

listes sovint hem d'estudiar de manera separada, atesa la incapacitat humana per abastar-ho tot, no es produeix a la realitat, en la qual tot té lloc alhora i de manera interdependent. Per això hi ha molts aspectes que cal analitzar globalment, fent servir totes les fonts a l'abast, ja sigui per part de grups interdisciplinars com d'estudiosos concrets, com és ara el cas de Francesc Massip, una persona que al llarg de la seva dilatada trajectòria investigadora ha demostrat saber-se moure amb una gran solvència en àmbits diferents relacionats amb el saber històric i cultural, en el sentit ampli dels termes. D'ací que aquest volum ens presenti una mostra força reeixida d'allò que constitueix l'anàlisi d'una temàtica des d'angles molts diferents.

Gabriel Ensenyat Pujol
Universitat de les Illes Balears
 Gabriel.Ensenyat@uib.cat



ROBERT A. MAXWELL and KIRK AMBROSE (eds.), *Current Directions in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Sculpture Studies*, Turnhout: Brepols (Studies in the Visual Cultures of the Middle Ages, vol. 5, Kathryn A. Smith, gen. ed.), 2010, XII+212 pp., 114 ill., ISBN 978-2-503-53165-6.

A "wide range of voices" offering current perspectives on the field of Romanesque sculpture is the rationale for this collection of nine essays edited by Robert Maxwell and Kirk Ambrose. They have accomplished a very useful presentation of problems and approaches to monuments in much of continental Western Europe, with authors from France, Germany, Spain, Canada, and the United States, and at various stages in their careers. For the most part, the essays integrate traditional approaches with the New Art History that gives even greater value than before to specific context. Rather than suggest thematic strands by the arrangement of the essays, Maxwell and Ambrose have chosen to publish them in alphabetical order according to the name of the author.

What emerges from this mix is an engaging read, even in this random order. All but one of the first four essays treats the cluster of monuments that represent the high moment of French Romanesque: the sculpture of Moissac, Souillac, and Beaulieu treated in a variety of ways by Jérôme Baschet, Thomas E. A. Dale, and Ilene H. Forsyth. The intervening article is on another classic in France, the reliquary statue of Sainte Foy, by Martin Büchsel. Then one moves to Italy to reconsider the portal at Nonantola with Dorothy E. Glass. These monuments

are followed by a reconsideration of German Romanesque portals by Klaus Niehr. The final three essays do not flow as easily into each other as the previous group. A study on the portal of San Zeno in Verona and the Porta Romana of Milan by Andrea von Hülsen-Esch, which could have followed nicely after Nonantola, is sandwiched between José Luis Senra's historiographic essay on the sculpture at Silos and John Williams's historiographic essay about Spanish scholarship on Romanesque sculpture. Although my brief summary has grouped the essays geographically, the grouping for the most part applies almost equally well to the methods and considerations each author has undertaken. The essays consider the current state of scholarship on their topics, then proceed to offer new approaches to the subject at hand.

In the first essay, master iconographer Jérôme Baschet undertakes a critique of methods of iconographic analysis by means of the Souillac reliefs ("Iconography beyond Iconography: Relational Meanings and Figures of Authority in the Reliefs of Souillac", pp. 23-45). The introduction reviews two important studies of these sculptures, those by Meyer Schapiro (1939) and Michael Camille (1999). Baschet appreciates Schapiro's ability to understand the reliefs of Souillac as a totality. Camille's "anti-iconography", an approach that considers certain motifs in isolation from the sculpture and its context, is roundly dismissed as a method for the study of monuments. Baschet posits that levels of generic significance can lay the groundwork for specific meaning; he labels his method variously: iconography beyond iconography, super-iconography (*sur-iconographie*), or relational iconography. In essence, he maintains that the relations between the elements of image-objects must be appreciated together with the specific place and function of each artwork. To demonstrate, Baschet analyses the Souillac compositions and correlates the reliefs' details to structures of social authority and power, a conjunction that Schapiro probably would have appreciated. This essay is a valuable contribution to studies on Souillac, as well as useful for its definition of the qualities deemed valuable in current iconographic studies.

The reception of monumental sculpture at the moment of its revival toward the end of the tenth century is examined by Martin Büchsel ("The Status of Sculpture in the Early Middle Ages: Liturgy and Paraliturgy in the *Liber Miraculorum sancte Fidis*", pp. 47-59). The article first takes up the definition of monumental sculpture proposed by Harald Keller in his classic study ("Zur Entstehung der sakralen Vollskulptur in der ottonischen Zeit" in *Festschrift für Hans Jantzen*, Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1951, pp. 71-91), then reorients the discussion toward ritual practices involving sculpture. Rather than focus on the weaknesses of Keller's premises, Büchsel takes up his primary source, the *Liber miraculorum sancte Fidis*, to rediscover the reception and use of the statue of St. Faith. This

becomes possible because the author, Bernard of Angers, himself underwent a change of attitude; he therefore provides an inside view of clerical ideas about the use of three-dimensional images. Büchsel concludes that liturgical function was fundamental to the eventual acceptance of sculpture. Such a view underlines the significance of including ritual as part of the history of monumental sculpture; prominent examples include Margot Fassler's work on Chartres Cathedral, Daniel Rico's on Avila, and, of course, Meyer Schapiro's linkage of liturgical change with the sculpture at Silos.

The reception of sculpture by medieval viewers is also taken up by Thomas E. A. Dale, but he employs a very different methodology ("The Nude at Moissac: Vision, *Phantasia*, and the Experience of Romanesque Sculpture", pp. 61-76). Drawing upon recent studies of vision and visuality, Dale explores how the nude figure of Lust on the portal of Moissac might have functioned in the minds of the contemporary educated clergy. Drawing upon a wealth of literature, liturgical and exegetical, Dale traces the evolution of the female nude as a device that encourages sexual fantasy yet converts it into something quite the contrary, a spiritual experience. The mind is channeled by setting the nude into the context of scenes threatening punishment and damnation. The subsequent suppression of desire is rewarded by the promise of salvation with the theophanic vision of Christ in the tympanum above. The essay is fortified by numerous examples from other monuments and an enlightening discussion of the meaning of *phantasia* ca. 1100. The collection of contemporary texts about the power of visualization makes Dale's essay a very rich resource, and sets his study apart from previous studies focused on style or the iconographic sources of the portal. In this case, he has taken one detail to elucidate the whole.

The same portal is the subject of Ilene H. Forsyth's article, "The Date of the Moissac Portal", pp. 77-99. This article expands the epilogue of her earlier article, "Narrative at Moissac: Schapiro's Legacy" in *Gesta* 41/ 2 (2002), pp. 71-93. Her introduction deftly surveys the historiography of dating Romanesque sculpture, noting that acerbic debates effectively froze certain areas of study. Forsyth employs as a springboard the recent critique by Jean Wirth of the methodology of dating in *La datation de la sculpture médiévale* (Geneva: Droz, 2004). He demonstrated that many conclusions about chronology are based on prior assumptions rather than on documents and careful comparison. Forsyth sets out to demonstrate that it is possible to identify a logical date for Moissac's portal using those very means. She concludes that the portal must have been undertaken shortly after the cloister was finished in 1100, and before the death of Ansquetil, the abbot who built the cloister, in 1115. The article is a virtuoso display of the interpretation of documents and visual analysis. While the method applied is

not new, the conclusion is important for the dating of many monuments that are often placed ca. 1115-1130, particularly in France and Spain.

Another revisionist history is provided by Dorothy F. Glass, "(Re)framing Early Romanesque Sculpture in Italy", pp. 101-117. At the outset, she frames the study with the observation that it is difficult to identify the impact of Benedictine monasteries on the development of architectural sculpture in Italy. Furthermore, she writes, the history of Italian sculpture is distorted by the emphasis given to Modena Cathedral, for which there are two inscriptions naming the architect and sculptor as well as marking the beginning of construction in 1099. The chronology of the entire region is based on these inscriptions, a situation of the sort that Jean Wirth laments. Glass proposes that the sculpted doorposts at San Silvestro, Nonantola, were produced ca. 1095, and thus, Nonantola must have preceded Modena. In addition, she points out that the imagery of the left doorpost is based on the false documentary history of the abbey, occasioned by the loss of the archives in a fire of 1013. The fabricated history represented on the relief emphasizes the closeness of the abbey to the papacy in Rome as well as its participation in the Gregorian Reform. With this case study, Glass confirms both the monastic portal's precocity and thus, the Benedictine contribution to the new sculptural forms.

These several studies on specific portals are followed by a more expansive overview by Klaus Niehr: "Sculpturing Architecture, Framing Sculpture, and Modes of Contextualizing the Arts in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries", pp. 119-40. Although this article is less focused than most of the others, a range of interesting material is covered, organized around the dialogue between sculpture and architecture. After reviewing Focillon's and Baltrušaitis's law of the frame, then Schapiro's and Sauerländer's critiques of this rigid approach, Niehr correctly concludes that no single theory can embrace all of the unprecedented possibilities explored during the Middle Ages. The last part of the essay contemplates the difficulty of writing a developmental history of German sculpture because there are few clusters of related monuments such as those found in France or Spain. Niehr proposes that German monuments might be better understood by studying the relationship between architecture and sculpture. As Niehr himself points out, modern categories and nomenclature are often inaccurate for the work they describe. It is disconcerting, therefore, to find the art of the Holy Roman Empire characterized as provincial by the author. Regional variation is a core value in Romanesque art. It is the advent of Gothic that unifies the arts of a slightly later Europe into a style invented in France. Despite this particular reservation, there is much to recommend this meditation on methodology.

The theme of institutional and civic identity that runs strong in Italian sculpture, already touched upon by Dorothy Glass, is given further development in the article by Andrea von Hülsen-Esch, "Romanesque Sculpture in Italy", pp. 169-84. Examples in Verona and Milan corroborate the theory that patron-specific sculpture develops to support civic identity. Von Hülsen-Esch distinguishes between strictly religious imagery and saints who have political value; her concern is to analyze the interplay between these two cultural spheres. The portal of San Zeno, Verona, a Benedictine abbey, was produced between 1120-39. In order to address the religious and secular roles of the city's patron, the sculpture weaves together secular and religious history to create a new iconography. The Porta Romana of Milan, the oldest surviving sculptural cycle on a medieval city gate, was created when the Milanese returned to their city after Barbarossa destroyed it. An inscription identifies Ambrose as the city's patron and dates the beginning of construction to 1171. The frieze imagery and inscriptions represent Ambrose as both celibate priest and protector of his city from heretics. A later inscription identifies the heretics as Jews who are driven away. An interesting constellation of evidence explains the original imagery and the inscription about the Jews, added in the thirteenth century. The article as a whole is enriched by a broad discussion of Italian portals.

I have reserved the two essays on Spanish Romanesque art for the end of this section because it is the field with which I am most familiar, as will be the readers of *Medievalia*. The final essay in the volume is by John Williams, "The Emergence of Spanish Romanesque Sculpture: A Century of Scholarship", pp. 185-200. It is an elegantly written historiographic survey, with a new, and much deserved, emphasis on Manuel Gómez-Moreno. Williams takes Gómez-Moreno's evolving views as the basis for his discussion. The essay lays out the field more or less as it is seen now, with a focus on the classic themes of "Spain or Toulouse?", León-Jaca-Compostela, Cluny's role in Spanish art, and pilgrimage as a conduit for art. He gives particular, well-deserved, credit to Gómez-Moreno, Charles Julian Bishko, and Serafín Moralejo, as well as José Luis Senra and Therese Martin, Williams' student. What is not immediately apparent is that the very important body of work by Joaquín Yarza Luaces is not mentioned, nor that of David and Sonia Simon. Manuel Castiñeiras González and others are given only a passing nod. The translation of the Pilgrim's Guide into English together with a catalogue of monuments by Annie Shaver-Crandel, Paula Gerson, and Alison Stones is overlooked. Williams cites Moralejo as having been exceptional for studying episcopal patronage, and so must be unaware of Eduardo Carrero Santamaría's authoritative and wide-ranging work in the field for

well over a decade. In this light, the valuable resource that this essay could be is somewhat diminished.

Williams left the discussion of Silos to José Luis Senra, "Between Rupture and Continuity: Romanesque Sculpture at the Monastery of Santo Domingo de Silos", pp. 141-67. Senra has published amply on the topic, though his emphasis is usually on the architecture rather than the sculpture. The lynchpin of dating for the monastery and its cloister lies, for Senra, in his conviction that the old lower church is the church that was consecrated in the Roman rite in 1088, and that the Romanesque upper church with transepts, added over the original apses, was constructed around 1130. I agree with Senra on many aspects of the length and appearance of this church but find his chronology difficult to accept. In the opinion of Isidro Bango, whose work is the basis for contemporary studies of the church, the acceptance of the liturgical reform of 1080 would likely be made visible with the addition of a new apse, the one consecrated in 1088. This would accord with the abbot Fortunius's activities to bring the monastery in line with the reform, something Senra recognizes for the manuscripts produced at this time. The transepts, in my view, were an addition of the mid-1120s; documents describe them as looking different from the apse. This review is not the place for an extended discussion on these matters, so I can only mention my own work on Silos, expected to be published by Brepols in September 2012, in which my argument is presented.

Senra's article goes on to discuss the cloister sculpture stylistically, correctly comparing the first cloister campaign to sculpture at the Pantheon of San Isidoro in León and Jaca Cathedral, monuments spanning ca. 1080-1100. He also makes valid comparisons to monuments such as Frómista, which he has recently redated to ca. 1120 in a very interesting article ("Rebellion, Reconciliation, and a Romanesque Church in León-Castile (c.1109-1120)", *Speculum* 87/2, 2012, pp. 376-412). Insofar as dating the first cloister campaign is concerned, Senra suggests ca. 1120, something within the range of possibility, although many of his comparisons are with earlier monuments. He seems to favor an evolutionary method for his dating, implying that the more refined sculpture of Silos must be later than less elegant work elsewhere. Serafín Moralejo, on the other hand, espoused the view that a masterwork is often followed by inferior copies (even if he did not apply this principle to early Silos). Nevertheless, Senra makes many worthwhile observations in reviewing the sculpture of the Puerta de las Vírgenes and loose fragments in the monastic collection. He is correct in his judgement that many institutions altered their architecture over time rather than completely rebuild, but of course, there are the notable cases in which other practices prevailed. In Senra's scenario, the monastery of Silos had a pre-Romanesque church

that was only altered after the 1070s, when St. Dominc's relics were translated, and did little construction until 50 years later when the cloister was undertaken ca. 1120; the cloister was then interrupted to build a new apse with transepts around 1130. I think that a monastery is more likely to build an adequate church before it decorates its cloister. On the whole Senra thoughtfully re-examines and re-interprets the evidence, but Silos is no easy task.

The introduction to the volume by Maxwell and Ambrose provides a convenient overview of the state of Romanesque sculpture studies, alive and well despite the lack of a professorate in most of the major research institutions in the United States today. As they note, there have been several significant exhibitions on the subject by European museums, in addition to impressive efforts to create digitized collections of Romanesque art. A certain ambivalence about the term "Romanesque" manifests itself in its absence from the title (substituted by the phrase "Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century") and its use in the Introduction as well as throughout the volume. Although they acknowledge problems with defining "Romanesque", they clearly embrace the term and simply should have used it in the title. They wisely recognize that a volume of nine essays cannot be comprehensive, though some of the areas not covered, such as England and gender studies, are sorely missed. Very few later Romanesque sculptures are included for reasons that are unclear.

As Maxwell and Ambrose point out, a broader range of evidence and method is now accepted than in the recent past, and that has opened the possibilities for a wealth of new studies. If this volume favors a particular approach, it is the contextualization of the work of art. The value now given to social and individual context is indeed a welcome movement in our field, one grandfathered by Meyer Schapiro's expositions on the power of society in the visual arts. It is remarkable that Schapiro's various methodologies permeate many of the essays, whether or not consciously. This raises the question of how truly new are the ways in which we study medieval art now. Panofsky advocated considering context in what he called "iconology" as opposed to "iconography", a distinction observed more in practice than in appellation. All in all Maxwell and Ambrose have presented a spectrum of methodologies and issues that inform contemporary scholarship.

Elizabeth Valdez del Álamo
Montclair State University
 delalamoe@montclair.net