The enthroned Madonna supports her son, seated on her left knee, with both hands. The child, in a frontal position, blesses with his right hand, holding a roll of parchment in his left. The composition is a variant of the type of the Hodegetria Virgin; in the present case, she does not point towards her son, as in the Byzantine prototype, but instead presents him to the spectator. [1] Her affectionate maternal pose is thus given precedence over her more ritual and impersonal role. But Mary's pose perhaps has another sense: she seems to be rearranging her son's small legs to conform them to the cross-legged position considered suitable for judges and sovereigns in the Middle Ages. [2]

The panel is painted in a rapid, even cursory manner. The artist omits the form of the throne's backrest, which remains hidden by the cloth of honor, supported by angels and decorated with bold motifs of popular taste (an interlocking pattern of quatrefoils and octagons). He designs the form of the throne itself in an incongruous manner, apparently semicircular at the seat and rectangular at the base. According to a convention widespread in Tuscany in the second half of the thirteenth century, the painter presents the seat of the Madonna as if it were seen
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not frontally but from the left. [3] This is suggested not only by the position of the step but also by the fact that while the figure of the Baptist is seen in its entirety, that of Saint Peter to the right is partially hidden by the throne. That the patron must have been a person of modest means is suggested both by the cursory execution and by the eschewal of gilding on the frame; instead, the artist adopts the unusual expedient of painting it red and decorating it with a frieze of daisies. [4]

Carlo Lasinio’s attribution of the painting to Cimabue, accepted in the sale catalog of 1835, remained ignored in the art historical literature until the panel reappeared at Patterdale Hall in the Lake District in 1934, and even then it did not meet with approval. [5] Following the panel’s purchase by the Florentine dealer and collector Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, however, several connoisseurs of late medieval Italian art concurred with the Cimabuesque authorship of the work in their correspondence with its then owner. [6] Roberto Longhi, on publishing the painting in 1948, confirmed this view, dedicating a brief but penetrating comment to the painting; in his opinion the image was a product of Cimabue’s first period of residence in Pisa. [7] Luigi Coletti, in 1941, took a different view and argued that the panel was better placed in the circle of the Magdalen Master. [8] Subsequently, once the Madonna had entered the Kress Collection in 1948, the attribution to Cimabue would continue to be supported, [9] but most scholars preferred to leave it in anonymity or ascribed it to Cimabue’s shop. [10] The present writer (1976) tentatively associated the panel with the group of paintings that he had gathered around the name of Gaddo Gaddi, [11] and Luciano Bellosi (1998) suggested an attribution to the Florentine Azzo di Mazzetto; [12] no certain works by either of these painters have come down to us. It is worth pointing out, in this regard, that documents record a painter by the name of Azzo who worked for the comune of San Gimignano in the years between 1288 and 1293 and who painted “cameram novi palatii comunis” (the room of the new municipal palace) in that town in 1291. [13] The subject of his paintings is not recorded, but it seems plausible to link his name with the frescoes in the Palazzo del Popolo that commemorate the privileges granted to San Gimignano by Charles of Anjou and bear an inscription with the date 1292. The massive, fleshy figures in these frescoes, often hesitant in movement, only vaguely recall the style of the delicate little panel in the National Gallery of Art. [14]

The attribution of the work to Gaddo Gaddi was based on a tradition handed down by Vasari, according to whom this master was responsible for the mosaic of the Coronation of the Virgin on the inner façade of the cathedral of Santa Maria del
Fiore in Florence. The authenticity of this tradition was accepted down to recent times, until art historians gradually began to perceive that the figurative style of the mosaic appears not to have been that of an artist of the generation of Giotto (Florentine, c. 1265 - 1337), as Gaddo Gaddi would have been, according to the evidence of documents, but that of a somewhat older master. In recent times, in fact, the identification of Gaddo with the Giottesque Master of Saint Cecilia has been proposed, while the Coronation of the Virgin on the inner façade of the Duomo has been either cited with the traditional attribution or attributed to Francesco Pisano, an artist belonging to Cimabue’s generation, or given to the so-called Penultimate Master of the mosaics in the baptistery in Florence.

Some of the paintings formerly associated with the name of Gaddo still seem to me stylistically homogeneous, even if not easy to refer to a particular artist. It is with this group of works that the panel now in Washington should, I believe, be most profitably compared. The agile, nervous figures, with their jerky movements, flashing eyes, and beaklike noses, which Longhi described so brilliantly, invite comparison both with the figures painted in the portable cross in the Fogg Museum in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and with those in the large painted crucifix in Santo Stefano a Paterno in Florence. [15] In this latter painting, in particular, the grieving Madonna [fig. 1] recalls the protagonist of the painting in the Gallery [fig. 2], while the severe and ascetic blessing Christ in the cimasa is comparable to the Baptist in the panel in Washington, bearing in mind, of course, the differences in pictorial technique deriving from their very different dimensions. Drapery forms in these paintings, enlivened by sudden darting highlights and furrowed by sharp, deeply undercut folds so that they seem made of twisted sheet metal instead of fabric, also compare closely. A further observation may be made about the presence of the rare frieze of daisies on the hem of the Madonna’s cloak in a painting now in the Allen Memorial Art Museum in Oberlin, Ohio (inv. no. 1945.9). Generally referred to an anonymous follower of Duccio or of Cimabue, recently (Boskovits 2007) it was attributed to the Master of the Cortona-Loeser Crucifixes. [16] That artist’s use of the same motif decorating the frame of the Washington Madonna suggests that he too belonged to the ambience of the painter of our panel. Unfortunately, the comparisons listed here do not help us to establish the date of the Gallery’s panel, but they do, more generally, permit its insertion into the context of Florentine painting at the close of the thirteenth century. [17]

The Pisan provenance of the panel, small and easily transportable, does not imply that it was executed in that city. The master who painted it must have been trained...
under the influence of Cimabue, and probably at the time of his fresco decoration of the upper church of San Francesco in Assisi. In particular some figures of angels that populate the right transept of that church, with their tense, frowning faces and ruffled garments, suggest that the execution of the panel in the National Gallery of Art should be placed around 1290.
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COMPARATIVE FIGURES


fig. 2 Detail of Madonna, Tuscan thirteenth century, *Madonna and Child with Saint John the Baptist, Saint Peter, and Two Angels*, c. 1290, tempera on panel, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection
NOTES

[1] Evelyn Sandberg-Vavalà, L'iconografia della Madonna col bambino nella pittura italiana del Dugento (Siena, 1934), 45–48, classified this subtype as the "seconda modificacione del tipo Odigitria" (second modification of the Hodegetria type). On the iconography of the Hodegetria (a term translatable as "indicator of the way"), cf. the exhaustive treatment by Gregor Martin Lechner, "Maria," in Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst, ed. Klaus Wessel, 7 vols. (Stuttgart, 2005), 6:58–71. The variants of the protagonists’ poses in this iconographic type are understood as attempts to augment the realistic effect of the image, i.e., expressions of vivacity and of the affection between mother and child.


[3] In a study on the types of thrones in thirteenth-century paintings, James Stubblebine (1954–1957) distinguished four types, of which the third, exemplified by such works as Guido da Siena’s Maestà in San Domenico in Siena and Duccio’s Madonna Rucellai, commissioned in 1285 and now in the Uffizi, Florence, is a structure conceived as a “three-dimensional block” and represented so that “the front and back are parallel to the picture plane, while the sides run diagonally.” This typology common to paintings dating to the last quarter of the Duecento naturally implies some indication of the chronological position of the panel discussed here. See James H. Stubblebine, “The Development of the Throne in Dugento Tuscan Painting,” Marsyas 7 (1954–1957): 25–39.

[4] It seems to me that the flowers cursorily painted on the frame can be identified as daisies or marguerites (leucanthemum vulgare), symbols, according to Mirella Levi D’Ancona, of the “blessed souls in heaven” as well as of the “incarnation of Christ.” See Mirella Levi D’Ancona, The Garden of the Renaissance: Botanical Symbolism in Italian Painting (Florence, 1977), 124–126. The decoration of the frame discussed here vaguely recalls that of the panel with Saint Catherine and stories of her legend, no. 1583 in the Museo Nazionale in Pisa; cf. Lorenzo Carletti, in Cimabue a Pisa: La pittura pisana del Duecento da Giunta a Giotto, ed. Mariagiulia Burresi and Antonino Caleca (Pisa, 2005), 193.
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In the 1934 sale, the painting was classified as “Italian school.” Byam Shaw, in his 1963 letter (see Provenance note 4), noted that the inscription on the label affixed to the back of the panel confirmed Lasinio’s ascription to Cimabue, adding, “not the highest quality, but undoubtedly a genuine Pisan work of the time.”

Copies of the expertises by Roberto Longhi, Evelyn Sandberg-Vavalà, Wilhelm Suida, Raimond van Marle, and Adolfo Venturi are preserved in the NGA curatorial files: they were unanimous in confirming the authorship of Cimabue for the painting. Of these experts, only Longhi provided a chronological indication, maintaining that the panel must antedate Cimabue’s Madonna (no. 8343) now in the Uffizi, Florence.

“La Madonna come un falchetto inciprignito,” Roberto Longhi wrote in 1948, “il Bambino con aria di censore prepotente...gli angeli che impugnano, quasi manovelle di timone, le cocche del drappo...i due santi collicerici...che sbuffano ai lati del trono. In un tema puramente sacramentale ce n’è abbastanza per alludere ai drammatici imminenti del transetto di Assisi” (The Madonna like an irritated bird of prey, the child with the air of an overbearing censor, the angels who grab the corners of the cloth like the handle of a boat’s tiller, the two irascible saints snorting at the sides of the throne. In a purely sacramental theme there is enough to foreshadow the imminent drama of the transept at Assisi). Longhi referred, of course, to the frescoes in the upper church of San Francesco in Assisi, which he dated to the years between the end of the eighth and the first half of the ninth decade of the thirteenth century. See Roberto Longhi, “Giudizio sul Duecento,” Proporzioni 2 (1948): 16.


The painting was classified as “attributed to Cimabue” in National Gallery of Art, Paintings and Sculpture from the Kress Collection (Washington, DC, 1956), 50–51; National Gallery of Art, Summary Catalogue of European...

[11] Miklós Boskovits, Cimabue e i precursori di Giotto: Affreschi, mosaici e tavole (Florence, 1976), n.p. [9], no. 22, pointed out that the style of the Gallery’s panel was close to that of the group of works he himself had referred to Gaddo Gaddi. His reconstruction of Gaddo’s oeuvre consisted of the fragmentary Madonna in the church of San Remigio in Florence; the crucifix no. 1345 in the Galleria dell’Accademia in Florence; another painted crucifix in the church of Santo Stefano a Paterno (Bagno a Ripoli, Florence); and a small portable cross in the Fogg Art Museum in Cambridge,
Massachusetts (no. 1929.250), in addition to the mosaic of the Coronation of the Virgin on the inner façade of the Duomo in Florence. Vasari cited the latter as a work by Gaddo Gaddi in his vita of that master, together with part of the mosaic on the façade of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome (in general ascribed by the art historical literature to Filippo Rusuti); the mosaic Assumption in the apse of the transept of Pisa Cathedral, in actual fact executed on the basis of a design by Simone Martini (Sienese, active from 1315; died 1344); and some other works, which today appear stylistically incongruous or are lost. See Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite dei più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architetti*, ed. Gaetano Milanesi, 9 vols. (Florence, 1878–1885), 1(1878):346–347. In more recent times, Marco Ciatti and Cecilia Frosinini (1993) and Ada Labriola (1998) cited the panel now in the National Gallery of Art as a work by Gaddi. Cf. Marco Ciatti and Cecilia Frosinini, ed., *La Madonna di San Giorgio alla Costa di Giotto: Studi e restauro, Problemi di conservazione e restauro* (Florence, 1995), 36; Ada Labriola, “Gaddi, Gaddo,” in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* (Rome, 1998), 51:155.


[14] Antonino Caleca (1986) placed in doubt Vasari’s claim that Gaddo was the master of the mosaic of the Coronation in the Florentine Duomo. He argues that the execution of the mosaic should be given instead to Francesco da Pisa, documented author of the Christ in Majesty in the apse of Pisa Cathedral. See Antonio Caleca, “Pittura del Duecento e del Trecento a Pisa e a Lucca,” in *La Pittura in Italia: Il Duecento e il Trecento*, ed. Enrico Castelnuovo, 2 vols. (Milan, 1986), 1:243; and Antonio Caleca, “Francesco da Pisa,” in *La Pittura in Italia: Il Duecento e il Trecento*, ed. Enrico Castelnuovo, 2 vols. (Milan, 1986), 2:570. For my part, ever since 1984, I have observed that the *Coronation of the Virgin* reveals features a good deal more archaic than the most advanced artistic tendencies in Florence at the close of thirteenth century and have conjectured that the work originally was intended for a site other than Arnolfo di Cambio’s Duomo. Miklós


**TECHNICAL SUMMARY**

The support consists of a single wooden panel with vertical grain, which was thinned and cradled in 1948. The frame was carved in one with the panel and
remains intact. Possible evidence of hinges on both sides is visible in the x-radiograph, indicating that the panel may have been the center of a triptych. The panel was prepared with a white gesso ground. Green underpaint was used under the flesh tones, and the gold leaf was laid over a reddish orange bole. The halos are decorated with incised foliate ornament. Paint and gold leaf losses are scattered throughout the painted surface; some flaking damage in the gold leaf has remained unretouched. Mauro Pelliccioli restored the painting, probably by the mid-1930s, and Stephen Pichetto treated it again in 1948. [1] Inpainted passages are especially evident in the cloth of honor and in the Virgin’s cloak, as well as in the left side of the right-hand angel’s face, the left side of Saint Peter’s face, and the child’s hair. The figures’ eyes and mouths have been reinforced. Inpainting also is evident in the frame, especially in the lower left and upper right corners.

TECHNICAL NOTES


PROVENANCE


[1] Wilhelm Suida (letter dated August 1935; copy in NGA curatorial files) and Roberti Longhi ("Giudizio sul Duecento," Proporzioni 2 [1948]: 16) could still read "Lasinio’s inscription" on the back of the panel, according to which the painting came from the "Sacristy of S. Francesco at Pisa [and] is Cimabue’s work". This
inscription must clearly have been in Italian and written on a paper label glued onto the wood, as usually was the case with paintings subjected to Lasinio’s expertise. It would also have been accompanied by the customary wax seal of the Pisan collector and dealer; see the back of panels 40559 and 40560 in the Pinacoteca Vaticana (Francesco Rossi, Catalogo della Pinacoteca Vaticana. Vol. 3: Il Trecento. Umbria, Marche, Italia del Nord, Vatican City, 1994: figs. 105, 108) and that of no. 174 in the Museo Amedeo Lia at La Spezia (Federico Zeri and Andrea De Marchi, La Spezia. Museo Civico Amedeo Lia. Dipinti, Milan, 1997: fig. 376). The label of the NGA painting was lost during its restoration in 1948 (typewritten note in the NGA curatorial files); however the examination report of the NGA Painting Conservation Department, 21 July 1988, states that “…x–radiographs both before and after the cradling show a dense circular area to the right of the Virgin’s head, which may be a seal or stamp on the reverse of the panel.”

[2] Donata Levi (“Carlo Lasinio, curator, collector and dealer,” The Burlington Magazine 135 (1993): 133-148) points out that in 1829 Lasinio offered Francis Douce a series of paintings, illustrated with a sketch representing fourteen panels of Italian masters. The last of these, reproduced at the bottom right of the sheet (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms Douce d 57, fol. 84; fig. 86 in Levi’s article), is identified with the caption “Madonna di Cimabue / 1200”, but unfortunately in this case Lasinio failed to provide any sketch of the composition. Dillian Gordon (National Gallery Catalogues. The Fifteenth Century Italian Paintings, London, 2003: 32-36) has identified the panel that Lasinio attributed to Cimabue, which together with the others was presumably sold to Douce in 1830, with a small painting, a genuine work of Cimabue acquired by the National Gallery in London (inv. 6583). Gordon’s proposal is, of course, a hypothesis based on the small dimensions of the work and Lasinio’s attribution to the Florentine artist. There is, however, no evidence that the London painting was ever in Lasinio’s collection and, in any case, as the same scholar remarks, “the small label on the back (£ 6.15.4) strongly suggests that it was acquired in England.” Thus, the alternative identification of Lasinio’s “Cimabue” with the NGA panel also may be hypothesized.

[3] A Catalogue of a Valuable Collection of Italian, French, Flemish Dutch and English Pictures...The Property of Charles John West etc.. Lots 75-90 in this catalogue, indicated as the “property of a Lady”, were, as the archives of Christie’s in London advised NGA systematic catalogue author Miklòs Boskovits, the
paintings from the collection of Mrs. Fanshaw. Dorothy Lygon and Francis Russell ("Tuscan Primitives in London Sales: 1801 - 1837," The Burlington Magazine 122 [1980]: 113) identify the woman as a Miss Fanshawe, "...one of three sisters who lived in Berkeley Square and knew Thomas Hope...

[4] In his letter of 16 May 1963 to John Walker (in NGA curatorial files), James Byam Shaw states that Mayer, his former partner in the Colnaghi firm, had purchased the painting "at a country sale" on 8 August 1934, and then he himself resold it on 8 April of the following year "to Volterra the Italian dealer", clearly a reference to Gualtiero Volterra, Contini-Bonaccossi's agent in London.

[5] As was his habit, Contini-Bonaccossi sought advice about the painting he had acquired by consulting the most highly respected experts of Italian painting of the day. Of these, Wilhelm Suida's and Giuseppe Fiocco's opinions (copies in NGA curatorial files) are dated August 1935 and were written in Florence, where the painting evidently was located at that time. The painting was eventually taken to New York and is one of twenty-eight works listed in the purchase offer addressed to the count by the Kress Foundation on 7 June 1948, and accepted by him on 11 July 1948 (copies in NGA curatorial files). See also The Kress Collection Digital Archive, https://kress.nga.gov/Detail/objects/1369.
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