest. A previous study of some carvings in the
stonework collection had already suggested to the present author the use of a mod­
el carving during the second phase of 13th-century construction.23

Ornamental stencil painting

Nave

There is stencil painting practically everywhere on the 13th-century surfaces of
the church interior (fig. 5a–b). The photograph of the apse mentioned above
shows a central-composition stencil pattern on the cupola and similar patterns in
the frieze along the wall under the cornice. The exposures proved that the motif
just perceptible under the dust on the north wall of the nave comprises the same
pattern elements, with very small deviations. On the north wall of the nave, the
central composition adorning the cupola of the apse lies above the archways in the
centre of the surfaces be­
tween the pillar clusters,
and the frieze in the capital
zone and the band under­
neath. The central compo­
sition consists of five ele­
ments. In the centre there
is an oval whose axes are
emphasised by lance-like
motifs, and attached to four
round elements. The
frieze consists of the same
oval and circular elements,
but alternating with each
other. The motifs are red,
applied by stencil on to a thin white coat of lime. The red stencil pattern is surrounded by a thin black line. The diameter of the circles is 37.5 cm, the vertical, smaller diameter of the oval is of the same size and its larger diameter is 50 cm. It is difficult to tell the age of the pattern. It is usually referred to as a Renaissance pattern, but there is considerable doubt surrounding this. Both patterns are possibly formed from the “Romanesque” idiom reminiscent of debased half-palmettes with tendrils. Above the frieze, from one cluster column capital to the next there is a red and yellow strip between black outlines, connecting astragals of practically the same colours. The stencil patterns used on the apse and the nave therefore draw on an almost completely identical stock of motifs. One difference is that a bracket-like supporting painted cornice with a cymatium and the colour green appear as new motifs under the frieze of the chancel. The painted cornice elements under the frieze in the chancel are alternating yellowish-white and green, and the centre of the oval pattern is green.24

The north aisle

Probably adapting to the proportions of the space, a smaller version of the central composition appears in the apse cupola of the north side-chapel and two other places—the centre of the north tower wall in the aisle opposite the apse, and under the gallery, on the wall above the west portal. The circle in the middle of this smaller central composition is identical to the motif repeated four times in that found in the nave, and the four smaller circles connecting to it contain a pattern reminiscent of a four-petalled flower or heart shape. The added lance motif emphasises the diagonal directions of the composition. Finally, the stencil of the flower or heart motif was also used on the ashlar-painted keystones of square ribs of the north aisle and in the centre of its infillings, where the lance-tips point towards the three ogee peaks.

In the north aisle and the front wall of the west gallery towards the nave there is another stencil pattern, different from the others in having an axially symmetric composition. The pattern is repeated in a ribbon along some structural features: the cornices at the edges of the wall mouldings in the north side-apse, the edges of the window bevels at the same place, the line of the vaulting on the east side of
the north tower, and the ashlar painting at the edge of the wide archway opening on to the nave beneath the gallery.

The present research discovered substantial painting on the wall surface of the south tower towards the aisle, above the imprint of the vaulting built in the mid-17th century. Reminiscent of a curtain motif, it is a series of arches following the imprint of the flat ceiling. Finally, remains of wall painting so thoroughly destroyed that the pattern cannot be made out were found on the east front wall of the space under the gallery, beneath the parapet built in the 19th century, and other traces of paint which cannot be interpreted were found in other parts of the church.

**Attempt at dating**

The paint layers which clearly show up on the research photographs can be used to date the wall painting described here, using the patchy data from the sources and by comparison with buildings where the wall painting, unlike at Ják, has not been destroyed. By reference to other ashlar painting applied directly to the stone surface, they can be confidently dated to the 13th century, and the form used at Ják is also found in works from the mid-14th century. Dating of stencil painting applied to the bare stone, however, is made difficult by the technique itself, since its use has almost no limits in either time or space, and the patterns, whose variation was tightly constrained, could have been used for a long time and in many different ways.25

Historical data suggest that the fresco—dated to the 1240s—in the space under the south tower could only have been covered over in the late 13th century or first half of the 14th century at the earliest.26 This was when the main line of the Ják clan died out and the abbey came under the patronage of branches of the clan based on the left bank of the River Rába—the Sitke, Szentiványi and Niczky families. Thus began a period of three hundred years, stretching up to the time just before the vaulting of the church in the mid-17th century, during which—we may confidently state—the interior of the church was painted.

There was fresco decoration in the western part of the building in the early period before the church was completed, and the fresco technique was also used for the St George altarpiece on the wall of the chancel at the time of consecration. The ashlar painting and the stencil paintings, despite having the same order of layers, may have been made at different times, but perhaps coexisted for a while. The former may have graced the walls from the late 13th century up to the 15th century, and of the latter, the axially symmetric ribbon pattern may have been applied as an addition to the ashlar painting during refurbishment, some time during the 15th century. The authors consider that the central-composition stencil pattern was added in the 16th century to painting that had hitherto emphasised the architecture, and must have been refurbished for the last time, as testified by the inscription, in 1637.27
In 2000, very similar stencil painting was found in the Gothic chancel of the medieval church of Ikervár, a village to the south of Sárvár on the left bank of the Rába, close to both Ják and the former estates of some branches of the Ják clan (fig. 6). The Ikervár stencil pattern was the lowest layer of decoration on the church's Gothic apse, applied to the socle, and its researchers have dated it to the early 15th century. The pattern is very similar to that found at Ják but much smaller, and its blurred outlines suggest that the stencil was old or much used, or perhaps made of poor material. Since the village was part of the Sárvár estate, its patrons were the lords of that estate. In the late 14th century this meant the Kánisza family, who must have been responsible for the Gothic construction and the wall painting of interest here.

It must be borne in mind that for the four hundred years from the mid-13th to the mid-17th century, the nave and south aisle of the church was covered by a ceiling. The ceiling timbers, or at least some of them, must surely have burned down from time to time. Repairs would not always have involved replacing all of these. The ceiling may have been decorated by a Romanesque stencil pattern which would have been copied and reused for the repairs, so that the impecunious abbey only had to make local repairs as necessary. Without the means to completely refurbish the church interior, repairs had to be adapted to what survived. When a new altar was set up or an old one was converted, local repairs were made to the chapels and in the vicinity of the altars. This gives the impression—in full agreement with the historical data—of an abbey community which conserved traditions and held the church building in great esteem, but lived modestly and with meagre means. Was it the abbey's modest means or some utterly different consideration which caused the cupola of the chancel to be decorated for the fifth time with the same schematic composition as had been repeated four times in the nave?
The church's wall painting was renovated for the last time in 1637, when Benedek Vinkovics (1631–42) was abbot. Later, as Bishop of Zágráb (Zagreb, CR), he had the west portal of his cathedral rebuilt in the 1640s on the pattern of the west portal of Ják Church. Not much later, a lightning that struck to the south tower ravaged a church which was richly decorated inside and out with stone carvings and wall painting. Upon restoration, for the first time in its history, its colouration was completely covered over, and upon the great restoration, almost completely destroyed.

Notes

1. The author has already presented talks on this subject in Budapest, Stuttgart and Brno, but no extended paper has previously been published.
6. This does not, however, mean that the portal was not painted. At the same time as the apostle gallery at Ják, the west gate of the Stephansdom in Vienna was also being restored, and the polychromy of the gateway was very successfully revealed. The plaster copy process used on the Ják gate at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries damaged its surfaces so severely that no colour residue remained. The Ják priest Nándor Magyarász wrote of the procedure in a letter, “in short, they have greatly helped the iron teeth of time in the work of destruction.” See *Jákí apostolszobrok* (n. 4 above), 95 and notes.
7. But there were insufficient funds for this, and external assistance had to be sought. In 1997, an application was made to the London-based Headley Trust for funding to expose, document and produce a restoration proposal for the exterior and interior stone painting. The grant permitted the absolutely essential scientific research in the church interior in 1997–98. The present study is an outline of the results. Painting restorer Ferenc Rády cleaned the inspection windows, made 1:1 tracings and produced reconstruction drawings of the wall painting. Geophysicist Mária Tóth examined the stone, plaster and paint materials from 135 sampling sites by machine analysis of 245 prepared samples. Róbert Hack produced documentary photographs and Efstatia Galacanu a video film. The author is grateful to them for their work, and to art historians Melinda Tóth and Tünde Wehli for their helpful involvement.
8. *Jákí apostolszobrok* (n. 4 above), 87, 92, figs. 44, 45, 53.
9. Drawing from 1878 by Norbert Neugebauer, a student at the Műegyetem (Polytechnical University Budapest), a pupil of Imre Steindl. KÖH Tervtár (Architectural Drawing Collection), Inv. No. 31342.
Gábor Erdődy, Abbot of Ják (1709–1744), became Bishop of Eger in 1715 but retained his abbot's title and took active care of his Ják estates and the church even in his absence. He repaired and vaulted the church, but the third level of the tower was temporarily roofed only with a Fachwerk-like timber structure covered with planks. He built this up to the original height in 1735.


Scaffolding was erected on the outside of the south aisle wall in the early 1990s. That was when the author, together with art historian Edit Szentesi, had the chance to make the observations presented here. During our joint research of the church lasting until 1996, it occurred to us that the red paint traces of even density on the 13th-century window carvings were the now-unrecognisably worn remains of a stencil pattern.

Rády Ferenc, who prepared the inspection windows and the authoritative documentation.

The south portal was restored in 1992 under the direction of stone sculptor and restorer Péter Rákos. Before the colour traces were examined in situ and on the stone carvings in the store. The pink cover paint has also been observed on many stone carvings in the stone collection, including original carvings from the west portal.

The surface was examined in more than twenty places by aqueous cleaning of nearly fifty inspection windows. Since it was known that the church interior was not likely to be restored in the foreseeable future, these points were chosen so as to cause the least possible damage, made as small a possible, but to reveal the greatest possible information.

Since research work by Tamás Bogay, the 13th-century architecture of the Ják Church has been closely linked to that of Bamberg Cathedral. Reference here is made to the documents made during the restoration of the Cathedral between 1826 and 1831, and research into its polychromy. For a treatment of these, see Ch. Hans-Schuller, *Der Bamberger Dom. Seine „Restauration“ unter König Ludwig I. von Bayern (1826–31)*, Petersberg 2000.
criticism and attempted to date them. Their findings, both overall and in detail, also stand up well in the architectural history context. They did not, however, consider the church's architectural and decorative wall painting. See M. Tóth, Árpád-kori falfestészet, Budapest 1974, 57–67, figs. 41–48; G. Entz, “Die Wandmalereien der Westempore in Ják,” in Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte und Denkmalpflege. Walter Frodl zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet, Vienna–Stuttgart 1975, 172–81; T. Wehli, “Donátorábrázolások a magyarországi román kori monumentális művészetben,” in Eszméltörténeti tanulmányok a magyar középkoróról, ed., Gy. Székely, Budapest 1984, 366–72, figs. 6–9; M. Tóth, “Falfestészet az Árpád-korban. Kutatási helyzetkép,” Ars Hungarica XXIII, 1995, 144–45. The main former St George wall painting serving as an altarpiece on the chancel wall was revealed from under the layers of whitewash by István Möller in 1889, but was restored only much later, in 1937, as were the frescoes in the spaces under the tower and the gallery, which had come to light a few years later, during the great restoration. They were restored by Luigi Pigazzini, assistant to the Italian restorer Mauro Pellicioli. Only some of the facial features and the additions to the eyes were by the master himself. The assistant cleaned the frescoes and did some repainting, chiefly the blue backgrounds of the figures and some colours of the clothes.

22 Repairs of this kind are thought to be late medieval. Partly because according to our present knowledge strong colours, at least, were not used for decoration of the church interior from the mid-17th century, and partly because stucco additions were used in Baroque repairs to the column capitals, as in Ócsa. This conclusion is based on the bud shapes visible from a photograph taken in the north aisle by Péter Gerecze, KÖH Fototár (Photo Archives), see Ják apostolszobrok (n. 4 above), 15, fig. 8; Zs. Lukács, Kutatási dokumentáció az őcsi templom helyreállításához (unpublished), 1986, KÖH Tervtár (Architectural Drawing Collection), Inv. No. 25450.

23 E.g. column capital LAHU-50-006 or the LAHU-50-294 element of the large round window, although there could be other technical reasons for the latter. (LAHU = Lapidarium Hungaricum, the national collection of architectural fragments, a cataloguing project of KÖH started about 25 years ago.)

24 The green colour and its tone are very similar to the colour traces on the top surfaces of the south gate on each side.


26 Since the subject of the frescoes in the space under the south tower is a reference to the founder's tomb, or at least to his death and direct kin, they could only have been covered up when the memory of him had faded. The aquarelle copies produced after the frescoes were discovered clearly show the ashlar painting which covers the fresco adornment of the west wall arch, and the stencilled decoration painted on whitewash also covered up the figural vault bays. See aquarelles by József Huszka, KÖH Tervtár (Architectural Drawing Collection).

27 There are occasional traces of decorative painting on the walls and archways, probably from the 17th century, see Bogyay (n. 4 above), and Ják apostolszobrok (n. 4 above), 19. / 41.


DEMETER NEKCSEI AND
THE COMMISSION OF HIS BIBLE

Zsombor Jékely

Introduction

In the first half of the fourteenth century, the most prestigious place of learning for Hungarian clergymen was Bologna. Clerics studying there not only became prominent ecclesiastical figures, but also fulfilled important roles in the chancery and diplomacy of the Hungarian Angevin kings. While in Bologna or after their return to Hungary, many of these men of letters commissioned illuminated manuscripts from Bolognese workshops, and thus played a decisive role in the reception of the new sensibilities of Italian art in Hungary. The first of these patrons that can be clearly identified is Demeter Nekcsei, *magister tavarnicorum* of the Hungarian court. Work on Nekcsei’s two-volume Bible was most likely completed by 1338, the year of his death (fig. 1).

Besides the Nekcsei Bible, another manuscript executed in Bologna for a Hungarian patron (although his identity is unknown) is the famous Hungarian Angevin Legendary. Clearly made for royal patrons, this lavishly illustrated picture-book of the lives of the saints contains four miniatures on each page, accompanied by one-line text labels. The majority of the dismantled manuscript is preserved in the Vatican and Morgan libraries, but leaves can be found in a number of other collections. As of today, altogether 140 leaves from the Legendary (some of them fragmentary) are known in six different collections in the world.

In addition to these two extraordinary works, a number of other Bolognese manuscripts commissioned by Hungarians are also known. Two decretals, ordered by Miklós Vásári, canon and later archbishop of Esztergom (1350–58) in 1343, were illuminated by the chief Bolognese artist of the period, the so-called “Illustratore”. A few other surviving Bolognese codices were commissioned by clerics, including a rich group preserved in Zagreb (CR). Of two mid-fourteenth-century Bolognese codices housed in Vienna, one may have been used at the royal chancellery of the Hungarian kings, while the other was owned in the 15th century by a canon at the chapter of Pécs. Bolognese legal codices were naturally in high demand, and frequently cropped up in other Central European countries as...
As a result, the pictorial solutions employed by Bolognese miniature painters had a lasting effect on Central European painting, especially in Bohemia.

The Nekcsei Bible, preserved at the Library of Congress in Washington, has been in the centre of the art historical problems of Bolognese manuscripts illumination, and Hungarian aristocratic patronage ever since its identification in the 1940s. The results of a careful study of the original manuscript in the Library of Congress challenge conventional ideas about the circumstances of its creation, linking it more securely to Bolognese workshops, and also shed light on the original destination of the Bible.

The manuscript itself belongs to the better-known treasures of both medieval Hungary and the Library of Congress. Only in 1942, however, thanks to the cooperation of Meta Harrsen and Dezső Dercsényi, was the true origin of the manuscript discovered. A few years later (in 1949), Meta Harrsen dedicated a detailed monograph to the Nekcsei-Lipocz Bible (as it is often known in English-language studies). Being a librarian at the Morgan Library, Harrsen was of course well aware of the celebrated Hungarian Angevin Legendary (parts of which are preserved at the Morgan), and developed an elaborate hypothesis concerning the origin of the two manuscripts. In 1988, a partial facsimile edition of the Bible, reproducing most of the illuminated pages, was published along with a booklet containing studies, in particular summaries of the research of Ferenc Levárda, a long-time researcher of the Angevin Legendary, and Tünde Wehli, a preeminent expert on medieval manuscripts in Hungary. When the facsimile was published, it was with the hope of giving easy access to the manuscript. Hungarian research, however, failed to seize this opportunity—not a single study has been dedicated to the Bible since the publication of the facsimile, and it has been mentioned only in passing in an ever-growing corpus of literature dedicated to the Hungarian Angevin Legendary.

The making of the Bible and the system of its decoration

The Bible consists of two large, thick, heavy volumes of 352 and 394 leaves. The size of the bound works is a respectable $475 \times 348$ mm, while the page size is $450 \times 323$ mm. The binding is identical: dark blue leather over thick wooden boards, with the coat of arms and initials of Henry Perkins in the center. The edges of the leaves are gilt, presumably dating from the time of the rebinding, and 2—2 flyleaves were inserted in the front and back of both volumes. There is another flyleaf, pasted at the beginning of the first volume, which contains a 16th-century text by a certain Zuleman. Apart from a short, two-line catalogue entry pasted inside the front cover, there are no other clues about the later owners and history of the volume. The Bible is known to come from the collection of a brewer, Henry Perkins (1778—1855, a partner in Barclay, Perkins and Co. Brewers), who bought the manuscript in 1825. After his death, his collection—which contained two
1. Nekcei Bible, Letter of St Jerome to St Ambrose, Library of Congress, Med. Mss. no. 1, fol. 1r
(Photo: Washington, Library of Congress)
Gutenberg Bibles as well— was bequeathed to his son, Algernon Perkins. The collection was auctioned off in 1873, a year after the death of Algernon Perkins, by the auctioneers Gadsden, Ellis & Co, and with the professional guidance of Bernard Quaritch, acting as commissioner. In Quaritch's list, which was published preceding the sale, the two-volume Bible was listed first among the books of the Holy Scriptures, described as "one of the most magnificent MS. copies of the Latin Scriptures in existence." The actual sales catalogue offers a brief description of the manuscript, Lot 174 on the first day of the sale (June 3, 1873). The accompanying illustration, a lithographed drawing showing the dedication scene from fol. 5, demonstrates the clear recognition of the work's importance. At the sale, the two volumes were acquired by the Library of Congress.

The parchment of the Bible is fairly thick, very well prepared, but often imperfect. Each page was carefully ruled and the text was written in two columns of 33 lines. A gothic textura script was used by several scribes throughout the book. Mistakes were also corrected by a textura hand, and there is no sign of the round littera bononensis script anywhere in the book. The manuscript contains the full text of the Latin Vulgate Bible, together with the complete set of common prologues, as set during the 13th century at the University of Paris.

The Nékcsei Bible has a unified system of decoration, which clearly marks the various divisions of the biblical text. This system ranges from simple red letters through various initials to elaborate frontispieces. Large, 8—9 line tall initials mark the beginning of each book of the bible, and always contain figures or scenes. The beginnings of the prologues are indicated by similar, although somewhat smaller (6—7 line) initials, also usually figural, while the very short prologues (such as to the Pauline epistles) have smaller (3 line), ornamental initials. Similarly small, (2 line) ornamental initials appear at the beginnings of biblical chapters. The standard form is a two-line initial decorated with the characteristic leaves and laid gold. Quite often, especially in the first volume, these initials are also filled with a head or bust of a figure in the typical Bolognese fashion. The arms of these figures sometimes extend beyond the borders of the initials, occasionally grasping at the vines, and otherwise enhancing the overall effect. The 'I' initials are somewhat more ornate and generally 7—8 lines tall. On numerous occasions these initials are turned into half or full figures in the margins: in size and execution these compare to the figures in the large chapter-heading initials.

Only a few pages in the Bible received a decoration more elaborate than the system outlined above. The most ornate pages mark the very beginning of the first volume, with the Letter of Jerome to Ambrose (fol. 1r) and the first page of Genesis (fol. 5v). In addition to the usual initials here, the margins of the pages are richly decorated with various images. These two frontispieces, however, present a number of problems as well. While most gatherings in the volume consist of ten leaves, the first quire is irregular, having only eight leaves (two empty leaves from the beginning are presumed missing). Of these, fol. 2 and fol. 5 form a conjoining double leaf, fols. 3—4 are similarly joined, while the composition of the
nabat. nec philius: octenit et thin in
dactus lacetua (uroa. muta. dervis
ur); ex catho. cutiet cugulat. dopri
zat. fidei (fris. a. magia. o. opus)
plus reterro. forte ete. si latento a
narrato templo repit.

2. Nekcsei Bible, Prologue by St Jerome, Library of Congress, Med. Mss. no. 1, fol. 2v
(Photo: Washington, Library of Congress)
remaining gathering is difficult to ascertain because of later restorations of the parchment. However, fol. 1 appears to form a double leaf with fol. 6, while folios 7–8 are separate sheets.

The text starts on the recto of the first folio, with the letter written by Jerome to Ambrose (starting Frater Ambrosius, Stegmüller 284)²⁴ (fig. 1). This beautifully constructed page was decorated by the chief master of the Bible in a very characteristic Bolognese style. The images in this frontispiece are new versions of Parisian Bible illuminations. Dealing with the Incarnation (bottom medallions), the Church (Peter and Paul), and Jerome himself (top), these images contain nothing specific that would reveal the patron or the intended function of the Bible. All information indicating the identity of the commissioner—including his coats of arms—appears on fol. 5v (fig. 3). Here, the six days of Creation are illustrated in six quatrefoil frames on the center of the page, with three further scenes of Adam and Eve at the bottom right. At the bottom left of the page an elaborate donation scene was also incorporated, showing Demeter Nekcsei and his wife presenting a church to Christ. The coats of arms of Nekcsei are held by angels, depicted in the upper margin of the page. Codicological evidence indicates that this double leaf (comprising fol. 2 and fol. 5) was inserted once the other pages of the quire were completed. This change clearly took place in the same workshop where the rest of the book was made, as the very attractive miniatures on fol. 5 are the work of the same artist responsible for fol. 1. The word inserted has to be understood literally,
Expletur plag. Intrepit biblia et simul generis.
as the conjugate leaves 2 and 5 are full of signs indicating their somewhat later origin than the surrounding leaves. First of all, these four pages are written by a different scribe, who—while using the same type of gothic textura—uses different letter forms than his colleague. Some of the letters are more elaborate, and this scribe also crosses the tironian sign for ‘et’, while the other does not. Even more telling is the way the text is arranged on these leaves. Fol. 2r follows where the first scribe left off on fol. 1v, and the next scribe apparently continued the work all the way to the bottom of fol. 2v. Then, as he was starting chapter 6 of Jerome’s prologue (Videlicet...) in line 20, he suddenly realized he only needed two more lines, as the rest of the text already follows on fol. 3. He therefore jumped to the bottom of the page (leaving ten lines empty), restarted the videlicet passage and wrote only the two lines needed (fig. 2). This same hand wrote the text on fol. 5 (which starts with Jerome’s prologue to the Genesis), where on the verso he had to deal with a different problem—this time there was not enough space to finish the text, presumably because of the large miniatures on the page. He had to add a few extra lines, and compress his text as much as possible (partially achieved by very heavy abbreviation) in the right column, so the already written text on fol. 6r could join his lines (fig. 3).

The process reconstructed in this form can only be interpreted one way: the original fol. 5v was probably a much more modest page, replaced (together with the conjoining second leaf) with the nicely decorated new frontispiece. This change apparently took place very soon after the other leaves of the folio were executed. Thus a fully illuminated Bible was almost certainly ready at the workshop, and when Nekcssei appeared as commissioner, a double-leaf with personalized decoration was inserted in the volume. This reconstruction of the making of the Bible challenges several elaborate theories concerning the illuminations and the identification of several coats of arms in the manuscript. In any case, this kind of embellishment of an already-existing manuscript can only be imagined in a well-run, professional workshop.

The workshop of the Bible

Illustration of the Bible was carried out by three illuminators, all working in a similar manner. The chief master painted the decoration of the two frontispieces (fol. 1 and fol. 5v), as well as the first part of the book, up to fol. 88r. From fol. 97, a different, somewhat less sophisticated artist follows, who decorated the next ten gatherings, up to fol. 169. In the next section (from fol. 204r, or perhaps already on fol. 185r) the work of the first master returns, up to fol. 272 (fig. 5). The next large part of the bible, a total of 31 gatherings from fol. 273r in the first volume to the middle of volume 2 (fol. 223r) is the work of the second master, while the end of the Bible, from fol. 237 to the end is the work of a third master. Most of the miniatures in the Bible belong to the common repertoire of Bolognese illuminators.
and the style of illumination is most closely related to books painted in the work-
shop of the “Master of 1328.” The main painter of the Nekcsei Bible was a close
associate of the Master of 1328, and his work can be detected in a number of
other Bolognese manuscripts as well.

Thanks to the research of Robert Gibbs, the stylistic place of the Nekcsei
Bible is now quite clear. Gibbs dubbed the main master of the Nekcsei Bible the
“Hungarian Master”. The origin of his style can be found in the art of the some-
what enigmatic Nerio, who signed a copy of the Codex of Justinian (Paris, Bib-
liothèque Nationale Ms. Lat. 8941). The most famous of Nerio’s works have
survived in Bohemian libraries (the Vyší Brod and the St Vitus Gratian manu-
scripts), and date from the second decade of the 14th century. Nerio and his
associates later worked on the decoration of the S. Domenico choir books, and it
is here, on the decoration of choir book no. 11 that Gibbs first identifies the work
of the Hungarian Master. His style developed from that of Nerio before 1320. He
was in all likelihood closely associated with the other leading illuminator of the
time, the Master of 1328. Just like Nerio, this group of illuminators had regular
contacts throughout Central Europe, and artists close to the Master of 1328 for
example worked on the choir books of St. Florian (1320–25). According to
Gibbs, another early work of the Hungarian master is the so-called “Buried De-
cretals,” auctioned at Sotheby’s in London in 1991, in which he worked in con-
junction with (as an assistant of?) a more conservative First Style master. The
decoration of a later work from the late 1330s, a copy of Guillaume Durandus’s
“Speculum Iudiciale” (Treviso, Biblioteca Comunale, Ms. 172), was executed by
the Hungarian Master (first seven gatherings) and the Illustratore. The style of
both artists also appears in one of the chief works of the Master of 1328, the Turin
Digest (Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria Ms. E.I.1). The Hungarian Master
was demonstrably influenced both by the Master of 1328 and subsequently by the
Illustratore. In the Nekcsei Bible, the Hungarian master was clearly the leading
artist, illuminating the frontispieces and much of the first part of the book. He
worked with an assistant, who was heavily dependent on him (described as the
“second master” above). This second artist executed much of the Cesena “Volu-
men” (Biblioteca Malatestiana Ms. S. IV. 1). A later work from the workshop of
the Hungarian Master is the beautifully illuminated copy of the Roman de Troie
(Public Library of Russia, St Petersburg, Fr.F.v.XIV.3). The workshop—perhaps
adding new members—later executed the Hungarian Angevin Legendary, this time
working already under the influence of the Illustratore. The Illustratore himself
worked for Miklós Vásári in 1343.

The anomalies in the system of decoration noted above, the rapid modifica-
tion this workshop was capable of, as well as the stylistic context of the manuscript
unveiled by Gibbs suggest that the Bible of Demeter Nekcsei was most likely ex-
cuted in Bologna. The strongest argument against the Bolognese origin is pre-
sented by the northern (as opposed to Bolognese) script used throughout the
book. Several scribes and rubricators worked on the manuscript, and several
corrections appear in the book. Although we can observe a number of different hands, the script is the same throughout. These are typical signs of Bolognese workshop traditions, where work was distributed by gatherings. Bologna most likely had plenty of scribes (including perhaps university students of Northern origin), who could have used this script when working for patrons from the North. The successful execution of this Bible may have led to the commissioning of this same workshop for the largest manuscript project of 14th-century Hungary, the creation and illumination of the Hungarian Angevin Legendary. These and other Bolognese illuminators may have come to Hungary in the end not for making the Bible of Nekcsei, but for the making of the Angevin Legendary.

The Commission

Although Demeter Nekcsei—like many of his contemporaries—may have studied for some time at the University of Bologna, he was certainly not in Italy at the time of the commission, c. 1335–1338. The manuscript must have been brought to Hungary by someone from his retinue, perhaps by someone studying in Bologna. The idea of commissioning from a Bolognese workshop might have been suggested to him by ecclesiastical figures close to the court, such as Miklós Dörögdí, who was rector of the ultramontane students in Bologna in 1316–17 or Miklós Vásári. This group of clerics may have been instrumental in the creation of the Hungarian Angevin Legendary as well. While this part of the story may never be deciphered, we can still speculate about the intended function of the manuscript.

The iconography of the frontispiece miniature clearly indicates that the commission of the Bible can be associated with its donation to a church or monastic institution. The image shows Demeter Nekcsei and his wife, Katalin Garai offering a church to the Virgin (fig. 4). This church has been variously—but always incorrectly—identified. The current theory, proposed by Dezső Dercsényi and Tünde Wehli, states that the Bible was destined for the Pauline hermitage of Csatár in Baranya county in Hungary, which Nekcsei had founded. However, we have no knowledge of any monastic institution at Csatár, definitely not anything founded by Demeter Nekcsei. A document from 1334 mentions an earlier donation of the Nekcsei-brothers, Demeter and Sándor, of property in the village of Csatár to “Fratres heremitarum de ecclesia S. Crucis et S. Salvatoris”. This Pauline monastery, dedicated to the Holy Cross and the Saviour can readily be identified with the one variously known as Keresztúr or Bodrogsziget. Bodrogsziget was near Csatár and south of Baranyavár, on an island in the Danube. First mentioned in 1282, it must have been founded some time before that, and is thus one of the earliest Pauline houses of Hungary. The island belonged to Baranya County and thus to the diocese of Pécs. As the text of the 1334 donation charter specifies, Demeter Nekcsei and his son-in-law, Pál Garai, were the patrons of Bodrogsziget monastery, and Nekcsei may possibly have chosen it as his burial place, although
there is no proof of this. His will, dating from 3 May 1336, provides no clues.\textsuperscript{43} The brother of Demeter, Sándor Nekcsei, who died before 1326, chose to be buried next to the tomb of Saint Ladislas in the Cathedral of Várad (Oradea, RO).\textsuperscript{44}

Another possibility exists, which seems more plausible, although, like the other theories, it cannot be proven by clear documentary evidence. Given his position, Demeter Nekcsei spent most of his life in the royal court (he owned a house in Visegrád). Nevertheless, we know the town of Nekcse (Našice, CR) in the southern part of the former Baranya County was important to him, since the family owned property there. Moreover, in 1310 Sándor, the older brother of Demeter, received the former property of the Templars there in 1310 (a location known as Nekcseszentmárton). This donation was again confirmed by the king in 1312, and Sándor also received permission from the king to build a castle at this location (castrum ... constmere). Soon after that, the two brothers, who belonged to the Lipóc-branch of the Aba clan, start calling themselves “of Nekcse”, although their predecessors were known as “of Lipóc”. The town of Nekcse remained in their possession through the entire 14th century.\textsuperscript{45} In 1316, a Franciscan friary was mentioned in the town of Nekcse—in all likelihood founded by the Nekcsei brothers after the town had become the principal center of their estates.\textsuperscript{46} The church—although rebuilt—still stands, awaiting investigation. Demeter may have chosen the Franciscan church of Nekcse as his resting place, and this church may have been the recipient of the lavishly illuminated Bolognese Bible.

\textbf{NOTES}


5 B. Zs. Szakács, “The Holy Father and the Devils, or could the Hungarian Angevin Legendary have been Ordered for a Pope?” in ... The Man of Many Devices, Who Wandered Full Many Ways... Festschrift in Honor of János M. Bak, Budapest 1999, 52–60.
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13 Washington, Library of Congress, Med. Mss. No.1. Throughout this study, we will simply refer to the manuscript as the “Nékcsei Bible”. See Schutzner (n. 2 above), 29–35.
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16 See also M. Harrsen, Central European Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York 1958.

17 See Nekcsei-Biblia (n. 2 above).
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23 See the collation in Schutzner (n. 2 above), 31.


25 The most convincing of these identifications concerns the shield on fol. 117r, which has been identified with the coat of arms of the Kakas and Köcski families: Dercsényi (n. 15 above, Nekcsei Demeter), 118. For further, much less certain identifications, see Gy. Szabó, Középkori magyar címerek emlékek Amerikában I.: A Nekcsei Biblia XIV. századi címerei, Warren 1959 (offprint from Fáklya). Levár’dy in his commentary to the facsimile edition saw the personal role of Nekcsei in the initial to fol. 265r (book of Nehemias), see Nekcsei-Biblia (n. 2 above), 56.

26 The folio numbers mentioned here are those in which the large initials enable us to grasp the character of the painters, and not the first folios of the gatherings in question. For collation, see Schutzner (n. 2 above), 31.


30 Gerhard Schmidt proposed a much more direct link between the Bolognese artists working in St. Florian and the workshop of the Nekcsei Bible, proposing that illuminators traveled from St. Florian to Hungary; see G. Schmidt, *Die Malerschule von St. Florian—Beiträge zur süddeutschen Malerei zu Ende des 13. und im 14. Jahrhundert*, Graz 1962, 135–43.

31 Gibbs (n. 28 above), 217–19.

32 St Petersburg, Public Library of Russia, Fr.F.v.XIV.3 (Benoit de Sainte-Maure, Le Roman de la guerre de Troie), see T. Voronova-A. Sterligov, *Western European Illuminated Manuscripts of the 8th to the 16th Centuries in the National Library of Russia*, St Petersburg, Bournemouth–St Petersburg 1996, 245–51, figs. 317–28. I thank Susan L'Engle for calling my attention to this manuscript.

33 Conti (n. 7 above), 92.

34 Gibbs (n. 12 above, Bolognese Manuscripts), 75. Interestingly, foreign researchers—including Harrsen, Gnudi, Gibbs and Schutzner—suggest that this workshop was active in Hungary, while recent Hungarian research often localizes the making of both the Bible and the Angevin Legendary to Bologna, see for example T. Wehli, “Megjegyzések a Magyar Anjou Legendárium stílusának kérdéséhez,” *Ars Hungarica XIX*, 1991, 141–48, and—even more forcefully—idem (n. 4 above), 77.


38 Meta Harrsen suggested the Priory at Óbuda, dedicated to St Peter and Paul, while Ferenc Levárday thought of the church at Gyöngyöspata—both without any documentary evidence.

39 This is based on the biographical article of Antal Pór, who talks of the Pauline monastery dedicated to the Holy Cross and the Saviour, to which Nekcsei donated the property of Csatár, see Pór (n. 3 above). See Dercsényi (n. 15 above, Nekcsei Demeter), 122–123; idem, “A Nekcsei-Biblia kora és története,” in the study booklet accompanying the *Nekcsei-Bible* (n. 2 above), 8–9. In this commentary on the facsimile edition, Csatár is mentioned as being in Zala County due to an unfortunate editorial error. The Benedictine Abbey of Csatár (Zala) is of course associated with another famous Bible, the so-called Admont Bible (Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Ser. nov. 2701–2702), see T. Wehli, “Admonti Biblia,” in *Három kódex* (n. 4 above), 19–70, and A. Fingernagel, *Die Admonter Riesenbibel*, Graz 2001. The Pauline monastery of Csatár in Baranya is mentioned by Wehli several times as the place for which the Bible was commissioned; see *Magyarországi művészet 1300–1470 körül*, vol. I., ed. E. Marosi, Budapest 1987, 364; Hoffmann–Wehli (n. 7 above), 221.

40 1334: *Anjoukor okmánytár. Codex diplomaticus Hungaricus Andegavensis*, vol. III. (1333–1339), ed. I. Nagy, Budapest 1883, 116: “Fratres heremitarum de ecclesia S. Crucis”. In 1377, the monastery is mentioned as: “Claustrum S. Crucis de insula Danubii” (Budapest, Magyar Országos Levéltár, DL. 6395).

42 Some confusion was also caused by the presence of another monastery on the other bank of the river, in Bodrog County. Variously known as Bodrogmonostor, Monostorszeg or Szentpéter-monostor, this Benedictine monastery stood near the castle of Bodrog, and was dedicated to St Peter. An important group of 11th-century stone carvings—described at the time of their discovery as originating in the Pauline monastery of Bodrogsziget (Keresztúr)—most likely comes from the early building of this Benedictine abbey, for which we have no written sources prior to the 14th century. See S. Tóth, “Az aracsi kő rokonsága,” in A középkori Dél-Alföld és Szer, ed. T. Kollár, Szeged 2000, 429–47.

43 Pórá (n. 3 above).


45 For the castle, see Engel (n. 3 above, 1996), vol. I., 375. The date the actual castle was built is uncertain, as the structure is first mentioned only near the end of the 14th century. The castle was not in the town, but some distance away, in present-day Bedemgrad (CR).

A little less than fifty years ago, shortly after completing my studies at Budapest University, I spent a fruitful year of voluntary service at the Budapest Museum of Fine Arts, where I began to develop my interest in early Italian painting. My supervisor (I might say my guardian angel), Miklós Mojzer, a young assistant curator, greatly encouraged my growing inclination for gold-ground pictures, through stimulating discussions of the items belonging to the Museum and also of other works by Italian ‘primitives’ he had seen in Hungarian private collections.

Among the latter was the painting I am going to illustrate here: a fine bust of the Mourning St John (fig. 1) whose attribution was, of course, a problem I could not solve at that time. What immediately struck me, however, was the saint’s nobly reserved conduct: he expresses his anguish without pathos or theatricality, merely knitting his brow slightly and raising his apparently-trembling right hand in a gesture of helplessness.1

From then on, I kept a photograph of the painting in my files, classified—following the advice of another dear friend, Carlo Volpe—among the anonymous Venetian painters. Returning to the image from time to time, I found it so intense, so ready to communicate, almost as if it were a portrait, that I gradually came to the conclusion it could only be by one of the leading masters of the Venetian Trecento. It was therefore a great disappointment, mingled with disbelief, to learn that the painting had been published in the catalogue of an exhibition in Budapest with the misleading attribution to a Sienese artist close to Niccolò di Ser Sozzo.2

As to the painting’s original position, it must have been the right-hand tabella of a painted Crucifix: its original trefoil shape, although now deprived of its engaged frame and integrated with a half roundel on the left side (where it was linked to the now lost Cros), is a recurring peculiarity of Venetian painted Crucifixes in the 13th and 14th centuries, as is proven by a number of surviving examples.3 St John may assume in them essentially three types of pose: he leans his face on the palm of his right hand; he raises his clasped hands towards his Master; or he makes the gesture seen in the painting discussed here, as in another, smaller painted Crucifix by Paolo Veneziano in the church of St Nicholas, Traù (fig. 4).4
Such images were produced in several versions in the first half of the 14th century. Their stylistic character and their Venetian workmanship offer important points of reference for our fragment. Strong support for their stylistic ties with Paolo’s circle comes from the minuscule dotted decoration of the Saint’s halo. Similar motives, indeed, gradually disappear from the ornamental repertory of paintings by the mid-century. Various features of the painting, however, particularly the delicacy of the pictorial rendering of the flesh parts, the softness of the clothes the Saint is wearing, and the intensity of characterization of his tormented state of mind, show that the author of our fragment was not simply a follower or workshop assistant of Paolo Veneziano. These aspects share the exceptionally high quality of the artist’s autograph works.

Recognizing Paolo’s direct responsibility, however, the problem of the Budapest fragment’s chronological position in his output remains to be solved. Muraro and Pallucchini considered some sixty of Paolo’s whole altarpieces or components of larger paintings, devotional panels and manuscript illuminations as products of his workshop, while Pedrocco, in his recent monograph, recognizes thirty-one as autograph works by the artist’s own hand. Paolo was last mentioned as still living in 1358 and we know that by 1362 he was certainly dead, but his birth date is unknown. Opinions vary considerably about how many years or decades of activity must have preceded the execution of his first signed and dated work, the frag-
2. Paolo Veneziano: *The mourning Virgin* (part from the *Pala Feriale*), Venice, Museo di San Marco

and modelled by a chiaroscuro with graduated shadows and intense highlights that recalls the way of rendering the suppleness of skin in the figures of the *Pala feriale*. The physiognomic type which characterizes the Budapest *St John*, with longish fleshy nose, firm lips, rounded chin and hair that curls with the ductility of wire, also recurs in Paolo’s San Marco altarpiece, where the slightly bent and twisted poses of the busts of the saints in the upper row (fig. 2) are another point of similarity. The distinctively naturalistic approach of these figures, just like those which populate the slightly earlier panels with *Stories of St Nicholas* in the Contini Bonacossi Bequest in the Uffizi, differentiates them from the figures thronging the Vicenza panels of 1333, and especially from the aristocratic refinement of both the gestures and the elongated proportions of the figures in works by the art-

mentary altarpiece of 1333 in the Museo Civico in Vicenza. If, as believed by Pallucchini (rightly in my opinion), the figures of donors painted on the relief of St Donatus, dated 1310 (Murano, Santi Maria e Donato), attest to an early phase in Paolo’s art, his career must have extended for half a century. Yet very few of his paintings are connected to a firm date, and all of these are from relatively late in his career.

Despite the uncertainties of Paolo’s chronology, I believe that the now-lost *Crucifix* of which the *Mourning St John* once formed part must have been produced around the same time as the *Pala feriale* of San Marco in Venice, which bears the date 1345 (fig. 3). The forms of the body are outlined by the same softly-modulated, fluent contours

3. Paolo Veneziano: *The discovery of St Marc’s relics* (part from the *Pala Feriale*), Venice, Museo di San Marco
ist from around mid-century, such as the panels of the Chioggia polyptych of 1349; the latter tendency is absent from the fragment of Crucifix being discussed here.

The artist's attention to the truthfulness of details, such as the fingers of St John sinking into the hem of the cloak he clutches with his left hand, can be found in Paolo's paintings dating from the late 1330s or early 1340s, such as the Madonna and Child in the Museo Diocesano in Padua and in the panel with the same subject from the church of Sant'Alvise, now in the Accademia in Venice, where realistic observations enliven the description of faces and particular attention is given to the rendering of the material substance of draperies. What seems to me particularly close in these paintings, however, is the extremely fine quality level of the execution, combined with the intensity of emotion that the characters emanate: each of them fully deserves to be considered a work by Paolo's own hand. There remains the question whether there survive other parts of the original Crucifix from which the Budapest fragment came. It would be tempting to identify it as the lost terminal tabella of Paolo's Crucifix from the Venetian church of San Samuele (at present in the church of Santo Stefano), but the St John Mourning panel seems somewhat too large, and in any case, stylistic considerations would place the Venetian Crucifix in a later phase of Paolo's career. So, for the time being, this hitherto unrecognized masterpiece by Paolo Veneziano remains an isolated work, and we can only hope that future research may identify its companion pieces.

Notes
1 The panel, which used to belong to a private collection in Budapest, measures 60.5 x 60.8 cm. I am grateful to Anna Harangi and Vilmos Tátrai for providing further information about the painting.
2 The exhibition Válogatás magyar magangyűjteményekből was held in the Magyar Nemzeti Galéria (Hungarian National Gallery) in 1981. The painting discussed here figured as no. 2, “Sienese painter, c. 1350”.
3 M. Muraro, Paolo da Venezia, Milan 1969, cites four large-sized painted Crucifixes (pls. 11, 12, 14, 93) with trefoil termination, of the milieu of Paolo Veneziano, two of which are in Croatia. To these G. Gamulin's volume The Painted Crucifixes in Croatia, Zagreb 1983 adds a fifth (pl. 41), and the exhibition catalogue Il Trecento adriatico, Paolo Veneziano e la pittura tra oriente e occidente, ed. F. Flores d’Arcais–G. Gentili, Milan 2002, 178–79, a sixth, both of which belong to Croatian churches. A further example is the one in the church of San Giacomo dell'Orio in Venice.
4 See Muraro (n. 3 above), pl. 13.
5 The punched or incised halo decoration of 14th century Venetian paintings is still a very rarely investigated subject. See, however, the observations in M. S. Frinta, Punched Decoration. On Late Medieval Panel and Miniature Painting, vol. I., Prague 1998, 46, 56, 127, 128, 130, 146, 149, 480; also F. Pedrocco, Paolo Veneziano, Milan 2003, 110–112.
4. Paolo Veneziano: *Painted Cross*, Trogir (Traù), Monastery of St Nicholas
6 See R. Pallucchini, *La pittura veneziana del Trecento*, Venice–Rome 1964, 17–60; also Muraro (n. 3 above), 103–59. This latter scholar uses more frequently the specification “workshop” or “Paolo and workshop”; but in general neither Pallucchini nor Muraro suggests any rigid distinction between autograph and non-autograph works.

7 Pedrocco (n. 5 above), 134–207. The term “autograph works” is, of course, somewhat misleading as applied to 14th-century painting: it is hardly possible to exclude workshop assistance in the making of an altarpiece.


9 See Pallucchini (n. 6 above), 19–20.

10 See Pedrocco (n. 5 above), 86–93.

11 The altarpiece is signed and dated 1349. See ibid, 180–83.

12 Ibid, 160–63, with a dating around 1340.

13 Ibid, 158–59. The painting in its present state measures 163 × 108 cm. Pedrocco considers it was executed towards 1340, but the aristocratic refinement of the figure of Christ would suggest a later date, from the last decade of the artist’s activity.


Angesichts der geringen Zahl erhaltener Wiener Madonnen verdient ihre im Hof des Wohnhauses Wiedner Hauptstraße 36 verborgene – und deshalb so gut wie unbekannte – Schwester (Abb. 2, 3) einiges Interesse, obgleich ihr relativ schlechter Erhaltungszustand die Bestimmung ihres genuinen Stilcharakters erschwert. Diesem diffizilen Unterfangen sind die folgenden Zeilen gewidmet.

Dieser Zustand wurde rund zwanzig Jahre später in dem entsprechenden Band der Österreichischen Kunsttopographie beschrieben und abgebildet.\(^{11}\)

Diese besteht aus Kalksandstein der Region Au-Loretto (Au am Leithagebirge), was zu der Annahme berechtigt, sie sei in Wien selbst entstanden. Mit ihrer Höhe von 154 cm ist die Statue knapp lebensgroß, und das Verhältnis von Breite (58 cm) zu Tiefe (45 cm) belegt, dass wir es mit einem vollrunden Bildwerk zu tun haben, dessen Rückseite ursprünglich sorgfältig bearbeitet war. Über die Herkunft der Statue und ihre ursprüngliche Funktion ist leider nichts bekannt.

Zum Erhaltungszustand enthält der Restaurierungsbericht einige entmutigende Passagen: „Ergänzungen sind: Kopf der Madonna inklusive Hals, Jesuskind ab Nabel aufwärts, linke Hand der Maria bis Kleidärmel, ein großer Teil der Plinthe."
Darüber hinaus zahlreiche Kittungen entlang der Faltenwürfe des Mantels und des Kleides. Nach der Aufzählung weiterer kleiner Schäden heißt es abschließend: „Die formale Veränderung der Skulptur durch oben genannte Ergänzungen wird durch zusätzliche bildhauerische Überarbeitungen verstärkt (es dürften hier wohl schon einige Bildhauer die Figur überarbeitet haben), z. B. Schärpe, einige Faltenwürfe etc.“


Gekleidet ist Maria in ein rotes Gewand und einen blauen Mantel. Dieser wird vor der Brust von einer vergoldeten, vierpassförmigen Brosche zusammengehalten; darunter öffnet er sich weit, so dass er in der Frontalansicht der Statue (Abb. 2) nur an zwei Stellen markant in Erscheinung tritt: als schmale glatte Stoffbahn an der linken Flanke der Figur, wo er auch das leicht seitwärts gestellte Spielbein bedeckt, und rechts lediglich als das üppige Stoffgehänge unterhalb des Kindes. Maria rafft den Mantel mit beiden Armen: links mit dem Unterarm so, dass er sich etwas unter Kniehöhe teilt und in der Seitenansicht (Abb. 3) den Blick auf ein Stück des Untergewandes freigibt, während er rechts mit dem Ellbogen gegen die Hüfte gepresst und dann um den Unterkörper des Kindes gewickelt wird, um zuletzt noch die schon erwähnte Falten- und Saumkaskade auszubilden.

Das einzige Kostümdetail unserer Madonna, das schon für den ersten Blick befremdlich wirkt, ist der relativ lange, schräg vor dem Rumpf gezogene Teil ihres weißen, von vergoldeten Rüschen gesäumten Schleiers. Das Motiv eines derart schräg angeordneten Schleierzipfels ist zwar selten, aber nicht einzigartig; es begegnet uns – obschon weniger auffällig und viel überzeugender gestaltet – auch an der Madonnenstatue der Friesacher Dominikanerkirche, die in den dreißiger Jahren des 14. Jahrhunderts entstanden sein dürfte (Abb. 4). Dort fließt die eine Hälfte des Schleiertuches von der linken Schulter schräg vor die Brust, während sich die andere auf der rechten Schulter staut. Bei unserer Statue hingegen fällt der Schleier nicht zu beiden Seiten des Kopfes herab; vielmehr verschwindet er hinter der linken Schulter Mariä zur Gänze, um dann in voller Breite über den rechten
4. Friesach, Dominikanerkirche, Madonnenstatue
(Foto: Wien, Bundesdenkmalamt)
Oberarm gezogen und wie eine breite Schärpe vor den Rumpf gelegt zu werden. Von schmächtigen, parallel verlaufenden Faltenstegen nur oberflächlich geglie­
dert, schmiegt er sich dem Körper wie angeklebt an und endet – als Rechteck mit
leicht abgerundeten Ecken – abrupt an der linken Hüfte der Figur. Unter allen
Kostümdetails unserer Madonna ist er das einzige, das dem gotischen Formemp­
finden so deutlich widerspricht, dass wir annehmen müssen, er verdanke seine
heutige Gestaltung einer der diversen nachmittelalterlichen Überarbeitungen der
Statue.

Dennoch ist dieser schärpenartig vor den Leib gezogene Schleier gewiss nicht
zur Gänze von einem Restaurator „erfunden“, sondern nur teilweise falsch inter­
pretiert worden. Bei schärfem Hinsehen bemerkt man denn auch unterhalb des
Schleiersaumes in der linken Leistenbeuge der Figur einen senkrecht nach unten
weisenden Stoffzipfel, der heute, da rot eingefärbt, als Teil des Kleides erscheint,
zu dem er sich jedoch in keine plausible Beziehung setzen lässt (Abb. 5). Es ist
dieses unerklärliche Stück Stoff, das ursprünglich den letzten Zipfel des Schleiers
gebildet haben dürfte; dieser wird also die linksseitige Mantelbahn gar nicht über­
lappt haben, sondern wird bereits neben ihr in einer schlaffen Kurve herabgefal­
len sein.

Die heute praktisch unsichtbare Rückseite der Statue wurde durch die jüngste
Restaurierung offenbar nur wenig verändert; sie wirkt weder gereinigt noch ist sie
farbig gefasst. Immerhin kann man dort noch den Verlauf des unteren Schleiersaumes
von der linken Schulter zum rechten Oberarm verfolgen und darunter eine
Kaskade voluminoser Zug- und Schüsselfalten erkennen, die sich zwingend aus der beidseitigen Raffung des Mantels ergaben.\(^{17}\)


Da unsere Madonna darauf verzichtet, eine Bahn ihres Mantels vor dem Körper zu raffen, dominiert die Vertikale auch in ihrem Faltensystem. Dabei wird zwischen Untergewand und Mantel hinsichtlich der textilen Qualität nicht differenziert: Beide Kleidungsstücke bestehen gleichermaßen aus relativ schweren, nur wenig geschmeidigen Stoffen, die zur Bildung lotrecht verlaufender, in Bodennähe steif umknickender Röhrenfalten neigen. Schmächtigere Faltenstege werden nur quasi synkopisch zur Belebung verschatteter Faltenmulden eingesetzt. Vereinzelte Bündel zarter Zugfalten schließlich bilden sich um den Unterkörper des Kindes sowie unterhalb der linken Brust und – von der Ellenbeuge ausgehend – am linken Oberarm der Mutter (Abb. 3). Wo der Mantel gerafft wird, verlaufen die vergoldeten Säume ungemein kurvenreich, was heute den Gesamteindruck der Figur erheblich bereichert.\(^{18}\)


Festzuhalten ist zunächst, dass unsere Figur keinerlei formale Verwandtschaft mit einer jener fünf Wiener Madonnen des 14. Jahrhunderts erkennen lässt, die ich einleitend genannt habe. Anders als diese erweist sie sich jedoch als stilverwandt mit einem Werk der zeitgenössischen Monumentalplastik: Es ist das Tympanonrelief über dem rechten Westportal der Wiener Minoritenkirche, in dem wir auf Figuren von sehr ähnlicher Gestaltung treffen. Ehe wir diese These durch Vergleiche erhärten, müssen wir allerdings kurz auf die ereignisreiche Geschichte des Skulpturenschmuckes an der Westfassade der genannten Kirche eingehen.\(^{22}\)


Das Bogenfeld des rechten Portals blieb auch nach der Vermauerung der Türe
noch sichtbar, und eben deshalb dürfte es durch Bilderfeinde beschädigt worden
sein, als die Kirche von 1559 bis 1620 unter protestantischer Verwaltung stand.
Vermutlich in diesen Jahren hat man schließlich noch das ganze Tympanon mit
seinem als anstößig empfundenen Bildprogramm zugemörtelt − und es so nicht
nur vor der völligen Zerstörung, sondern auch vor jenen Überarbeitungen beha−
wahrt, denen die Skulpturen des Hauptportals ausgesetzt waren. Denn erst im
Jahre 1903, also ganz zu Ende der Luntzschen Renovierungskampagne, wurde das
Bogenfeld wieder freigelegt, und glücklicherweise hat man damals darauf verzich−
tet, es zu restaurieren. So ist es das einzige Bildwerk geblieben, das uns − ungeach−
tet seiner Beschädigungen − den Stil der Minoritenwerkstatt im Wesentlichen
unverfälscht überliefert.

Dass dieser Stil nicht bodenständig ist, sondern sehr französisch anmutet, hat
man seit jeher gesehen; bestätigt wurde diese Einschätzung durch das Totenbuch
der Minoriten, demzufolge ein Bruder Jacobus von Paris − freilich in einer nicht
näher bezeichneten Funktion − an der Errichtung der Portale maßgeblich betei−
ligt war. Trotzdem neigten ältere Autoren wie Kieslinger und Ginhart dazu, den
französischen Einfluß durch Vergleiche mit ähnlich konzipierten Portalen in
Deutschland und den Hinweis auf eine mögliche italienische Komponente zu
relativieren. Letztere ist freilich ausschließlich ikonographischer Natur, insofern
die Darstellung der Stigmatisierung jener Formel folgt, die durch das entsprechende
Fresko in der Oberkirche zu Assisi (sowie durch die themengleichen Gemälde
Giottos) quasi kanonisiert worden war; die formale Gestaltung der Figuren aber
hat mit der Plastik des Trecento nichts zu tun und lässt sich unmittelbar aus
Frankreich ableiten.26

Stellt man nun unsere Madonna den zwei weiblichen Heiligen aus dem Bo−
genfeldrelief gegenüber, ist die Stilverwandtschaft der drei Figuren nicht zu über−
sehen (Abb. 1, 2). Vor allem die hl. Klara mit ihrem leicht schwingenden Körper,
der, sich verjüngend, über einem breiten Gewandsockel aufragt, ist von ganz ähn−
lichem Wuchs wie die Gestalt Mariä; Klaras schmale Schultern, der vorne offen
fallende, scharf seidich geraffte Mantel mit seinen mäandernden Säumen und die
Dominanz vertikaler, erst knapp über dem Boden umknickender Faltenstege in
ihrem Gewand unterstreichen die Ähnlichkeit der beiden Figuren. Weniger un−
mittelbar vergleichbar ist die hl. Elisabeth in ihrem leicht schwingenden Körper,
dem, sich verjüngend, über einem breiten Gewandsockel aufragt, ist von ganz ähn−
llichem Wuchs wie die Gestalt Mariä; Klaras schmale Schultern, der vorne offen
fallende, scharf seidich geraffte Mantel mit seinen mäandernden Säumen und die
dominanz vertikaler, erst knapp über dem Boden umknickender Faltenstege in
ihrem Gewand unterstreichen die Ähnlichkeit der beiden Figuren. Weniger un−
mittelbar vergleichbar ist die hl. Elisabeth in ihrem leicht schwingenden Körper,
dem, sich verjüngend, über einem breiten Gewandsockel aufragt, ist von ganz ähn−
llichem Wuchs wie die Gestalt Mariä; Klaras schmale Schultern, der vorne offen
fallende, scharf seidich geraffte Mantel mit seinen mäandernden Säumen und die
dominanz vertikaler, erst knapp über dem Boden umknickender Faltenstege in
ihrem Gewand unterstreichen die Ähnlichkeit der beiden Figuren. Weniger un−
mittelbar vergleichbar ist die hl. Elisabeth in ihrem leicht schwingenden Körper,
dem, sich verjüngend, über einem breiten Gewandsockel aufragt, ist von ganz ähn−
llichem Wuchs wie die Gestalt Mariä; Klaras schmale Schultern, der vorne offen
fallende, scharf seidich geraffte Mantel mit seinen mäandernden Säumen und die
dominanz vertikaler, erst knapp über dem Boden umknickender Faltenstege in
ihrem Gewand unterstreichen die Ähnlichkeit der beiden Figuren. Weniger un−
mittelbar vergleichbar ist die hl. Elisabeth in ihrem leicht schwingenden Körper,
dem, sich verjüngend, über einem breiten Gewandsockel aufragt, ist von ganz ähn−
llichem Wuchs wie die Gestalt Mariä; Klaras schmale Schultern, der vorne offen
fallende, scharf seidich geraffte Mantel mit seinen mäandernden Säumen und die
dominanz vertikaler, erst knapp über dem Boden umknickender Faltenstege in
ihrem Gewand unterstreichen die Ähnlichkeit der beiden Figuren. Weniger un−
mittelbar vergleichbar ist die hl. Elisabeth in ihrem leicht schwingenden Körper,
dem, sich verjüngend, über einem breiten Gewandsockel aufragt, ist von ganz ähn−
llichem Wuchs wie die Gestalt Mariä; Klaras schmale Schultern, der vorne offen
fallende, scharf seidich geraffte Mantel mit seinen mäandernden Säumen und die
dominanz vertikaler, erst knapp über dem Boden umknickender Faltenstege in
ihrem Gewand unterstreichen die Ähnlichkeit der beiden Figuren. Weniger un−
mittelbar vergleichbar ist die hl. Elisabeth in ihrem leicht schwingenden Körper,
dem, sich verjüngend, über einem breiten Gewandsockel aufragt, ist von ganz ähn−
llichem Wuchs wie die Gestalt Mariä; Klaras schmale Schultern, der vorne offen
fallende, scharf seidich geraffte Mantel mit seinen mäandernden Säumen und die
dominanz vertikaler, erst knapp über dem Boden umknickender Faltenstege in
ihrem Gewand unterstreichen die Ähnlichkeit der beiden Figuren. Weniger un−
mittelbar vergleichbar ist die hl. Elisabeth in ihrem leicht schwingenden Körper,
dem, sich verjüngend, über einem breiten Gewandsockel aufragt, ist von ganz ähn−

tümlich steif und befangen – ein Eindruck, der sich nur zu einem geringen Teil durch die erlittenen Restaurierungen und die modernen Köpfe von Mutter und Kind erklären lässt. Unsere Madonnenstatue ist also gewiss nicht von dem führenden (vielleicht aus Frankreich berufenen) Meister der Minoritenwerkstatt geschaffen worden, sondern von einem seiner lokalen Mitarbeiter, der sich die Formensprache dieses Ateliers angeeignet hatte.

Das Tympanonrelief des rechten Seitenportals der Minoritenkirche dürfte um 1345–1350 entstanden sein; deshalb wird man die von diesem Werk abhängige Muttergottes kaum vor 1350 datieren dürfen. Jedenfalls erweist sie sich als relativ frühes Derivat der Minoritenwerkstatt, die ja in Wien noch bis zum Beginn des siebenten Jahrzehnts aktiv bleiben und mit den Statuen von Maria am Gestade einen zweiten Höhepunkt erreichen sollte.27 Auch wenn wir nicht wissen, für welches Wiener Gotteshaus sie ursprünglich bestimmt war, ist unsere Madonna ein weiterer Beleg für den bedeutenden Anteil, den dieses ursprünglich französisch inspirierte Atelier an der bildhauerischen Produktion Wiens im mittleren 14. Jahrhundert hatte.
Anmerkungen


2 Zu dieser Statue vgl. H. Schweigert, in G. Brucher (Hg.), *Gotik* (Geschichte der bildenden Kunst in Österreich, Bd. 2), München u.a. 2000, 326 f. mit Abb.

3 Schweigert *ebenda*, 332 f. mit Abb.


5 L. Schultes in Brucher (wie Anm. 2), 351 f. mit Abb.

6 Schultes *ebenda*, 349 f. mit Abb.


8 Zwischen der Familienmadonna der Minoriten und der Dienstbotenmadonna besteht nur eine ikonographisch-typologische Übereinstimmung hinsichtlich des um das Kind gewickelten Schleiers Mariä.

9 Zu St. Stephan siehe Brucher (wie Anm. 2), 303–305 und 329–331, zur Minoritenkirche *ebenda*, 305 f. und 342 f.

10 Hierzu vgl. Ginhart (wie Anm. 4), 9 f. Der Autor referiert ausführlich über seinen Fund, bildet die Statue jedoch nicht ab.


12 Für die Übermittlung des Restaurierungsberichtes (GZ. 7914/1/95 vom 20.1.1995) bin ich Herrn Dr. Friedrich Dahm vom Wiener Landeskonservatorat zu Dank verpflichtet.


15 Ob sich die heutige Farbgebung auf Spuren einer ursprünglichen Polychromie berufen kann, geht aus dem Restaurierungsbericht von 1995 nicht hervor.

16 Zu dieser Figur siehe Brucher (wie Anm. 2), 337 f.
17 Diese Angaben über die jetzt unzugängliche Rückseite der Statue wurden mir durch Fotos ermöglicht, die Frau Mag. Michaela Schuller mit viel Geschick angefertigt hat.

18 Gegenwärtig ist nur der bodennahe Saum des Mantels vergoldet, und nur dieser kommt in den Raffungen zur Geltung; die lotrechten Säume beiderseits der Mantelöffnung blieben ohne diese Verzierung. Ob diese Unterscheidung dem Originalzustand entspricht, dürfte sich heute nicht mehr feststellen lassen.

19 Wie Anm. 4.


21 Diese mit altertümelnden Ziffern geschriebene Pseudo-Datierung wurde offenbar von einem kunsthistorisch gut informierten Restaurator angebracht.


23 Vgl. Ginhart (wie Anm. 4), Abb. 16.

24 Vgl. Brucher (wie Anm. 2), Abb. auf 74.

25 Das ganze Bogenfeld bei Ginhart (wie Anm. 4), Abb. 21.


Ce n’est pas seulement au grand médiéviste hongrois que je voudrais dédier ces quelques lignes, mais aussi au collègue qui, en 1996, a été chargé par le gouvernement hongrois alors que j’étais désigné moi-même par les autorités luxembourgeoises, afin de concevoir une grande exposition consacrée à Sigismond. Après avoir été ajouronné dans un premier temps, le projet verra finalement le jour dix ans plus tard.1


La question du portrait médiéval, sculpté ou peint, est particulièrement délicate : après une première phase historiographique de “découverte” inaugurée par l’article célèbre de Harald Keller publié en 1939 et qu’illustre encore le livre de Claire Richter Sherman sur Charles V de France où la notion de portrait ne semble pas faire problème, on est entré avec les décennies 1980 et 1990 dans une phase nouvelle.3 La caractérisation d’une physionomie telle qu’elle se manifeste surtout à partir du XIIIe siècle, est alors considérée comme un phénomène en soi, qu’on cherche à distinguer du portrait intentionnel.4 En fait, il manque aujourd’hui une grande somme sur la typologie physionomique du Moyen Âge dont les perspectives seraient équivalentes à celles qu’ont tracées les travaux de spécialistes de l’Antiquité comme Luca Giuliani ou Paul Zanker.5

L’idée générale qui domine les études médiévales fait de la naissance du portrait un phénomène équivalent à celle du paysage qu’il faut situer l’une comme l’autre aux alentours de 1350. Une plus grande attention au réel, un nouveau sens
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de l'observation de la nature, consécutifs à l'influence de la philosophie aristotélicienne, expliqueraient ces changements. Mais l'observation de la nature est une chose, l'intérêt pour le portrait en est une autre. On a confondu, semble-t-il, sous le même terme générique de portrait — selon la définition du genre en usage après la Renaissance mais aussi consécutivement à un paradigme introduit par Jacob Burckhardt — des préoccupations artistiques tout à fait différentes. Les artistes de la fin du Moyen Âge manifestent un intérêt pour les figures expressives, parfois jusqu'à l'outrance, sans pour autant vouloir reproduire les traits d'une personne précise.

Le colloque organisé en 1999 à Francfort par Martin Büchsel a cherché à ouvrir de nouvelles voies. En particulier, en élargissant le problème de la physiognomonie tel que l’avait posé Lavater, à celui de la pathognonmie définie par Lichtenberg. La pathognonmie est une sorte de “sémiotique des affects”, selon les mots du philosophe, dont le visage et le corps forment les supports. Cette notion permet de mieux distinguer différents régimes de représentations individuelles et en particulier, de saisir les étapes progressives d’une caractérisation toujours plus poussée des relations entre les personnages figurés, ces relations étant exprimées par la mimique et la gestique. L’existence d’une “sémiotique des affects”, ne signifie pas pour autant qu’un visage expressif doive être rangé dans la catégorie des portraits. Cette confusion a peut-être d’autant plus facilement gagné l’historiographie de l’art médiéval, que le 13e siècle nous livre des sources textuelles sur l’importance de l’étude de la physiognomonie. Ainsi, Albertus Magnus réactualise d’une façon empirique l’intérêt que l’Antiquité accordait à l’interprétation morale des traits du visage.

C’est dans les textes de Duns Scot que la question de l’individuel et du singulier se trouve posée dans ses liens avec la représentation (mentale ou peinte). La connaissance d’une notion comme celle de l’homme en général passe nécessairement par la connaissance empirique de l’individuel qui est une concrétisation de l’existence universelle. La beauté corporelle se manifeste sous forme de grandeur, de figure ou de couleur : mais cela est vrai aussi bien pour l’animal que

2. Image d’un Apôtre (cycle des Capucins de Prague), Galerie Nationale, Prague (dépôt)
pour l’inorganique ou l’humain. Ce qui fait l’originalité de la pensée de Duns Scot, c’est l’importance qu’il accorde au caractère unique et singulier de la beauté individuelle. C’est une esthétique de l’haecceitas qui désigne l’ensemble des notes constitutives de l’individualité.9 Certes, on ne peut pas expliquer l’intérêt que les peintres manifestent pour les traits individuels aux XIVe et XVe siècles à l’aide de
la seule scolastique scotiste. Mais celle-ci exprime bien un des arrière-plans philosophiques et esthétiques sur lequel va se développer une nouvelle relation au singulier et à l’universel.

Je ne prétends pas reprendre ici les problèmes encore nombreux à mon sens, que pose le célèbre portrait de Sigismond du Kunsthistorisches Museum de Vienne (fig. 1). Dans les actes du colloque de 2005 à Luxembourg, Ulrike Jenni a, d’une façon très complète, abordé l’œuvre aux plans iconographique et technique.\(^{10}\) Il s’agit du seul portrait de l’empereur peint de son vivant et d’un portrait de souverain très précoc dans la peinture septentrionale. D’après les examens de réflectographie à l’infrarouge qu’elle publie, on doit convenir de la grande qualité de cette œuvre, y compris à son stade préparatoire. Le dessin sous-jacent tel qu’il apparaît lors de ces examens de laboratoire, confirme le soin avec lequel le peintre a modelé le visage et traité la coiffe si caractéristique de Sigismond. La technique du dessin au pinceau gris appliqué directement sur le parchemin sans couche préparatoire, n’incite pas nécessairement à voir en l’auteur un peintre du livre. Ulrike Jenni rappelle aussi les différents points de vue en présence quant à l’attribution de ce portrait à un artiste donné : mais ni Pisanello, ni Konrad Laib, ni le Maître du retable de Raigern à la Galerie nationale de Prague, n’offrent apparemment d’analogie, au stade des dessins préparatoires respectifs que l’on a pu examiner, avec le portrait de Sigismond. Cependant, je voudrais suggérer que le portrait de Vienne n’est pas sans analogie avec la technique de certaines têtes du cycle des Capucins de Prague, conservé aussi à la Galerie nationale. Il s’agit d’un ensemble de quatorze bustes (le Christ, la Vierge, Jean-Baptiste et les Apôtres) : les cheveux sont peints avec un soin remarquable, l’un après l’autre, mais rassemblés en volumes aérés spatialement cohérents (fig. 2). On oublie le travail quelque peu mécanique qui transparaît au vu de l’ensemble, grâce au traitement de la matière et de la lumière où le peintre se distingue comme un des grands artistes de ce début du 15\(^e\) siècle.\(^{11}\) Je me rallie volontiers à la thèse de Milena Bartlová qui voit la possibilité d’un atelier pragois qui serait à l’origine et du portrait de Sigismond et du cycle des Capucins de Prague, atelier qui aurait également répondu à des commandes de Sigismond.\(^{12}\)

La question de l’attribution ne me paraît cependant pas cruciale dans le cas de cette œuvre. Elle a peut-être même obnubilé à ce point les spécialistes qu’elle a fini par faire oublier les qualités véritables de ce portrait. Sa grande originalité s’impose lorsqu’on le compare aux “essais” antérieurs de portraits peints – comme le soi-disant portrait de Jean le Bon au Louvre, comme le portrait de Rodolphe IV d’Autriche à Vienne, comme les portraits de l’empereur Charles IV. Le buste coupé et l’ampleur conférée à la tête par la large coiffe de fourrure, mettent l’accent sur les traits du visage et l’expression du regard.

Les rapprochements qui ont été jadis suggérés entre ce tableau et les têtes d’Apôtres du cycle des Capucins à Prague restent valables, non pas pour des raisons stylistiques, mais surtout à cause de la parenté spirituelle qui les relie. Le peintre du portrait de Vienne a cherché à exploiter les possibilités expressives contenues dans
3. Pisanello: Portrait de Sigismond de Luxembourg, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, Inv. 2479
le choix du visage vu de trois-quarts. La forte présence plastique du buste est essentiellement obtenue par le traitement très subtil du col de fourrure et de la coiffe qui suggère la troisième dimension, à la différence du vêtement. Les zones d’ombre inscrites dans le mouvement tournant du col ou dans les pourtours de la coiffe, renforcent l’importance du visage.

On pourrait dire que le regard, tout entier tourné vers l’horizon d’une pensée, semble détacher le souverain des affaires du monde, tandis que sa bouche entrouverte signale l’imminence de la parole, soit sa présence au monde. Il s’agit littéralement d’une figure inspirée. Le Sigismond de Vienne offre ceci d’intéressant et d’unique dans la généalogie du portrait peint dans l’Europe de la première moitié du XVe siècle, qu’il occupe une position intermédiaire entre l'idéalisé de la figure du souverain et la vérité d’une physionomie existante. Si on le compare aux portraits de Rodolphe IV, de Charles V de France ou de Charles IV de Bohême, le portrait de Vienne témoigne d’un effort d’élévation à un plan spirituel du portrait de souverain, d’une transfiguration. Mais confronté aux bustes des Capucins de Prague, le portrait de Sigismond partage avec eux une sorte d’idéalité, qu’il ramène cependant à une dimension terrestre.

Autour de 1425–30, c’est dans les Pays-Bas méridionaux que se trouve formulée la nouvelle réalité dont la peinture se veut l’expression privilégiée. Cette réalité est celle que mettent en scène Robert Campin et les frères Van Eyck. Ils ont rompu d’une façon radicale avec l’artificialité et l’exaltation d’une beauté purifiée qui dominaient les cours européennes quelques années plus tôt. Le portrait de Sigismond est d’une certaine façon un exemple remarquable de cette tendance, mais ses liens avec le gothique raffiné des environs de 1400 sont encore visibles. C’est la raison pour laquelle plusieurs historiens de Pisanello lui ont attribué cette œuvre. Je ne prétends pas revenir à cette thèse qui doit, me semble-t-il, être abandonnée, du moins dans l’état actuel de nos connaissances. Mais je voudrais m’intéresser à ce peintre, qui a vu Sigismond et l’a dessiné, pour tenter de saisir ce processus d’active interaction entre l’image paradigmaticque du souverain, telle que l’artiste cherche à l’établir, et le portrait individualisé de Sigismond.

Mon point de départ sera le dessin de l’Album rouge du Louvre (n° 2281, 4. Pisanello: Tête d’homme barbu, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, Inv. 2281
verso, fig. 4) qui, en quelques traits de plume griffés avec une remarquable spontanéité, fixe les caractéristiques identifiables du visage de Sigismond. Il s’agit d’une sorte d’instantané, tout comme la tête de profil (n° 2479) du même modèle, que Pisanello a pu exécuter à Rome lorsque le pape Eugène IV a coiffé Sigismond de la couronne impériale, le 31 mai 1433 (fig. 3). Dans le même album, une autre feuille

5. Pisanello: Tête d’homme barbu, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, Inv. 2621

L (n° 2621, fig. 5) montre une belle tête à la barbe courte bifide et aux cheveux bouclés, vue de trois quarts vers la gauche, qui fait immédiatement penser à la scène de l’Histoire de saint Georges de San Anastasia à Vérone, fresque que Pisanello a peinte entre 1433 et 1438 et où l’on voit une tête tout à fait analogue (fig. 6). Celle-ci a été à son tour rapprochée d’une tête de roi dans l’Adoration des Mages de Gentile da Fabriano aux Offices à Florence, datée de 1423, rapprochement qui n’a rien de surprenant lorsqu’on connaît les affinités entre Pisanello et ce peintre, durant ses œuvres de jeunesse. Se pose cependant l’épineux problème de la date et du caractère autographe du dessin n° 2621 : il ne paraît pas contestable qu’il s’agit d’une œuvre d’atelier, mais sa proximité avec la fresque de San Anastasia suppose que l’élève de Pisanello qui en est l’auteur, aurait repris un motif du maître antérieur aux fresques de Vérone et témoignant encore de la proximité de Gentile da Fabriano et de Pisanello lorsque celui-ci était à Venise.

Dans cette séquence formée par les dessins et les motifs analogues des peintures de Pisanello et Gentile di Fabriano, on pourrait se contenter de distinguer deux ensembles : celui de la tête due à l’élève de Pisanello et de son modèle (perdu) dû au maître, mais aussi de la tête de l’Histoire de saint Georges et de son alter ego, la tête du roi de Gentile da Fabriano. Après tout, un tel ensemble peut être interprété comme un type physionomique que Pisanello et son atelier auraient repris durant une longue période pour l’intégrer dans différentes compositions. Comme l’avait relevé B. Degenhart, le carnet de modèles du Kunsthistorisches Museum de Vienne montre de tels types (fig. 7). Ce recueil atteste la circulation des types physionomiques dans une grande partie de l’Europe, particulièrement dans le premier quart du XVème siècle. Révélant une grande unité stylistique à la différence de bon nombre de recueils de ce genre, le recueil de Vienne rend apparent le processus d’appropriation et d’intégration à son propre style par un artiste de Bohême, de toutes sortes de figures appartenant à des thèmes iconographiques connus. Les têtes de ce recueil, tout comme celle de l’Album rouge de Pisanello, pouvaient être réutilisées par l’artiste et par ses élèves. Chez Pisanello, on connaît plusieurs cas d’un lent travail de transformation attesté par les dessins d’étude, le point de départ pouvant être l’observation ad vivum qui subit ensuite un processus d’idéalisation de plus en plus poussé. Il est tout aussi concevable qu’une observation ad vivum puisse modifier le cours d’un processus de stabilisation d’un thème (comme la
figure impériale) auquel l'artiste s'était livré pour ainsi dire *in abstracto*. Ces phénomènes d'assimilation devaient être relativement fréquents chez les artistes des premières décennies du XVᵉ siècle : ils rendent délicate, sinon improbable, l'identification d'un cryptoportrait dans des scènes où l'on a voulu voir la présence de portraits, comme dans l'Adoration des Mages. Mais ce n'est que tardivement, si l'on en croit l'âge de Sigismond sur le portrait de Vienne, qu'a pu se faire sentir la nécessité d'élaborer un portrait de l'empereur qui fût en même temps une image idéale de souverain.

**Notes**

1. A la différence d'Ernő Marosi, je n'ai pas pris part à l'organisation de ce second projet.
13. On sait aujourd'hui que ce n'est pas Stefano da Verona qui a exercé une influence sur Pisanello, mais Gentile da Fabriano auquel il doit de nombreux emprunts.
14 Nous suivons volontiers l’hypothèse émise par Dominique Cordellier dans le catalogue Pisanello. 


DRACHE ODER SCHLANGE?
Das Louvre Profilporträt Sigismunds von Pisanello
im Licht der italienischen Quellen

Die Pisanello zugeschriebene, sorgfältig ausgearbeitete Profilzeichnung im Louvre (Abb. 2) gehört zu den bedeutendsten Porträts des Kaisers Sigismund von Luxemburg. Der Abgebildete trägt auf der Brust ein Kreuz mit herunterhängendem Ring, das als Zeichen des Drachenordens identifiziert worden ist. Es ist aber evident, dass die Form des Juwels sich von den erhaltenen Ordensabzeichen (Abb. 1) wesentlich unterscheidet. Es stellt sich deshalb die Frage, ob es sich wirklich um Ordensabzeichen handelt. Interessante Interpretationen des von Sigismund getragenen Kleinods bringen zwei italienische Quellen, die in diesem Zusammenhang bisher noch nicht erwähnt wurden.


...Conosciuta la volontà de’congiurati, lo Spano al Re ne venne, e qual sia l’animo loro a lui racconta, esponendo quello che a lui ed al regno utile sia. Finalmente-lo pria e grava, che in lui sia luogo di misericordia, e che conceda perdoni a chi lo domanda....Non facendo frutto alcuno la prima volta, non molto di poi, uscendo finalmente lui del campo, essendogli renduto il fermaglio o vero pendente che al collo tenea, il quale a caso in terra era caduto (che
era uno serpente che con la bocca la coda tenea, il quale segno avea preso quando della Ungheria in Boemia fuggendo, si partì; sotto uno certo velame mostrando, che quelli che per prigione preso l’aveano e che contro di lui l’anne aveano mosse, in breve tempo dell’impresa si pentirebbono, e leggendo in una croce appiccatavi uno certo brieve nel quale era scritto: oh quanto sei, Iddio, misericordioso, giusto e pio! ipso facto, quasi come stringendolo il divino fure, allo Spano rivolto, disse: volere a tutti perdonare, e le vestigie dello omnipotente Iddio immitare.


2. Pisanello: Brustbild Kaiser Sigismunds im Profil, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, Inv. 2339
die Form, die Ägypter in Hieroglyphen für die Bezeichnung des Jahres verwendeten. Die sich in den Schwanz beißende Schlange war dem Kreislauf der Sonne ähnlich, die immer auf den selben Ort zurückkehrt. Die italienischen Humanisten beschäftigten sich mit der Ars hieroglyphica seit der Auffindung einer späantiken Schrift, die dem Horapollo (Horus Apollo Niliacus) zugeschrieben wird, welche die symbolische Bedeutung der 193 ägyptischen Hieroglyphen erklärte. Horapollos Hieroglyphica wurde 1419 auf der Insel Andros vom Florentiner Cristoforo de Buondelmonti entdeckt und 1422 nach Florenz gebracht. Die Hieroglyphen wurden als Zeichen einer sehr alten Weisheit erklärt, wobei visuelles Verstehen der Dinge als eine Form des göttlichen Denkens galt. Mellini ist aber nicht direkt vom Text Horapollos ausgegangen, weil in der Hieroglyphica die sich in den Schwanz beißende Schlange als Symbol für Ewigkeit und Universum steht. In Verbindung mit der Bewegung der Sonne wurde ein ähnliches Schlangenbild der Ägypter von Macrobius erwähnt. Andere antike und späantike Quellen, wie z. B. Martianus Capella De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii, die im


Frau Dr. Gude Suckale-Redlefsen gilt mein besonderer Dank für die schnelle und gründliche Korrektur des deutschen Textes.
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4 lacopop di messer Poggio [Bracciolini], „Vita di messer Filippo Scolari, e di latina in fiorentina tradotta da Bastiano Fortini,“ Archivio Storico Italiano 4, 1843, 163—184.
7 Jacopo sagt wörtlich, dass Sigismund das Zeichen bei sich hatte, als er aus Ungarn nach Böhmen flüchtete. Er handelt sich wahrscheinlich um Sigismunds Reise nach Böhmen im Herbst 1401, siehe Baum (wie Anm. 6), 46.
8 Im Jahre 1401.
Die Kreuzinschrift entspricht Eberhard Windeckes Nachricht, dass Čeněk von Wartenberg von Sigismund ein Abzeichen mit den Worten o quam misericors est deus/ justus et pius bekommen hat:


10 Jóllehet lelkes és heves volt Spano kérlelése, mégsem elegendő, hogy akkor elnyerje a felháborodástól felinduló király jöindulatát, aki szigorú volt [...] és ellenségein bosszút kívánt állni. Nem sokkal ezután azonban [...] nyakából leesett egy aranyszéke, amely egy kör alakban tekeredő, a saját farkába maró kígyót ábrázolt, pontosan olyat, amilyent az egyiptomiak hieroglifákban az év jelölésére használtak: ami nem más, mint a nap körülvágás, amely egy meghatározott pontóról kiindulva ugyanoda visszatér. Ezt a nyakláncot azóta mûdign viselte, hogy kiszabadult a fogságból és Csehországba menekült, mintegy címerjelképként, amely talán azt fejezte ki, hogy akik elfoglalták és ellene fegyvert ragadtak, hamarosan meg fogják vágni, mivelhogy szándékkában állott bosszút állni. Muttán egyik hive visszaadta neki a láncot, Zsigmond kézbe vette, és rögtön elolvasta a szöveget, ami a rajta lógó kereszt körül volt írva, és így szólt:

Oh Istenem, milyen igalmaz vagy, igazságos és kegyes. Véletlenül azt jelentette, hogy különleges keget kapott a fenséges Istentől, hogy kiszabadult a fogságból és ellenfelei kezéből, ami éppen nem látszik különösen egyezni a nyaklánc jelentésével, amely inkább bosszúvágyat, mintsem őrgalmat tükrözik. Mégis úgy tűnik, isteni sugallat budzítására, és őViet meg a nyakláncot azóta mûdign viselte, csendben megdorgáltatván a gyulóliot miatt, ami eddig a szívében volt ellenük, odaadott Spanohoz, és azt mondta neki, szívesen megbocsát mindenki, és ebben az irgalom és összes vigasztalást, Istent akarja utánozni. „Nach der Übersetzung von I. Vigh (wie Anm. 10), in Ozorai Pipo emlékezete (Anm. 5), 37.


12 1505 im Originaltext veröffentlicht, 1515 erschien die erste lateinische und 1547 die italienische Übersetzung.

13 The Hieroglyphics of Horapollo (wie Anm. 12), Buch I, 1–2, 43–44.

14 Saturnalia XIX, 16: „In Mercurio solem coli etiam ex caduceo claret, quod Aegyptii in specie draconum maris et feminae conitoruum figuraverunt.“ Andere Zusammenhänge in IX, 12:
„Hinc et Phoenices in sacrís imaginem eius expresserunt draconem finxerunt in orbem redactum caudamque suam devotantem, ut appareat mundum et ex se ipso ali et in se revolvi.“

16 I, 70.

17 Africa III, vers 143–8, De deorum imaginibus libellus, 897.


20 Historia libri Genesis, 6: De opere quartae diei, PL 198, 1060.


22 Engel (wie Anm. 5), 54.


24 Bruno della Scala, Reg. Imp., 11, 159; Berthold Orsini, Reg. Imp., 22, 359; Lövei (wie Anm. 23), 166.

25 Antonio Collalto, Luigi del Varne, Antonio de Nagaroli, Bartolomeo Campagna, Jacopo Lavagnolo, Giovanni de Cavalli, Gentile Spolverino, Wiligelmo della Pozza, Alexandro Guagnino, Niccolò de Medici, Jacopo Emigli, siehe Edler von Smittmer (wie Anm. 9), 70; Baranyai, (wie Anm. 9), 708; Lövei (wie Anm. 23), 166.


27 Johannes de Schillinis, Johannes Franciscus Snardus, siehe Baranyai (wie Anm. 9), 718; Lövei (wie Anm. 23), 166.

28 Gy. Fejér, Codex Diplomaticus Hungaranae ecclesiastici ac civilis, Bd. X/4, Budae 1841, 682–694; Sigismundus (wie Anm. 1), Kat.–Nr. 4.38, 338–339.


31 F. Banfi, Ricordi ungheresi in Italia, Romae 1942, 167; Lövei (wie Anm. 23), 153.
33 P. Lövei, „Hoforden im Mittelalter, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Drachenordens,“ in *Sigismundus* (wie Anm.1), 260, weiter ebenda, Kat.-Nr. 4.51, 347–348 mit Abb.
34 Beschreibung des Abzeichens in der Gründungsurkunde des Drachenordens und im Wappenbrief des András Csapi, *Sigismundus* (wie Anm.1), Kat.-Nr. 4.38 und 4.46.
35 Der Anhänger ist wahrscheinlich nicht an der linken Schulter befestigt, wie es auf den Grabplatten der Fall ist, sondern in der Mitte auf der Brust.
37 É. Kovács, „Zsigmond császár halotti jelvénye,” in *Művészet Zsigmond ...* (wie Anm. 23), Bd. II. *Katalógus*, Kat.-Nr. Zs.62, 91–94.
38 Am Hals des Tieres befinden sich zwei Wulste, die in Wirklichkeit auch mit dem Ende des um den Hals gewickelten Schwanzes identisch sein könnten.

Sowohl der Stil der Illustrationen als auch der Inhalt der spekulativen Handschriften Winand von Steegs sind mittlerweile zum Objekt mehrerer Untersuchungen geworden. Im Gegensatz dazu hält sich das Interesse an den beiden letzten


politisch mindestens verständlich, bleibt der ansonsten reichlich durch Identifikationsporträts belegter Herrscher in der Rolle Joachims und somit im Kontext der Heiligen Sippe in der ersten Hälfte des 15. Jahrhunderts eine Ausnahme.19 Wie verhält sich aber das nun so postulierte Kryptoporträt der Person des Adressaten der Handschrift gegenüber?
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6 Von Wilckens (wie Anm. 3), 32.

7 Ebenda, 34–35.
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Die Beispiele sind Sigismundus (wie Anm. 5), 229, 330–331 zu entnehmen.


19 Poleross (wie Anm. 10), Bd. 1, 28–29, 162–166, 180–182 sowie Kéry (wie Anm. 10), passim.
21 Hoensch (wie Anm. 18), 188–189.
Terezia Kerny

PATRONAGE OF ST LADISLAS FRESCO CYCLES
DURING THE SIGISMUND PERIOD IN CONNECTION
WITH A CONTRACT OF INHERITANCE

Yet, I don’t believe it is possible to store ready topics and
retrieve them from a drawer when their turn has mechanically come:
they wither, or rather our affinity with them withers.

Anna Lesznai

Stósz (Štós, SK), the famed birthplace of writer Zoltán Fábri (1897–1970), lies in
the southeastern part of the Volovec Mountains on the southern side of the Liptó
Alps. The settlement’s German-speaking residents were involved in copper and
silver mining. Stósz was one of the seven mining towns of the lower Szepes (Spiš,
SK), although it actually belonged to Abaúj County.2

A notable monument among the art historical sights of Stósz is the Roman
Catholic church dedicated to All Saints. To date, however, this building has failed to
excite any significant interest among medievalists. István Genthon (1903–1969)
compiled the most complete bibliography on the church from the period 1929
through 1969.3 Deserving the greatest attention are the publications of Kornél Di-
vald (1872–1931). Divald first dealt with the church in his topography of Upper-
Hungary, but in the section on Sáros, rather than Abaúj County: “An 18th-century
stone building, with tower, built on the site of an older church.”4 According to the
Slovak topography published six decades later, this church of 13th-century origins
was renovated in the 15th century in the Gothic style, and expanded around 1500.
The Renaissance tower was built in 1611. In the second half of the 17th century the
church was completely reconstructed in the Baroque style.5

Archeological research and investigations of the church walls, which could
accurately pinpoint the various architectural periods, has not yet taken place. Even
a simple inspection of the walls of the nave, currently under a coat of whitewash,
has not been carried out, although this diagnostic work could yield some surprises.
A written reference to the paintings of the medieval church of Stósz can be found
in the larger town record-book of Szomolnok (Smolník, SK) under the date
11 September 1421, although it is unclear if its painted decoration was only imi-
nent or already complete. An excerpt of this record appears in the eighth volume
of the Zsigmondkori oklevéltár published in 2003:
“Memoriale Nycolai in fine de Staz. Johannes Weichardi city judge before the
jury of Szomolnok town Nycolaus de fine in villa Staz dicta unacum uxore su»
Girdrude freely entered into a mutual contract of inheritance, according to which
the surviving spouse is free to dispose of the others fortune at will, except if the
husband dies first, then the wife debet apreciare pictorem, ut depingat in ecclesia
Omnium Sanctorum in Staz vitam seu pugnam Sancti Ladislay, is further required
quatuor alvearia unacum apibus to Mathie Goldin; if the wife dies first, the hus­
band singula clenodia uxorissue sive aurea seu argentea will give ad ecclesiam in
Smölnicz in honore Beate Katherine, pro monstrantie seu clacis preparatione, sine
recusatione et quorumvis contradictione amicarum. All this has been registered by
the libro civitatis nostre mayori of Szomolnok.”

So far this is the only written document known in which a fresco depicting the
history of St Ladislas (Ladislas I, King of Hungary: 1077—95) was commissioned. It
also contains other important information about customs regarding wills and in­
heritance among citizens, including the residents of mining settlements, who had
special legal status. The document tells about the inhabitants’ financial situation,
intellectual sophistication and devotion, and provides an accurate picture of the
costs of ordering a fresco at that time. The path leading to this point began more
than a century earlier and just happened to reach its culmination in the first dec­
ades of the 15th century.

The history of St Ladislas in the court of Sigismund of Luxembourg

During the reign of Sigismund of Luxembourg (1387–1437), the cult of St Ladis­
las was an organic continuation of the kind of courtly representation employed by
the Hungarian Angevins. The Western concept of the Christian knightly ideal still
provided the example, although the benchmark and centre of taste was the royal
court. An indisputable, although often overlooked fact, was the persistence, with
minor fluctuations, of Sigismund’s veneration of St Ladislas throughout his entire
reign. From the very moment he ascended the throne, this cult was constructed
as consciously and conceptually as possible, and in the first decades of his reign,
between 1387 and 1407, veneration of Ladislas was undeniably intense. Perhaps as
he headed the troops into battle against the Turks in Nicopolis (in today’s Bul­
garia), Sigismund summoned the image of St Ladislas’s former triumphs against
nonbelievers in the spirit of the new order of knights, the Militia Passionis Jhesu
Christi, established by Philippe de Mézières (1327—1405). In the struggle against
Ladislas Anjou (1377–1414), the ruler of Naples and pretender to the Hungarian
throne, Sigismund’s reliance on the cult is clearly evident. In fact both sides used
elements of the St Ladislas cult in political propaganda and artistic representation.
The cult of this formerly dynastic saint, Ladislas, who gradually evolved into a
national patron saint venerated across the country, was also motivated by the threat
of Turkish attacks.
As under the Angevins, the closest analogies are the cult of St George, which was at its peak throughout Europe, and the Bohemian court’s veneration of St Wenceslas. Although the former had experienced continuous popularity in Hungary from the 11th century on, it reached astonishing heights in the 15th century. For Sigismund, who founded the Order of the Dragon in 1408 and wore the badge of the English Order of St George, veneration of the martyr was a serious matter.

St Ladislas monuments linked either directly to the king or to the royal residences constructed at the time (Buda, Pozsony [Bratislava, SK], Tata) have since been destroyed, making it impossible to know whether the narrative of the girl rescued in the battle of Kerlés (Chiraleş, RO) against the Cumans existed in some kind of form at court. Certain hypothesis, however, are worth proposing despite these losses of material. The art of the tapestry in Europe was at its zenith in this period. Enormous, imported textiles filled with hunting scenes and love stories from knights’ tales may have graced Sigismund’s court. Some of those which travelled with the emperor during his frequent changes of residence may have contained episodes from the legend of St Ladislas.11

Prevalence of the Legend of St Ladislas in Hungarian fine arts during the reign of Sigismund of Luxembourg

Traces of the legend of St Ladislas in the court of Sigismund of Luxembourg disappeared with the destruction of material and written sources. Nevertheless, some kind of central, intellectual influence certainly existed, leading to the staggering proliferation of this topic. After all, the five decades of Sigismund’s rule represented the most virulent and productive period in the veneration of the saint. At this time, fresco cycles depicting the battle of Kerlés crisscrossed the entire territory of Hungary. Thanks to the need of patrons for representation, the walls of churches in flourishing settlements (today nothing more than insignificant villages) were rapidly adorned with superb quality fresco cycles. These works were an immediate reflection, with no lag time, of the current ideals and tastes of the court. The fresco cycles of St Ladislas in the churches of Liptószentandrás (Liptovský Ondrej, SK), located in the royal County of Liptó; Szlatvin (Slatvina, SK) and Szepesmindszent (Bijacovce, SK) in the County of Szepes; Szentmihályfalva (Michal’any, SK) in the region of Csalloköz; Vörösalma (Červenica pri Sabinove, SK), in the County of Sáros (this cycle was discovered only a few years ago);12 Süvete (Sivetice, SK) in Gömör; VízsolNy in Abaúj; and Tereske in Nógrád were all made around this time. In Transylvania, cycles in the churches of Bibarcfalva (Biboréni, RO), Csíkszentmihály (Miháileni, RO), Kászonimpér (Imper, RO), Kilyén (Sepsikilyén, Chilieni, RO), Székelydálya (Dáia, RO) and the second cycle at Sepsibesenyő (Pádureni, RO) can also be dated to this period. These monuments no longer offer any real iconographic surprises. Instead, they deserve our attention because of an unusual structure (as in Bibarcfalva) or a rare motif or
genre scene (as in Vitfalva [Vitkovce, SK]), or costume (such as St Ladislas's scaly leather shield in Kilyen). In Sepsibesenyo the series was probably painted a second time, since the message of the rudimentary 14th-century cycle was no longer clear. Its program, meaning, and characters had faded, but because the subject-matter itself was still timely, a completely new cycle was added in an attempt to clarify the earlier fresco, although the legend was reduced to just three scenes. This spectacular process, however, relied on the stereotypical repetition of certain formulas, and innovation was bypassed.

At the beginning of the 15th century, the structure of cycles for the most part followed a scheme developed in the previous century. The number of scenes varied and sometimes direct stylistic connections can be found between the cycles. All of these reveal the cultivation, broad knowledge, and special spiritual needs of the patron.

Cycles originating in the Sigismund period reflect the same political timeliness that can be observed in independent depictions of St Ladislas from the end of the 14th century. In particular, we can discern the process whereby the role of the Athleta Christi was replaced by the Athleta Patriae in the iconography of the saint, symbolized by a new badge alongside the attribute of the axe: the country's coat of arms, the shield with the double cross, or flag (Zsegra [Zehra, SK], Karaszkó [Kraskovo, SK], Sepsikilyén, Bántornya [Turnišče, SLO]). The ideological background of the shield with a double cross, the symbol of the Hungarian Kingdom, was first formulated in the Bull of Constance issued on 19 September 1417, and frequently quoted in defence of patronage rights: "The hinterlands of Hungary, bordering on the land of nonbelievers, is known as the bastion and shield of Christianity." The Cumans were now immediate neighbours, and were identified with the increasingly more threatening Turks. Memories of the unfortunate battle of Nicopolis and the internal struggles against Ladislas of Naples were just as present in the Hungarians' minds as reminiscences of the mythical legend of the Argonauts in search of the Golden Fleece. The donators inserted episodes not mentioned in the original story among the events of the Kerlés battle. All these interpolated supplements, episodes and players provide a completely new interpretation of the series. In the confusing proliferation of copies, variations and compilations, the concrete events of the original story become very often and unavoidably blurred.

Iconographic curiosities and unusual stylistic characteristics emerged in these decades: St Ladislas's physiognomy in the Tereske cycle follows the facial features, quickly canonized, of the second head reliquary of the saint (c. 1430) in Várad (Oradea, RO). Stylistic analysis has clearly shown the same painter was responsible for the cycles of Székelydálya, uncovered in the 1990s, and Székelyderzs (Dăriu, RO). In the frescoes of Székelydálya an interesting thematic development appears. The girl is shown fighting against the Hungarians, almost supporting the negative characterization of the maiden in the Gesta Ladislai, which appears in the 14th-century Hungarian Chronicle. On the opposite wall is the legend of St George, painted as a counterpart to the St Ladislas cycle. In the Sepsikilyén cycle,
discovered in 1886, the front line of Cuman warriors struggle with slashed shields against the Hungarian soldiers. This could refer to a tactical ruse to confuse the enemy, but it might also recall internal struggles in which the Hungarian king relied on Cuman troops for assistance. Discovered in 2001, the cycle in the church of Kászonimpér in Csák County, also has as its companion a scene of St George killing the dragon, preserved in greater detail. The two legends appear together in Vizsoly, too.

Patrons of the cycles

As in the Angevin period, the patrons of the cycles were the secular aristocrats. Although in most cases the identities of the donors cannot be definitely established, occasionally genealogic and archontological research leads to a precise identification of the family and name.

Chronologically, the earliest case (1389) is a cycle in the Roman Catholic church of Bántornya in Zala County. Painted by Johannes Aquila and his workshop, the frescoes were commissioned by the Bánfi family of Alsólendva. The series beginning in the uppermost field on the northern wall is at present in a fragmentary state. The beginning and ending parts have been destroyed. The northern segment framed in red-ochre was presumably dedicated entirely to the battle at Kerles. The individual scenes were accompanied by inscriptions above, but these explanatory texts were already fragmented when uncovered in 1863. Nevertheless, Flóris Rómer, the first scholarly publisher of the cycle, managed to establish that the text followed a chronicle writing in the Angevin period. Meanwhile research has also clearly shown that the miniatures in the Illuminated Chronicle served as a prototype for certain scenes. Also, Istrian and Dalmatian traditions, which Miklós Bánfi, as ban of Croatia and Slavonia, might have known well (for example the Salamon scene), had an impact.

Painted around 1410–20, the cycle of Karaszkó in Gömörf County, in which the facial features of St Ladislas reflect the portrait of Sigismund of Luxembourg, shows a man on horseback with a club and no halo. He may be the patron identified by Mária Prokopp in 2003 as Frank Szécsényi.

In the Church of the Holy Spirit in Zsegra, Szépes County, an inscription exalting the Holy Sacrament on the south wall of the sanctuary informs us that Pope John XXIII granted visitors to the church a 20-day indulgence. The fact that the text was preserved in this way suggests the importance of this privilege to the patron, a descendent of the Zsigray family. In this same period, this patron commissioned the Kerles cycle, too, which is still visible in a fragmentary and heavily repainted state on the northern wall of the nave. The family also had the cycle painted in the church of the Virgin Mary in the nearby village of Szlatvin.

The finely executed wall paintings found in the nave of the fortified church of Székelyderzs, Udvarhely County, were uncovered from under a layer of
whitewash by József Huszka (1854—1934) at the end of the 19th century. One of the armed men in the scene of Saul on the south wall carries a flag with a perplexing inscription: “hoc op(u)s fec(it) d(e) pingere seu p(rae)parare mag(ist)er Paul(u)s fili(u)s Stephani d(e) Ung an(n)o d(omi)ni m(illesi)mo cccc(m)o x nono scriptum scribebat et pulcras puella(m) i(n) mente tenebat”. Both the scene showing St Paul's conversion and the St Ladislas cycle on the opposite wall can thus be dated to 1419; in fact, as the alliterated element “pulchram puellam” suggests, the date may refer even more strongly to the St Ladislas cycle. Furthermore, the inscription reveals the identity of the patron, who is perhaps among the most mentioned donors in art historical literature in this period. Important data on the genealogy of the family in connection with the fresco was published in 1998. Only one, essential element has not been clearly deciphered: the meaning of the rhyming sentence with its profane content in the second half of the inscription.

Political interests and personal piety together shaped the special devotion to the Hungarian saints shown by the many branches of the Bebek family, a phenomenon which can also be well circumscribed geographically. The family's status was most strongly reflected in their veneration of St Ladislas. In this kind of representation centring on Ladislas, religious and knightly ideals are given equal prominence—a result of the family's earlier positions. Detre Bebek (III), an active member of the League, cleverly employed the cult for political purposes on the side of Ladislas of Naples, as the veneration of St Ladislas ensured the legal status and the ideological background that would justify the pretender's claim to the throne. His sons, especially László Bebek, wizened by their father's political failure, were contented to limit the popularization of the cult to the churches under their patronage. The Hungarian saints, which had at that time become conventional, appeared on the walls of the naves in Gecelfalva (Kocel'ovce, SK), Krasnohnorkavárja (Krásnohorské Podhradie, SK), Körtvélyes (Hrušov, SK), Pelsőc (Plesivec, SK), Rákos (Rakos, SK) in Gömör County, and in Tornaszentandrás, Zsip (Zíp, SK) and perhaps Torna (Torna nad Bodvou, SK), their tituli clearly referring to the given names of the sons of Detre Bebek (III). The patron of the Kerlé cycle on the north wall of the nave in the parish church of Rákos was László Bebek, who may have also ordered the cycle (later destroyed) in Szalonna, Borsod County, and the cycle in Hárskút (Lipovník, SK). The latter is covered by a 19th-century layer of paint, and is at present known only from a brief 18th-century description by Samuel Timon (1675—1736). Not only is the identity of the donor of Szalonna frescoes (dated to 1417—27) known, but the painter's identity, too: András Szepesi. At the end of the 1980s, a cycle with a wrestling scene was uncovered in the nave of the round church of St Margaret of Antioch in Süvete, very near to Szalonna. This work, which art historians had previously only assumed existed, was probably made at the same time as the frescoes in Szalonna.

The commissioners and donors of St Ladislas legends in the first decades of the 15th century occupied the immediate surroundings of the king, or were among the most influential prelates (the Bánfi, Bebek, Nagymihályi, Szécsényi, and
Zsigray families); in other words, almost without exception they were the barons of Sigismund of Luxembourg. They adjusted the decoration of the churches under their patronage to the samples and expectations emanating from the court, and gave precedence to these trends. The intellectual organ of the aula, local traditions and the individual devotional habits of certain families together shaped the various scenes in the cycles.33

Furthermore, among the patrons known today, not one was a member of the Order of the Dragon.34 At the same time, given how the founders and later members of the order (Miklós Garai Il, the Marótis, Pipo Ozorai, Pál Özdögei Besenyő, one of the Pálóci brothers, Stibor Stiborici), openly expressed their veneration of St Ladislas, the order may have been involved in some way in the proliferation of the depictions. Although at present there are no known cases in which someone in the Order of the Dragon commissioned a cycle of St Ladislas, members may still have had the battle scene painted on their property. Perhaps they were even forerunners, with such commissions giving a sign of their common identity.35 In Székelydálya, Kászonimpér and Vízsoly, the legend of St George that emerges alongside the battle of Kerléś may refer to this still unclear connection.

The role of the bourgeoisie in the spread of the cult of St Ladislas

In the Sigismund period not only the barons, but the urban middle class also contributed to the expansion of the veneration of St Ladislas to a national scale. The forms in which their activities were expressed were almost without exception associated with the guilds.

In Buda, the church dedicated to the three Hungarian saints in the cemetery of the Church of Our Lady was granted the license to issue indulgences in 1334.36 From the end of the 14th century the church was frequently mentioned as the chapel of Saint Emeric, and even more frequently as the chapel of St Ladislas.37 At that time it was entirely independent of the Church of Our Lady and had a large ecclesiastical staff. Members of the high clergy made up the rectorate, which was supported by a large endowment.38 A notarial document dated 12 September 1436 already mentions the chapel’s altar of St Ladislas.39

In Pozsony, too, traces of the cult of St Ladislas exist from the first half of the 14th century.40 The statue of St Ladislas, originally intended for private devotion, can be seen on the facade of the Unger House.41 In 1421 it became one of the patron symbols of the city, most likely based on the St Roland prototype common throughout Europe. At the same time the private chapel of a building transformed into the city hall was decorated with a wall painting of the saint bearing a shield with a double cross. In 1440, for the first time, an altar of St Ladislas, consecrated several years earlier, was listed in the provostal church of St Martin. Soon after, an altar dedicated to St Ladislas was erected in the church of St Michael. The guidelines of numerous guilds and St Ladislas Day customs confirm the veneration of the saint.42
In 1408, the chapel of St Ladislas was built in the northern suburb of Kassa (Košice, SK), and it frequently appeared in documents through 1458. In an undated papal supplication submitted in 1418, Margit, the widow of Jakus, a butcher from Vác, bequeathed her two vineyards to the monasteries of (Mária)Nosztra and Toronyalja (Pottornya, Podtureň, SK), and the monastery of St Ladislas.

The circumstances of Locse (Levoča, SK), which was under royal protection and received a staple right in 1402, were unusual. The commissioning of the wall paintings of Sts Stephen and Ladislas in the sanctuary of the parish church of St James masked direct imperial intentions, since the population, which had a different economic life and customs, mostly reinforced the cult of saints transplanted from their birthplace. All this is evident in the depiction of the Hungarian saints, too, since the painter, completely versed in local iconography, placed a lance instead of a battle-axe in the hand of St Ladislas. The dedication of the Minorites' church at the same time advertised the consistent continuation of missionary activities and the cult of Francis, which developed under the Angevines.

To understand the spread of the cult in an urban setting, the Translyvanian Saxon communities are worth examining. The most significant among them were the seven “seats” (‘sedes’), that is, districts under the control of Nagyszében (Sibiu, RO). The privileges won in 1224 under King Andrew II (“Andreanum”) were continually renewed by later rulers. Its legal status was similar to that of free royal towns. By the time of Sigismund of Luxemburg, Nagyszében had become one of the largest economic powers among the towns. Its legal position, which probably derived from its unusual status and as a consequence of the personal intentions of Sigismund, lay behind the agreement entered into in 1432 by the people of Nagyszében and their parish priest, Miklós Rynisch. According to this the priest was required to say thirteen royal masses in the parish church of Our Lady. One was a mass dedicated to Ladislas to be performed at the altar of Hungarian king-saints. Similarly, imperial will may have been the driving force in Ecel (Aţel, RO), where the battle of Kerlés was painted on the north wall of the parish church.

According to the information listed the citizens (or guilds) together had churches, chapels, and altars erected bearing the name of St Ladislas. No sources exist relating to private commissions, with the exception of the wall paintings of Stós. The instructions in the inheritance contract of Miklós Stószi (“Nycolaus de fine in villa Staz”) and his wife, Gertrud (“Girdrude”) in part further cloud the data on veneration of the saint in urban settings, but at the same time they shed light on the pragmatic approach of the town’s citizens toward the Church. The text of the document gives a precise time limit to when the demand for representations of the legend of St Ladislas spread through court and secular aristocracy to wealthier citizens. Miklós, who acquired a fortune from the copper and silver mines, was certainly not motivated by personal devotion (since his patron saint was St Nicholas of Myra). Instead he wished to preserve the cycle on the walls of his local church in conformance with national propaganda or its expectations. This
is especially likely given that the majority of inhabitants of the town were Germans, who sharply differed from the Hungarians in their cultural and religious practices and their economic roles.\textsuperscript{51}

The laconic reference in this source to the commissioner offers art historians dealing with the subject few answers to the unresolved problems concerning the St Ladislas cycles. Indisputable, however, is when the first private citizen, independent of any town or guild community, commissioned a Ladislas cycle. The crucial question of whether the legend of St Ladislas was actually painted in the parish church of All Saints in Stósz, on the other hand, to this day remains unanswered.

According to the second stipulation in the contract, if the wife died first, the husband would have to donate a gilt silver clenodium to the Church of St Catherine of Alexandria in Szomolnok and have a monstrance repaired. Its material value and the labor costs must have been exactly equal to the cost of painting the fresco. Neither Kornél Divald,\textsuperscript{52} nor the Slovak surveyor of movable property and land in Stósz\textsuperscript{53} found any medieval clenodium in the church of Szomolnok. The liturgical objects in question of course could have been destroyed over the centuries, but it is also possible that this obligation was never fulfilled. And if we continue on this logical path, thus using negative results as our starting point, then most certainly the husband died first, and the wife had to carry out her husband’s wishes. This means the legend of St Ladislas lies concealed somewhere under the present layer of paint.

Hopefully wall soundings performed in the near future and investigations will provide a satisfying answer to this question. In any case, this source remains invaluable for art historians researching the cycles of St Ladislas.

Notes
\textsuperscript{1} Detail from Anna Lesznai’s Journal, Budapest, Archives of the Petőfi Literary Museum, V 3870/43/17.
\textsuperscript{2} Gölnícánya (Gelnice, SK), Szomolnok, Krompach, Svedlér, Stósz, Remete and Merény formed the seven lower mining communities of Sze pes, but they never formed an autonomous unit. Their inhabitants were known as “Gründlers” to distinguish them from other Germans.
The mining community was established in the 12th century by the Saxons of Szepesség. In 1327 Charles Robert bestowed the rank of free mining town on the settlement, granting rights to mine, holding markets, hunt and fish. In the 14th century it was the seat of the mining chamber.


Iván Gerát (Director, Institute for Art History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava) called my attention to this cycle in 2002.

E. Mályusz, A konstanzi zsinat és a magyar főkégyüri jog, Budapest 1958, 12–14, 75–84; German edition: Das Konstanzer Konzil und das königliche Patronatsrecht in Ungarn, Budapest 1957.

In the iconography of St Ladislas, the double cross first appeared in a miniature in the Illuminated Chronicle, folio 47r, clearly marking the process by which the saint, who embodies the ethical ideals of the knightly-court and represented the earlier House of Arpád and the Angevin Dynasty, transformed into the guardian, the patron shield, of faith and the country against enemies. The depiction on the back side of the royal seal issued in 1383 by Queen Mary of Anjou (Budapest, Magyar Országos Levéltár, V. 1, 68, 69; Dubrovnik, Državni Arhiv u Dubrovniku) may have been the one—if only because its political function—that very strongly promoted the quick dissemination of the new type. Internal political factors were certainly involved, too. In 1386 Mary and her mother, Elizabeth, were imprisoned. The royal council governing the country issued a seal with a double cross at this time with the legend “Regnicolorum hungariae sigillum”. In 1401, at the time of King Sigismund’s imprisonment at Siklós, the same act was repeated. The governing prelates and barons used a seal in the name of the Holy Crown, the embodiment of the feudal country. This phenomenon did not pertain just to the iconography of St Ladislas, but to that of St George, too (the wall paintings of Székeleydálya, Szentsimon, Tappa, Zolna [Zolná, SK]), who from the 11th century had been considered a patron saint of the Hungarian Kingdom. For related discussions, see also E. Marosi, “Nemzeti elemek a régi magyar művészetben: a középkor,” Ars Hungarica XVIII, 1990, 182; idem, “Die Persönlichkeit Sigismunds in der Kunst,” in Sigismund und Luxemburg, Kaiser und König in Mitteleuropa.

The legend of St George was painted in the church of St Michael in Szentmihályfalva in Csalloköz and also in Rimabánya in Gömör County (Rimavská Baňa, SK). On Szentmihályfalva, see L. Kovács–J. Görföl, Középkori templomok a Csalldközbeti, Dunaszerdahely 2002, 61.


Zoltán Magyar (Institute of Ethnography, Hungarian Academy of Sciences) called my attention to this on 14 November, 2002. I am indebted to him for his photographs.

In terms of interpretation, Hungarian research has not progressed significantly since F. Römer's detailed description: Régi falképek Magyarországon, Budapest 1874, 24–32. Recent interpretations (Tamás Bogya, Ernő Marosi, Terézia Kerny) essentially rely on his conclusions as a starting point. Ernő Marosi tied the painting of the fresco cycle to the struggles for the crown following the death of Louis I (1382–87): "The version of the legend was probably made with the knowledge and using the text of the Chronicle, as Römer suggested. In the depictions of the election of Ladislas and the struggle against King Salamon, the concept of idoneitas as a condition for royal power was expressed, which in 1389, shortly after Sigismund ascended the throne, may have acquired a concrete significance. In the cycle, references to two members of the family, Miklós and László, mentioned in the 1389 charter dividing property, are easily recognizable, although the other images cannot be explained by these connections." See E. Marosi, "Eine Einleitung in die Probleme um Johannes Aquila," in Johannes Aquila und die Wandmalerei des 14. Jahrhunderts. Tagungsbeiträge und Dokumente aus den Sammlungen des Landesdenkmalamts Budapest, ed. E. Marosi, Budapest 1989, 46–47. About this same political background, see more recently: idem (n. 13 above 2004), 452. The main idea in the St Ladislas legend did indeed centre on legitimacy and idoneitas, although at that time those could not have been problems of the day.


M. Prokopp, Középkori freskók Gömörben, Somorja 2002, 55. The author declares Frank Szcsényi as the patron of the cycle in Rimabánya, too. If so, the identity of the figure sounding the trumpet in the first scene is the same as that of the trumpeter seen in the Karaszko cycle. In any case, the figure appealing for help also appears in the first scene, repainted in the 15th century, of the Tereske cycle.

"Mutatur specie panis meditante priore / Sed non est talis qualis senitur in ore / Res occulatur qualis quia si videatur / Foristant horreres et manducare timeres / Fit Christus in missa quoties audies que Maria / Et flectit genua dat Johannes tibi papa / "
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In the battle scene, the figure of St Ladislas is the most intact.

Flóris Rómer first mentioned the cycle in Slatvin, which had been covered in whitewash, in his corpus on wall painting: “...the current parish priest said, that during the first years after his arrival there—some 34 years ago—he heard from the older members of the congregation that the recently plastered-over wall paintings could not have shown saints, since a bloody battle scene was painted and the horrible bloodbath was very frightening to the ladies sitting near the wall.” See Rómer (n. 17 above), 70. The wall paintings were uncovered again in the summer of 2008. I am indebted to József Lángi who informed me of their discovery and supplied me with photographs.


In the 14th-century chronicle, the following epithet was derived from the word “speciès, ēi”... “unam puellam Hungaram speciosam.” Edition: Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regnumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum, ed. E. Szentpétery, vol. I., Budapest 1937, 186.

The patron of the painting was Pál, son of István (Ungi) of the Nagymihályi family of the Kaplyon clan. The family tree was compiled by Pál Engel. The patron’s great-grandfather and grandfather were both named László (Ladislas), although a study of the genealogical tables reveals a noticeably high frequency of the name László among members of the clan.

The following text provides some interesting information about the family’s early veneration of St Ladislas: “In memory of master Gergely, son of Lorinc, we announce that Charles, king of Hungary, by the grace of God has bestowed on us the right to collect customs fees because of our bloodshed and service in Nagymihály. For the salvation of our souls, we shall give one tenth of that to the church of St George. Every priest living there is required to celebrate mass twice a week: once on Tuesday in honour of the dead, and another time in honour of St George. If a priest fails to do so, St Ladislas should excommunicate him, and if a neighbour or relative would like to reclaim the tithe, St Ladislas should excommunicate him.” Edition: A nagymihályi és sztiráni gróf Száray család oklevélára, vol. I., Budapest 1887, 41. Hungarian translation by Ágnes Kurcz, published in László király emlékezete, ed. T. Katona, Budapest 1977, 65.

Pál’s activities can be followed in documents from 1424 to 1457. At the time the frescoes were made, the family’s power was at its height, thanks to one of its members, provost Albert (1380–1434). In 1410, he was a youth in the court; from 1417 to 1432, he was prior of Vrana (“Aurana”); and from 1419 to 1426, he was ban of Dalmatia–Croatia. His entire clan benefitted from his high positions. Scholars have occasionally suggested that the church frescoes in Székelyerdzs, Csíkszentmihály, and Felsőboldogfalva in Udvarhelyszék (Feliceni, RO) were painted by the same persons. On-site examinations by József Lángi and Ferenc Mihály offer no support for the hypothesis, although the possibility that the master of Felsőboldogfalva may have worked alongside the painter of the Székelyerdzs and Csíkszentmihály frescoes and was thus familiar with those works has not been excluded. See J. Lángi–F. Mihály, Erdélyi falképek és festett faberendezések, vol. II., Budapest 2004, 38–40.

For an earlier attempt at interpretation, see T. Kerny, “Huszka József és a székelyföldi Szent László-legendák,” in Művészet... (n. 8 above), vol. II., 348, 361, n. 20.


Two members of the family were also church dignitaries. Domokos Bebek was briefly bishop of Nagyvárad in 1372. A document dated 1357 (Budapest, Magyar Országos Levélár, Dl. 4669) mentions György Bebek and István Bebek, wardens of the castle, as royal flag-bearers.
From 1402, the settlement was the property of the Bebek family. The destroyed cycle had earlier been dated to the same period as the cycle of St Margaret of Antioch, that is, the second half of the 13th century. For a more recent discussion relating to the history of the village, see É. Mezősi-Kozák, “Borsod megye román-kori műemlék temploma, Szalonna,” in Dethy Mihály nyolcvanadik születésnapjára – tanulmányok, ed. I. Bardoly–A. Haris, Budapest 2002, 64.

“Exstat in vico Harscheuthiensi provinciae Gemeriensis ad Rosnaviam pervetusta pictura, et Sancti illus Regis et Cuni ac puellae in equis insidentium.” See S. Timon, Imago Novae Hungariae, repraesentans regna, provincias, banatus et comitatus ditionis hungariae Historico genere strictim perspectiva, Vienna 1754, 41.

The wall painting recovered from under the 19th century historicizing layer of paint reveals fragments of the wrestling scene. The Cuman wears white clothes tied with a black belt. His huge tether can be clearly discerned. St Ladislas is also seen in white attire. In the present state of the wall painting (17 September 2004) a headless girl in red cuts the Achilles tendon of the Cuman with a long-handled weapon (battle-axe?) held in her right hand. The left side of the scene is demarcated with two perpendicular red stripes.


Members of the Bánfi of Alsóendva and Szészényi families became members only later. For a related discussion, see P. Lővei, “A Sárányrend fennmaradt emlékei,” in Művészet... (n. 8 above), vol. I., 158–59.

This connection suggests more thorough research should be done on the art patronage of those members of the Order of the Dragon not mentioned here. Enikő Csukovits pointed out an interesting phenomenon: a conspicuously large number of members set out on pilgrimages for a variety of reasons. See E. Csukovits, Középkori magyar zarándokok, Budapest 2003, 151–54.


41 Presently a copy can be seen on the facade of the building.

42 T. Ortvay, Pozsony város utcai és terei. A város története utca és tér nevekben, Pozsony 1905, 524. The hospital, which appears in the sources between 1379 and 1529, was also dedicated to St Ladislas. See ibid, 263. In a document dated 15 June 1418, a new St Ladislas’ hospital is mentioned (“das new spital ze sent Lasla ze Prespurg”). Presumably it was built in place of the former, cramped and out-dated building. See Budapest, Magyar Országos Levéltár, DF 239397; Hungarian language extract: Zsigmond kori oklevéltár, vol. VI., 1417–1418, the manuscript of Elemér Mályusz was edited and expanded by I. Borsa, Budapest 1999, 517–18, no. 2053. In addition to the altar found in the chapel of the hospital, gifts from grateful patients, wax and silver offerings, pilgrim’s badges and a votive panel painting of St Ladislas should be included in the count.

43 K. Kabos, Adatok középkori egyháznak némelyikéről (a Källay család levéltárából Bunyitay Vince alapján), Eger 1887, 228; B. Wick, Kassa története és műemlékei, Kassa 1941, 43.

44 Budapest, Magyar Országos Levéltár, DF 286489. For a Hungarian language summary, see Zsigmond kori..., vol. VI. (n. 42 above), 643, no. 2674.


46 Later re-paintings generally destroyed the wall-paintings completely.

47 Cultural-historical factors related to St Ladislas (and the other Hungarian saint-kings) and originally tied to the Angevins, which until the end of the 18th century determined the spirituality and iconography of Hungarian Franciscans, are completely unexplored as yet.


49 A Hungarian language abstract, without the Archives’ call-number appears in L. Reisenberger–I. Henszilman, A nagyszebeni és szekesfehérvári régi templom, Budapest 1883, 41. The name Ladislas, although rare, did occur as the patronium of churches in the Saxon seats–Gross-Propstdorf (Nagyekemező, Tarnava, RO), Gross-Lasseln (Szászszentlászló, Laslea, RO), Leschkirch (Újegyháza, Nocrich, RO)–as data from 1402 attests: Monumenta Vaticana Historiam Regni Hungariae Illustrantia – Vatikáni magyar okiratok, vol. I., 4, Budapest 1891, 204, 422; G. Gündisch, “Die Patrozinien der sächischen Pfarrkirche Siebenbürgens,” in Festschrift für Attila T. Szabó und Zsigmond Jakó, ed. K. Benda–T. von Bogay–H. Gassl–K. Zs. Lengyel, Munich 1987, 95, 97, 99–100; and Mező (n. 45 above). The special status of the free royal town was most likely responsible for these facts.

50 A plaque of a king on the throne (Sigismund?) can be seen on the church bell and refers to royal authority, see E. Benkő, Erdély középkori harangjai és bronz keresztelőmedencéi, Budapest–Kolozsvár 2002, 225, Cat. No. 85.

51 Szűcs (n. 45 above), 133; Klaniczay (n. 45 above), 278, on the patronum of churches in Saxon settlements in Upper Hungary, see Hudák (n. 45 above); Mező (n. 45 above).

52 Divald (n. 4 above), 388.

The wide-ranging scholarly achievement of Ernő Marosi has enlarged the possible methods of research of 14th–15th-century art history. I would like to pay tribute to him with a modest contribution from the side of “museum art history”, at the same time paying off my older debt with the publishing of these documents. Already in 1995, we have investigated the two Austrian panel paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts (Szépművészeti Múzeum) in Budapest. The spectacular infrared reflectographies have not been published yet.

The two well-known panels of the International Gothic style are attributed recently to the Master of the St Andrew Altarpiece, working most probably in Vienna around 1430–1440 whose conventional name originated from a curious paradox, namely from the fragments of an altarpiece from the Neukloster in Wiener Neustadt. These panels were taken to St Stephen’s Cathedral in Vienna and completed there with a statue of St Andrew. They stayed there until 1973, when the panels were taken to the Dom- und Diözesanmuseum. The panels treated here are not from the same series, but from another Passion-series of unknown origin.

In the early 19th century four panels were in the remarkable collection of Miklós Jankovich in Pest. This collection was donated to the Hungarian National Museum in 1836, later the paintings were handed over to the Museum of Fine Arts in 1875, to be more precise to its predecessor. The four panels were in the Museum of Fine Arts until 1934, when, according the so-called Treaty of Venice two panels from the series were handed over to the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, in exchange for Hungarian works of art. Thus The Entry into Jerusalem and The Last Supper are in Budapest, The Betrayal of Christ and The Mocking of Christ are in Vienna now. Nothing is known of the provenance of the panels, as the detailed inventory of Jankovich’s painting collection remained unfinished. Here I do not intend to deal with question of attribution, I can only refer to the two catalogues with nearly complete bibliographies of the Budapest paintings. Research tried to prove, that the four Passion panels in the Sležské Museum (Silesian Museum) in Opava (Czech Republik) were parts of the same altarpiece. Their uncertain origin is said to be in the Valley of the river Váh (SK). Recently the possibility of placing the origin of the dispersed altar into the northwest Hungarian region arose.
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The master was introduced by Otto Benesch in 1925 to art historical literature, he called the attention to the panels in Opava in 1930, and Karl Oettinger named the master after the putative St Andrew altarpiece, finally Andor Pigler and Austrian scholars both thought that the master was a pupil of the Master of the St Lambert Votive Panel. The Passion series can be dated between 1430 and 1440. The question whether it is connected or not to the large size Crucifixion panel in the Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum in Linz, and whether they belonged to one altarpiece or not, is still unclear. I am not convinced of that, but alas no infrared investigation of the Linz painting has been carried out yet. The panel with The Entry into Jerusalem (fig. 1) is made of six planks executed in a rather rough way, and has its original surface on the reverse. The original bevelling is visible on the upper edge and on the right. Horizontally two thick boards are placed
on it, thus it cannot have been a movable wing of an altarpiece. The gilding of the background is original, and the punched decoration framing the composition is visible on the upper edge down to the round tower, on the left as far as the head of the third apostle. This ornament consists of punched rosette and semicircular motifs with three dots, very similar to the ones visible in the Albrecht-altarpiece (fig. 6a–b). The technique of incising the outlines into the chalk ground, originating from 14th-century Bohemian painting, was almost out of fashion at that time, and can only be detected in the lines made with a ruler separating the gold background from the architecture, at the red tower, and on the side of the city door. The haloes of the holy figures are marked with a rich decoration of pouncing and pointillé technique.

In the infrared reflectogram assembly the underdrawing of the whole composition is visible. The linear drawing is made with black material, containing charcoal
and is made with a brush. The underdrawing has grown through the paint at some parts and is visible even with the naked eye, but the reflectography penetrated through all colours. Such a detailed underdrawing, showing not only the contours, but also the inner forms was not rare in early the 15th century. In its character it reminds us of the much earlier underdrawing of an Austrian panel from c. 1410, *The Trinity* in London. However, it slightly differs from the underdrawing of the Master of the St Lambert Votive panel. The underdrawing style of the Andrew Master is very individual, for instance he marks the form of the noses with two parallel lines. The most remarkable feature of his individual style is the way he crosses the vertical lines of the folds in the drapery with short parallel lines. This “abbreviated” form to mark the hatching, the parts to be painted as shadows is
singular and has no relation to his contemporaries. In the Budapest panel there is no difference between underdrawing and the paint layer, with the exception of some very slight modifications in changing the longer fingers to shorter ones. This is very frequently met in painting.

The panel with The Last Supper (fig. 2) is cut on its lower edge, and the panel itself is thinned and cradled. The golden background has the same punched frame decoration and due to the subject-matter the haloes of the apostles are richly decorated here as well. Judas in the foreground has, of course, no halo. An interesting technical feature is visible on this panel. All medieval paintings were first covered with gold leaf, leaving out the surfaces where the figures would be. In this case the master changed his design, thus the gold paint can be seen under the face
of St John. The underdrawing of the complete composition is now visible, with slight changes. The drawn fingers of Christ, St Peter, Judas and St John are much longer than their final size, since in the course of the painting process they were shortened. In some faces he drew the curls on the forehead, then he did not paint them.

The complete underdrawings of the compositions are obviously made as free-hand drawings, no remnants of pouncing dots or tracing lines are visible, or no signs of squaring. The composition was certainly sketched first on a smaller paper, as in other works in Austria from the early 15th century, where such small sized composition sketches as preparatory drawings for paintings were known. It is a question whether those or the detailed underdrawings on the panels served as a Visierung for the donor at that time.

We are in a lucky situation, that the other panels from the Jankovich collection, now in Vienna have also been investigated with infrared photography. The Betrayal of Christ (fig. 3) is identical in its underdrawing style with the Budapest panels. The manner indicating the shadow with small parallel lines crossing the vertical lines in the drapery is also visible here. The other panel in Vienna, The Mocking of Christ was published earlier (fig. 4). Here the hatching in the draperies is richer than in the Budapest panels, but it is by the same hand. Unfortunately there is no publication of underdrawings of the Opava panels,
and on the available old photos the state of preservation of those panels is also questionable.  

It happens very rarely that one can compare a preparatory drawing on paper and an underdrawing by the same master in the 15th century. They differ not only in their size and material but also in their function. In this case a rare example can be quoted. Thanks to the publication of Fritz Koreny a drawing by the Master of the St Andrew Altar could be identified in Munich (fig. 5). Drawing and underdrawing can well be compared here, and both show the same formal and stylistic idioms. The drawing of The Mocking of Christ shows similarities with the panel not only in its figures, but also in its drawing manner. We note the same short lines crossing the long lines of the draperies. Koreny dated the drawing earlier, to 1430, but I think its characters are much more realistic than the puppet resembling, caricature like figures of The Last Supper in Budapest.

This paper is just a modest contribution to find a missing link in research. If the infrared investigation of the Linz Crucifixion could be realized in the near future, the connection between the passion scenes and the putative central panel could be established. In the research of Early Netherlandish paintings the technical investigations could solve some intriguing questions. Similarly in early 15th-century Austrian panel painting this might also clear some questions. All those masters with conventional names, and all the many workshops could eventually be discerned from each other. Some workshop methods and connections between workshops and masters could be better investigated. We have very little idea for instance, how workshop drawings or workshop cartoons mediated between masters and workshops. The Entry into Jerusalem and The Last Supper compositions appear with slight changes in the so-called Znaim-Altarpiece from c. 1440, too (Vienna, Österreichische Galerie). Those intertwining workshops connect the production of Vienna and the neighbouring region of north-western Hungary in those decades.
NOTES

1 HAMAMATSU C-2400-03 vidicon camera, Kodak Wratten filter 87/a, Ilford Pan 100 film. I have to thank for András Fáy for his help.

2 W. Kuba-Hauk–A. Saliger, Dom- und Diözesanmuseum Wien, Vienna 1987, 100–04. The foundation year of Neukloster is 1444, thus much later.

3 Jankovich Miklós (1772–1846) gyűjteményei, exh. cat., ed. Á. Mikó, Magyar Nemzeti Galéria, Budapest 2002, 47; see the review about this exhibition by Orsolya Bubryák in Ars Hungarica 32, 2004, 141; The paintings of the “German” school and of Upper Hungary are not listed in the inventory.


7 Spruce, 99 × 63,3 cm. Inv. No. 1631; Spruce, 100 × 68,5 cm. Inv. No. 1634.


10 G. Biedermann, Katalog. Alte Galerie am Landesmuseum Joanneum, Mittelalterliche Kunst, Graz 1982, fig. 97.

11 I thank Manfred Koller, Veronika Pirker-Aurenhammer and the Bundesdenkmalamt, Vienna for their help.

12 Published in M. Koller, “Die technologischen Untersuchungen am Albrechtsaltar und ihre Beiträge zum Problem der ‘Werkstatt’ des Albrechtsmeisters,” in Der Albrechtsaltar und sein Meister, ed. F. Röhrig, Vienna 1981, 134, fig. 58 and 131 ff. I thank Arthur Rosenauer for sending me this book.


14 While proofreading the present paper, I got the valuable information through Anna Boreczky from Milena Bartlová, that the Opava panels have also been investigated recently and the IRR documents will be published by Kaliopi Chamonikolasová in the forthcoming catalogue From Near To Far. Imported Medieval Artworks in Moravia, ed. T. Berger, Brno, Moravské Galeria. It seems that the underdrawing of the Agony in the Garden painting for instance is identical with those of the Budapest and the Vienna paintings! I thank for their kind information. Anna Boreczky has already urged the investigation of the underdrawings of this master and their comparison with the Munich drawing. See A. Boreczky, A budapesti Concordiae Cartitatis, Ph.D. dissertation, Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Budapest 2009, 83.

15 Munich, Graphische Sammlung, I am grateful for the photograph. See F. Koreny, “Die Österreichische Handzeichnung der Gotik,” in Gotik (n. 6 above), 552 ff, 560, no. 300.
“It follows from the character, as well as the neglect, of the Gothic stock of re­
mains that it is smaller, more sporadic and less elaborated than the group of Re­
naissance works that are more in the limelight.” This statement, which speaks of 
the stylistic duality of art in Hungary during the age of King Matthias or, more 
precisely, about the still-existing lack of balance in researches connected with it,
comes from the pen of the scholar celebrated in the present volume, and is based 
on a comprehensive consideration of the artifacts that have survived.1 The scholar 
in question is Ernő Marosi, who endeavoured to moderate this long-perceived 
unevenness in connection with the 1990 King Matthias anniversary—and subse­
quently also—, and tried to sketch an overall picture of the court art of the period, 
taking into account the material in the old style as well as that in the new.2 This 
may seem trite, but neither before nor since that has it been customary in the art 
historical literature in Hungary to speak about both aspects in a study or in a chap­
ter of a book, in other words to present both phenomena together.

This specific feature of the research into the period is also typical for another 
region of Europe: Italy. The parallel is hardly coincidental. Along with Italian 
masters, humanists, too, arrived at King Matthias’s court in Buda armed with theo­
ries propagating the new style. They attempted to present the phenomenon of the 
Renaissance as sharpe a break as possible, a view which right up until the present 
day has sometimes put a uniform gloss on the overall picture of 15th-century Ital­
ian art. It was as though in the course of this break the old style—which itself uti­
lized numerous antique elements—disappeared from every area and stratum of art 
as if by the wave of a magic wand. Although it was long ago clear that medieval 
structures from a narrow area provided the models for Brunelleschi’s cupola on 
Florence Cathedral, this work has for the most part always been considered as a 
manifestation of the Renaissance.3 The handbook Architecture in Italy 1400–1500, 
which can still be regarded as a basic work, deals automatically only with creations 
of the Renaissance, with the *tiburio* of Milan Cathedral and the Gothic elements 
of the cathedral of Pius II at Pienza receiving mention only because they can be 
also understood in a Renaissance context.4 Even in Florence, and even after the 
middle of the century, there were numerous elements adopted from the medieval
tradition—for example in painting\textsuperscript{5}, not to mention the very slow transformation in art during the 15th century in Lombardy and especially in South Italy. In what follows, we shall deal with an artifact or a group of artifacts from this last-mentioned region which well represent this situation, and which for this reason could not count on excessive interest either in Hungary or in Italy, despite the surviving material there.

In the Old Sculpture Collection at Budapest's Museum of Fine Arts there is a large-sized, figural stone retable from the Middle Ages (fig. 1). At the bottom of the upright rectangular carved limestone retable is a broken, profiled base-cornice, and on either side it is framed by a thin pilaster divided by a smooth panel. At the top the retable ends in a steep-sided gable carved from a separate piece of stone. Its cornice is likewise broken and profiled, and augmented with fillets inside, and enriched with a finial fashioned from crockets and acanthus leaves. Within this frame the field of the retable is filled out with dense figural depiction. The majority of the surface is occupied by three figures placed close to each other on a moderately bulging bracket-like plinth placed between the pilasters. In the middle there is Mary enthroned with the infant Jesus; on one side stands a female saint and on the other a male one. Mary's entire body is turned slightly to the left. Because of this, only one corner of her throne can be seen. Situated at the front, this points diagonally outwards and juts out slightly from the plinth. Above her tunic that reaches to the ground, Mary wears a cloak that also covers her wavy hair. The cloak is held in place at the breast by an unembellished, oval-shaped clasp. The naked Child, similarly turned to the left, raises His right arm in benediction; in His left hand He holds an object that it is difficult to identify, presumably a fruit. Turning towards her slightly, the saints on either side of Mary are the same height as the seated Madonna. Their heads are set in smooth-surfaced halos similar to her own but slightly smaller. Their attire is likewise a tunic with a cloak on top of it, which in the case of the man is worn across the left shoulder only. The male saint can be said to be middle-aged, and his one and only more definite attribute is his pilgrim's staff held behind the Child. The young female saint holds a book in her left hand and an arrow in her right, which is behind Mary. The countenances of the protagonists so far betray scarcely any physiognomic characteristics: they are worked in a mask-like manner. In front of the male saint kneels the patron at prayer; he is shown on the plinth from the side. Turning towards the Child, he looks at the infant Jesus as the latter bestows His benediction on him. The intercession of the saint standing behind him is indicated by the movement of that saint's right hand, with which he holds the patron's head from behind. Based on his facial features, the kneeling figure is a middle-aged man.

Directly above each of the three main figures are depicted small angels kneeling on clouds; the angels are turned towards one another. Leaning towards the centre, their postures accord with the cornice line of the gable, although a kind of perspective, too, is discernible in their arrangement, just as it is in the case of Mary's throne. The working of the faces and hair of the angels strongly recalls that
1. Stone relief from L’Aquila, Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts
of the faces and hair of the saints, especially the one on the right. Their gaze is directed upwards, where a half-length figure of Christ can be seen protruding out of a cloud that completely fills the gable’s field. In his left hand He holds a chalice, on which a wafer is depicted. The hand part of His right arm, which is raised in blessing, has broken off. The wound in His side is made visible by a square aperture in His tunic. His attire is similar to that of the male saint, although the paruras of His tunic are embellished. His halo, too, is enriched with engraved motifs. The fashioning of His mask-like face and hair can likewise be compared with that of the faces and hair of the saints, especially the one on the left. At the level of the gable there are two round sculptures carved from separate blocks of stone. As a continuation of each of the pilasters there are—instead of pinnacles—figures from the Annunciation. Depicted from one side on the left is the Archangel Gabriel, turning towards Mary and extending his right hand to her. On the right and depicted front-wise is Mary, holding a book in her hand and wearing the same attire as the Madonna. The reverse sides of the sculptures are executed in a slipshod fashion, as is the reverse side of the retable itself, which is carved flat in a rough manner.

In many places on the retable traces of painting and gilding can be made out. On the background surface, blue coloration can be seen; the darker spots that appear scattered across refer to stars. Traces of gilding can be seen on the hair of the figures (with the exception of the patron), on the borders of their clothes, on the crockets of the gable, on the halos, on the upper parts of the wings of two of the small angels, and on the mountings of the book held by the female saint. On the inside of the cloaks, including that of the patron as well, there is blue coloration; on the outsides, however, there are no traces of paint. More precisely, on the three main figures small remains indicating a layer of white, perhaps of lime, can be observed. Likewise, traces of blue paint refer to the one-time colour of the tunics of the three angels, while red paint can be seen on the smooth surfaces featuring on the pilasters. Whether all these paint remains belonged to the original coloration or, if they are later, how they relate to any conceivable original colouring is difficult to decide without laboratory examination.

The relief arrived at the Budapest museum as part of a contingent of sculptures purchased by Károly Pulszky in Italy in the late 19th century, in order to lay the foundations for a collection of sculpture there. He acquired the work along with many others in Florence, through the mediation of a certain Emilio Costantini, whose role in Pulszky’s purchases is yet unclear. In any case, a list dated 4 July 1895 has survived at the end of which there is an attestation, by a Florentine dealer supposedly (he is unknown), stating that Costantini had paid the full purchase price for the pieces in question. In the list we read the following about the relief under discussion: “Bassorilievo di pietra d’Aquila, la vergine col bambino, santi e donatore in ginocchio 2000 [lire].” The work appeared in most of the museum’s early inventories and catalogues as North Italian, its date fluctuated between the 14th century and 1460, and, on the basis of the above sentence, it was
thought to be the work of a certain master by the name of Aquila. Jolán Balogh has pointed out that in this sentence the word Aquila indicates provenance, moreover hardly that of the stone but rather that of the relief. Accordingly, the retable originates neither from the place of its acquisition (Florence) nor from the vicinity of it, but came to Budapest from the town of L'Aquila (Abruzzo) situated in the hills 100 kilometres east-northeast of Rome, which became better known after the tragic events of 2008. As to where it originally stood in the town, we have no data for the moment. In L'Aquila, which was artificially established in the mid-13th century and which soon became the seat of a bishopric, there were, in comparison with settlements of similar size, many more possibilities for the positioning of such a relief. L'Aquila became the second most important town in the Kingdom of Naples when, at the time of its foundation, the inhabitants of surrounding, partly surrendered, settlements were moved into different districts in accordance with their earlier places of residence and when every district was obliged to build its own parish church. Hence, even if the number ninety-nine often mentioned in connection with the town’s districts and churches could have hardly been true, in the Middle-Ages the sum total of parish churches alone reached several dozens, of which many can still be seen today.

Concerning the original placement of the relief within the structure receiving it, a certain amount of data is given by its design. Its size and profiled base indicate that it must not have stood directly on the ground, but on some kind of a structure, as a superstructure. On the basis of its negligently carved reverse side and two projecting iron pegs that served to fasten it, it was placed in front of an architectural structure; moreover, the unworked nature of its left side indicates that this side would not have been visible. In all likelihood, then, it stood in a corner of some kind: in a corner where two walls met, possibly next to a larger pilaster.

Although the depiction on the relief shows a customary medieval theme, the identity of three of its protagonists is uncertain. The attributes of the two saints flanking Mary are too general for us to give an unequivocal reference as to who they are. In the case of the young female saint, a certain basis is provided by the arrow held in her right hand. This attribute can be brought into connection with some half-dozen female saints. Because of the geographical extent of the veneration for them and the timing of it, only three may be mentioned here. Of these veneration, the cult of St Ursula was the most widespread, the medieval depictions of whom can be pointed out in every territory of Europe, including South Italy. An arrow was likewise an attribute of another martyr-saint, one who, moreover, was connected to Italy: St Christina. The veneration of this saint, who was born and buried in Bolsena, was pronounced in Italy, but can be pointed out also north of the Alps. Not going beyond local significance but linked precisely to L'Aquila, the veneration of a third personage can be mentioned: that of St Giusta, who was buried in Bazzano (in the close vicinity of L'Aquila) where the church built above her tomb became the centre of her cult. In Abruzzo and in Campania, St Giusta had many devotees; in the town of L'Aquila itself a church
was dedicated to her and she was also one of the town’s patron saints.20 There is a saint who was “international”, a saint who was local but known more widely also and a saint who was expressly local—for the moment it is difficult to choose between these three possibilities, even if we can reflect on the most likely.21

The other, bearded, saint to the right of Mary seems at first sight to be easier to identify, on the basis of the pilgrim’s staff in his left hand. This may be St James the Apostle, who was often depicted merely with a staff, without any other pilgrim’s gear.22 One Neapolitan monument—which also plays a role in connection with the style of the Budapest retable (see below)—complicates the situation, however. This is the tomb of Ludovico Aldomorisco, admiral of King Ladislas Anjou-Durazzo of Naples, a structure erected in S. Lorenzo Maggiore in 1421. On each of the two longer sides of the sarcophagus there appears a figure whose attire, physiognomy and even pilgrim’s staff resemble those of the male saint in the Budapest relief. On each of the two crowded sarcophagus reliefs depicting many scenes together, the figure appears before Mary as the patron of the work, clasping the shoulder of King Ladislas and his patron. His identification is made “easy” by an inscription in French on one of the sides, according to which the figure is a certain “ayme”. The monograph dealing with the tomb elucidates the name as Emericus (Imre in Hungarian) and explains its emphatic appearance on the sarcophagus by reference to the embracing of the cult of the holy kings of Hungary by the Neapolitan Angevins, by Ladislas’s claim to the throne of Hungary, and by the prominent role for Aldomorisco in Ladislas’s plans. (In 1402, the king appointed the admiral governor of Hungary and sent him to Dalmatia at the head of a fleet in order to prepare the way for his coming to power; in a few months Aldomorisco acquired Dalmatia for Ladislas almost completely).23 However, the author also remarks that the iconography of Imre is completely unique.24 This consideration, together with a name-form difficult to bring into connection with Imre and with the fact that his established iconography could not have been unknown to the Angevins precisely because of their embracing of the above-mentioned cult (see the depiction of Imre in S. Maria Donnaregia from the early 14th century in Naples),25 indicates that barring some basic misunderstanding, it is hardly Imre who was depicted on Aldomorisco’s tomb.26 The French word Ayme (Aime) covers another Christian name, the Latin Amatus (Italian: Amato). Four saints with this name are known, and each gave rise to a cult that was local only. These saints were the first abbot of Remiremont (France), b. c. 565–570, d. after 628; the bishop of Sion (Sitten, Switzerland), d. 690; the bishop of Nusco (Italy), d. 1093; and Amato Ronconi, c. 1225–92.27 For us the last two may be of interest. Nusco is situated approximately seventy kilometres east of Naples, and the biography of the bishop written by Francesco de Ponte in the 15th century was published there in 1543. Although his cult developed as early as the 14th century, the first depiction of him is known from Ponte’s book. This shows the bishop in a cloak and with a mitre and crook but lacking any less usual attribute; and this iconography is traceable in the later depictions of him also. Since no detail from his life is known
that would warrant his depiction as a pilgrim, it is not likely that the figure either on the Neapolitan or on the Budapest relief is the bishop of Nusco.28 The second candidate, Amato Ronconi, a Third Order Franciscan venerated as a blessed from around 1300, was born in Saludecio, near Rimini and founded and operated a hospital nearby for the poor and for pilgrims. He went to Santiago de Compostela four times and it is for this reason that in depictions of him—naturally none earlier than the modern age are known—he appears with the attributes of pilgrims, with a staff among other things.29 Ronconi, then, fits the Neapolitan depiction in theory, but his cult was definitely local, and we do not know how close he may have been to Ladislaus Anjou-Durazzo (or possibly to Ludovico Aldomorisco). Hence the Neapolitan figure can for the moment be brought into connection with him merely as a supposition, and the Budapest one only on the level of postulation; in the last case identification with St James the Apostle seems much more probable.

The third figure in the Budapest relief whose identity is, alas, not known—although it would in part provide answers to the above questions—is the donor kneeling in the lower left-hand corner. The figure, who is being commended to the attention of Mary and Jesus by the saint on the left, is wearing ecclesiastical attire. He is wearing a version of the surplice that can be pointed out from the 11th century onwards, one which had conspicuously ample, long sleeves and which reached below the knee, sometimes as far as the ankle (superpelliceum, cotta). This item of attire probably appeared in connection with canons, but in the 14th—15th centuries was on certain occasions worn in a much broader circle from the lower clergy to prelates even.30 A little more information is given about the place of the donor in ecclesiastical society by the piece of attire that is depicted folded in two and placed over the shoulder of the donor. This is a version of a head covering known as an almucium, which—originally as protection against the cold—hung down, covering the shoulders and sometimes even the entire upper body. The almucium was an item of clothing that expressly belonged to the non-liturgical dress of canons and as a distinguishing mark, placed over the shoulder or, in warm weather, over the arm belonged to their attire.31 Obviously, therefore, it appears on many figural tombs of canons in the late medieval period, for example in Rome also (for Hungarians the best known may be the tombstone of János Lázói, archdeacon of Telegd, in S. Stefano Rotondo, Rome).32 The donor of the relief was, therefore, a canon, who naturally may have performed other functions as well, and who may have had the work made for practically any church in L’Aquila.33

On the basis of the design and the depiction, the function of the relief seems at first sight to be obvious: it must be an altarpiece. Retables made from stone did not play a very big role in the medieval art of Italy. Their number is insignificant compared to painted altarpieces, they appeared much later and mostly copied the composition and iconography of the painted works.34 The depiction on the Budapest retable, the Madonna enthroned with saints on either side of her, was the most frequent theme of painted altarpieces during the Trecento. On these, donors,
too, sometimes appear in front of the Madonna, generally, however, in a much smaller size than in our example, and it is comparatively rare for their patron saints to commend them with a gesture of the hand to the safekeeping of Mary and her Child. The latter mentioned do not very often turn towards the donors, as in the Budapest retable, but appear in a frontal pose, turned towards the viewer. On altarpieces that are painted and supplied with a wooden frame, figural depiction in the place of the pinnacles is not known. We encounter this solution mainly next to the gables of carved canopies, predominantly in a funerary context, as a part of sepulchral monuments, and the figures depicted are most often protagonists from the Annunciation. These small differences remind us that the L'Aquila relief should not necessarily be regarded as an altarpiece. This cautionary note may be strengthened by the depiction of the three main figures in one field, unseparated from one another. In the case of painted altarpieces, the depiction—the composition itself whether unitary or not—is always vertically divided by means of architectural framing, and, after certain preliminaries in the second half of the 14th century, only by the end of the first third of the Quattrocento did there develop, on the Madonna col Bambino fra santi theme, a picture field without architectonic division. An altarpiece by Gentile da Fabriano from around 1400 is perhaps the earliest work on this theme in which, instead of the traditional solution articulated by frame pillars, there are only individual painted trees referring to the rule for the earlier, architectonic separation of the main figures. However, depiction of the figures without articulation appeared much earlier than the composition in question, although not on altarpieces but in a funerary context. From the first third of the 13th century, we have written sources to the effect that the depiction of the theme appeared in connection with sepulchral monuments in Italy. The earliest known example is the tomb of Cardinal Guglielmo Fieschi (d. 1256) in Rome, where, on a wall behind the canopy, saints above the sarcophagus commend the deceased, and his uncle Pope Innocent IV, to the mercy of an enthroned Christ, in this case not to that of the Madonna. A composition with the Madonna appears in the 1270s on a tomb in Viterbo of a person who is difficult to identify, and around 1300 on a largely uniform group of monuments that can be grouped mostly around the tomb of Boniface VIII and the workshop of Giovanni di Cosma. These are wall-mounted sepulchral monuments, on the wall above the sarcophagus, with the composition in question being either painted or made from mosaic, and being in some kind of connection with the tomb and in many cases with an altar, too. In view of the fact that, in contrast with altarpieces, here it is not a depiction of the heavens but the intercession for the salvation of the deceased that is represented, commendation by patron saints is often expressed by a gesture of the hand. Acceptance of this by the Madonna and her child is in many cases depicted by means of a turning towards the deceased and likewise a movement of the hand. Vertical division between the figures does not appear. At the same time, the depiction appears on the top of monumental sepulchral monuments as a sculptural group also—it should be noted that early on the group was placed
in a three-part architectonic frame rather than being undivided—, and in Trecento sepulchral sculpture various undivided composition solutions of the theme became universal. With time it even became a separate picture type, serving as a recurrent depiction for epitaphs. The L’Aquila stone retable can in theory be conceived of as an epitaph, or even as a part of a tomb; indeed, in the final analysis, it cannot be ruled out that it belonged to such an ensemble in which the tomb was combined with an altar, and in this way the panel may also have fulfilled the role of a retable. Many different forms of this design are known, among which a work by Tino di Camaino is especially worthy of mention in connection with the Budapest panel. Situated at one time in Pisa Cathedral (today the Museo dell’Opera del Duomo, Pisa), this is the St Rainerius tomb monument made before 1306 which originally consisted of three parts: an altar table standing in front of the wall, a sarcophagus resting on brackets above
it, and a retable topped by a gable. On the last mentioned, which is the earliest known stone altar retable in Italy, similarly to the Budapest relief an enthroned Madonna can be seen with her Child, as she receives into her mercy donators commended by saints. On the basis of the above possibilities, it is for the moment difficult to decide in the case of the L’Aquila work what it is exactly: whether the unusual solutions, linked to funerary sculpture most of all, appear on an altarpiece ordered in stone as a consequence of the accomplishment of the sculptor in his own genre, or whether these designs indicate that despite its basic form the relief was not intended as an altarpiece, but was made for a funerary ensemble satisfying devotional and/or commemorative needs.

The standard of the Budapest relief does not indicate a master of outstanding skill, but one who was much practiced. The piece is the work of a sculptor of above average quality. Those capable to work at this level clearly did not make one piece only. Accordingly, it is worth looking around in L’Aquila and its vicinity to see whether any comparable sculptural work from this period has survived, unless they should be imported works. Jolan Balogh has already mentioned two such works in the town whose style, in her opinion, resembles that of the Budapest piece, and thus underscores its provenance. One is a tympanum relief, on the west portal of the parish church of S. Maria di Roio (fig. 2a). The tympanum, which in the middle shows the Madonna seated with her Child (Madonna del Latte) and on either side of her St Peter and a bishop-saint in half-figure depictions, is in lower relief than the Budapest work, but similarities are apparent. The relatively stiff posture of the figures and their hand movements; the slightly awkward working of the hands; the solutions for the softly curving, pleated drapery; and the identical nature of the plain-surface haloes all indicate that the two works are very close to one another. A comparison of the Madonnas permits even a more concrete conclusion than this (fig. 5a-b). In addition to the above similarities, recurring details appear on their cloaks; indeed, from the identical wavy lines on the edges of the cloaks covering their heads through the mask-like faces to the small detail of the lock of hair over the ear it is as if they were copies of one another. Accordingly, the two works are the creation of the same sculptor, or at least were made in the same workshop.

The other work is a piece of furniture, the choir-stalls from the chancel of the already-mentioned Church of S. Giusta (fig. 3a-b). The choir-stalls are not a uniform creation: at least two end- and two dividing panels—on which depictions of standing figures can be seen—were originally not made here and in all probability came from an earlier choir-stalls. Each of these panels is topped by a gable the surface beneath which is filled out with a full-figure relief depiction of a saint. The principal characteristic of these is that they are carved in a very low relief; on two of the four panels the mask-like character of the faces is conspicuous, and the same can be said of them as of the tympanum of S. Maria di Roio and the Budapest relief. The best opportunity for comparison is given by the female saint (St Giusta) depicted in profile on the end-panel of the south side (fig. 5c-d). Her
hand holding a book and at the same time the edge of her cloak, the lower part of her clothing flattening out on the ground, the upper border embellishment (expanded in the middle) on her tunic, her head with a diadem, and the arrangement of her hair all match more or less completely those of the right-hand-side female saint on the Budapest stone relief. It is clear that these choir-stall panels were made in the same workshop as the above mentioned two works.

Even in L'Aquila, another three sculptures can surely be linked to this workshop. A medieval Pietà relief appears as the centre piece of a Baroque altar on the east wall of the east aisle in the S. Biagio di Amiterno (today S. Giuseppe) Church (fig. 2b). In the rectangular field a niche topped by a semi-circular arch can be seen. Its backdrop is covered with hung drapery, and in front of this is depicted Mary holding her Son in her arms. Almost stretching the frame in many places and producing a crowded field, the two figures are worked with the same stiff postures, awkward hands, mask-like faces, and drapery handling as the above, and
many of the minute detail solutions already mentioned also appear. It is worth
calling attention to Christ’s head, which is as if it has been borrowed from the male
saint on the Budapest retable (fig. 5e-f). Although the quality of the sculpture
seems rather poor compared to that of the above works—which, of course, we can
attribute to the thick lime layer covering the relief—, the Pietà likewise can be
linked unequivocally to the workshop of the Budapest retable.

The remaining two sculptures appear in a secondary application in the upper
part of the west façade of the S. Marco church (fig. 4a-b). Under the main cornice
and surmounted by a Baroque canopy, an enthroned Madonna can be seen, her
Child sitting on her left knee. On the south corner-pilaster on the south tower,
on the other hand, is a male saint (Apostle?) with the probably secondary inscrip-
tion “S • MARCUS • E” under a similar canopy and holding a book. Both
figures are placed on a plinth projecting in a bracket-like manner and intended to
depict ground; the handling of their drapery, their faces, and the working of their
haloes all give sufficient basis for including them among the sculptures mentioned
hitherto.

In terms of their style, the L’Aquila sculptures, together with the Budapest
piece, form a rather uniform group whose members show more or less the same
quality and can be linked to one another relatively easily because of the character-
istic stock of motifs. It exemplifies a particular version of International Gothic,
invariably calling to mind the sculpture of North Italy in general and exhibiting
the slightly antique tendencies customary in the sculpture of the Trecento. The
uniform stock of motifs may indicate that in the workshop where they were made
a single dominant sculptor worked, although on the basis of the quantity of the
works that have survived to the present we must reckon this was a productive
business anyway (on the basis of the choir-stalls, we know for certain, for example,
that in the workshop sculptures were made not only of stone, but also of wood). The
number of surviving pieces also indicates that the workshop must have operated
in L’Aquila: it is unlikely that such a large number of works would have been
imported into the town from a single outside supplier. This is underscored by the
significance and wealth of the town, and also by the unusually high number of its
ecclesiastical institutions, which definitely created the demand for several sculpture
workshops operating parallely. When exactly this workshop operated in the time-
frame from the late 14th century to the mid-15th is not easy to say. On the
pieces there is no inscription to indicate this, neither date, and most of them are
today not in their original position. Moreover, the coat of arms of a highly sig-
nificant and old L’Aquila family on the Pietà makes it impossible to link this piece
in the absence of additional information to any particular member of the family.
For dating, then, we have but style criticism, namely the charting of the question
emerging in any event concerning the kind of links the workshop had in its nar-
rower and broader environment with regard to its style.

From the sculpture of the period in L’Aquila, and in Abruzzo only a few monu-
ments are known. There are no really outstanding works, and the style of the pieces
generally is rather old-fashioned—some can even be linked to the Roman period—, and often it is difficult to ascribe to them any kind of stylistic trend. The existence of sculpture centres determinable in a broader sense cannot be proved. The material of surviving works is largely wood; in Abruzzo, sculptors rarely used stone in this period. Besides local masters, the presence of German sculptor(s), too, can be detected in a group of sculptures of better quality that can be delineated comparatively well. However, these works are the only ones in whose connection the stylistic concept of International Gothic can be imputed. Because of research concentrating on architectural sculptures of the Roman period and that of the Renaissance, the surviving material from the period is poorly studied. With regard to the overall picture, the group of sculptures under discussion certainly stands out considering not only its quality but also its characteristic forms. In other words, prototypes and parallels to be discussed must be sought beyond L’Aquila and Abruzzo.

Because of its geographical location, it is first and foremost Rome that should be mentioned. Similarly to other areas of culture, sculpture in the city does not present an over-rich picture in the late Middle Ages, and within them, in our period either. For this the explanation is largely political and social: the Curia only

4a-b. L’Aquila, Reliefs of the Virgin and Child and a saint on the façade of S. Marco Church (Photo: Author)
moved back to Rome in the early 15th century, and a middle-class group of patrons was also lacking in the city. The genre was almost exclusively confined to funerary monuments, of which neither the style, nor the subject matter, nor the compositions really indicate a point of contact with the L'Aquila material. Since L'Aquila belonged to the Kingdom of Naples, the next location that could be mentioned is Naples itself, which had much richer sculptural traditions. The sculp-
5e-f. Details of the figures 1 and 2b

5g. Head of a Virtue figure on the monument of King Ladislaus of Anjou-Durazzo in Naples, S. Giovanni a Carbonara
ture of the city was determined right up until the end of the 14th century by the style that appeared early in that century with the works of Tino di Camaino. Only after this did there emerge a markedly new direction, the main figure in which was Antonio Baboccio, who maintained a significant workshop that can be traced in Naples between 1407 and 1421. Baboccio, an architect, goldsmith, and painter, worked for the Anjou-Durazzo court. According to an 18th-century record, he arrived in Naples from Milan. Although the style of his works is not uniform and their quality is rather uneven—something attributable to the versatility of Baboccio and the large size of his workshop—, in the Neapolitan sculpture it was he who represented a style new to South Italy, namely International Gothic. Along with this, he was the first to utilize consciously antique elements, too, in his works, which can be brought into parallel less with the natural employment of the antique in the Trecento than with the Renaissance in Florence that came into being at more or less the same time.68 The most important work of the decade after Baboccio is the sepulchral monument of Ladislaus Anjou-Durazzo in S. Giovanni a Carbonara. Although his Tuscan sculptors were already proficient in the style of the Early Renaissance, the general impression given by the work and the overwhelming majority of its details follow, in accordance with the ideas of those commissioning them, the sepulchral monuments of the 14th-century rulers of Naples, principally that of King Robert the Wise.69

These Neapolitan monuments made in the first third of the 15th century, mainly works by Baboccio, define the style of the L'Aquila workshop relatively well. Similarly to the approach seen on the Budapest relief, Baboccio had a penchant for crowding together the figures depicted in the panel field. This approach already appears with the choir of angels in Naples Cathedral and on the portal of the Pappacoda Chapel, and characterizes all his sepulchral monuments.70 We encounter it in the Madonna col Bambino fra santi theme also, where instead of a row of saints traditionally depicted separately and each surrounded by a frame, he depicted the theme as a single scene.71 Despite reliefs executed in low relief, in his late works Baboccio was able to achieve an impression of deep space, which is characteristic of the S. Biagio Pietà, the S. Marco sculptures and the Budapest panel.72 In the last mentioned, the most obvious means for this is the outwardly turning corner of Mary’s throne.73 In contrast to early Neapolitan sculpture, on Baboccio’s figures it is already possible to sense the limbs underneath the draperies, and gesticulation is an important element.74 This approach is typical for all the pieces in the L’Aquila material, and both groups show a certain hazyness in the appearance of these solutions. Along with the sameness in approach numerous similarities and agreements can be pointed out in connection with detail. In both groups of monuments, elongated heads, mask-like, template-like faces, moderately worked mouth contours, and sharply carved eyes predominate.75 Very characteristic are the awkward and often disproportionately large hands. Moreover, a conspicuously uniform contorted way of holding the hands characterizes Mary in the Annunciation shown on the Budapest panel, one of the caryatids on the sepul-
chral monument of Margaret Anjou-Durazzo, and the falconer, as well as St Cecilia on the Aldomorisco monument. Hand gestures are worth comparing, too, since both St Antony on the last mentioned sepulchral monument and the male saint on the Budapest panel touch the head of the patron in a similar way. Both workshops had a predilection for using the anyway generally widespread motif of a crease appearing in the middle part of the neckline of garments. Clearly identical plant forms appear on the brackets holding the canopy on the choir-stalls in the S. Giusta church and on the base and middle pilaster of the sarcophagus of Margaret Anjou-Durazzo. The handling of the drapery likewise shows a similar approach, although with regard to the working of the drapery it is generally different. However, here, too, can be found agreements, for example between Mary’s clothing of S. Biagio and that of S. Marco, between garments visible on the sarcophagus of Agnes and Clemenza Anjou-Durazzo, and between the cloak of the female saint on the Budapest panel and that of the figure third to the right of the enthroned queen on the front side of the Margaret funerary monument. It is also worth mentioning that the colours of the paint remains on the Budapest relief and the places where the colours appear are similar to those on the Margaret sepulchral monument, which mostly preserves its paint: a blue background; partly blue garments with gold borders and appliqué; hair and plant ornamentation in gold; and red paint on architectural elements.

All these interconnections are illustrated among others the depictions of identical themes: the figures of the enthroned Virgin Mary turned to one side on the Neapolitan and L’Aquila monuments. The posture and approach of these are almost identical, and their quality is mostly the same. Numerous, almost literal agreements can be found between the fashioning of the details, but in the elaboration major differences, too, appear. In other words, here we have two groups of monuments whose styles stand in direct contact with one another, but there is no such a degree of agreement that can be sensed between the L’Aquila pieces. If we wish to translate this relationship into concrete connections between those executing the works, naturally we can deal only in suppositions. The connections are much closer than would be if the style of the monument groups were merely derived from common prototypes. Although in the case of both groups a northern origin on some kind of level seems obvious, the head of the L’Aquila workshop must certainly have been very familiar with the works of Baboccio. This knowledge he could not really have acquired as an outsider. Accordingly, we cannot exclude the possibility that he spent some time in the Naples workshop, as one of Baboccio’s numerous colleagues, which of course means he must have come face to face with sculpture in that city during the 14th century.

However, certain solutions on the L’Aquila monuments indicate that their prototypes were not exclusively works by Baboccio. The shaping of the architectural frames on the Budapest relief and the use of pilasters supplied with broken cornices as supports for the gable cannot be found on Baboccio’s works. These are rare in the Trecento sculpture of Naples, too, which characteristically used
columns on the canopies of sepulchral monuments.\textsuperscript{83} They appear in an identical context on the sepulchral monument of Ladislaus Anjou-Durazzo, where, moreover, the proportions of the gables, the profiling of their cornices, and the filling out of their fields with depictions stretching as far as the cornice are exact parallels with those of the Budapest panel (fig. 6).\textsuperscript{84} Of the L'Aquila monuments, the Pietà relief in the S. Biagio Church may also point in this direction. The semicircular arch in the top part of a square frame, with armorial shields appearing in front of plant motifs in the corners in between, reminds us of the central scene of the sepulchral monument of Ladislaus: the two enthroned siblings.\textsuperscript{85}

Certain Renaissance elements of the sepulchral monument in S. Giovanni a Carbonara and one of the portals of the church can likewise be referred to in connection with the L'Aquila material. In the last mentioned, it is principally on the female heads that they can be discerned, but the antique character appearing after antique monuments in a scarcely direct manner does not automatically stem from Trecento sculpture. It appears to be more traceable from the shaping of the heads of the virtue figures appearing on the Ladislaus sepulchral monument, or from the female heads based unequivocally on antique prototypes that appear on the sideportal of the church (fig. 5c, g).\textsuperscript{86} The aspiration to imitate the new set of forms would not have been completely alien to the L'Aquila master, but in its realisation he was still strongly tied to his own accustomed stock of forms.\textsuperscript{87}

The connections revealed above approximately delimit the period of the activity of the L'Aquila workshop. On the basis of works by Baboccio from the first two decades of the 15th century as well as the date 1428 on the funerary monument of Ladislaus Anjou-Durazzo, most of the material must have been made in the 1420s and 1430s.

Concerning the style of the monuments, besides Naples a further possible point of comparison should briefly be mentioned, although in connection with our material that would only raise questions at present. Moreover, it touches problems belonging to an area of interest to research for a considerable time, where we likewise do not see matters very clearly. Around the turn of the 20th century, approximately a dozen secondarily placed stone carvings built into the

---

6. Gable on the monument of King Ladislaus of Anjou-Durazzo in Naples, S. Giovanni a Carbonara (Photo: Pál Lővei)
wall were noticed in the Castel di Sangro, which is situated in the southern part of Abruzzo: six square-shaped reliefs with scenes taken from the life of Christ, and one enthroned Madonna in the courtyard of the so-called Patini building, as well as a Pietà relief on the outside of the Baroque Cathedral S. Maria Assunta, a figural capital, and smaller fragments. The pieces—also those inside the Patini building—probably come from the medieval cathedral demolished in 1695. It quickly turned out that the six reliefs copy in part compositions on Ghiberti’s first Florentine door. In connection with the carvings, the names of two masters have emerged. One is a certain Amico di Bartolomeo, on the basis of an inscription from 1423 deriving from the medieval church. The other is Nicola da Guardiagrele, on the basis of the close connection of some of his works with those of Ghiberti, a goldsmith from Abruzzo, active in the first half of the 15th century, who advanced almost to the status of a national master. In any event, the connections are not clear. To begin with, it is not unequivocal that the dozen carvings come from one structure or even from the same period, or in what connection the six reliefs—which, because of their connection to Ghiberti, appear frequently in the art historical literature not alike the other carvings—stood with Guardiagrele. It has been said that possibly they mediated the works of the Florentine master to the goldsmith, but since Nicola’s works, created mainly after 1431 seriously suggest that he personally knew the works of Ghiberti, it seems more likely that it was Guardiagrele or his workshop that made the Castel di Sangro reliefs. Although sculptures can be attributed to Nicola only on the basis of style, and pieces that have emerged so far show a very heterogeneous picture concerning both quality and style, the goldsmith certainly worked also as a sculptor, which is indicated by a contract dated 1456. From the point of view of the L’Aquila material, it is not the six reliefs but the Madonna relief now unfortunately missing and known only from archive photographs that

7. Castel di Sangro, Virgin and Child
represents a point of connection to the issue (fig. 7). Insofar as can be judged on the basis of these photographs, the depiction itself bears the same characteristics—in approach and in characteristic details—that can be observed on the L'Aquila works. (A good comparison is offered by the four L'Aquila reliefs that show Mary.) These are as follows: the rather block-like shaping of the figures, the stiff postures, the clumsy hands, the expressionless faces, the characteristic treatment of the hair, and to some extent the fashioning of the drapery, too. The difference may be detected rather in the poorer quality of the Castel di Sangro sculpture, although it is difficult to say anything sure on that work which appears to be in a fairly bad condition in the photographs. However, based on the photographs, the author would dare to risk to say, that the Madonna was made in the same workshop as the L'Aquila sculptures.

Although the style of the six reliefs is obviously different from that of the Madonna, in connection with the latter it seems worthwhile to suggest a connection between the L'Aquila material and Guardiagrele as well. That the L'Aquila master and Nicola operated partly in the same period and largely in the same field is clear on the basis of the above. We may suspect that the former was in some way connected with goldsmith's work: the bracket-like support imitating (rocky) ground, which appears on two sculptures in the S. Marco Church and which to all intents and purposes is unknown in sculpture, is much characteristic of the works of Nicola. Beyond this, it is principally the handling the drapery that similarities show, in particular with those works of Guardiagrele that already attest to the influence of Ghiberti (it is, however, characteristic that the animation of the figures, the depiction of which Guardiagrele mastered thanks to Ghiberti, never makes itself visible through the draperies of the L'Aquila master). How general these connections were, or whether we can really conclude from them a connection of some kind between the two masters, is difficult to say, at least from Budapest. Whether or not the L'Aquila group represented a factor of some kind in connection with Guardiagrele—let us say a link between the goldsmith and the art of Baboccio—, the retable preserved in the Museum of Fine Arts in any event provides an occasion for a little-known episode in the sculpture of L'Aquila in the late Middle Ages to be discussed.


6 Inv. No. 1197; 191 × 94.5 × 7.5 cm, see (together with the earlier literature) J. Balogh, Katalog der ausländischen Bildwerke des Museums der Bildenden Künste in Budapest, vol. I., Budapest 1975, 49, No. 36, vol. II., figs. 47–51.

7 The finial is likewise carved from separate stone. On the retable a small addition made largely of plaster may be seen: the lower part of the right-hand pilaster along with the base-moulding, details of the brackets of the gable, and the plinth of the Archangel Gabriel. Recent damage can be seen on the base-moulding and on the sleeve of the donor’s clothes.

8 An engraved circle can be seen only at the edge of the female saint’s halo.

9 As the hole there attests, at one time Gabriel held something in his left hand; his right wing is largely broken off, and fingers of his right hand are missing.

10 On the upper surface of the ledge beneath each of the two sculptures, at the back, a perpendicularly carved recess can be seen in which a metal peg serving to attach the retable appears. The front surface and side surface of the right-hand pilaster are profiled and, in accordance with this, the profiling of the lower and upper ledges also run along the side. On the other hand, on the left pilaster the side surface is merely carved smooth, and the ledges are fashioned with a simple, bevelled surface, without profiling.

11 Since the surface of the retable is strongly soiled, its intended restoration will bring out the colours to a more significant degree.

12 On the basis of the handwriting, the list was very probably written by Costantini; see Szépművészeti Múzeum, Irattár 279/1894, no. 30. The relief had already featured on a list compiled by Costantini and dated 6 June 1895 that had been asked beforehand to facilitate remittance of the purchase price of the art works (ibid, 139/1895, no. 7).

13 A Szépművészeti Múzeum részére vásárolt festmények, plasztikai művek és grafikai lapok lajstroma, ed. K. Pulszky–J. Peregriny, Budapest 1896, 11. (Aquila, 14th century); Katalog der Bildwerke der Italienischen Renaissance des Museums der Bildenden Künste, ed. P. Schubring, 1913, no. 65 (marble tympanum, Verona, c. 1460); Az Országos Magyar Szépművészeti Múzeum állaigai, ed. J. Peregriny, III/3, Budapest 1915, 23 (master named Aquila, 14th century); A közép- és újabbkori szobrászati gyűjtemény, ed. S. Meller, Budapest 1921, no. 45 (Upper Italian master, second half of the 14th century); A. Hekler, Budapest als Kunststadt, Küsnacht am Rigi 1933, 113 (Northern Italian, first half of the 15th century).


15 Since at the time of the Florence purchase in 1895 it was still known that the relief was from L’Aquila, in all probability the work spent most of the 19th century in the South Italian town.
In that century, many historical-topographical descriptions of the town and its province appeared (see the bibliographies in the works mentioned in the following footnote). However, of these works only one of the earliest—admittedly a study which from our point of view appears suitably detailed—was accessible for the present author: A. Leosini, *Monumenti storici artistici della citta di Aquila e suoi contorni. Colle notizie de’ pittori, scultori, architetti*, Aquila 1848. Leosini mentions no work that could be identified with the relief. However, as the majority of the artifacts mentioned below do appear in his account, this may indicate that in the mid-19th century the Budapest piece was already in a place that was out of reach, or perhaps not in the town at all. For the other 19th-century topographical works, and for the 17th-century unpublished *canonica visitationes* drawn up on the churches of L’Aquila, see O. Lehmann-Brockhaus, *Abruzzien und Molise. Kunst und Geschichte*, Munich 1983, 222–23; these may furnish information regarding the original location of the relief. See also H. W. Schulz, *Denkmäler der Kunst des Mittelalters in Unteritalien*, vol. II., Dresden 1860, 67–77, in which likewise no mention is made of the panel.


20 A collegiate chapter came into being early on in Bazzano in the church of the saint, and this was moved to L’Aquila when that town was founded. The S. Giusta Church there became the main parish church of the St George quarter of the town and was, after the cathedral, the richest ecclesiastical institution in L’Aquila. See F. Murri, *Santa Giusta e le sue chiese all’Aquila e Bazzano*, L’Aquila–Rome 1986; for depictions, see also *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie* (n. 17 above), vol. 7., 251–52; Kaftal (n. 18 above), 656–57; Lehmann-Brockhaus (n. 15 above), 364.

21 Most signs refer perhaps to S. Giusta. Certainly grounds for caution are given by, for example, the fact that the two principal figures of the main altar (made after 1600) in L’Aquila’s S. Giusta church were St Giusta and St Ursula. See Murri (n. 20 above), 80, fig. on p. 43.


24 A detailed treatment of the tomb is given by N. Bock, *Kunst am Hofe der Anjou-Durazzo. Der Bildhauer Antonio Baboccio (1351–um 1423)*, Munich–Berlin 2001, 329–409; for a depiction of the saint, see ibid, figs. 194–98; for the inscription, see ibid, 391, 434, fig. 107; for identification of the saint with Imre, see ibid, 393–95; for the tomb’s Hungarian connections, see P. Lővei, “Anjou-magyar síremlékek és címeres emlékek Nápolyban,” *Ars Hungarica* XXVI, 1998, 34.

26 For the iconography of St Imre in the Middle Ages, see Szent Imre 1000 éve. Tanulmányok Szent Imre tiszteletére születésének ezredik évfordulójára alkalmából, ed. T. Kerny, Székesfehérvár 2007, ch. 4; for depictions of him in Italy, see M. Prokopp, “Szent Imre Itália művészetében,” ibid, 83–87.


28 For his life, see G. Passaro, Sant’Amato di Nusco, Naples 1965; for depictions of him, see idem, Iconografia di Sant’Amato da Nusco, Nusco 1994.

29 For Amato, who was officially made blessed only in 1742, see M. Molari, Amato Ronconi, il Santo di Saludecio, Verucchio 1993.


31 Bock (n. 30 above), 352–54; Braun (n. 30 above), 355–57.


33 Five chapters operated in the town in the Middle Ages: that of the cathedral and the collegiate chapters of the main parish churches of the four large quarters of the town (S. Giusta di Bazzano, S. Maria Paganica, S. Marciano di Roio, S. Pietro di Coppito). See Murri (n. 20 above), 87–88.

34 No comprehensive treatment of stone altar-panels in Italy exists. For mention of the rarity of the genre along with some outstanding works, see J. Braun, Der christliche Altar in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung, vol. II., Munich 1924, 310–11; J. Poeschke, Die Skulptur des Mittelalters in Italien, vol. II., Gotik, Munich 2000, 43.

35 For altars in Siena, for example, see H. Van Os, Sienese Altarpieces 1215–1460. Form, Content, Function, vols. I–II., Groningen 1984–1990.

36 Clearly, the point here is that since the frames of panel paintings were made not by sculptors but by cabinetmakers, patrons would not have involved sculptors in the execution of paintings. For picture-frames in Italy in the 14th–15th century, see M. Cämmerer-George, Die Rahmung der Toskanschen Altarbilder im Trecento, Strasbourg 1966; Ch. Merzenich, Vom Schreinerwerk zum Gemälde. Florentiner Altarwerke der ersten Hälfte des Quattrocento, Berlin 2001, esp. 46–47.

37 See, for example, A. Venturi, Storia dell’arte italiana, vol. IV., La scultura del Trecento, Milan 1906, 392, 414, 545, 546, 569; for artifacts in Naples, see Bock (n. 24 above), figs 12, 22, 29.

38 For the process, see Cämmerer–George (n. 36 above), 191–92; Ch. Gardner von Teuffel, "Lorenzo Monaco, Filippo Lippi und Filippo Brunelleschi. Die Erfindung der Renaissancepala," Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 45, 1982, 6; for this in a new light, see Merzenich (n. 36 above), 95–98; for the emphasising of the early appearance of single compositions in Siena painting despite architectonic division, see Van Os (n. 35 above), vol. II., 163–67.


40 K. Bauch, "Anfänge des figürlichen Grabmals in Italien," Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz 15, 1971, 243; on whether the origins can be traced back to French tombs or Roman catacomb tombs is not entirely clear, see ibid, 250; also idem, Das Mittelalterliche Grabbild. Figürliche Grabmäler des 11. bis 15. Jahrhunderts in Europa, Berlin–New York 1976, 145.

41 An explanation for this unusual solution, known only in another connection, could be given by the presence at one time of a Madonna depiction next to the tomb. See J. Gardner, The Tomb and the Tiara. Curial Tomb Sculpture in Rome and Avignon in the Later Middle Ages, Oxford 1992, 64–68.


Bauch (n. 40 above, 1976), 198–214.

For figural reliefs of the same format topped by gables as part of a tomb, see the tomb of Pietro da Canetolo (d. 1403) in Bologna, in L. Cavazzini, Il crepuscolo della scultura medievale in Lombardia, Florence 2004, 23–25, fig. 45.

As well as the above-mentioned tomb of Boniface VIII and the monuments grouped around it, see also the tomb of Giangaetano Orsini (d. 1294?) in Assisi in Gardner (n. 42 above), 439; other Assisi monuments from the early 14th century in Goffen (n. 44 above), 202–06, 215, and the tomb in Naples of Enrico Minutolo (c. 1402/05) in Bock (n. 24 above), 53–60, fig. 22. About saints’ tombs, see J. Garms, “Gräber von Heiligen und Seligen,” in Skulptur und Grabmal… (n. 43 above), 88–91.


It seems that Tino was the first artist who instead of painted altar-panels made stone retables in small format for private devotion, and in large format as well. For other altar-panels linkable mainly to his Naples period, see G. Kreytenberg, “Ein doppelseitiges Triptychon in Marmor von Tino di Camaino aus der Zeit um 1334,” in Medien der Macht. Kunst der Zeit der Anjous in Italien, ed. T. Michalsky, Berlin 2001, 261–74, esp. 269–70 ibid, 275–94.

A detail on the panel points rather to the former possibility. Although the half-length depiction of Christ featuring in the gable is a customary element on monumental tombs in Italy mainly, placed on the gable of the canopy, here Christ, a book in his hand and giving a blessing, appears as a judge passing judgment on the deceased. See, with examples from Naples, Bock (n. 24 above), 400–02. On the Budapest panel, the Christ holding a chalice and wafer, and showing the wound in His side, is making reference to the Eucharist. This seems more to be interpretable in connection with an altar: it may refer to its title, and possibly to one of the most popular kinds of grouping for clergy in Italy, the Corpus Christi fraternities, as the erectors of the altar. The person of the canon in no way contradicts this.

I did not find important literature on the works mentioned below, but a good proportion of the local history and art history volumes were inaccessible for me. In general surveys some works feature on the level of mention, but often with contradictory data.

Balogh (n. 14 above), 10–11.
For the church, see Antonini (n. 16 above), 156–61.

54 L. Serra, L’Aquila, Bergamo 1929, 56–58; Lehmann-Brockhaus (n. 15 above), 229, 454; Murri (n. 20 above), 80–81, figs. on p. 49–51; Antonini (n. 16 above), 137, fig. 74.

The brackets supporting the canopy of the choir-stalls are likewise decorated, with plant motifs, animals, and busts. The style of these agrees unequivocally with that of the end-sections and dividing sections, although it is not so clear that their use in the construction of the choir-stalls was secondary. Perhaps in the fashioning of the present choir-stalls at least some of the earlier elements that could be used were taken into account.

55 The saints are traditionally identified with St George, Pope Celestine V, Maximus, and Giusta. See Lehmann-Brockhaus (n. 15 above), 454; Murri (n. 20 above), 81.

56 The striking similarity of the fashioning of the figure with that of the Budapest female saint may actually be an addition for the determination of the last mentioned, although there are no inscriptions on the choir-stalls; the traditional identification of the female figure next to St George with S. Giusta is logical, since the church was dedicated to St Giusta and was the main parish church of the town quarter named after the equestrian saint. In the gable above it can be seen a half-length depiction of Christ very similar to the one in the Budapest gable, only less finished.

57 In the upper two corners of the relief, the armorial bearings of L’Aquila’s Gaglioffi family appears. For some members of the family, see Dizionario biografico degli italiani, vol. LI., Rome 1998, 286–91.

For a depiction of the church façade with the sculptures, see Serra (n. 54 above), 32; there is a mention of it with dating to the early 15th century in P. Toesca, Storia dell’arte Italiana, vol. II., II Trecento, Turin 1951, 377, n. 129. The male saint is one member of a four-part series. On the corner-pilasters of the two towers of the main façade there are three other figures of the same size and height likewise depicted as Evangelists, but these seem to be baroque sculptures. These pieces probably came together in an ensemble because of the need to maintain medieval works that had lost their original function—but which at one time perhaps belonged together—and to fashion a uniform composition for the façade.

60 It is easy to conceive that a further stone Pietà relief, one that earlier probably functioned as a tympanum over a door and is now in the S. Maria al Ponte di Roio Church, can be ranked among the creations of the workshop. See A. Cadei, “Percorso di Nicola da Guardiagrele,” in idem, Nicola da Guardiagrele. Un protagonista dell’autunno del Medioevo in Abruzzo, Guardiagrele 2005, 79–80, fig. 72. Not only does the composition of the piece accord in a striking manner with the S. Biagio Pietà; the detail solutions on the drapery are in many places fully the same and the clumsy finishing of the limbs is also very similar. However, instead of the stiff posture of the figures, much more natural gestures appear, and insofar as can be judged from the photograph, the finish of the faces is also different.

61 In connection with the pieces, local stylistic parallels have come up at random. See, for example, the choir-stalls of S. Giusta, which have been brought into connection with the Camponeschi tomb in the S. Biagio Church and fragments appearing secondarily in the cathedral and in the walls of Il Gesù (S. Margherita). See Murri (n. 20 above), 81; Antonini (n. 16 above), 58, 137. However, these scarcely detailed conjectures mostly lack foundation.

62 See, for example, the sculpture of Venice or Lombardy at the same time; Wolters (n. 44 above); Baroni (n. 44 above); Cavazzinni (n. 46 above). For antique influence, see the figure of Mary in the Annunciation scene on the Budapest relief, particularly the finish of her face and hair, or the bust of a bearded man depicted in profile on one of the brackets of the S. Giusta choir-stalls.

Additional sculptures linkable to this workshop may easily come to light in L’Aquila. My two-day stay there was not long enough for me to go into all the churches and other possible locations in the town and its vicinity.
The dating of the pieces is rather variable and random. Characteristic is the example of the S. Giusta choir-stalls, the dating of which is different almost every time they are mentioned, even within a particular book. See Leosini (n. 15 above), 163: 15th century; Serra (n. 54 above), 57: mid-15th century, 58: second half of the 15th century; Lehmann-Brockhaus (n. 15 above), 229: 15th century, 454: 14th century; Murri (n. 20 above), 49–50: 15th century, 80: first half of the 15th century; Antonini (n. 16 above), 57–58: 1430?, 137: before 1444.

The argument for dating the S. Giusta choir-stalls to before 1444, namely that the ihs-monogrammed sun-disk of the Observant Franciscans does not appear on them (in other words, that they must have been made before the death of St Bernardino of Siena in 1444), rests on mere conjecture, see Antonini (n. 16 above), 137.

For the L'Aquila material, see M. Moretti, *Museo Nazionale d' Abruzzo nel castello cinquecentesco dell'Aquila*, L'Aquila 1968; For the Abruzzo see M. Gabrielli, *Inventario degli oggetti d'arte d'Italia*, vol. IV., *Provincia di Aquila*, Rome 1934; Lehmann-Brockhaus (n. 15 above), 356–65, 374–75, 379–82; for the German presence, see ibid, 365–66; and V. Pace, “Il sepolcro Caldora nella Badia Morronese presso Sulmona. Una testimonianza delle presenze tedesche in Italia nel primo Quattrocento,” in *Skulptur und Grabmal...* (n. 43 above), 413–22; Cavazzini (n. 46 above), 50–53.


For the portal, see Bock (n. 24 above), figs. 12, 40, 50, 53; for the tombs, see ibid, figs. 85, 98, 125, 185, 197.

See the sarcophagus of Antonius de Penna, and the traditional solution in Bock (n. 24 above), fig. 98, and figs. 24, 76, 152; for the same theme in connection with tombs, see above.

In connection with Baboccio, see Bock (n. 24 above), 147.

This rare solution seems also to appear on the main portal, made by Baboccio, of Naples Cathedral. In the coronation of Mary scene above the tympanum, Mary’s throne, in keeping with her posture, is positioned a little diagonally. From this it may be perceived, similarly to the case with the Budapest piece, that the end portion of the throne is visible from behind Mary’s
cloak, appears to point in a somewhat diagonal direction. Whether or not this difference in axes is the result of later restorations is in any event debatable. See Bock (n. 24 above), 46–47.

74 In connection with Agnes and Clemenza Anjou-Durazzo, see ibid, 146–47.

75 For these on the works of Baboccio see, for example, ibid, figs. 53, 159–61, 198, III–V.

76 It always appears when the figure in question is holding something in his or her hand or hands, ibid, figs. 84, 189, IX.

77 For St Anthony, see ibid, fig. 198.

78 See the male saint and Christ on the Budapest panel, the male saint of S. Marco, and almost every work by Baboccio, ibid, figs. 52, 128, 190, 198.

79 For the last mentioned, see ibid, figs. 131–32.

80 There is a good photograph of the sarcophagus of Agnes and Clemenza in O. Ferrari, “Per la conoscenza della scultura del primo Quattrocento a Napoli,” Bolletino d’arte 39, 1954, fig. 15; for the other tomb, see Bock (n. 24 above), fig. 160.

81 For a description of the paint remains, see ibid, 429; there is a good colour picture: L’Europe des Anjou... (n. 68 above), 20–21.

82 See the Budapest relief, the Mary of the S. Maria di Roio Church, the Mary of the S. Biagio Church, the coronation of Mary on the main portal of the Cathedral, and the Mary on the west side of the Aldomorioso sarcophagus. For those last mentioned, see Bock (n. 24 above), figs. 18, 196.

83 T. Michalsky, Memoria und Repräsentation. Die Grabmäler des Königshauses Anjou in Italien, Göttingen 2000, figs. 12, 31, 39, 67. For the execution, see the tombs monuments of Mary of Hungary (d. 1323) and Robert the Wise (d. 1343), ibid, figs. 20, 55.

84 The front sides of the pilasters on the tomb are decorated with sculptures, see Bock (n. 68 above, Antiken...), fig. 1.

85 This form of framing—the filling of corners without the use of armorial bearings—may originate from the 14th-century sculpture of Naples, where it appeared in the work of Tino di Camaino (tomb of Mary of Valois, S. Chiara Church, see Michalsky [n. 83 above], fig. 44), and became rather widespread. See also for example in the same church the tomb monument of Nicola Merloto (d. 1358), where behind a Madonna depiction the curtain motif, too, can be found. See F. Negri Arnoldi, “Scultura trecentesca in Calabria: apporti esterni e attività locale,” Bolletino d’arte 68, 1983/21, 5, fig. 10.

86 See, for example, the head of the female saint on the Budapest retable with the head of the figure depicting Fortitudo on the Ladislaus tomb monument; for the portal of S. Giovanni a Carbonara, see Bock (n. 68 above, Antiken...), 241, figs. 2, 4.

87 In connection with one artifact in the contemporaneous sculpture of L’Aquila, the same Neapolitan connections have already emerged, admittedly in connection not with its style, but with its structure and iconography. On the 1432 Camponeschi tomb the influence of both the Ladislaus tomb, see Lehmann-Brockhaus (n. 15 above), 381, and the workshop of Baboccio, see Bock (n. 24 above), 48, n. 74, has been assumed; in the case of the last mentioned, the sculptor’s activity at the Naples workshop has also emerged. The style of the Camponeschi tomb is otherwise unequivocally different from that of the L’Aquila artifacts under discussion.

88 For the most recent treatment of this issue with literature, see Cadei (n. 60 above), 58. Until the closing date of the present manuscript I could not have access to the catalogue made for the 2008–2009 travelling exhibition on Guardiagrele, which contains a chapter on Nicola as sculptor too. See Nicola da Guardiagrele. Orafo tra Medioevo e Rinascimento. Le opere. I restauri, exh. cat., ed. S. Guido, Todi 2008.


91 This solution appears on a processional cross made in 1431 (Guardiagrele, S. Maria Maggiore) and on all of his works after this; see Cadei (n. 60 above, *Nicola da Guardiagrele*...), 207–85. It is open to question whether the plain, unembellished haloes very characteristic of the L’Aquila material can likewise be linked to the works of Guardiagrele. See ibid, e.g. 169–71, 177, 194, 275, 277, 285.

92 See, for example, the Madonna of S. Marco and St Luke on a processional cross at L’Aquila Cathedral, ibid, 249/8.11, or the Madonna at S. Maria di Roio and St Augustine on the antependium at Teramo, ibid, 217/6.9.


I should like to thank my former colleagues Éva Galambos, Manga Pattantyú and Szilveszter Terdik, and also Nicolas Bock, Enikő Jánó and Luciano Artese, for the help they offered me while I wrote this paper.
As with most medieval works preserved in museums, it is only from the second half of the 19th century onwards that we know the provenance of the finally carved alabaster head which, from the ownership of Emil Delmár, passed first to Budapest's Museum of Applied Arts (Iparművészeti Múzeum) and then from there to the Old Sculpture Collection at the Museum of Fine Arts (Szépművészeti Múzeum) in the same city (fig. 1). In the middle of the flat reverse side of the longish mask framed by curly hair there is an oval hollow, and at the slightly opened mouth the carving is pierced through and teeth are visible. The straight mouth is framed by a moustache and by a beard decoratively arranged into symmetrical curls but broken off at the bottom. Characteristic features of the face are the long, straight nose and the deeply-set, half-open eyes. The wrinkles on the forehead are engraved parallel to one another, and on the lower part of the neck a schematic depiction of the veins and arteries of the severed head can be seen. Decorative stylization of the symmetrical details accompany to the simplified, geometrical facial features.

The iconographical interpretation of the carved work, which is somewhat bizarre, is entirely unequivocal: it shows the severed head of St John the Baptist in line with the particular artistic tradition that remodeled the head offered to Herod on a platter according to the story of John's martyrdom (Mt. 14: 3–12 and Mk. 6: 17–19) into an object for veneration, a separate Andachtsbild. The depiction of the martyrdom appeared in 10th–11th-century Byzantine painting in connection with the fact that St John's head was the second most venerated relic in Constantinople after the Christ-relics there. The relic, the earliest known description of which is from the 12th century, passed into the possession of Wallon de Sarton, a canon from the vicinity of Amiens, during the Fourth Crusade, which led to the sack of Constantinople. He happened upon it near one of the emperor's palaces, in a concealed place in the Mangana church dedicated to St George, where it was together with the head of St George. Afterwards he brought it to Western Europe, where since 17 December 1206 it has been one of the treasures of Amiens Cathedral. However, the round platter comprising an important part of the relic had by then
1. Workshop of the Rimini Master, 1430s: St John’s head, Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts
2. Workshop of the Rimini Master, 1430s: St John's head, Munich, Bayerisches Nationalmuseum
become separated from the head; the canon allegedly covered the costs of his journey home from the price he obtained for it. The skull covered by a mask and supplied with a replacement platter, was the most important relic in Amiens up until the French Revolution and was the main object of pilgrimages. Pilgrims prayed before the relic for the cure of maladies connected with epilepsy, melancholia and headaches first and foremost. The 13th-century replacement for the Byzantine platter could not have been very successful since, as a 1419 inventory of the Amiens Treasury attests, King Charles VII or his consort Queen Isabeau was ready to commission a new one.

It is also important from the standpoint of the history of the cult that the dish on which the severed head of the prophet was placed, according to the Gospel account, was itself an eminent relic. Many ‘original’ examples of it were in circulation in the Middle Ages. Among them is a platter kept at Geneva Cathedral since its donation in 1492 by Pope Innocent VIII on which there is a ronde-bosse enamelled head made in Paris around 1420–30. Another is mentioned in a 1402 inventory listing the treasures of the due de Berry. The latter piece passed from the Sainte Chapelle in Bourges to the cathedral there and later to the city’s museum. A third well-known example was recorded in the treasury of King Henry VIII of England. In addition to the replicas made from wood or precious metal of the relic that reached the West from Byzantium and soon became popular, from the 14th century onwards there were also Andachtsbils depicting the severed head of John the Baptist that were made from stone.

As a mysteriously translucent stone resembling marble but much easier to work, alabaster was especially popular for the production of small-sized stone carvings. According to Anton Legner, its increasing popularity in the 14th century was partly due to the fact that it was especially suitable for mass production. In England, thanks primarily to the quarries in the vicinity of Nottingham, the working of alabaster took place on an almost industrial scale. Among the depictions on panels generally used as parts of altar retables, we know of heads of John the Baptist placed separately or in the company of other saints. In written sources likewise there are many data relating to the carving of heads of John the Baptist and to the trade in them. This type of carved work must have been one of the favorite specialties of alabasterers in England.

However, from the Continent, too, we know of sources that speak of the liturgical use and ownership of heads of John the Baptist that were made from alabaster (but probably not in England): from Hildesheim from the second half of the 15th century and from Brunswick from the early 18th century. We know of a whole series of late medieval Continental alabaster carvings that depict the St John the Baptist relic. In some cases, an inscription runs around the edge of the platter, helping identification of the depiction. A characteristic example of such a platter is the piece kept in the Gruuthusemuseum in Bruges which bears the inscription “INTER NATOS MULIERU NON SURREXIT MAIOR JHOANNE BAPTISTA”.
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Returning to the head of St John the Baptist preserved at the Budapest Museum of Fine Arts, after attributions to Italy, the Rhineland and Bavaria-Salzburg, the piece was said by Jolán Balogh to have been made in England, although László Eber had already drawn attention to the similarity between the Budapest sculpture and the head of John the Baptist at the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in Munich (fig. 2). The two carvings are indeed closely connected to one another. Differences show primarily in their condition: the end of the beard on the Budapest head is broken off. Another difference is that on the Munich sculpture a gash has been carved on the forehead, a reference to the dishonoring of the severed head following John the Baptist's martyrdom. The relief on the Munich piece is higher: its reverse side is not as smooth as that of the Budapest sculpture and in addition the hair continues behind the ears. It should be noted that in the 1960s the Budapest head underwent cleaning, during which not only soiling was removed, but also the original painting and gilding on the hair and beard. In all likelihood a similar thing happened in the case of the Munich piece, too.

A carving fragment is displayed in the exhibition at the Diözesanmuseum in Freising (only the mask-like face has survived: the hair around it has broken off) is rather larger than the works described so far. However, the manner of the carving of the hair and beard is the same, and the mouth is likewise slightly open (fig. 5c). Here, too, the eyes, which are more detailed in their showing of wrinkles on the lids and in the corners, are open in a slit-like way, although the eyebrows are less strong. By way of summary, we could say that the Freising alabaster is more lifelike than the other two sculptures, and not so abstract. The head kept at the Landesmuseum in Mainz since the mid-19th century can be regarded as the nearest parallel of the Freising carving (fig. 5b). On the basis of the description, the fashioning of the reverse side is similar to that of the Budapest piece, but the hair covers the ears, with the result that the face looks rounder and less ascetic than the faces on the abovementioned works. An additional modest difference is represented by the manner of the grooving at the beginning of the beard below the middle of the lower lip.

A further three alabaster heads very akin to one another may be mentioned in this connection. With regard to detail, carved works preserved in Brussels, Hanover and London may be brought into connection with the preceding group (figs. 5a, d-e). Their size is somewhat larger than that of the Budapest and Munich examples (20—23 cm) and the heads are less elongated; in fact they can be said to be rounded. The details are softer in form and the lines of the eyebrows milder. In all three cases, the wrinkling at the bridge of the nose merges with the curves formed by the eyebrows and the line of the mouth is looser, although the slightly open shape remains. According to the descriptions, here, too, all three have a hollow on the reverse side, although on the Hanover and London pieces this is a rectangular aperture on the reverse side of a head that has been carved in the form of a circle. The solution of the hair—moustache—beard unit is similar, as is the calligraphic mode of depiction formed by thicker and thinner strands.
arranged alternately and in parallel. On the Hanover sculpture the solution of the head is different on the forehead: the curls do not hang down over the forehead, but go backwards in the direction of the top of the head.

In any event, the seven carvings listed above constitute a group whose pieces are connected with one another. They probably all came from the same workshop. In the case of certain pieces, this interconnectedness has always been emphasized, although the list of kin works has varied from publication to publication. When the network of the formal connections is brought together, the picture that takes shape is unequivocal for the most part. The problem is simply localization of the workshop in question.

In connection with the place of manufacture of the St John the Baptist head in Munich, arguments were
5b. Workshop of the Rimini Master, 1430s: *St John’s head*, Mainz, Landesmuseum

5c. Workshop of the Rimini Master, 1430s: *St John’s head*, Freising, Diözesanmuseum

5d. South Netherlandish (Circle of the Rimini Master), 1430s: *St John’s head*, Brussels, Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire

5e. South Netherlandish (Circle of the Rimini Master), 1430s: *St John’s head*, Hannover, Niedersächsische Landesgalerie
initially produced in favor of an English origin. Revising his earlier standpoint, Theodor Müller subsequently (in 1966) listed the piece among the dispersed works of the Rimini Master.\(^{33}\) The sculptor received this designation as an interim name from an altar from the Covignano Santa Maria delle Grazie church at Rimini that is now in the Liebieghaus in Frankfurt. Three Crucifixion groups and figures of the Apostles remain on this altar.\(^{34}\) We know neither the original arrangement of the figures and groups, nor the exact original structure of the altar. The ensemble of sculptures was thought by Georg Swarzenski—who purchased the works for the Liebieghaus—to have been by a German sculptor active in Italy.\(^{35}\) He identified the master with the itinerant master named Gusmin\(^{36}\) who originated from Cologne and whose work in Florence was highly esteemed even by Lorenzo Ghiberti.\(^{37}\) Although this hypothesis was soon discarded,\(^{38}\) it is undeniably true that a significant number of works have survived in Italy from the workshop of the master of the Rimini altar and from those around it. Nevertheless, the history of these works can only be traced back to the Middle Ages in exceptional cases, as in that of the *Madonna dell'Aqua* devotional sculpture in Rimini.\(^{39}\) By means of dealers, the small-sized works could easily have reached their present places of preservation, like the recently published Madonna kept in the church of Betancuria in the Canary Islands.\(^{40}\) The number of sculptures attributed to the master or his workshop rises from time to time. Also, characteristic works from the workshop appear continually at auctions, mostly from complete obscurity.\(^{41}\)

The image formed of the Rimini Master has not changed substantially in recent times, although it has become more nuanced. Walter Paatz, who in many studies\(^{42}\) dealt with examples of medieval alabaster sculpture, distinguished two Continental workshops of crucial significance in the early 15th century that began operations under the influence of the popularity enjoyed by English alabaster sculpture. Their customers were initially the courts of the French monarch and his brothers. One of these significant workshops was that of the master of the Rimini altar, a workshop which, according to Paatz, operated in northern France or Flanders, possibly in Lille. The other he localized to Paris. From this second workshop came the ‘Women at the Foot of the Cross’ sculptural group,\(^{43}\) which, as the sources attest, was carved in Paris and soon taken to Breslau (Wroclaw in Silesia). Today it is kept in Warsaw. Shortly afterwards, Anton Legner investigated the question of the master and his workshop, examining the surviving artifacts from the workshop. He also concluded that it was located in Lille, stressing at the same time the master’s stylistic links with the great painters in the Low Countries around 1400: the Master of Flémalle, Jan van Eyck, and Rogier van der Weyden.\(^{44}\) In his monograph on 15th-century alabaster sculpture, Norbert Jopek wrote about the Rimini Master merely when reviewing the history of the research, referring, in the wake of Swarzenski, to his links with the Low Countries.\(^{45}\) Hartmut Krohm defined the workshop of the Rimini Master as a large, expansive export workshop—in the Lille-Tournai area—,\(^{46}\) stressing once again that it was in competition with English alabaster workshops and that it aimed at mass production.
The research on the issue has uncovered archival data which indicate that the Rimini altar preserved in Frankfurt could not have been an exceptional creation. Apostles carved from alabaster and placed in an altar shrine, a raised central scene (the Coronation of Mary) and painted wings joined onto the painted and gilded cabinet embellished the altar of the Lady Chapel behind the High Altar in the church of the Benedictine abbey of St Vaast. The sculptures were purchased from a German dealer on 28 May 1432 by the influential Jean du Clercq, abbot there from 1428 to 1462 and chancellor to Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy. The painting of the cabinet, the gilding of the sculptures, the painting of the flesh-colored parts, and the wings are all the work of Jacques Daret. The altar was still in its place in 1651. Today only the wing pictures remain, and also a sculpture of an apostle conditionally identified with St Peter which, so tradition has it, is from this altar (fig. 3).

Other such cases may be mentioned, too. In 1429, Gauthier Ponche, canon of Notre-Dame in Saint Omer, and his brother Michael ordered an altar containing alabaster sculptures in which there stood sculptures of the Twelve Apostles, among other works. It is customary to trace the four figures now found in Saint Omer Museum to among those Apostle statues. In 1431, Jodocus, abbot of the Augustinian monastery at Breslau in Silesia (St. Maria auf dem Sande), purchased a Crucifixion group from a Paris dealer. Erich Scheyer identified the abovementioned group depicting three mourning women (Warsaw, National Museum) as a part of this group. Generally accepted since publication in 1933 and evaluated on the basis of the sculpture’s style as relevant from the viewpoint of the Rimini Master’s working place, this identification needs, in the opinion of the present author, to be revised. The text informs us that the abbot purchased the alabaster panel depicting the Crucifixion cum suis attinentiis for forty gold florins, and also that in the very same year Johannes Cromendorff had a gold frame made around the tabula by the goldsmith for twenty marks. The word tabula can in medieval usage mean altar retable, but the differing language usage of an Arras and of a Tournai source (ymages, ymages d’alabastre), as well as the ordering of a frame worked in gold, indicates that the purchase datum may instead relate to a relief depicting the Crucifixion. From an examination of 19th-century Breslau and Silesian sources, it emerges that many alabaster sculptures and sculpture groups were inventoried when the Breslau cloisters were secularized; descriptions of two figures not identified precisely may conceal Apostles.

We may risk the assumption that in the early 19th-century fragments of an altar similar to the Frankfurt one in that it was assembled from a Crucifixion and Apostle figures may have come to light in Breslau. This, however, would hardly be identifiable with the much-mentioned acquisition of the abbot of the Sandkloster. A reference to a sculpture ensemble is to be found in the diary of Andrea Gattaro, a member of the Venetian delegation taking part in the Synod of Basle between 1433 and 1435. This mentions the forty-two altars of Basle Cathedral, among them one as follows: “L’Altaro grande si à una bellissima ancona de alabastro et ege suso scolpiti xij apostoli e Christo in croxe”. This altar fell victim to iconoclasts in 1529.
Of the above data, the Arras source mentioning the German dealer is not in the least bit useful in characterizing the activity of a workshop localized to the vicinity of Lille. Also, the style of the four Apostle statues identified as once belonging to the Saint Omer altar differs from that of the Rimini altar. In the case of the Silesian example, the source documents of a Parisian origin, as we have seen. The ‘Women at the Foot of the Cross’ group in Warsaw is more aristocratic (Legner) than its pair in Frankfurt. It can be brought into parallel most of all with the terracotta sculptures of the Road to Calvary scene from Lorch (Berlin, Skulpturensammlung). In connection with the Basle source, the most we can establish is that many works similar to the Rimini altar may have been standing in the second quarter of the 15th century. This would refer to the esteem enjoyed by these ensembles, the carving of which was, on the basis of the large number of Apostle sculptures remaining, a specialty of the workshop of the Rimini Master, although they do not bring us any nearer to the judging and evaluation of the workshop’s production. For this we must turn once again to the group of works among which the Budapest head of John the Baptist can be assigned.

The works created in the workshop of the Rimini Master are characterized by an attempt at a certain degree of mass production and are typically standing figures 30 to 40 cm tall, principally representations of Apostles. They are structured in a similar way, and the long, softly falling attire that covers the body and the light, thin drapery taking shape as linear articulation on the surface represent a solution exploiting their style and the properties of the alabaster. Their quality is very variable, ranging from the altar in question or the angel in New York’s Metropolitan Museum to the St Arianus sculpture that has recently come to light in art trade.

With regard to their function, the abovementioned alabaster sculptures could have been separate cultic images, like the heads of John the Baptist, or may have stood on altar tops. However, the sculptures that survive in altars—the figures at Schwabstedt, Isola Bella or Schwerte—no longer preserve their original context. Sometimes large and new compositions have been put together using pieces from many different series. The best example of this is the enormous altar erected in the chapel of the Borromini palace in Isola Bella in Lombardy.

The Budapest head of St John the Baptist is undoubtedly related to some of the figures of the Rimini altar in Frankfurt, namely to those of Longinus and Stephaton, both of them bearded. Stephaton’s countenance—the solution represented by his straight, thin nose and the deep wrinkle crossing the nose between the eyes—may be compared with the face of St John the Baptist (fig. 4), while in the case of Longinus the curled carving of the hair and beard may be described as similar. Striving for symmetry, the slightly stiff forms of the heads do, however, differ from those featuring on the Frankfurt altar. This is apparent primarily in the case of the Budapest and the Munich pieces. This difference, however, is not so great that the St John the Baptist heads enumerated cannot be fitted into the heterogeneous production of the workshop of the Rimini Master. Their difference from one another or from the Frankfurt figures is not greater than the stylistic or
qualitative differences between the sculptures on the Rimini altar. Not unimportant from the point of view of the Budapest head is the fact that the face of Stephen and especially that of Longinus belongs among the most sensitive and finely resolved details of the series.

Finally, it may be said that the iconographically and stylistically connected St John the Baptist heads may have been made in a workshop at some time around the middle of the first half of the 15th century that operated on the southern edge of the Low Countries or on the northern edge of the Kingdom of France, perhaps in Lille—which from the late 14th century onwards verifiably possessed an alabaster-carving workshop—or in Tourna. As Walter Paatz suggests, we must simply continue to wait until some happy breakthrough provides grounds for a more precise identification of the person and the workshop of the Rimini Master.65

Notes

1 Cat. No. 84.16. Measurements: 15.3 x 10.6 x 7.2 cm. It is from the collection auctioned at the Dorotheum in Vienna in 1911, and belonged to the Viennese painter Josef Kastner, who died in 1871. Kastner purchased his collection in the Tyrol and in Vienna in the 1830s–40s, see Th. von Frimmel, Lexikon der Wiener Gemäldegemälde, vol. II., Munich 1914, 330–31. Emil Delmar first put the carving on public display in 1912, at the Small Sculpture Exhibition staged at the Museum of Applied Arts in Budapest (“A Szent György czéh kisplasztikai kiállítása az Iparművészeti Múzeumban, Katalógus,” A Gyűjtő 1, 1912, Nos. 147, 158, fig. 231). Its number in the Delmar collection was D. 74. In 1940, it passed to the Museum of Applied Arts as a deposit, in company with the other works in the Delmar collection that were still in Hungary (case 19, Iparművészeti Múzeum, Adattár [Archive], No. 114/1940); in 1949 or 1950, the Museum of Fine Arts took over the sculptures in the material deposited (Deposit No. L 4078). The Museum of Fine Arts purchased these pieces from the heirs in 1984 (Szépművészeti Múzeum, Irattár [Archive], Nos. 115–3/83, 657–8/84).


3 “… duos discos argentoeos magnos, rotundos, cum sibi respondentibus operimentis…” quoted by A. Weyl Carr, “The Face Relics of John the Baptist in Byzantium and the West,” Gesta XLVII, 2008, 166; Arndt–Kroos (n. 2 above), 245.


5 The relic and the rock crystal that covered it were saved by Mayor Lecouve. A copy of the old reliquary was made in Paris in 1876/77 after a print in the Acta Sanctorum (Th. Perkins, The Cathedral Church of Amiens, London 1902, 79). For a picture of the reconstruction, see Weyl Carr (n. 3 above), fig. 9. See also Arndt–Kroos (n. 2 above), 245–47.

6 See Combs Stuebe (n. 4 above), 3.

7 A description of the reliquary can be found in an inventory from that time. See Combs Stuebe (n. 4 above).

8 É. Kovács, L’âge d’or de l’orfèvrerie parisienne au temps des Princes de Valois, Dijon 2004, 224, Cat. No. 6, with illustration: Paris (?), 1420–30.

9 La Sainte-Chapelle de Bourges: une fondation disparue de Jean de France, duc de Berry, Paris–Bourges 2004, 151, fig. 207, Cat. No. 52.

11 Another St John platter, from the monastery of St Florian in Upper Austria, was preserved in the Delmár collection. This was identified as an early sixteenth-century work from the Master of the Kefermarkt Altar. Today this piece is in Illinois, in the Martin D’Arcy Gallery of Art, Inv. No. 1.79. See D. Gillerman, *Gothic Sculpture in America. II. The Museums of Midwest*, Turnhout 2001, 54, No. 41.


18 Approximately 20 such pieces are known having been preserved in European museums.


20 Szent György ... (n. 1 above), 147, no. 158.

21 L. Éber, "Delmár Emil plasztikai gyűjteménye III.," *Magyar Művészet* 5, 1929, 89; fig. on p. 84; *Régi Egyházművészeti Országos kiállítása*, exh. cat., Országos Magyar Iparművészeti Múzeum, Budapest 1930, No. 95.
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29 J. Squilbeck, "Quelques sculptures anglaises d'Albâtre conservées en Belgique," The Antiquaries Journal 18, 1938, 65, fig. XXVI/2. The museum purchased it commercially, in 1872.

30 G. der Osten, van, Katalog der Bildwerke in der niedersächsischen Landesgalerie Hannover, Munich 1957, no. 83, with photograph. The head was in Uslar, a small town in Lower Saxony, until 1863.
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40 F. J. G. Gómez, "Una escultura de alabastro producida en los talleres del Maestro de Rimini: La Virgen de la Peña, en Betancuria (Fuerteventura)," Archivo español de arte 80, 2007, 141-60.

41 Among the most recent examples is London, Sotheby's (L09731), 9 July 2009, lot 23.


44 Legner (n. 34 above), 101-68.

45 Jopek (n. 17 above), 2-3, 8-13.


47 "XIII ymages de alabaster": the source is published by Jopek (n. 17 above), 9, text no. 5.


49 De Loo (n. 48 above), 207.
Earlier on it was in the Silten collection in Berlin; later, in 1960, it surfaced at an auction in Munich (Weinmüller, Munich, Auktion 74, 7/8. December 1960, lot 421). Since then its whereabouts have not been known. Is it possible that this conjecture will be amenable to proof and that the other sculptures, too, will be identified?


We are able to follow the story of these four works only until 1840. See Laatgotische Beeldhouwkunst (n. 51 above), Cat. No. 99A–D.


The 90-cm-tall Pieta preserved in the Louvre in Paris is an exception. See J.-R. Gaborit, Le Louvre. La sculpture européenne, Paris 1994, 95.

For the best evaluation, see Große Kunst des Mittelalters aus Privatbesitz, exh. cat., SchnütgenMuseum, Köln 1960, no. 36.

Neumeister auction catalogue, Munich, December 8, 1993, no. 38.


Paatz (n. 42 above, 1957), 130.
Robert Suckale

DIE BEKEHRUNG DES PAULUS, EIN VERSCHOLLenes Bild aus dem Umkreis Hans Siebenbürgers


Auf der Tafel finden sich zwei Inschriften, oben eine zweizeilige, von der nur das Wort „persequeris“ zu entziffern ist, wohl zu ergänzen zu dem Bibelzitat (Acta Apostolorum 9,4): „Saule, Saule, quid me persequeris“ (Saul, Saul, was verfolgst du mich?), während der Spruch links vom Kopf des Paulus am ehesten so gelesen werden kann: „Domine quid me oportet facere“ (Herr, was soll ich tun? Acta 9,7).

Schon ein kurzer Blick macht deutlich, dass der Maler aus dem Kreis des Hans Siebenbürger kommt, der meiner Auffassung nach ein aus Ungarn zugewanderter Schüler von Hans Pleydenwurff in Nürnberg war, dann jedoch nach Wien ging, wo er maßgeblich an der Schaffung des 1469 vollendeten Hochaltar-Retabels des Schottenstifts beteiligt war. 1483 ist er dort hoch angesehen verstorben. Es bedarf

Der Maler hat sich bemüht, dem Geschehen größte Dynamik zu geben. Das Zusammenbrechen des Pferdes und das Niederstürzen des Reiters sind überzeugend dargestellt. Doch ist das Gesicht des Paulus nahezu ausdruckslos. Es kann sich auch deshalb kaum um ein eigenhändiges Werk Hans Siebenbürgers handeln, weil den Gesichtern der ihm eigentümliche Zug von Gram und melancholischer Ver-
Hans Siebenbürger und Werkstatt:
Detail der Darstellung des 12jährigen Jesus im Tempel, 1469, ehem. Hochaltar-Retabel des Schottenstiftes in Wien (Foto: Bundesdenkmalamt, Wien)


übernimmt von seinem Vorbild ganze Gruppen, manchmal sogar vollständige Kompositionen, variiert sie aber zumindest in Details: so kommt z. B. das Motiv des von rechts hereinreitenden vornehmen Herrn im Profil aus einem neuen Rezeptionsschub niederländischer Motive.\(^8\)


Christi wird als direkte Konfrontation dargestellt, während in unserem Bild Saulus von hinten überrascht wird.

Dass die anderen Motive der Szene wenig zu dieser eindrucksvollen Erfindung passen und deshalb kaum für das Nürnberger Vorbild in Anspruch genommen werden können, wurde bereits an dem hierinstolzierenden Reiter deutlich, der in seiner Ruhe so gar nicht zu dem Schrecken erregenden göttlichen Gewitter passt. Im Blick auf unser Paulusbild lässt sich jedoch plausibel begründen, dass sich schon im Urbild weitere Reiter in der zweiten Reihe befinden haben müssen und bereits die Raumtiefe für die Bilderzählung ausgenutzt wurde. Es wurde ein Kompromiss zwischen kultbildhafter Flächigkeit und raumgreifender Erzählung gesucht. Wie im Striegauer Bild dürfte Paulus vornehm gekleidet gewesen sein, mit einem Lendner aus kostbarem Goldbrokat, einer spitz zulaufenden Haube mit Sendelbinde, deren Ende in der Luft flattert und denselben weiten Ärmeln, die vom ältesten König in Rogier van der Weydens *Columba-Retabel* bekannt sind.

c


Am Anfang der eigenartigen mitteleuropäischen Ikonographie steht die um 1415–1420 datierbare Federzeichnung im Berliner Kupferstichkabinett, die vielleicht ein eigenhändiges Werk des Meisters der Worcester-Kreuztragung ist (Abb. 4). Dieser Meister, einer der großen Erneuerer der Malkunst zur Konzilszeit, hatte zur Erweiterung seiner bildnerischen Mittel und zur Stärkung seiner Ausdruckskraft italienische Inventionen aufgegriffen. Ungewöhnlich ist, das Ereignis
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des Sturzes auf demselben Blatt in mehreren Varianten darzustellen, je zwei im Vorder- und im Hintergrund. Ein derartiges Durchspielen verschiedener Möglichkeiten auf einem Blatt ist in dieser Zeit nur bei italienischen bzw. italienisch geprägten Künstlern zu bemerken. Doch ist mir kein analoger Fall bekannt, wo nebeneinander so viele unterschiedliche Kompositionen entwickelt werden. Pleydenwurf und seine Schüler haben jedoch nicht die beiden kühnsten Lösungen, d. h. einen der beiden mittleren Reiter, zum Ausgangspunkt genommen, sondern den Reiter am linken Rand der zweiten Reihe. Das ältere Blatt war jedoch noch in zwei weiteren Punkten Vorbild, einmal darin, dass es die beiden Hauptfiguren in der Mitte exotisch kostümiert zeigt und darin, dass vom Himmel nicht nur Strahlen und kleine Engel ausgehen, sondern auch Hagelschlag.

In den Umkreis des Meisters der Worcester-Kreuztragung gehört auch die Initialminiatur des Hieronymus-Prologs zu den Paulusbriefen in einem 1422 von dem Nürnberger Notar Johannes Vorster geschriebenen Neuen Testament.14 Daneben wird die ältere Tradition der bildparallelen Darstellung weiter gepflegt, so zuletzt noch in der Schedelschen Weltchronik.15


In der damals besonderen Zuspruch erfahrenden „Frömmigkeitstheologie“ gewannen Augustinus und durch ihn der Apostel Paulus ständig an Bedeutung.19 Die augustinische Predigt war emotionaler als die thomistische, sie war gefühlse-
tonter und weniger selbstgewiss. Ihr größter, schon in eine andere Epoche hereinragender Vertreter ist Dr. Martin Luther, der 1502, von einem neben ihm einschlagenden Blitz erschüttert, Umkehr gelobte, Augustinermönch in Erfurt wurde und über der Exegese der Paulusbriefe zu seiner Rechtfertigungslehre fand.20


Anmerkungen

1 Die größte Fundgrube ist die Witt Library im Courtauld Institute in London.
2 Kat.-Nr. 115, auf Holz, 64 x 40 cm, aus der Sammlung G. H.
3 Das einzig gut lesbare Wort „persequeris“ wäre auch auf Acta 9,5 zu beziehen: „Ego sum Jesus quem tu persequeris“. Es scheint mir aber nicht ganz so gut zu passen. Paulus berichtet auch in Gal 1,15–16 davon.
6 Ich halte den Hut nicht für ein Phantasiestück, da wir ihn zuvor schon bei dem ältesten der Berner Nelkenmeister finden; siehe C. Gutscher-Schmid, Nelken statt Namen.
Die spätmittelalterlichen Malerwerkstätten der Berner Nelkenmeister, Bern 2007, bes. 35 ff. über eine Zeichnung im Berliner Kupferstichkabinett, die den typischen Hut mit Fransen zeigt, aber schon um 1450–1460 zu datieren ist und wohl kaum aus Franken oder Österreich stammt.


11 O. Benesch, Österreichische Zeichnungen des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts, Freiburg/Br. 1936, 40 ff., Kat.-Nr. 29.


13 Hartmann Schedel, Weltchronik, illustriert mit Holzschnitten von Michel Wolgemuth und Wilhelm Pleydenwurff, deutsche Ausgabe, Nürnberg (Koberger) 1493, fol. 103v.


22 So etwa im Retabel des Kreuzaltars im Dom zu Brandenburg.
Professor Suckale was essentially correct when he first reconstructed the signature on the altarpiece of the Master of the St Florian Triptych (fig. 1). A more precise reconstruction, however, is worth pursuing, since concealed behind this unique kind of playful, almost sophomoric puzzle lies a concrete geographical location.

On the hem of one of the figures' clothing is a mysterious text published by Otto Benesch and corrected to some degree by Robert Suckale to read: IHOANES VII / HERNICU / UHRAN OPUIS / VISAIEIH. Let's start with the subject of this sentence. The painter did not include—although Suckale does—the phrase castris, castrensis, or castra following the Roman numeral VII, because in a text written in antique script it is clearly a serial number and refers to IHOANES, even if it alludes to Septem castra or castris (meaning Transylvania, or Siebenbürgen in German). IOHANES thus is himself IHOANES Septimus, as it would be stated in the first line of a royal charter, while he is UHRANUS as well, as given two words later, and noted appropriately by Suckale. However, retaining the original appellation in the reconstruction is preferable to replacing it with Hungaricus, because here again alliteration and allusion reign. Reference is made to nationality with the word Uranus, the father of Saturn, the ancient god. This phrase in the memorial text offers a mystical continuation of the beginning, which conveys the role of the ruler. IHOANES (Septimus)–UHRANUS is indeed the same nominative noun. Thus the signature, according to custom, had to indicate an object (accusativus), which the painter does with the letter combination in the word OPVIS. The subject and object require a predicate, which is provided for in the second half of the word group VISAIEIH: the E and I very likely refer to exegi, while the H at the end is the first letter of the pronoun HOC, indicating OPV. IS indicates ipse referring to URANUS. Thus the signature can be reconstructed as the following Latin sentence—which includes a predicate drawn from Horace:

IHOANES VII (Septimus)
HERNICIA SILVA UHRANUS IPSE
EXEGI HOC OPUS

Although the words are clearly legible, Suckale—again considering the essentials—is also right when he reluctantly writes Hercinia silva, a well-known ancient
geographical concept, since *Hernicia silva* probably never existed aside from in this inscription. Because the order of the letters in IHOANES (and elsewhere) and also the order of the two syllables in *silva* had been exchanged, "bezeichnend an dessen Schreibweise ist die absichtliche Buchstabenumstellung..." Suckale accepted that an inadvertent spelling error had been made.

The mistake, however, occurred in the spirit of a "classical", conscious sort of Humanist analogy, mainly as a slogan of UHRANUS, based on quasi mythological examples. The letters themselves are a classical antique type, the text is also in Latin and the words IHOANES VII – UHRANUS themselves are superlatives preceding the predicate quoted from Horace. The group of modifiers referring to the area represents precisely that counterpoint which better highlights and even assigns a place to the modified words.

Hercinia, in the central German forested mountains along the northern border of the Roman Empire, inspired a comparison with the terrain of Transylvania. In Old Hungarian, Transylvania, or Ultrasilvania was originally *Erő elő*, or "beyond the forest", and this geographical concept and the notion of mountain and forest dividing the continent recalls this idea of Hercynia. As the ancient empire envisioned its geographical expansion to extend downwards and out from Rome, its Hungarian medieval descendent also traditionally viewed its expansion also spiraling outwards from the center, from the Danube Bend.

Transylvania, also known as Ultrasilvania—Septem Castra, Castris, or Hungary Minor—may aptly be represented in the signature by the ancient Roman designation *Hercinia silva*, in particular because this notion, which in the ancient times referred only to the southeastern part of the Alps, later included the region to the north of the Danube, the German Mountains extending from the Bohemian forest, and finally included the Carpathian Mountains of Dacia. Before Tacitus and Pliny, Caesar was the first to put in writing the term *Hercinia silva*, forested mountain region, and the first to mention, more precisely describe, three kinds of strange animals. These creatures were all large game animals, but one—a beast bearing a single horn (the unicorn)—was just imaginary, and was not named by Caesar. Perhaps it is mere coincidence, but in using the name *Hernicia*, the painter drew upon the word *Hercinia*, which is similar in sound to the Latin name for hedgehog: *herinaceus, erinaceus*, which was known in medieval times, in Old Hungarian as *hernecś* (in German *der Igel* and in Old English "urchin"). The Hungarian word in its old form has completely disappeared from modern usage, surviving only (in at least forty instances) in geographical names.

The Latin form has been preserved in only one place: in the name of the medieval gold mining settlement of Herneacova, in Erdőhát (Waldrücken, Podişul Lipovei, RO) in the hilly area of southwestern Transylvania. This place is located 15 kilometers to the northeast of Temesvár (Timişoara, RO). Whether the painter included this in the list of *hemacś* and *hernecs* we can only speculate. But the name *hernecs* was used frequently in this area of large forested mountain ranges and valleys running along Erdőhát. In a strange occurrence of accord, the Hungarian
1. Hans Siebenbürger: The Calvary. Central panel of the St Florian Triptych, Kunstsammlungen des Augustiner-Chorherrenstiftes St. Florian
name today is Aranyág ("Gold Branch"; see below for place names related to Aranyak [Golds] in Zarând County).

The Zarând Mountains are nearly 60 km long, and at their widest in the eastern part they stretch across 30 km, covered to this day by undisturbed forest. In the south, the Maros River forms the border, and in the north towards the Great Hungarian Plain a sloping landscape unfolds in a triangular layout, enclosed by the Fehér-Körös River. Beyond the flat lands, lays the town of Gyula, which was the western seat of Zarând County, although in the 15th century it sometimes belonged to Békés County. At the time Siebenbürger painted this panel, Zarând County included a good third of the Transylvanian Érchegešég (Ore Mountains), and later the northern part of Hunyad County, too.6 On the western plains of Zarând County stood the castle of Világos (Şiria, RO), which as a castle estate operated mines in the Zarând Mountains as well as about 80 kilometers away, in the Érchegešég, close to the Fehér-Körös River. These mines generated a significant portion of Transylvania’s entire gold production, thus Körösbánya and its environs formed another centre at the eastern edge of the county.

Place names derived from the word *hernécs*, or hedgehog, were common in the western part of the Zarând Mountains near Világos castle. Hernyácsfalva (1439, 1441, and 1445) was part of the chapel district of the castle estate of Világos, and Hernácsfalva/Herniczfalva (1464) and Hernecesth (1525) belonged to the district of Tornova (Târnova, RO). All these were clearly distinct settlements.7 The forest of Zarând thus had at least two or three settlements with *hernécs* in its name. Information from 1464 proves that *Hernicus* was called *Hemécs* in Hungarian. The settlements were destroyed during the Turkish occupation, but their locations can be established from among the surviving place names. Another settlement, Borzlyuk (Dachsloch in German or "badger's hole" in English), which sources identified as an *oppidum* (near the right bank of the Maros, today Marosborsa, or Bârzava in Romanian), neighbored on a place Hernyakowcz/Herniakovci, of which no trace has been found in the area so far.8 All of these places were situated on the northern slope of the Zarând Mountains or the western edge of the triangle created by the two branches of the Fehér-Körös River. Along the southern branch of the river below the Hegyes (Hidiș, RO) peak extended another settlement which existed until modern times: Aranyág. By the 15th century, it had split in two: the Lower Aranyak, and higher up in the valley Székes Aranyagh which in 1525 was followed by Upper Aranyak upstream. (Only the Hungarian names were known; in German the places were simply called Unter-, Stuhl- and Obergoldzweig, i.e. Lower-, Central-, and Upper-Goldbranch.) Could those mines with names derived from *hernécs* in the Zarând Mountains also have been primarily gold producers?

The Zarând Mountains line Transylvania’s southern, and most comfortable, entranceway, along the right banks of the Maros from the Great Plains (formerly with the addition of northern Hunyad County) all the way to Déva (Deva, RO).9 In Transylvania nearly 100 of 5000 place names are variants on animal names. Of these, fourteen are four-legged, vertebrate forest animals, and one, *hernécs*, is among
2. The Zaránd Mountains in the former Zaránd County (the chief town of the County–Gyula–in the left upper corner), J. Lipszky: Mappa Transilvaniae et Partium Hungariae Repertoriumque Objectorum, Budae 1806 (reprint: Szeged 1987), XLIII.

today’s Hungarian name variants. Although this name is indeed medieval in origin, the settlement was located in Máramaros County, and thus does not truly belong to historical Transylvania. These numbers are only partially valid for the late medieval period. Still, based on at least three place names derived from the word *hemécs*, these figures still suggest that this name could have only referred to just one mountain range, forest and watershed, and also provided a county with a name, that is: the Zaránd Mountains (fig. 2).

Cities and urbanized localities were mostly in the western half of the county, with only a few on the eastern perimeter, in the Érchezegség. The others, Kis Bánya, Csikebánya, Medvepataka—the suburbs of Kőrösénya (Altenburg, Baia de
Criş, RO)—were far from heavily travelled roads, while those in the west were much more accessible to the other parts of the country. Világos, Meszt and Gals were all suburbs of the royal center, Világosvár, while Simánd (Simand, RO) and Pankota (Pincota, RO) were independent towns. Both laymen and clerics from these settlements wishing to pursue further studies appear on the lists of students attending the universities of Cracow and Vienna. Simánd and Pankota may have been inhabited mostly by craftsmen, and a guild may also have been located there. Unfortunately records and other archival material were lost. The most important city was still Gyula, which functioned as the seat of Zaránd County. In 1403 the Marótis began to make great strides in developing the town, with their most active period around 1445. In 1476 the town became a royal city, or Castrum Gyulense. The town belonged to John Corvinus (illegitimate son of King Matthias Corvinus) from 1482, and from the 13th century until 1566 the church (dedicated to Nádi Boldogasszony / “the Blessed Virgin of the reeds”) next to the town was the only pilgrimage place in the southeastern part of the Great Plain. Hans Siebenbürger most likely came from this region, if not from Arad itself, the other county center along the borders of Zaránd–Békés–Arad Counties to the south. The gentle slope at the base of Arad Mountain leads from the plains across to the Zaránd Mountains. But did Hans, an independent commoner, who did not yet possess a surname (thus was not yet known as Siebenbürger), set off from Gyula instead, or at least pass through the town before arriving at the Nuremberg workshop of Hans Pleydenwurff, and only later settling in Vienna?

Stephaton and his “mission” also deserve mention in connection with the private devotional altar of St Florian (middle panel 65.5 × 41 cm), because in this painting, the signature is found not in the foreground (on the ground) but rather at mid-height, on the attire of the Stephaton-figure offering Christ a vinegar-soaked sponge. The letters are mixed in a way that they are legible from right—perhaps recalling the form of Hebrew texts. The missing I from IHOANES; SI/LVA and HERNICIA and later the first I in VISAIEIH perhaps recall the Hebrew method of writing from left to right, while the IS following OPV comes from the word IP/SE/, and the surviving E and I are the first and last letters of exegi. Meanwhile the H may mean, as a part of the OPV’s hoc on the hem of the clothes: “can be buttoned together”. The robe is a strikingly bright yellow (Benesch: “krellgelb”!). Use of this color strongly reminds us of how the color yellow was otherwise ignored in all of late medieval art, and calls particular attention to the Jewish origins of the wearer of the robe, who is not named in the Scripture. In the final moments of the Savior’s life on earth, however, he is the last man to act, and is fatedly, according to the Gospel of St John (Jn 19,28–30), a close witness of Jesus’ passing: “After this, when Jesus knew that all was finished, he said (in order to fulfill the scripture), ‘I am thirsty.’ A jar full of sour wine was standing there. So they put a sponge full of the wine on a branch of hyssop and held it to his mouth. When Jesus had received the wine, he said, ‘It is finished (consummatum est).’ Then he bowed his head and gave up his spirit.” The Gospel recalls the Book of Psalms:
3. Hans Siebenbürger: The Calvary, detail. Central panel of the St Florian Triptych, Kunstsammlungen des Augustiner-Chorherrenstiftes St. Florian
“And for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink” (Ps 69, 21). Still, the written testimony of the signature appears strange, especially given its location on the clothing of this figure. The head of the young man raising the stick is certainly not a self-portrait, nor the image of someone else. His clothing is distinctive, but he is only one of many, a John Q. Public, and therefore his features are dispensable. His mouth, however, is open (as Benesch also noted), as if speaking. John the Evangelist, who was also present at Calvary, wrote about himself in his Gospel as one of the characters, in the third person, and thus using his name. Here at the Calvary, however, this John (Iohanes) VII does the opposite. He did not want any ostentatious display of his own image. This was of course true of other painters too: it is difficult to find portrait-like representations of Stephaton. As was true of Longinus, too, who stabbed the Son of God with his lance, this was the most important act he would perform in his life. In this work, however, Longinus, demonstrating the curative powers of Christ’s blood (dropping from the tip of the lance), raises his left hand to his left eye, and with his right attempts to retrieve (!) the weapon which the helmeted soldier standing with his back to us is thrusting with both hands into the dead body. Meanwhile (and after), Longinus looks with both eyes and accepts Christ as his Savior. The man in the yellow robe, who stands closest to the thief on the iconographic right, likewise converts. In his right hand he grasps the upright hyssop branch, but his left hand makes a gesture of remorse, and he gazes at the crucified Christ as a sign of his acceptance. Thus he achieves a position of distinction in the painting, behind, or rather next to, Mary Magdalene, in the group that supports the Virgin Mary. He forms a single unit with John the Evangelist, standing behind him. With his last glance towards us, Christ on the cross utters his final words: “Consummatus est: It is finished.” Stephaton, who according to the Scripture represents the converted Jew, responds to this in the form of the predicate of John (Iohanes) VII. The classical, thus still pagan quote from Horace responds—“I have done it” or “I have completed it”—exegi ... hot ... opus, since the word opus has two equivalent meanings. The first meaning is an action or deed and refers to the eternal role allotted this figure in the Scripture. It is not they but I who serves Christ his final drink. But seeing Christ’s stiff, dead look made me understand with a shock what it meant for Him “to be finished”. That I had faith and believed Him from the moment I alone met with this dead man. This is the continuation of my deed and conversion from his consummatum to the moment of His death, for my entire life.

This is how the man in the yellow robe with the hyssop branch came to be represented among Christ’s family, like an exclamation mark chopped in two. Together at the Calvary—naming him—two Johannes can be seen. And two inscriptions. The first is INRI on the cross, and the other, reconstructed in the introduction, appears on the hem of the robe worn by the man with the long stick and raised arms, pointing toward the Sacrifice. The signature, which is (also) an answer.

The text on the figure’s garment begins on the sleeve as he raises his arm. This is illogical, since the name would have appeared upside down and hidden by the
body; in other words it would not have generally been visible. As such the visibility of it here in the painting shows that the words are at least a name-avowal of a sort and in this way a kind of declaration of faith. According to this pictorial dialogue, the letters of John (Iohanes) VII, alliterate with the first word in INRI, Jesus’ name, then the place name Hernicia silva can be aligned with Nazarenus (because it is regional in character). Here, the ancient god Uranus appears in this form derived from the word Rex. The letters of the inscription on the cross only indicate the name in this way (Jesus + Nazarenus + Rex), while John (Iohanes) VII’s inscription indicates his acts and its object, but in the first person. The text placed by Pilate above Christ treats the Jews as a crowd, using the plural genitive Iudeorum. John the Evangelist comments: “it was written in Hebrew, Latin and Greek” (Jn 19,20). As mentioned in the introduction, the use of Hebrew letters and changes in the letter order can be traced to the Greek name variation Uhran-Uranos-Uranus in the sense of the Old Czech Uhran meaning “the magyar” in the Latin text of the inscription. The cross inscription is also ambiguous, and the Jews requested but were not granted its correction. The text of Hans Siebenbürger is a paraphrase of the inscription on the cross, while at the same time its superlatives also function as diminutives (deminutio). Johanes with his serial number is Uhranos in the forest of the hernicus. In other words, he can be presumed to be a wild man-giant, a ranger in the forest of hedgehogs.

Also relevant, perhaps, is that the judge (?) in the cloak holding a sword is not pointing toward the cross but rather to the inscription ‘Johannes’ on the raised arm, meanwhile the centurion with a sword and battle axe also gestures toward the inscription, while talking with the man in the cloak. Was this for security purposes? Because in this panel, according to the groupings and the details, conversion is the central theme in addition to the Crucifixion: “And when all the crowds who had gathered there for this spectacle saw what had taken place, they returned home beating their breasts.” (Lk 23,48) Without going into the second interpretation of the words of the signature, opus = monumentum, the private devotional altar of St Florian (with the exception, of course, of the outer wings) can be considered an exclusively intellectual and technical work of pictor Hans. This, allowing for earlier discussions with his patrons, evolved as his creation, thus his work was the messenger of the person who had it erected. In this case a memorial of a conversion. It was suitable for a private chapel or studiolo, or perhaps served as a travelling devotional altar for a highly ranked convert. The patron was certainly someone named John, who had opportunities to commission such a work and can be easily linked in place and time to this work.

The identity of the patron could be an Austro-Hungarian father and one of his sons (and maybe another son, too, although it is not likely): János Ernst (Ernuszt) (died 3 March 1476), born into a Jewish family from Vienna, was baptized and later settled in Buda as a merchant. In 1461 the king entrusted him with collecting the “thirtieth,” or customs fees, in Pozsony (Bratislava, SK) and in 1464–1467 he was hamincadispán, or bailiff of the thirtieth. He was King Matthias’ financial
advisor in the drafting of the treasury reform. Between 1467–1476 he was royal treasurer, from 1470 to 1475 served as steward of Zólyom (Zvolen, SK), and ban of Slavonia from 1474. In 1474, he also became the ban of Croatia and the head steward of Zólyom and Körös Counties. One of his sons, Zsigmond János Ernuszt (born in Buda? c. 1440, died autumn 1505; diocesan bishop) was appointed by Matthias royal treasurer and was granted Szklabina (Sklabina, SK) castle in Túrör County. Later he was made permanent head steward of this county. After receiving Csáktornya (Čakovec, CR) and its castle, he took on the title of nobility, Csáktornyi. In the first half of 1470 he studied in Vienna, then went to Ferrara, where his studies were directed by Ludovico Carbone (Ludovicus Carbo, 1435–1482), poet and orator. In December of 1473 he was administrator of the bishopric of Pécs, and later was elected and confirmed bishop until his death. From 1493 to 1496 he was the royal treasurer, and had a register prepared. He was captured and after presenting his accounts he was freed, but had to pay a ransom of 400,000 forints, and then returned to Pécs. He donated money for the reinforcement of the border castles. In 1494 he worked for the office that rented out the copper mines of Besztercebánya (Banská Bystrica, SK) to the Fugger–Thurzo company for three years. In 1494 he became the ban of Dalmatia-Croatia-Slavonia. In 1486 he became the “governor” of Austria. After his death, the 300,000 gold pieces he had obtained partially as a copper merchant was seized by the treasury. The other son of János Ernst (Ernuszt), János Ernuszt II—who took on the surname Hampo—was the ban of Croatia and Slavonia from 1508–1509, and died around 1525. The grandson of János Ernst (Ernuszt) was János Ernuszt III (died 1527).

The family’s insistence on the name János taken by the first convert among them, was so strong that the bishop of Pécs, Zsigmond, took it as his second name (as did his brother János II), and he was also resolute about retaining the name Hampo as a surname, which according to tradition was a derivation of Hans/Hansel (János). Hans Siebenbürger must have created this devotional altar for the father, or more likely the son, the bishop of Pécs, Zsigmond János.

The signature (like the inscription on the cross) leaves it to the viewer to figure out who hangs from the cross and who was the instrument of this “completion”. Meanwhile the words of the Scripture from the Old and now also the New Testament offer clues as to who had this pictorial opus made. The painter used that person to emphasize the acknowledgement of Christ and the conversion of Longinus, but more particularly Stephaton. Given the origins of the bishop-patron, it was particularly apt that he should assign this painter with the task of erecting an opus to preserve the name and memory of his father, since the painter, like the Evangelist and the patron, was also John.

The father and both his sons were formerly known in Slavonia, which at the time was still a traditional part of the country belonging to the Hungarian crown, as they served as governors and bans. Near Laibach (Ljubljana), where the Kranker and Sava rivers merge (in Kraina, presently in Slovenia), was once the residence of the former German border lords in the region of Untersteiermark, known as Krainburg.
If the small altar had wound up there, it would have remained there in peace. The old Austrian monastery of St Florian, in any case, could have obtained it from Krainburg, along with the most beautiful examples of Austrian late Gothic altar panels.

Notes
1 R. Suckale, “Der Maler Johann Siebenbürger (um 1440–1483) als Vermittler Nürnberger Kunst nach Ostmitteleuropa,” in Die Länder der Böhmischen Krone und ihre Nachbarn zur Zeit der Jagielenenfürsten (1471–1526). Kunst – Kultur – Geschichte, ed. E. Wetter, Ostfildern 2004, 363–84. On the literature and exhibition data related to the St Florian triptych, whose signature and its possible letters are also discussed here, see K. Schütz, “Die Kunstsammlungen des Augustiner-Chorherren-Stiftes St. Florian,” in Österreichische Kunstdtopographie, vol. XLVIII, Vienna 1988, ill. p. 179. The modest comment of Suckale in his above mentioned study, note 4 (“Jodocus havser” epitaph: “dass auf dem Kreuzestitulus unter den Buchstaben INRI eine hebraisierende Form durchscheint, die mit derjenigen im Schottenretabel übereinstimmt”), is more than “bemerkenswert”, since the inscription on the cross on the triptych of St Florian belongs to this important group of common details that provide some evidence. The signature—as I read it: VHRANVS IPSE EXEGI HOC OPVS—refers to the entirety of the altar panel, at least from the main viewing point with the altar open. The word “opus” is thus complete, and “exegi” together with the wings emphasizes this. Perhaps the painter wanted to assure (the patron too) that he did not entrust the execution of the parts to anyone else either. The outer wings do not add to the essential theme of the altar, and as outer coverings, may have been made later. It is true, as Suckale also noted, that “nur die Mitteltafel mit der Kreuzigung kann von seiner Hand stammen” (idem, 365). We are quite certain that the wings were also executed in the painter’s hand. The Hauser epitaph, however, is another story, and perhaps the label of “Hans Siebenbürger and workshop” is most apt, since it was not the job of the workshop leader to make the background ornament but rather that of the ornament painters (“Lazuristen”). This “detail” forms the decorative closing of the figural scene, fitting to the genre of such epitaphs. Thus Suckale’s entry on the authorship of the epitaph cannot be doubted based on the background. Cf. I. Takács, “A budapesti Eligius-táblakép: a bécsi későgotikus festészet ismeretlen emléke/Das Budapester Tafelbild des Heiligen Eligius: ein unbekannter Werk der Wiener Spätgotischen Malerei,” in Annales de la Galerie Nationale Hongroise, Budapest 1991, 85–93. The author, sharing the opinion of Benesch and agreeing with the dating of the St Florian private devotional altar, dates this work to the middle of the 1470s. Takács attributes the panel of St Eligius before King Chlotar (wood, tempera, 73 × 48) to Hans Siebenbürger. The other side of the panel was obtained in 1990 by the National Gallery through an artwork exchange with the Christian Museum of Esztergom, and Takács strongly believes the work originally came from the St Eligius’ Chapel of the Stephansdom in Vienna. See idem, 88–89.
2 Suckale (n. 1 above), 366.
3 Ibid.
B. Kempelen, *Magyar nemese családok*, vol. V., Budapest 1913, 41; D. Csánki, *Magyarország történeti földrajza a Hunyadiak korában*, vol. I., Budapest 1890; vol. II., 1894; vol. III., 1897; vol. IV., 1941; vol. V., 1913. While the geographical names of Latin origin (herinaceus—erinaceus—erinacius; erinacus), caught on and were widespread in their Hungarianized form, the word “Hermés” is absent from even the most thorough etymological dictionaries. The dictionary of Calepinus, *Dictionarium decem lingüarum*, Lyon 1585, does not mention it, although *herinaceus* does appear (p. 478). The last trace of the word can be found in G. Czuczor–J. Fogarasi, *A magyar nyelv szótára*, vols. I–VII., Pest 1862–1872; vol. II., 1364, 1541, but only in the form of the modifier “hernécses” (when describing the white-furry tufts that form in wine); “hernécs” as a noun is listed, but not defined. By the end of the 16th century, the word had lost its former commonly known meaning.

On the history of County Zaránp, see Csánki (n. 5 above), vol. I., 718–56, esp. 718–22.

Ibid, 719, 732, 733. The five place names described can be divided into two categories: each with two place names. Csánki was unable to identify the third district center with certainty, and could not place it along or near the Fehér-Körös River.

A(nother?) place known as Hermyakfalva or Hernyakowczy cannot be identified at present. According to a registry prepared by Bántfi in 1483 and in a 1471 diploma, it was in Temes County (neighboring Zaránd, their borders continually changing over the years), which was situated close to Borzlyuk (Borzlik)—perhaps today’s Marosborsa along the Maros, or on the opposite bank of the river near Erdőhat? See Csánki (n. 5 above), vol. II., 16, Bo(r)zlyuk/no. 16.

Here it should be mentioned that the eastern border of the former Zaránd County was marked by the Maros (and to the north by the Fehér-Körös River and the mines along it in the Transylvanian Őrhegyseg) and was barely two miles away from the settlement of Haro located not far from the right banks of the Maros, opposite the castle of Déva. Written records show that the goldsmith Mathias Stoss, the younger brother of Veit, came from Haro. A road led from Haro north to the series of goldmines in the southernmost bend of the Fehér-Körös River, in fact to the much closer area of Hondol, where gold works operated until modern times. The 15th-century border between Zaránd and Hunyad counties had extended as far as the southern bend of the river.

At this time the hedgehog was not only a “follower of people” and a partially wild animal that destroyed worms, but also had its own iconography with an ancient moral: the hedgehog retreats into itself for protection—just as virtue does—and thus defeats any random event or forces that attack it. As Horace noted, “rolling into a ball, it takes shelter in its own virtue”, (Horatius, *Carmina* 3, 29–49. The introduction and reference to Horace from Valeriano: Hieroglyphica 8. Contra pericula munitus). See C. Ripa, *Iconologia*, trans., and notes by T. Sajo, Budapest 1997, 599. That a “limitaneus” (a person in charge of supplying the border regiment) in southern Transylvania was granted a title of nobility with the name Hernya—contra pericula munitus—is appropriate although unintentional, but the name can be added to the list of late Transylvania’s geographical memorials. The Old Testament, however, considered the hedgehog unclean, and thus in medieval art its role was associated with the devil. Plutarch was more forgiving when he emphasized the animal’s cleverness: how it picks the grapes and carries them home on its spines to its babies, and is careful not to get pricked by the sharp spines of the newborn hedgehogs during birth(!). As the enemy of the snake, it also embodies the triumph of good over evil, and may have been the attribute of the Virgin and Child in the Middle Ages. The hedgehog has also appeared on coats of arms: the emblem of the French king Louis XII (†1515) was the short-tailed porcupine, the modesty of the eastern court taken to extremes by western rulers, see *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie*, ed. E. Kirschbaum, vol. II., Rome–Freiburg 1972, 355. The French king’s personal coat of arms (corps de devise) “gewinnt der den Emblemen zugehörige Spruch durch Anspielung auf zoologische Eigentümlichkeiten oft den Charakter eines Bekenntnisses oder einer Lebensphilosophie”—and the motto: “Wortdevise, âme de devise”—in
the case of Louis XII, the “Stachelschwein” placed on the spikes meant the crown (see O. Neubecker, *Heraldik, Wappen, ihr Ursprung, Sinn und Wert*, Frankfurt a. M. 1977, 186, fig. 210).

11 Place names with Hernécs also appear in southern Transdanubia (Zala, Pozsega, Tolna and Baranya Counties); on the Southern Plains: Bács, Temes, and Arad Counties, but most often in Zaránd. The only exception in the north is the place in Máramaros, which—just like the one in Zala—survives to this day. Among the nineteen varieties, we did not mention the one in Pozsega County (“Hernychowcz”), because although this contains the Hungarian name stemming from Latin, its ending may be a Slavic form. We heed Csányi’s warning that similar forms might be Slavic additions in this region and thus—as their pronunciation cannot be reconstructed—might be either Slavic or Hungarian words. See Csányi (n. 5 above), vol. II., 385, n. 2. As Csányi did not even recognize the Hungarianized version of the original Latin in the word “hernécs”, his caution is understandable. But in precisely this case, the spelling of Hernychowcz differs little from the place names ending with -ovcz, -evcz, -ovacz -ovecz, -ouvczi, -evczi, -ócz, -ócsi (non of which contains the letter u), all mentioned by Csányi. Moreover, the word can be read in Hungarian as Hernycsösz, meaning “field-guard of hedgedogs”. This, however, is just an interesting aside, not included in our argument, although it might have relevance to the VHRANVS of the signature, which—if taken as a diminution—might provide a good analogy.

We should also mention that in Pozsega County, which was smaller than Zarád, the name’s version as Hemych–Hemye is common. At one place, the word is known from a noble family’s name. It is the only medieval example of this word used as both place name and family name. Its location was near Tonica or Paska, in the vicinity of Orlyava: see Csányi (n. 5 above), vol. II., 388, 411, 434. Given the appearance of ‘hernyék–hernyik’ place names, here with a Slavic ending, the possible place of origin of Hans Siebenbürger could be sought in this county but for two reasons. First, only in Zarád County do we find “hernécs” among the variations of the name, and second, because the name and the signature of the painter (“Septimus” included in the latter) clearly refer to a place in Transylvania. Pozsega County is about 3-400 kilometers to the west of Zarád, on the left bank of the river Sava. During the 18th century, it was part of Slavonia, later—until 1919—part of Hungary, and now it belongs to Croatia.

12 The mines along the 15th-century northern border of Hunyad County were at least in part listed as part of Zarád County, and it is important to consider that to the west along the Fehér-Körös River there was a much shorter route to the south toward the Maros River, upon which it was possible to travel by boat through Arad and Szeged and connect with the Danube in Titel, above Belgrade. Traffic from the mining towns along the Fehér-Körös heading toward Déva did not even have to cross the Maros (moorings for downriver traffic were on the north side!), and here was a crossroad for the main route of travel through Haró (along the north bank reaching Zámon, the main port on the Maros, also in the direction of Szeged).


15 The elder Albrecht Dürer (Ajtos, near Gyula 1427–1502 Nuremberg) had begun his studies around 1440 in Gyula in his father’s goldsmith workshop. In 1443 he may have settled in Nuremberg. He studied and worked as a “Geselle” in the workshop of his future father-in-law. In June 1455 he returned there after a stint in other German towns and the Netherlands. In 1467 he was granted the rights of a citizen of Nuremberg, and in this year he married Barbara, the daughter of his employer. In July 1468 he was awarded the rights of a master. (If Hans Siebenbürger had also arrived in Nuremberg at the age of seventeen or later, the two may have got acquainted after 1455–56, before Siebenbürger’s possible move straight to Vienna). See M. Mende’s article in K. G. Saur’s *Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon*, vol. XXX., München–Leipzig 2001, 292.
16 Mentions of depictions of Stephaton in later medieval sources: *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie* (n. 10 above), vol. II., 614, 623, 634. John the Evangelist had such little interest in the name and personality of the person who offers the sour wine (and bile) that he refers to him in the third person plural: “they put a sponge full of wine on a branch of hyssop and held it to his mouth.” In the Calvary of St Florian the role of Stephaton receives a concrete name, a certain Johannes VII.

17 The volunteer naming himself—undertaking a historical and pictorial role in Jewish garb—uses his own (although hidden) name to elicit the general subject of the Evangelist and transfer it upon his own ego, but at the same time upon his own name and of the name of “John”, who was also present and has described everything. The painter is thus an alter ego, who almost steals in and genuinely paints everything according to the Scripture—what his name giver, the Evangelist, here has silently (but with sympathy, and in writing, much earlier than the artist) authenticated.

18 The gestures reveal how the person holding the hyssop with the long stick presents a pantomime of remorse and conversion. The raised arm, the palm opened toward the cross, the clearly visible acknowledgment of the Savior, the mouth open in the act of avowing, the glance locked on the already dead face are all simultaneously an expression of penitence and a confession of faith.

19 The painter writes “exegi … opus” about the work itself with quotes from classical poetry, but the word “exequor” that is “exegi scelus” survived from liturgical Latin, too, meaning “I sinned”, as the Stephaton figure standing there states about this opus or act, but in the sense of a bad deed. Thus, it may have already been foretold in the psalm. Christ’s last wish also refers to this: “yet I was the one among many who did this …” in the role of Stephaton (for the verb “exequor” used with the words “opus - scelus - monumentum”, see the interpretations of M. Finály, *A latin nyelv szótára*, Budapest 1884, and 2002; 752, 1379.) In any case, it is well-know that in the gradual of the mass: “quia peccavi nimis in cogitatione, verbo et opere” refers to the act, which the Second Vatican Council expanded with the sin of “omission”, or omission.


22 The Calvary triptych of St Florian may have earlier been kept in a building owned by Ernuszt—perhaps in their house or palace in Buda; in the episcopal castle of Pécs; in the castle of Csáktornya, where they frequently resided; in Körös County in the estate of Szentgyörgymező on the left bank of the Száva; and even possibly for a while in Vienna, during the period when János Zsigmond served as governor.


24 The painter depicted the man in yellow as a kind of “Bildparallelität”, when he, as a representative of converted Jews, accepted the crucified Christ as his Savior. This is perhaps the only (?) artistic and secular expression of his that appears related to—perhaps even a precursor to—Dürer’s “Gottesebenbildlichkeit” in the way formulated by Peter-Klaus Schuster? Or is this merely an isolated case? I am indebted to Orsolya Hessky at the Hungarian National Gallery for supplying the word “Bildparallelität”. See P.-K. Schuster, *Melancolia I., Dürers Denkbild*, vols. I–II., Berlin 1991, with a little difference on similar meaning, see vol. I., 260, 262, 264, 267, 302, 357–400.
In 2008, Hungary celebrated the “Year of the Renaissance”, on the 550th anniversary of King Matthias Corvinus’ accession to the throne. Four major Budapest exhibitions demonstrated the European significance of Hungary’s Renaissance art in the 15th and 16th centuries. The first of these was an exhibition in the National Széchényi Library of surviving codices from the library of Johannes Vitéz of Zredna. Vitéz was a scholar-prelate of European renown, the tutor of the future King Matthias Corvinus and later his Chancellor. The exhibition also included some outstanding books from Hungary from the same period but not originally belonging to his or the Corvina Library. A total of fifty codices were on display. The exhibition catalogue edited by the exhibition curator, Ferenc Földesi, head of the Hungarian National Library’s Manuscripts Department, included several substantial essays. It was a treat for both historians and non-professionals to see even a fragment of this library in a former royal building, which itself stands on the site of Matthias’ Buda palace, and thus in the close vicinity of where Johannes Vitéz worked for several decades as an official, and for a while the head, of the royal chancellery. The Archbishop of Esztergom, scholar, prelate and statesman, was admired even by the Italian humanists, and the books he gathered in his library covered the most diverse subjects, revealing the breadth and depth of his erudition. Most bear Vitéz’s coat of arms and are decorated to a high artistic standard. His close scrutiny of the text and the course of his own thoughts are revealed by marginal notes in his own hand. The books stand as evidence of his great knowledge of all branches of learning in both humanities and natural sciences, as does his considerable encouragement and support for scientific research, given for example to Georg Peuerbach, the eminent professor of astronomy at the University of Vienna. When he built an observatory in Várad (Oradea, RO) during his tenure as Bishop, Vitéz commissioned Peuerbach to produce the Tabulae Varadenses, which gives calculations of solar and lunar eclipses based on the Várad meridian.2

The exhibition also presented lines written in praise of Vitéz by the eminent Italian and German humanists who wrote or translated some of the books. Looking beyond the polite Renaissance formulas, they clearly express the high esteem
he enjoyed among scholars and authors of the time. Most of them had a direct, personal relationship with Vitéz. It was at the behest of Vitéz that Regiomontanus produced his *Tabulae directionum*, tables of the orbits, rotation and declinations of the heavenly bodies. He dedicated the work with the lines: “You are illustrious in scholarship and virtue, to a wondrous extent! Although you are prepared to learn from the scholars of the sciences, you surpass every one of them with the richness of your knowledge. Those who got to you as teachers declare themselves your pupils.”

The young poet of Modena-Ferrara, Gasparus Tribrachus, sent a volume of his seven eclogues with a dedication to Vitéz in verse and, knowing of his love of the arts, had a sumptuous title page made for the book presenting the dedication in visual form: the young humanist, in an attitude of great respect, offers his work to the archbishop, above whose head is the inscription in gold letters “LUX PANNONIAE” (fig. 1).

The high points of the exhibition were the large, lavishly-executed books by Livy from Vitéz’s library. These came from the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich. The famous Roman historian Titus Livius of Padua was a favourite author of Vitéz, and one he frequently quoted in his speeches and letters. These three volumes, containing the first 40 parts of the work which traces the history of Rome from its foundation—*Ab Urbe condita*—were among the most outstanding

1. Caspar Tribrachus: *Eclogae*, Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Cod. lat. 416, fol. 1r
pieces of a library which was famous throughout Europe. By right of the high standard of the painted illustrations, especially on the title pages and the 1v folios opposite, the gold letters of artistic humanist book script on every page, i.e. on the 220+211+168 leaves of the three books, and not least the blind-stamped red leather bindings, these codices rank among the great works of European Renaissance art. Ferenc Földesi rightly stated that “the illumination of these books surpasses that of even the finest Corvinas.” Research suggests that the great miniaturists responsible for the work were Mariano del Buono (1st and 3rd volumes) and Ser Ricciardo di Nanni (the 2nd). The copyist of the text, however, was the
same for all three, and is well-known to have been no less than Messer Piero di Strozzi, the finest, most painstaking copyist in Florence. The latest research dates the books to 1469–70, i.e. when Vitéz was Archbishop of Esztergom. He must have ordered them as Primate of Hungary, Chancellor to King Matthias Corvinus. On the 1v folio of all three volumes, a sumptuously executed picture of a Renaissance white marble tabernacle, following the finest all'antica architectural plans of Leon Battista Alberti, introduces Livy's history of ancient Rome. The all'antica entablature, with bronze-clad plinth and Tuscan capitals, is graced with fluted pilasters in the first volume, and coloured marble columns in the second and third, supporting a richly adorned all'antica architrave. Above this rises a semicircular lunette whose frame connects to the all'antica adornment of the mouldings. Above it are three lunettes containing all'antica decorative motifs: horn of plenty, trophy, and rosette. There are gold antiqua-lettering inscriptions in praise of Livy in the centre of each tabernacle. The lunettes contain the bust or name of the author of the laudatory lines. In the first volume, a half-figure representation of St Jerome appears on a bright ground resembling blue marble, in the second a portrait of the Roman rhetor Quintilianus, and in the third the name of Quintilianus. The two latter lunettes are closed by a perspective drawing of a reticulated vault with a deep spatial illusion (fig. 2).

The presence of these three paintings in Vitéz's Livy volumes is clear evidence of his devotion to the artistic school which was reviving the forms of ancient Roman architecture, represented above all by the great humanist scholar Leon Battista Alberti (1404–1472), educated at the University of Padua where he studied liberal arts, mathematics, and music. He had been in the service of the popes in Rome for several decades. Alberti was famous for a treatise on painting (Della Pittura, 1436) and a book which took up the work of Vitruvius and set out the theoretical foundations of Renaissance architecture (De re architettura ..., around 1450). Two copies of the latter work are among the surviving volumes of King Matthias' Corvina library. In all probability Vitéz read and adopted Alberti's architectural principles and teachings, and it is fair to assume he had a copy in his own library. In fact he may well have known Alberti personally. They may have studied together in Padua, and met in Ferrara and Rome. During his long life, as a member of the royal chancellery, and later bishop and chancellor, Vitéz may have visited Rome several times, starting with Sigismund of Luxemburg's coronation as Emperor in 1433, and particularly during his twenty years as Bishop of Várad, which included the holy year of 1450. This may be true despite his having obtained the Pope's permission for believers to be granted the holy-year indulgence even if they remained in Hungary provided they met the prescribed conditions, which included contributing the costs of the pilgrimage to the crusade against the Turks.

Vitéz did not have to go to Rome, however, to see classical buildings. Architectural remnants in the Hungarian Kingdom of the ex-Roman provinces of Pannonia and Dacia were present in abundance. These included the ruins of the
amphitheatres, baths and houses of Aquincum, the former civilian and military settlement, and the remains of Hadrian’s Palace on what is now Hajógyári Island in Budapest.

The absence of written records is clearly insufficient reason to deny Vitéz’s journeys to Italy. Neither is his letter of 24 April 1445, in which he complains that his attempt to go to Italy had been thwarted and he had been forced to turn back, decisive in this question. The failure of this journey does not mean he never went to Italy at any time before or after. It is highly probable that even as a seminarist in Zagreb, through his uncle, Mártyás Gatalóci, Provost of Zagreb and later Chancellor to King Sigismund, he may, after chapter school, have gone to the nearby University of Padua. The present author has scrutinised the list of students who matriculated at the University of Padua. The register is missing for several years, and the names of several students are entered without their place of origin. There were several otherwise undesignated entries with the name “Johannes” in the 1420s and 30s. One of these may have been Joannes de Zredna... Firmer evidence for his having studied at an Italian university than official registration is his humanist scholarship, and his friendly, collegiate relations with Italian humanists, as testified by his letters to them. Iván Boronkai has convincingly argued that nobody could have been admitted to the chancellery of King Sigismund without a university degree.

Johannes Vitéz was held as a great authority among European humanists. The letters of Greek and Latin scholars living in Italy and their dedications of works to him testify to the international respect which attended his great abilities, scholarship, and exceptional human virtues. The highest evidence of the international renown of Vitéz’s humanist erudition was a laudation by the eminent Italian humanist Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini. As chancellor to the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick III, Aeneas encountered Vitéz, chancellor to King Matthias-Corvinus, as an opponent in momentous diplomatic battles. Despite being on the opposite political side, Aeneas was won over by the humanist construction and presentation of Vitéz’s speeches. An opponent became a sincere, respectful friend unto death.
Aeneas later asked for Vitéz’s intercession in his appointment as cardinal, and did not fail to express his gratitude. As Pope Pius II, he gave the Bishop of Várad full support in organising European unity against the Turks. It is not hard to imagine that Vitéz might have seen Aeneas’ great building projects in his home city of Pienza and the pontifical seat in Rome. Even if he did not have a mansion in the centre of Rome, unlike his contemporary, Primate Dénes Szécsi, whom he succeeded as Archbishop of Esztergom in 1465, he may have seen the loggia in the courtyard of the nearby Palazzo Venezia and the several-storey loggia on the outside of St Peter’s Basilica on Vatican Hill (fig. 3). Both follow the coliseum motif, according to the principles of Leon Battista Alberti, who probably designed both buildings around 1450–60.

Vitéz’s high office in the royal chancellery, his enthronement as bishop in 1445, and his elevation to Primate Archbishop of the Kingdom of Hungary in 1465, demanded ever higher respect from ecclesiastical and secular scholars. We may thus ascribe even greater significance to the nature of the friendship with many of them which emerges from his letters. The direct tone of the letters to Guarino, the renowned teacher of the Accademia d’Este in Ferrara, implies a personal acquaintance. Perhaps they knew each other from their time spent at the University of Padua in their youth.

Vitéz’s great respect and liking for Livy also strengthens the hypothesis of a period of stay in Padua. Eight surviving Livy books (some only in fragments) are known to have formed part of his library. It is also highly likely that the magnificent architectural design of the grand hall of the Palazzo Ragione in Padua and its early 15th-century paintings were imprinted in his memory through personal observation.

Only the University of Vienna holds a document—from 1434—of Vitéz’s university studies. At that time he was an official in the chancellery of King and Emperor Sigismund in Buda. He probably had a place in the Emperor’s retinue on many foreign journeys. He may have been in Rome in 1433 on the great occasion of Sigismund’s imperial coronation, as has been suggested by research. He may have travelled to the cities of the Holy Roman Empire quite frequently. There is direct evidence, however, only for some diplomatic negotiations (Wiener Neustadt, Mainz, Prague, Brünn, Graz etc.) and imperial gatherings where he held highly significant speeches, as in Frankfurt, Regensburg and Wiener Neustadt in 1454–55.

After the death of Sigismund, he became King Albert’s protonotary, and after the latter’s death in 1439, he took control of the chancellery as “regnii Hungariae protonotarius”. Under Władysław I he retreated to Várad, where he became provost, and then bishop from 1445 to 1465. No record survives of the buildings, the houses, churches and cathedrals, in Buda, Zagreb or Várad built by Johannes Vitéz, one of the leading personalities of the royal court and the Hungarian Church. All that is known is an inscription on the outside wall of Várad Cathedral: 1456. Johannes E(piscopus) W(aradienses), recorded by István Miskolczy in 1609.
This suggests that after the destruction of Várad in the 1443 earthquake, the large-scale construction pursued for several years—urged earlier even by King Sigismund, who wanted to be buried there—was completed in 1456 by Bishop Johannes Vitéz. Regent János Hunyadi and Bishop Johannes Vitéz petitioned the Pope for permission to sell indulgences, and were granted it: Pope Nicholas V granted indulgence
to pilgrims to the Cathedral of Várad in the holy year of 1450 on similar terms to those who visited the “great” basilicas in Rome. Várad Cathedral was thus raised to the same rank as the great basilicas of Rome.

During his twenty-year tenure as Bishop of Várad, the city of St Ladislas, Vitéz while engaged in building on a large scale, built up a large library of European renown and organised a scholarly society, the Academy. He appeared on the national and European political stages through highly successful diplomatic commissions, securing the return of the Holy Crown of Hungary from Emperor Frederick III in 1464 and making impressive speeches at imperial assemblies. These activities established his authority on a European scale. After the death of Dénès Szécsi, he was appointed Primate Archbishop of Esztergom, the old seat of Hungarian kings and a cultural centre of European significance since the time of king St Stephen. When Vitéz arrived in Esztergom, 20 of its 39 canons in its cathedral chapter held canon-law doctorates, which they had gained in Bologna, Padua and Vienna. All of them had well-stocked libraries, as research by Kinga Körmendy has demonstrated.

The 57-year-old prelate, Chancellor to King Matthias Corvinus, the Lux Pannoniae, who had a decisive influence over education throughout the country for decades, including that of young Matthias Hunyadi (Corvinus), immediately started work on establishing a Hungarian university of European prestige. In 1465, he sent the highly respected Bishop of Pécs, Janus Pannonius, to Italy to seek Pope Paul II’s approval for a full university on the Bolognese model, with four faculties. The Pope immediately signed the university proposal laid before him, making no changes to it. This fact in itself implies that he was already familiar with Archbishop Vitéz’s work as a scholar and prelate. The university lecturers were drawn from Vitéz’s scholarly society, people who had known him for several decades and enjoyed his patronage. They gave up their chairs in Paris, Rome, Vienna and Padua for professorships in the Accademia Istropolitana in Hungary. The opening ceremony took place in Esztergom on 20 June 1467, in the cathedral and palace which Vitéz had already refurbished. The constellation of the planets played a major part in the timing of the ceremony, as evidenced by the horoscope for the day produced by the eminent astronomer of Cracow, Martin Ilkus, an Accademia Istropolitana professor, and colleague of Regiomontanus. His drawing has been preserved in a Ptolemy codex, Magnae compositionis libri (seu Almagest) a Georgio Trapezuntio traducti, which bears the coat of arms of King Matthias Corvinus. Teaching started in October in Pozsony (Bratislava, SK). Since this was near Vienna, young people trying to get into the University of Vienna had the option of choosing a university in their own country instead of the imperial capital.

The Archbishop’s palace in Esztergom was no doubt refurbished as befitting the venue of an international opening of a university, which must have been attended by representatives of peer institutions, devotees and humanist friends of Vitéz as well as its own eminent professors. His famous buildings in Esztergom were praised in the writing of several 15th- and 16th-century humanists. The most important was Antonio Bonfini, historian to King Matthias and reader to Queen
Beatrix, who spent ten years in Esztergom after the death of her husband King Matthias Corvinus. He could not have had any interest in praising an archbishop who had organised a plot against the King and had died twenty years previously. His praise in the highest possible terms was thus thoroughly authentic, and archaeological excavations in 1934–38 and 1966–99 have borne out his words. The original palace, laid out so splendidly by King Béla III, was one of the earliest examples of European Gothic, and particularly the Castle Chapel and the connecting residential tower, so impressed Vitéz that he chose it as his study. Vitéz took as a model King Béla III, who returned from Byzantium in 1172 and—as heir apparent to the imperial throne—was for ten years the most powerful man in the Empire after Manuel I. As King of Hungary, he united in his Esztergom court the cultures of the eastern Roman Empire and western Christendom. The struggle to save Greek culture was a recurrent theme throughout Vitéz’s lifetime. As an official of King Sigismund, he may have been present when the Byzantine Emperor, Johannes VIII Palaeologus, was received in Tata on his way to the Council of Florence in 1437, having considered it important to seek the support of the King of Hungary and the Holy Roman Emperor against the Turkish threat. Vitéz was in personal contact with several fleeing Greek scholars, such as the highly cultured humanist Patriarch, later Cardinal Bessarion, who moved from Nicea to Rome and was one of the principal champions of the unification of eastern and western Christendom. If nowhere else, they may have met at the University of Vienna, where Bessarion taught Greek for several years. Vitéz was there in the 1440s during János Hunyadi’s campaigns against the Turks, and learned with great sorrow of the fall of Byzantium in 1453 there. Afterwards, he considered it his greatest task to spur the rulers of Europe to liberate Byzantium as soon as possible, above all his former pupil King Matthias Corvinus, who came to the throne in 1458. After the triumph of Nándorfehérvar (Belgrade, SRB) in 1456, he saw the realistic opportunity of expelling the Turks from Europe. It was the failure of a union in this aim that ultimately led him to organise a plot against the King.

When he came to establish a fully-fledged Hungarian university in Esztergom, drawing on the lessons of several decades at the top of political and ecclesiastical affairs, Vitéz took Morality as the basis of teaching all branches of learning. He alluded to this in letters he wrote in the 1440s. And when he sent his nephew Janus Pannonius and other young men from Hungary to Ferrara to study at the Academy of Guarino of Verona, he hoped they would “take on the aspect of the master” as well as learning the sciences. He expressed a similar sentiment in the painted decoration of his study.

Excavations on the first floor of the residential tower of Esztergom Palace in 1934–38 discovered in situ 15th-century Renaissance frescoes beside a doorway. It lead into the chapel on the north wall of the great hall of the piano nobile, whose original ceiling was a two-section groined vault. The frescoes were allegories of the four cardinal virtues (fig. 4). The four female figures stand under perspective-drawn loggia arcades. They are identified by their attributes and by text ribbons...
floating above their heads. The vaulting collapsed during the Turkish wars, together with the curved ends of the side walls. An archivolt with signs of the Zodiac was reconstructed from painted stones among the rubble. Further fresco fragments are clearly from pictures representing the procession of the planets. In 1944, the historian Antal Lepold used this information to reconstruct the iconographic programme of the frescoes in the hall. In addition to the allegory of the seven virtues, he inferred the presence of the seven liberal arts under the arches of a painted loggia, and above them the procession of the seven planets on two sides of a Zodiacal arch, under a blue sky. The programme was further elaborated through researches by the present author starting in the 1960s. The architect Konstantin Vukov produced a drawing of the frescoes in the 1980s (fig. 5).

The more familiar we become with Vitéz, the more clearly his Christian humanist personality emerges. In Hungary, the Church was the standard-bearer of humanism and Renaissance culture, and Johannes Vitéz was the father of Hungarian humanism. The Esztergom frescoes indicate that Vitéz devoted his life to following the teachings of Apostle Peter: “Add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity.” (Peter 1:5-7, King James version.) His scholarship grew directly from the Fathers of the Church, primarily St Augustine and St Jerome, and—partly through them—the ancient Greek philosophers, above all Plato and Aristotle. The 30-36 books known to have been part of a library which was famous throughout contemporary Europe, his notes in other codices he known to have emended, and not least his Book of Letters, are clear evidence of his broad competence in all branches of learning. Some ideas from the poetic masterpiece of medieval Europe, Dante’s encyclopaedic Divine Comedy, are also present on the Esztergom frescoes. It was probably in the light of the seven planets that the Seven Virtues triumphed, as in the first seven circles of Paradise. There were also representations of the godly virtues, Faith, Hope and Charity, which in Dante ruled the sky of the Moon, Mercury and Venus. The Cardinal Virtues of the Aristotelian Ethics, depicted with great artistic refinement in Esztergom, must have bathed in the light of the other four planets: Wisdom in the Sun, Temperance in Saturn, Courage in Mars, and Justice in Jupiter. The relationship between the virtues and the planets was a favoured subject in humanist thought and Renaissance art. Examples are Agostino di Duccio’s ethereal paintings in the Tempio Malatestiano in Rimini and Mantegna’s playing cards, which spread widely throughout Europe in the mid-15th century.

Vitéz added to his humanist programme, however, Dante’s philosophical-theological ideas. He was also one of the most significant competent supporter of scientific, mathematical-astronomical research, including the calculations of Peuerbach, Regiomontanus and Martin Ilkus. He erected an observatory in Esztergom. The university he set up, on the Bolognese model, put particular emphasis on the teaching of natural sciences. Regiomontanus left his chair in Vienna and moved to
Esztergom. Here he compiled his *Tabulae directionum*, which for the next two hundred years was the manual of astronomers in Europe. As mentioned above, he dedicated it to Johannes Vitéz.29

Vitéz’s studiolo in Esztergom stands out among other humanist studiolos known to have existed in the 15th century. We see here, albeit in fragments, the study of a prelate, statesman and scholar. It becomes all the more significant when we consider that even less is known of the studiolos of comparable contemporaries. Cardinal Bessarion had a famous study in his house in Rome, Pope Nicholas V (1447–1455) (originally Tommaso Parentucelli) and Pope Pius II (Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini) had studies in the Vatican, but nothing of these survives. The studiolo and chapel of Pope Nicholas V, who himself translated from Hebrew and Greek into Latin, and founded the Vatican Library with his own library of 5000 volumes in Greek and Latin and restored some 40 churches in Rome, were adorned with frescoes by Fra Angelico. The frescoes in the chapel survived. Pope Nicholas V was familiar with affairs in Hungary, being in correspondence with Bishop Vitéz of Várad. He highly esteemed János Hunyadi’s heroic struggle against the Turks, and awarded him the titles “Prince of Rome” and “Golden Rose”. These honours were later also conferred on the Popes’ general, the Prince of Urbino, Federigo da Montefeltro (1420–82). He was also an important patron of the sciences, and had a great library, although he did not build this up himself; he contracted Vespasiano da Bisticci to establish a humanist library of two hundred volumes. Vespasiano, by his own account, hired 45 scribes, who produced the 200 sumptuous volumes in 22 months.30 Most of these are now in the Vatican Library. Cosimo de’ Medici’s library in Florence came into being by a similar route. The wealthy humanist, former banker and condottiere, may have appreciated the sciences, but were not themselves scholars. Their studiolos therefore had fundamentally different functions. This is clear from a comparison of the studiolos of Federigo da Montefeltro in Urbino and Gubbio with that of Vitéz in Esztergom. They were much smaller and their decoration featured different iconography.31 They had points in common: they were similarly situated, close to the chapel, the terraced garden and the bedroom. In Esztergom, the library may have been in a room connecting to the south side of the studiolo. Stairs from the north wall of the studiolo led to the bedroom, and the terraced garden facing the Danube was beside the chapel.

Johannes Vitéz, Primate of Hungary, Lux Pannoniae, was a highly competent patron of the arts as well as the sciences. It is evidenced by the artistic standard of the decoration in his books and of the Esztergom frescoes as cleaning currently in progress revealed.32 The wealth he accumulated as archbishop and royal chancellor afforded the use of luxurious materials such as azurite and gold on the Frescoes of his palace as we can see in his studiolo there.33
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In June 1469 Cosme Tura finished the four large shutter canvases for the new organ of the Ferrara Cathedral. On the outer canvases we see the figure of St George, while the inner ones show the Annunciation. The outside canvas of the left shutter depicts the princess as she flees in horror (fig. 1). Behind her rises a mountain, which fills the entire field of the picture and has a serpentine path leading from the rocky, cavernous base all the way to the top. Eight men appear at the start of the path outside the walls of the city. They are all wearing Eastern attire, although they differ in many respects. The legs of the three on the left are hidden by the steep cliff in the foreground; they do not appear to have completely reached the path. The man in yellow, his back turned to the viewer as he vigorously leans forward, is fleeing to the left with both hands raised, and his head turned back slightly. The second man, shown from the side, runs after him with hands held in front. The third man, facing forward, looks up with bearded face. In his right hand he gathers up his loose cloak—disencumbering his steps—while he opens his left arm wide. A short distance from the three there is an older man meditating motionlessly with closed eyes. Although his left leg hangs over the precipice, his other is firmly on the path. His right elbow rests on his right leg with his head supported by his right hand, while his left hand is placed on his hip. To his right four more men stand on the path, quietly praying with heads bowed.

The eight men are generally identified as the rescued princess’s father, the king of Libya, and his followers. The men’s location outside the castle, the absence of the queen consort and the lack of interest in the struggle, however, are inconsistent with this supposition. Related scenes in the legend tell of either trembling residents as they escape following the slaying of the dragon, or citizens—the converted dead—resurrected by St George.
The story of St George and the dragon is about the triumph of good over evil, light over dark. Beyond this general meaning, Cosmé Tura's work commemorates an important step taken by the Este family in developing the landscape: the draining of the marshes. At the same time, Tura dramatically calls attention to the need for another crusade against the Turks, to which the eight exotic figures in the painting, some fleeing, some meditating, are clearly linked.

The decorations of the organ shutters provide information on Christianity's political situation at the time as well as on contemporary religious ideas. Guidoni and Marino justifiably linked the depictions to the most up-to-date neo-Platonic doctrine advocated in Florence: the paintings were intended not only to convert non-believers, but also expressed the desire to smooth over religious differences and appropriate the knowledge of the ancients. On the closed shutters the princess safeguards the symbols of antique wisdom. The Annunciation, which serves to frame the resounding music, proclaims the ultimate triumph of wisdom and the new, cosmic harmony of Christianity which incorporates all antecedents. In this reading of the work, the height of the mountain symbolizes the difficulty of discovering the truth, and that of acquiring knowledge. The eight exotic men are the eight representatives of pagan wisdom, and embody the degrees of recognition of light, faith and divine truth. Resurrected, they set off on the path to the sacred mountain of wisdom which encompasses all earlier religious traditions. (In my opinion the eight wise men may also be connected to the eight planet gods
adorning the building in the Annunciation scene, who recall the defeated, defused idols resurrected, with the help of St George, in the service of Christianity. The neo-Platonic Christianity of the Renaissance appropriates and—literally—in-corporates these gods, as it does the knowledge of the eight pagan wise men.

II.

On 30 August, 1481, the first Florentine printed edition of *The Divine Comedy* was published with the commentary of Cristoforo Landino. The publisher was Nicolò di Lorenzo della Magna of Breslau, and the engravings were probably made by Baccio Baldini of Florence. According to Vasari, the latter was a silversmith and copper engraver, who relied on the works of Botticelli to compensate for his poor drawing skills.

In the engraving made for the First Canto of Hell, Dante in a loose cloak appears three times (fig. 2). On the left, deep in thought, he wanders among the trees with his hands clasped, his head bowed, and his eyes closed. Slightly higher on the right he steps out of a dark forest, throwing up his head. In his right hand he holds a rope and lifts up his cloak, while his left hand touches his head covering. The panther and the lion attack from the right. Finally, slightly farther above and to the right, we see the poet from behind, his two arms raised as he quickly escapes from the wolf, while looking back at the wild beast. Vergil appears between the second and third figures, his legs obscured, his left hand reaching for his beard (?), and his eyes closed. The sunrays illuminate the peak of the towering mountain near the right edge of the image.

In my opinion this engraving could not have been made without the knowledge of Cosmé Tura’s depiction of the wise men in Ferrara Cathedral. The poet

2. Baccio Baldini: *Dante, Inferno, Canto I*, 1481, Budapest, Szépművészeti Múzeum
quietly meditating with bowed head resembles the two standing figures in the right side of Tura’s painting. In both pictures, figures are shown from behind with uplifted arms as they run to the left while looking back toward the right. The absent-minded Vergil, dressed as an Eastern magician, is similar to the fourth, bearded figure in Tura’s picture, shown half on the path, half in the air, immersed in his own thoughts. Although the depiction of Dante stepping out of the forest is less clearly influenced by the third figure from the left in the Ferrara painting, in light of the above similarities the connection is probable. Tura’s figure similarly grasps his cloak in his right hand and lifts his left, but instead of a bent position, his arm is outstretched. The overall impact of the two compositions is also comparable, as both are characterized by a left-to-right ascension and a series of side-by-side, but non-interacting figures.

Similarities in content are not a prerequisite for borrowing form—however, if we can discover a likeness of this kind, too, the probability that one work effected another increases. In the case of these two works, several fundamental analogies can be drawn between their meanings. In both, the main character struggles with an attacking beast, the symbol of sin; the rope in the hand of Dante as he steps out from the forests is the leash that will bind the wild animal. Vergil is just as much a wise man of antiquity resurrected from the dead as Tura’s figures; they all lived “when the false gods were worshipped ignorantly”. Both pictures tell of the difficult path from darkness and ignorance to the shining mountain of virtue and divine wisdom. The same neo-Platonic spirit that invigorates Tura’s paintings also inspires Landino’s commentary on Dante, so much so that several passages could relate to the eight pagan wise men of Ferrara, too.

III.

“Costui fu migliore disegnatore che pititore,” wrote Vasari about Tura in one of his two sentences on the painter of Ferrara. Basing their opinions on some surviving drawings and underdrawings on his painting, as well as the expressive linearity of his style, many have declared Tura an excellent drawer. He was among those artists of the Quattrocento for whom the disegno was not merely an aid but a tool to capture invention, the prima idea. Tura himself was clear about the
value of his drawings: in his first will dated 14 January 1471, he left his draw-

ings—along with money and tools—to a painter named Domenico di Jacopo Valeti.\textsuperscript{20} This took place a year and a half after the organ shutters of Ferrara were painted. We have reason to suppose—based on the large size of the canvases alone—that pre-
liminary sketches were used in the making of the canvases. (Perhaps this explains why the fresco depicting March in the Palazzo Schifanoia [1470] shows St George again while August contains the figure of the fleeing princess.\textsuperscript{21}) Most likely a study was prepared for the eight figures in Eastern dress on the organ shutter, and it may have cropped up in the Florentine workshop of Baccio Baldini, and served as a prototype for the illustration to the First Canto of Hell.

Botticelli should be included in this investigation, too. Many believe his drawing to the First Canto of Hell is among those closely related to Baldini’s illustrations (fig. 3).\textsuperscript{22} The figure of Dante originally appeared six times in the drawing. The first, the wandering figure in the forest, resembles the corresponding figure in Baldini’s engraving; thus, he is related in some way—perhaps only indirectly—to Tura’s standing, meditating wise man. The second and third figures (resting with his head in his hands, stepping out of the forest) were destroyed. In the next three instances the poet fearfully encounters the animals approaching from the right; no corresponding fig-
ures appear in either Baldini’s engraving or Tura’s painting.

Baldini’s figure shown from behind summarises in one person Botticelli’s three depictions of the poet confronting animals, and thus the main motif of the entire First Canto: the repeatedly impeded en-
deavours upward. This is the only figure with no prototype in Botticelli’s drawing. Baldini’s decision to borrow instead the de-
piction of the wise man running in the left of Tura’s painting was an excellent one, as this is the most powerful figure in the en-
graving. Its quality, however, has hitherto been overlooked, probably because Baldini is written off as an unimaginative Botticelli-
imitator. His Dante dodging the wolf proved so successful, however, that from the 16th to the 18th centuries a fleeing figure similar to this—and of course to the Ferrara proto-
type—defined almost every Venetian illustration of the First Canto of Hell (fig. 4).\textsuperscript{23}

Botticelli’s Vergil is proof that he, too, was familiar with Tura’s painting. Unlike Vergil in the engraving, this “or very man, or ghost” (Inferno 66) is not motionless, but steps up from behind the hill, and instead of bowing his head in contemplation, he looks

4. Dante, \textit{Inferno}, Canto I, 1544, Venice (Francesco Marcolini)
upward at the mountain. His right hand clutches his loose cloak. I think the source of the figure is Tura, though not the fourth, meditating wise man, but rather the third, bearded figure stepping out from behind the hill, looking up, with his cloak in his right hand.

(The link between Tura’s Ferrara works/drawings and the Florentine press that printed Dante’s work might be—alongside many other possibilities—either the publisher himself, Niccolò di Lorenzo della Magna, or Batolomeo della Fonte, humanist of the Medici circle. Both left the court of Ferrara in 1471, upon the death of Borso d’Este; in 1481, when the volume of Dante in question was prepared, they were business partners.  

IV.

Finally, a look at the decoration of the marble floor of the Cathedral of Siena, which follows a neo-Platonic hermetic program, is worthwhile. In the nave, the fourth allegory, based on a cartoon by Pinturicchio, shows a steep, rugged path imperilled by poisonous snakes. The path ascends from the lower right corner—from the unstable figure of Fortuna—to the high mountain of wisdom (fig. 5). The ten figures in Eastern attire, longing to know the divine truth, prepare to climb the rocky summit. The first two figures seen from behind are already plodding upward. Following them is a third figure who turns back while walking and extends his left arm. Behind him stand five others. At the base of the path, a figure with turban and a book underarm is seated on the ground, meditating, as he supports his bearded head in his hands. Certain figures and especially the composition as a whole also recall Tura’s painting.

This manifold influence (on Baldini and Botticelli, in Venice and Siena) alone suggests a drawing by Cosmè Tura did indeed exist, showing several wise men, who attempt to “unfold the bands with which the earth him ties”, and served as a prototype. In a likewise manner, we need to liberate ourselves from many bands inherited from Vasari, including his ideas about the “untalented” Baldini and “provincial” Ferrara.
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The succession of Ferdinand I, better known as King Ferrante, to the throne of Naples after the death of his father Alfonso I (1443–58) was not uncontested. From the very beginning of his reign he had to face serious threats to his rule, the legitimacy of which would be questioned throughout his life.¹

He was not only a ruler who lacked legitimacy in the political sense, but also a Spanish-born natural son of Alfonso I of Naples, with the result that legitimacy was a more serious concern for him than it had been for his father. Ferrante’s accession to the throne was challenged by Renè of Anjou and his son John, and their claim was supported by the most powerful barons in the realm. In 1462, after his victory against the rebellious barons at Troia, Ferrante consolidated his power, beginning his rule in a hostile and impoverished country.²

After the first revolt of the barons, one of many politically difficult periods during his reign, the two crises he faced in the 1480s were the most important. The first involved the Turks, against whom his son, Alfonso, Duke of Calabria, won a decisive victory at Otranto with military help from King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary. The second came in 1485–86 when the barons in the Regno rose against his rule. At the same time, Ferrante had to deal with the hostility of Venice and the Papal States. The final blow came from Charles VIII of France who supported the Angevin claim, and when all the alliances built by Ferrante through diplomacy and marriage policy collapsed as well.³

Despite the constant struggle against his many internal and external enemies, during his reign of thirty-six years Ferrante was able to assert his authority for long periods, maintaining the status of the Kingdom of Naples as one of the five great powers on the Italian peninsula. He used his own family to strengthen his rule and that of the dynasty. His marriage to Isabella di Chiaromonte, the granddaughter of Giovanni Antonio Orsini, Prince of Taranto, the wealthiest and most powerful baron in the Kingdom of Naples, had the added advantage of strengthening the domestic position of the Aragonese dynasty in the Regno. Four sons and two daughters resulted from this marriage, and his children were Ferrante’s best assets. Their respective marriages, due to their father’s clever nuptial policy, earned Ferrante precious allies.⁴
Ferrante, whose achievements were constantly compared to those of his father, did not enjoy a reputation for magnanimity. Nevertheless, he kept one of the most resplendent Renaissance courts in Italy; famous humanists, artists, and musicians were employed there. Bentley convincingly proved that art patronage continued on a large scale, but with a much more realistic approach under Ferrante, since it helped him express and retain political power.\(^5\) Panormita and Bartolomeo Facio were responsible for his humanistic education, but Ferrante, intelligent and capable, as a young prince was more interested in chivalric culture and military education, and as an older man in law and political theory, than he was in humanistic studies. All of these fields were used to help him consolidate his political power and influence. Unlike his first-born son, Ferrante was not a capable military commander, although he excelled in chivalric activities such as tournaments and hunting.\(^6\)

In 1465, Ferrante re-established and re-structured the Studio, an educational institution, providing himself with much needed administrators as well.\(^7\)

One of the first printing shops in Italy was opened in Naples around 1470, partly to print books for the Studio but most importantly to serve Ferrante's political goals. He recognized the potential in printing, and used it with particular frequency after the second revolt of the barons. The indictments against them were printed and sent to the courts in Italy and abroad, justifying his policies against the barons and spreading his political propaganda.\(^8\)

Although there are no documents testifying that Ferrante particularly liked music or has any talent for it despite his collection of musical instruments, his patronage of singers and musicians of international repute earned him recognition. It also helped the creation of a favorable public image of him, while strengthening his political status internally and externally. The Neapolitan chapel became under Ferrante one of the major European musical establishments of the period with regard to both size and quality. In the late 1460s and in the 1470s, Ferrante enjoyed in his court the services of such famous Franco-Netherlandish musicians and composers as Tinctoris, Vincenet, and Vilette. The quality of the chapel was high judging by the general praise that came from the rival courts of Milan, Ferrara, Florence, and Rome.\(^9\)

Contrasting with the few references to his physical appearance, there are many that describe Ferrante's vengeful and mistrustful personality. His contemporaries agreed that he had ..."l'amore della dignità e della gloria, lo spirito cavalleresco, ma anche pure l'ambizione di primaggiare, la tenacia, il carattere chiuso e più o meno taciturno,..." ("a love of dignity and glory, a chivalrous spirit, but also the pure ambition to prevail, tenacity, and a closed, more or less taciturn character").\(^{10}\) Ferrante gained one of the worst reputations of 15th-century Italy based largely on the biased description of him given by the French ambassador Philippe de Commynes, who accompanied King Charles VIII of France on his Italian campaign in 1494. According to the ambassador, Ferrante was even worse than his "lascivious and gluttonous son", Alfonso, Duke of Calabria, since "no one knew when he was
angry or pleased”. However it is probably Burckhardt’s damning opinion that caused the most harm, presenting Ferrante as cruel and bloodthirsty. This evaluation is still sustained, although many excellent, and historically more accurate, assessments of his reign and his personality have been published during the last decades.

Although he was a major player in Italian and European politics, not many descriptions have remained of Ferrante. Summonte’s is the most detailed and best known: “Fu il re Ferrante di mediocre statura, con testa grande, con bella, e lunga zazzerà di color castagno, buono di faccia, e pieno, di bel fronte, di proporzionata vita, fu assai robusto” (“King Ferrante was of medium stature, with a large head, beautiful and long brown mane, a pleasant and full face, a beautiful forehead, and with a proportional and a fairly robust body”).

Some of these physical characteristics are rendered best on medals and coins showing Ferrante that were issued under his rule. Coins minted under Ferrante are important, since most probably they were made from life by Girolamo Liparolo, the royal die and seal engraver who served the king for two decades. The royal coinage was at times the most innovative in 15th-century Italy due to very significant changes made to the design of medieval coinage. First, Ferrante introduced his own individualistic profile portraits on his ducats and double-carlino (tari), and on almost all of his coronati and copper cavalli throughout his reign. The second innovation of the Neapolitan mint in the Regno was the introduction of Ferrante’s own devices on the reverse of his coins.

What could have been the reason behind these important changes, apart from the intention to imitate antique coinage? Coinage is a very conservative medium, and any change in its centuries-old form and design indicates political or economic reasons behind that change. Ferrante used coinage as one of the most important means for the assertion of his power in Naples, as part of his intention to gain absolute control over the Regno. It is indicative that his earliest ducat with his crowned portrait bust is from 1458, and that the earliest carlini, also with a portrait bust of the young Ferrante with a medieval-type crown, date from 1459 (fig. 1). The date 1458/1459 also demonstrates that contrary to general and earlier opinions, Ferrante’s portrait coins are earlier than the portrait ducats of Francesco Sforza minted in Milan in 1463. Ferrante’s are the earliest silver coins of 15th-century Italy with an individualistic portrait.
This fact also shows that Ferrante had from the very beginning difficulties in making his lack of legitimacy accepted. This might have been the most important and urgent political reason behind the introduction of his portrait on coins. This was a very effective way to indicate his legitimacy, since coinage was always identified with a particular state. Therefore, the ruler whose image was on the coin was identified with the state itself. In order to make himself accepted, i.e. to achieve his most important political goal, he had likeness and meaning combined on his coins. Accordingly, the design on Ferrante’s coronato issued from 1462 on, after the first revolt of the barons, shows a very detailed representation of the king seated and facing forward, holding a scepter and orb, with a cross. To the left is Cardinal Orsini placing a crown on his head and to the right the Archbishop of Bari standing and facing forward (fig. 2). A document of 1472 testifies that the above design was replaced at the same time as the introduction of the copper cavallo. Girolamo Liparolo was personally responsible for making the new cavallo’s dies —“moneta tutta de rame grossa al modo delle medaglie antique con la imagine de la Maesta sua et con lo reverso de qualche digna cosa” (“coin made entirely of bronze in the same manner as antique medals with the image of His Majesty, with something worthy on its reverse”)—ordered in February 1472. A slightly different bust appeared when the king’s medieval-type crown, seen on his gold and silver coins, was replaced by an all’antica type, the so-called radiate crown of the sun god Apollo known from the antoniniani of the 3rd century A.D. (fig. 3). On most of these coins Ferrante’s bust appears turned to the right. It is interesting to follow the slightly changing image of the king,
although up-to-date representations of rulers’ portraits on coins were usually not a priority. On the earliest coins he is represented as a young man, with a large head, curly hair at the back, and with an aquiline nose like his father’s. His later bust portraits are less detailed: in these the king appears heftier and is represented with prominent nose, chin and double-cheeks, a family characteristic which appears on portraits of his children as well (fig. 4).22 On the last coins, issued between 1488 and 1494, he looks heavy and visibly aged (fig. 5). He is invariably represented in contemporary attire, and before 1472 he always wears a medieval-type crown. Neither on his coins nor on his medals is he represented as an antique emperor, as was his father.23

On the reverse of Ferrante’s coinage, personal devices often appear. In previous centuries, legitimate rulers had emphasized the family identity by using heraldic images. Ferrante, who was called by his enemies the “Spanish Bastard”, could not rely on such identity. By putting his personal insignia on his coins, he could convey the message that his royal status had been rightly gained as a result of his virtues. In this way, similarities were suggested with his father’s role models, the Spanish-born emperors Hadrian and Trajan, since they both became emperors owing to their personal virtues. The very evocation of these historical heroes allowed Ferrante to project an image of a ruler who was not only virtuous, but also strong and powerful.24

It seems that Ferrante’s creation of his own monarchical Order of the Ermine early in his reign served the same goal. The order was founded in 1465 on St Michael’s Day (September 29) to celebrate his victory over the barons. His success was commemorated on the inner bronze portal of Castelnuovo, which was signed by Giulielmo Lo Monaco. Six narrative panels depict episodes from
the king's military campaign against the rebellious barons, among them the attempt on Ferrante's life by Marino Marzano, Duke of Sessa and Prince of Rossano.\textsuperscript{25} After his victory, Ferrante spared the life of his disloyal brother-in-law, the Prince of Taranto, and by this act exercised clemency, one of the most valued virtues, allowing him to appear as a ruler of the highest morality.\textsuperscript{26}

This exceptional act by Ferrante was directly linked to his device, the ermine, considered in Ancient Rome already to be a symbol of purity and moral probity, as well as to his personal motto featured on the pendant above the ermine: "Malo mori, quam foedari" ("Death Before Dishonor").\textsuperscript{27} By choosing this very chivalric motto and the ermine as a device, Ferrante makes his message clear: he is as spotless, i.e. as virtuous, as the pure (white) ermine, since he did not soil his hands with the blood of a close relative.\textsuperscript{28}

The motto of the Order was "Decorum" (decency, justice, honor), i.e. one of the chivalric values \textit{par excellence} to which Ferrante aspired so much. The gold ermine, enameled in white, was suspended from a heavy collar made up of Ferrante's main devices, adopted from his father, such as the Open Book, the Mount of Diamonds, the Siege Perilous, and the Sprouting Stock, or a tree trunk from which two shoots have sprung, beginning to produce leaves.\textsuperscript{29}

Put in a political context, the choice of insignia and legends well shows Ferrante's ambitions, and the qualities he finds important, or useful, for a king. All were popular chivalric values still much appreciated in Italy during the second half of the 15th century. The preference for them indicates that humanistic education did not exclude the influence of chivalric culture. Interest in it explains the continuous spread of romance literature,\textsuperscript{30} but also the frequently organized hunts, tournaments and jousts at the court of Naples in which Ferrante was always an active participant.\textsuperscript{31}

Besides the ermine, Ferrante's other insignia, too, served his intention to convince subjects and rivals of his legitimacy. The Siege Perilous, a symbol of the Arthurian legend, had the strongest chivalric connection, and at the same time sent a powerful political message about his legitimacy, also expressing his political status. The vacant seat at King Arthur's Round Table could only be occupied by the best knight of all, who would accomplish the quest for the Holy Grail; otherwise it would burst into flames. Galahad, Lancelot's son, was this future hero and therefore the Siege Perilous became his seat.\textsuperscript{32} By evoking this fictional hero, Ferrante became his spiritual heir, and through this symbolic lineage he intended to prove that he had the right, and the legitimacy, to govern. Not only was Ferrante a self-appointed heir of Galahad: so, too, was his father, Alfonso I of Naples, and Ferrante's elder son and heir continued the tradition.

The emblem is represented on the Pisanello drawings forming part of the so-called Codex Vallardi. One such emblem appears on a design for cannons from around 1449, another, from 1448–49, appears twice as a crest on a helmet, made probably as a study for an Alfonso I of Naples medal.\textsuperscript{33} Pontieri mentioned that Ferrante had a piece of jewelry in the form of the emblem.\textsuperscript{34} The Siege Perilous
often appears on the coins of Ferrante and his father, and also in the margins of their manuscript pages.35

Another of Ferrante's devices, the Open Book, conveys the idea of wisdom, and was originally his father's device. It appears very frequently in the margins of Ferrante's manuscripts as well.36

The "Mount of Diamonds" symbolizing hardness and durability, and usually accompanied by the motto "Naturae opus non artis" or "Naturae non artis opus" ("The work of nature, not art"), was also one of Ferrante's favorite devices, appearing on the reverse of his coins and on the pages of his manuscripts.37

The Stock with the shoots beginning to produce leaves signifies purification and renewal. It was the least used and known of his devices.38

Some of the legends on Ferrante's coins were also very indicative of his political goals. On the carlino he issued for his coronation, the reverse contains "CORONATVS QVIA LEGITIME CERTAVIT", in which legitimacy, the main theme of his rule, is taken up. On his early gold ducat (1458) and on his double-carlino (1459), Ferrante's name surrounds his coat of arms, while on the obverse the legend conveys a different message: "RECORDAT MISERICORDIE SV or SVE", in which his mercy is compared to that of God. The legend is a partial quotation from the Magnificat: "suscepit Israel puerum suum, recordatus misericordie suae" ("He has come to the help of Israel his servant, mindful of his faithful love." Lk. 1:54).39

On the early half-carlino the legend is "IVSTITIA E FORTITVDO MEA", an allusion to Wis. 2:11.40

On his quintuple-ducat he is called "VICTOR ET TRIVMPHATOR.", after the second revolt of the barons, and accordingly this coin was probably issued in 1487. He was justifiably never called "PACIFICVS", as was his father.41

Ferrante's coinage shows how much the design of the coin mattered, and how closely his person and his chivalric order were identified with his coinage. On his coronato, issued in 1488, the design is changed in comparison with his earlier coronato of 1472. The king's name is written with a different spelling around his portrait bust: "FERRANDVS ARAGO..." instead of the usual "FERDINANDVS...". On the obverse, the earlier cross is replaced by the king's portrait bust turned to the right, while the reverse depicts St Michael slaying the Dragon (fig. 5). This was one of the favorite representations on coins of those rulers who had problems with legitimacy. In Ferrante's case, it was a statement; it appeared on his coins after the second revolt of the barons, and indicated what awaited those who opposed his rule. The legend, "IVSTA TVENDA", is in accordance with the representation.42

Given the importance of Ferrante's court, his own role in international politics, and the tradition inherited from his father who employed Pisanello to make his medals, it is surprising that, as Hill attests, only five medals with his portrait are known. Hill attributed the two larger ones to an anonymous Neapolitan die (nos. 326, 327). One was most likely made after Liparolo's coins, the only difference
being that the youthful looking Ferrante on the medal is turned to the left. Ferrante is represented with the radiate crown of Apollo, known already from his coin portraits. He is clad in the usual robe with a chain around his neck, with the legend: “+: FERANDVS : ARAGO: REX: SICILIE: MI”. There is no reverse. Since the radiate crown first appeared on Ferrante’s coins after 1472, this date serves as a terminus post quem. Hill dated it between c. 1475 and 1500. Similar portraits of the king are known from manuscript paintings.

The second medal has no reverse either. It is unusual since the king is shown without a crown. The likeness of Ferrante is easily recognizable, and although he is bareheaded, the legend clearly indicates his rank: “FERDINANDVS REX PIVS . FELIX REGNI.” He again wears the usual robe with the chain, but looks older and heavier. Hersey attributes it to Liparolo, Hill to an anonymous Neapolitan die. According to Hersey, it could not have been struck after coins, since the crown is not represented. It is dated to between 1475 and 1500.

Surveying Ferrante’s medals and coins, it is conspicuous how much the use of all’antica elements is restricted in their design. In this respect, there is a very marked change in the visual representation of the king of Naples. Instead of antique motifs, mostly chivalric elements were employed to prove his legitimacy, but by putting his realistic portraits on coins Ferrante, and not his father, produced the novel design in Renaissance coinage. The frequent use of chivalric motifs can be explained partly by his enthusiasm for chivalric culture and values, but mostly by the urgent need already at the beginning of his reign to justify and prove his legitimacy, the fundamental problem throughout his life. By means of his art patronage and his coinage, he continually tried to convince his subjects and rivals of his personal virtues and worth that justified his right to rule. His chivalric Order of the Ermine and his motto served the same goal. His naturalistic portrait profile on his coins allowed him to associate himself with the state in the closest possible way.

It is worth noticing that the term “divus” or “divo” is completely missing on Ferrante’s coinage. His father certainly used it; so did a number of 15th-century rulers in Italy. Was this a sign of modesty on Ferrante’s part? It might have been, if he had known about Francesco Sforza’s damning comment about his father, made after the death of the latter: “...La sua arroganza, il suo orgoglio erano tali, che si teneva degno non solo de essere onorato tra gli uomini ma anche adorato tra gli dei...” (“His arrogance and pride were so great that he wanted to be honored not only among men, but also among the gods”). In fact, the 16th-century scholar and numismatist Sebastiano Erizzo justly noted that “I signori tiranni si mettono in medalia e non i cavi de repubblica” (“Tyrant lords, not the heads of a republic, put themselves on medals”), a most fitting remark about King Ferrante as well.
Although pronounced legitimate in 1440, formally recognized by the parliament at San Lorenzo as Alfonso I of Naples’ heir in 1433 (at which time he received the title Duke of Calabria), and crowned king at Bari by the papal legate, Cardinal Latino Orsini, on 4 February 1459, he had not been accepted by his subjects as their legitimate ruler. See the modern and detailed surveys by G. Galasso, *Il Regno di Napoli: Il Mezzogiorno angioino e aragonese (1266–1494)*, Turin 1992, 625–729; M. del Treppo, “Il regno, aragonese,” in *Storia del Mezzogiorno*, ed. G. Galasso–R. Romeo, vol. IV., *Il Regno degli Angioini ai Borboni*, Naples 1986, 87–201.


The Papal States, Milan, Venice, Ferrara, Siena, and Mantua signed a pact which left Naples politically isolated. Ferrante’s son and heir, Alfonso II (1494–95), could no longer count on the help of Matthias Corvinus of Hungary, since the Hungarian ruler had died in 1490 and the new Hungarian king, Ladislaus II, refused to marry Beatrice, Matthias’s widow and Ferrante’s daughter. Lorenzo de’ Medici, with whom Ferrante had built a good relationship, had died in 1492, and his son, Piero, was not ready to accord any Florentine aid to Naples.

In 1465, his first-born son, Alfonso, Duke of Calabria, later Alfonso II of Naples (1494–95), married Ippolita Sforza, the daughter of Francesco Maria Sforza. This was meant to enhance the Naples–Milan relationship against the French. Alfonso I already dreamed of uniting Naples with Milan. In 1473, Ferrante’s elder daughter, Eleonora, married Ercole I d’Este of Ferrara (1471–1505), and in 1476 his youngest daughter, Beatrice, became the queen of Matthias Corvinus of Hungary (1458–90); both alliances were thought to strengthen Naples against Venice. In 1479, Federico married Anne di Savoia, and by this alliance Ferrante hoped to bolster his position against the French. His son Giovanni became a cardinal, and represented his father’s interests in the Papal States. Ferrante had eight illegitimate children, and their marriages, too, served their father’s dynastic interests. André Chastel called the Aragonese family “una sorte de ‘who is who’ europeen.” See A. Chastel, *Louis d’Aragon. Un voyageur princier de la renaissance*, Paris 1986, 227.


E. Pontieri, “La giovinezza di Ferrante I d’Aragona,” *Studi in onore di Riccardo Filangieri*, vol. I., Naples 1959, 531–601; He greatly increased the size of the royal library by purchasing luxurious books and manuscripts, but also by confiscating the libraries of barons opposing his rule, especially after their second revolt in 1485–87. At that time about 260 books were confiscated, and deposited in the royal library, which contained an estimated 2000 books around 1495.


8 Bentley (n. 5 above), 16–17; M. Santoro, La stampa a Napoli nel Quattrocento, Naples 1984, cited by Bentley (n. 5 above), n. 34.

9 Around 1513, Raffaele Brandolini mentioned in his treatise Ferrante's large collection of musical instruments, but did not say whether the king or any member of the royal family played music. In his treatise "Opusculum de musica et poetica" written for the Medici Pope Leo X, he enumerated the most generous patrons of musicians in Italy, among them Ferrante, praising the quality of the chapel in Naples. He also mentioned that Lorenzo de' Medici used the Neapolitan chapel as a model when he refashioned his own chapel in San Giovanni in Florence. See Bentley (n. 5 above), 21–23; A. W. Atlas, Music at the Aragonese Court of Naples, Cambridge 1985, 53. It is also known that Tinctoris dedicated at least two of his works to Princess Beatrice. This might imply that Beatrice excelled in music, but there is no evidence that Tinctoris tutored her; nor is there any to suggest which kind of musical education she might have had. See Atlas as above, 71–76.
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22 Here I shall give a few examples only. For representations of Alfonso II, e.g. medallic portraits and Mazzoni's bust of him in the Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, Naples, see A. Lugli, *Guido Mazzoni e la rinascita della terracotta nel Quattrocento*, Turin 1990; G. F. Hill, *Corpus of Italian Medals of the Renaissance before Cellini*, London 1930, nos. 311, 745, 746, 752; Hersey (n. 17 above), 27–28; for Beatrice of Aragon's medal, see Hill (as above), no. 238. For her relief portrait in Budapest, see L. Varga, "The Reconsideration of the Portrait Reliefs of King Matthias Corvinus (1458–1490), and Queen Beatrice of Aragon (1476–1508)," *Bulletin du Musée Hongrois des Beaux-Arts* 90–91, 1999, 53–72; for her representations in manuscript painting, among others in the Codex Didymus, New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, Ms 496, fol. 2r and in the Breviariun, Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Urb. Lat. 112, fol. 8r, see *Biblioteca Corviniana*, ed. Cs. Csapodi–K. Csapodine Gárdonyi, Budapest 1981, figs. 104, 130; also for Laurana's bust of Beatrice, see C. Damianiaki, *The Female Portrait Busts of Francesco Laurana*, Rome 2000, 76–83, figs. 117–21.

23 For a medal made for Alfonso I by Cristoforo di Geremia, see Hill (n. 22 above), no. 754. Cristoforo created for Alfonso I a medal on which the king wears a cuirass, round at the bottom, and hollowed out, a 2nd century A.D. antique bust form, while its base is a crown. He is represented as a true Roman emperor. See J. Woods-Marsden, "Art and Political Identity in Fifteenth Century Naples: Pisanello, Cristoforo di Geremia, and King Alfonso's Imperial Fantasies," in *Art and Politics in Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Italy: 1250–1500*, ed. Ch. M. Rosenberg, Notre Dame–London 1990, 21. The same antique form was chosen by Giovanni Montorsoli, the 16th-century Florentine sculptor who made Alfonso I's posthumous bust, a very fitting choice and one which would have pleased the ambitious king. See M. Leithe-Jasper, *Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien, Führer durch die Sammlungen*, Vienna 2005, 160–61. In both cases the iconography, the inscription, and the style all tell of Alfonso's imperial aspirations.


25 The doors (c. 1474) are *in situ* in the museum of Castelnuovo. See R. Filangieri, *Castelnuovo, Reggia angioina ed aragonese di Napoli*, Naples 1934; C. Sama, "Porte de bronze du Château-Neuf de Naples," in *L’Europe des Anjou, aventure des princes angevins de XIIIe au XVe siècles*, exh. cat., ed. G. M. Le Goff, Fontevraux 2001, Cat. No. 216, 392–93, fig. 254; *Le porte di Castel Nuovo. Il restauro*, Naples 1997. Beside the six panels, texts accompany the represented events, drawing a parallel between Ferrante's victory over the barons and that of Caesar over Pompey. Ferrante's devices also appear, such as the life of Prince Orsini was spared, but the other conspirators were caught and paid dearly for their treachery, especially Marino Marzano, who was apprehended together with his very young son. Although not executed, both spent the next thirty years in the prison of the Castelnuovo. See Bentley (n. 14 above), 26; G. M. Fusco, *Intorno all’Ordine dell’Armellino da re Ferdinando I d’Aragona*, Naples 1844, 7; J. D. D’A. Boulton, *The Knights of the Crown. The Monarchical Orders*


30 Correspondence and library inventories attest that tales of chivalry were read in the Italian courts as well. Leonello d’Este, who in his youth spent about a year at the court of Alfonso I of Naples, commissioned illuminations for a “Lancelot” and Arthurian romances were rebound in Ferrara in 1447–48. See Pisanello (n. 27 above), 56, n. 20. The inscriptions on the sinopie of Pisanello’s unfinished frescoes at the main sala or reception hall of the Gonzagas at Mantua also prove the popularity of chivalric tales. At Mantua episodes from a 13th-century Arthurian romance entitled “Lancelot” were planned and partially executed. See J. Woods-Marsden, “Pictorial Style and Ideology: Pisanello’s Arthurian Cycle in Mantua,” Arte Lombarda 80–82, 1987, 132–39.
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32 M. Whitaker, The Legends of King Arthur in Art, Woodbridge 1990; Alfonso I already used the Siege Perilous as one of his devices. It is often seen in the margins of his manuscript pages, and it is frequently represented in flames, i.e. before Galahad took it. See Pisanello (n. 27 above), 241.
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in Wolfenbuttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 39, where it is seen with other Aragonese insignia around a wreath, on fol.13r. See Csapodi–Csopodiné Gárdonyi (n. 22 above), fig. 130. It is represented on maiolica tiles, or floor tiles in Naples under both Alfonso I and Ferrante, and also in Eger (Hungary) during the reign of King Matthias Corvinus, after his marriage to Beatrice of Aragon in 1476. See G. Donatone, La maiolica napoletana del Rinascimento, Naples 1994; G. Balla, “Beatrix hozományai. Az itáliai majolika művészeti és Mátyás király udvara,” in Beatrix hozományai, exh. cat., ed. G. Balla, Iparművészeti Múzeum, Budapest 2008, 18–20, n. 40. Alfonso I’s triumphal procession was carved on the Arch of Castelnuovo, where this Roman imperial theme, showing him as “triumphator”, is represented. Caesar himself is calling Alfonso the new Caesar, “re di pace”, and is giving him the throne and crown of the Kingdom of Naples. But the symbolism of the Arch’s reliefs went further. Alfonso I was also identified with Galahad, the knight whose Perilous Seat is occupied on the relief by Alfonso, while the flames are tamed, and placed on the floor in front of his feet, proving that Alfonso is the true heir of Galahad. See E. S. Driscoll, “Alfonso of Aragon as a Patron of Arts: Some Reflections on the Decoration and Design of the Triumphal Arch of Castel Nuovo in Naples,” in Essays in Memory of Karl Lehmann, ed. L. F. Sandler, Locust Valley, New York 1964, 87–96; G. L. Hersey, The Aragonese Arch at Naples, 1443–1475, New Haven–London 1973, 15, 47; Woods–Marsden (n. 23 above), 11–37. Antonio Pinelli has convincingly proved that the iconography of the relief made by Laurana and several other sculptors relies heavily on the antique relief representing Marcus Aurelius’ triumphal entry into Rome that is today kept in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, Rome. See A. Pinelli, “Feste e trionfi: continuita e metamorfosi di un tema;” in Memoria dell’antico (n. 24 above), 200–78. There is a dual symbolism on the Castelnuovo relief, since classical motifs are mixed with chivalric elements, as Woods-Marsden rightly noticed.

36 Andrea Contario’s Obiurgatio in Platonis calumniatore, Paris, Bibliothèque National, ms. lat. 12947, in which the margin of the frontispiece (1r) contains all Ferrante’s main imprese. Among them the Open Book is emphasized in the middle of the upper margin in a medallion held by two putti. On the same page there are two particularly beautiful portraits. One of them represents Ferrante in an initial “C” with the Order of the Ermine around his neck, while the other, in a medallion placed in the upper right corner, shows his father’s likeness. See de Marinis (n. 35 above), vol. III., fig. 76.

37 Grierson–Travaini (n. 17 above), 369.
38 Rona (n. 28 above), 346–58.
39 Syson (n. 19 above), 118, n. 29.
40 Grierson–Travaini (n. 17 above), 361.
41 See on Pisanello’s medal of 1449 in Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Münzkabinett, Inv. No. 24.
42 Syson (n. 19 above), 121; Grierson–Travaini (n. 17 above), 375–77.
43 Hill (n. 22 above), no. 326.
44 Ibid, 323, pl. 50; Hersey (n. 17 above), 27, n. 3.
FIRST MEETING OF THE BETROTHED PAIR
A Habsburgian Iconographic Type

The fresco cycle adorning the walls of the Piccolomini library of the Cathedral of Siena depicts the ten most significant events in the life of Enea Silvio Piccolomini, or Pope Pius II. One scene shows the meeting of Frederick III, King of the Romans, and the Portuguese princess Eleanor (fig. 1). Here, a common image type from the Bible was adapted to represent a contemporary secular event that had not been customarily depicted.

The work was commissioned by Cardinal Francesco Todeschini Piccolomini, nephew of Pope Pius II and himself Pope Pius III for a few days in 1503. Pintoricchio was hired to do the painting in 1502, and he and his workshop continued their efforts following the death of Pope Pius III until the end of 1508, at the request of Andrea Todeschini Piccolomini, nephew and tutor testamentarius of Pius III and grand nephew of Pius II.

Before becoming Pope Pius II, Enea Silvio Piccolomini was one of Frederick III's courtiers. In Naples, he personally negotiated the details of the marriage of Frederick and the younger sister of the Portuguese king with the ambassadors of King Alfonz V. Later, as Bishop of Siena, he performed the duties of host and presented the bride to the Habsburg ruler when the betrothed pair first met before one of the gates to the city in 1452. Following their meeting, the couple continued their journey to Rome together for Frederick's coronation as Holy Roman Emperor. Enea described the meeting twice, in his work The History of Austria and in his memoirs. The two narratives concur, although the earlier account is considerably more detailed. When the bride approached Siena after a long and dangerous sea voyage, the city's citizens of the "best extraction" came out to greet her, followed by more distinguished personages from Frederick's entourage, such as his nephew Prince Albert (VI) and his grandnephew, the Hungarian and Bohemian king Ladislas (Ladislas V in Hungary, also known as Ladislaus Posthumus). Later both accompanied their guardian, Frederick, to Italy. Next the city's prelates and magistrates came in a procession, and finally Frederick III himself arrived flanked by two bishops. The couple met in a large field, dismounted their horses and embraced. Salutations were given by both parties, with Enea speaking on Princess Eleanor's behalf.
The formula used to portray a “meeting” generally consists of a central group of two figures. Among the most commonly depicted encounters in the Bible is the meeting of Anna and Joachim, the long-time married couple, at the Golden Gate: they are generally shown *embracing.* Jacob and Rachel—although they met for the first time at the well—are shown as Jacob hugs Rachel and then weeps (after watering the sheep). They are not an engaged couple, however, but long-lost relatives reunited. Conversely, most “first meetings” are more restrained, for example in depictions of King Solomon and Queen Sheba, they are shown *holding hands.*

The behaviour described in Enea’s texts is the appropriate response of an “old married couple or relatives upon meeting”: the engaged couple embrace. A pictorial depiction of just the couple, however, would not have provided an opportunity to emphasize the role of the prelate as intermediary; thus an iconographic formula was adapted which allowed for a main group of three: the marriage ceremony. (The actual wedding of Frederick and Eleanor would not have fit in Enea’s biographical fresco cycle, since he had no role in the marriage: the pair took their vows before Pope Nicholas V in St Peter’s Cathedral soon after their arrival in Rome.)

1. Pintoricchio and workshop: *The meeting of the Holy Roman King Frederick III and his betrothed, Eleanor of Portugal, before the gate of Siena in 1452.* Wall-painting in the Piccolomini Library of the Cathedral of Siena, before 1508.
The most frequently depicted marriage is that of Joseph and Mary: *lo sposalizio*. In these images the bride and groom generally stand in the foreground, facing each other with their sides to the viewer. They are shown touching hands, as Joseph slips the ring on Mary’s finger. Meanwhile, the high priest stands between them, holding their hands and facing the viewer. Lined up behind the couple is usually a larger or smaller entourage grouped according to sex on the appropriate side. Two splendid paintings of this type are known from this period—one by Perugino and the other by Raphael.

The large-scale composition sketch for the Sienese wall painting was certainly drawn, or at least conceived of, by Raphael. The basic idea of the depiction can be seen in his *cartoncino*: a central group of three is drawn from the *sposalizio* iconographic scheme, thus providing Enea with an adequate role. Not only the need for three figures, but also the iconographic status of the basic scenario called for this “first meeting” type of depiction rather than the “the meeting of a married couple or relatives”, despite Enea used the latter formula in his narratives. The “first meeting”, however, is modified so that the man not only holds the woman’s hand but places his other on her shoulder. No significant alterations were made in the central group when the final wall painting was completed, although—in the uncomprehending eyes of later generations—the figures appeared flattened, the composition confused, and the entire spatial structure of the image off-balance in comparison to the original sketch. Important changes were made to please the patrons: the clothing was made more “distinguished” and sumptuous; the movements were rendered more graceful and studied. The group behind Enea was turned into a portrait of the Piccolomini family members, and a few local elements were included, such as the column erected to commemorate the pair’s first meeting (which of course had not been there at the time of the actual meeting). The ideal column drawn by Raphael was transformed into a real memorial, and in the background the cityscape of Siena is shown with some easily recognizable details.

At the time the Sienese frescoes were being painted, work was underway on a series of semi-fictive autobiographical volumes commissioned by Emperor Maximilian I. These books, which were intended to contain a rich array of engravings, have survived in varying degrees of readiness. Created two to three decades after Maximilian and Mary of Burgundy’s wedding, they mythologize the emperor’s marriage, although Mary died in a horse-riding accident just a few years after the couple exchanged vows.

In *Freydal*, the first volume according to the logic of the narrative, the young hero embarks on a journey with the blessing of his father, the great and powerful prince. He participates in sixty-four complete “hofs”, that is *Turnierhof*, or jousts involving three kinds of combat. As winner of all the tournaments and participant in the closing night costume balls, he proves he is the perfect knight.
with a multitude of woodcuts, the next volume recounts in German verse the journey of Teuerdank (Maximilian) to Ghent to see his betrothed, the princess Rich in Virtues (Ehrenreich). He is hindered and delayed along the way by countless trials, adventures, accidents, attempts on his life, bad advice and the machinations of his companions, but he arrives triumphantly to the city gates, where the princess greets him. Following the formula of the “first meeting”, the engraving depicting this scene shows the princess, who has just stepped through the gate, holding hands with the recently-arrived knight (fig. 2).
Of the volumes planned, the most ambitious is Weisskunig, which was intended to present the entire life of Maximilian in words and images. Joseph Grünpeck’s work Historia Friderici et Maximiliani, more or less a syllabus of contemporary history written in Latin, is generally considered a preparatory work for Weisskunig. Designed as a history book for Charles V, it contains ink drawings with watercolour made in the mid-1510s by an artist from the circle of Albrecht Altdorfer. These illustrations, which earned the artist the appellation Meister der Historia (Master of the Historia), unlike the other volumes, show no traces of iconographic innovations in the representations of marriage. One drawing depicts the engagement of the children of Frederick III and Charles the Bold in 1475 as reinforcement of a peace treaty: in the centre the two rulers stand arm in arm, facing forward, as they turn their children to face each other. In another drawing the marriage is depicted according to the sposalizio iconography, but with the two fathers also present on either side of the priest. (The depictions may be symbolic, since Maximilian was first introduced to Charles the Bold in 1473 in Trier, but at the 1475 meeting of the two fathers, during which they arranged the marriage, neither of the children was present. When the young couple was married in 1477, on the other hand, neither father attended.) Conversely a unique image with no known precedents or followers conveys the couple’s happy family life: Maximilian and Mary visit their children in the nursery. The two older children, Philip and Margaret, their parents, and their limited entourage stand beside the cradle of the youngest child (who died in infancy).

The first part of Weisskunig contains the birth of the hero and the events preceding it, such as a detailed narrative of his parents’ meeting, their marriage, and the king’s coronation in Rome. It begins with the Old White King (Frederick III) as he sends secret ambassadors to distant kingdoms and lands in search of a wife equal to him in virtue, nobility and power, until finally he is told the king of Portugal has such a daughter. The narrative of the meeting in front of the city of Hohensyn (Siena) and the order of those who parade out to receive the princess correspond exactly to Enea Silvio Piccolomini’s presentation, and here too the couple embraces. But in the emperor’s novelistic autobiography, neither Enea nor his role is mentioned, although the text does say that after the pair is escorted into the city, they hear Te Deum laudamus sung by an unnamed bishop. Although the text recounts the meeting in Siena and mentions the embrace, too, the woodcut places the scene at the seaside and depicts the event as a “first meeting”, thus showing the couple holding hands (fig. 3). Then follows the pair’s further journey, their arrival in Rome, and their marriage performed by the Pope. The woodcut uses the traditional sposalizio iconography to depict the wedding ceremony.

The second half of the second part of Weisskunig recounts the marriage of Maximilian to Mary of Burgundy. After the enormous Flint King (Charles the Bold, prince of Burgundy) and his only daughter are introduced, the text tells how the two fathers meet and agree on the marriage of their children, how the Flint King dies, and how the widowed queen consort and the princess summon
the Young White King (Maximilian). After a small border skirmish with the Green (Hungarian) King,26 the prince thus sets off to see his bride, supplied with his father’s good advice. When he approaches the city, first the citizens march out, followed by the distinguished and noble ranks, and finally the procession of prelates with relics. He is then jubilantly escorted to his lodging. Meanwhile the queen consort and princess invite him to a night-time feast in the palace, where they will have the opportunity to personally welcome him. The prince appears in splendid attire rather than a knight’s armour. In disguise, the old queen consort, however, mixes into the crowd and observes the prince. She cannot believe this young boy,
who is more handsome than any man she has ever seen, is the prince. Returning to her daughter, she too gushes about his beauty. Finally the two royal ladies solemnly file in, gaily greet the prince, and sit at the table. The wedding follows and then a description of the tournament organized for the occasion. (Mary of Burgundy’s mother, Isabelle Bourbon, died when Mary was eight; thus the "mother" or queen consort we see here is Margaret of York, Charles the Bold’s second wife and later his widow.)

The text does not detail the meeting of the betrothed couple, and the accompanying woodcut simply employs the iconographic scheme of the “first meeting” (the couple holding hands)—but placed in an interior setting in keeping with the text. The two people, however, are Maximilian and the widowed queen consort (Margaret of York); thus the figure of the bride, Mary of Burgundy, is relegated to the background, almost completely absorbed into the entourage. The depiction of the feast following the meeting gives equal weight to the three main characters: Maximilian seated at the table, flanked by the queen consort and princess. The woodcut showing the marriage could follow the iconographic scheme without raising questions.

In 1496, Maximilian and Mary’s two children, Philip (the Fair) and Margaret, were married to Johanna and John respectively, the children of the King and Queen of Castille and Aragon. John, the heir to the throne, died soon after and following several more unexpected deaths, Johanna and her son Charles (V) became heirs to the Iberian throne in 1500. Margaret and John are therefore left out of the Weisskunig, and the engraving only shows the meeting of Philip and Johanna. To be more precise, the work contains a second seaside “first meeting” woodcut in which only one pair is seen; probably another was planned according to the same scheme showing the meeting of one of Maximilian’s granddaughters and her husband.

* *

Only through continually suppressing renewed wars and uprisings was Maximilian able to secure for Philip the Fair the majority of the Burgundian inheritance, which was under threat from French Kings and the Flemish orders. This marked the beginning of the radical increase of kingdoms and countries under the sceptre of the Habsburgs, which continued with the “Spanish marriage” and was fully accomplished at the 1515 meeting of kings in Vienna (the First Congress of Vienna) organized by Maximilian. However, the emperor did not live to see the double marriage of his grandchildren to the children of Wladislas II (Jagello), king of Hungary and Bohemia, and thus the Habsburgs’ achievement of dominion over Hungary and Bohemia.

Depictions of these marriages naturally appear prominently in the dynastic-representative works commissioned by Maximilian. All three are among the so-called main works (Hauptstrick) of the Ehrenpforte (“Triumphal Arch”), which depicts the twenty-four most important episodes in the life of Maximilian.
The wedding scenes are shown according to an essentially uniform scheme which largely omits any indication of the pairs' personal relationships or any kind of specific happening. While the husband's coats of arms can be seen at his feet, the coats of arms of the wife, or rather of the countries the heiress brings to the marriage, are held or lifted by both members of the married couple: the princess thus presents her dowry to her husband. The German verses accompanying the images also note what the Habsburgs gain through the marriages: according to the inscription of the "Spanish marriage" for example, Philip inherited six valuable kingdoms for his family. There are two known versions of the "Burgundian" and the "Spanish" marriages, which from our perspective are essentially identical. In the depiction of the "Spanish marriage" Maximilian appears at Philip's side, while in the meetings of kings in Vienna, the prominent presentation of the coats of arms in the foreground is absent, since the outcome of the engagements—in other words, whether these marriages would really bring new countries under Habsburg rule—was unknown at the time the woodcuts were made. In this image, Sigismund, the Polish king, appears beside Maximilian, leading his granddaughter, and Wladislas II (Jagiello), king of Hungary and Bohemia, who is leading his two children. While the Habsburg princess Mary and the Jagiellonian prince Wladislas were actually married at that time, Ferdinand and Anne exchanged vows only six years later. The young princess, however, was raised from then on in the Habsburg court.

Analogous scenes of exchanging coat of arms can be found essentially parallel with the Triumphal Arch, however the Triumphal Procession was executed by different masters. In an earlier, miniature version of the Procession the images of the events were shown painted on large panels carried in procession by horses and people on foot. The sheet showing the "Burgundian marriage" is closest to the first version of the corresponding engraving in the Triumphal Arch. The architectural frame of the "Spanish marriage" depiction is a large barrel-vaulted hall with piers from which a wide panorama opens behind the young pair.

In the woodcut Triumphal Procession, the presentation of the images is completely different: here splendid, heavy triumphal carriages roll one after the other, and the two levels show two different types of depiction. On the side of the carriage a busy, multi-figural scene in relief can be found, while above, the core features of the event are shown in the strictest representative depiction using a centuries-old type for portraying regal grandeur. In this type a tight circle of central characters presented in a stiff sculptural group represent the different aspects of imperial power. All this is expanded with mythological-allegorical apparatus completely absent from the watercolours. In this woodcut, which depicts the marriage of Maximilian and Mary of Burgundy and which is known instead as the Little Triumphal Carriage of Albrecht Dürer, the pair carrying the coat of arms stands in a carriage drawn by three horses. A canopy rises above them supported by putti characterized as Hymens, or little gods of marriage with their torches. In the similar "Spanish marriage" once again the groom's father, the emperor, is present.
Sides of both carriages show the princess and her entourage encountering a group of distinguished courtiers, but these are diplomatic negotiations: the reception of ambassadors and not the first personal meeting of a betrothed pair.

Preceding the appearance of the pair, a huge procession of knights covering some thirty printing blocks is shown, each man carrying territorial coats of arms painted on huge flags and images of female figures personifying dominions. The heraldic expression of marriage emphasizing the acquirement of lands is thus prepared for and reinforced. Leading a long line the lands under Habsburg control are shown, followed by the family’s former Swiss territory (lost long ago), then those regions on which the empire had staked a claim for whatever reason, and finally the provinces belonging to the Burgundian principality and the areas acquired by the Habsburgs through the marriage. Thus, the united coat of arms presented by the princess is explained in meticulous detail before the main scene. A similar procession would have introduced the “Spanish marriage”, too. A miniature was made, but not the woodcut.

In the Habsburg political philosophy the fiction of the empire’s peaceful acquirement of land plays an important role. The Habsburgs’ luck in gaining territories was originally mocked by a couplet in wide circulation at the turn of the 16th century. Created from the opening of a verse by Ovid, it read: “Bella gerant alii, tu, felix Austria nube; Nam que Mars aliiis, dat tibi regna Venus.” In Emperor Maximilian’s dynastic-autobiographical works, obtaining or maintaining land both through peaceful means and through war are equally prominent. In fact, the continual warring that occurred throughout his life naturally fills a greater part of these volumes than the “benefits” of marriage. Erasmus first expounded on the higher level of Christian morality represented by the peaceful acquirement of land in November 1503, when he gave a panegyric at the gathering of the united Flemish orders at which Philip the Fair, the accepted heir to the Spanish lands, and Joanna of Castile were welcomed upon their return from Hispania. In the speech, Erasmus praised the peace among Christian princes, which he felt was far more valuable than any kind of military glory. In 1516, in his tract The education of a Christian prince (Institutio Principis Christiani) written for the sixteen-year-old Charles V, who had just begun his rule of the Netherlands, he emphasized in the dedication and the conclusion how fortunate Charles was to have obtained his empire “without blood shed”: he need not acquire, only retain it through good governing. (Erasmus was thoroughly in favour of peace, but even so he strongly doubted whether dynastic marriages could achieve this. He felt that in addition to placing the girls from ruling families in disadvantageous situations, the arguments over inheritance gave ample reason or excuse for more wars.) The most influential mirror of princes of early modern Europe, written by Antonio de Guevara also for Charles V, was the Diall of Princes (Reloj de principes). Guevara radically rejects all
forms of war except for self-defence, just as Justus Lipsius did in his work *Politica*. One of Lipsius' students, Niklas Vernulz / Nicolaus Vernulaeus, professor from Leuven and court chronicler of the Spanish Habsburgs, presented the Habsburgs as examples of the Christian-Neostoic ethos of rulers in his many works published in the mid-17th century. In one of them, his *Apology for the Royal House of Austria*, he surveyed the Habsburg countries and determined that the dynasty ruled according to law, and this right had been acquired through peaceful means and without force.\(^5\) Vernulaeus had thus shaved off a little of the radicalism of 16th-century utopias and smuggled back in the high Christian-moral assessment of dynastic marriage.\(^5\)

Nevertheless, marriages did not have a significant role in Habsburg dynastic or imperial representation during the following centuries. In the works commissioned by Maximilian, three different iconographic schemes were used to
represent dynastic marriages: the newly created representative presentation of the coat of arms scheme that never recurs in any other work, the traditional formula of *sposalizio* used to portray royal marriages, and the fictitious representation of personal happiness in the depiction of the first meeting.

The presentation of the coat of arms was last used in the second to the last design for Maximilian's funerary monument in Innsbruck. On the side of the sarcophagus, the twenty-four most important events in the life of Maximilian are shown in relief (always referred to in contemporary texts as: *Historien*), among them three weddings, which were to be depicted in a composition based on the "main pieces" of the *Triumphal Arch*. Finally, however, the *sposalizio* formula was chosen to represent the marriages. The marble relief works of the "Burgundian" and "Spanish" weddings also show the traditional arrangement of a central group of three (bride, groom and the priest giving his blessing) in the interior of a church, before the altar. The coats of arms of the couple are at their feet, in the foreground, separated from the scene.

Francesco Terzio, painter for the court of Prince Ferdinand II (of Tyrol), similarly participated in the redesigning of Maximilian's tomb in the mid-1550s, and was thus well acquainted with the bronze statues, too. The series of engravings in his album *Imagines gentis Austriacae* had a great impact on the later iconography of the early Habsburgs. Terzio's sculptural depiction of the figures of the princes were placed in an architectural frame topped by small rectangular fields, each bearing an inscription and representing an important event from the life of the prince. He did not choose to show Maximilian's first marriage, but above Philip's head, on the left, the "Spanish Marriage" can be seen, once again in the traditional *sposalizio* arrangement.

Apart from the actual success of these marriages, the (fictive) account of the happy personal aspect of them informed the thoughts and behaviour of Habsburg family members for centuries in the spirit of "the more useful the happier" principle. Since antiquity, the mark of this (fictive) personal aspect has been a narrative topos in eastern and western literature: "the prince glimpses the portrait of the princess and falls passionately in love" theme. The foundation or rather the consequence of this topos in Europe, the exchange of portraits as part of the diplomatic practice of forging dynastic marriages, was contemporaneous with the birth of the "portable independent portrait". Examples range from the cycle of Maria de' Medici to the *Magic Flute*. In the first two decades of the 16th century, nevertheless, another unique Habsburg formula for representing this topos was developed: the depiction of the first meeting of the betrothed pair. However, this recurs only occasionally after Maximilian's commissions.

In Florence, ten different painters painted ten large-scale canvases showing events from the recent past, which Maria de' Medici had placed in the Cabinet Doré of the Luxembourg palace in 1627, immediately after the works in the cycle of Maria de' Medici were hung there. Four wedding pictures belonged to the series. Two of them use the *sposalizio* theme to show the marriages of the Medici
women to French royalty. In contrast, the third depicts the marriage of Francesco de’ Medici, the oldest son of the grand duke Cosimo I, and Johanna Habsburg (!), the youngest daughter of Emperor Ferdinand, according to the iconographic type of the “first meeting”. (The fourth painting of the Spanish-French double marriage, which took place in 1615, is a completely different type: a pictorial record with the ceremony on the Bidassoa, the river dividing the two countries, shown from a bird’s eye view with small figures.)

In April 1635 the Cardinal-Infante Ferdinand Habsburg, younger brother of the Spanish king Philip IV and new governor of the Spanish Netherlands, marched triumphantly into Antwerp. One of the triumphal arches, the so-called Philip’s Arch, part of the temporary decorations to commemorate the occasion, demonstrates Ferdinand’s Spanish Habsburg ancestry. The pictures on the arced
superstructure show on one side the marriage of Maximilian and Mary of Bur­
gundy and on the other that of Philip the Fair and Johanna, both painted by Jacob
Jordaens based on a compositional sketch by Peter Paul Rubens. In the “Burgun­
dian marriage” Maximilian and Mary are shown holding hands. The young couple
are accompanied by their fathers, and also by the goddess Kybelé and the little
Hymen. The central group is completed by the train-bearer (as Mary dons a hen­
nin) and the dog signifying faithfulness in marriage (fig. 5).65 While unfortunately
Rubens’ inspirational source is unknown,66 the painting bears witness to the most
frequent use of the iconographic scheme of the “first meeting” in depicting Maxi­
milian’s meeting with Mary of Burgundy.67

The governors of the Netherlands probably drew upon this source for the
continued use of this formula in the images portraying the marriages of members
of the house of Orange. The paintings of the Oranjezaal (Orange Hall), the central
gallery of the Huis ten Bosch castle near The Hague, were commissioned by the
widow of Prince Frederik Hendrik as a tribute to her late husband. One of the
central images on one wall shows the “allegory of the marriage”, as it is known, of
Amalia van Solms to Frederik Hendrik.68 The pair is depicted according to the
“first meeting” scheme with grand mythological accompaniment: the couple ex­
tends their arms towards each other. Behind them in the shadow of two bending
palm trees appears the veiled figure of Hymen.69 The work of Gerrit van Honthorst,
a Caravaggist who worked in northern courts after years in Italy, the painting
nevertheless belonged to a group that was completed between 1648 and 1653 not
only by painters from the court in The Hague but also by artists from Antwerp
belonging to the circle of Rubens.70
Notes


6 Only the Apocrypha mentions this meeting or Joachim at all. The portrayal of this event as an intimate embrace became common with Giotto’s fresco in the Arena Chapel in Padua.


8 Perugino: Sposalizio della Vergine (wood panel, oil; 234 × 185 cm. Caen, Musée des Beaux-Arts). The picture was originally commissioned from Pintorficio in 1489 for one of the chapels in the Cathedral of Perugia. When he failed to complete the work, Perugino was commissioned in his place in 1499 and finished the painting by 1504. Perugino for the most part adapted his much earlier composition found in the Vatican’s Sistine Chapel: Consegna della chiavi.


10 Raphael, Compositional sketch for the fifth scene of the fresco cycle in the Piccolomini Library in the Cathedral of Siena: The meeting of the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick III with his betrothed, Eleanor of Aragon before the gate to Siena in 1452; c. 1503 (paper, pen, brown ink and wash, with traces of a preliminary drawing in black chalk; 545 × 410 mm; New York, Pierpont Morgan Library; previously in the Casa Baldeschi, Perugia), see E. Knab–E. Mitsch–K. Oberhuber–S. Ferino-Pagden, Raphael. Die Zeichnungen, Stuttgart 1983, Cat. No. 28.

11 Already in 1915 Erwin Panofsky felt that the question of the sketch’s authorship had been discussed to exhaustion. Morelli sharply criticized the acceptance of Raphael’s role by Schmarsow (n. 5 above), and completely rejected any kind of contribution by Raphael to the creation of the Siena cycle; see I. Lermolieff, “Raphael’s Jugendentwicklung. Worte der
Verständigung gerichtet an Herrn Prof. Springer in Leipzig,” Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft 5, 1882, 147–78; E. Panofsky, “Raffael und die Fresken in der Dombibliothek zu Siena,” Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft 37, 1915, 267–91; and again, idem, Deutschsprachige Aufsätze, ed. K. Michels–M. Warnke, vol. II., Berlin 1998, 779–804, for the interpretation attributing a role to Raphael. K. Oberhuber, “Raphael and Pintoricchio,” in Raphael before Rome, ed. J. Beck, Washington 1986, 155–72, essentially presented a variation of the same argument. More recently Donatella Toracca (n. 2 above)—although she does not debate whether Raphael drew the cartoon—focuses rather on Pintoricchio as the source of the innovation, which his skilled assistant rendered on paper; S. Roettgen, Wandmalereien der Frührenaissance in Italien, 2. Die Blütezeit 1470–1510, Munich 1997, however, also attributed the drawings and sketches entirely to Pintoricchio. Raphael and his workshop used the scheme of the betrothed pair meeting a decade and a half later in the painting The Visitation of Mary and Elizabeth (1519; canvas, oil; 220 x 145 cm; Madrid, Museo del Prado). August Schmarsow (who did not refer to the Madrid painting) considered the stepping motion of the prince to be Raphael’s greatest innovation, and in poetic sentences hailed the secular transformation of lo sposalizio. He felt the stepping motion was a faithful rendering of the description in the pope’s memoirs. This element from the repertoire of movements, however, already appeared in another earlier work by Perugino depicting the marriage of Mary and Joseph, part of a series of five panel paintings made in 1496 in Fano, in the church of Santa Maria Nuova. See P. Scarpellini, Perugino, Milan 1984, 92–94, No. 73; Hiller (n. 9 above), 59, when discussing the sposalizio paintings notes that Raphael borrowed other motifs from Perugino’s painting (the young boy breaking a stick), which he knew well.

12 For a long time Panofsky offered the most liberal assessment of the relationship between the compositional sketch and the fresco. To the detailed interpretation of the “unfavourable” changes, he added: “[z]wischen dem Cartoncino und dem Fresko nicht sowohl ein Qualitätsunterschied, als vielmehr ein fundamentaler Gegensatz des Kunstwollens besteht [...]”. Donatella Toracca (n. 2 above) emphasized that the variations primarily arose from the increased assertion of aspects of convenientia and magnificencia: the individual scenes were formed and tailored according to the protocol prescribed in the papal book of ceremonies, Ceremoniale Romanum, commissioned by Pope Innocent VII and written by Agostino Patrizi, who was first the secretary of Pope Pius II, later the confidant of Cardinal Todeschini, and finally the papal master of ceremonies.


16 Drawing by Leonhard Beck–woodblock by Wolfgang Resch: Teuerdank’s meeting with the princess Emreich; woodcut for the chapter of Teuerdank entitled “Wie der Tugentsam Held Tewrdannck zu der Künгин Emreich kam vn[de] welchermaß Er von Ir empfangen ward”; before 1517;
The work was founded on an autobiography of Maximilian in Latin, which the emperor dictated to Grünepeck around the turn of the century and which was edited and stylised by Grünepeck in several versions. Finally, however, Maximilian decided on a German-language version. Grünepeck was no longer at court when he prepared this excerpt from the Latin dictation between 1507 and 1515 (but most likely in 1514–1515). The oeuvre of the unknown master draftsman was compiled by Otto Benesch. On the entire scholarly history of the question, see O. Benesch–E. M. Auer, Die Historia Friderici et Maximiliani, Berlin 1957; also see H. Wiesflecker, “Joseph Grünepecks Redaktionen der lateinischen Autobiographie Maximilians I.,” Mitteilungen des Institutes für österreichische Geschichtsforschung 78, 1970, 416–31.

The Master of the Historia: Emperor Frederick III and Charles the Bold, the prince of Burgundy, making peace in Neuß in 1475, 1514–1516 (paper, ink and watercolour, 165 × 112 mm); Historia Friderici et Maximiliani, Vienna, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, f. 16v; also Historia... (n. 17 above), Cat. No. A. 6.

The Master of the Historia: The marriage of Maximilian of Habsburg and Mary of Burgundy, 1514–1516 (paper, ink and watercolour, 161 × 117 mm); Historia Friderici et Maximiliani, Vienna, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, f. 49v; also Historia... (n. 17 above), Cat. No. A. 24.

The Master of the Historia: Maximilian of Habsburg and his wife visit their children, 1514–1516 (paper, ink and watercolour, 161 × 117 mm); Historia Friderici et Maximiliani, Vienna, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, f. 51v; also Historia... (n. 17 above), Cat. No. A. 25.

Part 1, chap. 1–12 in Weisskunig. Nach den dictaten und eigenhändigen Aufzeichnungen Kaiser Maximilians I. zusammengestellt von Max Treitszauerwein von Ehrentreitz, ed. A. Schultz, Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des alterhöchsten Kaiserhauses 6, 1888, 5–45. The entire passage is a borrowed text in this volume: in some places it is a direct translation into German of Nikolaus Lanckmann von Valkenstein's Historia desponsationis et coronationis Friderici III, which was published anonymously in 1503; see Müller (n. 13 above), 131, with the earlier literature.

The drawing and woodblock of Leonhard Beck: The Old White King accepts his bride, woodcut for the chapter of the Weisskunig entitled “Wie die jung kunigin Lenora aus dem kunigreich Portugal auf dem mör weg fuer, und wie sy zu irem gemahel, dem alten weißen kunig, kumen ist.” Caption: “Wie der w(eiß) k(unig) seinen gemahel empfing”, 1514–1516; see Weisskunig... (n. 21 above), 20. Alwin Schultz’s identification of the master craftsmen is heretofore relied on, see A. Schultz, “Vorrede,” and “Einleitung,” in Weisskunig... (n. 21 above), v–xxvii, xxv–xxvi, concerning the captions of the woodcuts, or their substitutes, as well as the connections between the woodcuts and the location of the texts. For more recent corrections in the identification of certain themes of the woodcuts, see K. Rudolf, “Das gemäl ist also recht’. Die Zeichnungen zum ‘Weisskunig’ Maximilians I. des Vaticanus Latinus 8570,” Römische historische Mitteilungen 22, 1980, 167–207.

The drawing and woodblock of Leonhard Beck: The Pope joins the Old White King and his bride in marriage, woodcut to the chapter of the Weisskunig entitled “Wie unser heiliger vater der babst den alten weißen kunig und die kunigin nach ordnung der christenlich kirch mit der ee zusammen gab.” Caption: “Wie der pabst den alten w(eiß) k(unig) und gemahel vermehelt”, 1514–1516; see Weisskunig... (n. 21 above), 32.

“Ain mechtiger kunig, genant der kunig vom fewreyßsen.” The name refers to the Order of the Golden Fleece, or more precisely to the briquet, the flint that produces the sparks on the chain and vestments of the order. Derived from the personal emblem and motto (Ante ferit quam flamma micet / Zuvor der Schlag, dann glänzt die Flamme) of the founder of the order,
Philip the Good, the prince of Burgundy, the sparks became a part of the order’s repertory of symbols, just as the order itself became a part of the Habsburgs’ Burgundian inheritance.

26 For a detailed comparison of this description to other sources, see I. Biró, Miksa császár Weiskunigja és Teuerdankja a magyar történelem szempontjából, Budapest 1913.

27 Drawing and woodblock of Leonhard Beck: The meeting of the Young White King with the Queen Consort of Flint and her daughter, woodcut for the chapter of the Weisskunig entitled “Wie der jung weyß kunig zu der jungen kunigin kam und wie er empfangen was.” Substitute for the missing caption: “Wie der junge Weißkunig mit der Königin von Feureisen und ihrer Tochter zusammentriﬀt”, 1514—1516; also Weisskunig... (n. 21 above), 131.

28 Drawing and woodblock of Leonhard Beck: The banquet of the Young White King, the Queen Consort of Flint and the Flint Princess, woodcut to the chapter of the Weisskunig entitled “Wie der jung weyß kunig zu der jungen kunigin kam und wie er empfangen was.” Caption: “Das costlich pankatiern”, 1514—1516; also Weisskunig... (n. 21 above) 132.

29 Drawing and woodblock of Leonhard Beck: The Marriage of the Young White King and the Flint Princess, woodcut to the chapter of the Weisskunig entitled “Wie der jung weyß kunig und die jung kunigin vom fewreyßen mit der ee zusammenengeben worden sein.” Caption: “Die vermehlung des jungen w(eiß) k(unig) mit der kunigin von fewreysen”, 1514—1516; also Weisskunig... (n. 21 above) 134.


31 Drawing and woodblock of Leonhard Beck: King Philip’s splendid and fitting welcome of his bride from Hispania, woodcut to the Weisskunig, caption: “Wie k(unig) Philips sein gemahel aus Hyspania kam und er sy gar costlich und ehrlich empfiieng”, 1514—1516; also Weisskunig... (n. 21 above), 379.

32 No text was prepared for this woodcut. The plans for the volume include a “histori der lieb”, which would have narrated the marriage and journey to Iberia of Philip the Fair, and—similar to the first part—would have been a borrowed text, see Müller (n. 13 above), 131; also Rudolf (n. 9 above), No. 58, and according to 189, 205 a sketch for the woodcut can be found in the codex in the Vatican Library, and the caption reads: “das der w(eiß)k(unig) ain dochter verheyrat dem kunig von den wilden leytten”, probably referring to the marriage of Philip and Johanna’s daughter, Isabelle, to the Danish King Christian II in 1515. (The uncertainty was caused by use of the name “King of Wild Men”, usually referring to the ruler of Scotland.)


34 On the production of the manuscript for the Weisskunig, in addition to Alwin Schultz, see C. Biener, “Entstehungsgeschichte des Weiskunigs,” Mitteilungen des Institutes für österreichische Geschichtsforschung 44, 1930, 82—102, esp. 94. The latest event to appear in the edited fair copy of the main manuscript made in 1514 (published in 1775 and 1888), was a battle fought in October 1513. But Karl Rudolf published the preliminary drawings for the woodcuts depicting later events, these were found in one of the codices from the Vatican Library. Among them were images related to the two engagements of 1515, see No. 131: “heyrat zwischen teytschen und ungarischen kunig kunfig”; or No. 132: “wie der w(eiß)k(unig) die ein dochter verschicket und die den gruenen kunig verheyrat dem jungen jungen kunig.” Reproductions of only the latter, showing Mary of Habsburg’s being sent from the Netherlands to Vienna, have
been published: several boats travel on the Danube as part of the princess’s entourage; on either side of the strongly winding river stand a castle and a church respectively, see Rudolf (n. 9 above), 189, 203.


36 The verses quoted by Schauerte (n. 35 above), 261–62, 273–74.

37 Drawing of Hans Springinklee—woodblock of Hieronymus Andreae: The “Burgundian marriage”, woodcut, first version of the second historical scene in the Triumphal Arch (the middle of the upper left row), 1512–1517; as well as the drawing of Albrecht Dürer—woodblock of Hieronymus Andreae: The “Burgundian marriage”, woodcut, second version of the second historical scene in the Triumphal Arch, 1512–1517 (fig. 4). No woodblock of either version has survived. In the 1799 edition of his survey, Adam Bartsch included the first version, and later this appeared in the 1886 edition too, which caused problems of attribution in the later literature.

38 Drawing of Hans Springinklee—woodblock of Hieronymus Andreae: The “Spanish marriage”, woodcut, first version of the fifteenth historical scene in the Triumphal Arch, 1512–1517. This block was not used in any edition. Reproductions can be found, for example, in Meder (n. 35 above), 206, fig. 140b, and Schauerte (n. 35 above), fig. 43. The second version of the fifteenth historical scene in the Triumphal Arch (outside right scene in the upper right row): drawing of Albrecht Dürer—woodblock of Hieronymus Andreae: The “Spanish marriage”, woodcut, 1512–1517.

39 Drawing of Albrecht Dürer—woodblock of Hieronymus Andreae: The meeting of kings in Vienna, woodcut, twenty-third historical scene of the Triumphal Arch (middle image in the lower right row), 1512–1517.

40 The inevitable conclusion is that Jörg Kölderer introduced the iconographic innovation in those compositional sketches which he made for both works in 1507, and which Maximilian himself judged and perhaps corrected. Using different arguments F. Winzinger, “Albrecht Altdorfer und die Miniaturen des Triumphzuges Kaiser Maximilians I.,” Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien 26, 1966, 157–72, esp. 171; E. Egg, “Jörg Kölderer und die Donauschule,” Werden und Wandlung. Studien zur Kunst der Donauschule, Linz 1967, 57–62; also F. Winzinger, Die Miniaturen zum Triumphzug Kaiser Maximilians I, Graz 1973, 45, reached the same conclusion. However, we will probably never know for sure because these have not cropped up among the sketches. In contrast, Meder (n. 35 above), 206, attributed the composition to Dürer, but he only examined the Triumphal Arch, and did not consider that the type appears simultaneously in the Triumphal Procession, too. Rudolf (n. 9 above), 183, suggested that the Weisskunig contained a woodcut known only from a preliminary sketch and a proof which depicts Mary of Burgundy offering a piece of clothing to Maximilian, a scene related in meaning to the delivery of the coat of arms (the clothing would have been the Wappenrock worn by herolds).

41 The program of the ensemble dictated by Maximilian in 1512: Österreichische National Bibliothek, HSS, Cod. 2835, published by F. Schestag, “Kaiser Maximilians I. Triumph,” Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses 1, 1883, 154–81, esp. 155–71. Drawings on large sheets of vellum with watercolour were made based on this in the workshop of Albrecht Altdorfer between 1513 and 1516. Only the first page and about the second half of this so-called Miniature Triumphal Procession have survived, in other words, pages 49 to 109 of the original series, which was still in the possession of the Abbey of St Florian in the 19th century. A critical edition of these: Winzinger (n. 40 above, 1973). The entire series can be reconstructed from three 16th- and 17th-century copies of the series; among these, the copy in the Albertina especially, catalogued under D.1196, accurately follows the lost original pages, see Winzinger
(n. 40 above, 1973), 58–59. The sheets were earlier attributed to Jörg Kölderer and his workshop. Otto Benesch suggested an attribution to Altdorfer and his workshop, which was elaborated on by Franz Winzinger, see idem (n. 40 above, 1966), and idem (n. 40 above, 1973). In indentifying the masters, the author of this essay relies on the latter’s conclusions.

42 Georg Lemberger: *The “Burgundian marriage”*, 1513–1515 (vellum, watercolour and wash; 455 x 312 mm. Vienna, Albertina), see Winzinger (n. 40 above, 1973), No. 2. Originally sheet no. 49 in the series; the inscription above the scene: “Kaiser Maximilians Heyrat mit der Erbtochter von Burgundt”; see in the program, Schestag (n. 41 above), 164: “Item darnach sollen zwen zu Roß des kaisers heirat fueren vnnd der Titel soll also lauten: [\() Kaiser Maximilians Heirat mit der Erbtochter von Burgundj.”

43 Albrecht Altdorfer (panels) and Georg Lemberger (the horses): *Biscay and the “15 islands”, or the flag bearers of the coats of arms of the New World and the “Spanish marriage”*, 1513–1515 (vellum, watercolour and wash; 450 x 850 mm. Vienna, Albertina), see Winzinger (n. 40 above, 1973), No. 16. Originally sheet no. 63 in the series; inscription above the scene: “Der heyrat mit Kunig Philipen Erzhertzogen zu Osterreich etc. Kaiser Maximili [\() ans Sun mit der Erbtochter zu Hyspani.” Cf. the program in Schestag (n. 41 above), 166: “Darnach sollen Zwen zu Roß kunig philips heirat fueren vnnd der Titel soll also lauten: [\() Der heirat mit kunig philipen Erzherzogen zu osterreich, kaiser Maximilians Sun, [\() mit der Erbtochter zu Hispany.”

44 Carving of the woodblocks for this was begun in 1516, but at the time of the emperor’s death in 1519, when work ceased, the series was not yet complete. In its final form it would have included—although it was produced in a separate working process—the main scene: Dürer’s *Grand Triumphal Carriage*, which was finally printed from eight woodblocks, and first published in 1522, see Kurth (n. 14 above), 312–17 and Meder (n. 35 above), 226–33, woodcut no. 252. The publication of the 135 woodblocks: *Triumph Maximilians I. (Beilage zum I. und II. Band des Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses)*, Vienna 1883–1884. In identifying the masters who drew the compositions for the woodcuts, the author of this essay relies on K. Giehlow, “Dürers Entwürfe fur das Triumphrelief Kaiser Maximilians I. im Louvre. Eine Studie zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Triumphzuges,” *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* 29, 1910, 14–84, esp. 23, no. 3; the carvers were identified based on the inscriptions on the reverse side of the blocks in Schestag (n. 41 above), 177–79. Long inscriptions were planned but never made for each woodcut in the *Triumphal Procession*; the windows intended for the inscriptions are empty.

45 Drawing of Albrecht Dürer—woodblock of Hieronymus Andreae: *The Little Triumphal Carriage*, or *The Marriage of Maximilian and Mary of Burgundy*, woodcut in *Triumphal Procession*, 1518, see *Triumph...* (n. 44 above), figs. 89–90; Kurth (n. 14 above), 309–11, and Meder (n. 35 above), 233–34, woodcut no. 253.

46 Drawing of Hans Springinklee—woodblock of Hieronymus Andreae: *The “Spanish Marriage”*; woodcut in *Triumphal Procession*, 1518, see *Triumph...* (n. 44 above), fig. 105.

47 For the program, see Schestag (n. 41 above), 162–64; in the procession led by the musicians “Kaisers Zug des Burgundischen Heirats”, first come the Austrian territories under the following title: “Die österreichische lannde”, then the “Burgundisch pfeyffer”, and after that “Die Burgundischen Lannde”. At the beginning of this procession, the following inscription would have appeared: “Das Edle Hauß von Österreich [\() wie sich das mit Burgunt vergleicht [\() wer das will grundtlich wissen han, [\() dem thuens nachgehent Wappen sagen, [\() die Kaiser Maximilian [\() durch heyrat hat vermischet schon.” In addition to prescribing the order of the countries depicted, imperial instructions also provided guidance in the dress of the flag-bearers.

48 The emperor’s musicians are only in the miniature version, in no. 32 of the entire series, the original is lost; the beginning of the procession of the coats of arms of the emperor’s countries and territories: miniature no. 27, the original is lost, see the woodcut *Triumph...* (n. 44 above), fig. 57; the procession of coats of arms: miniatures nos. 28–41, the originals are lost, see the
woodcuts ibid, figs. 57–76; the Burgundian musicians: only in woodcuts, ibid, figs. 77–79; the procession of the coats of arms of the Burgundian inheritance: miniatures nos. 42–48, the originals are lost, see the woodcut, ibid, figs. 80–88.

In the program, see Schestag (n. 41 above), 166, it is the part entitled “Kunig philips heirat.” In the miniature version, nos. 59–63 of the complete series, published in Winzinger (n. 40 above, 1973), Nos. 12–16.

Ovid, The letters of heroi enes, XIII. 84: “Bella gerant a li! Protesilaus amet!”

The doubts of Erasmus (and Thomas More) are discussed and examined in: A. Kohler, “Tu felix Austria nube ...” Vom Klischee zur Neubewertung dynastischer Politik in der neueren Geschichte Europas,” Zeitschrift für historische Forschung 21, 1994, 461–82.


In the original plan of Maximilian’s sepulchral monument, perhaps a sarcophagus was not even included (although many have debated this). In any case, beginning in 1528, when Ferdinand I ordered work to resume, a sarcophagus was definitely included in the plans. In the 1550s, bronze reliefs showing 24 historical scenes based on the compositional sheets for Triumphal Arch were prepared, and the accompanying verses were even translated from German to Latin. Later, however, the translator, Dr. Sedl, the chancellor, assembled a new program after a thorough study (1560). He wrote that the program should be created by preserving five scenes from the original material (including the two marriages and the double engagement of 1515, see nos. 1, 12, 23), in other words, by adapting the appropriate scene from the Triumphal Arch (“Pictura poterit manere eadem, quae ante in Porta honoris” or: “Maneat pictura antiqua”). Finally, after a horizontally formatted marble relief was selected instead, Florian Abel drew the individual scenes, carved first by his two brothers and later by Alexander Colin between 1562 and 1566. On the more than fifty-year, complicated history of the making of the tomb, see first of all, D. Ritter von Schönheck, “Geschichte des Grabmals Kaisers Maximilian I. und der Hofkirche zu Innsbruck,” Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerköchsten Kaiserhauses 11, 1890, 140–268; V. Oberhammer, Die Bronzezustandbilder des Maximiliansgrabmals in der Hofkirche zu Innsbruck, Innsbruck–Vienna–Munich 1935; K. Oettinger, “Die Grabmalkonzeptionen Kaiser Maximilians,” Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft 19, 1965, 170–84;

55 In Florian Abel’s plan made in the original size (1561; paper, tempera, transferred to canvas; 2095 × 4740 mm; Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Kunstkammer), eight historical scenes appear in two rows on the long side visible in the drawing. Among these is the “Spanish marriage” on the outer right of the upper row, with the transferral of the coat of arms. See, for example, Werke für die Ewigkeit. Kaiser Maximilian I. und Erzherzog Ferdinand II., exh. cat., ed. W. Seipel–M. Rauch, Schloss Ambras, Innsbruck–Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna 2002, Cat. No. 53 (K. Seidl) for a good reproduction.

56 Helga Dressier identified the drawing of Florian Abel (on the art market, recently in Bruxelles, Bibliotheque Royale; drawings for the other panels are unknown), see idem (n. 54 above), 47, figs. 53, 85. The white marble relief for Florian Abel’s composition – carving of Bernhard and Arnold Abel: The marriage of Maximilian and Mary of Burgundy, on the tomb of Maximilian’s imperial sepulchral monument in Innsbruck, 1562–1563.

57 Composition of Florian Abel – carving of Alexander Colin: The marriage of Philip the Fair and Johanna (“the Mad”), white marble relief for the tomb of Maximilian’s imperial sepulchral monument in Innsbruck, 1563–1566.

58 The reason often given in the literature (by scholars with a more romantic bent) for the absence of any depictions of Maximilian’s second marriage to Bianca Sforza in the works commissioned by the emperor is that Maximilian did not like his second wife. More practical scholars, however, point out she was not of appropriate rank, and Maximilian, always tight for money, was persuaded only by the large cash gift given by Sforza’s uncle, Lodovico il Moro. Conversely, one of the reliefs entitled Maximilian bestowed the imperial fief of Milan on Lodovico il Moro (which appears both in the Triumphant Arch and the Triumphal Procession) indeed belongs to the series of depictions showing the acquirement of countries through marriage. After all, this event, which took place about one and a half years after the marriage, legitimised Lodovico’s rule over Milan and simultaneously registered Milan as a fiefdom of the Holy Roman Empire. The enthroned emperor offers the flag of Milan decorated with the biscione, the Visconti family’s snake swallowing a child, to the prince kneeling on the step to the throne. In the relief on the tomb, this earlier iconographic formula is expanded to include Bianca seated beside the emperor, while the inscription clearly states the event was among the acquirements of land without bloodshed: “DVCTA IN MATRIMONIV BLANCA MARIA, PRINCIPIS MEDIOLANI FI [ ] LIA, RECEPTOQUE A LVDO: SFORTIA FIDEI IVRAMENTO, DVCATVS MEDI [ ] OLANI AD OBEDIENTIAM IMPERII SINE SANGVINE RVDVCTVS.” The same appears in the program of 1560.

59 See E. Scheicher, “Die Imagines gentis Austriacae des Francesco Terzio,” Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien 43, 1983, 43–92 for a reproduction of all the panels. The first edition was published in five volumes beginning in 1558; a second edition was published in 1569–1573; Gaspar Patavinus was the engraver.

A. Blunt, “A series of Paintings illustrating the History of the Medici Family executed for Marie de’ Medici,” The Burlington Magazine 109, 1967, 492–98, 562–66. Among the images, seven—including all four marriage depictions—were in the Collection of the Earl of Elgin, Broomhall, Fife, from the early 19th century, and are now in the National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh. According to the 1627 record of payment in Florence, the painting of the marriage of Catherine de’ Medici and Henry (II) was painted by Francesco Bianchi Buonavita, the marriage of Francesco de’ Medici and Johanna Habsburg by Jacopo Ligozzi, the per procurationem marriage of Henry (IV) to Maria de’ Medici by Jacopo da Empoli, and the marriages of Louis (XIII) to the Infanta Anna of Austria, and Philip (IV) to Isabella by Valerio Marucelli.

The two paintings copied in a horizontal format were originally painted in 1600 by Jacopo da Empoli for the decoration of the Palazzo Vecchio in honour of the marriage by proxy of Maria de’ Medici of Florence and Henry IV, see A. Marabottini, Jacopo di Chimenti da Empoli, Rome 1988, 198–99, Cat. No. 38, figs. 286–87 (Cat. F3). The second was considered lost, but has since resurfaced and was acquired by the Uffizi in 2006: F. de Luca, Le nozze di Maria de’ Medici con Enrico IV. Jacopo da Empoli per l’apparato di Palazzo Vecchio, Florence 2006. K. Weber und J. Müller Hofstede, “‘Non si fa niente contra la verità’. Historischer Schauplatz und ikonografische Inszenierung im Vermählungsbild von Rubens’ Medici-Zyklus,” Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch 51, 1990, 131–63, interpreted the pictures as representative depictions of marriage in which Rubens, who was present at the 1600 marriage by proxy in Florence, followed the special traditions of Florence in painting the sposalizio image in the cycle of Maria de’ Medici. Warnke [(n. 53 above, 1997), 160–99] who reproduced one of the sposalizio woodcuts from the Weisskeunig and a similar relief from the tomb of Maximilian, called this interpretation into question. Blunt (n. 61 above), fig. 21. published a sketch (paper, oil, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum) showing an unidentified pair in the “first meeting”. Marabottini rejected the attribution of the work to Jacopo da Empoli, but no identification of the scene is presently known.


Drawing and engraving by Theodoor van Thulden from the sketch by Peter Paul Rubens: Front of Philip's Arch, erected as part of the decoration in honour of the Cardinal-Infante Ferdinand of Habsburg’s 1635 march into Antwerp, engraving, published by Jan Casper Gevaerts / Casparius Gevartius in his Pompa Introitus honorii serenissimi principis Ferdinandi Austriaci Hispanorum Infantis S. R. E. Card. Belgarum et Burgundionum gubernatoris etc. a S. P. Q. Antwerp. decreta et adornata [...], Antwerp 1642, 25, reproduced by Martin (n. 63 above), fig. 16.

Drawing and engraving by Theodoor van Thulden from Jacob Jordaens' painting based on the sketch by Peter Paul Rubens: The marriage of Maximilian of Habsburg and Mary of Burgundy, engraving, published in Gevartius (n. 64 above), 25; reproduced in Martin (n. 63 above), fig. 21.

According to Martin (n. 63. above), 76, Rubens preferred for the formula depicting the Roman Emperor the so-called junctio dextrarum scheme over religious depictions of marriage. The junctio dextrarum can be seen on numerous period coins and money, and examples were even found in the private collection of Rubens. The formula was first examined in the literature in an analysis of Peter Paul Rubens’ 1609 painting, Self Portrait with Isabella Brant in a honeysuckle bower / Het geitenloofprieel (Munich, Alte Pinakothek), and was believed to be derived from Alciati’s Matrimonium emblem. See H. Kauffmann, “Rubens und Isabella Brant in der Geißblattlaube,” in Form und Inhalt. Kunsthistorische Studien Otto Schmitt zum 60. Geburtstag ... dargebracht, ed. H. Wenzel, Stuttgart 1950, 257–74; W. Schöne, Peter Paul Rubens Die Geißblattlaube Doppelbildnis des Künstlers mit Isabella Brant, Stuttgart 1956. Rubens used this motif twice in showing Juno and Jupiter holding hands in the Maria de’ Medici cycle. But, in all of these junctio dextrarum scenes, the pairs are shown seated.

The image portraying the marriage of Philip the Fair to Johanna was constructed from these same elements: the pair is also shown holding hands, but they are not facing each other. Instead
they stand side by side, as if Philip is leading his bride in front of Providence and Time, which appear opposite.


69 In the literature, attempts have been made to discover the iconographic antecedents of the pictures in the Orange Hall in Rubens’ cycle of Maria de’ Medici, although the “first meeting” scheme does not appear there (see, below). The two bending palm trees as the emblem of a harmonious marriage originate with Piero Valeriano, which Judson (n. 68 above), 124—25, addresses in the literature. Beatrijs Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij, wrote that the antecedents of the images are more obvious in woodcuts showing the decorations in honour of the Cardinal-Infante Ferdinand’s march into Antwerp than in the Maria de’ Medici cycle. In the painting of Prince William II of Orange and Mary Henrietta Stuart’s arrival on shore, she specifically traces the closed doors of the Janus temple and the sea creatures in the foreground to these woodcuts, idem, “Notities betreffende de decoratie van de Oranjezaal in Huis Ten Bosch. Uitgaande van H. Peter-Raupp, Die Ikonographie des Oranjezaal, Hildesheim/New York 1980,” Oud Holland 96, 1982, 133—90, esp. 165—76. A 1641 woodcut (thus published one year earlier than the woodcuts depicting the decorations for the march into Antwerp) of the marriage of Prince William II and his wife follows the “first meeting” scheme (in the foreground on both sides we see the two sets of royal parents on their thrones): Peter-Raupp (n. 68 above), 117, fig. 54, reproduces this work, but does not discuss the antecedents or the history of the painting by Isaac Isaacsz (presumably in Amsterdam). (More recently the woodcut was reproduced in Oranien. 500 Jahre Bildnisse einer Dynastie, exh. cat., ed. U. Schögl, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna 2002, Cat. No. 38.)

70 The material presented here is a considerably abbreviated chapter of the author’s 2003 Ph.D. dissertation, Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Budapest, see E. Szentesi, Birodalmi patriotizmus és honi régiségek. Az egykori osztrák hazafias történeti festészetének szóló írások Josefa Hornayi lapjánban (1810—1828). I. Kísérlet a hazafias történeti festészet megteremtésére az Osztrák Császárságban (1808—1813), although it contains some new information. The dissertation advisor was Emnő Marosi. Reader’s opinions and the defense of the dissertation were published in Művészettörténeti Értesítő LIV, 2005, 196—204. In the original dissertation this discussion was an excursus attempting to interpret Anton Petter’s 1813 picture entitled Maximilian Habsburg’s first meeting with his bride Mary of Burgundy in Ghent in 1477 (Graz, Landesmuseum Joanneum, Neue Galerie). The direct iconographic antecedents of the Petter image is an engraving in the so-called Fugger’scher Habsburg Ehrenspiegel, printed in Nuremberg in 1668. About this work see E. Szentesi, “Az úgynevezett Fugger-féle Habsburg Ehrenspiegel,” in Jankovich Miklós (1772–1846) gyűjteményei, exh. cat., ed. Á. Mikó, Magyar Nemzeti Galéria, Budapest 2002, 291—93, Cat. No. 271.
Art historical literature containing more than a brief mention of the Tolhopff Corvina1 is scant.2 As one of the contributors to the catalogue of the exhibition Uralkodók és corvinák (Potentates and Corvinas),3 I examined the Wolfenbüttel material in the microfilm collection of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Magyar Tudományos Akadémia), including the microfilm of Johannes Tolhopff’s Stellarium,4 although this manuscript was not on the list of items to be exhibited. At that point it became clear that in addition to the incipit page, which was frequently reproduced, though perhaps not convincingly interpreted in every detail, the codex contained other noteworthy illustrations and initials.5 Years passed before I obtained better black and white negatives in place of the microfilm, which was unsuitable for a more thorough study. Recently some colleagues called my attention to an internet site displaying the codex and a good quality DVD of the illustrated material.6

According to biographical information, Johannes Tolhopff was residing in Buda in 1480, when he wrote the Stellarium for King Matthias.7 The style of the title page and initials clearly show that the manuscript was not only written there, but illuminated, too. The stylized floral ornamentation of the frame and the figural compositions enclosed in a medallion are analogous to two Trapesuntius Corvina title pages,8 both painted in the royal workshop of Buda.

The figure on folio 6r (fig. 1) has no stylistic analogies in the codex painting of Buda. Several elements in the manuscript, such as the shape and colour of the Sun on the title page, the drawing and technique of the composition dedicated to the position of the Sun, and finally certain components of the planetarium page are definitely related to this page in question, which seems to prove that the entire codex was a unified production.

The natural colour of the vellum in folio 6r serves as a background to the three vertical and four horizontal green lines which divide the illustration into six, almost square, units. The vertical row of squares nearest the spine contain the centrally placed letters “S G M”. Their meaning may be secundus, gradus, and minutum.9 One, two or four images of coins are placed along the vertical lines, while three squares contain additional coins floating in the center. They were made with black
ink and brush gold. The legends and the coins themselves provide enough clues to identify fairly securely their issuers. The coin earliest in chronological order is that of the Hungarian King Sigismund. The obverse of the golden florin shows in the picture field a three-sided, round-bottomed shield divided into four quarters. In the fields, the Hungarian coat of arms and the Luxemburg lion can be seen. The legend appears in capitals: “+ SIGISMVNDI*D*G/ *S •LADISL/AVS•REX •R•VNGARI(?)”. The picture and the legend are almost precisely the same as on the gold florin minted by King Sigismund from 1402 to 1437. The reverse of the gold florin shown depicts St Ladislas with nimbus. The king’s head is decorated with a leafy crown. He wears a body-tight, hip-length tunic with a row of central buttons, a weapon belt, knee-length, pleated skirt, and stockings. He has a long cloak draped over him, fastened with a clasp or buckle at the right shoulders. The cloak forms a pronounced, curved pleat from his left elbow to the opposite shoulder. In his right hand, Ladislas lifts a hatchet, while his left hand swinging out from the elbow, holds an orb with cross. This image with the legend in capitals “•S •LADISL/AVS•REX” appears in the picture field in question in Stellarium. The current identification of the coin however is called into question by the mint mark “R-R” on both sides beneath the arms of Ladislas, which better resemble the marks on coins of King Matthias minted by Peter Schaider in Körmöcbánya (Kremnica, SK) between 1452 and 1470. This circumstance causes no problem because this type of coin representing St Ladislas appeared from the time of Louis the Great until 1480 with only mild modifications. In fact, its reverse could also be found on gold coins of King Matthias which had the obverse appearing in the corvina in question. Since the cloak worn by the St Ladislas figure on the coin issued by King Matthias is sometimes fastened with a clip at the center of his breast, and when clasped at the right shoulder the pleat is less pronounced and narrower than that found in the Sigismund coins, a Matthias coin could not have been used as the model for the depiction in the Tolhopff manuscript. At the most, we may assume the draftsman was more familiar with the newer mint mark than the older one. The obverse of the early Matthias-period version of the St Ladislas coin contains a rounded, quartered shield, with the Hungarian stripes, the double cross, the coats of arms of the Hunyadi family (with raven) and that of the Count of Beszterce (with lion). The legend, written in with capital letters mixed with uncial, reads: “+MATHIAS*D*G•R•VNGARIE”. A later version of this coin shows the Bohemian-Luxemburgian, in place of the Hunyadi lion. Issues of King Matthias’ coins included the form depicted in the codex, although the legend differs. The legend captured in the codex is entirely in capital letters and is shorter than its prototype: “+ MATHIAS •D*G•R*VNGARIE”. Among King Matthias’ early gold coins one more is recognizable in the Stellarium: an early veiled Madonna type. The central field of the coin is occupied by a seated Madonna with a swaddled Child Christ in her left arm. The figures with their faces almost touching, the taut, pronounced pleats at the knees of the Virgin, and the legend “MATHI/AS*D•G*” can be traced to two of King Matthias’ golden
1. Johannes Tolhopff’s *Stellarium*, Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. 84. 1. Aug. 2°, fol. 6r
Several variations on this Madonna are known from King Matthias' coins, but the Child held in the left arm appeared only in later coins.

Besides coins of Hungarian kings those of other foreign dignitaries also appear on the same folio. The coin with the legend "+REX*FERTINANDVS..." appearing all in capitals shows a king facing forward with an open crown, shaved face, and short, wavy hair. The neckline of his garment is decorated with a pattern of circles. The coin most resembles the granos of Ferdinand I of Aragon (1458–1494) of Naples, although there is a more simplified form of that. Clearly discernible on this coin is the round-bottomed shield decorated with a leafy tree rising from a small hill. The legend reads: "+PAPA*SISTVS III(I)*". The image on this coin appears on the obverse of the gold quarto of Pope Sixtus IV (1471–1484) of the Rovere family, with the addition of a papal tiara and keys. The legend shows a further divergence from Sixtus’ gold coins with the words, written in capitals, shown in the reverse order. The last coin on this page shows the profile portrait of a young man with a well-proportioned head turned to the left and framed by short hair. His garment has a high, tight neckline, with the breast decorated in lilies and the sleeves plain. The letters "*I*" and "*G*" which flank his head are not mint marks, but rather refer to the child Giangaleazzo Maria Sforza (1469–1494), prince of Milan from 1476, as does the legend written in capitals, "+•I•G•M•DVX•MEDIOLANI•". Regents ruled in place of the child. Numerous portraits of the prince are known from coins, medals, marble reliefs and paintings. This impression, however, cannot be concretely connected to any of these, but the master of the prototype of this image must have drawn elements from more than one of them, and above all reproduced their Renaissance style.

At the bottom of the preceding page is the inscription: "Cuius hec est exemplaris figuratio". Unfortunately, the text above it offers no clues to deciphering these words. The direction in which the figure is to be viewed is not even clear. Historical events during the decades when the work could have been made similarly provide little explanation for the selection of coins. In fact no historical, family or astronomical connections could be found between the coins chosen, although the efemerides, which relates to 1463 and the semi-circle of Buda (f. 7v), may prove a suitable starting point for astronomical approaches. Statistics also offer no assistance. King Matthias leads with six coin impressions. Of these, four show the veiled Madonna with the Matthias legend. On one of them we can see the stamp design with the Hunyadi lion, while on another there is the Bohemian lion. Two images in the codex may also come from one coin. King Matthias is followed by Sigismund in terms of quantity. Both the obverse and the reverse of a gulden from among the coins minted by Sigismund as king of Hungary is shown, creating a complete unit. The obverse appears yet again and the reverse appears two more times. King Sigismund is thus represented by five depictions of coins. King Ferdinand I of Aragon appears with two obverses of coins, just like Giangaleazzo Maria Sforza of Milan. The reverse of Pope Sixtus IV’s coin also appears twice. Whether the obverse or reverse side of the coin was more important is not
certain, although the name of the issuer was indisputably essential. The only exception to this is King Sigismund's gold piece with the figure of St Ladislas.

Finally, more than one question concerning this page of the manuscript has remained unanswered. Introducing and discussing the codex is nevertheless worthwhile for several reasons. First, scholars of different disciplines might be inspired to further thoughts. Second, the page itself is very valuable as the earliest work depicting Hungarian coins. As such, despite the minor mistakes and forms and the careless execution of the texts, the master of this illustration carried out a task not to be underestimated for his time—the copying of contemporary coins. This achievement is particularly laudable if we compare it to Adam Berg's work Neu Müntz-Büech published in 1597 by the Antwerp printer-publisher Christophe Plantin. This book examines—for the first time—primarily Hungarian impressions from the era of King Matthias, and one hundred years later still did not manage to depict coins more accurately than the Stellarium miniature. The draftsman of the Neu Müntz-Büech can be reproached not only for blurring some words of the legends, but for completely omitting the legends' forms, too. In addition, around 1480, miniaturists from Italian centres began incorporating contemporary numismatic artifacts into the families of antique medals, coins, and gems; thus the endeavors of Tolhopff and the Buda workshop was up-to-date. Finally, this page provides some insight into the circulation of coins in the royal court of Buda around 1480, and into the court's coin collection, too.

Notes

1 Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. 84. 1. Aug. 2°.
4 Budapest, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára, Mf337/III.
5 K. Csapodiné-Gárdonyi (n. 2 above, 1984), 338–40 has dealt most thoroughly to date with the title page and identified most of the images enclosed in laurel wreaths, but neither she nor her successors managed to answer all the questions. These are dealt with below without aim at completeness.
Her interpretation of the upper right medallion cannot be considered decisive, as the image cannot be declared with absolute certainty a symbolic depiction of the Old and New Testaments. Some uncertainty surrounds the identification of figures in the lower left medallion, too. Whether the figures are King Matthias, Johannes Corvinus, and Johannes Tolhopff is debatable. For example, it is strange that the figure described as King Matthias does not wear a crown, while Ptolemy and Alphonse the Wise do. At the same time, however, the head of a lion can be discerned on the shield, which was known to be an emblem of King Matthias at that time, such as in János Zsámboki’s work Emblemata (Antwerpen, Plantin, 1564, 161, see Budapest, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára, RM III, 172). The description of the frame ornamentation omits the discs depicting the Sun and the Moon respectively, although the presence of these majestic celestial bodies in a book on the planets was not coincidental. The opening R initial is also open to reinterpretation. For example, the fish could not refer to the zodiac sign Aquarius, although King Matthias was born under that sign, since the codex contains no zodiac depictions. Even if the fish did represent Aquarius, the owl facing forward, which forms the stem of the letter requires explanation. (This bird adorns the borders of the image from the Zsámboki volume, too.) The upper part of the letter, also clearly contains a representation of the four elements, while the figure of an old man with his arms raised can be discerned in the circular space between the stem and base of the letter. He could embody the microcosm, as in an illustration in Johannes Scotus’ 1503 edition of Gregor Reisch’s Margarita Philosophica. See <http://www.clendening.kumc.edu/dc/rti/popularculture 1503 reischl.jpg>. A closer analogy appears on the title page of Haechts en de Jode’s Miktadugros, Panus Mundus published in Antwerp in 1579 by Plantin. Here too the four elements appear with a male nude encased in a circle as a symbol of the microcosm, see <http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/ groo028visi01-01/groo028visi01ill01.gif>. A similar, c. 1175 composition of man and the four elements as microcosm is known from Herrad of Landsberg’s Hortus Deliciarum. O. Heinemann in his Die Handschriften der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel, I-II. Abteilung, Wolfenbüttel 1894–1903, no. 2866 mentions—but not describes—not only the title page, but miniatures, astronomical depictions, and gilt and painted initials; Csapodi–Csapodiné–Gárdonyi (n. 2 above), no. 208 mentions the illustration on f. 25v–26r; idem, Ködexek és nyomtatott könyvek Magyarországon 1526 előtt, vol. 2., Budapest 1993, no. 2802.

Here follows a brief introduction to the codex from the perspective of book illumination, as the literature on this is meager. In addition to a meticulously composed title page, the volume contains painted initials and gilt-painted illustrations on a gold background. The following description is limited to a survey of these features. The scribe used red ink for the chapter titles. In the text, the red and blue initials indicate the beginnings of chapters and the more important parts of the text. The initials and the illustrations: 1r: border decoration, R(em...) 9 lines; 2v: U(niversus...) 3–4 lines. 5v: C(onsueverunt...) 3 lines; 6r: illustration to the chapter beginning De Tabularum Mediorum Mororum Celestum mobiHum Institutione ...; 6v: O(rdinamus...) 4 lines; 14r: M(otum ...) 4 lines; 15v: S(tatio ...) 3 lines; 16v: V(erum ...) 3 lines; 16r: chapter title on the previous page: “De veri loci Solis”—full page illustration. The carefully rendered depiction corresponds to the image of the Sun on the title page; 16v: V(erum...) 3 lines and chapter title; “De vero loco lunae”; 17r: illustration to the chapter title; 17v: V(erum ...) 3 lines and chapter title: “De vero loco Mercurii”; 18r: illustration to the chapter title; 18v: V(erum...) Chapter title: “De vero loco Veneris”—depiction on the lower half of the page; 19r: S(tellarum ...) 3–4 lines; 20r: H(acetus ...) 3 lines—chapter title: “De vero loco planetarum in ordine ad octavam speram”—illustration; 20v: A(nus...): 25v–26r: celestial globe: two page illustration. The earth and around it the seven planets framed in a medallion. In the outer
sphere angels and saints appear in groups of three (Trinity?). The illustration is the work of a steady hand.

6 <http://diglib.hab.de/mss/84-1-aug-2f/start.htm>; I am grateful to Dorottya Gáspár and Edit Madas for the former, and Orsolya Karsay for the latter.

7 Csapodine-Gárdonyi (n. 2 above, 1984), 355.


9 I am indebted to Dorottya Gáspár for her interpretation. I also consider the signum, gradus, meridian solution possible.

10 The following numbering helps to identify the coins in the drawing and the description:

1. 2

3. 4

5. 6

7. 8

9. 10

11. 12

13. 14

15. 16

17. 18

19.

20.

Nos. 9, 10. See L. Huszár, Münzkatalog Ungarn von 1000 bis heute, Budapest 1979, Nos. 572, 573 (with illustration).

12 Ibid, no. 573 and esp. no. 574.

13 Nos. 7, 14, 18.

14 Huszár (n. 11 above), nos. 673, 675 (with illustration).

15 No. 3., ibid, nos. 674, 675 (with illustration).

16 No. 17.

17 Huszár (n. 11 above), no. 673.

18 Nos. 1, 4, 15, 19. On the use of this type within the period 1471–1481, see L. Huszár, "Mátyás pénzei," in Mátyás király emlékkönyv születésének ötszázadik évfordulójára, ed. I. Lukinich, Budapest 1940, 560.

19 Madonna figure, see Huszár (n. 11 above), nos. 679 (with illustration), 658 (with illustration); legend, see ibid, no. 687 (with illustration).

20 Ibid, no. 686 (with illustration).

21 Nos. 8, 13.


23 Nos. 2, 5, 11, 12.

24 Corpus Nummorum Italicum (n. 22 above), vol. XV. Roma, Parte I., Rome 1934, pl. XVI, 1, no. 106.
Nos. 8, 13.

For coins most closely analogous, see: *Corpus Nummorum Italicum* (n. 22 above), vol. V. *Lombardia (Milano)*, Rome 1914, pls. IX/13/A, no. 17, IX/17/A, no. 24.

Nos. 1 and 3 may represent the two sides of the same coin.

Nos. 3, 7.

J. Búza, “Négyszáz éves a müncheni ’New Müntz-Büech’,” *Numizmatikai Közlöny* LXXXVI–LXXXVII, 1997–98, 47. I am thankful to Csaba Tóth for calling my attention to the study cited and to the copy of the book housed in the Hungarian National Museum (Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum) in Budapest.
On 20 April 1502, in the Palazzo Ducale in Venice, Doge Leonardo Loredan and the members of the *Maggior Consiglio* received John Corvinus (1473–1504), who had been admitted among the Venetian nobility in 1497. John was just returning from a pilgrimage to Loreto. The special honour was a message not only to the son of a former enemy (King Matthias), but to an accomplished military commander who, as ban (*banus*) of Croatia and Slavonia, was, like the Venetians, under constant threat from the Turks. John stayed at the palace of the Este of Ferrara on the Canale Grande, where the *Signoria* put up high-ranking foreign guests. It was a strikingly similar level of pomp as was laid on for the same man, John Corvinus, on 28 May 1485, when, four days ahead of his father King Matthias, he led the ceremonial entrance to the captured city of Vienna.

The life of John Corvinus, reflected in his artistic representation and his artistic patronage, is divided in two by one tragic event, the death of his father, Matthias Corvinus. Until 1490, he was a central figure in Matthias’ display of power; only in the second phase of his life did he undertake patronage on his own account, naturally with much more modest means.

I.

It was probably in February–March 1470, when he was 27 years old and already a widow for six years, that King Matthias met the pretty commoner from Stein an der Donau in Lower Austria, Barbara Edelpöck, during his abortive meeting in Vienna with Frederick III, possibly in the whirl of a carnival ball. Or perhaps he strayed into Stein during an excursion. What is certain is that he took the girl with him when he returned to his Buda palace. On 2 April 1473, Barbara gave birth—in Buda, according to his biographer, Gyula Schönherr, or in Pozsony (Bratislava, SK), according to Richard Perger—to a son who was christened after his Hunyadi grandfather János (John), hammer of the Turks. Six months later, on 13 November 1473, in the queen’s castle in Diósgyőr, Matthias issued a German-language(!) charter granting to his lover a stone house in Besztercebánya (Banská Bystrica,
A mine and a farm, as well as six villages close to the town in Zólyom (Zvolen, SK) county. Subsequently, Barbara probably raised her son in the queen’s town of Besztercebánya, far from the court, although the royal father also visited his son on his first birthday. In 1475, prior to the arrival of Beatrice of Aragon, the king’s fiancée, Barbara was obliged to leave Hungary: King Matthias purchased for her the castle estate of Enzersdorf near Vienna. Barbara even married and bore her husband two children, the half-siblings of John Corvinus. This latter visited his mother in Enzersdorf on 29 October 1482, and when King Matthias also went to visit his former mistress on 25 November 1484, during the Austrian War, he probably brought his son with him. Barbara went to Buda in autumn 1489 to face an accusation of witchcraft, Beatrice having claimed that she was the cause of the queen’s barrenness, and she was summoned to an inquiry by the Papal legate. Barbara Edelpöck made a will in Vienna on 19 September 1491, in which she left her house in Besztercebánya to her son: “liebn Sun und herrn hertzog Hannsn”. After 1475, John was raised by his grandmother, Erzsébet Szilágyi, and after 1477, by a Humanist teacher chosen by Matthias, Taddeo Ugoleto (c. 1448–1513) of Parma, who spoke perfect Greek and had formerly (1475–1477) been professor in Reggio Emilia. There is a report of the education of John Corvinus by Naldo Naldi, who claimed that Ugoleto taught him trivium, astronomy, astrology, law and statecraft. He taught him the poets and the Latin historians, and John was able to read the poets and the orators in Greek. Besides being responsible for John Corvinus’ Humanist training, Ugoleto was Matthias’ librarian and the procurer of the new codices from 1487 onwards.

As the years passed following King Matthias’ marriage to Beatrice of Aragon on 22 December 1476, it became increasingly clear that the young queen was sterile, and Matthias faced one of the greatest blows that can befall a king: he had no legal heir. In a charter of 21 October 1479, he mentions John as, Duke of Liptó (Liptov, SK) and Count of Hunyad, “our only born child” and conveys the sadness of a king forced to renounce the succession. But it also includes the statement, often to be repeated, that Queen Beatrice had given her consent to the grant of these titles. Matthias had originally intended to give the prince to the Church, as Charles I, King of Hungary (†1342) had his illegitimate son, and in 1480, at Matthias’ request, Sixtus IV appointed John administrator of the Bishopric of Győr. But a letter written by Albrecht, Margrave of Brandenburg in 1481 conveyed the news—clearly originating from the Hungarian court—that Matthias intended John to succeed him on the throne.

Matthias granted his son more and more estates during the 1480s, the earliest being a large complex of dwelling houses in the Buda Castle District. In 1481, the aristocratic Garai line came to an end with the death of Jób, and Matthias granted to John the enormous Szerecsen House, later known as the Garai House, which looked on to two streets. According to a description of 1412, on the east, there was a two-storey wing looking on to Olasz (now Országház) street, and on the west, a three-storey wing on Mindszent street (now the north end of Úri street),
with large halls and the family chapel on the upper floors. The Clarissa convent was later built on the site. In 1502, John undertook before the chapter of Zágráb (Zagreb, CR) to grant the buildings to Boldizsár Batthyány, who was in his service and later became vice-ban of Slavonia (1509), but title was never actually transferred. After John’s death in 1504, the property was inherited by his wife Beatrice Frangepán and their children Erzsébet and Kristóf, who died in 1505 and 1508 respectively. After Beatrice herself died in 1510, her husband of one year, Georg von Brandenburg, was granted title to the Hunyadi estate, including this house, by King Wladislas II (3 March 1510). John Corvinus was owner of the complex for 13 years, but there is no record of any building activity during that time.12

The grant of the house was one of the earliest moves in Matthias’ new policy of patronage: from that time on he gave to his son nearly every estate which fell
vacant through death or confiscation. But as the number of his estates grew, so did that of his enemies: the king could not acquire new supporters through granting estates, and faced growing discontent. On 8 April 1482 (a few days after the prince’s ninth birthday), Matthias conferred on him the family’s prime residence, the castle of Vajdahunyad (Hunedoara, RO) from which they took their name. It is in that charter that the prince is first referred to as John Corvinus.13

The grant almost certainly set off a new period of Late Gothic construction in Vajdahunyad, probably starting with the completion of the new gate tower and continuing with the reconstruction of the new western, oriel-windowed frontage of the palace range. The hanging keystone design of the vaulting of the outer passage—similar to some details of the Benedictine Abbey Church of Pannonhalma—dates the work to the 1480s.14 It must also have been in the late 1480s that the inner mural on the outer wall of the Matthias Loggia on the Gold House was made, with disc-and-ribbon decoration on the pillars, a hunting scene and pairs of figures in the spandrels.15 All of these can therefore be placed in the period when John Corvinus was owner, but probably King Matthias, or even more likely Erzsébet Szilágyi, gave the instructions for the building.

Pietro Ransano, Bishop of Lucera, wrote the history of János Hunyadi in 1453, and it was here that the fiction of Hunyadi’s origins among the ancient Corvinus clan first appeared. This was used for the surname of the illegitimate son, as we have seen, from 1482. The Humanists quickly realised the boy’s political importance (being one of Matthias’ most sensitive points): in 1485, Galeotto Marzio wrote a book for John Corvinus on King Matthias’ brilliant, wise and amusing sayings and deeds.16 Bartolommeo Fonzio also dedicated one of his Saxettus poems to John, written at the end of the corvina of his works (now held in Wolfenbüttel).17 Aurelio Brandolini Lippo also wrote a dialogue on a comparison between the republic and the kingdom (De comparatione reipublicae et regni), although this was only completed after Matthias’ death (John Corvinus was one of the protagonists),18 and in late 1486, after the successful siege of the castle of Retz in Austria, Bonfini presented to King Matthias his book on the origins of the Corvinus family (De Corvine domus origine libellus). Although the latter was lost, Bonfini included the essence of the text into the third Decas of his Rerum Ungaricarum decades, (Liber IX. 215–285).19

In the final years of Matthias’ reign, the Corvinus legend, the final, glorious period of the Corvina Library, and John Corvinus’ position as co-owner were all factors in the issue of John Corvinus’ succession and became the central themes of royal policy, particularly of politically directed artistic display.20 Evidence of the political significance of the Corvina Library is its prominence in the agreement made on 17 June 1490 between John Corvinus and the royal council: “Similiter etiam Bibliothecam pro regni decore exstructam libris exhauriri non patiatur, sed universos libros ibidem relinqui faciat, liceat tamen eidem cum consilio et revisione Praelatorum et Baronum, aliquos pro suo usu de illis recipere et de bibliotheca extrahere.”21
IVNCTAVNOHAEC FVLGENT
PRAECLARAINSIGNIANEXV:
QVAE TOTVM VICERE ORBEM
QVAE VINCERE NVLLI
CONTIGIT ET NE IPSIS SECVM
CERTARE DARETVR:
PERPETVA IVNGI VOLVERVNT
FATA CATHENA:

2. Marlianus corvina, title page with two coats of arms, after 1487
Volterra, Biblioteca Guarnacci, Cod. lat. 5518. IV.49.3.7 (after Schönherr [n. 1 above])
The Corvinus name and the legend of the Corvinus-family origins meant much to the young prince, as borne out by his use of an ancient gem as one of his seals. And just as Bonfini considered the eagle holding a wreath in his beak beside the figure of Jupiter on Constantine the Great's follis, John Corvinus also used as one of his seals an ancient gem depicting the eagle of Jupiter. Humanists in Hungary, such as Mihály Kesztölcz and János Megyericsei often used ancient gem seals.

King Matthias strove to present his son to the outside world as heir to the throne. This was behind his sending his son ahead of him into Vienna on 28 May 1485, after the city's capitulation (on 23 May), as reported by an eye-witness, the doctor Johannes Tichtel. During his one-day visit, John went round the main points of the city and visited baths. On 1 June, he joined his father on his procession into the city, and on 6 June they received Vienna's oath of loyalty. Bonfini also records a joust between the young prince and a knight. The city also held a ball in the Regensburgerhof in honour of John Corvinus in 1486.

Matthias soon—in October 1485—followed the capture of Vienna with the siege of Wiener Neustadt, but took it only on 17 August 1487. After the ceremonial review, Matthias entered the city with his wife like a victorious Roman emperor. Bonfini, who describes the capture of Wiener Neustadt in the foreword to the Philostratus corvina, does not highlight the prince's role, but that of the queen and Ippolito d'Este. The frontispiece of the codex, however, is a double title page, on the left, a portrait of King Matthias in the style of the medal portraits of Nero and Hadrian, between whom he appears, and on the right, the initial N clearly represents a young man in a crown, almost certainly Prince John. He stands on a triumphal chariot drawn by two horses and surrounded by soldiers, among them two bound prisoners, and in the background the image—as imagined in Florence—of the captured city and its churches. The miniaturist of the codex has been identified by Edith Hoffmann as Boccardino il Vecchio of Florence, and this attribution has been accepted in the history of Florentine miniature painting. According to Ilona Berkovits, a portrait of John Corvinus appears in the lower right hexagonal picture of the marginal decoration (opposite Bianca Maria Sforza). John almost certainly appears on the title page of the Didymus corvina (fol. 2r), on the left, above the kneeling figure of Matthias; on fol. 82 of the Breviarium of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, to the right of Matthias, and disputedly, indeed with low probability, on the title page of volume III of the Florence Bible (fol. 2v), as the mysterious youth with lily decoration on his clothes. Ulrich Middeldorf claims to have discovered John's portrait in the guise of John the Evangelist in the chancel of the S. Maria delle Grazie in Milan, and according to Jolán Balogh, he is represented on the title page of the codex containing Brandolini's Dialogus de comparatione Reipublicae et Regni, in the illustration of the protagonists of the dialogue.

On 25 November of the same year, 1487, John Filipec, Bishop of Várad (Oradea, RO) and privy counsellor, signed in Milan the agreement for Prince
John’s *per verba de presenti* marriage to the 16-year-old daughter of Duke Gian Galeazzo Sforza, Bianca Maria Sforza, who would have brought with her one of the largest dowries in Europe. In the introduction to the ceremony, the court Humanist Gianfrancesco Marliani (later archbishop of Milan) made an address in praise of Hungary and the two families entering into the marriage bond. The Neapolitan ambassador also attended the ceremony, and another eye-witness, the Papal nuncio Giacomo Gherardo, wrote in a letter that it proceeded with royal, rather than ducal pomp: “omnes ornatu et cultu non tam ducali quam regio”. The oration was set into a separate corvina, now held in Volterra: *Epitalamium in nuptiis Blancae Mariae Sfortiae et Johannis Corvini*. On its title page (2v) is written:

IVNCTA VNO HAEC FULGENT
PRAECLARA INSIGNIA NEXV:
QVAE TOTVM VICERE ORBEM
QVAE VINCERE NVLLI
CONTIGIT ET NE IPSIS SECVM
CERTARE DARETVR:
PERPETVA IVNGI VOLVERVNT
FATA CATHENA:

Above the inscription, the coats of arms of the two houses, linked by a ring, are each enclosed in a laurel wreath, and the ribbons winding around them are joined by a knot in the centre. At the beginning of the text, an initial contains one of the most famous portraits of King Matthias (5r). Mario Salmi and Wilhelm Suida have attributed the painting of the codex to Ambrogio Preda (Ambrogio de Predis). The binding is damaged, but the missing centre and corner decorations are suspected by the Csapodi couple to have been coats of arms, and by Di Pietro Lombardi, portraits. The codex was in Tuscany by the late 16th century, and passed into the ownership of Pirro Lisci of Volterra in 1592. According to Bonfini, Marliani was in Vienna on 5 May 1488 and presumably presented the codex to the king and his son then. The poet Bernardo Bellincioni wrote a sonnet to Bianca Maria Sforza on the occasion of the engagement.

John Corvinus had clearly taken his love of books from his father and from Ugoleto; proof of this is his gift of an early print of Virgil, made in Florence in 1487, to his bride Bianca Maria Sforza. It is presently held in Innsbruck. And it was John whom the Duke of Milan, Giangaleazzo Sforza, approached when he wished to borrow a Festus codex from the Corvina Library, or from Ugoleto. During these exchanges (or earlier), might have also arrived the four codices decorated with the coat-of-arms of Francesco Sforza to Buda, then they came back from Istanbul to the University Library.

A customary accompaniment to royal proxy marriages was a portrait of the other party. The half-figure portrait of the then 14-year-old prince was probably made for his marriage to Bianca Maria Sforza, probably to rebuff the intrigues of Beatrice, who tried to frighten off the bride by allusions to his ugliness. It has long been disputed whether the portrait is the work of an Italian or northern artist.
Given John’s location at the time, it was probably painted in Vienna, and so the painter may have been Austrian or German, and most recently Miklós Boskovits has ascribed it to the circle of Michael Pacher. The prince’s headgear is a wreath of red *dianthus barbatus* (Sweet William), the symbol of marital fidelity and fertility. A blue precious-stone pendant, bearing a raven with a ring in its beak and surrounded by seven pearls, hangs from his left ear. The painter has placed a crown and a cross-shaped pendant to John’s left, a reference to his hopes for a regal future. On his right there is an *aigrette* calpac (not a bracelet) in the form of a stylised bird’s feather and a sword with the Hunyadi arms on the hilt. These were all probably real artefacts.

On 14 April 1482, Matthias pronounced his son *dux Lipthoviensis*, granting him the Counties of Liptó, Árva and Turóc, followed a year later with the royal domain of Sáros. The enormous grants of land were preparing John for succession to the throne. The count (*comes*) of these four counties (and also those of Abaúj, Ung and Zemplén to the east) was Máté Kis of Cece, who later gave his life for his master. Szilárd Papp has pointed out that the construction of the Liptó Franciscan friary at Okolicsnó was connected most of all with Matthias, and judged from the coat of arms identified in the north chapel, with Cece. Matthias therefore started the building, but the work continued in John’s name and using his revenues, and the inscribed years 1489 and 1490 indicate the completion phase.

Okolicsnó was paralleled by what is perhaps John Corvinus’ most important act of artistic patronage, the reconstruction of the Pauline friary in Lepoglava (CR). Matthias’ two favourite religious orders were the Paulines and the Franciscans, so it is logical that John’s other privileged monastery was Pauline.

According to Bonfini, John donated several church artefacts to the Fehérvár provostal church, which is Matthias’ burial place, upon Matthias’ death: a cross set with precious stones, goblets set with precious stones, a gold cup, candle-holders, cups, and a monstrance: “Dominico, deinde basilice huius antistiti rite sacrificanti a Corvino duce oblata pretiosa munera, imprimis crux solida gemmataque ex obrisa affabre facta, quam quinque et quadraginta aureorum milibus venisse predicabant: item gemmata phiale et pelvis aurea, candelabra, calices, eucharistie tabernaculum, omnia e puro solidoque auro confecta lapillorumque multorum varietate discinillantia.” He also donated to the Basilica silver statues (statue argentea) made for his father, and twelve sets of church vestments.

II.

John Corvinus’ hopes in the contest for the throne fell apart very quickly after King Matthias’ death. The dissipation of his father’s treasures—the books of the Corvina Library—started with John’s own actions. When his followers (including Lőrinc Újlaki and Zsigmond Ernuszt) persuaded him to remove himself from Buda in 1490
and have himself crowned in Fehérvár, he loaded Matthias' treasures—gold and jewellery, heirlooms, corvinas, charters granting him his domains—on to carts, and after losing the battle of Csontmező (or Sárvíz) in the county of Tolna on 4 July, the carts were looted by the army of Ernuszt or István Báthory, the remainder being returned to Buda. Bonfini and Tubero both mentioned the loss of treasures there.51

John inherited the Erlangen Bible, a version of the Bible for personal use, which had once belonged to John Hunyadi.52 After his death, it passed to his wife, Beatrice Frangepán and her second husband Georg von Brandenburg, who had it taken, together with the Hunyadi archive, to Ansbach.53

John lost possession of many prized items of Matthias' treasury as pledges or in lieu of repayment of debt, such as the Matthias Calvary, the Corvinus drinking horn, etc. The Matthias Calvary was among treasures which John pledged to Tamás Bakócz for 5200 florins (charters of 30 May and 31 July 1494) and which ultimately passed into Bakócz's possession.54 Matthias' monstrance passed first to his son, then to Jakab and László Rosályi Kun, and through Péter Pázmány to the treasury of Esztergom Cathedral.55 The Corvinus Drinking Horn may also have belonged to Matthias, but was donated to the Esztergom Cathedral treasury by John Corvinus.56

The promise of the throne of Bosnia came to nothing, and John had to make do with the banate of Croatia and Slavonia. He had nearly as much power as Matthias had wanted to secure for him from Frederick III in 1489 (this was the pessimistic version). John was forced to compromise with the barons and Wladislas.57 John's prospects narrowed after 1490, and he faced constant financial problems. From that time on, his patronage was mainly confined to the territory of Slavonia and Croatia. He presumably carried on building in his own castles and in his capacity as ban he reinforced the castles of the south-west border country.

One of John's building projects for which there is a record in the charters is that of the Jasztrebarszka (Jastrebarsko, HR) castle (castellum) in Zágráb County. Mátyás Geréb had built a timber fortress here, with a wide moat, between 1483 and 1489. John demolished this in 1502 and built a new castle in the interior of
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the village. This must have been of more substantial proportions, because the sources refer to it as a *castrum* in 1524.\(^{58}\)

Gyula on the Great Hungarian Plane was another important family castle. Matthias granted this to his son in 1482, for whom it may have been the prime residence, a source of indubitable reliability, Ferenc Schérer claiming that it was where the family treasures were held in 1492.\(^{59}\) In the third phase of construction of the building, John—or, according to István Feld, his widow Beatrice Frangepán—made additions around 1500, and the latter moved in together with her daughter Erzsébet Corvinus in 1506 or 1507. This is when the courtyard was filled in with the north-east range, and probably when the ground floor pillars of the passage around the castle courtyard were erected.\(^{60}\) John also had other dealings with the town: Gyula is crossed by several streams, and he obliged the inhabitants to maintain the bridges.\(^{61}\) Less is known of the Slavonian and Croatian castles he lived in—Bihács (Bihac, Bosnia and Herzegovina) and Krapina (CR). His son Kristóf was born in Bihács in early August 1499, and John Corvinus spent the summer of 1504 in Krapina, from where he set off on his last campaign.\(^{62}\)

The most outstanding product of John Corvinus' patronage is the Pauline friary at Lepoglava in the County of Varasd founded by Hermann of Cilli—Cilli, Ortemburge Zagorieque comes—in honour of the Virgin Mary around 1400 (Schönherr dates it to 1398). A charter issued in Varasd (Varaždin, CR) by Hermann's grandson Ulrich of Cilli on 15 October 1455 also mentions the foundation.\(^{63}\) The church was already standing in 1415, and the Chapel of the Holy Spirit was completed in 1462. In 1481, the building burned down during a Turkish attack; for the period in office of György, Pauline prior, John Corvinus rebuilt the friary in 1491, placing it approximately in parallel with Okolicsnó. John chose the Lepoglava church as his burial place.

The *Liber Memorabilium parochiae Lepoglavensis* mentions John as the founder:

"Quod cum post vastationem a Turcis grassatibus causatam in misero statu existere observasset, ad Restaurationem hujus Claustri benignum animum adjecit, ut propterea in hoc Principe Lepoglavense Monasterium novum Fundatorem et Beneficium Restauratorem perpetua gratitudine reveri debeat. Restaurationem vero hanc primo aut secundo post Mortem Parentis sui anno opere complevit circiter anno vulgari 1491 aut 1492."\(^{64}\)

There have been several archaeological excavations in the building in recent decades. These were carried out by the archaeologists of the Czech State Institute of Monument Care (*Statní ústav památkové péče*) between 1991 and 1993, and by the archaeologists Marko Radičović and Tajana Pleše (*Hrvatski restauratorski zavod*) in 2003–2004. The friary was rebuilt in the 17th century, leaving the Gothic church largely intact, but with the addition of a new Baroque west façade, furnishings and murals. The excavations found the medieval friary building which connected to the church from the north, with foundation walls of three sides of a somewhat smaller building than the present cloister, and the Chapel of the Holy Spirit in the east wing, the end wall of which makes up three sides of an octagon.
The church consists of a single nave with a net-vault, an elongated, star-vaulted chancel ending with three sides of an octagon, and three chapels extending the south side of the nave. This follows the arrangement of most Pauline monasteries and churches in historic Hungary (among others in the territory of today's Croatia).

In 1505, John Corvinus or his widow donated to the Lepoglava friary a gilded silver cross containing relics of the cross: “Crucem magnam pro sacro ligno sanctissimae crucis domini”, mentioned in the 1687 inventory of the church’s treasures. Jolán Balogh identified this with Matthias’ reliquary cross, which the king had carried in front of him in the ceremonial procession as he went to war. John and his wife also donated a silver monstrance, which the 1687 inventory mentions thus: “Monstrantia argentea tota et inaurata, turriculis et variis exornata statuis”.

These pieces have since disappeared, but a Late Gothic monstrance donated by John Corvinus to the Pauline friary in Lepoglava was transferred to the treasury of Zagreb Cathedral, the Riznica, in 1495, and has remained there ever since. Above the lobed base and the polygonal nodus decorated with little tracery windows, the ringed ciborium and the “armi” projecting from it consisting of two arcs support, on four columns, a triple baldachin, under which are three statues on bases: St Catherine of Alexandria with a broken wheel on the left, St Dorothy with a basket to the right, and a Mettceria group in the middle: St Anne with the child Virgin Mary and Christ child. The baldachins have turrets at the top, and in the centre canopy there is a putto on each side gable field.
and the resurrected Christ at the front, a flag in his hand, above him a medallion in relief of the coronation of Mary. The point of the highest, central turret is topped by the figure of Christ hanging on the cross, flanked by figures of Mary and St John the Evangelist on the side-turrets. The inscription *Mithzeth prope Zomes* on the base has been scratched on later—in the 16th or 17th century, and probably refers to the Mindszent friary near Balatonszemes. The monstrance was purchased from the Lepoglava Paulines by Zagreb Cathedral for 400 forints in 1897. John Corvinus and Beatrice Frangepán also gave other artefacts to the Lepoglava friary: two silver chalices set with precious stones and with patens, two other silver chalices with patens, a silver censer, four chasubles with pearls, a humeral veil with precious stones, "Phialam cum Tussorio magnum argenteam", and a gilded silver chalice with silver candelabra, "Scyphos argenteos inauratos cum candelabris argenteis". The records show that all of these goldsmiths' works were sent to Frater Petrus of Lepoglava by Pater Nicolaus the Abbot General of the main Pauline friary at Szentlőrinc near Buda, and it is possible that many of them were originally donated by King Matthias.

The written sources also mention other goldsmiths' works. In the dispute between John Corvinus and Jakab Székely, there is a mention of two necklaces and a jewel which John pledged to Székely for the extraordinarily large sum of 11,000 florins, and freehold title to castles of *Wynnyce* (Vinica, CR) and Trakostyán (Trakošćan, CR), pledged for the sum of 16,000 florins, also passed to Jakab Székely for the sum of 27,000 florins. Even more interesting is a charter in which King Władysław II orders that...
three goldsmiths' works pledged by John Corvinus to the Zagreb chapter be re­
deemed by Beatrice Frangepán's second husband, Georg von Brandenburg. These
(possibly from King Matthias' treasury) are: a clock, whose base and little columns
are of pure gold ("horologium vnum cum Vtraque Base et columnulis ex puro
auro factis conclusum"), a seashell set in gold and plated with pure gold at the
edges ("Concham marinam, in labio similiter puro auro confectam"), and a brace­
let, set with gold, pears and precious stones ("armillam vnam similiter auro, gem­
mis et lapidibus preciosis confectam et ornatam").

A Humanist school formed at Lepoglava during John's time. It was in existence
between 1503 and 1526. Its successor operated between 1582 and 1637, and in
1645, even the Pauline philosophical faculty founded in Wiener Neustadt (Austria)
moved to Lepoglava. Besides Lepoglava, John also supported the reconstruction
of the Franciscan church at Atyina (Voćin, CR) in Körös County, Slavonia, in the
1490s, in conjunction with Wladislas II. Like his father, then, he assisted the Fran­
ciscans as well as the Paulines. The vaulting of the nave and that of the south side's
easternmost chapel are related to the spatial-curve vaults of the Franciscan monas­
tery church in Visegrad. This implies that a workshop familiar with the designs of
Benedikt Ried and Hans Spiess of Bohemia worked in Visegrad and Atyina.

It was not only in connection with Lepoglava that John Corvinus contem­
plated his father's and his own salvation: on 24 February 1503, Provost Marton
and the chapter of the Lesser Provostal Church of the Virgin Mary, also known as
the Provostal Church of St Sigismund, in Buda Castle, acknowledged that John
Corvinus had restored to them the town of Eszék (Osijek, CR) and promised in
return that they would sing a mass of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin every
Saturday for the souls of King Matthias, Prince John and their descendants.

John inherited his father's and grandfather's military prowess, and exhibited it
in his battles with the Turks. In October 1504, setting out from Krapina Castle, he
clashed again with the Turks, but died of plague on 12 October.

In accordance with his final wishes, his widow buried him in the Lepoglava
Pauline Church and donated to the Friary, besides the gold candelabra, Matthias' 
red cloak, two chasubles with pearls, women’s clothes, the large cross with relics 
of the Holy Cross mentioned above, chalices and other ecclesiastical vessels. His 
gravestone in the church, however, was ordered not by Beatrice Frangepán, but
by János Gyulai, vice-ban of Slavonia, which may explain its simplicity and infe­
rrior material. Schönherr, on the basis of the inscription and the use, according to
the 18th-century history of the order, of the word *tumba* in the original inscrip­tion,
proposes that the tombstone was originally the lid of a sarcophagus.

"Haec tenet arcta Ducem tumba Joannem [Corvinum]
Mathiae, qui stirps inclyta Regis erat.
Strenuus hic armis, partaque mundo triumpha
Plurima post victor diem clausit extremum.
Anno Christi ter quingentesimo quarto
Die Octobris 12. Joannes de Gyula fieri fecit."
Pál Lővei considers it possible that the inscription ran around the frame of the tombstone.\textsuperscript{80} The carved sandstone former sarcophagus lid, which now measures $188 \times 80.5$ cm (Schönherr puts it at 190 cm long and 82.5 cm wide) has a representation of John in armour, a full standing figure with a flagstaff with lance point in his right hand, and a sword and emblazoned shield in the left. In 1650, the stone was laid into the floor and wore down completely over the centuries. In 1824, Count János Eszterházy had the tombstone placed in the north wall of the chancel. John’s son Kristóf Corvinus, Matthias’ grandson, who died at the age of six in 1505, was also buried in the church. Shields and a flag were mounted on the wall at the funeral, and John Corvinus’ tombstone was made in 1505.\textsuperscript{81}

On 13 December 1507, three years after John’s death, his widow Beatrice Frangepán, “in castro nostro Hunyad” donated seven Varasd County villages to the Paulines on the condition that they sing mass every day in honour of the Virgin Mary and for the salvation of her husband and her son Kristóf, who are buried in the Pauline Basilica in Lepoglava. She also specified that the vicarius and at least 20 monks should live in the friary.\textsuperscript{82} Gregory, Pauline Abbot-General, showed his gratitude for the many gifts presented by John and Beatrice when, in a charter of 22 November 1508, he admitted the widow into the fraternity of the Pauline order.\textsuperscript{83} It was a similar gesture to that of Gregory, Superior of the Paulines, when he admitted Erzsébet Szilágyi (the mother of King Matthias) into the confraternity of the Pauline order in 1472.\textsuperscript{84}

The century-long history of the Hunyadi family came to an end with John Corvinus. His life after 1490 was above all constrained by the struggle against the Turks on the southern borders, for which he still occupies a fitting place in the historical memory, especially in Croatia.\textsuperscript{85} A plaque above his tombstone hails him thus:\textsuperscript{86}

\begin{quote}
"Anno Domini Millesimo, quingentesimo quarto.
Octobris duodecima die, hora undecima nocturnali,
Heros ultimos dies, Joannes Corvinus clausit extremos,
Sub eremo corpus ad Clastrum Lepoglava tumulare iussit.
Aspice rem charam, bini hinc inde cingunt gloriosae Virginis aram:
Dux Joannes, et filius eius Christophorus, quibus assint gaudia trina.
Et sequitor, dum licuit, tua dum viguit regia o Joannes potestas
Fraus latuit, pax in Regno iste tui tempore firma fuit, regnavitque honestas."
\end{quote}
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RENAISSANCE IN RED AND WHITE
The use of coloured stone
in Hungary at the turn of the 16th century

Internationally, the most recognized work of Hungarian Renaissance architecture is the Bakócz Chapel, built largely between 1506–10. Constructed as the burial place for the archbishop of Esztergom, cardinal Tamás Bakócz (†1521), it was originally adjoined to the southern side of the medieval cathedral of St Adalbert, and today it forms a part of the 19th-century cathedral of Esztergom.1

A classical Renaissance structure, this chapel rivals the best Italian monuments. Its Italian stylistic origin, however, cannot account for certain features related to the fashioning of the entire work and its details, in particular the unusual use of materials: the crimson-red marble wall covering.2 This characteristic can be explained by examining the categories of conformity and individuality:3 the wall covering of the building, a reflection of Bakócz’s individual choices, is an exceptional example of adhering to a 300-year-old local tradition, a consequence of conforming to the decorative principles of the interior of St Adalbert’s cathedral, built in the period of King Béla III (1172–96).4 We should not forget, however, given its impact on contemporaries, the result of this seemingly delicate conformity, it was highly suited to the self-representation of the archbishop, who aspired to the papal throne. As the Viennese humanist, Ursinus Velius, remarked in 1527, in the cathedral of Esztergom, “sacellum conditum est sumptis ingenti Thomae Cardinalis antistitis Strigoniensis illustre parietibus ex porphyrietico lapide”,5 that is, the chapel’s red marble, in Humanist thinking, had become comparable to porphyry used by antique emperors. In any case, it also certainly matched the original intentions of King Béla III, who was raised in the court of the Byzantine emperor.

The red marble wall covering of the Bakócz chapel gives way to another kind of stone in just one section: the carved altar by Andrea Ferrucci (fig. 1), made of white marble, and presumably installed nearly a decade after the rest of the chapel was completed. This is not the only example of two different coloured stone materials used during the Jagiello period in Hungary. Krisztina Havasi collected classicizing compositions showing angels holding a coat of arms encircled by a wreath and definitely or presumably made of red and white stone.6 In Gyulafehérvár (Alba Iulia, RO), above the entrance to the Lázói chapel, two angels hold the coat of arms of the Transylvanian bishop László Geréb. This work is carved of red
marble and is inserted into a façade entirely made of limestone. In Nagy dobos in Szabolcs-Szatmár County, a red marble fragment with the coat of arms of the Perényi family was discovered, and the place where the different coloured arms of angels probably would have been is visible. A similar, Renaissance work originally assembled from several pieces was also located in Eger. Its fragments, belonging to an angel relief, were made of a marble-like, whitish stone.

In addition to relief works, there were also sarcophagi assembled from red marble and bright coloured stones. The sarcophagi erected by Benigna Magyar for
her first and second husbands, Pál Kinizsi (†1494), the great military commander and vanquisher of the Turks under King Matthias I (“Matthias Corvinus”, 1458–90), and Márk Horváth of Kamicsác (†1508), ban of Croatia respectively, both had red marble lids decorated with figures, while the side slabs containing relief work were carved from yellowish marl found in the environs of Buda (fig. 2). The base of one of the sarcophagi was also made of red marble. In front of the main altar of the provostal church of Szepeshely (Spišská Kapitula, SK) stood the tomb of the palatine Imre Szapolyai (†1487), while the tomb of the palatine István Szapolyai (†1499) was located in the centre of the Corpus Christi chapel. Only their red marble lids have survived. As it is known from Miklós Jankovich’s 1818 description, the sides of the sarcophagi were covered in red and white marble. The architect, János Sedlmayr, recognized the Renaissance-profiled, red marble lid fragments and elements of the base (the location and points of insertion of the bronze tomb sculpture are clearly visible on the lid) of the sarcophagus of Orbán Nagylucsei (†1491), the bishop of Eger, in the storage facility of the Eger museum. Restorers at the museum reconstructed the sarcophagus by binding the pieces together with masonry painted white. Without realizing it, they may have been recreating the sarcophagus’ former appearance, assuming the other monuments mentioned above are indeed analogous. Moreover, if we accept this reconstruction as valid, then among the fragments of the lapidary only a composition of angels holding a wreath or coat of arms, published by Krisztina Havasi and mentioned above, could have decorated the long side of the sarcophagus. Italian analogies to this appeared just as frequently in 15th-century funerary art as among
architectural ornaments. Whether the above mentioned ensemble of angels belongs to this sarcophagus or not, the tomb of Nagylucsei is most likely the first Renaissance funerary monument *par excellence* to have survived, if only in fragments, in the territory of medieval Hungary. In the future, we should consider that materials of different colours may also have been used in sarcophagi of which only the red marble lids can be identified today.

The earlier tomb from Szepeshely shows this method of decoration had appeared in the Carpathian Basin by the Matthias period. Among the Renaissance stone carvings of the royal palaces of Buda and Visegrád are a sizeable number of white marble, sandstone and marl fragments, alongside the plentiful red marble.
4. Interior of the Sigismund Chapel, 1519–33, Cracow, Wawel Cathedral (Photo: Author)
The stone material from Hungary was obviously carved there, while it is reasonable to presume the majority of white marble works were imported from Italy, although there is increasing evidence of the use in Eger and Diósgyőr of marble-like raw materials from the Bükk Mountain region. Certainly, during the furnishing of the palace chapel of Visegrád, carvings of both red and white marble were used, and even the imported Italian white marble tabernacle may have been placed in a red marble frame carved in Hungary. Somewhat later, a similar kind of colour combination—but with opposing arrangement—was used in the tabernacle made in 1497 for the cathedral of St Emmeram in Nyitra (Nitra, SK) during the tenure of bishop Antal Sánkfalvy (1490–1501). The central part was made of red marble, while the frame was made of marl from the environs of Buda. The two tabernacles of the parish church of downtown Pest—one erected sometime before 1507 by the parish priest András Nagyrévy, bishop of Thermopylae and vicar of Esztergom, and the other by the city of Pest in 1507—were made of the same two kinds of stone material (fig. 3). Just as the frame for the more valuable, imported Italian white marble middle section was carved from local stone in Visegrád, in Nyitra and Pest the more expensive and distinguished hard red limestone (quasi marble) was used for the carving of the middle, while the frame was made of marl.

Although it is not certain if this work was kept in Buda, the royal court have possessed a pair of portraits showing King Matthias and his queen Beatrice in white relief with dark green jasper background inlay, building on the tonal contrasts of light–dark stones. Very likely, the original inspiration for the use of an ensemble of coloured stones was found in the palace of Buda, just as the invention of the monumental inscription in gilt bronze letters in the Bakóczi chapel may have had its roots in King Matthias’ palace in Buda.

Recent research has shown the use of red marble and white stone together in wall coverings or in interior architectural features took place in Hungary in the two periods preceding the Renaissance. The first was during the rule of Béla III (1172–96) and his two sons, Imre (1196–1204) and András II (1205–35), largely between 1180 and 1220, producing the palace and the cathedral of St Adalbert in Esztergom, the royal castle of Óbuda, the Porta speciosa of the Benedictine monastery of Pannonhalma, and some ornate disks, an inlaid tomb of a knight, and the sarcophagus of Gertrude, the queen consort, in the Cistercian abbey of Pilisszentkereszt. The second period took place during the reign of Louis the Great (1342–82), yielding the sepulchral baldachin in the northern side aisle of the provostal church in Székesfehérvár, and perhaps in the Angevine sepulchral chapel on the southern side, as well as in the tomb of Louis’ predecessor, the Polish ruler Casmir the Great (†1370) in the Wawel Cathedral of Cracow. All of these works were intact and visible, as best we know, during the later Matthias and the Jagiello periods, when this fashion apparently regained some currency, as the examples mentioned earlier suggest. This immediate trend in the preference of materials may have led to the unusual observation of the Dominican nun, Lea...
Ráskaí, in medieval Hungarian source materials. She notes that the gravestone of St Margaret of the Árpád dynasty (†1270 or 1271) on Margaret’s Island in Buda was carved from red marble, while the sepulchral monument, constructed later, was of white marble. Ráskaí found it important enough to refer to this fact in the contemporary translation of the Legend of Margaret.26

The pairing of red marble with white stone in the sepulchral art of the Polish Renaissance was popular from the early 16th century. The Polish king Sigismund I (1506–48) became acquainted with Hungarian Renaissance works during his travels as a prince. After the death of his first wife, Barbara (1515), whose father, the palatine István Szapolyai, was buried at Szepeshely, Sigismund had a burial chapel for his family built onto the southern side of Cracow’s Wawel Cathedral. The plans of Bartolommeo Berrecci were used, who was presumably invited from Hungary to Poland. The structure, erected between 1519 and 1533, is Renaissance in style with a dome and central ground plan similar to that of the Bakócz Chapel. The bright sandstone architecture of its richly ornate interior contains dark accents of red marble in the niche statues, tondos, royal stalls and sepulchral monuments (fig. 4).27 The stone slabs were transported from the Hungarian red marble quarries, as accounts from 1520 show.28 In 1524, on the order of Sigismund I a Renaissance baldachin made of white sandstone was placed above the Hungarian red marble tomb of the Jagiello king Władysław II (†1434), which had been carved almost one hundred years earlier. The effect of the colour ensemble links this work to the 14th-century sepulchral monument of Casimir the Great, mentioned above. The sepulchral chapel of Sigismund’s uncle, John Albert, king
of Poland (1492–1501), reflects the influence of Veit Stoß, as does the king’s Gothic-structured tomb carved of red marble. The white sandstone carvings of the niche that frames it, however, as a work of the royal architect Francesco of Florence, bears the stylistic marks of the High Renaissance.29 The fashion almost immediately gained a following among prelates of the Church, as demonstrated by the sepulchral monument of Bishop Jan Konarski in the Wawel Cathedral, which Konarski ordered from the Berrecci workshop in 1521 (fig. 5).30 Although the types of sepulchral monuments changed over time, the Hungarian red marble quarries were taken over by the Turks, and the mannerist style came into fashion, compositions built on the contrast of red and white stone were still popular in the early 17th century, as demonstrated by the towering wall tombs of the bourgeois Montelupi and Cellari families in Cracow’s Church of Mary, or the tomb of Andrzej (†1593) and Katarzyna (†1601) in Radlin.31
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LUKÁCS SZEGEDI,
THE BISHOP OF ZAGREB AND THE ARTS
Paths of the all'antica style in the Kingdom of Hungary
in the early 16th century

Next to the western tower on the north side of the parish church of St Demetrius in Szeged, the son of the city, Bishop Lukács "of humble origins" (ex humili statu) erected a chapel dedicated to the Annunciation. In the foundation letter dated 29 May 1501 in Buda, Lukács endows the chapel with various incomes, listing among his motivations reverence for his hometown and gratitude for his education. What interests us the most, however, are the necessary furnishings he provides: two gilt chalices and their requisites, two missals, five chasubles, four altar fittings, seven rugs, and brass candlesticks for both altars. One chasuble is made of black, the second of red, the third of green velvet with gold threads, the fourth of yellow damask, and the fifth of white with gold damask. Of the altar fittings, the two for the larger altar are made of red velvet and green damask while both cloths for the smaller altar are damask. Although not lavish, this donation is respectable—an assertion we can make even if nothing of it survived, or at least could be identified. Two medieval chasubles have been preserved in Szeged, both in the Franciscan friary of the Lower town. One is known as the Gellért chasuble. The other was traced in the 18th century to King Matthias Corvinus. The Baroque embroidery depicts the scene in which the Woman clothed with the Sun (similar to the devotional picture in the church) receives homage from King Matthias.

Bishop Lukács’s chapel in Szeged is of course no longer standing and only one tower of the medieval church of St Demetrius remains. The building survived the Turkish period, but was torn down in the middle of the 18th century. The bells from the chapel’s own small tower were transferred to the large tower of the Baroque church. The original copy of the foundation letter and one, rough ground plan (1711), as well as the local histories of Szeged by the likes of János Reizner and Sándor Bálint, preserve the memory of the chapel of Bishop Lukács.

By May 1501, when he founded the chapel in Szeged, Bishop Lukács had risen high in the Church ranks in Hungary. In 1493 he had been appointed to the modest post of bishop of Csanád (Cenad, RO), and prior to that he was bishop of...
On 15 April 1500 he was elected bishop of Zagreb (CR), although the pope only transferred him from Csanád to this much wealthier post in May of that year. His Church career—like that of many prelates during the period—began with service in the royal court, before he ascended the ranks. He entered the court of Matthias Corvinus as a clerk from Szeged, and following his job as *registrator*, he was a close assistant of Orbán Nagylucsei in financial management. From 1482 to 30 January 1494 he was the royal treasurer. One of his predecessors as treasurer, Osvát Thuz, was the bishop of Zagreb, and one of his under-treasurers, Zsigmond Wemeri, would have preceded him as bishop of Zagreb if he had not died soon after being chosen. Lukács's appointment as bishop of Zagreb did not terminate his service to the court. In 1502, following the tenure of Domonkos Kálmáncsehi, bishop of Gyulafehervár (Alba Iulia, RO), he briefly became head of the Royal Court of Justice. He owned a 1400 forint corner house in St Nicholas Street in Buda, which he secured in 1503 in exchange for a mass at the altar he had erected in the sanctuary of the cathedral of Zagreb. Like his predecessor, Osvát Thuz, he supported the construction of the early 16th-century Pauline monastery in Budapest, as proclaimed in Gergely Gyöngyösi’s history of the Order and a monumental inscription in verse.

Lukács Szegedi finished his schooling at home, but no records have survived of his university attendance. His career and his patronage of the arts— to be more precise his relationship with arts—might be considered completely ordinary if not for the several pieces made in all'antica style among the surviving works he commissioned in Zagreb. The most interesting and the largest—25 centimeters tall with the handles—is a Holy Water bucket (fig. 1). The bishop's coat of arms appears on it four times enclosed in a carved string of astragal, or a typical all'antica wreath. Among the Renaissance features, symbols of the four evangelists appear, with their names written on banners in early Humanist capitals. Historicizing features appear on the body of the bucket, such as the antique molding around the base of the vessel and the handles composed of Renaissance elements. The central part is divided with radiating ribs, a recurring pattern in Renaissance vessels from this period in Hungary (such as appears on the ciborium from the Kölesd or the Radna [RO] treasures, or the chalice with lid from Bogysízló, etc.). The difference, however, is significant: the ribs do not rise from the surface of the vessel, but rather form furrows reminiscent of tiered grooves. In the 1582 inventory of the cathedral the aspersgile ordered for the bucket bears the date 1496, although no clear proof exists that the two belonged together. No date appears on the Holy Water bucket and nor does any inscription that would aid in the dating; Lukács Szegedi would have been able to use the bishop's coat of arms beginning in 1490. The base and handle of the *pacificale*, also associated with bishop Lukács, are covered in all'antica moldings: egg and dart, bead molding, and leaves. A pectoral cross richly inlaid with rubies, sapphires, and pearls was recorded in the treasury of the Zagreb Cathedral from 1582. The 1582 inventory lists another four silver gilt.
candlestick holders\textsuperscript{19} and two silver altar-cruets,\textsuperscript{20} which, however, have been lost. His crosier (with the coat of arms), whose main features are Gothic in style, reveals classical proportions at the node.\textsuperscript{21} The mixing of styles in metal works was common in this period after 1500. The filigreed chalice of the canon of Zagreb, Johannes Supanich (Ivan Županić), for example was made in 1525,\textsuperscript{22} and some other filigreed chalices from the early 16th century, now housed in Nyitra (Nitra, SK) and Szepeshely (Spišská Kapitula, SK),\textsuperscript{23} could also be mentioned here. Each contains Late Gothic decorations with subtly incorporated all'antica elements. The blending of styles must have been especially characteristic in Zagreb: the decoration of the entire cathedral of Zagreb reflects the mixing of the Gothic and all'antica styles. In the 18th century, a portion of the extant choir stall in the cathedral's chapel of St Ladislas was almost certainly made in the all'antica style. Unfortunately only the inscription has survived: “INCLYTO VLADISLAO REGE, LVCA VERO PONTIFICE DIGNISSIMO, IOANNES DE MAROCHA ARCHIDICA[onus]. GORICENS[sis]. ET CAN[onicus]. HVIVS ALMAE ECCLESIAE, HVNC CHORVM DEO ET PATRIAIE PROPRIIS FECIT FIERI IMPENS. MDVII.” and “OPVS MAGISTRI IOANNIS NIČZE FLOREN[TIN]. MDVII.”\textsuperscript{24} Studies by Mihály Détshy showed that Johannes Nicze Fiorentinus may have worked in Buda, or at least the model of the Cathedral of Eger's choir stall was purchased from him there in 1506.\textsuperscript{25}
More has survived from the Renaissance choir stalls of the Zagreb cathedral, but with one exception, none bears any inscription or date. Earlier some were dated to 1499, the period of Osvát Thuz's tenure as bishop, but more recently they have been dated to 1507, the period when Johannes Nicze Fiorentinus worked in Zagreb, which is much more probable. Stylistically these stalls are not significantly different from the more famous three-seated stalls from the altar of St Emeric (with inscribed date) made in 1520, well after the death of Bishop Lukács. These gained some fame thanks to the inscription, which names not only the patron (Ladislas, canon of Zagreb) but the masters too. The text also includes the "arte et ingenio" formula, which was unprecedented in the area: "ARTE ET INGENIO | MAGISTRI PETRI | PICTORIS ET SCULPTOR[is] | NICOLAIQ[ue] CARPENTARIVS". More importantly, by this time it was natural to install an all'antica choir stall in the cathedral. The style of the 1520 Zagreb structure corresponds in several ways to the stalls in Nyírbátor made in 1511, and both are connected primarily to Italian stalls, or Italian works made in Hungary.

Bishop Lukács devoted a larger sum to the organ. In 1505—drawing on the sum left by Osvát Thuz to the cathedral—he paid eighty-five and a half forints "pro emendis tribus centenariis stanni et sedecim libris auri pro organo zagrabiensti per mag[istrum] Marcum fiando". The inscription of Bishop Martinus Bogdan also alludes to this in 1601.

The tombstone of Lukács Szegedi has survived only in fragments, but even in this form its quality is clear. What makes it exceptional is the signature on the work. Above the head of the figure are two details of an inscription: the first is fragmented, and all that can be discerned is that a certain "IOA[nnes]" was the craftsman, and his family name or place of origin ends with an "s". In other words, to the left was a name, while to the right was the formula "ME FECIT". The complete signature can be inferred as "IOA[nnes Fiorentinus] | ME FECIT", which would correspond to the signature of Ioannes Fiorentinus, who transported tombstones as far as Gniezno and Wloclawek and who was documented in Esztergom in 1515—1516. Of course Szegedi's fragmented tombstone bears no date. Croatian literature on the subject—perhaps with the exception of studies by Andela Horvat—dates the funerary monument to an earlier period, attributing it to Ivan Duknović (Giovanni Dalmata), in part because of his signature, in part based on stylistic analysis. (fig. 2)

From our perspective in Budapest, however, the signature and stylistic analysis appear to point to Esztergom. In early 2007, careful tests of the material showed definitively that the sepulchral monument, as had been suspected for some time, was made of red marble from the Gerecse Hills, and thus the place of execution could have been Esztergom or Buda. Furthermore, the type of the funerary monument offers no contradictory evidence. The tabula ansata under the leg of the figure had once been considered a specialty of Zagreb, since another example of it, the tombstone of Blasius de Marocha, also originates from there. Since then, a fragment of this kind has come to light in the Cathedral of Gyulafehérvár, from
this same time period. The sepulchral monument of Bálint Bakócz, provost of Titel and Buda also followed this arrangement at the end of the 15th century, although the place of origin cannot be determined at present. All of these are made of red marble from the Gerecse hills near Esztergom.

It is not known who had erected Bishop Lukács’s tombstone, as the inscription does not provide this information. Perhaps it was the bishop himself or the chapter. In any case, the tomb certainly stood at the altar of St Luke in the sanctuary of the cathedral on the epistle side. The fragments offer no evidence but descriptions tell us that the coat of arms at the right foot of the figure was made of bronze. The immediate successor, the archbishop of Esztergom, Tamás Bakócz, who headed the bishopric only briefly, is less likely to have made the tombstone. Certainly the inscription would have made ample mention of this. Bishop Lukács himself could have erected the altar, too. In 1550 Farkas (Vuk) Gyulai, the bishop of Zagreb, was buried in the cathedral “retro aram Luce episcopi, sub saxo marmoreo”.

As mentioned, no information exists on Bishop Lukács’s education and none on his bibliophilia either—although much of the material may have been destroyed. He had probably not been educated as a Humanist. György Bónis was right, when faced with the lack of surviving material, in emphasizing his church foundations. In the time of Bishop Lukács—at the end of the Middle Ages—as in other bishoprics in the Kingdom of Hungary, a large ritual book was compiled summarizing the local liturgical music tradition. According to the source, the chapter had Stephanus literatus prepare a richly ornamented antiphonal between 1501 and
3. Patrona Hungariae, woodcut in the Missale Zagabriense on the verso of the title page, 1511, Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár

1506. This was certainly related to the preparation of two printed ritual books for the diocese of Zagreb. The most important, the Missale Zagabriense, was published in Venice by Peter Liechtenstein only after Lukács's death on 20 June 1511, but his coat of arms (and that of the ruler, Wladislas II) adorns the title page. According to the inscription, work began on the book in 1509. Of the ritual books made for the dioceses of Hungary, this was the most richly illustrated with woodcuts (fig. 3). The verso of the title page contains a full-page Italian type santa conversazione depiction: the Patrona Hungariae in the company of the three Hungarian saint-kings.

The other liturgical document, the Breviarium Zagabriense, was also made in Venice, at the press of Luc'Antonio Giunta, somewhat earlier, in 1505. Paid for by
the Buda bookseller Johannes Paep, the volume contains a woodcut depicting the coronation of St Stephen, alongside the offices of the saint-king. Interestingly, only three copies of this little book are known. The most intact is in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. The other two have survived in the historical territory of Hungary: one in Pest and the other in the Franciscan library of Németújvár (Güssing, A). (fig. 4)

Copies of the Missale Zagribeanse—sometimes richly illuminated or bound in velvet—were highly esteemed by the 16th-century Hungarian prelates: the volumes belonging to Miklós Oláh, the archbishop of Esztergom; János Chereődi, bishop of Eger and apostolic administrator of Esztergom; János Kuthassy archbishop of Esztergom; and András Monoszlói bishop of Veszprém have survived
library contained a considerable collection of Italian manuscripts (two have survived today). His Psalter was illuminated by Master Cassianus and the master bookbinder of the Corvina Library bound it in gilt leather. Nothing is known of Lukács Szegedi’s personal love of books, only some goldsmith works he commissioned are known.

The other question relates to Zagreb’s special position. The city was close to Northern Italy, yet there is no doubt that all’antica style artistic works were connected to the bishops and to Buda, as was the case in other ecclesiastical sees in the Hungarian Kingdom from Esztergom, Pécs, and Vác to Veszprém, Nyitra or Nagyvárad (Oradea, R.O). The Missale of Osvát Thuz came from the Buda workshop of Franciscus de Castello, and the tombstone of Lukács Szegedi was almost certainly made in Esztergom. One of the choir stalls was signed by Ioannes Nicze Fiorentinus, who worked in Buda (too), while the unfinished Missale of the abbot of Topuszkó (Topusko, CR), either János Erdődy or Simon György Erdődy, was completed in Buda in the workshop of the so-called Monogramist of Bakócz. An exciting question is how the painter of the panel attributed to Giovanni Francesco da Tolmezzo found his way to Zagreb and what his subsequent destination was. Similarly interesting is what connections brought stone carvers from Zara (Zadar) and Spalato (Split), or Giovanni Dalmata (Ivan Duknović) of Traù (Trogir) and much later, at the end of the Jagiello period, Giulio Clovio (Julije Clović) to Buda. Did the bishops of Zagreb or the canons have a role, or were they too just beneficiaries of the existing associations? Only new, as yet unknown archival sources would provide answers to these questions. One thing is beyond dispute, however: the Kingdom of Hungary—especially Buda—played an independent role in the expansion of the Italian Renaissance beyond the Alps not only in the last third of the 15th century, but in the early 16th century, too, and Zagreb should certainly be considered a possible stop along this route.
Notes

1 S. Bálint, Szeged városa, Budapest 1959, 12, fig. 4.


3 Bálint (n. 1 above), 28–31.


5 Reizner (n. 2 above), vol. III., Szeged 1900, 7.


7 Juhász (n. 2 above), 81/12, 82/29.


10 Ibid, 47–48, 52.


16 See Riznica... (n. 14 above), 177, Cat. No. 17M.

17 Ibid, 177, Cat. No. 18M; Dobronić (n. 14 above), 66, 70.

18 See Riznica... (n. 14 above), 178, Cat. No. 20M; I. Kampus–I. Karaman, Das tausendjährige Zagreb, Zagreb 1978, 66; Dobronić (n. 14 above), 71.

19 Ibid, 71.

20 Ibid, 72.

21 See Riznica... (n. 14 above), 41, 148, 178 (19M); Czobor (n. 14 above), 70, figs. 47–48 (as the crosier of Osvát Thuz); I. K. Tkalič, Prvostolna crkva Zagrebačka, Zagreb 1885, 119; Pulszky–Radisics (n. 14 above), 47–48, with photos; Ötvösműkiállítás... (n. 14 above), 93, no. 82. (as the crosier of Osvát Thuz); Dobronić (n. 14 above ), 66–67; Pelc (n. 14 above), 437–41.

22 See Riznica... (n. 14 above), 189, Cat. No. 43M; Pelc (n. 14 above), 440–41; Here I would like to thank Milan Pelc for keeping me apprised of the latest Croatian literature.

23 E. Toranová, Goldschmiedekunst in der Slowakei, Bratislava 1983, 194, no. 85, 195, no. 92; E. Wetter, “Neskorogotické zlatníctvo. Úvahy o remeselných a umelcko-geografických


26 Dobronić (n. 14 above), 46–53.

27 Pelc (n. 14 above), 401–03.

28 Zlinszky-Sternegg (n. 25 above), 31.

29 Dobronic (n. 14 above), 46–53.

30 Pelc (n. 14 above), 401–03.

31 Dobronic (n. 14 above), 46–53.
the direction of G. Borsa, Budapest 1996, 263. (Appendix. A budai könyvárusok kiadványai, 1480–1525, no. 21.)


47 Budapest, Országos Szechenyi Könyvtár, Regi Nyomtatványok Tára, stamped: RMK III 176; See Miko (n. 32 above), 193. This was presumably the book left by András Monoszló to the chapter of Pozsony (Bratislava, SK), see Magyarországi magánkönyvtárak, vol. I., 1533–1657, ed. A. Varga, Budapest–Szeged 1986, 90. The above database identified 17 volumes from the library of Monoszló. This Missale Zagabiense, however, was not registered. Similarly, it does not contain the Livius volume either (Ab urbe condita libri XXXV. Patavii 1576[?]), which I saw on 25 May 1992 in the window of a second-hand bookshop (no longer in business) on Váci street, Budapest. On the tombstone of András Monoszló, with his biography and literature, see A. Miko–G. Pálffy, “A pozsonyi Szent Mártón-templom késő reneszánsz és kora barokk sírelmélei (16–17. század),” Művészettörténeti Értesítő I, 2002, 143–44, fig. 21.


52 E. Hoffmann, Régi magyar bibliófilek, Budapest 1929, 120–21.

53 Interestingly, when the breviary of the diocese of Zagreb was published in 1484 with the carefully edited text “ad aeternam memoriam,” the foreword contained no mention of the national significance of the affair. Reference to this is found, however, in the Breviarium Strigoniense of 1480. A. Tarnai, „A magyar nyelvet imi kezdik”. Irodalmi gondolkodás a középkori Magyarországon, Budapest 1984, 75–77.


55 Whether Lukács Szegedi spent time in Italy is a big question which raises the issue of what forms his name appeared in. Samu Borovszky tentatively identified him with Lukács Baratin, who joined the Society of the Holy Ghost in Rome (S. Borovszky, “Szegedi Baratin Lukács zágrábi püspök, 1500–1510,” Századok 34, 1900, 831–34). This proposal was later accepted by many. Sándor Bálnat linked all the Baratins of Szeged to this: Márton Baratin attended the university of Vienna (S. Bálnat, Szeged reneszánsz kon műveltsége, Budapest 1975, 44, 80). Croatian literature for a long time referred to him as Luca Baratin (and thus A. Horvat and D. Vukičević-Samaržija, too); most recently M. Pelc discussed him as Lukács Szegedi (Pelc [n. 14 above], 537); while András Kubinyi rejected any identification with Lukács Baratin, see (n. 9 above), 41, n. 96–101. The bishop himself signed his name Luca de Zegea, see Bónis (n. 11 above), 232, n. 69.


The proposition of Netherlandish influence on painting in the Szepesség region almost certainly first arose in a book by Kornél Divald, who linked the St Michael altarpiece in Szepeshely (Spišská Kapitula, SK) to works by Memling. Laszló Éber disagreed and connected the work with Rogier van der Weyden’s altarpiece in Beaune, and considered it an imported piece. His opinion was fiercely rejected by István Genthon, who regarded the St Michael panel as the work of a Hungarian painter, clearly with the intermediation of a woodcut or engraving. In his article on panel painting in Szepeshely, Dénes Csányky took up the possibility of Netherlandish influence on the same altarpiece, but not a direct one; he saw it as an irradiation from the style of Hans Pleydenwurff, who worked in Nuremberg and the even closer Breslau (Wrocław) in Silesia. Erich Wiese proposed Netherlandish sources in general for the Szepeshely panels, particularly the altar panels of the Coronation of the Virgin. Vladimir Wagner mentioned Netherlandish style elements in a discussion of the Master of Okolicsnó (Okoličné, SK). Csányky linked a specific painter, Joachim Patinir, to the style of the St John panel in Kassa (Košice, SK); the idea was taken up in a paper by Henrik Horváth, and later Dušan Buran also mentioned Patinir in connection with the Anna altarpiece in Szepesszombat (Spišská Sobota, SK). Jolán Balogh suggested an investigation of Netherlandish style origins for the panels of the main altar, but Robert Suckale limited this to transmission from Vienna and Breslau.

Dénes Radocsay’s review mentions the phenomenon briefly but affirmatively, particularly when discussing the Szepeshely altarpieces. Radocsay also proposed the name of a northern Netherlandish master, Albert van Ouwater, for the Mary altarpiece in Liptószentmiklós (Liptovský Mikuláš, SK). Zsuzsa Urbach’s list of potential Netherlandish connections in late 15th-century Hungarian art—overwhelmingly compositional and iconographical adoptions—was more extensive than anything that had gone before. Gyöngyi Török took up the issue again, taking the inferences of the foregoing papers further, and adding some of her own.

This paper sets out to extend the investigations to a later period, the first two decades of the 16th century, examining one specific group of paintings from the Szepesség. These have long been held to be the work of the Master of the St
Anthony altarpieces, or the Master of the St Anthony Legend,12 or that of his studio, but there is as yet no general consensus on the attribution.13 In general, the altarpiece in Szepesszombat14 (fig. 1) and the separated panels of the St Anthony altarpieces in Szepesbélá (Spišská Belá, SK) are traced to him or his associates,15 as are the inner panels of the St Nicholas altarpiece in Nagyszalók (Vel'ký Slavkov, SK),16 the pictures of the Triptych of St Margaret in Malompatak (Mlynica, SK),17 and the St John the Almsgiver altarpiece (earlier known as the St Nicholas altarpiece) in Lőcse (Levoča, SK),18 a predella with Adoration of the Magi-scenes19 taken out of its original context, the images of the high altar20 and the altarpiece of four St Johns pictures at the same place,21 panels of the Latin Doctors’ altarpiece22 in Kisszeben (Sabinov, SK), the outer panels of the Triptych of St Stephen and Stanislas (or Valentin)23 in the same place, the main altarpiece panels in Káposztálfalva (Hrabušice, SK),24 Szepesszombat25 (fig. 2), and Hizsnyó (Chyžne, SK),26 and sometimes the St John panel27 (fig. 3) and the Visitation altarpiece in Kassa are also attributed to him or his circle.28 (Netherlandish influence has several times been proposed in discussions of the Master of Okolicsnó, in most detail by Jiří Fajt.29 Here, however, he will only be given a brief mention.)

Most of these panels distinctively feature slim or indeed gracile figures (although the hypothesised oeuvre is quite heterogeneous, and the high altar in Szepesszombat, for example, is an exception) situated in a warm, light, sunlit landscape. There are usually rolling hills on the high horizon, on some of which there are somewhat bizarre, sharp-edged cliffs.30 Despite their ubiquity (except in rare cases where the subject matter does not permit), the presence of these landscapes is never over-emphasized. Their modest role
2. The Torture of St George on the high altar in Szepesszombat (Spišska Sobota, SK)

is to give a festive and appealing framework for the actions of the people. This is true even for such images as the hermits on the St Anthony the Great altarpiece in Szepesszombat, whom legend places in the Egyptian wilderness, but hardly seem to be languishing in a desert here. The "empty wilderness" means no more than the principal figures being almost entirely alone. Elsewhere, forest animals emerging from among trees convey the purity of nature, although there are quite often towns or castles in the background, in small scale. The landscape is occupied by
groups of people showing little movement, as if not wanting to break the silence, standing somewhat closer together than might seem necessary. They are no more animated even in events which might be described as dramatic, and appear side by side rather than engaging with each other. The posture of the figures is correspondingly hieratic and rigid.32
Those who see in this unusually prominent representation of nature the influence of the Danube School are certainly wide of the mark. The masters of that school specialised in lush, uninhabited forests; gnarled, sprawling tree trunks; and Alpine peaks suggesting distant views. The “forests” here might rather be termed groves, consisting of one or two stands of “trees” which are generally slightly-overlapping bushes, although some are so high that their silhouette reaches to the edge of the sky, in which case their foliage is thinned down for the sake of decorativeness, each branch and leaf being distinguishable. (The leaves are sometimes alternately green and yellow, giving rise to a lace- or embroidery-like decoration.) The sky is always brilliant blue. The depiction of clouds, very rare in Central Europe, is very common on the works under study; scattered in some, such as in the St John panel of Kassa, but denser in others, such as in the the St Anthony the Great of Szepesszombat, arranged almost in a grid-like pattern; and reduced to only one or two in yet others, such as the main altarpiece in Malompatak. These charming, somewhat uniform little cumuli, each having a horizontal projection at the base (as if they have just floated on) arouse most interest among Slovak art historians, who sometimes refer to the painter himself as the Master of the Scattered Clouds.

Fitting in harmoniously with the gentle, contemplative mood of the natural surroundings, there are figures with small, rounded heads. The women are exclusively of this kind, and have strikingly small eyes; the men often have slanting eyes and truly Mongol-like high cheekbones. Almost all the men have large noses, and their eyes—especially among the elderly—are tired, feeble, sometimes with bags under them. (For women and young people only the tips of their noses are slightly more distinctive.)

4. Master of the Youth of St Romuald: St Romuald Healing a Blind Man, Mechelen Cathedral (Copyright IRPA-KIK Brussels)
These Morellian forms occur rarely in the painting of the direct neighbourhood (Austria, Bohemia, Poland), so the influence could hardly have come from there, but these characteristics can often be found among the Netherlandish masters. The logic of the depiction of landscapes also fully corresponds to what we see in Netherlandish painting. Their paradisiacal serenity can be traced from the van Eyck brothers, and the curious cliffs occur in an even older picture, the Birth of Jesus by the Master of Flémalle. The same kind of landscape continues to appear right through early Netherlandish painting and persists even into the late phase with its Mannerist tendencies. The finest examples of the combination of sunlit serenity, sharply-rising cliffs, alternating dark and light tree-leaves, and tree silhouettes rising above the horizon can be found in the paintings by Hans Memling and Gerard David. Both the wooded landscapes and the figures placed in them on the Szepesség paintings show striking similarities to pictures by some lesser-known late 15th-century Netherlandish artists. One of them is a painter from Bruges known as the Master of the Youth of St Romuald (Rumbald, Rombout), associated with the Master of the Legend of St Lucy (fig. 4). Groups of figures of the kind we are interested in—standing straight and slightly stiff in the landscape—are to be seen in paintings by artists close to Geertgen, most notably by the Master of the St John Altarpiece (Dutch master about 1490). Netherlandish forest landscapes also sometimes feature very high horizons, and the trees can be more like large bushes joined to each other. A fine example of a hermit in a wilderness which is only ostensibly uninhabited is Geerten tot Sint Jans’ St John the Baptist in the Wilderness. Behind the protagonist there is even a small-scale castle. Of particular significance to us is how commonly another Bruges painter—a member of Gerard David’s circle, the Master of the Madonnas with the Chubby Cheeks—used similar features on some of his pictures, most prominently on his Madonna and Saints in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (fig. 5). The round heads of the young women and their dreamy facial expressions can be traced to Flemish pictures, where they had been present since the works of Jan van Eyck. Closer examples can only be found again on panels by Memling or David, or those of an artist whose name refers to them, the Master of the Madonnas with the Chubby Cheeks (where even the forms of the noses are frequently the same as those mentioned above). The slightly slanted, tired-looking eyes and strong noses of the elderly men can also be found among painters in this circle, namely Bouts, Geertgen and even David, and by lesser artists such as the Master of the Legend of St Catherine. Clouds are a feature used much more commonly by Netherlandish artists—from Dieric Bouts to Hieronymus Bosch—than any others, and some of the minor masters painted their clouds very similarly to those on our Szepesség panels. Clouds in the paintings of the Master of the Youth of St Romuald, and others by the Master of the Legend of St Barbara, the Master of the Legend of St Lucy, the Master of the St John altarpiece and the Master of the Khanenko Adoration are good examples of these.

It is notable that in German lands this influence, certainly where it involves the full combination of components occurring here, is manifest only where we know
5. Master of the Madonnas with the Chubby Cheeks: *Madonna and Saints*. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Bequest of George Blumenthal, 1941 (41.190.18)
(Image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art)

of a direct and strong Netherlandish influence, primarily in the Rhine country, for example in the works of Schongauer and Derick Baegert. In the areas closest to Szepesség—according to reliable surveys and data derived from them in special studies—only one component of them has been found to have exerted an influence at any one time.

These small but well-composed groups of serene, hardly-moving figures, with bright outlines and proportions perfectly suited to the action being performed, bring to mind the Coronation of the Virgin altarpiece in Szepeshely. According to the unanimous findings of research on the subject, it must have been in the studio to which the painter of that altarpiece belonged where the feature in question developed in the late 15th century. A more thorough study of the Szepesség and Netherlandish pictures, however, prompts some modification of this conclusion. The mode of execution—the number of figures, their body proportions, face shapes, and the preference for free, wooded, rolling landscapes (relatively modern landscapes which had only appeared at the turn of the century) rather than puritanical interiors—suggest that the artist, even if originally trained in Szepeshely, must have personally travelled to the source of the style, almost certainly to Bruges, and studied works by Hans Memling (who died in 1494), Gerard David.
(who lived until 1523) and several other painters influenced by them. Since he adopted only compositions and motifs rather than a whole style of painting, he must have made this visit late in his career. That explains why his style, brushwork and colour compositions did not change from the visit, and possibly why we can only follow his work for a decade and a half.

In the previous paragraph, the artist is referred to in the singular, given the unlikelihood that more than one person from Szepesség would have gone on the great journey at once. There are clear discrepancies between the panels examined, however, and detailed studies have often suggested that one altarpiece or another could not have been the work of the same hand. To distinguish these, and elucidate the structure of the studio and the relationship between the master (who supposedly went to the Netherlands) and his associates, will require further work.
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46 Master of the Legend of St Ursula: Legend of St Ursula: Scenes before the Walls of Rome, see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 6., 113; Master of the Legend of St Ursula: Virgin and Child with St John the Baptist (Kunsthalle, Hamburg), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 6., 128; Master of the Turin Adoration: Adoration of the Magi (Galleria Sabauda, Turin), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 6., Supp. 250; Geertgen: The Lamentation (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 5., 6.

47 Gemäldegalerie der Staatlichen Museen, Berlin, see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 5., 12.

48 Some major artists who used similar features: Master of the Virgin among Virgins: Entombment (City Art Museum, St Louis, Miss.), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 5., Supp. 126; Master of the Morrison Triptych: centrepiece of the Morrison Triptych (Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 7., 8; Master of the Legend of St Lucy: Virgin and Child with Saints (Musées Royaux des Beaux–Arts de Belgique, Brussels), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 6., 155; St Jerome (Bearsted Collection, Banbury), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 6., Supp. 241; Master of the Legend of St Barbara: Christ on the Cross, Votive Panel (Gemäldegalerie der Staatlichen Museen, Berlin), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 4., Supp. 114.


50 A relevant Memling work is the Altarpiece of the Virgin Enthroned with Saints and Angels, see Friedländer (n. 41 above), vol. 6., 11; a David work is the Altarpiece of the Nativity (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 6., 160; The Master of the Madonnas with the Chubby Cheeks pictures, see Martens (n. 49 above, 2000–01). Similar features: some Madonnas of the Master of the Legend of St Madeleine, see Friedländer (n. 41 above), vol. 12., 8, 19, 20; Master of the Legend of St Lucy: Legend of St Lucy (St-Jakobskerk, Brugge), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 6., 39 etc.
51 Dieric Bouts: *Altarpiece of the Eucharist* (St-Pieterskerk, Leuven), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 3., 18; Dieric Bouts: *Triptych of the Adoration of the Magi* or *The Pearl of Brabant* (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 3., 24. For Geertgen, see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 5; Master of the Legend of St Catherine: *Triptych with the Feeding of the Ten Thousand* (National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 4., 49; David: *Adoration of the Magi* (National Gallery, London), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 6., 182.

52 Dieric Bouts: *Altarpiece of the Virgin* (Prado, Madrid), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 3., 1; Dieric Bouts: *Triptych of the Descent of the Cross* (Capilla Real, Granada), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 3., 28; Joos van Ghent: *Altarpiece of the Crucifixion* (Cathedral, Gent—note that here a strip projects from the bottom edge of the clouds), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 3., 100; Hugo van Goes: *Portinari altarpiece* (Uffizi, Florence), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 4., 10; Hugo van Goes: *Virgin and Child with St Anne* (Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts, Brussels), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 4., 2; Hieronymus Bosch: *Temptation of St Anthony* (Gemäldegalerie der Staatlichen Museen, Berlin), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 5., 94.

53 *St Romuald Healing a Blind Man* (Cathedral, Mechelen), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 4., 106.

54 *Henry II Fighting the Infidels* (Landesmuseum, Münster), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 4., 63.

55 *Virgin and Child* (Stirling and Francis Clark Institute, Williamstown, Mass.), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 6., 149.

56 *Christ Meeting St John the Baptist* (John G. Johnson Collection, Philadelphia), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 5., 37.

57 *Virgin and Child* (Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart), see idem (n. 41 above), vol. 4., 46 (here a strip projects from the cloud)

58 Schongauer: *Nativity* (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), see A. Stange, *Deutsche Malerei der Gotik* (vols. 1–11., Munich–Berlin 1934–61), vol. 7., 21, fig. 26; on several works by Derick Baegert, e.g. *Crucifixion* (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), see idem (as above), vol. 6., 61, fig. 103; *The Holy Kinship* (Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerpen), see idem (as above), vol. 6., 59, fig. 104; *Christ Carrying the Cross* (Landesmuseum, Münster), see idem (as above), vol. 6., 60, fig. 108.


60 Radocsay (n. 7 above), 123–25, 442–43, pls. CX–CXXXIII; Török (n. 10 above), 94; Glatz (n. 13 above), 56–57; Fajt proposes a nearby studio, but does not say what was made there, see Fajt (n. 4 above), 418–19. For the finest reproductions of the altarpiece images, see M. Spoločníková, *Korunovanie Panny Márie. Oltár v Zápol’škého kaplnke v Spišské Kapitule*, Košice 1997 (does not take a position on the question of Netherlandish influence). Most recently, in agreement with what has gone before, see I. Ciulisová, “Obraz Judasov bozk z retabula oltára Korunovanie Panny Márie v Spišské Kapitule. Možne odpovede na niektore otázky súvekej vizuálnej praxe,” *Ars* 37, 2004, 137–55.

61 This seems probable even though research finds only indirect Netherlandish influence on the proposed artist, the painter of the Coronation of the Virgin altarpiece in Szepeshely. See notes 3–9 above, and also Ciulisová (n. 60 above), 142–43. An Austrian investigator of the Netherlandish influence has proposed that only Schottenmeister actually went there; the others must have been inspired by imported pieces: see Simon (n. 59 above), 14.
Gyöngyi Török

UNKNOWN EARLY 16TH-CENTURY
VIR DOLORUM ALTARPIECE
IN THE HUNGARIAN NATIONAL GALLERY

This publication is a by-product of the work made on the complete catalogue of panel paintings, wood carvings, and winged altarpieces (14th–16th century) from the territory of the Hungarian Kingdom in the collection of the Hungarian National Gallery (Magyar Nemzeti Galéria) Budapest.

Until 1973 the Old Hungarian Collection was held in the Museum of Fine Arts (Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest). In 1967, an altar shrine of unknown provenance with three fixed wood-carvings—Man of Sorrows (Vir dolorum) flanked by St John the Evangelist and the Virgin Mary—were taken over there from the Museum of Ethnography (Néprajzi Múzeum, Budapest).¹ The acquisition followed the restoration of the shrine and its sculptures in the Department of Restoration at the Academy of Fine Arts under Professor Nándor Kapos between 1964 and 1966.² Dénes Radocsay, in his 1967 corpus of wood sculptures of medieval Hungary, dated the shrine with the carvings of unknown provenance, to between 1510 and 1530, and noted that the other parts of the altarpiece had been lost.³

In 1999, there was an exchange of art works between the Museum of Ethnography and the Hungarian National Gallery. The latter took possession of two altar wings of around 1500, painted on both sides, from an unknown provenance in Upper Hungary.⁴ The paintings do not appear in Radocsay’s corpus of panel paintings of Medieval Hungary.⁵ In 2006, restorers Margit Borgulya Eisenmayer and Szilvia Hernády Menrath assessed the condition of the shrine with the wood-carvings and the two altar wings in the museum storage for the catalogue. Their observations clearly implied that the pieces are part of the same altarpiece (figs. 1–3).⁶ By assembling the shrine and the wings, inventoried in the Museum of Ethnography and transferred to the Hungarian National Gallery at very different dates and kept in both museums separately, we could reconstruct a sacral entity almost fully (lacking the superstructure and the predella). The meaning of the paintings and the wood-carvings have been greatly enriched in cross-reference to one another.

The lower part of the shrine was found to have been cut off, probably because of rot due to water ingress. The missing strip, about 7 cm high, which was also the
base of the sculptures, must have been filled with ornamental carving. The hinge marks on the wings and on the shrine clearly indicate the places of the left and right wings. The shrine and the wings show the same background pattern motifs, and the same modelling and surface treatment: on the bolus ground there is an engraved brocade pattern covered with silver plates and gold lustre. The frames were later given a blue, marble-like painted finish; this can be seen on the bottom board of the shrine and on the frames of the wings as well.

The entire altarpiece is in a very bad condition. The back of the shrine is decorated by the remains of pale red ornamental tendrils. The azurite-painted inner surface on the upper part of the shrine may originally have been covered by carved tracery. The brocade curtain, with a pattern painted on red bolus ground, was originally covered with silver plates, of which only the oxidised remains are visible. The top trimming of the curtain is a border imitating gems, and at the bottom the remains of painted green fringes are visible. The forms of the three sculptures are simplified, even coarse in places, but no doubt presented a finer appearance with their original priming and polychromy. This is backed up by the traces of finely-executed surface treatment.7

A stylistic appraisal of the paintings is hampered by their poor condition. Test strips show that the wings were given a complete Baroque overhaul, which extended to all of the draperies, and to parts of faces, hands, hair and the modelled surface of the pattern. It is obvious that the panel paintings were already damaged by the Baroque Era, since some of the repainting was applied directly to the wood in places where the priming and paint had detached. Behind the saints is a richly modelled pattern identical to that on the inside of the shrine, and underneath both there is the part of the canvas glued on the wood. On the outer side of the panels

1. *Vir dolorum* altarpiece, unknown provenance, early 16th century.
   Budapest, Hungarian National Gallery
2. Interior paintings of the wings of the *Vir dolorum* altarpiece

there are the original wooden reinforcing bands. The image field fills the surface between the two bands, and in glancing light, semicircular traces of once applied carving can be recognized on the upper part.

The infrared reflectography shows thorough, freely-designed underdrawing throughout the paintings. It is executed with only the usual minor deviations from these except for St Damien who in the underdrawing holds an enormous shovel-like attribute in his right hand instead of a spatula, and the painter has corrected this (fig. 4).

On the inside of the left wing in the centre there is the standing figure of Pope St Gregory the Great, who is accounted the fourth of the great Latin doctors of the Church, holding a double cross and a book, and wearing a tiara and a red
cloak. Behind him to the right and left there are two bishop saints with croziers in their hands; they might be two other church fathers, St Ambrose and St Augustine respectively. The fourth church father, St Jerome, wearing a cardinal’s hat, stands on the left in the second row. Beside him St Bernardine of Siena is visible wearing a tonsure and a Franciscan monk’s habit, and holding the disk with the radiating monogram of Christ. On the outside of the left wing there is the standing figure of the physician St Damien, with medicinal vessel and spatula.

On the inside of the right wing in the centre St Peter stands in a red cloak, holding a key. To his left, judging from the face type, is probably St Paul the Apostle, and to his right St Bartholomew, with a knife in his hand. In the back row, to the right, wearing a hat with a cockle-shell, a pilgrim’s symbol, holding a stick, the bearded apostle St James the Greater can be seen, and to his left St James the Less, a relative of Jesus, with a youthful face, together with the symbol of his martyrdom, a club. The outer side of the panel shows St Cosmas, holding in his hand a glass urological vessel.

In its closed state, the altarpiece presented to the congregation the figures of the two physician-saints Cosmas and Damien, facing each other. They were the first two oriental saints to be invoked in the canon of the Roman mass. Inside, on the opened wings, the Apostles on the right represent one of the sources of the Revelation, while the Western Fathers of the Church on the left, stand for the

3. Sts Cosmas and Damien on the outside of the wings of the *Vir dolorum* altarpiece
interpreters of the holy tradition. The figure of St Bernardine of Siena with the disk, bearing the monogram of Christ (IHS), surrounded by rays, is related to the sculpture of the Man of Sorrows in the shrine, but may also allude to a Franciscan connection. Many representations of the saint are known in Upper Hungary, Little Poland and Moravia from after St John Capistran’s 1451 papal mission against the Hussites. On the small altar of the Man of Sorrows in Hervartó (Hervartov, SK), in 1514, the sole figure of the saint on the left wing of the altar framed the former *Vir dolorum* carving of the shrine. Angels holding symbols of the passion also allude to the latter.

The iconography of the paintings of the altarpiece, with representations of the heralds of Salvation, corresponds with the message of the shrine, with the Man of Sorrows in the centre. It was undoubtedly a man of the church who determined the altar’s iconographic programme.

The representation of the Man of Sorrows (*Vir dolorum, Imago Pietatis*) became widespread outside the context of representations of the passion narrative, as “Mystisches Andachtsbild”. It appeared on altarpieces first and most frequently on predella paintings and sculptures, between Mary and John, and was also common
5. *Vir dolorum*, unknown provenance, early 16th century, Budapest, Museum of Etnography

as a superstructure carving. These two locations made the Man of Sorrows permanently visible during the mass, even when the wings were closed.\(^{13}\)

Representations of the *Imago Pietatis* became widespread based on the vision of the Mass of St Gregory.\(^{14}\) On the left wing of the altarpiece in the National Gallery, the central positioning of St Gregory may be related with the sculpture in the shrine. The *Vir dolorum* placed between the Virgin Mary and St John the Evangelist in an altar shrine became more frequent in the last third of the 15th century. Its finest and largest example in Hungary is in the *Vir dolorum* altarpiece of Lőcse (Levoča, SK), of around 1480.\(^{15}\) In this context, the *Vir dolorum*, the timeless embodiment of the sufferings of Christ, is not to be interpreted as an “Andachtsbild”,
but as the standard expression of Misericordia, mercifulness, intercession for the faithful, as in epitaphs. Placing him in the company of the grieving Mary and John does not return the image to the category of narrative representations of the passion, but brings suffering closer to human feelings.  

The figure of Christ of the present altarpiece, bleeding and wearing a crown of thorns, points with his right hand to the wound in his side and makes a blessing gesture with his left. The turning of his head to the left intensifies the expression of profound pain. Gert von der Osten calls this type “Der wundzeigende Fürbittschmerzensmann”, and one of its finest examples is a sculpture by Hans Multscher in Ulm Cathedral, also flanked by Mary and John. 

The compact proportions, the inclination of the head to one side and some aspects of vernacular provincialism suggests an affinity to an early 16th-century Man of Sorrows figure held in the Museum of Ethnography in Budapest (Inv. No. 68.120.101, fig. 5). This sculpture is marked “Gergelylaka” (Gregorovce, SK) in the County of Sáros and “Bártfai Múzeum” (Museum of Bártfa [Bardejov, SK]) on its back. Although the execution of the hair and beard of this carving shows the distant influence of the art of Pál Lócsai, which is absent from the figure in the Hungarian National Gallery, it still offers some help in localising the altarpiece. The sculptures of the altar shrine in Bertót (Bertotovce, SK) in Sáros County, also show some relationship with the wood-carvings discussed here, and the shrine’s gold engraved brocade pattern in the background must have been made in the same workshop. It was common for the painter and the wood-carver working on altarpieces in Sáros County to be artists of different levels. In our case, the painter seems to have been more experienced. Overall, our knowledge of the art of Sáros County altarpieces in early 16th-century Hungary has been enriched by a hitherto unknown work of art.

Notes
1 The material of the altar shrine is spruce (Picea spec.), and of the sculptures, lime wood (Tilia spec.). The woods were kindly determined by Peter Klein (Hamburg). The shrine has a painted ground and engraved brocade pattern. Its dimensions are 142 x 140.5 cm, Inv. No. 67.1.1.M. The carvings are primed and polychromed, much of the paint layers are missing. The sculptures: Man of Sorrows, 97 x 35 x 20 cm, Inv. No. 67.1.2. M; Virgin Mary, 93 x 22 x 12 cm, Inv. No. 67.1.3. M; St John the Evangelist, 91.5 x 29.5 x 15 cm, Inv. No. 67.1.4.M. Transfer file number: 155/966.
2 The sculptures of the Virgin Mary and the Man of Sorrows have been restored by Margit Forgó, and the St John the Evangelist by Margit Borgulya Eisenmayer. On 14 October 1964, the shrine with the carvings were handed over to the Academy of Fine Arts (Képzőművészeti Egyetem) for restoration by Tibor Bodrogi, Director of the Museum of Ethnography. They were subsequently transferred to the inventory of the Museum of Fine Arts by the Ministry of Culture’s Department of Museums under order no. 66294/66. Prof. Nándor Kapos was instructed to transfer the shrine with sculptures directly to the Museum of Fine Arts immediately after completing the restoration.
According to information from Tibor Bodrogi, the shrine’s inventory number got lost, and its provenance was unknown. See letters from Tibor Bodrogi to Klára Garas and Nándor Kapos, ref. no. 120-08-1966, dated 7 and 10 February 1966 respectively. In a letter of 15 February 1966 (ref. no. 155/1966), Klára Garas, Director of the Museum of Fine Arts, expressed her thanks to Tibor Bodrogi for releasing the medieval altar shrine with the sculptures and noted that after the restoration she would receive them and have them entered into the inventory of the Old Hungarian Collection. I am grateful to Éva Szacsvay and Zsuzsa Tasnádi of the Museum of Ethnography for providing me with this information.

3 D. Radocsay, *A középkori Magyarország fasszobrai*, Budapest 1967, 175. (no photograph of this piece)

4 Both altar wings are made of spruce (*Picea spec.*). Panel painted on both sides (right altar wing): 148 × 69 cm, Inv. No. 99.1. M; Panel painted on both sides (left altar wing): 147.5 × 69 cm, Inv. No. 99.2.M. Transfer file number: 863-844/98, with erroneous Museum of Ethnography inventory number. On the edge of the right wing is the correct Museum of Ethnography inventory number: 81.79.161. According to information from Éva Szacsvay and Zsuzsa Tasnádi, the wings were entered into the inventory in 1981 together with 252 other items involved in a reorganisation of the storages. Their provenance in Bárta (Bardejov, SK) was proposed on the basis of oral tradition, and is not backed up by documentary evidence. Neither do they appear among Kornél Divald’s collections. The Hungarian National Gallery (Magyar Nemzeti Galéria) obtained “two altar wings from upper Hungary” in exchange for a small statue of Jesus from Prague (wood, polychromed, 36 cm, Magyar Nemzeti Galéria Inv. No. 52.568), an item “related to popular religion, belonging to the sphere of collection of a different museum,” under Ministry of the National Cultural Heritage permit number K-967/Múz-434/98.


6 Documentation in the Hungarian National Gallery, Old Hungarian Department. It was the restorer József Lakatos who first noticed that the wings belonged to the altar shrine.

7 One of the three sculptures, St John, is slightly hollowed out at the back, probably because of a longitudinal exostosis of the wood. There is a plug filling up a hole in the head of each sculpture, and the mark of a two prong iron on the base. The lining of the cloaks of Mary, Christ and John were at one time coated with azurite, but there are traces of refurbishment of the same colour as the blue repainting of the shrine. Christ’s loincloth and John’s clothes have the same colouring: bolus-silver-gold lustre. Christ’s green crown of thorns is roughly carved, and the thorns were represented by nails, all now broken off and lost. There is a 2.5–3 centimetres wide strip along the edge of the cloaks, a decorative motif, made with a sculptor’s chisel, worked in the same way as certain elements of the background pattern. The flesh colours are very light pinks. On Christ’s body, on the forehead, around the nail marks, the streams of blood are represented in stronger red. Traces of paint show that the convex bases must have been green.


9 On the apostles, see ibid, vol. 1., cols. 150–73.

10 On Sts Cosmas and Damien, see ibid, vol. 7., 344–52. The infrared reflectography of St Damien was kindly made by Zoltán Zsupos.

11 Representations of St Bernardine of Siena from around 1453 in the territory of Szepesség (Spiš) and Little Poland, the altarpieces in Matejovce (Matejovce, SK) and Lopuszna, the little panel painting with the Crucifix of Korzena and an altarpiece in Grybów destroyed by fire in 1945 follow the early, portrait-like, ascetic type in almost identical ways. These representations are connected with the cult of St Bernardine of Siena which spread from Kraków, where St John


In Hungary one of the finest examples of the situation of a half-figure Vir dolorum, Mary and John as a predella carving is in the St Anne altarpiece in Leibic (L'ubica, SK), around 1510–1520. A Vir dolorum as a carving in the superstructure stood on the High Altar at Kisszeben (Sabinov, SK), of around 1490. See Török (n. 11 above, 2005), 15, 78. The man of Sorrows occurs as a central figure in an altar shrine in the High Altar in Pulkau, Lower Austria, about 1515, in the Church of the Holy Blood. See R. Kahnsnit, Carved Splendor. Late Gothic Altarpieces in Southern Germany, Austria and South Tirol, Los Angeles 2006, 342–44.


14 Lőcse, St James Parish Church. Vir dolorum altarpiece, see Radocsay (n. 3 above), 192–93; J. Homolka–T. Honyt, Gotická plastika na Slovensku, Bratislava 1972, figs. 105–11. On the occurrence of the three figures in the altar shrine, see also the Szepesdaróc (Sipské Dravce, SK) altarpiece of around 1470–1480. See Radocsay (n. 3 above), 214; D. Radocsay, "Ismeretlen és elfelejtett középkori magyarországi fászobrok," Művészettörténeti Értesítő IX, 1960, 1–16, fig. 1. One of the finest examples of stone sculpture is on the south entrance of the Church of the Holy Cross in Késmárk (Kežmarok, SK) from 1498. See Gotika, Slovenská národnej galéria v Bratislave. Dejiny Slovenskeho výtvarneho umenia, exh. cat., ed. D. Buran et al., Bratislava 2003, fig. 257.

15 Schiller (n. 14 above), 225–29 ("Der betrauerte und verehrte Schmerzensmann").

16 Osten (n. 12 above), 94–114, fig. 114.

17 Schiller (n. 14 above), 225–29 ("Der betrauerte und verehrte Schmerzensmann").

18 Vir dolorum, lime wood, polychromed, 95 × 36 × 16.5 cm, not hollowed at back. Old Inv. No. on base: Sz 436. The sculpture does not appear in Radocsay’s Corpus (n. 3 above). The carving was held in the attic of the church of Gergelylaka in Sáros County, near Kisszeben and Eperjes (Prešov, SK). The village was mentioned in a charter of Béla IV as Gregorfalva. See Súpis pamiatok na Slovensku, ed. E. Güntherová–Mayerová, vol. I., Bratislava 1967, 380–81. In the Museum of Ethnography in Budapest Zsuzsa Varga produced a description of the Vir dolorum 1968 as an "unnamed item found during a review of the storages". The figure was restored in the Budapest Academy of Fine Arts by a 4th-year wood-carving restoration student Renáta Kelemen, supervised by Professor Erzsébet B. Szent-Gály, in 2007. They kindly permitted the present author to inspect the restoration documentation.

The statue was included in the Museum of Ethnography’s 1989 exhibition Húsveti passio (10 March–12 April 1989), curated by Éva Szacsavay. No catalogue was produced for the
The wood-carving was last displayed in the Bible exhibition in the Széchényi Library. In the unsigned catalogue entry for the latter, it is attributed to "Pál Lőcsei or his workshop" and dated, somewhat uncertainly, "16th–17th century?". Although the wood carving has certain marks suggestive of Pál Lőcsei's work, it is not of the standard of carvings attributable to that artist or his workshop. Pál Lőcsei's style spread widely among 16th-century sculptors in Upper Hungary, even to those working in the vernacular style. See *Biblia Sacra Hungarica. A könyv, "mely örök életet ad",* exh. cat., ed. J. Heltai–B. Gáborjáni Szabó, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Budapest 2008, 282–83.

19 Radocsay (n. 3 above), 156. The figures from the altar shrine of the Virgin Mary altarpiece from Bérott are the Madonna, St Martin and St Nicholas (the latter is actually St Brice), c. 1500, Šarišské múzeum v Bardejove, Inv. No. 730. The restored altar shrine with the sculptures are on display in the permanent exhibition in Bárta.

20 An arbitrary example is the relief of the *Assumption of Mary Magdalene* in the shrine of the altarpiece in Berki (Rokycany, SK), whose execution surpasses that of the painting of the wings. See Török (n. 11 above, 2005), figs. 30–31.
In September 1876, Viktor Myskovszky, schoolmaster of a main grammar school for sciences and a committed defender of historical monuments in Upper Hungary, called upon the National Commission for Historical Monuments (Műemlékek Országos Bizottsága) in Budapest to take urgent measures. It had come to his attention that the town council of Kisszeben was, as patron of the parish church of great archeological interest, planning to reconfigure the roof on the tower and to paint the interior of the building. "Lest the church be ruined in this way, despite its pristine Gothic style...!" At the suggestion of Imre Henszlmann, who dispatched a detailed report from the scene at the very same time, the Commission promptly called upon Mayor József Ribosy to submit the plans and the budget for the renovation work to the Historical Monuments Commission, for the appropriate supervision and checking. For his part, Ágost Mazalik, deputy archdeacon and parish priest, was called upon in no uncertain terms to "desist from his intention" to have the painting done. In connection with the church's appointments also, Henszlmann took the view that it would be best if the locals did nothing beyond simple strengthening work. In other words, from his report it was very clear that not only the building itself and the newly uncovered frescoes merited attention, but—as Myskovszky had pointed out earlier—the appointments also: the tabernacle, the pulpit and especially the winged altarpieces. It was then that historical monument champions in the capital, museum experts, and, through the latter officials at the cultural ministry became aware of Kisszeben's Church dedicated to St John the Baptist. From this time on, they struggled for decades—more than once going against the wishes of local believers and crossing their interests—for the preservation of the threatened artifacts in an authentic condition.

Only after a long delay could the construction work begin. Almost twenty years passed before Frigyes Schulek, architect to the Commission, found the report on the state of the building and the preliminary plans for its reconstruction to be suitable and "consented in every particular, hence fully, to the carrying out of the operations proposed by" Vilmos Fröhde, head of the building activities at Kassa (Košice, SK) Cathedral. In the meantime it had turned out that not only the tower, but also the entire building required "the carrying out of urgent work to
exhibition. The wood-carving was last displayed in the Bible exhibition in the Széchényi Library. In the unsigned catalogue entry for the latter, it is attributed to “Pál Lócsei or his workshop” and dated, somewhat uncertainly, “16th–17th century?”. Although the wood carving has certain marks suggestive of Pál Lócsei’s work, it is not of the standard of carvings attributable to that artist or his workshop. Pál Lócsei’s style spread widely among 16th-century sculptors in Upper Hungary, even to those working in the vernacular style. See Biblia Sacra Hungarica. A könyv, „mely örök életet ad”, exh. cat., ed. J. Heltai–B. Gábórjáni Szabó, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Budapest 2008, 282–83.

19 Radocsay (n. 3 above), 156. The figures from the altar shrine of the Virgin Mary altarpiece from Bertót are the Madonna, St Martin and St Nicholas (the latter is actually St Brice), c. 1500, Šarišské múzeum v Bardejove, Inv. No. 730. The restored altar shrine with the sculptures are on display in the permanent exhibition in Bártfa.

20 An arbitrary example is the relief of the Assumption of Mary Magdalene in the shrine of the altarpiece in Berki (Rokycany, SK), whose execution surpasses that of the painting of the wings. See Török (n. 11 above, 2005), figs. 30–31.
In September 1876, Viktor Myskovszky, schoolmaster of a main grammar school for sciences and a committed defender of historical monuments in Upper Hungary, called upon the National Commission for Historical Monuments (Műemlékek Országos Bizottsága) in Budapest to take urgent measures. It had come to his attention that the town council of Kisszeben was, as patron of the parish church of great archeological interest, planning to reconfigure the roof on the tower and to paint the interior of the building. "Lest the church be ruined in this way, despite its pristine Gothic style...!" At the suggestion of Imre Henszlmann, who dispatched a detailed report from the scene at the very same time, the Commission promptly called upon Mayor József Ribosy to submit the plans and the budget for the renovation work to the Historical Monuments Commission, for the appropriate supervision and checking. For his part, Ágost Mazalik, deputy archdeacon and parish priest, was called upon in no uncertain terms to "desist from his intention" to have the painting done. In connection with the church's appointments also, Henszlmann took the view that it would be best if the locals did nothing beyond simple strengthening work. In other words, from his report it was very clear that not only the building itself and the newly uncovered frescoes merited attention, but—as Myskovszky had pointed out earlier—the appointments also: the tabernacle, the pulpit and especially the winged altarpieces. It was then that historical monument champions in the capital, museum experts, and, through the latter officials at the cultural ministry became aware of Kisszeben's Church dedicated to St John the Baptist. From this time on, they struggled for decades—more than once going against the wishes of local believers and crossing their interests—for the preservation of the threatened artifacts in an authentic condition.

Only after a long delay could the construction work begin. Almost twenty years passed before Frigyes Schulek, architect to the Commission, found the report on the state of the building and the preliminary plans for its reconstruction to be suitable and "consented in every particular, hence fully, to the carrying out of the operations proposed by" Vilmos Fröhde, head of the building activities at Kassa (Košice, SK) Cathedral. In the meantime it had turned out that not only the tower, but also the entire building required "the carrying out of urgent work to
make it safe” thoroughgoing repair. In March 1890, Mayor Antal Eiszelt informed the Commission that the church “especially by virtue of cracks visible in the vaulting and the dilapidation of the high altar in its present condition is already liable to profound censure even from the point of view of public safety”. Accordingly, he was obliged to “halt divine service there” and to have the church closed officially. Church services eventually resumed on 28 July 1899, scheduled by the same mayor, still in office at that time. The restoration of the church was at last complete, “leaving aside the issue of the altarpieces”.

This exchange of letters makes it clear that from the very beginning the most problematical element in the reconstruction work was the restoration of the Gothic altarpieces. Considering them in forms unaltered since the Baroque age, Imre Henszlemann wrote in 1876 that the “interior appointments are much more interesting and estimable than the architecture of the church...”. As well as the high altar and the Annunciation and St Anne altarpieces in front of the walls on either side of the triumphal arch, he mentions retables in the nave— one dedicated to St Joseph and another to St Stephen,— and also a “sixth, older than the last ones”, a small altarpiece in front of the north wall of the sanctuary that is called the “Altare doctorum, although of the four Church Fathers in the winged shrine only three appear in the finished relief”. This list never appears in the subsequent reports and descriptions. In 1885, Viktor Myskovszky compiled an inventory of the parish church of Kisszeben “with its art items, three Gothic altarpieces— the high altar, the St Anne and the Annunciation altarpieces—, its tabernacle, and its portals by Master Vincentius de Ragusa”. In 1888, Vilmos Fröhde, who was then drawing up plans for the building operations and the budget, mentioned three winged altarpieces in good condition, which, however, needed to be mended and re-gilded: the cost for the high altar was set at 2000 forints and the cost for each of the abovementioned side retables at 1000 forints. With regard to the costs for the “extensive repair, re-gilding and augmenting of the winged altarpieces— at the request of the town of Kisszeben in 1888—Mór Hölzel, an image-carver from Bártfa” (Bardejov, SK), compiled a budget set at 4475 forints. However, in 1894, based on a recommendation by Frigyes Schulek, the National Commission for Historical Monuments did not find this at all acceptable from the professional viewpoint, fearing that the “art historical value of the altarpieces [...] would decline significantly”. And perhaps this fear led the Commission to make its proposal, namely that it would be better “if these altarpieces— the three in question— were transferred to a museum and maintained there in their present condition, and that in their place faithful copies were put in the church”. And while in March 1896 the general public of Kisszeben wrote letters to Hungary’s minister of religious and educational affairs about the unclear costs of the restoration of the altarpieces hoping that the complete restoration of the ancient building could be finished entirely in the millennial year, the opinion of the Historical Monuments Commission and the minister was unalterable. The three altarpieces— found by Jenő Radisics, director of the Museum of Applied Arts, in the so-called Old Barracks building following their disassembly as early as February 1895 (presumably because
of the construction work\textsuperscript{15}—were packed up in the summer of 1896. According to reports in November, the consignment was then on its way to the capital, while the country was already celebrating the thousandth anniversary of its existence.\textsuperscript{16}

From this time on, the handing over of the three altarpieces, their placing in a museum, and the issue of the copies of the high altar and the side altarpieces were the main themes in the reports of the Commission, in the submissions of the ministry, and in the petitions arriving from the town. In the meantime, however, the parish church of Kisszeben continued to be out of use: the building work there was still unfinished and we have good reason to believe that the appointments items that remained \textit{in situ} were also dismantled, still awaiting their fate. Speaking of this, beside the pulpit and, from time to time, the organ, only one altarpiece remaining there was mentioned: the small retable, more frequently described as the fourth altarpiece. Where were the other altarpieces of the six listed by Henszlmann? And which, after the three taken to Budapest, was the fourth? We are familiar with a good deal of data in connection with this matter. Nevertheless, unequivocal identification will be impossible until the oft-mentioned design drawings and the detailed descriptions submitted here and there come to light.

On 23 November 1896 just days after the taking away of the altarpieces, Vilmos Fröhde, who was in charge of the building operations, called the attention of Péter Hartsár, dean and parish priest of Kisszeben, to the fact that two sculptors in Kassa\textsuperscript{17} had drawn up plans for the repair of the small retable and for the restoration of the pulpit and sculptures' consoles in the church. They had even submitted a budget: "altar-stand (foot), also framing of two panels, repairs to new and present altarpieces 480 forints". Fröhde found the plans satisfactory and the price favourably inexpensive, and proposed that the very Reverend Father acquire as soon as possible the ministerial permits necessary for the starting of the work. He also pointed out that for a while there would be an urgent need for the small altarpiece, in place of the high altar taken to Budapest. However, the National Commission for Historical Monuments stood strict guard in matters stylistic: the sum requested for the building work was transferred in March 1897 in the interests of completing it as quickly as possible. However, the architect László Steinhausz raised professional objections to the plans submitted for the restoration of the fourth altarpiece and the pulpit. The sculptors, who were in the service of Kassa Cathedral, "gave evidence of a feeling for Gothic, but [their drawings] were not of such quality that they could be used in the restoration of these esteemed artifacts". The Commission intended to entrust with the direction of the work the subsequently appointed head of Kassa Cathedral's construction workshop, and Imre Steindl with the supervision of the work.\textsuperscript{19} Matters took their course. Imre Steindl was very busy, the date for the resumption of the construction work at Kassa became uncertain, and for almost an entire year again nothing happened.\textsuperscript{20} Finally, in March 1898, in connection with the completing of the plans made for the copy of the high altar, Ottó Sztehló was entrusted with perfecting the sketches for the fourth altarpiece and the pulpit, for which work he was given just one week.\textsuperscript{21} And although in July
1899 the issue of the church's retables was not yet settled finally, in a letter written by the mayor the possibility of restarting divine service could be raised.\textsuperscript{22} The new high altar was already installed at this time (the copies of the side-altarpieces were put in place only in 1907), and with regard to the fourth retable there was never any further mention in the documents reaching and leaving the National Commission for Historical Monuments. By that date its restoration had clearly been completed, since it was in those years that the restoration of the other appointments of the church took place, presumably with the co-operation of local masters for the most part. As well as the three copies, not only the fourth altarpiece but another two as well—six retables in all, exactly the same number as that given by Henszlmann in 1876—today stand in the church in the places allocated to them at that time, as lively witnesses to the historicist approach of the years around 1900. On the two sides of the triumphal arch stand the St Anne and the so-called Church Fathers altarpieces respectively. The latter, the “Altarpiece of the Doctors”, as Henszlmann called the little retable, has been located in one of the two most prestigious places after the high altar—on the spot originally occupied by the Annunciation altarpiece—as an equal pair of the St Anne altarpiece. The Calvary retable—in this case the title is different from the one noted by Henszlmann in 1876—can be seen in front of one of the north pillars of the nave.

Of the church's three original altarpieces that remained in situ, the “Altarpiece of the Doctors” was the only one that was augmented and made more impressive in the course of restoration. Its superstructure, judged to be lost or in bad condition and therefore impossible to rescue, was replaced by a “true-to-form Gothic” structure essentially the same height as the re-fashioned shrine and containing three newly-made sculptures (fig. 1).\textsuperscript{23} The repainted, un-authentically angular predella probably came into being by means of a complete refashioning of the old one executed in the spirit of the new taste. Besides the Vir dolorum relief that can be seen on it today, half-length figures of the Mater Dolorosa and St John the Evangelist featuring on archive photographs\textsuperscript{24} may have originally belonged to it. Whether these were newly made carvings or almost totally reworked versions of old ones cannot be decided without systematic investigations. Of the elements of the predella, the carving woven from finely formed ornamental foliage is the most authentic element. The most intact unit of the composition, the shrine, was placed on a dark brown stand decorated with a traceried band carved with illogical stiffness. Augmented with broad framing running round it, the new structure increased the original size of the middle part of the altarpiece by a third, despite the fact that the medieval shrine itself—perhaps again by the changing of damaged parts—was reduced slightly in height. Adjusted to the new shrine, the moveable wings, too, were enlarged and put into new frames. The wooden panels bearing the paintings were extended above and below. The additions were covered on both painted sides of the wings with stiff, thickly gilded tracery that more than once intrudes into the compositions. The damaged or lost fixed wings of the altar were replaced with those depicting standing saints that originally belonged to the St Stephen and St Valentine altarpieces. This procedure
1. The St Martin altarpiece at Kisszeben (Photo: Author)
proves unequivocally that the appointments connected to the interior renovation of the building—not only the altarpieces to be sent to Budapest, but also those that remained in situ—were dismantled into parts. In a complete rebuilding that accompanied a thorough “restoration”, pieces from different retables could easily be mixed up. It is possible, too, that a change of fixed wings was performed deliberately in this case. Compared with that of the other retable, the remodelling of the “Altarpiece of the Doctors” seems to have been more careful, more planned from the stylistic point of view, and at the same time more goal-orientated. By replacing the missing elements and by enlarging and supplementing those still in existence, those involved perhaps wished to make it suitable for a new function. Maybe this was “the fourth altarpiece that remained there”, an altarpiece intended to substitute provisionally for those delivered to Budapest, and which, after the copies were made, was considered more suitable for placing in front of the triumphal arch than the not-overly-convincing new Annunciation retable.

Which parts of the medieval altarpieces remained untouched by the restoration planned in style by the National Commission of Historic Monuments? And how should we interpret the iconography of the “Altarpiece of the Doctors”, for the veneration of whom it was dedicated? Our starting point is the slightly truncated, somewhat altered and mended shrine with the three sculptures decorated with foliated tracery. Together they make a slightly strange impression: a curtain tassel painted on the reverse side of the shrine hangs down to the ground, there is no room for the refashioned interior vaulting, and the figures are forced into a space that is rather cramped. However, they can easily be examined individually. The foliated tracery constructed on two flat arches can, in the form it achieved after restoration in the 1970s, be regarded as essentially original, although the acanthus-leaf fields filling out the corners, the middle, propeller-like flowers, and the thick and stiff columns are clearly recent additions. It shows a somewhat distant kinship with the altarpiece at Dobronya (Dobrá Niva, SK) dated 1519 with its ogee-arch tracery, and with the St Apollonia retable in Bártfa, while the St Helen and St Giles altarpieces at Zólyom-száspfalva (Sásová, SK) indicate a little closer relationship with its all-round burgeoning plant creeper ornamentation. The ornamentation embellishing the shrines’ baseboard and predella may also be reckoned among the same group.25

In the shrine stand three male saints in half-life size; according to the traditional interpretation, they are three Church Fathers. On the left is St Jerome, wearing a cardinal’s headgear and holding in one hand the front paw of a lion. In the middle and on the right side are bishops. In their left hand each holds a crook mended during the most recent restoration and in their right a book. The one specific attribute is a small figure, depicted with a naked upper body and legs, kneeling under the lifted hem of the central figure’s cloak. Traditionally, this figure has been identified as the child appearing before St Augustine in the fig-grove or on the seashore. But is it really a child? Does the exhausted, wrinkled and elderly face not contradict such a view? Is it not, rather, a kneeling beggar, and should we not, therefore, see in the middle, taller, bishop the figure of St Martin?
The posture and the hand gestures of the small figure do not bring us any nearer to an interpretation. On archive photographs (fig. 2),\textsuperscript{26} the arms of the figure are broken off at the shoulder, meaning that the hands held together in prayer that we see today are additions made at the time of the most recent restoration. If the figure is a "child", it must originally have held a spoon or a shell, and if it is a "beggar" it must have clutched the cloak of the saint. In deciding the issue, analysis of the iconography of the wing scenes, and on the basis of this the establishment of the title of the altarpiece, will provide guidelines. A function of these will be the identification of the bishop on the right-hand side, traditionally interpreted as the third Church Father, St Ambrose.
The upper paintings of the feast-day side show miraculous happenings, making visible manifestation of the will of God showing itself through the persons of the saints. The left-hand scene shows an episode from the Legend of St Martin that is depicted rather seldom: the bishop is casting out a devil (fig. 3a). Moreover, he is doing so not from a person, but from an animal. Possessed by a devil, frenzied and foaming at the mouth, a cow charged along the road goring many people. Raising his hand in blessing, Martin commanded it to stop, and on the back of the now motionless animal recognized a devil. After he had cast the devil out, the cow, now calmed, knelt before the legs of the saint.\footnote{Exorcism, miraculous healing, or the liberation of one possessed could also be the subject of the upper right-hand painting, although this cannot be determined exactly for lack of a characteristic attribute. Almost lifeless, the figure lying on the ground in an unnatural posture is probably being purified and healed of its bodily and mental torments by the blessing of a bishop-saint. Assuming the parallelism of the composition, the place of this story, too, is to be sought in the Legend of St Martin.}

The paintings at the bottom exemplify the true faith, bearing witness, and the power of faith. On the left-hand side a key episode from the life of St Augustine is depicted. A child squatting on the sand is using a shell to fill a hole he dug with all the water of the sea (fig. 3b). “I shall succeed in this before you comprehend the essence of God,” he replied to the bishop who had asked what he was doing, and having offered satisfaction on a matter of faith, vanished.\footnote{The lower right-hand painting (the fourth) shows, placed at the foot of the Calvary, the 10,000 martyrs tortured and then taken to the stake who, led by St Achatius, chose to die for their religion in the time of Emperor Hadrian. This story differs from the previous ones: it is not linked directly to the saints depicted in the shrine, and goes for...}
beyond the content of the paintings described earlier. It can only be understood as
an example with general force, and along with the earlier representations in the
oneness of the community of believers and martyrs.

The outside row of paintings is entirely linked to the Legend of St Martin. The upper panels show two key events in his life, while in the bottom ones two bishops of Tours, St Martin and his successor St Bricius, are featured. The worn scene on the left depicts the meeting of the young Roman soldier and the beggar at Amiens. This is a story of recognizing Christ and coming to know the nature of true love. It is the scene which most tellingly and at the same time most clearly characterizes the earthly life of the saint, and which, as such, is suitable in itself, for the evocation of Martin’s personality. In the upper right-hand painting—in the second principal place in the row of depictions—the Mass in Albenga must follow, as a parallel of the meeting with the beggar. The Mass scene (fig. 4) depicted is, however, confused. Instead of the miracle described in the Legend of St Martin that took place at a moment of the Presentation of the Host, we see a blessing. Angels are not hurrying to the assistance of the modestly dressed bishop of Tours; instead, next to the altar two cardinals are holding a golden tiara, and from the hand of the saint a kneeling woman is taking the wafer. On the altar-table, just behind the chalice, there is the Vir dolorum showing His wounds.

We see protagonists and accessories of the Mass of St Gregory. We see the woman, who every Sunday offered bread to Gregory and who without belief took the Eucharist bread she herself had kneaded, as well as the Maundy Thursday vision, the suffering Christ appearing in human form on the altar. It was probably on account of error—owing to the misunderstanding or mixing up of models—that the scene shown in Rome’s Santa Croce in Gerusalemme church ended up in the place of the Albenga Mass. This is all the more

3b. St Augustine and the child. Inner wing, lower left-hand painting of the St Martin altarpiece at Kisszeben (Photo: Author)
the case since the mixing up of these Mass scenes occurred elsewhere, too. An example is on the St Martin altarpiece at Sővenység (Fişer, RO),\(^{30}\) where, following Dürer’s models of Masses of St Gregory, Christ, rising from a coffin and showing his wounds, appears on the altar as a vision before the very eyes of those kneeling. The scene is a pair of the Amiens meeting—just as in Kisszeben—, and a further two wing scenes on the feast-day side of the altarpiece also show events from the life of St Martin. There was definitely an iconographical mistake here. On the lower left-hand painting of the Kisszeben altarpiece is the figure of St Bricius, Martin’s successor as bishop of Tours, in bishop’s vestment and bearing a burning ember in his raised cloak (fig. 5). “As much as my garment is unharmed by the ember, so is my body undamaged by a woman’s touch”, he said to those doubters who charged him with making a pious woman pregnant. He was able to prove his innocence through the intercession of his holy predecessor: he took the burning ember to Martin’s tomb, and when it was cast off, his garment could be seen unharmed.\(^{31}\) In fourth place in the row of episodes on the closed wings, opposite Bricius, the bishop presented without any personal attribute and with a book and crook in his hands can in this form be none other than St Martin.

With the iconography of the wing paintings resolved, a final question emerges: who are the bishops in the shrine depicted next to Jerome, and how do the three male saints connect with the series of scenes on the feast-day side? What kind of association can we assume between the Church Fathers—Jerome; Augustine, who in any case features on one of the paintings inside; and even, possibly, Ambrose—and the Legend of St Martin? For the tangle, we might, at first glance, blame the late 19th-century “restorers”, who having possibly mixed up different elements of the altarpieces dismantled during the restoration of the building,
created “new” works, while replacing missing details with parts recently made. Could not the wing paintings and the sculptures or, come to that, the wing paintings have belonged together originally? It would be a convenient explanation, albeit one a thorough investigation soon refutes. The paintings are linked together by an identical background pattern; indeed, the compositions, referring to each other from the standpoint of both content and form, of the altar panels on both sides could scarcely be arranged in any other order. The original size of the altar wings presumably matches the original size of the shrine. The fixed wings are alien elements. The explanation needs to be sought in another direction.

Painted or carved figures of Church Fathers appeared most often in the shrine, in the wing paintings, and on the superstructures of Late Gothic winged altarpieces as examples with general applicability. Most frequently Jerome is depicted, in pair mostly with Augustine, more seldom in a foursome, or sometimes grouped together with various other saints. Just a few examples: in the middle panel of the St Michael altarpiece in Szepeshely (Spišská Kapitula, SK)—this retable can be dated to the 1470s—the archangel holding high the scales is flanked by Jerome, Ambrose, Gregory, and Augustine displayed as figures on the wings. Altar wings likewise from Szepeshely that were made in the 1480s feature full-length figures of St Augustine and St Jerome on their outer sides. The feast-day sides in this case reproduce scenes from the childhood of Jesus, and although the altarpiece’s title is unknown, it is not likely that it stood in closer connection with the protagonists of the outer-side wing paintings. Jerome features in the company of the Madonna and St Barbara in the shrine of Besztercebánya’s (Banská Bystrica, SK) St Barbara altarpiece dated to 1509, and here, too, the scenes of the feast-day side are not connected to the “title protagonists”. Two episodes from the Legend of St Barbara are given a place merely in the bottom row of paintings on the outer side. St Martin often features together with St Nicholas, between St Gregory and Jerome.
The two Church Fathers appear as companions of equal rank in the row of paintings on the feast-day side of the Szmrecsány (Smrečany, SK) altarpiece dedicated to the joint veneration of the two bishop-saints. This row of paintings bear the date 1510 which can be seen on the altarpiece. On the everyday side, St Christopher and St Sebastian flank two bishop figures not distinguished by means of characteristic attributes: on the right in all probability St Augustine, wearing the black *tunica* of the Augustinians, and next to him clearly the fourth Church Father, St Ambrose. The example nearest to the “fourth altar” at Kisszeben with regard to iconography is, however, Szepesszombat’s (Spišská Sobota, SK) St Nicholas altarpiece made in the first decade of the 16th century. In the shrine, next to St Jerome, stand two bishop figures not distinguished by any characteristic attribute. Their identification may likewise be ventured on the basis of an iconographical investigation of the painted panels and the establishment of the altarpiece’s title. However, here the formula is a good deal simpler. On the inner side of the wing paintings, four well-known episodes from the life of St Nicolas are represented. The middle bishop figure of the shrine, somewhat taller than those standing beside him, holding a crook and raising his right hand in blessing, can be none other than the titular saint of the altarpiece, St Nicolas. The figure on the right looking at a book he is holding in his left hand and not distinguished by any distinctive attribute is probably another Church Father, St Augustine, who is often paired with Jerome. Nevertheless, it cannot be absolutely excluded that the figure depicted is St Martin, who is very frequently featured with Nicolas. The paintings do not provide guidelines relating to this. The predella shows the martyrdom of St Ursula and the Virgins in her retinue, while on the everyday side there are male saints not connected closely with the theme.

On the Kisszeben altarpiece the depictions can be threaded together with more difficulty, and in accordance with this the establishment of the title, too, requires more consideration. Taking into account the iconographical error made in the case of the Mass scene, the series of paintings on the everyday side can be linked fully to St Martin. And in all probability it is he who plays the decisive role on the feast-day side as well. Seldom depicted but certainly linkable to him is the exorcism scene of the first painting, and presumably it is he who is the main protagonist in the miraculous healing visible on the right side, too. However, it may seem strange that the scene of the 10,000 martyrs, as a general example of the profession of the true faith, has forced to the outer side the meeting at Amiens, which counts as a basic element in the Legend of St Martin. But we must recognize that on the inner side the leading theme is that of miracle working and miraculous events. Whether by way of chance selection from among well-known scenes or for some personal reason connected with the donor, this scene perhaps fitted into the series better. Often depicted on other altars in various connections, separately or, more than once, performing a similar role or mediating a similar meaning, it is conspicuous on the abovementioned Szepesszombat predella also, placed in a pair with the scene of St Ursula’s martyrdom. The vision of St Augustine also fits into the very same series of thoughts emphasizing miraculous events. This rarely represented detail from the
legend of the Church Father did not, however, win a place on the feast-day side by chance. That he is one of the bishops standing in the shrine is proved unequivocally by the establishment of the winged altarpiece’s subject. He appears in a pair with St Jerome, as on the abovementioned Szepeshely altarpiece wings, the Szmrecsánya retable, and, in all probability, on the St Nicolas altarpiece at Szepesszombat, too. But a detail of his legend in epic form was depicted only on the Kisszeben altarpiece. That this emphasis does not apply to the Church Fathers in general but to St Augustine personally is best proved by the fact that no depiction linkable to Jerome has a place in the series of paintings. This thematic-contentual characteristic, however, should be understood most of all on the basis of the source-material relating to the donor, or at least to the circumstances of the commission.

At the end of this analysis, an answer can be given with a degree of certainty to some of the questions raised earlier. On the basis of an investigation of the iconography of the wing paintings, St Martin can unequivocally be regarded as the titular saint of the fourth Kisszeben altarpiece. Taken as a function of this, then, it is even less likely that only three out of the four abovementioned Church Fathers were depicted in the shrine. On the basis of thematic investigations, and last but not least on the basis of the analogy of the Nicolas altarpiece at Szepesszombat, we must recognize St Martin in the middle bishop figure. The small-scale figure, therefore, is not a child, but a kneeling beggar, who appears very frequently on sculptures as the most popular attribute of the bishop of Tours. St Martin—let us look merely at the example of the Szmrecsánya and Szepesszombat altarpieces—is flanked by two Church Fathers, from the left by St Jerome and from the right by St Augustine, who here, too, appears without any distinguishing attribute.

The St Martin altarpiece at Kisszeben can be dated with some accuracy to the 1510s by the artifacts that are close to it from the semantic and iconographic standpoints. The outlining of its stylistic environment and the connections of the workshop which produced it—taking into account the other winged altarpieces from the Kisszeben church that have come down to us—would require further research and further investigations.
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25 Here I should like to thank Edit Szentgyörgyi, artist-restorer, for her co-operation and exact observations in helping me describe the ‘restoration’ and refashioning of the altar.
26 Magyar Nemzeti Galéria, Régi Magyar Gyűjtemény, Fotótára (Hungarian National Gallery, Old Hungarian Collection, Photo Archives), Inv. No. 694.
29 Jacobus de Voragine (n. 27 above), 86.
30 Ibid, 86.
31 Ibid, 276.
32 Magyar Nemzeti Galéria (Hungarian National Gallery), Inv. No. 55.917.3–6.
34 This is how Libuše Cidlinská, too, interprets the iconography, see idem (n. 28 above), 81–82, and also János Végh, in *Gotika* (n. 33 above), Cat. No. 4.64., 733.
The borderlands of Hungarian medieval art were unaffected by economic booms in the region, even in later periods. As a result they frequently surprise researchers with unexpected monuments given the continually changing demands and rebuilding that took place in wealthier areas. This thought, expressed several decades ago by Ernő Marosi about Hungary's village churches, can without restriction be applied to Transylvania, too. The following paragraphs highlight such a phenomenon, which, although not at all unique, is at present only found along the peripheries.

Homoródjánosfalva, a village first mentioned in 1448, lies along the River Homorodul Mare in the former county of Udvarhelyszék ('Sedes Udvarhely'). Its parish church, today Unitarian, is certainly of medieval origin. It is generally suggested in the art historical literature that the church was constructed in the 13th century (and is thus originally Romanesque), and was expanded around 1522. Architectural details visible today, however, offer no support for this almost 140-year-old hypothesis.

The church, with its tower-nave-sanctuary arrangement, stands at the top of the hill, and is surrounded by an oval churchyard wall supported by buttresses (fig. 1-2). The medieval form of the church can be reconstructed without the west tower (built in 1749), the modern porticus affixed to the south side (after 1788), and the sets of stairs leading to the present day pulpit and eastern gallery. The first set of stairs also explains the destruction of the medieval sacristy. What remains is a nave consisting of three bays and a sanctuary with a slightly irregular floor plan terminating in three sides of an octagon. Both the sanctuary and nave were supported by buttresses largely corresponding to the bays.

Both parts of the church are vaulted. Cone-shaped corbels with moulded rings support the double grooved ribs of the net vaulting in the nave, while the somewhat lower net vault in the sanctuary, consisting of lower, single grooved terracotta ribs, is supported by more spectacular pyramidal corbels decorated with shields.

The supposition that the nave has Romanesque origins relies on the seriously damaged, primitively carved, heavily segmented frame of the church's west portal.
with rounded arch. Its details, such as the profile with a bead moulding flanked by grooves, which continues even in the shoulder area of the frame, suggest the carving was made at the earliest in the last decades of the Late Gothic period. The south porticus of the nave was built to protect a similarly Late Gothic, shouldered door frame. Its shape and kyma-profiled edges are typical of a later, Renaissance period, and therefore suggest an early 16th-century origin. Similarly a detail of a Late Gothic carving, perhaps from a door-frame, appears in secondary use, embedded in the base of the porticus: the beaded edge of the free surface is accompanied by a bead moulding flanked by two grooves, which branches off in two directions.

The Gothic structure of the church and the exclusively Late Gothic details all point to the early 16th century and in no way support a Romanesque origin for the nave. The details of the sanctuary provide a more precise dating: a sanctuary equal in width to the nave is a Late Gothic phenomenon. The identical technical solutions used for the vaulting in both the sanctuary and the nave suggest both spaces were probably constructed or restructured at the same time. The eastern corbels of the higher nave and the western ones of the lower sanctuary fit cornerwise with the triumphal arch, which has a pointed arch. The present impost of the triumphal arch and the asymmetrically lobed solution to the north shaft resulted from the creation of the pulpit (1802), and are thus much later developments. Two dates inscribed next to the modest tabernacle with shouldered frame date the sanctuary: the year 1522 is engraved in one of the corbels (fig. 3b), and this same year is painted in the western composition of the now uncovered, fragmented fresco cycle. According to the restorer the wall paintings were made shortly after the vaulting was constructed, their colours similar to those used in the shields decorating the corbels.

If we reject the supposition popular in art historical scholarship, that the church has Romanesque origins, then we need to consider that in the first quarter of the 16th century, the village’s medieval church probably underwent significant
3a-f. Homoródjánosfalva. Corbels of the sanctuary (Photo: Klára P. Kovács)
rebuilding and, obviously, expansion. Without excavations and examinations of the walls, however, we cannot know anything about the church's earlier form.

The series of reliefs on the corbels in the sanctuary attracted the attention of researchers some time ago (fig. 3a-f). The sanctuary vaulting rests on ten corbels shaped like inverted pyramids, as would be expected given the structure of the vaulting as described above. The corbels were decorated with shields à bouche, as the patrons and stone carvers intended. In the hands of the stone carver, however, the shield shapes were simplified: the contours are fashioned almost symmetrically, and only the unusual form of the upper corners follows the prototype. Emblems and depictions similar to coats of arms appear in relief on the shields. Research has yet to offer an interpretation of these, although since Balázs Orbán's first survey, many have described and reproduced their details.

Following László Dávid's description, moving counter-clockwise from the southwest corner of the sanctuary, we find the following depictions: 1. An inverted omega with an arrow rising from it, described by László Dávid as an "arrow rising upwards from a heart shape". 2. A heart punctured diagonally from the upper right by an arrow. 3. A satchel hanging from a disproportionately short stick, interpreted by László Dávid as a "dagger with another weapon beside it" (fig. 3a). 4. A "crown of lilies" floating in a green (?) field (fig. 3b). The numbers 1522 above the crown are painted in the same English red colour as the ribs. 5. A four-petal rose on a shield somewhat larger than the others with a stoncutter's mark engraved in the upper left corner. 6. A scallop shell motif, described by László Dávid as a "fluted tear shape" (fig. 3c). 7. A jumping squirrel (?) (fig. 3e). The animal is shown with a relatively long tail, vertical body position, and head facing forward, but the carving is too crude to be clearly identified. 8. A hand holding a dagger (more likely a disproportionately small sabre!) diagonally with the blade facing left on a per fess green shield (fig. 3f). 9. A hand holding a diagonally positioned, ribbed mace on a green shield. 10. A bird turning left as it lifts off from a branch (fig. 3d).

The owners of these coats of arms were the promoters of the church's construction or rebuilding: the parish priest, the more important landowners in this medieval Hungarian (szekler) settlement, or perhaps leading figures from Udvarhelyszék. Little hope exists of identifying them since we have no information on the settlement until the second half of the 16th century, and thus know no names. Only the "squirrel" shield has been interpreted by some as the coat of arms of the Transylvanian vice-voivod Miklós Thuróczi. Balázs Orbán's identification of the carved creature as a dog, however, demonstrates the futility of the task. Because of its primitive form, the carving could represent any animal from bear to squirrel. Moreover the date of 1522 also presents a problem. Thuróczi came to Transylvania as a vassal and played an important role in the establishment of a voivodian chancellery, but in 1517 he left the region and never returned. Use of his coat of arms in 1522 would have been anachronistic.

The second coat of arms presents a similar problem. While only the horizontal positioning of the arrow distinguishes the depiction from the coat of arms of the
count of the Transylvanian szekler people (‘comes siculorum’), János Lábatlani, mentioned in 1495, the large time gap disproves this identification.

Given its size and position in the ensemble, the rose shield must have had special significance. However, as a motif commonly used on coats of arms, it provides no reliable information about the patron. The upper left corner of this shield bears the emblem of a member of the middle class, perhaps the mark of the stone carver, as suggested by Jolán Balogh. The owner of the stone carving mark may also have been the master of the 1522 Gothic rebuilding of the church. His decision to use his mark was not guided by the requirements of the guild, but rather arose from the craftsman’s own self-consciousness as an artist. He may have been a local carver, as 17th-century sources show the famous and much sought-after stone quarry in the area produced a social stratum of stone carvers, and this may have been true in the late medieval period, too.

How the third and sixth shields are interpreted plays a crucial role in understanding the carvings listed above, and there are a variety of conflicting opinions. Balázs Orbán reproduced the composition of the third shield, but did not interpret it, while László Dávid described it as weapons. In fact, the two objects are the well-known insignia of pilgrims: the pilgrim’s staff with its pointy end, separately formed grip, and crook, and the pilgrim’s satchel, hanging from the staff, with its fringe discernible in the carving. The straight staff appears in most pilgrim depictions, while the version with a hook is considerably rarer because of its proportions, although it, too, can be considered relatively common.

Before setting off, the pilgrims confessed their sins in the parish church, listened to mass and took communion. At the end of the ceremony the priest not only blessed the pilgrims but also their staffs and satchels. The satchels were supplied with “the sign of the venerable cross”. The accessories were then presented to the pilgrims with the following words: “Take this satchel, the sign of your pilgrimage, so that on the journey ordered by God you should be escorted by the holy angel and your gifts should be blessed in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Take this staff, the symbol of God’s assistance, so that you will be able to persevere on the road of wisdom, the path of truth, and return to your home with joy in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.”

The sixth shield does not contain a fluted tear as László Dávid thought, but rather a pilgrim’s scallop (Pecten Jacobaeus L.). This 10- to 20-cm-long sea scallop was used throughout the Mediterranean region as a drinking vessel by pilgrims, and later became one of the attributes of St James the Greater. The shell adorned the soft hat of St James when shown as a pilgrim, and pilgrims seeking his grave at Santiago de Compostela purchased scallop badges, which became an eloquent, easily recognizable symbol of their piety.

The appearance of pilgrim emblems on the shield carvings is connected to the important medieval phenomenon of pilgrimages, which has only recently been appreciated in Hungarian historiography. In his recent study on Transylvanian bell-casting, Elek Benkő called attention to the cast reproductions of medieval
pilgrim badges and coins on bells.\textsuperscript{24} His study and the rich literature on the subject have shown how these objects were believed to protect people and ward off trouble. Furthermore, they were thought to preserve the power of the saint’s or martyr’s grave to perform miracles. As a result, people of the Middle Ages often cast the insignia in bells or hung them on their walls.

Although the examples discussed by Elek Benkő do not relate to El Camino, his work is still important as a guide to interpreting the carvings of Homoródjánosfalva, which bear close similarities to the bell decorations.

As evidence of a completed pilgrimage, often the pilgrim staff was offered to the church.\textsuperscript{25} It is reasonable to assume the carvings in question in the church of Homoródjánosfalva had a similar function. The patrons of the church, known only from their carved coats of arms, may have begun the Late Gothic refashioning of the church in the beginning of the 16th century to commemorate a pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela. Their memory of the undertaking was captured in the corbels of the sanctuary. The scallop shell emblem of the apostle St James the Greater and the pilgrim’s accessories may also have served to ward off evil.

According to 15th-century Spanish sources, Hungary ranked fourth or fifth in terms of the number of pilgrims arriving from its lands to the distant Santiago de Compostela. For Transylvanian pilgrims, however, the destination was not as popular.\textsuperscript{26} As far as we can judge today, Transylvanians preferred Rome, Aachen and other large pilgrimage places in Central Europe. The pilgrims from Homoródjánosfalva probably set off on their very costly pilgrimage to El Camino well before the equally expensive restructuring of the church began. Their journey also most likely took place during a jubilee year—perhaps in the year St James the Greater’s feast (July 25) fell on a Sunday. Because construction and painting of the sanctuary, and probably construction of the nave too, was completed by 1522, researchers intent on perusing the lists of pilgrims\textsuperscript{27} should concentrate on the jubilee years preceding construction: 1507, 1512, or 1518.

\textbf{Notes}

\textsuperscript{1} E. Marosi, \textit{Magyar falusi templomok}, Budapest 1975, 8.

\textsuperscript{2} Brașov County

\textsuperscript{3} The settlement \textit{Villa Eyanis} mentioned in the papal tithes was identified by some as Homoródjánosfalva, but in fact Héjasfalva (Vânători, RO), a village near Segesvár (Sighișoara, RO). See \textit{Erdélyi Okmánytár/Codex Diplomaticus Transsilvaniae}, vol. II., 1301–1339. Published with charters and notes by Zs. Jakó/Ad edendum in regestis preparavit notisique illustravit Sigismundus Jakó, Magyar Országos Levéltár, Budapest 2004, no. 1142.


5 In 1788 inspectors counted fourteen buttresses. This number suggests the nave was also enclosed in regularly distributed buttresses. See Unitárius Püspöki Vizitáció, 622, published by Dávid (n. 4 above), 148.

6 Dávid's ground plan (n. 4 above), nos. 144/135 slightly exaggerates the irregularities. In the absence of an accurate survey we performed our own examination with shoddy tools and found that the position of the second southern corbel in the sanctuary counting from the west deviates from the axis of the corresponding buttress not by a meter but by just 20 cm.

7 A very small survey drawing was given by László Dávid (n. 4 above), fig. 145/136.

8 The long-discredited belief inherited from the 19th century that all rounded arches point to a Romanesque origin has to this day led to a series of incorrect, too early dates for historical monuments in Transylvania.

9 Dávid (n. 4 above), fig. 145/137.

10 Among the medieval churches of the region (all RO), those in Dálnok (Dalnic), Esztelnek (Estelnic), Homoródszentmárton (Mártnis), Kézdialbis (Albis), Lémhény (Lemnia), Nagyajta (Aita Mare), Sepsiszentgyörgy (Sfântu Gheorghe), and Zabola (Zäbala) have a similar spatial arrangement. In all of these cases, an early 16th-century rebuilding or restructuring has either been proven or is likely. See J. Gyöngyössy–T. Kerny–J. Sarudi Sebestyén, Székelyföldi vártemplomok, Budapest 1995; Dávid (n. 4 above), 157 ff.; K. S. Tüdös, Erdélyi védőrendszer a XV–XVIII. században. Háromszéki templomvárak, Budapest 1995.

11 Jékely–Kiss (n. 4 above), 120–33; before they were uncovered, Dávid (n. 4 above) and Lángi–Mihály (n. 4 above), 43, dealt with the wall paintings.

12 The bell, cast in 1481, may offer proof of the church's earlier existence.

13 Balogh (n. 4 above), 98, 255, figs. 120–23.

14 Traces of the original painting can only be discovered on the cleaned surfaces of the corbels beneath the wall paintings conserved on the north wall. The colour of the upper half of the shield is unknown. The painter emphasizes the upper boundary of the green field by using black paint.


17 “Lábatlanló Lábatlan,” see Siebmacher (n. 15 above), 353, fig. 266.

18 The master of a 1526 restructuring of the Dálnok (Dalnic) church similarly marked his work, creating a frame with an intersecting bead moulding and rounded arch, and another with a straight termination.

19 In 1646 János Bethlen sent his own stone craftsmen from along the Homoród to help in Kolozsvár (Cluj, RO): “Five stoneworkers came from along the Homorod from the estate of Sir Janos Bettlen. That day we took them to the quarry to cut stone. They claimed their master had sent them not to do that, but to build a stone wall. We paid them for that day's work. f. 1. d. - Sending them home, the Lord Judge and Honourable Council gave them a payment for the work of their feet f. 1. d. 80.” See Arhivele Naționale Direcția județeană Cluj, Primăria Cluj, Socoteli, vol. 24., bundle XV, 751/14 April, 1646; “Above, on the side of Köveshegy there are superb quarries. The people of Homorodjánosfalva are doing a fine trade in the finely grained sandstone, which is easily cracked and, although hard, easily carved, and they are transporting it to the 499
Köhalom, Udvarhely, and beyond. The craft of stone carving has developed to the point that gravestones and columns are being produced. (Köhalom = Rupea, RO; Udvarhely = Székely-udvarhely, Odorheiu Secuiesc, RO) See Orbán (n. 4 above), 170; The quarry of Homoródjánosfalva was used by the Romans, and stone was transported from there for the building of the church of Homoróddaróc (Drăușeni, RO), too. See Dávid (n. 4 above), 149. When the church of Homoródjánosfalva was repaired in 1817–24, the stonework was carried out again by a local, Mihály Benkö, from neighbouring Homoródkarácsonyfalva (Crâciunel, RO). See Dávid (n. 4 above), 148.

20 It appears on the Burgundian prince Charles the Bold’s flag, which is kept in Dijon, see Lexikon der Christlichen Ikonographie, vol. 7, founded E. Kirschbaum, ed. W. Braunfels, Rome–Freiburg–Basel–Vienna 1974, 28, fig. 2; in a later depiction that still corresponds entirely to medieval forms in the 1603 edition of Cesare Ripa’s Iconologia, the figure of Esilio (Exile) in an engraving referring to the work of Fra Ignazio Danti Perugino (1536–86), bishop of Alatri, see C. Ripa, Iconologia, transl. and ed. T. Sajo, Budapest 1997, 172.


22 Balogh correctly identified it as a shell, see n. 4 above; L. Kakucs, Santiago de Compostela: Szent Jakab tisztelete Európában és Magyarországon, Budapest 2006, 269. Because the depiction was interpreted as a St James scallop, Homoródjánosfalva was added to the database.


25 Zalán (n. 21 above), 48, quotes a visitation report that notes how the visitors in 1674 found “16 baculi pro peregrinantis violaei coloris cum stellis ornati” in the church of Lők (formerly in Sopron County: Unterfrauenhaid, A).

26 Csukovits (n. 21 above), 145; R. Schuller, “Pilgerfahrten im Mittelalter aus Ungarn und aus dem Siebenbürger Sachsenlande nach berühmten Gnadenorden,” in Festschrift für Bischof D. Dr. Friedrich Teutsch, Herrmannstadt 1931, 322; see Pásztor (n. 23 above), 113/3, n. 118; according to a 1493 record from Brassó (Brașov, RO), priests sent penitents to the nearby Kerc (Cârla, RO) shrine or to Rome, Mariazell, Loreto or Santiago de Compostela for forgiveness of their sins.

27 The lists of pilgrims have survived, although the names are written with Spanish phonetics.
Evelin Wetter

DA SOLCH KIRCHENN GEPRENG WAR, BILD FINGENN DIE WIDERSACHER AN ZU PREDICENN WIDER DAS ABENDMAHL DES HERN...

Zu Strategien konfessioneller Selbstverortung in Siebenbürgen


Medgyes, RO) nahe, das reformationszeitlich um eine Predella mit dem Abendmahl aus einem anderen Zusammenhang ergänzt wurde (Abb. 1).\(^5\)

Das polyethnische und politisch von den drei Ständen, also dem ungarischen Adel, den Szeklern und den Sachsen getragene Siebenbürgen war auch als Fürstenamt von 1541 bis 1688 in Glaubenssachen weitgehend selbstbestimmt. Versuchte man zunächst einen einheitlichen Weg zu beschreiten, so ist spätestens mit der Synode in Straßburg am Mieresch (Aiud, Enyed, RO) 1564 von zwei ko-existierenden protestantischen Bekenntnissen zu sprechen: der siebenbürgisch lutherischen und der siebenbürgisch reformierten Kirche.\(^6\) Diese reformierte Kirche entwickelte sich bald weiter in Richtung eines Antitrinitarismus (Unitarismus), der 1571 auf den Landtagen in Neumarkt (Târgu Mureș, Marosvásárhely, RO) neben der reformierten Kirche, der katholischen und der lutherischen als vierte rezipierte Religion anerkannt wurde.\(^7\) Die orthodoxe Kirche, der vor allem die Bevölkerung in den ruralen Siedlungsgebieten der Rumänen angehörte, galt lediglich als toleriert.\(^8\)

Angesichts einer zunehmenden Diversifizierung der Zeremonien unter den verschiedenen Einflüssen forderte die Nationsuniversität als oberste Vertretung des

Auf das erwähnte Mediascher Ensemble zurückkommend, bringt der Eingriff in das Bildprogramm ein im Sinne Luthers rechtes Verständnis des Abendmahls zum Ausdruck (Abb. 2). Der Agens richtete sich auf den Erhalt bestimmter Bildwerke und zugleich auf deren Neuinterpretation. Die im Vordergrund ausgestellten Gefäße alludieren zeitgenössisches Tafelsilber wie es als Abendmahlsgerät just vor dieser Predella Verwendung gefunden haben könnte: eine Historisierung des Geschehens am Altar, bei der die Einsetzungsworte mit Blick auf die Realpräsenz Christi im Vollzug des Abendmahls auf der Predella auch bildliche Darstellung finden. Handelt es sich hier um ein nachträglich sakramental zugespitztes Bildprogramm, so existiert auch der umgekehrte Fall einer absichtsvollen Beibehaltung einer eucharistischen Darstellung.

(Foto: Emese Sárkadi Nagy)
von Ewigkeit zu Ewigkeit" (Offb. 1,18), mit denen auch die übernommenen Darstellungen der Kreuzigung im Hauptfeld und des Schmerzensmanns darunter eschatologische Evidenz erhalten. Der Schmerzensmann hinter dem Gitter der gemalten Architektur evoziert die Vorstellung einer Weisung des Corpus Christi in Sakramentshäusern. Nach der Umgestaltung von Ritus und Kirchenraum im Zuge der Reformation kann diese Illusion einer Sakramentsnische allerdings kaum mehr auf eine im Bildmedium gleichsam auf Dauer zur Darstellung gebrachte Ausstellung des Corpus Christi anspielen. Vielmehr ist sie eine Art „Bekenntnisbild": In einem Altarraum, in dem das Abendmahl nach lutherischem Verständnis gefeiert wurde, muss sie als dezidierte Stellungnahme gesehen werden zur seit den
1540er Jahren heftig geführten Debatte um das Verständnis des Abendmahls, die das Fürstentum in Glaubenssachen spaltete.


Auch die Elevatio war ein heftig umstrittenes Adiaphoron. Während Honterus in seiner 1543 gedruckten Reformatio sie mit keinem Wort erwähnt, suchte der Hermannstädter Reformatorum Matthias Ramser die Elevatio eben mit Blick auf die 'Sakramentarier' (Reformierten) beizubehalten. Das 1547 erschiene Reformatio büchlein offeriert daher eine Kompromissformel: „Nach dem allen, kert sich der Priester zum volck, und spricht am ersten in klaren worten das Vater unser, bald darauff die wort der Consecration über das brod und wein, welche er auch darzu nacheinader in den henden hält.“ Im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert war eine
echte Elevatio unter den Worten „das ist mein Leib“ und „das ist mein Blut“ sowohl in Kronstadt als auch in Hermannstadt gebräuchlich.25

Vor diesem Hintergrund haben die Abendmahl- und Kreuzigungssikonographien auf Altären und liturgischer Gewandung sowie nicht zuletzt das Hermannstädters Wandbild eine affirmative Funktion. Auf Damasus Dürr zurückkommend, war dieser Kirchenprunk, den man in Siebenbürgen in den evangelischen Gemein-

In einer Art kontroverstheologischen Abgrenzung des konfessionellen Raumes, als welcher der ausgestattete und durch den Ritus belebte Kirchenraum der lutherischen Gemeinden zu verstehen ist, durchziehen solche Erläuterungen die gesamte Dürrsche Sammlung. Seine Texte speisen sich aus dem Gegensatz zu den weiteren Strömungen eines siebenbürgischen Protestantismus. Vor diesem Hintergrund sind die hier diskutierten Zeugnisse des Mittelalters in ihrer Auswahl wie in ihrer adaptierten Gestalt das Ergebnis einerseits affirmativer Diskurse zur Realpräsenz im Abendmahl, andererseits aber auch das Produkt einer sukzessiven Abgrenzung gegenüber radikaleren Bekenntnissen, wie sie in Siebenbürgen aufgrund der standesrechtlichen Verfassung besonders dicht vertreten sind.

ANMERKUNGEN


16 Hermannstadt (Sibiu), Zentralarchiv der Evangelischen Kirche A. B. in Rumänien, 209–DA 175, 902.


22 Netoliczka (wie Anm. 10), 10–28.


24 Netoliczka (wie Anm. 10), 55–125, hier 116–117.

25 Roth (wie Anm. 23), 165.


The problem of regionalism is one of the hot issues of art historical research nowadays. It was the subject of the last Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art (CIHA) conference "How to write art history—national, regional or global?" held in Budapest in 2007. One of the organisers and the speaker of the opening plenary session was Ernő Marosi, former Hungarian member of the CIHA and at that time vice-president of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The acts of the conference have been published in his edition,1 but the question is still on the floor: can we (or should we) find characteristics which could serve as the basis of national or regional art historical narratives?

For the first generation of Hungarian art historians, the answer was self-evident, as I try to demonstrate here through the example of Romanesque architecture in Hungary.2 This was the subject of a theory formulated by Imre Henszlmann (1813–1888),3 one of the founders of Hungarian art history. In 1846, he produced the first art historical monograph written in Hungarian. Later, he became the leading figure of the protection of historic monuments in Hungary and the first professor of art history at the University of Budapest. He was the first to publish a monograph on the Early Christian, Romanesque and Transitional style monuments of the country in 1876.4 In the introductory section, he defined the peculiarities of Hungarian Romanesque style. He stated that it was brought from abroad by foreign monks, but showed some definitely "provincial" characteristics.5 His description of the Benedictine Abbey church of Lébény, which he considered one of the best representatives of the Romanesque in Hungary, forms the most detailed presentation of his theory. He pointed out three key elements: "[1] the church does not have an elongated sanctuary, i.e. there is no bay between the apse and the nave which would enlarge the longitudinal measurements of the sanctuary; [2] there is no transept extending to the north and the south between the sanctuary and the nave; and [3] the two western towers are not separated from the aisles. ... The first two points are negative, but the third is positive, because it enlarges the interior considerably and demonstrates a remarkable bravery, founded on long experience, in breaking the tower walls at the ground floor."6
He insisted that the prototypes of the church of Lébény can be found exclusively in France, and particularly the south of France. He enumerated five buildings as points of comparison: the Saint-Just church of Valcabrère, the collegiate of Saint-Gaudens and the church of Saint-Aventin (all of them are in the Pyrénées), Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux in Provence and Saint-Mathieu de Finisterre (or Plougonvelin) in Brittany. In fact, the first three churches are three-aisled basilicas terminating in three semicircular apses (although the apsidioles of Saint-Just form a horse-shoe in the interior and the main apse is polygonal with big niches from the exterior) and none of them were built with an elongated sanctuary or transept. Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux has a transept; and finally Plougonvelin is a very strange building with a flat end and no apparent similarities to Lébény. None of the above mentioned churches were built with two western towers. One can only wonder at the heterogeneity of this group. Henszlmann himself admits that only one or two of the three aspects are common in these churches, and not all the three, as in Hungary. That is exactly why this feature can be regarded as the definition of the Hungarian “provincialism”, if not school. He evaluated this kind of arrangement as a kind of defect of Hungarian Romanesque architecture, since “it excludes the graceful articulation or arrangement of the building with a transept, therefore it cannot provide a favourable form to the edifice. Still, since there are only few exceptions, even in its imperfection it could be regarded as a special provincialism.”

Henszlmann attributed great importance to the origins of the building types applied in medieval Hungary. In 1865 he stated that “the nationality of Romanesque architecture in Hungary is in general German”. By 1876, partly influenced by the discoveries of the French beginnings of Gothic style, he recognised German origin only in the royal basilica of Székesfehérvár and grouped all the other monuments (e.g. Pécs, Esztergom, Kalocsa, Lébény, Zsambék, Aracs [near Novi Bečej, SRB]) into the French school. However, a few years previously, in 1863, Henszlmann was also convinced of the importance of Italian influence. In his monographic study on the Romanesque church of Kisbény (Biňa, SK) he declared that Hungarian Romanesque churches without transepts follow Italian prototypes. In this early study, the other features related to the sanctuary are not mentioned yet, and no “Hungarian provincialism” is supposed. Instead, he named Ipolyi as the one who had originally realised the importance of the lack of transept.

Arnold Ipolyi (1823–1886), another founding father of Hungarian art history, started his career as a Catholic priest and parson of Zohor (SK), a small village in north-western Hungary, near Pozsony (Bratislava, SK). After studying Hungarian mythology, he turned to art history. Since the autonomy of Hungary was suspended after the Revolution and War of Independence of 1848/49, protection of monuments was naturally integrated into the newly created Viennese Central-Commission für Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale in 1850. Ipolyi was appointed as one of the Hungarian conservators. He started the inventarisation of the
historic monuments in the regions around Pozsony. In his description of the White Mountains (Záhorie) area in 1859–60, he mentioned the tower of the church of Stomfa (Stupava, SK), which was built in the “Hungarian architectural style”. With a certain scepticism, he borrowed this idea from Rudolf von Eitelberger (1817–1885), who travelled in Hungary in 1854–55 and recounted his discoveries of Romanesque buildings in the next year. Eitelberger pointed out that certain wooden towers in the Tisza region follow a special local form with galleries and turrets resembling medieval Western monuments. Ipolyi added the typical ovens of the Csallóköz region and the tent-like Hungarian village houses as original national architectural, but not artistic, forms; otherwise he detected no special Hungarian architectural taste.

However, Ipolyi very soon changed his opinion. In 1860, he became a member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and spoke in his inaugural address about the Romanesque church at Deaki (Deakovce, SK). He regarded this church as a typical example of Hungarian High Romanesque architecture. He noticed that it is different from contemporaneous buildings abroad in four aspects: 1) the lack of transept; 2) the apse is connected directly to the nave, thus omitting the choir; 3) they lack a crypt; 4) the western towers are integrated into the aisles. He admitted that the first aspect is generally typical for Hungary, the second is usual, and crypts can be found only in Early Romanesque buildings. These three are deficiencies, while the arrangement of the towers is a development of Hungarian Romanesque art. On the other hand, all of them are results of an economic taste which unifies the most important architectural elements (apse, nave and tower) without applying any kind of mediators. Ipolyi circumscribed three typical groups of Hungarian Romanesque architecture: one from the Early Romanesque period (e.g. Pécs), another from the High Romanesque (represented by Deaki) and the village churches. Thus, Deaki is regarded as a representative of local architecture but only for one of the periods.

The lecture on Deaki was a monographic study, although with special attention to its analogues. At the end of the year 1861, he gave a more general lecture on the entire medieval monumental architecture of Hungary. This is the first summary of the topic, and is based on local and international literature (Ipolyi had a wonderful private library) and on his own travels. He claimed that some special local forms can be detected in Early Romanesque architecture (ca. 1000–1150). However, it was only the High and Late Romanesque period (ca. 1150–1300) when an independent and national architecture was developed. In general, the simplicity of the Hungarian monuments is striking: the apse is connected directly to the nave, and the ground floor of the two western towers are integrated into the aisles. Here again, he emphasised the economic character of these buildings, as well as their good proportions and harmony which lend a tasteful and decorative appearance. This national character is also detected only in the second half of the period, a time regarded as the most splendid era of national architecture. He linked this phenomenon with the successful fight for freedom of the Hungarian nobility.
in the same time. He quoted the inscription of the Romanesque portal of the cathedral of Esztergom: “Mentem sanctam spontaneam honorem Deo et patriae liberationem”—“Of holy and free mind in honour to God and liberation of country”, which also had a current political meaning in 1861.

This later idea was rejected by Henszlmann. In 1863 he referred to “my friend Ipolyi” as a source of inspiration regarding the lack of transept, but by 1876 Ipolyi’s name had disappeared, and his view that the Romanesque was the period best fitted to the character of the nation was quoted anonymously. Henszlmann doubts this, since the period lasted only fifty years, quickly giving way to the Gothic style. What is more, Romanesque forms were also borrowed from abroad. For the characteristics of the “Hungarian provincialism” Henszlmann quoted German authors, namely Kugler and Lübke. But did these foreign authorities really recognise these features?

Writing in 1856, Eitelberger complained that Hungary and the countries south-east of the Danube were still territories whose medieval monuments were almost completely unknown. He mentioned the works of Kugler, Rosenthal, Agincourt and Gailhabaud as examples of negligence. The situation changed after Eitelberger’s publications. However, Henszlmann’s reference to Kugler is strange. Although Ipolyi himself quoted Franz Kugler’s Geschichte der Baukunst in his monograph on Deák, he did it with a different aim; he wanted to elucidate the usual western type of tower arrangement. Kugler dealt with the Hungarian monuments in his second volume, relying mainly on Eitelberger’s description, including the reference to the special wooden towers of the Tisza region. However, he did not add any general observation to the characteristics of the country, neither regarding the transept nor the western towers. Thus Henszlmann’s reference to Kugler seems unfounded.

The case of Wilhelm Lübke is somewhat different. In his work on Deák, Ipolyi referred to Lübke as having adopted these observations in his Geschichte der Architektur. In fact, Lübke noted that the transept is missing from all known Romanesque churches of Hungary with the exception of Ócsa. He did not deal with the towers and had no idea about any kind of “Hungarian provincialism”. He discussed Hungary within Germany in the chapter on the Austrian lands. He stated that no strong school or tradition can be detected in these territories. For Hungary he stated the buildings follow the Romanesque style of Germany in every respect. Thus, although the lack of transept is noted, no Hungarian architectural tradition is suspected at all.

Henszlmann’s references cannot, therefore, be taken seriously. Ipolyi was more accurate. In his study on Deák he also referred to August Essenwein (1831–1892). Describing the church of Lébény (which was restored following his plans), he pointed out that the lack of transept and the connection of the tower porch to the interior substantially separates the church from the contemporaneous German buildings. However, he did not recognise this fact as a Hungarian speciality. It was therefore Ipolyi who identified that the special basilical arrangement of
Romanesque churches, for which Lébény is a good example, is typical of the
country, and Henszlmann who developed this into a theory of “Hungarian pro­
vincialism”.

The following generations unfolded the idea further. In a monograph on
Hungarian Romanesque art published in 1938, still the finest work on the subject,
Tibor Gerevich (1882—1954) noted that the Hungarian basilicas are three-aisled,
have no transept (which separates them from the French and German churches),
and the sanctuary follows the Italian types with one or three apses.37 Regarding
the towers, he admitted that they are not unique to Hungarian Romanesque ar­
chitecture, since they are also known abroad, but they are typical.38 On a theo­
retical level, these observations returned in the formulation of Dezső Dercsényi
(1910—1987), a student of Gerevich. He stated that “the ground plan system, or­
iginating from Italy, became an absolute characteristic of Hungarian architecture in
the last phase of the Romanesque style, completed by local peculiarities”.39 The
western part with its twin towers, gallery and open ground floor was regarded as
such. He called this arrangement a type of family or clan monastery and connected
it to a Benedictine workshop. This theory was criticised by Emő Marosi in 1986,
who pointed out that the “frequently mentioned ‘Benedictine’ type [...] is in
reality a collective term for architectural types of different character and signi­
ficance”.40

What is certain is that the transept was usually omitted in Hungarian Roman­
esque churches. It appeared as late as the end of the 12th century, applied by
certain orders as the Benedictines (Ercsi, Vértesszentkereszt, Szer?), the Cistercians
(Cikádor I?, Pilis, Zirc, Szentgotthárd etc.) and the Premonstratensians (Garáb?,
Ócsa, Gyulafirátót). On the other hand, at the turn of the 12th—13th centuries, it
was applied in the complete rebuilding of two cathedrals: Gyulafehérvár (Alba Iulia,
RO), in a classical Romanesque structure, and Kalocsa, in a pioneering Early
Gothic form. The use of the transept in any way was quite limited in Hungary.41

Churches without transepts often omitted the elongated choir, too. Although
there are some exceptions (e.g. Dömös, Ják, Türje, Kisidisznó [Cisnădioara, RO]),
the majority of these simple basilical churches had the aisles and the nave terminat­
ing in the same line. The form of the sanctuaries is variable: the most common is
the triapsidal form, although in some, the aisles terminated rectangularly (Ákos
[Acás, RO], Csolt, Esztergom—Sziget) or with semicircular interior and flat exter­
tior (Esztergom, Harina [Herina, RO], Bátmonostor, Kremecz [or Kecsemo­
rostor, RO] near Csanád [Cenad, RO], Herpálly ). In other cases the aisles have
apsidioles and the nave terminates in a flat end (Visegrád: St Andrew’s; Pástó) or
horse-shoe form (Bizere [Frumușeni, RO], Lengyeltóti). Despite this variety,
these basilicas seem to be typical for the region, although not without time limits.
The earliest provenly datable representatives of the triapsidal type are only those of
Pécs (rebuilt after 1064) and Garamszentbenedek (Hrons ký Beňadík, SK, founded
in 1074). It was in use constantly in cathedrals as well as by different orders until
the mid-13th century.42
As for the western part of the churches, it should be noted that there are different types in Hungarian Romanesque architecture; churches with open ground floors are neither exclusive nor constantly present. The 12th-century cathedral of Esztergom is one of the earliest notable examples. It was popular in monastery churches of the 12th and early 13th century (Nagykapornak), especially in the eastern half of the country (Ákos, Harina, Kaplony [Cäpleni, RO], Pankota [Pâncota, RO], Bátmonostor; also the unfinished church of Kisdisznód). In Transdanubia this type was also preferred during the first half of the 13th century (Lébény, Ják, Türje, Zsámbék). While this kind of arrangement seems to have been favoured in Hungary, it is less usual in the West. There are some parallels in Bavaria (Steingaden, Thierhaupten, St. Peter’s in Munich). In Austria it is almost unknown (with the exception of Kremsmünster). In Bohemia it is quite popular (Prague: church of the Knights of St John and Poříčí, St Peter’s; Tismice, Litomyšl, Milevsko, Teplá, and Rajhrad in Moravia). In Poland it is known, but rare (Strzelno, Inowrocław).43

In general, the type described by Ipolyi and Henszlmann was in use in the entire region of Central Europe during the second half of the 12th century and the beginning of the 13th century, but was most popular in Hungary. Henszlmann’s thesis can therefore be accepted cautiously, even though this type was not applied from the beginning and was only one of the preferred church arrangements. Hungary, together with some of the neighbouring countries, was influenced by the Lombard basilical type of the Mediterranean and the tower arrangement of the North. Despite the presence of other types, and the variety of the details, the territory circumscribed by Ipolyi and Henszlmann still seems to form a logical unit on which further art historical research may be based.
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This study considers the role played by the Church of St Elizabeth in Kassa (Cassovia, Kassau, Košice) in different cultural contexts in the early 1940s. The inquiry focuses on the writings of two authors of divergent outlook. The first was a priest and church historian, the second a well-known Hungarian writer. Political and philosophical disagreements between a priest and a liberal writer are perhaps not surprising. These two men did, however, have an intimate connection on a spiritual level, born of their deep feelings about the cathedral, the role it played in the history of their city, and its place in their own personal and spiritual experience.

A discussion of the political atmosphere forming the background to their differences regarding the interpretation of the cathedral will be followed by the exploration of some philosophical and aesthetic problems.

The Church of St Elizabeth might be described as a symbol, a means to overcome the temporal (in many respects historical) limitations of individual human existence (fig. 1). However, any attempt to transcend boundaries and limitations in a historically significant situation has its consequences.

The first, seemingly simple example gives an idea of how interpretations of the cathedral were perceived in the political disputes of the time. It concerns a book written mainly by priest and historian Béla Wick, with a preface written by Dr Sándor Pohl, the mayor of the “free town” of Kassa. Wick had been professor of Church history and canon law of the theological seminary in Kassa since 1921. By the early 1940s, he had already established his position in the local church hierarchy. He was recognized as an expert on the history of local monuments, including the Church of St Elizabeth. The book in question is concerned with the history and monuments of Kassa, and was published in 1941. Dr Pohl’s preface included a passage which was to cause Wick, the main author, many problems in the years to come. It describes enthusiastically the events of 11 November 1939, when the Hungarian leader, Miklós Horthy, arrived in Kassa riding a white horse and liberated the town from “twenty years of Czech occupation”. Pöhl ends his introduction by claiming that Kassa had always been, and would always be, exclusively Hungarian. This rhetoric had a very short temporal relevance (fig. 2). What was opportune in 1941 became a heavy burden after the end of the war in 1945.
1. Kassa, the Church of St Elizabeth from the west (Photo from the 1930s by István Pettrás: Budapest, Photo Archives of the National Office for the Protection of Cultural Heritage, Inv. Nr. 2073N)
part of the consolidation of the re-established political order, there was to be a re-evaluation of the past. This was the background to a court case brought against Wick by the District People’s Court of Košice (Okresný l’udovy súd), in which the book was cited in evidence.\(^5\) The court did not focus on the interpretation of the Church of St Elisabeth. Wick stood accused of pro-Hungarian and anti-Czechoslovak rhetoric. The court considered the book to be part of the propaganda effort launched by the “Hungarian invaders and collaborators”, trying to re-establish the greater Hungarian state at the expense of Czechoslovakia.\(^6\)

However, Wick’s own version of Hungarian patriotism was not primarily motivated by contemporary politics. It was based on traditional loyalty to the crown and ideas about King St Stephen. For Wick, the Cathedral of St Elizabeth was a symbol of the honoured Christian tradition of the Hungarian kingdom. In the Middle Ages, the latter was a multi-ethnic state, providing a framework for a peaceful co-existence of peoples of different origins and cultural backgrounds.\(^7\) Béla Wick, a well-educated historian, knew that loyalty to the crown was an option not only for the original Hungarian and Slavonic inhabitants of Cieszowia, but also for the settlers coming there mostly from Germany and partially from Italy. Vojtech (Béla) Wick was a loyal citizen of both pre- and post-war Czechoslovakia.\(^8\)

Wick had cultivated his passion for the cathedral for many years. In 1936 he published his scholarly research in a book on the history of the cathedral, in both Hungarian and Slovak. Some parts of this bilingual publication may considered documents of the tension under which personal identities were formed and defined in the region. Wick was forced to face problems of self-definition and identity. It was not a simple choice of Slovak or Hungarian identity. There was at least one more option, and one which was important for Wick: during the war, he was very probably co-president of Ojčízna,\(^9\) a cultural society of Slavonic inhabitants of eastern Slovakia. Ojčízna, which had the support of the Budapest government, tried to cultivate a new “Slovjak” nation as an alternative to the mainstream Slovak national movement.\(^10\)

As an honest historian, working with historical sources, Wick could not suddenly become a narrow-minded nationalist. He felt a deep respect for the patron
saint of the cathedral, Elizabeth, born in 1207 into the royal family of medieval Hungary and active in the German regions until her death in 1231. St Elizabeth, who unified in herself different ethnic and political identities, was represented on the municipal seal. There, she stands in the centre of a three-partite architectural structure, between two angels. According to Wick, this might represent the original retable of the parish church dedicated to her. The seal's inscription “+S(anc)ta+ELISABET+SIGNALM+CIVIVM+DE+CASSA” shows that she also bore importance for the local citizens (fig. 3).11

In the Middle Ages, St Elizabeth’s was a parish church and represented a symbolic bridge among ethnic identities. The church stood both geographically and symbolically between the community of the original inhabitants and that of the settlers.12 In such a position, it was an important symbol of identity, emphasizing the unity between the original population and settlers of a different nation, language and culture.

A fire destroyed the older building of the parish church at the end of the fourteenth century. The new construction began during the reign of Sigismund of Luxemburg (1387–1437), King of Hungary and Holy Roman Emperor. The church retained its importance as a symbol of national identity, and without it the already growing national tension could have led to serious conflicts.13 This heritage survived, at least partially, for centuries, and became a source of inspiration for thinkers formulating their ideas around a culture of tolerance among the different ethnic groups. An important figure among such thinkers was Sándor Márai (1900–1989), a Hungarian writer with a broad education and growing international reputation.14

St Elizabeth’s Church, in the centre of his native town, played a significant role in Márai’s entire life and figured prominently in his work. Márai was born and raised in Kassa. In 1940, by which time he lived in Budapest, Márai described a visit to his home town in an essay entitled Kassai öjjarat (“The Košice Marches”).15 During his day-long trip, in search of the meaning of his life, he tried to define the basic values of European culture. St Elizabeth’s stood for him as a symbol of stability, a watchtower of European Christian culture, standing, as it had done for centuries, in the centre of the town and in the heart of its spiritual life. His relationship to the cathedral was an important part of his own personal identity: Márai understood himself to be part of a common European culture, in which cathedrals play a unifying role.
In Márai's narrative, the temporal dimension of his own life is confronted with the past represented by historical monuments. Returning to Kassa, he saw the changes wrought on the city by the post-First World War political turbulence. Many places known to him from his youth had simply disappeared. He connected his feelings, observations and contemplations on this experience of loss to the general process of destruction, caused primarily by the war. However, Márai also considered much of the destruction to be due to the laziness and selfishness of the citizens, who concentrated their lives on short-time goals and sought the pleasures of mass culture. “Mass culture” had at least two meanings for him: one is the statement of a thinker who—in the tradition of Friedrich Nietzsche, or more directly, Ortega y Gasset—feels an intellectual superiority to the currently predominant forces of culture. The other is a more precise temporal and temporary meaning, describing a specific form of industrial culture, observable in his home town. In this case, the general critique of the cultural shortcomings of the industrial age had a national relevance, too. This basic contrast of different cultures also had important consequences for the temporal dimensions of Márai’s reading of the city and its parish church. He saw St Elizabeth’s as a symbol of human creativity and eternal values, a guiding and motivating force for generations of citizens who worked on the construction of the building. According to Márai, Germans, Hungarians and Slovaks worked together for centuries to complete it. For him, the collective identity of the citizens of Kassa was a multi-national phenomenon. Their unity was created and guaranteed by cooperation on a centuries-long enterprise whose aims were eternal and which could never be replaced by any industrial product. Márai sets against this traditional society the new culture of mass production and consumption imported to Košice by the Czechs. He saw in mass production a symbol of decadence of the culture and venerable traditions of Europe. Márai disliked modern functional buildings like the department stores built in Košice between the two wars; he described them as “a kind of transition between Bata shoes and half-digested Le Corbusierism”. Neither did he show any interest for the developments of modern art in Košice in that period—this attitude corresponds with his generally sceptical remarks about modernism in his writings.

Despite his anti-Czech sentiments on the cultural level, and in a sharp contrast to Wick, Márai had important ideas about tolerance and future collaboration between different nations in united post-war Europe. He did not shrink from such a prophecy even in 1940! His vision has a close relationship with his interpretation of history. According to him, the way out of decadence is a new asceticism. Centuries earlier, a revolutionary programme of a new asceticism, parallel to the radical aspects of the Franciscan movement, was followed by St Elizabeth of Hungary/Thuringia (1207–1231). Márai conspicuously did not write about her radical activities or make any reference to her life. He did not draw a parallel between the two asceticisms even when standing in front of the altarpiece depicting important events from her life. In 1933, Márai had published a long essay entitled “School of the Poor”, in which he discussed the idea and meaning of poverty for the spiritual
life of an individual, even referring back to St Francis of Assisi.\textsuperscript{21} Why was there no deeper continuation of this dialogue? From the aesthetic point of view, Márai might have been afraid of being labelled a Romantic. From the political point of view, mentioning St Elizabeth might have been considered support for right-wing propaganda.\textsuperscript{22}

To differentiate between “eternal” and “temporary” values, Márai developed an aesthetic theory which attempted to separate the objective beauty of the cathedral from his own personal experience of it. Eternal values are anchored in the collective religious tradition, and mean more than just personal experience. In his essayistic novel \textit{Ég és föld} (“Heaven and Earth”), originally published in 1942, Márai described his elevated feelings during Christmas Day mass. He wanted to separate these feelings from the personal memories of his childhood, which were, or would be, forgotten; the church would survive in what he described as “cold inattentiveness”. According to Márai, only an artwork can be so inattentive, looking down with an almost inhuman indifference to its creator.\textsuperscript{23} The passions of the human soul develop and exist in the temporal dimension, substantially different from eternity celebrated by religions, or even from the long historical processes described by philosophers.\textsuperscript{24} The passions are very individual but their eternal aspects can be alienated and “cold”. The symbol offers a path to transcend the temporal limits of a few aspects of human life. As an alternative to this way of symbolic salvation, Márai was proposing a kind of religion of beauty.\textsuperscript{25}

Márai was deeply interested in the existence of the artist who lives in a perpetual inner struggle to fulfil his dreams and ideals. In 1940, he published an allegorical drama entitled \textit{Kassai polgárok} (“Bourgeois of Košice”), whose main theme is the political struggle that took place in the city in 1310.\textsuperscript{26} Some experts even see a continuity between this play and the tradition of medieval religious drama.\textsuperscript{27}
The play demonstrates that there are other and much more important struggles, especially in the life of an artist, than those in politics. Master John, a sculptor, the main character of the novel, works on a statue representing St Elizabeth. His struggle appears to be futile—he can never be satisfied with his work, but he has a strong feeling of his calling, leading him to ultimate loneliness.

5. The main altar of the Church of St Elizabeth in Kassa (photo from the 1930s by István Petrás: Budapest, Photo Archives of the National Office for the Protection of Cultural Heritage, Inv. Nr. 3698/aN)
In his search for eternal values, Márai could have observed the pictorial narratives of the saintly patroness in the Church of St Elizabeth, since they are closely connected to the history of salvation. On the north portal, the Crucifixion and the apocalyptic vision of the Last Judgement directly refer to the crucial stages of salvation (fig. 4). The events from the life of the Saint, depicted in the lateral slabs of the portal’s superstructure, appear in this perspective as works of mercy, described by Jesus according to Matthew 25 as the right way to salvation.28

On the main altar retable the same narrative appears, and is connected to the problems of contemporaneous Church and devotion. Two depictions of the body of Christ on the central axis of the retable can be clearly understood in their relation to the cult of the Eucharist, liturgically staged in front of the altar (fig. 5.). The suffering of Christ and the life of the Virgin Mary, represented on the wings of the retable, refer to Easter and Christmas respectively, and could be presented to believers during the liturgical celebrations of those most important feasts of the liturgical year.29 Nevertheless, the life of St Elizabeth also included a few visionary scenes closely connected to the process by which forms of personal devotion developed. The vision in the hospital, an original iconography, represents the personal devotion of the Saint as superior to the activities of the priest.30 Emphasis on such a radical idea about personal devotion was very rare in the 1470s. Accordingly only the understanding of both personal calling and social service can represent a way out of the feeling of senselessness caused by vanishing temporal values of human life.

The narratives of the modern human being struggling for the meaning of personal existence are deeply felt, sincere and passionate. The roots of such narratives can be traced back to the late medieval search for individual forms of religious life, as is reflected by the pictorial legends. Nevertheless, this legendary world does not sufficiently satisfy all the spiritual needs of a modern individual. It does not cover large parts of the terrain Márai was mapping so diligently in his literary works. This might be one of the reasons why he was not interested in the medieval pictorial narratives of his native town. The historical development of culture produced alienation here, too. The striving for authentic existence has always produced the most interesting narratives. When a more pragmatic, ideologically biased approach to history ignores these narratives, the cultural past becomes boring, and contemporary cultural life more endangered. In this case political regimes tend to suppress the richness and creative potential of individuals in the name of their own political or economic agenda.

Notes
1 For the initial historical information see e.g. O. R. Halaga, Počiatky Košíc a zrod metropoly, Košice 1992. The multi-ethnic character of the town is also reflected by its names in different languages—it was called Cassa or Cassovia in Latin, Kaschau in German, Kassa in Hungarian and today it exists as Košice in eastern Slovakia. In this text, either the Slovak, Hungarian or the Latin version will be used according to the linguistic and political context.
Neither of them was any kind of soldier in the propaganda war, producing images of a Czech lion trying to swallow the church.


B. Wick, Kassa története és múemlékei, Kassa 1941.

The complete transcript of the final hearing and the decision, dated 9 December 1947, was published in Vojtech Wick… (n. 3 above), 75—80 (Hungarian translation on 82—86).

Košice/Kassa was given to Hungary as a result of the First Vienna Arbitration, which took place on 2 November 1938 and was declared invalid by the Treaty of Paris in 10 February 1947. For more on these events see L. Deák, Hungary’s game for Slovakia, Bratislava 1996 (translation of the Slovak original Hra o Slovensko, Bratislava 1991). Speaking up for the Hungarian character of the city was seen as a crime on the part of Wick. In his defence, Wick denied the authorship of the most tendentious chapter entitled “Twenty years of Czech occupation”. According to his testimony, this part was written by Géza Forgách, the former editor in chief of the newspaper Kassai Újság. More general facts concerning the policy regarding the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia are discussed in Š. Šutaj, Maďarská menšina na Slovensku v rokoch 1945—1948, Bratislava 1993, the most important sources on 181—92.

Among the most important documents of this political programme are St Stephen’s admonitions to his son Emeric (“Libellus sancti Stephani regis de institutione morum ad Emericum ducem,” in Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum, vol. II., ed. E. Szentpétery, Budapest 1938, 619—27).

His activities in favour of Slovak culture between 1920 and 1938 were acknowledged by many, including the president of Czechoslovakia, Dr. Eduard Beneš. Even the court, on 12 December 1947, mentioned these activities positively. In his letter of 8 May 1946 applying for his pension, Wick describes his mother tongue as Slovak and calls attention to the fact that he declared himself Slovak in the census of 2 December 1930. Furthermore, he gives a list of his books written in Slovak between 1920 and 1936—see Vojtech Wick… (n. 3 above), 51—52.

The main evidence of his position in this society is an article published in Felvidéki Újság, No. 14, on 18 January 1941. This article, celebrating the “pro-Hungarian orientation” of the Slovaks and stressing their difference from the Slovaks, was used as a proof during the above-mentioned court hearing. In his defence, Wick denied any political activities during the war.


See Halaga (n. 1 above), 191.


14 As an introduction, see e.g. M. Szegedy-Maszák, Márai Sándor, Budapest 1991; T. Mézáros, Képek és témék Márai Sándor életéről, Budapest 2006.
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16 For an explicit reference to the concept of élite by Ortega y Gasset, see S. Márai, Kassai űjrát, Budapest 1999, 42.
17 “...a dómot mi építettünk, évszázadokon át, kassaiak, őslakók, magyarak, németek és szlovákok”--Márai (n. 16 above), 35.
18 Márai (n. 16 above), 40: “...átmenet a Bata cipő és a rosszul megemészttet Le-Corbusierizmus között”.
19 Márai (n. 16 above), 41, 42.
20 A quite explicit “prophetic” vision of a common European market is described in his 1942 Rőpinat a nemzetnevelés ügyében, Pozsony 1999, 57. English title “Tract on the Raising of the Nation” by Mészáros (n. 15 above), 13.
21 Mészáros (n. 15 above), 8–9.
22 Márai’s respect for the value of individual life prevented him from identifying with either the right- or the left-wing dictatorships, which both suppressed the freedom of an individual, which he considered to be one of the essential values. His decision to withdraw from political life, “to defend himself from the world”. Quotation is from the Embers, see Mészáros (n. 15 above), 14.
23 In Slovak translation S. Márai, Nebo a zem, Bratislava 2003, 23; in Hungarian: S. Márai, Föld! Föld!, Budapest 1996.
24 For a detailed discussion of these philosophical and methodological questions see e.g. P. Ricoeur, Temps et récit, Paris 1983. The second part is about history and narrative (I used the Czech translation, P. Ricoeur, Čas a vyprávění, Praha 2000, 137–319).
25 “Mutasd fel a Szépet, mint a pap az ostyát, s olyan hittel mutasd fel, hogy hinni tanuljanak benne, mert a Szép nem a meddő eszmény, hanem az élet legnagyobb emberi erőfeszítése” Márai (n. 16 above), 83.
26 There were attempts to use this text politically in favour of Horthy’s regime, provoking mixed emotions in Márai. See E. Zeltner, Sándor Márai -- ein Leben in Bildern, Munich–Zurich 2001, 120, 124.
27 Szegedy–Maszák (n. 14 above), 54.
29 The basic structure of such duality of historical narratives has been recently studied by scholars investigating the relations of altarpieces and liturgy, e. g. by B. Williamson, “Altarpieces, liturgy, and devotion,” Speculum 79, 2004, 341–406; also P. Crossley, “The Man from Inner Space: Architecture and Meditation in the Choir of St Laurence in Nuremberg,” in Medieval art–recent perspectives, ed. G. R. Owen-Crocker–T. Graham, Manchester 1998, 165–82. According to their observations, collective identities could be more universal when they were based on the cult of Eucharist or more corporative or even individual when they were connected with the cult of saints. In Košice, the devotion to Elizabeth was shared by the whole community. In other towns, her role was probably more specific. The altar retable of Saint Elizabeth for the church of Saint Giles (Aegidius) in Bártfa/Bardejov/Bartfeld (SK) was commissioned by the guild of tailors.


Der erste Umstand ist der des denkbar prickelnden Entstehungszusammenhangs, der sich in Stichwörtern so ausdrücken lässt: Ein 20-jähriger Student, der später zum großen Kunsthistoriker werden wird, zeichnet einen 58-jährigen Philosophieprofessor, der das kunsthistorische Wissen seiner Zeit bis zur jüngsten
fachlichen Publikation noch einmal in ein enzyklopädisches System bringt. Der Student scheint davon nichts zu ahnen und auch nicht aufzuhören, selbst wenn der Philosoph über das Zeichnen eines Porträts so viel zu sagen hat, wie bislang wohl kaum jemals gesagt worden ist.


Der Zeichner


**Die Zeichnung**


So möchte man aus noch eigener Erfahrung die Situation beschreiben. Als Kunsthistoriker kann man noch hinzufügen, dass diese fünf, nur additiv vereinten Figuren allein von der konturierenden Strichführung, von einem konsequent, doch nicht aufdringlich von vorn links geführten, modellierenden Licht, von ei-
nem dunkel zugestrichenen Hintergrund sowie einem hellen Streifen zusammengehalten werden, der horizontal verläuft. Dieser Streifen markiert rechts die Tischkante und zieht sich von da hinter den drei Studierenden bis auf die linke Seite der Zeichnung fort. Er verleiht der ganzen Komposition eine Achse, um die sich wohl etwas dreht, das allerdings so rätselhaft wie die nicht entzifferbaren Zettel bleibt, die am Pult des Professors kleben.


Doch muss dies sein? Spricht nicht auch Ironie aus dem kleinen Gruppenporträt des 20-jährigen Zeichners? Musste man denn tatsächlich so nahe ans Pult kommen, um den schwäbelnden Philosophen überhaupt zu verstehen? Und dann noch die lange Strähne, die dem unfrisierten Philosophen über die Stirn fällt! Bis zur Nasenwurzel scheint sie zu reichen. Erinnert sie noch an die Locke des Apoll, die auf einigen Dichterporträts der Romantik den großen Geist, das Genie zu kennzeichnen hatte. Also eine verkappte, etwas verzagte Karikatur? Auch schon der junge Kugler distanziert sich, macht sich sogar etwas lustig? Dieser Gedanke ist nicht abwegig, wenn man die Porträtlehre gegenüberstellt, die Hegel für die einzig möglichen hielt.

**Der Gezeichnete**

halb kann Kugler Hegels Ausführungen über den mythischen Ursprung der Malerei aus der Silhouette, die eine Liebende von ihrem Geliebten gezeichnet hat, und über ein untergründiges „Hinarbeiten“ der Malerei zum Porträthaften überhaupt noch nicht gehört haben.


Doch dem nicht genug! Nach diesem Durchgang setzte Hegel zu einem zweiten an. Ganz Professor wollte er zwar „nur einige Hauptpunkte herausheben“, reflektierte dann aber doch ausführlich über den Blick überhaupt und die Blicksiegigkeit griechischer Skulpturen. Er berichtete über die Sorgfalt, mit der die griechischen Bildhauer Ohren gestaltet haben, und sprach erneut über Nase, Mund und Kinn, die „zu den feinsten Nuancen des Spottes, der Verachtung, des Neides“ ebenso befähigt seien wie zur „ganzen Gradation der Schmerzen und der Freu-
Hegel endete mit einigen Sätzen über das Haar, das „mehr den Charakter eines vegetabilischen als eines animalischen Gebildes“ habe, „vielmehr ein Zeichen der Schwäche“ sei. Ohne sich am eigenen Schopf zu fassen zitierte er Winckelmann – „Die Barbaren lassen die Haare platt hängen oder tragen sie rund abgeschnitten, nicht wallend und gelockt“ –, und stellte dann unterschiedliche Haartrachten des Altertums vor. Er fasste schließlich seine Ausführungen zusammen und nannte das Ideal eines Bildnisses die „schöne Gestalt“, die durch „eine Linie bestimmt“ wird, „welche dem Eirund am nächsten kommt und alles Scharfe, Spitze, Winklige dadurch zur Harmonie und einem fortlaufenden milden Zusammenhang der Form auflöst, ohne doch bloß regelmäßig und abstrakt symmetrisch zu sein.“ Weil er sich nicht erneut „in das weitere Detail“ einlassen wollte, schloss er mit dem Satz: „Zur Bildung dieses in sich zurückkehrenden Ovals gehört besonders für den vorderen Anblick des Gesichts die schöne freie Schwung vom Kinn zum Ohr sowie die schon erwähnte Linie, welche die Stirn die Augenknochen entlang beschreibt; ebenso der Bogen über das Profil von der Stirn über die Spitze der Nase zum Kinn herunter und die schöne Wölbung des Hinterkopfs zum Nacken.“

„nach der Natur“ oder „getreu den Verhältnissen“

Das klingt höchst poetisch und belehrend zugleich! Ja, heutzutage möchte man meinen: So könnte eine gute Korrektur im Zeichenunterricht an der Akademie sich angehört haben. In einem Hörsaal aber, in dem immer mal wieder aus Langeweile oder Lust und Laune gekritzelt, skizziert und porträtiert wird, kann Hegels verbale Präzision den Zeichner nur aufgeschreckt und danach fragen lassen haben, wo er denn zeichne? Gewiss in einem Hörsaal der Universität mit einem Katheder, an dem „der grämliche, bleiche Philosoph“ sitzt, der aller rhetorischer Defizite zum Trotz ein „Hauptelement des damaligen Berliner Lebens“ bildete! Doch kann Kugler die Zeichnung und vor allem die Lithographie der Zeichnung nur an einem zweiten Ort, an einem Arbeitstisch, in einem Atelier und einer damals hochmodernen Druckwerkstatt nach seiner, ihm eigenen, keineswegs klassizistischen Manier fertiggestellt haben. Damit hat er aber auch zeichnend in Frage gestellt, was er denn, wie auf dem Blatt steht, „nach der Natur gezeichnet“ habe.

Gewiss den bedeutenden Philosophen Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, aber auch drei von dessen Studenten und einen, im wahrsten Sinne des Wortes Assistenten, also Beisitzer bzw. Helfer! Die drei Studenten aber sind einander so unnatürlich ähnlich, dass sie ohne weitere Hilfen nicht benannt werden können.

Die erste Hilfe ist heutzutage relativ schnell zu finden. Sie liegt in der eingangs skizzierten Ausgangssituation der unzähligen Bilder, die selbst die digitalen Suchmaschinen von dicht besetzten Hörsälen und von Professoren in der Vorlesung, vor Tafeln und hinter Versuchsgeräten, und von gut gekleideten Studierenden in Farben, Tüchern und Strickwaren aller Fakultäten anbieten. Unter diesen Bildern...
finden sich auch, wie gesagt, einige wenige, nicht fotografierte, sondern gezeich­
nete und gemalte Bilder, die auf die Verhältnisse an den mittelalterlichen und
neuezeitiachen Universitäten verweisen. Das wohl bekannteste und gewiss auch
schönste ist die Reproduktion einer Miniatur aus dem Kupferstichkabinett der
Staatlichen Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin. Auf ihm ist der Theologe
Heinrich von Friemar d. Ä. vor seinen Schülern zu sehen, die dicht gedrängt in
vier Bänken auf das reagieren, was der bärtige Turbanträger von dem erhöhten
Katheder, in das er gezwängt ist, vorträgt. Sie tun dies auf unterschiedlichste Wei­
se. Einige lauschen gespannt, andere lesen nach, wieder andere diskutieren, einer
schläft usw. Drei aber sitzen seitlich vom Katheder auf einer eigenen kürzeren
Bank. Nur ihre Rücken und somit ihre blauen und verschiedenen roten Mäntel
sowie ihre unterschiedliche Kopfbedeckung ist auszumachen und es ist zu erken­
nen, dass sie Bücher vor sich auf den Pultflächen zu liegen haben. Zwischen dieser
Dreiergruppe und dem Katheder mit dem Lehrer sitzt eine weitere bärtige Person
ins Profil gedreht, die dem großen Vorsitzenden höchst aufmerksam lauscht, ver­
mutlich ein Assistent.

Dreiergruppen wie diese sind auf einigen weiteren mittelalterlichen Universi­
tätsbildern immer wieder zu entdecken. Selten sitzen sie so still da, wie auf der
Miniatur mit dem Thüringer Theologen. In den meisten Fällen sprechen sie dabei
mit den Händen. Noch leichter sind diese Gruppen von jeweils drei Diskutanten
auf fast allen Bildern auszumachen, die den zwölfjährigen Jesus lehrend im Tempel
zeigen, und am bekanntesten ist vermutlich die kleine Tafel, die Duccio di Bu­
oninsegna gemalt hat. In der Domopera zu Florenz wird sie aufbewahrt.

Ob der eben mal 20-jährige Franz Kugler auch nur eines von diesen Bildern
schon und auch nur in einer Reproduktion gesehen, geschweige denn gekannt
hat, ist höchst unwahrscheinlich. Wahrscheinlich aber ist, dass er solche Dispu­
tationsgruppen selbst in der humboldtschen Reform-Universität noch erlebt, eine
davon bestimmter Kommilitonen wegen gezeichnet und dann auch noch für eine
Vervielfältigung lithographiert hat. Denn auch diese Reform wurde nicht von
einem Tag auf den anderen, in einem Jahr, ja selbst nicht einmal in einem Jahr­
zehnt durchgeführt. Daher wird man hoffentlich zum Jubiläum im Jahr 2010 auch
einiges über eine Intensivierung der Forschungen lesen, die immer noch in den
Anfängen stecken: die Forschungen über das Prüfungswesen!20 Daher muss die
zweite notwendige Hilfe erst noch geschaffen werden! Denn selbst von den Ha­
bilitationen und Promotionen, die Hegel eingeleitet und bei denen er mitgewirkt
hat, sind nur einige bekannt gemacht.21 Offenbar schwiegen sich auch die vielen
Zeitzeugen aus,22 so dass ausgerechnet diese Zeichnung Franz Kuglers einen Wi­
derspruch festhält, der offenbar über Jahre, ja weit mehr als zwei Jahrzehnte in der
Berliner Universität bestand und ausgerechnet bei Hegel eklatant deutlich wurde.
Rhetorisch keineswegs glänzend erfüllte er in den Vorlesungen den Reform­
wunsch seines schärfsten Gegners an der Berliner Universität, Friedrich Daniel
Schleiermacher: Er ließ alles, was er wusste, „vor den Zuhörern entstehen“, so
dass diese „nicht etwa Kenntnisse sammelten, sondern die Tätigkeit der Vernunft
im Hervorbringen der Erkenntnis unmittelbar anschauen und anschauend nach­bildend“ konnten.23 Bei den Prüfungen jedoch und insbesondere in den privaten Prüfungen, die es wie eh und je gab, scheint Hegel die überkommenen Formen selbst der Disputation ertragen, wenn nicht gepflegt zu haben. Franz Kuglers Zeichnung und Lithographie wird dann nicht mehr nur längst bekanntes Defizit Hegels illustrieren, sondern das Defizit der Forschung indizieren: Wie lange dauerte es, bis die Humboldt-Schleiermachtsche Reform durchgesetzt war? Auf eine Promotionsordnung z. B. konnte sich die Philosophische Fakultät in Berlin offenbar erst 1838 einigen! Wie viel Abstriche mussten hingenommen werden? Wann schlug das Reformwerk zum Mythos um?

ANMERKUNGEN
10 Ebenda 103.
11 Ebenda 385.
12 Ebenda 386–387.
13 Ebenda 387.
14 Ebenda 387.
15 Ebenda 394.
16 Ebenda 395.
17 Ebenda 396.
18 Ebenda 396.
19 Jaeschke (wie Anm. 6), 51.


23 F. Schleiermacher, Gelegentliche Gedanken über Universitäten im deutschen Sinn nebst einem Anhang über eine neu zu errichtende, Berlin 1808, 142.
László Beke

THE THREE MAXIMS OF ERNŐ MAROSI:
ART HISTORY AS LAYING A MOSAIC,
AS HISTORIOGRAPHY, AND AS ANTI-AESTHETICS

Laying a mosaic. Several decades ago, in a private conversation, Ernő Marosi said that an art historian simply lays stones of a mosaic. There was in this confession-like statement a kind of quiet resignation: we just lay the stones, the complete picture will never come together, man is not omniscient. The metaphor gives rise to a two-dimensional model: a mosaic, a map, a picture. History, however, is not a picture, but a single or multiples story, narrative, writing.

History of art history. Another confession-like, somewhat cynical statement of Marosi's: "I am much more interested in the history of art history than in art history itself, you know." Or perhaps I do not remember correctly, and he actually said: "I could much better write about (understand) medieval art from its 19th century reception than from studying the medieval period itself." There may be a glaring difference between these two sentences, but they both mark out the topic of the discourse: history, the purpose of historiography, the knowability of history.

Anti-aesthetics, horror pulchri. Marosi's third maxim, which he has several times given voice to, is extremely provocative and liable to misunderstanding, but extremely simple. Following logically and with absolute consistency from the foregoing, it may be regarded as the warp of the methodological fabric that runs right through his work: "the question of, for example, whether a painting is beautiful, has no place in art history." Of course he did not say it exactly like that, but that is the essence of what he meant, and again refers to the task of the art historian.

All three maxims should be put on the common denominator of contemporary art.

Mosaic

The mosaic of history is a kind of jigsaw puzzle (or to use the strict term for filling the plane, a tiling), and a kind of map. The picture that is art history is a considerably more complex map. The jigsaw reference suggests that it can only be laid in one way, just as everything only happens one way; "that is the way it happened, and that way only," there is only one “solution”, although the historical
philosophy of our time permits several possible interpretations or narratives. In whatever way, two-dimensionality encloses the picture of history within bounds. For a more subtle depiction, it is impossible to avoid plotting the third dimension—with family trees, process diagrams and graphs. The crystallising of a historical moment results in a constellation—such were the subject of the East Art Map project undertaken by the IRWIN Group of Ljubljana, which drew out simultaneities between the principal artists in Eastern Europe by linking them to years.2

Another possibility is the use of charts: chronological tables which order historical events along the time axis. This technique has been most spectacularly used by George Maciunas, founder of the Fluxus movement, who started out with arranging world-history dates into schools, and arrived at the graphical depiction of the history of the Soviet Union, the precedents of the Fluxus movement, and other complex historical interrelationships. In some places he also had recourse to the third dimension: he had to use tapes perpendicular to the paper to display synchronous events, and even had a designer produce a filing cabinet in which the compartments were arranged in a way to reproduce spatial and temporal relationships.3 Also to be regarded as one of the first results of such speculation was Alfred H. Barr Jr’s design for the New York Museum of Modern Art exhibition Cubism and Abstract Art, where the floor plan of the exhibition halls was set out by an artistic family tree displaying historical relations.4

One of the most classical models of the complex visualisation of temporal and spatial relationships is the historical atlas. The world atlas of art history edited by John Onians uses arrows marked with years to map out geographical developments within art (where a single mechanism may be detected in geographical progression, like the spread of constructivism from its origins in Russia).5 It should perhaps also be mentioned that this book, containing several hundred maps, devotes no more than 4 pages to the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, South-Eastern Europe and Eastern Europe, and Hungary is represented by one solitary reproduction (István Csók: Chest with Tulips, 1910). Another prototype of two-dimensional art atlases is the Mnemosyne Atlas produced by Aby Warburg between 1924 and 1929, which represents iconological/historical interrelationships with photographic reproductions of art works arranged into tables, like on a notice board.

Attempts at the spatial representation of historical phenomena, events and processes are related to the postmodern tendency for certain academic models to take shape through topographical metaphor. Since the 1980s, it has been fashionable to call the process of dealing with certain sets of problems “mapping” or “kartografieren”; to talk, in the sense of art geography and post-colonialism, of the “centre” and the “periphery”; to be concerned with “field theory” and “théorie de champs”, to take a psychoanalytical approach based on the Freudian “vertical” arrangement (superego, subconscious, etc.), to talk, in the modern curatorial parlance, of the “art scenario”, and to “focus” on everything possible.

Taking all these into account, the present author is working on a construction of modern and contemporary Hungarian art history in which the historical,
written narrative is supplemented by considerably more significant graphical models than what have done before. These plot “constellations” linked to points in time along a common time axis (this is in itself a virtual third dimension); each point (artist), however, constitutes a set, the set of his own work, and these in turn give rise to process diagrams and constellations among each other. A single work constitutes a “black hole” on the plane of the constellation, since it has an infinite number of interpretations. The black hole of the work opens up a new dimension (or dimensions) on this graphical model.

Nonetheless, the question remains open as to whether, in the case of history/historiography, it is possible to talk of “representation” or “figure” as “image” in relation to “writing”. The creation and reconstruction of a history and the history is constrained by chronology to be one-dimensional or linear, i.e. discourse, statement, narration, narrative and writing. This is the starting point of narratology. It is why Vilém Flusser can say of the possibilities for a new system of relationships between text and image, that digitization can also rearrange linear writing by transforming the written form into numbers and points and thus render it capable of creating new kinds of images.6

**History of art history and historiography**

To juxtapose the terms “history of art history” (in our case the history of the study of art or of history of art) and historiography (really the writing of history itself) involves more than just word play. It has definite terminological, methodological and even philosophical consequences. What is history? The chronological experience of the life of humanity. Writing this down is the discipline of studying history, and relating it is history. By contrast, historiography, according to the modern consensus, is not the writing down of history (the original meaning of the word), but the history of the discipline of history. This difference is semantically a mere nuance, but it stems from major differences in outlook. Just as in the 19th century there were theoretical proposals that phenomena can only be described and not explained, nowadays there are philosophical opinions that there is now no philosophy (ontology, epistemology, etc.), only history of philosophy, describing and comparing the stages of human thinking. If we are not talking simply of the study of history and of history, but of art history as the coexistence of history and art, then we can set out a series of paradigms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>story (event)</th>
<th>art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>story telling</td>
<td>artistic event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history</td>
<td>discourse on artistic event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narration of events</td>
<td>art history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing of events</td>
<td>narration of artistic history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>writing of artistic events (Vasari)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are other series of paradigms which may be placed in context with the above (some of which only “work” in Hungarian or in one of the standard languages of art historiography):

- the historical series: the history of the universe, history of the Earth, natural history, prehistory (see the inaugural address to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences by the historian Ferenc Glatz: Gaia View in History Writing, 2005), archaeology, history of the future, teleological history, planning, futurology, science fiction, salvation history;

- art work, artist, art: it is possible to conceive of a general study of art (artology) dividing into descriptive, interpretative and historical disciplines, so that art history is part of it, but so is research into form, psychology and cognitive aspects; the study of art must have an interdisciplinary cooperation with art theory, art philosophy and aesthetics;

- as applying to museums, exhibition-organising and contemporary art, the “4 C’s”: custos, commissaire, curator, critic.

The latter two terms offer a new interpretation of how both art history and art are conducted. The role of the curator, the critic or art theorist in contemporary art can be set in parallel with those of the politician and political scientist in modern society and contemporary history.

- other terms to be interpreted for the study of art history are: knowledge, doctrine, education, research, learning, theory.

Contemporary history and the study of memory

This is not simply a question of terminology. It would require a comparative study of historical theory to detect the interrelationships between social sciences, cultural studies and contemporary history. German Zeitgeschichte, being concerned with the constant transition between past and present, regarding the present as the product of the past (it discovers in the present, and so in currently existing artworks, the traces of the past, i.e. historical links), and embracing everything we still remember, is a transitional discipline. What causes the events of the Second World War and the Holocaust to be constantly discussed by survivors and later generations is that what happened was simply atrocious. But among the philosophical and anthropological returns from this discussion is the ability to observe
the workings of social memory: the present turns into the past on the disappear­ance of the last witness who experienced or was a contemporary of the events, that is when an era comes to an end, but the memory lives on in the thinking and memory-objects of other people. Artworks form a particular set of memory-objects, and these include monuments and special art objects produced specifically for the purpose of remembering: memorials.7

The German term Zeitgeschichte means more than “contemporary history”; it is also “social history”, as often translated, at least into Hungarian. Social history is an area of the social sciences, which comprise broadly intersecting sets that include cultural studies and cultural anthropology.

History is the study of memory. Art history is the history of memory. History comprises only that which can be related, that which we remember. The survivor can only remember what he experienced, the generation which follows him can only remember what it took over from the previous generation, or what is written down. The historian is obliged to work by criticism of sources; the artist and the curator do not carry out academic research, but call into question what the survivor and the witness says, and accept without criticism what is written down. Going further along this line of thought brings us to the significance of a new method of researching recent events, oral history. The more people providing their memo­ries, the greater variety of answers obtained, but the more precise the reconstruc­tion of the subject of memory—the event under study. Characteristically, oral memory is much more credible (being more spontaneous) than written memory (corrected by self-control).

We only remember memories. Young researchers go as far as transcribing oral memories (recorded on tape) or having them transcribed, because it is only with text they are able and willing to work.8

It is at this point that Derrida’s Grammatology finds relevance. It provides us with the authorisation to regard, and read, everything we study as text, and to call the result a reading, just as in the interpretation of artworks.9 It is the source of encouragement for the present author in proposing that work with diagrams as a means of representing art history processes and interrelationships should be termed not just “diagrammatics”—after Gerhard Dirmoser10—but indeed “diagrammatology”,11 derived from Derrida.

Reconstruction and deconstruction

In dealing with the past (and with art works) we use two apparently mutually contradictory methods. “Reconstruction” is the restoration and presentation of events, processes and objects from very few remains, clues or data, almost out of nothing. “Deconstruction”, introduced by Derrida, at first goes in the opposite direction—“dismantling”—but nonetheless a tool of understanding. In fact, the de­construction of a historical process is effectively congruent with its reconstruction.
If we unearth something from “the well of the past”, we are not writing history, we are doing archaeology, bringing archaeological finds to the surface. Such a probe occupies a point-like section of the time-scale, and only becomes history if it becomes part of a process, i.e. establishes links with other point-like events. When we establish a process and talk about it, we thereby reconstruct it, and work it into a narrative. History itself is a narrative.

With deconstruction, a state arises which Roland Barthes calls “the death of the author”, because we arbitrarily construe the deconstructed object (process or artwork), which is cut off from its origins and the intention of the author, and create our own reading. With the history of memory, inasmuch that we proceed arbitrarily, there occurs “the death of the witness”.

And what about the area of the past which we do not remember and cannot reconstruct? There begins the empire of fiction.

**Contemporary art, curator outlook**

As we approach our own times, the writing of history as reconstruction of a past age and the writing of chronicles as recording of the present begin to fuse, intermingle, flow into the same channel. The present becomes history, and the past the present. The interface of these two separate tendencies is the study of historiography. We achieve a much more sophisticated interpretation of an earlier age by putting on the spectacles of a later age. Secondly, in recent decades the study of history has also become historic, and now has its own history. It is not the history of art which is being studied, but the history of its history. Historiography is becoming identical with the writing of history. The history of the writing of art history is ultimately a tautology, because describing the history of art is the same as writing art history.

This apparently complicated development is, however, in no respect retrograde. On the contrary, underlying it is the realisation that without a contemporary outlook it is impossible to examine the past—and vice versa. According to Michael Podro, it is in the interest of “critical history” to show “how the art of foreign or past cultures can become part of the intellectual life of the present”. At the forefront of this realisation is contemporary art, and its representative and intermediary, the curator.

The curator does not seek academic recognition. His purpose is to display and to do so—in setting up an exhibition—on equal ranking with the exhibiting artist or artists. In the case of art from the past, he almost inevitably comes into conflict with the historian, because he wants to present the past—to make it part of the present. He raises events from the past into the present, so that past and present start to run into one another, and he attempts to keep the latest events from the past continuously in the present. The reconstructions attempted by *Invisible Exhibitions* (2009), a major venture of the international curator project *Tranzit*, came
into confrontation with the art history profession by displaying exhibitions of old works without any basic research, dispensing with academic methods, updating the past in a radical, voluntarist way. The curator, and to a certain extent the new, critical art historian (cf. “new critical history”), demands of the academic world that it reveal and hand over all artworks, all sources and all data, in modern database form, in which the technical quality of the data (and in the ideal case the art work itself) approaches the original.

The art historian and the curator are diametrically opposed to each other. Both know that the exhibition they are producing is ephemeral, and so the historian attempts to record his research results in printed (or digitized) book form (preserving it for posterity), while for the curator the exhibition is an attempt to form the past in his own image. But obsolescence is the nightmare of both. The historian reconstructs, but the more thorough and detailed his reconstruction of the past (micro-history), the more it diverges from the present, and becomes an autonomous virtual reality, influencing the process of canonisation.

By the late 20th century, historical reconstructions had given rise to such idiosyncratic developments within the discipline as the new field of exhibition history. Major results were the sample-like Westkunst exhibition (curator: Kasper König),14 and then the reconstruction of the Stationen der Moderne (1988)15 and the Armory show (1912),16 which presented in ideal circumstances what the protagonists of current contemporary art need from the past. And then all this, too, fades from memory.

The continuous presence of the past, the state of “all-knowingness”, epistemological considerations

In fact, the constant conflict between history and the contemporary art outlook finds a special resolution in the museum, the library, the archive and the database. A little earlier, at the beginning of the postmodern era, this tendency took expression as the simultaneous presence of consecutive style eras: as long as the pyramids stand, we are living in the Age of the Pyramids (too).17 Every memory exists in the present. Our historical outlook discreetly retires to the background as we state that we now know everything. This train of thought comes to an abrupt halt on reaching the principal questions of Ernő Marosi’s work: firstly, can history be known, and secondly how does our need to be up-to-date affect our conception of history, assuming that contemporary art provides the terms for expressing our need to be up-to-date.

Our era—call it postmodern, the era of second modernity or simply the 21st century—is sceptical, cynical (ironic) but not necessarily pessimistic. In respect of historical fields of study, this basic stance is expressed by the “end of history” theories of Fukuyama and Belting. Ernő Marosi is not agnostic; the components of his work are research, opening up sources, discovery, reconstruction of associations, and reflection on academic processes; always starting out from the present.
state of affairs: intervention into contemporary academic affairs – from the viewpoint of contemporary art, a special part of history. Contemporary history combined with historiography.

The quest for omniscience launched by the Enlightenment has found a response in scepticism. Omniscience—and omnipotence—is a principle of God as Absolute, and it is from this (from Him) that the chief characteristics of the Arts are usually derived: the association of the Good, the Beautiful and the True. Herbert Marcuse has stated that this harmony broke up in the catastrophe of recent history, total war, holocaust and totalitarian systems. He proposed as the emblem of the arts of our time the Medusa, which presents the Truth—however dreadful—even at the expense of the Beautiful and the Good. This is the epistemological environment in which Marosi conducts his academic and contemporary-art activities.

What we might regard as a symbolic “Marosi progress report” is being published just at the moment this essay is being completed: the catalogue of the Ferenc Kazinczy centenary exhibition in the Budapest Petőfi Museum of Literature, entitled A Szép és a Jó (The Beautiful and the Good). Kazinczy, creator of modern Hungarian aesthetic thinking, wrote in a letter to Gergely Berzeviczy in 1810, “history proves that wherever Good has put down roots, it was always Beauty that prepared the way”. One of the major essays in the catalogue, and the key lecture at the opening of the exhibition were written by Ernő Marosi. Marosi regards Beauty, if not as an epistemological criterion in his work, then certainly as a moral imperative.

Notes
2 The slogan of the project: written on a “constellation” displayed on a postcard: “HISTORY IS NOT GIVEN. PLEASE HELP TO CONSTRUCT IT”. The historical moment here is really the entire post-1945 period. See also: East Art Map. Contemporary art and Eastern Europe, edited by IRWIN. An Afterall Book, Central Saint Martins College of Art and Design, University of the Arts London 2006.
3 Maciunas’ exhibition was arranged in the Art Collection of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 2006 by Astrit Schmidt-Burkhardt. See idem, Maciunas’ LEARNING MACHINES. From Art History to a Chronology of Fluxus, Detroit–Berlin 2003.
Historian Tibor Takács, talking about a lecture he gave on the political transition, said that his work as a historian was first to render the factual material and statements of witnesses "into text", so that he can work with them (Kossuth Radio, Budapest, 20 December 2009). On the methodology of memory research, see also Tükörszilánkok. Kádár-korszakok a személyes emlékezetben, ed. É. Kovács, Budapest 2008.
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Mencel, Václav 9866
Merény 2672
Meszt 338
Mézières, Philippe de 260
Michaelermeister 2297
Michal'ny (SK) see Szentmihályfalva
Michelangelo Buonarroti 129
Middeldorf, Ulrich 418
Miháileni (RO) see Csikszentmihály
Mihalik, Sándor 61
Mihály, Ferenc 27026
Milan 169 296, 368, 369, 3753, 408, 419
Cathedral 281
S. Maria delle Grazie 418
Miobézdeki, Adam 9866, 100106
Mirimonde, Albert P. de 467
Mlynica(SK) see Malomtak
Moholy-Nagy, László 128
Mözer, Miklós 213
Möller, István 185, 187, 19621
Molnár, Erik 9544
Molnár, László 65
Monogramist of Bakócz 452
Monostorszeg 21242
Monoszlói, András 449, 45547
Montecassino 173
Montefeltro, Federigo da 37829
Montefeltro, Guidobaldo da 37829
Montelupi family 440
Montorsoli, Giovanni 37723
Monyorókerék 45438
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Moore, Henry 132
Mudrák, Attila 163
Müer, Johannes 45
Müller, Theodor 316
Multscher, Hans 475
Munich 279, 313, 314, 318, 32023, 32024, 322
Church of S Peter 516
Murano
Santi Maria e Donato 215
Muraro, Michelangelo 214, 218
Nagaroli, Antonio de 249
Nagy, Ildikó 128
Nagydobos 434
Nagyekemező 272
Nagykapomak 516
Nagyrevy, András 436
Nagyszalok 458
Nagyszeben 266, 504, 505
Our Lady parish church 266
Nagyvárad 208, 245, 246, 247, 262, 418
Naldi, Naldo 414
Naples 285, 294, 296, 297, 368, 369, 372, 375, 375, 376, 376, 376
Castel Nuovo 371, 377, 379
Cathedral 296
S. Giovani a Carbonara 295, 307
Cathedral of Ladislas Anjou-Durazzo 296, 298, 307
S. Lorenzo Maggiore 286, 297
Sta Maria Donnaregina 286
tomb of Enrico Minutolo 304
S. Chiara 307
Cathedral 286, 297
tomb of Mary of Valois 307
Cathedral 286, 297
tomb of Merloto 307
Pappacoda chapel 296
Naście (CR) see Nekcsei
Naumburg 168, 170, 178
Cathedral 101118
Nekcsei 208
Nekcsei (-Lipócz), Demeter 197, 202, 204, 207, 208, 208, 210, 211
Nekcsei, Sándor 207, 208
Nekcszentmárton 208
Nemes Lampért, József 128
Németh, László 206, 207, 211
Neumarkt (Târgu Mureș, RO) see Marosvásárhely
Neumünster Abbey 74
New York 318
Nicolaus Carpentarius 446
Nicolaus Pater, Abbot 424
Nicopolis 260, 262
Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm 64
Nitra (SK) see Nyitra
Nocrich (RO) see Újegyháza
Rigvándy, Friderico Wilhelm 64
Nottingham 312
Noyon
Cathedral 164
Nuremberg 254, 324, 326, 328, 329, 338, 345
Nusco 286
Nyírbátor 446
Nyitra 445
Cathedral of St. Emmeram 438
Nyolcak (Group of Eight) 128
Ócsa 196
Ocskay, Antal 95
Oderheiu Secuiesc (RO) see Székelyudvarhely
Oettinger, Karl 274
Okoličné (SK) see Okolicsnó
Okolicný
Franciscan friary 420, 422
Oláh, Miklós 378, 449
Olomouc 477
Oltványi-Wartinger, Imre 61, 94
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Onians, John 540
Opava 273, 274, 278
Oradea (RO) see Nagyvárad
Orbán, Balázs 496, 497
Oroszlán, Zoltán 94
Orsini, Giovanni Antonio 367
Orsini, Latino 370, 375, 377
Ortega y Gasset, José 523
Orvieto
  tomb of Cardinal Guillaume de Bray 304
Osijek (CR) see Eszék
Osten, Gert van 475
Otranto 367
Otto of Meran 163
Ouwater, Albert van 457
Ozdögei Besenyő, Pál 265
Ozorai, Pipo 265
Pastz, Walter 316, 319
Pach, Michael 420
Pächt, Otto 88, 88, 91, 130
Padua 169, 170, 209
Pádureni (RO) see Sepsibesnyő
Paep, Johannes 449
Pallucchini, Rodolfo 214, 215, 216
Pánkota (RO) see Pankota
Pankota 339, 516
Pannonhalma
  Benedictine monastery 438
  Abbey Church 416
Panofsky, Erwin 77, 78, 98
Panormita 368
Paolo Veneziano 213, 214, 215, 216, 217
Pap, Gyula 136
Papal States 375
Papp, Szilárd 420
Paris 312, 316, 317
  Saint Pierre de Montmartre 163
  Sainte Chapelle 160
Parler, family 231
Parma 167, 168, 169, 414
Pascal I, Pope 170
Passuth, Kristzina 128
Pásztó 515
Patinir, Joachim 457
Pázmány, Péter 421
Pecs 207, 271, 342, 346, 452
Cathedral 83, 512, 513, 515
Pedrocco, Filippo 214, 218
Pellicoli, Mauro 196
Pelšóc 164
Perényi family 434
Perger, Richard 413
Perkins, Algernon 199
Perkins, Henry 198
Perneeczky, Géza 84, 89, 104, 106, 128
Perugia
  tomb of Pope Benedict XI 304
Peter Abelard 147
Peter Lombard 143, 149
Pethő, Sándor 93
Petrarca 246
Petrovics, Elek 128
Petrus Comestor 246
Petrus, Frater of Lepoglava 424
Pfeiffer von Niklashausen 329
Philip the Chancellor 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 148, 148, 149, 149, 149, 149, 149, 149, 149, 149, 149
Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy 317
Philolaus 365
Piacenza 174
Pienza
  Cathedral 281
  Pierre Maucerc 178
Pietro, Niccolò di 366
Pigazzini, Luigi 196
Pigler, Andor 274
Pigler, Andor 61
Pilis (Pilisszentkereszt) 152, 157, 163, 165, 515
  Cistercian Abbey Church 152, 152, 153, 153, 154, 155, 156, 156, 157, 157, 158, 159, 159, 160, 160, 161, 162
  sarcophagus of Gertrude 438
Pimandros 365
Pinkota (RO) see Pankota
Pinturicchio (Pintoricchio) 364
Pisa
  Cathedral (Museo dell’Opera del Duomo)
  St Rainerius tomb 289
Pisanello (Antonio di Puccio Pisano) 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 241, 243, 246, 252
Pisano, Nicola 167
Pius II, Pope 281
Plantin, Christophe 409, 410
Plato 36510
Pleše, Tajana 422
Plesivec (SK) see Pelsć
Pleydenwurf, Hans 324, 326, 327, 329, 338, 457
Pliny 135, 334
Plotinós 85, 36510
Plutarch 34410
Podišul Lipovei (RO) see Erđohát
Podro, Michael 544
Podtureň (SK) see Toronyalja
Pogány, Gábor Ö. 57, 936, 938, 9426, 9540
Pogány, Kálmán 128
Poggio Bracciolino, Gian Francesco 241
Poggio Bracciolino, Jacopo di 241, 246, 247, 2477
Pohl, Sándor 519
Pohl, Walter 9649
Polack, Jan 3318
Pompey 37725
Ponche, Gauthier, Canon 317
Ponche, Michael 317
Ponte de, Francesco 286
Pontieri, Ernesto 372
Popescu, Mircea 9540
Popper, Leó 84
Pör, Antal 21139
Pör, Péter 80
Poreč 170
Pofičí
Church of St Peter 516
Pörloláb, Miklós 931
Poznaň 3318
Pozsony 261, 341, 413, 521
Unger House 265
Church of St Martin 265
Church of St Michael 265
St Ladislas Hospital 272242
Pozza, Wiligelmo della 24925
Prague 232, 2364764
Church of the Knights of St John 51
Preda, Ambrogio (Predis, Ambrogio de) 419
Prešov (SK) see Eperjes
Prohászka, Lajos 9312
Prokopp, Mária 264, 26919
Prolemi 4105
Pulszky, Ferenc 60, 81
Pulszky, Károly 284
Pythagoras 36510
Quaritch, Bernard 199
Rabinovszky, Máriusz 128
Radigović, Marko 422
Radisics, Jenő 480
Radlin 440
Radna 444
Radnóti, Sándor 80, 90, 91, 130
Radocsay, Dénes 457, 465, 469
Radovan 167, 168
Rády, Ferenc 1947, 19514
Rajhrad 516
Rakos (SK) see Rákos
Rákos 264
Rákos, Péter 19515
Ramser, Matthias 506
Ransano, Pietro 416
Ráskai, Lea 439
Ratsel, Friedrich 82
Ravenna 169, 170, 173
Recht, Roland 74
Regensburg Cathedral 161
Reggio 37616
Reggio Emilia 414
Reims 168, 178
Reisch, Gregor 4105
Reizner, János 443
Rembrandt 531
Remete 2672
René of Anjou 367
Rengersdorf 506
Retz 416
Révai, József 61, 9428
Révhelyi, Elemér 61
Ribosy, József 479
Richenthal, Ulrich von 252
Richter Sherman, Claire 231
Ried, Benedikt 425
Riegel, Alois 81, 82, 89, 116, 118
Rimabánya 26914
Rimavská Baňa (SK) see Rimabánya
Rimini 287, 308
Church of Santa Maria delle Grazie 316, 317
Rimini Master (Workshop of the Rimini Master) 309, 310, 310, 311, 311, 311, 314, 314, 315, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319
Ripalda 1626
Rippl Rónai, József 128
Robert the Wise, King of Naples 296
Rodolphe IV d’Autriche, see Rudolph IV, duke of Austria
Rokycany (SK) see Berki
Rome 173, 175, 17, 237, 285, 288, 293, 294, 334, 368, 498
S. Stefano Rotondo
tombstone of János Lázió 287
Santa Croce in Gerusalemme 487
Rómer, Flóris 59, 60, 64, 263, 26917, 27022
Ronconi, Amato 286, 287
Rosályi Kun, Jakab 421
Rosályi Kun, László 421
Rosenauer, Artur 43044
Rontenthal, M. 514
Rovere family 408
Róza, György 73
Rudolph IV, duke of Austria 234
Rupea (RO) see Köhalom
Rynisch, Miklós, parish priest 266
Sabinov (SK) see Kisszeben
Saint Aventin 512
Saint Gaudens 512
Saint Omer 137, 138, 139, 143, 144, 14612
Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux 512
Salamanca, King of Hungary 26917
Salmi, Mario 419
Saludecio 287
Salzburg 22914
San Angelo in Fornis 170
Sáskálváros, Antal 498
Sanctu Gaudens 287, 497, 498
Sarton, Wallon de 309
Sárvár
Parish Church 193
Sásová (SK) see Zólyomszázfalva
Sauerländer, Willibald 83, 101118, 108, 154
Schaider, Peter 406
Schaffenburg 74, 75, 9765
Schedel, Hartmann 329
Scherer, Ferenc 422
Scheyer, Erich 317
Schillínis, Johannes de 24927
Schleiermacher, Friedrich Daniel Ernst 530, 535, 536
Schlosser, Julius von 76, 77, 81
Schmidt, Gerhard 21130, 240, 255
Schmoll gen. Eisenwert, Josef 80
Schongauer, Martin 462
Schönherr, Gyula 413, 425, 426
Schulze, Frigyes 1943, 479, 480
Schutzner, Svato 21134
Schwabstedt 318
Schwarte 318
Schwings, Rainer Christoph 53720
Schwitters, Kurt 135
Scolari, Andrea 246
Scolari, Filippo 241, 242, 246
Scotus, Johannes 4105
Scrovegni, Enrico 170
Second Master 206
Secundinus 138, 139, 14716, 14717
Sedlmayr, Hans 79, 9866
Sedlmayr, János 435
Seibt, Ferdinand 83, 9649
Senlis
Cathedral 16327
Sepsibezenyő 261, 262
Sepsikőyén see Kilyén
Sepsizsengergyörgy 499
Ser Sozzo, Niccolò di 213
Serenus, Bishop 137, 138, 139, 143, 144, 14612
Sántu Gherghe (RO) see Sepsizsengergyörgy
Sforza, Bianca Maria 418, 419
Sforza, Francesco 369, 374, 3754, 419
Sforza, Giangaleazzo 419
Sforza, Giangaleazzo Maria 408
Sforza, Ippolita 3754
Sibiu (RO) see Nagyszeben
Sicardus 175
Siebenbürger, Hans (Werkstatt), 324, 324, 325, 326, 326, 327, 328, 335, 338, 339, 341, 34515, 34515
Siena 30335, 30338, 359, 364, 3753
Cathedral 364
Sienese painter c. 1350 216
Sigismund of Luxemburg, King and Emperor 64, 73, 74, 231, 234, 235, 236, 237, 239, 241, 246, 2489, 252, 253, 254, 255, 25716, 2582, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 26811, 26813, 26917, 406, 408, 409, 522
Sigismund I, King of Poland 439
Siklós 26813
Simand (RO) see Simánd
Simánd 338
Simon, Achim 468
Ungi, László 27026
Ungi, Lőrinc 27026
Ungi, Pál 27026
Urbach, Zsuzsa 457, 464
Ursinus Velius 433
Uslar 3210
Utrecht
    Catharijnekonvent 32024
Uzsai, János 20910

Vác 452
Vaculik, Karol 464, 465, 466, 468
Vajda, Lajos 128
Vajda, Mihály 57, 58
Vajdanunyad 416
Valcabrère
    Saint Just 512
Valeti, Jacopo Domenico di 363
Várad see Nagyvárad
Varasd 422
Varaždin (CR) see Varasd
Varga, Zsuzsa 47718
Varne, Luigi del 24925
Varsányi, János 165, 166, 166
Vasari, Giorgio 362, 364, 541
Vásári, Miklós, Archbispoph 197, 206, 207, 20911
Vattimo, Gianni 106183
Vayer, Lajos 57, 59, 61, 65, 65, 66, 67, 74, 83, 938, 9312, 9540, 101113
Végh, János 92
Venice 167, 168, 169, 176, 238, 359, 364, 367, 3753, 3754, 447
    Palazzo Ducale 413
    San Marco 215
    Santo Stefano 216
Vergil 361, 362
Verona 238, 246
Vértesszentkereszt 515
Veszprém 449, 452
Vézelay
    Cathedral 16427
Vicenza 215
Vienna 8, 219, 221, 228, 233, 236, 238, 239, 273, 278, 279, 323, 324, 328, 338, 341, 3431, 34515, 34622, 457, 413, 418, 420
    Dominikanerkerloster 219
    Maria am Gestade 228
    Ring 80
    Stephansdom 1948, 219, 2298, 22913
    Eligiuskapelle 219, 22914
    Minortenkirche 219, 220, 225, 226, 228, 2298
    Vienna school of art history 77, 81, 82, 83, 88, 113, 116, 129
    Wiedner Hauptstrasse 36 219, 221, 224, 224, 227
Vigh, Tamás 130, 132, 135
Világos 336, 337
Világosvár 338
Vilette 368
Vilt, Tibor 136185
Vincenot 368
Vincennes 171
Vincentius de Ragusa 480
Vinica (CR) 424
Vinkovcs, Benedek 194, 19518
Viollet-le-Duc 159, 160, 160, 161, 162, 16440
Virgil 419
Visegrád 115, 119, 208, 425, 436, 438
    Church of St Andrew 515
Viterbo 288
Vítálfva 262
Vitkovce (SK) see Vitfalva
Vitrivius 87
Vizsoly 261, 263
Vočin (CR) see Atyina
Voit, Pál 61, 9427
Volpe, Carlo 213
Volterra 419
Vörösalma 261
Vorster, Johannes 329
Výšší Brod 206

Wagner, Vladimír 457, 464
Wagner-Rieger, Renate 80
Walzel, Oskar 85
Warburg, Aby 88, 540
Warnke, Martin 78, 101118
Warsaw 316, 317, 318
Weber, Max 90, 106186
Weber-Kellermann, Ingeborg 103143
Wehli, Tünde 88, 1947, 19521, 198, 207
Weichardi, Johannes 260
Weil, Simone 55
Wemer, Zsigmond 444
Weyden, Rogier van der 316, 328, 457
Wick, Béla 519, 521
Wickhoff, Franz 81
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Wied, Alexander 466
Wiener Neustadt 418, 426
Neukloster 273
Wiese, Erich 457
Wilckens, Leonie von 252
Wilde, János 128
Winckelmann, Johann Joachim 80, 534
Winecke, Eberhard 248, 252, 253
Wiślica 172, 172
Wladislaw II, King of Hungary 415, 424, 425, 439, 448, 450
Wloclawek 446
Wolfenbüttel 405, 416
Wölflin, Heinrich 87, 88, 101118
Wolgemuth, Michel 323
Workshop of Pécs 131
Wörschweiler 162
Wrocław see Breslau

Ybl, Ervin 61

Zábala (RO) see Zabola
Zabola 499
Zadkine, Ossip 132
Zadar see Zara
Zádor, Anna 57, 59, 60, 60, 61, 62, 66, 80, 81, 9312, 9426, 9428, 101113, 103138
Zádor, Mihály 71
Zagreb 194, 197, 246, 415, 425, 444, 445, 446, 448, 448, 449, 449, 450, 452
Cathedral 423, 423, 424, 444
tombstone of Lukács Szegedi 447, 447
Zanker, Paul 231

Zara 452
Žehra (SK) see Zsegra
Žip (SK) see Zsegra
Zirc 515
Znaim 279
Zohor (SK) 512
Zolná (SK) see Zolna
Zolna 26813
Zolnay, László 10093
Zólyom 341
Zólyom 414
Zólyomszászfaluva 484
Zombor 173, 173
Zoroaster 36510
Zuleman 198
Zvolen (SK) see Zólyom
Zrínyi family 19511
Zsámbék 512, 516
Zsámboki, János 4103
Zsegra 262
Church of the Holy Spirit 263
Zsigray family 263, 265
Zsip 264

Abbreviations:
A = Austria
CR = Croatia
RO = Rumania
SK = Slovakia
SLO = Slovenia
RH = Republika Hrvatska
Ár: 8000,- Ft