

of painting ('*molto perito nella teorica di detta arte*'), not of knowledge in general (p.22). Given that we have almost no evidence of the books Dante read, we should also admit our ignorance of the texts that Lorenzetti might have known and that might have influenced his painting.

Gabriella Piccinni's essay on the political circumstances of the decade in which the Sala della Pace was painted is perceptive and subtle. While emphasising that this was a period of peace and economic boom, which saw the completion of major public monuments, such as the Palazzo Pubblico, as well as the initiation of new ones, Piccinni also points to profound political and economic problems such as the butchers' rebellions of 1318 and 1325, which nearly overthrew the government of the increasingly tyrannical Nine, and the diminishing power of Siena's international banks. Her insights might lead one to question the orthodox interpretation of the Sala della Pace as straightforward propaganda for the good government of the Nine. It is somewhat disappointing that the otherwise useful essay by Marco M. Mascolo and Alessandra Caffio on Lorenzetti's role as the city's de facto official painter following Simone Martini's departure for Avignon in 1336 accepts the orthodox interpretation of *Good and Bad Government*, as does Seidel himself. Indeed even Piccinni sees Lorenzetti's frescoes as a self-serving utopian vision.

The attributions in the catalogue are generous. Only five securely documented and dated works of Lorenzetti survive. About ten undocumented, unsigned and undated works are excellent candidates for inclusion in his *œuvre*. But the catalogue confidently attributes an additional dozen works to the artist, all of which on grounds of style or quality are at best debatable. This matters because Lorenzetti's autograph works show that he was both a supremely gifted visual artist and a great colourist, whose handling of paint is intrinsic to the expressive significance of his art, as shown by Hyman and Seidel. Optimistic attributions dilute our sense of what makes his work so outstanding. In turn, this approach supports the traditional – predominantly iconographic – treatment of the Sala della Pace, where sections of fresco, ineptly repainted in the 1360s, possibly by Bartolomeo Bulgarini, are used as evidence for unfounded conclusions. Nonetheless, the exhibition was magnificent and the catalogue will be invaluable. Both support Lorenzetti's reputation as Ghiberti's '*perfettissimo maestro*', perhaps greater even than Giotto, with immense influence on fifteenth-century painting in Tuscany and beyond.

¹ N. Rubinstein: 'Political ideas in Sienese art: the frescoes by Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Taddeo di Bartolo in the Palazzo Pubblico', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 21 (1958), pp.179–207.

² See the review by Jane Martineau in this Magazine 146 (2004), p.699.

The Tombs of the Doges of Venice from the Beginning of the Serenissima to 1907. Edited by Benjamin Paul. 390 pp. incl. 161 b. & w. ill. (Viella, Rome, and Centro Tedesco di Studi Veneziani, Venice, 2016), €40. ISBN 978–88–6728–559–4.

Reviewed by DEBORAH HOWARD

LIKE POPES, THE DOGES of Venice were chosen by an elite electorate – in this case the Venetian nobility – and comparisons have often been drawn between the tombs of both groups. As early as 1484, in a much-quoted passage, the German Dominican pilgrim Felix Fabri (Faber) remarked: 'Never have I seen more extravagant tombs. Even the graves of the popes in Rome cannot compare with these'. Prior to this study, Jan Simane's *Grabmonumente der Dogen* provided an authoritative basis for future research, while historians of Renaissance sculpture, such as Anne Markham Schulz, have analysed individual monuments.¹ The first book to adopt an interdisciplinary framework was Debra Pincus's *The Tombs of the Doges of Venice*, which explored ducal tombs down to that of Andrea Dandolo (d.1354), the last doge to be buried in S. Marco. This pioneering work integrated politics, liturgy, biography, materiality, style, iconography and dynastic concerns.²

The book under review sustains this rich interdisciplinary but spans the whole history of the Venetian Republic – and even beyond, for the last chapter narrates the fascinating story of the reburial of the remains of Sebastiano Venier (d. 1578), the hero of the Battle of Lepanto (1571). As Jan May and Benjamin Paul relate, Venier was originally laid to rest in the family tomb in S. Maria degli Angeli, Murano, but in 1907, amid renewed hostilities with the Ottoman Empire, he was reinterred in the great Dominican church of SS. Giovanni e Paolo. This ceremonial transfer reflected the national and royal identity of the emerging Italian state, and even involved the creation of a full-length standing effigy in bronze to adorn the tomb.

A conference held at the Centro Tedesco di Studi Veneziani and the Fondazione Giorgio Cini Onlus in 2010 forms the basis for the sixteen essays by an international line-up of authors drawn from museums, academia and heritage bodies. Because the essays in English, German and Italian reflect a range of different approaches, there are inevitably many overlaps between them. Some authors focus on individual tombs or small groups of monuments, while others examine particular aspects such as ducal testaments (Judith Ostermann), tombs of *dogaresse* (Dieter Girgensohn), epitaphs (Debra Pincus) or the choice of materials (Victoria Avery). As a matter of principle in such a varied and multi-lingual volume, it would have been helpful to have included abstracts.

A new and valuable emphasis is the theme of agency, which is threaded through the whole volume, although not highlighted as a

concern.³ Henrike Haug suggests that when Enrico Dandolo died in Constantinople in 1205 after leading the Fourth Crusade, the Venetian state probably erected his tomb in the atrium of Hagia Sophia as a victory monument. The Venetian Republic did not fund or administer the erection of monuments to deceased doges except in exceptional circumstances, such as the one for Marc'Antonio Trevisan (d.1554), who died without heirs and whose tomb slab and monument in S. Francesco della Vigna were probably commissioned by the Procurators of S. Marco as trustees of the estate. Ostermann's long and scholarly examination of the testaments of Venetian doges as a source for the study of their monuments is extremely valuable, even if her thematic arrangement precludes a chronological structure.

The complexities of inheritance and private finances (or the lack thereof) led to many different burial scenarios. Ducal remains were often interred beneath the floor, sometimes at some distance from the monument itself, as for instance in the tomb of Francesco Erizzo (d.1646) in S. Martino. Following the initial interment, the monument might reach completion long after the subject's death, such as that of Leonardo Loredan (d.1521), who presided over the catastrophic Cambrai Wars. The complex history of this monument forms one of Avery's exemplary case studies. Heirs did not always respect a doge's wishes, as in the case of Nicolò Tron (d.1473), who requested burial in the tomb of his family but was instead commemorated by a monument in the presbytery of the Basilica dei Frari (Fig.3). In other instances the doge might erect his tomb within his own lifetime, for example Marino Grimani (d.1605) at S. Giuseppe di Castello, examined by Ruth Schilling.

The tension between the public career of the doge and the celebration of family honour is another recurrent theme. The heirs of doges who died in disgrace, such as Francesco Foscari (d.1457), might use the tomb as a means of restoring the family's reputation. In a rare case of one brother succeeding another as doge, Marco (d.1486) and Agostino (d.1501) Barbarigo's double tomb, formerly in S. Maria della Carità, allowed a large expanse of wall to be dedicated to one family. The concentration of ducal tombs in SS. Giovanni e Paolo invited visual and iconographic comparison, whereas the patronage of a single church as a mausoleum by the unpopular Cristoforo Moro (d.1471) in S. Giobbe, as Janna Israel explains, derived prestige from its monopolisation of the site.

The volume draws attention to different types of effigies and their meanings. In the monument to Nicolò Tron in the Frari, a recumbent effigy (introduced to Venice with Andrea Dandolo's tomb in S. Marco) lies at some height above a standing effigy. Benjamin Paul's essay, which develops Ernst Kantorowicz's theory of the separation of the body politic from the mortal body, explores this curious solution. Despite the role of the



3. Monument to Doge Nicolò Tron, by Antonio Rizzo. 1476–80. Istrian stone, polychromatic marbles and gold, 15 by 7.35 m. (S. Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice; photograph Apollonio Tottoli).

doge as a defender of the faith, the implied link between the doge and the resurrected Christ in the tomb of Pietro Mocenigo (d.1476) remains anomalous.

David Drogin is the only author to dwell in any detail on funerary architecture, here using the theories of Bourdieu, Bakhtin and Volosinov, but a full study of the process of design and production, the choice of orders and the use of classical models would need a further volume. The local Arco dei Gavi in Verona seems to this reviewer a far

more influential Antique source than the Arch of Constantine, cited by Drogin. The book's numerous black-and-white photographs are of excellent quality, though often too small to allow the reader to study the architectural details.

This is a rich and informative volume, and in this short review it has not been possible to do justice to all the chapters and the fascinating connections between them. The editor has done Venetian studies a great service in the production of this book.

¹ J. Simane: *Grabmonumente der Dogen: Venezianische Sepulkalkunst im Cinquecento*, Sigmaringen 1993; and A. Markham Schulz: *The Sculpture of Tullio Lombardo*, London 2014; see the review by Claudia Kryza-Gersch in this Magazine 158 (2016), pp.906–07.

² D. Pincus: *The Tombs of the Doges of Venice*, Cambridge 2000; see the review by Julian Gardner in this Magazine 142 (2000), p.780.

³ T. Martin: review of D. Pincus, *op. cit.* (note 2), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 55, 4 (2002), pp.1392–94, highlighted the absence of this aspect in Pincus's otherwise admirable study.