Bartlová, Milena

The case of Bohemian origin claimed for two small panel paintings

MILENA BARTLOVÁ

THE CASE OF BOHEMIAN ORIGIN CLAIMED FOR TWO SMALL PANEL PAINTINGS.

There exist such movable works of medieval art which can be found today in some other country than the one of their origin. Identification of the country of origin represents an art–historical masterpiece in such cases when any other kind of information is missing. Theoretically, there were two ways of getting the artworks out of their home country: either as a result of activity of modern collectors or international art market, or sometimes before. The second group may be subdivided in many concrete situations: the work may have been ordered from abroad (case in point being, e.g., the *St. Barbara's altarpiece* by Master Francke) or taken away by the owner shortly after execution (Portinari's *Nativity altarpiece* by Hugo van der Goes). The import during the Middle Ages could have been part of Christian cult (icons of *Notre–Dame–de–Grace* in Cambrai or *Our Lady* in Freising), but the crossing of borders could have happened in the framework of early collectorship (Dürer's *Rosenkranzmadonna*). Finally, there should exist also the category of works executed by foreign artists residing temporarily outside of their home country (again the case of the *Rosenkranzmadonna*). It may be rather difficult or even impossible to distinguish this last category from imports if we lack information from other sources. A possibility of sojourn of some foreign artist is supported, more reliably but still indirectly, by traces left by his style in wider local artistic production.

Identification of artworks of Bohemian origin abroad was often based by patriotism inherited from the era when Czech art history has defended the position of Bohemian art against the demands of Greater Germany. Even today, e.g. the scholarly discussion on appropriation of some prominent statues of the "Beautiful Style" around 1400 seems often to take place in the one hundred years old atmosphere of anti–Habsburg resistance. Between the wars, there surfaced on the German and Austrian art market several Gothic paintings and sculptures that were identified as Bohemian without much scholarly debate and Vincenc Kramář was very active in buying such artworks for the Czechoslovak public collection of old art: e.g., the panel with the so–called *Madonna Ara-*

coeli with painted frame, the *Crucifixion triptych from the Reininghaus collection* and the panels of the *St. James' altarpiece*. After the World War II, the reaction to Bohemian attributions had to be reduced, on the part of Czech art historians, from acquisitions to scholarly discussion. If we leave aside the field of study of illuminated manuscripts which are attributed to Bohemia on the basis of the contents of their text or of an owners' notice, the most concentrated attention was given to the panel paintings. Contributions by Mojmír Frinta,[1] Jaroslav Pešina[2] and Ivo Kořán[3] were, in part, written in a framework of a mutual discussion; other contributions were published by Josef Krása[4] (reacting to Charles Sterling[5]), Hannelore Sachs[6] and Robert Suckale.[7] Bohemian attribution is, of course, to be found in diverse cases of panel paintings dispersed namely in museum catalogues and in Alfred Stange's *Deutsche Malerei der Gotik*. During my participation in the team project led by Jaromír Homolka which aims at a new edition of the *Corpus of Bohemian medieval panel painting*, my task was to review the scholarship concerning the paintings of the "Beautiful Style" period.[8] I do not intend to survey the scholarship on all the possible Bohemian panels abroad, but only to draw attention to problems connected with two recent attributions.

[1]   Mojmír Frinta, Medieval bohemica: addenda et subtrahenda. *Acta historiae artium* 26, 1980,
      pp. 238–244; idem, A Few Remarks on International Contacts of Bohemian Painting in the
      later Middle Age. *Umění* XL, 1992, pp. 89–99.
[2]   Jaroslav Pešina, Tři gotická bohemica v zahraničí? *Umění* VI, 1958, pp. 238–244; Jaroslav
      Pešina – Jaromír Homolka, K problematice evropského umění kolem roku 1400. *Umění* XI,
      1963, pp. 161–206; idem, České země a Evropa. In: *České umění gotické*. Praha 1970;
      Jaroslav Pešina, Bohemica pravá a nepravá (Na okraj studie M. Frinty v českém gotickém
      deskovém malířství). *Umění* XXIX, 1981, pp. 418–421; idem, Neznámý gotický obraz Madony s dítětem českého původu. *Umění* XXVII, 1979, pp. 351–352.
[3]   Ivo Kořán – Zbygniew Jakubowski, Byzantské vlivy na počátky české malby gotické a roudnická Madona v Krakově. *Umění* XXIV, 1976, pp. 218–242; Ivo Kořán, K vývoji tzv. svatovítského typu madony. *Umění* XXIX, 1981, pp. 193–217; Ivo Kořán – Hannelore Sachs –
      Werner–Dietrich Kunze, Krásná madona frankfurtská – Eine Madonnentafel des frühen 15.
      Jahrhunderts in Frankfurt/Oder. *Umění* XXXIII, 1985, pp. 330–336; Ivo Kořán, Život našich
      gotických madon. *Umění* XXXVII, 1989, pp. 193–220.
[4]   Josef Krása, Česká madona v Louvru. *Umění* IX, 1961, pp. 280–283.
[5]   Charles Sterling, Une madone tchéque au musée du Louvre. *Revue des arts* 10, 1960, pp. 75–86.
[6]   Hannelore Sachs, Böhmische Gotik in der Mark Brandenburg. *Bildende Kunst* 1979, pp.
      122–126; eadem, Eine böhmische Madonnentafel in Frankfurt/Oder. *Seminaria Niedzickie*
      III., Kraków 1988, pp. 53–55.
[7]   Robert Suckale, Das Diptychon in Basel und das Pähler Altarretabel. Ihre Stellung in der
      Kunstgeschiche Böhmens. *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte*,
      43, 1986, pp. 103–112; idem, Die Passionstafel in Pechüle – ein Retabel der Klosterkirche
      Zinna? *Zisterzienser in Brandenburg*. Berlin 1996, pp. 128–135.
[8]   One of the results of the research is also this article. The project is supported in the years
      1997–1999 by the grant GA ČR no. 408/97/0240.

I. Crucifixion from the Nathan's collection in Zurich [*fig. 1*]

A small panel with Crucifixion, the right wing of a diptych, was published by
Olga Pujmanová in 1983 after having been restored by Mojmír Hamsík. She has
classified the image in the context of Bohemian art in the 1390s.[9] The second
panel of the same diptych has, however, escaped her attention – it is the picture
of *Carrying of the Cross* from the Adenauer's collection in Cologne and it was
published by Otto Benesch in 1930 [*fig. 2*].[10] Although we know the picture,
unfortunately, only from a black–and–white photograph accompanying his arti-
cle, there can be no doubt that the two pictures belong to each other: both panels
have precisely identical measurements of painted surface[11] and the same, highly
specific, punched decoration of its border. Even if we have only a photograph to
compare, we can clearly see the same modellation of eyeballs, hair and beard, of
the terrain and wood of the Cross and of the depicted metal arms and instru-
ments. Identical in both pictures is also the formulation of the open loop of folds
on the knee of the Virgin's free leg. Also the stylistic concept of both paintings
is the same, the symmetrical composition is complementary and both themes
form a common pair of images in a diptych for private devotion.[12] An identifi-
cation of the second wing of the diptych offers an intriguing possibility of veri-
fying the attribution of the Crucifixion panel to Bohemia. Otto Benesch has
published the *Carrying of the Cross* in the framework of a group of small panels
which had attributed to the circle of Salzburg art between 1420–1430.

The technology of painting of the *Crucifixion* was classified by Mojmír Ham-
sík as a representative of a transitional position between the followers of the
Master of the Třeboň altarpiece and the "Beautiful Style"; his report has been
published together with Pujmanová's article. Similar technological investiga-
tions of relevant Austrian panels have not been published so far. That means
that we cannot be sure, that the results of analysis of the *Crucifixion* not only
confirm a possible Bohemian origin, but that they should, at the same time, also
eliminate a possible Austrian origin of the painting. The possibility cannot be
excluded – and in my opinion remains rather high – that the technological char-
acter of Austrian painting ca 1400 could have been quite similar or even identi-
cal to that of Bohemian painting. We have, therefore, to relay only on formal
analysis of both images for differentiation. The small format forced a simple
composition and reduced number of personages, so that the most visible formal
feature is the composition of draperies of the dress. Both images confirm the
opinion of Olga Pujmanová that the compositional patterns of the "Beautiful

---

[9]   Olga Pujmanová, Nová gotická deska českého původu. *Umění* XXXI. 1983, pp. 131–149.

[10] Otto Benesch, Grenzprobleme der österreichischen Tafelmalerei. *Wallraf–Richartz Jahrbuch*,
      N.F. 1, 1930, pp. 66–99, esp. p. 98

[11] *Nathan's Crucifixion*:17,5 x 15,7 cm; *Adenauer's Carrying of the Cross* according to O.
      Benesch (as in note 10), p. 97: 17,8 x 15,8 cm.

[12] For an overview of the typical use of the pair of images of the Carrying of the Cross and Cru-
      cifixion in diptychs, see Jörg Oberhaidacher. Der Meister der St.–Lambrechter Votivtafel und
      Simone Martini. *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 45, 1992, p. 177.

style" were not used by the painter: regularly patterned bowl–like folds, cas-
cades of tubes and decorative turning out of the hemlines are completely miss-
ing. That means we have to date the paintings either to the decade preceding the
development of the "Beautiful style", or to a later period when such regular fold
patterns were discarded in favor of more accidental, more "realistic" composi-
tion – i.e. to the decade suggested by Benesch for the *Carrying of the Cross*.
Olga Pujmanová has dated the *Crucifixon* in the years after 1390, following the
first of these two alternatives and assuming that the earliest dated Bohemian
panel of the "Beautiful style", that is the *Epitaph of Jan of Jeřeň* who has died
in 1395, represents the initial stage of the new style. It is not important for our
argument, that this chronological construct of the "Beautiful style" in Bohemian
art has been undergoing a revision which moves the starting line to the 1380s.[13]
Much more important is the fact that in the period before assertion of the
"Beautiful style", be it in the 1380s or 1390s, the images of the diptych would
be stylistically isolated in the known Bohemian art. Connections to the illumi-
nations of the group of manuscripts made for king Wenceslas IV, mentioned by
Pujmanová as comparisons for the *Crucifixion*, are only partial. They concern
only some of the figural types, while most of the motifs of draperies in both
pictures cannot be incorporated in their framework. On the other hand, we en-
counter, in both paintings, numerous cases of rather flat bending of draperies
where they meet the ground: they are cut here instead of forming elastic loops.
This is a formal feature typical for the central European style of the second and
third decades of the 15th century. Also the formal character of the body of the
crucified Christ, the expressive features of his face and the hilly line of the
"horizon" in the *Carrying of the Cross* suggest more convincingly a dating ca
1420.

Even in that time, however, the system of drapery folds in the diptych would
remain an isolated case in Bohemia. On the other hand, we can find rather close
affinity to a group of small–format panels which are tentatively attributed to
workshops active in Salzburg or Vienna of the 1420s: the group is formed not
only by the small panels with Passion themes, mentioned in this context also by
Benesch (we will return to them later), but also by the paintings from the circle
of the so–called Master of Vienna Adoration.[14] The closest parallel for the *Na-
than's Crucifixion* is the small panel of the same theme in the Austrian Gallery
[*fig. 3*].[15] It is important that the group is directly related to the contemporary
and slightly later extensive group of paintings attributed to the so–called Master

[13]   See especially Jaroslav Pešina, Zur Frage der Chronologie des schönen Stils in der Tafel-
       malerei Böhmens. *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity* F14–15, 1971, pp.
       167–191 (cf. also *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Institutes der Universität Graz* 7, 1972,
       pp. 1–28); Jana H. Hlaváčková, Courtly Body in the Bible of Wenceslas IV. In: *Künstleri-
       scher Austausch – Artistic Exchange. Akten des XXVIII. Internationalen Kongresses für
       Kunstgeschichte in Berlin 1992.* Berlin 1995, pp. 371–382; Jiří Fajt (ed.), [Cat.] *Magister
       Theodoricus. Court Painter of Emperor Charles IV.* Praha 1997–1998.
[14]   Elfriede Baum, *Katalog des Museums mittelalterlicher Österreichischer Kunst.* Wien-
       München 1971, pp. 27–29.
[15]   Ibidem, p. 31, no. 11.

of the Votive panel from St. Lambrecht (earlier also called Hans von Tübingen) and affiliated painters from a group that was active in Vienna and Wiener Neustadt between ca 1420 and 1440. If our diptych would come from Austria, it would be much easier to explain the iconographic details that set the Nathan's Crucifixion apart from Bohemian standards and which have inspired Pujmanová to much sophisticated interpretation – the most conspicuous being the absence of the face on the shield held by the centurion under the cross.[16] The fact that St. John Evangelist is missing under the cross in the Crucifixion scene, although his halo was designed in the gold background, may not be so important as Pujmanová has suggested. Similar phenomenon which has resulted from a change in the concept of the image in the period between completion of the preparatory works and the execution of the painting can be encountered also in other cases, e.g. in the scene of the Death of the Virgin on the frame of the *Madonna from the English Royal collection* (Bohemian, ca 1440). In the *Nathan's Crucifixion*, the occurrence of the halo in the back row of a group of people may also be an expression of relatively progressive spatial concept of the image. The reason why it was St. John who was hidden behind the group of three in front of him can be, in my opinion, explained by the fact that the three women may have been more important, e.g. if the diptych was made for a woman customer.

Formal analysis has led us to suggest that Benesch's opinion was the more adequate attribution, and to decline the inclusion of the *Nathan's Crucifixion* into the body of Bohemian Gothic painting of the "Beautiful Style" period. But what should we do, in such a situation, with such features of both paintings of the diptych which are undoubtedly related to Bohemian art? There must have been some form of quite close relationship between artistic circles in Bohemia and in Austria in the decades around 1400. Several iconographic motives point in this direction: the blood–stained cloak covering Mary's head in the Crucifixion part of the diptych may derive from the same detail in the *Crucifixion from St. Barbara's chapel* by the Master of the Třeboň altarpiece; the same formulation is found in the small Crucifixion panel in the Austrian Gallery mentioned before.[17] The figural type of centurion under the cross comes from Bohemian art, as Olga Pujmanová has shown. The man with raised arm behind Christ car-

---

[16]   The face on the shield of one of the soldiers taking part in a Passion scene can be found also in pictures that have nothing to do with Bohemian inspiration, e.g. on the *Carrying of the Cross* by Hans Hirtz from Strasbourg (now in Kunsthalle Karlsruhe; ca 1450). It is possible that we will have to dismiss the conviction that this motive was typical solely for Bohemia. This was, after all, suggested by Olga Pujmanová herself when she has pointed to the earliest occurrence of the motif in the Passion tympanum *Portale de la calende* of the Rouen cathedral from the middle of the 14th century (O. Pujmanová 1983 /as in note 9/, pp.134–135).

[17]   In her studies about the genesis of the motif of *peplum cruentatum*, O. Pujmanová discusses the blood–stained white veil but here the drops of Christ's blood fall on the Virgin's blue cloak. In some cases, both veil and cloak on her head are covered with blood: e.g., in the *Crucifixions from Vyšší Brod* and from the *Pähl Altarpiece*. Cf. Olga Pujmanová, The Vyšší Brod Crucifixion. *Bulletin of the National Gallery in Prague* V–VI, 1995–1996, pp. 105–112; eadem, Iconographie de la Crucifixion du Missel d'Henri Thesauri. In: Klára Benešovská (ed.), *King John of Luxembourg and the Art of his Era*. Praha 1998, pp. 256–259

rying the cross is one of the very few common motifs shared by both the Austrian and Bohemian concept of the scene in the first half of the 15th century, otherwise quite different; the man with the raised hand seems to come from the "franko–flemish" or Netherlandish art of the turn of the century.[18] From the point of view of search for mutual artistic relations between Bohemia and Austria in the first decades of the 15th century we should also recall an earlier opinion of Gerhard Schmidt, unfortunately overlooked by Czech art historians: namely, that the style of the group of paintings around the *Votive panel from St. Lambrecht* is based on a lesson taken from Bohemian painting of the stylistic level of Master Theoderic.[19] Close connections of art in both countries have appeared also as a result of the study of the stone sculpture of the *Saint Virgin holding a book* – a work of art of a possible Bohemian origin which was bought by the National Gallery in Prague in Zurich in 1996, an important resuming of the acquisition policy of Vincenc Kramář after several decades.[20] We can see that the suggested relationship of the paintings from the diptych with *Crucifixion* and *Carrying of the Cross* to both Bohemian and Austrian art, are no isolated phenomenon but that they fit well into a more complex net of mutual connections. From the historical point of view, such cultural ties would be highly probable in the decades around 1400: the agreement of succession between the Austrian Habsburgs and Bohemian Luxembourgs, long–time economical ties of Bohemia and Moravia to the Austrian Danube basin and personal links of prominent prelates of Salzburg (and Passau) to Prague, all these were undoubtedly important facts which helped to orientate the mutual cultural and also artistic connections of the neighboring countries.

II. Adoration of the Magi, called "Bucher's Epiphany" [*fig. 4*]

The second panel to which we will devote our attention is quite similar to the first one. It has been found in the Christie's auction catalogue by Olga Pujmanová who has classified it as a Bohemian painting from the third fourth of the 14th century.[21] The image was auctioned by a private collector and all the art historical expertise is done on the basis of its photographs and of a report from a

---

[18] See Gerhardt Schmidt, Die österreichische Kreuztragungstafel in der Huntington Library. *Österreichisches Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege* 20, 1966, pp. 1–15; Jörg Oberhaidacher, Westliche Elemente der Ikonographie der österreichischen Malerei um 1400. *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 43, 1990, pp. 83–85; J. Oberhaidacher (as in note 12), pp. 173–181. On the iconography of Carrying of the Cross see recently and thoroughly Dietmar Lüdke in: [Cat.] *Die Karlsruher Passion*. Karlsruhe 1996.
[19] G. Schmidt 1966 (as in note 18), p. 14.
[20] Milena Bartlová – Jiří Fajt, [Cat.] *Saint Virgin holding a book – Světice s knihou*. Praha 1996.
[21] Olga Pujmanová, Portraits of kings depicted as Magi in Bohemian painting. In: Dillian Gordon – Kisa Monnas – Caroline Elam (eds.), *The Regal Image of Richard II and the Wilton Diptych*. London 1997, pp. 247–267, colour reproduction on pl. 21; eadem, Neznámé bohemicum. In: Jiří Fajt (ed.), *Gotika v západních Čechách (Sborník k 70. narozeninám J. Homolky)*. Praha 1998, pp. 215–221.

Swiss art dealer, cited by Pujmanová in her articles. The measurements of the Epiphany picture – 22,5 x 20,5 cm including the frame – are only a few centimeters larger than the panels of the previous diptych and again prove that the work was intended for private devotion. In her contribution on a Prague conference in 1996 (published 1998), Olga Pujmanová has attributed the painting into the context of Bohemian art on the basis of the portrait features of Charles IV which she has identified in the face of the middle king, and also on the basis of stylistic similarity, on the one hand with Master Theodoric and on the other with the Master of the Třeboň altarpiece.

A more definite assessment must be left for the future when art historians will have the occasion to study the picture firsthand and when a technological analysis will be made. Still, even the knowledge of photographs allows a discussion of some problems called forth by Pujmanová's attribution. First, it is necessary to introduce the picture into the context of other known central European paintings which have a similar format, concept, technical elaboration of the gilded background and, at least in part, also the forms used. In this case, we cannot supply another panel to form a pair (according to the report of the art dealer, the frame does not provide clues for joining other panels), but we still want to call attention to a group of similar pictures. The group is formed by two pictures in the art collection of the monastery in Stams with *Lamentation* [*fig. 5*] and *Noli me tangere, Crucifixion* in the National Gallery in Dublin (acquired in Vienna), diptych from the Historisches Museum Bamberg with *Agony in the garden* (the three sleeping apostles are separated from the kneeling Christ on two panels) and, finally, the still unrestored diptych in the monastery in Salzburg–Nonnberg with *Annunciation* and *Doubting St. Joseph*. The whole group has been tentatively and highly hypothetically attributed to Salzburg art in the 1420s and around 1430.[22] The *Bucher's Epiphany* is linked to the Stams, Bamberg and Dublin images of this group, through close resemblance of the punched decorated band along the sides of the panel and also by the fact that draperies and grassy terrain reach over on the slanted inner part of the frames. The style of the painting differs so that it is not possible to include our *Epiphany* into the same "workshop group". Still, we have to verify a suggestion that the newly found picture could belong to another local and chronological context than the one proposed by Olga Pujmanová. A move to a younger dating, namely to the time around 1420–1430, is suggested also by the information contained in

22 See Albin Rohrmoser and Beate Ruckschio, in: [Cat.] *Spätgotik in Salzburg – Malerei 1400–1550*. Salzburg 1972, nos. 6–11 a 13, pp. 54–56, with bibliography. – The diptych from Stams has been recently mentioned by Lucas Madersbacher, Zu einer vergessenen Marientod–Tafel in der National–Gallery in London. *Österreichisches Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege* 49, 1995, p. 25. Author's localization of the diptych into the "Inn valley" seems to me quite vague and I fail to recognize the "close relationship" to the Altarpiece from Rangersdorf. – On the diptych from Bamberg, see recently Frank Olaf Büttner, Zu Bildform, Stilmitteln und Ikonographie der Tafelmalerei um 1400. *Internationale Gotik in Mitteleuropa. Kunsthistorisches Jahrbuch Graz* 24, 1990, pp. 66–67 (like O. Pujmanová, F. O. Büttner recalls a similarity of procedure to Master Theodoric for the fact that the painting crosses over on the frame).

the description of the picture: an energetic black underdrawing can be seen through the layer of paint. This phenomenon occurs due to a heightened amount of oil binding agent in the painting medium and it can encountered in Bohemian panels from *Madonna from Svojšín* up to the *St. James' altarpiece*. The same character of underdrawing can be recognized in the small panel with *St. Martin and the beggar* in Gemäldegalerie Berlin, classified there as "Bohemian".[23] It would be difficult, however, to find in Bohemia relevant and close enough paintings, while similar iconography can be found rather in Austria (Steiermark).

Again, we are found in a situation similar to the first part of this article. Some features relegate the *Bucher's Epiphany* into an isolated position in the context of Bohemian art of both periods suggested – "around 1360" and "around 1420–1430". The latter date would be, moreover, a highly problematic date for a painting of Bohemian origin due to the well known historical situation during the decade of the Hussite wars. We can find no convenient parallel to the figure of the Virgin in the *Epiphany*: to the type of the spatial construction of the throne, to the rather stiff and straight folds of drapery which are bending when they get in contact with the basement of the throne, nor to the arrangement of the veil on Mary's head. The veil which is tucked up on one side is typical for Austrian painting and it can be encountered often in the so–called *Albrechtsaltar* and in the works attributed to the Master from Liechtenstein. Also the modeling of the face of the oldest king could be included into the formal usage of the wider group around the Master of the Votive panel from St. Lambrecht. The swaddled infant was painted much more often in Austria than in Bohemia, where we know the only case of the *Adoration from Hluboká* (Frauenberg) by Master of the Třeboň altarpiece. In Bohemia, the dominant type was, for a long time, a completely naked child, because its strong eucharistic connotation fitted well into the context of heated theological and social debates of the pre–Hussite era. The swaddled child leaves the eucharistic connotation aside and proves a more direct link of the image to the original source of the motif in the text of *Meditationes vitae Christi*.[24]

The identification of the second king of the Epiphany as the Emperor and king of Bohemia Charles IV does not seem too convincing. The problem of using the type of originally individual face for a general expression of "the good king" is rather complex and the results suggest more skeptical approach to such

23 From a demolished chapel of St. Martin in Nauen, 44 x 35,5 cm, Nr. 2252. *Gemäldegalerie Berlin – Gesamtverzeichnis*. Berlin 1996, p. 141, fig. 30; Rainer Michaelis, *Deutsche Gemälde 14.–18. Jahrhundert. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie*. Katalog III., Berlin 1989. – Sincere thanks to Dr. Rainald Grosshans of the Gemäldegalerie Berlin for providing information and access to the panel.

24 On the iconography of new–born Jesus see Bert–Alan Kéry, Über die Veränderung der ikonographischen Typen der Geburt Christi in der österreichischen Buchmalerei der Internationalen Gotik. *Internationale Gotik in Mitteleuropa. Kunsthistorisches Jahrbuch Graz* 24, 1990, p. 103–113; F. O. Büttner 1990 (as in note 22, p. 73) and Jörg Oberhaidacher, Der Wiener Neustädter Altar zu St. Stephan in Wien und seine kunsthistorischen Probleme. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege* 49, 1995, pp. 36–40.

identifications.[25] I am also not convinced that this king should carry between his fingers a thorn from the Christ's crown of thorns. Although more definite results can be brought only by an inspection of the original painting, the excellent colour reproduction[26] provides no clue for anything in the king's left hand. His courtly gesture is an analogy to the gesture of the third king in a row. More important, in my opinion, is the fact, that the second king displays distinctive three hermin stripes on the shoulder of his red cloak. This has been interpreted as a sign of the French Dauphin worn in some images by the future Charles V.[27] It does not seem probable that the Emperor would like to be portrayed as the Dauphin. It may be interesting to mention in this connection, that Charles V is documented to have organized a dramatic realization of an adoration of the Magi at his Paris court with himself in the leading role during the feast of Epiphany in 1378 (it may be more appropriate to speak about a "happening" than about "drama").[28] While giving arguments against Pujmanová's attribution of the *Bucher's Epiphany* picture into the context of Bohemian art, these speculations provide very little clues for an alternative suggestion. The tentative links to Western art can be only supported by pointing to the fact that the only parallel to Theodoric's creative use of stretching the painted surface onto the frame[29] can be found in the Crucifixion from the *Carrand diptych* (Florence, Bargello), now attributed to French or Netherlandish art in the last third of the 14th century.

In the case of the diptych formed by the *Nathan's Crucifixion* and *Adenauer's Carrying of the Cross* we have identified some links to the Bohemian painting of the "Beautiful Style" period and other, more prominent links to Austrian art "around 1420–1430". Similar is the case of the *Bucher's Epiphany*: while the relationship to Bohemian painting is less pronounced, we can find some features suggesting a more direct link to the West. While the punched decoration of the *Carrying of the Cross – Crucifixion diptych* is formed in a way which is close to Bohemian panels of the decades around 1400,[30] the punched border decoration of the *Bucher's Epiphany* is closer in form and elaboration to Austrian examples of the first quarter of the 15th century.

[25] On the problem see e.g. Gerhard Schmidt. C. R. Sherman: The Portraits of Charles V of France (Buchbesprechung). *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 34, 1971, pp. 72–88; Elfriede Knauer, Kaiser Sigismund. In: *Festschrift für Otto von Simson zum 65. Geburtstag.* Frankfurt –Berlin–Wien 1977, pp. 173–196; Bert–Alan Kéry, Kryptoporträts oder nicht? In: Jaroslav Macek – Ernö Marosi – Ferdinand Seibt (eds.). *Sigismund von Luxemburg, Kaiser und König in Mitteleuropa 1387–1437.* Warendorf 1994, pp. 279–286

[26] See note 21.

[27] G. Schmidt 1971 (as in note 25); Götz Czymmek, in: [Cat.] Anton Legner (ed.), *Die Parler und der Schöne Stil.* Köln a. R. 1978, Bd. I, pp. 51–52; Karel Stejskal, Die Wandzyklen des Kaisers Karls IV. Bemerkungen zu Neudatierungen und Rekonstruktionen der im Auftrag Karls IV. gemalten Wandzyklen. *Umění* XLVI, 1998, pp. 19–41, esp. pp. 23–24 and fig. 3.

[28] Frank Olaf Büttner, *Imitatio pietatis.* Berlin 1983, p. 27.

[29] Cf. Milena Bartlová, Why did Master Theoderic paint on his frames? *Bulletin of the National Gallery in Prague* V–VI, 1995–1996, pp. 102–104.

[30] The punched decoration of the *Nathan's Crucifixion* see in: O. Pujmanová 1983 (as in note 9), note 5 on p. 141 and illustrations on p. 136.

We have already pronounced the conviction that the problem of proper attribution of these pictures cannot be solved without regard to the questions connected with the complicated inquiry into artistic relations between Austria and Bohemia during last third of the 14th and first third of the 15th centuries. Such a statement is usually followed by another question: which of the countries was the leading and which was the following member of the pair? If we try to get free from patriotic interests on both sides and if we take earnestly the contributions of Austrian art historian from recent decades, namely of Gerhardt Schmidt, Lothar Schultes and Jörg Oberhaidacher, we will not be able to accept any more the opinion of the older generation of Czech art historians who considered Prague, or Bohemia, to be the center where the "Beautiful Style" was born and from where it has "radiated" into neighboring countries, in the first place namely to Austria. Beside the both possibilities conferring the leading role on one country or the other, we can also take into account a third solution: namely the version that art in both countries around has, in the decades around 1400, accepted and adapted the impulses from the West, from the Paris court and from the "franko–flemish" circle, in very similar ways and more or less contemporaneously.[31] Such an orientation of artistic relationship could have been based on the well known family ties of both ruling houses to the house of the Valois. The hypothesis needs, of course, further validation and verification. For the problem of correct attribution of the two "Bohemian" panels we have studied in this article, the hypothesis of parallel artistic relationship of Bohemia and Austria to the West could offer a vantage point that would not have to lead to the position when an origin of individual iconographic and stylistic features either from Bohemia or from Austria is viewed as an irreconcilable antagonism.

Another specific theme which will have to be studied in more detail is the so–called "Bohemian influence" around and after 1420. As a result of the outbreak of the Hussite wars, many artists left Prague in these years. Their activity has been, so far, identified, in one way or another, in Nürnberg, Augsburg, Breslau (Wroclaw) and Krakow. Theoretically, we could anticipate their activity also in Buda, Vienna, Passau and Salzburg. Proper understanding of this specific case of "influence" based on an exile of numerous artists is complicated by the fact that in most of these places, the Bohemian art tradition had been more or less active already in previous decades. Only when we know better the relationship of Bohemian art to neighboring countries, including Austria, the attribution of the panels in discussion could be more convincing. Until then it must remain an open question.

---

[31] I am indebted to Jiří Fajt, who is studying the formal genesis of the style of Master of the Třeboň altarpiece, for inspiring discussions on this hypothesis.

K PROBLÉMU NĚKTERÝCH TZV. ZAHRANIČNÍCH BOHEMIK.

Studie se věnuje možnostem, jak ověřit nedávná připsání dvou malých deskových obrazů ze zahraničních soukromých sbírek do souboru českého gotického malířství. První z nich, tzv. *Nathanovo Ukřižování*, publikovala Olga Pujmanová v roce 1983 [*pozn. 9, obr. 1*]. Přitom uniklo její pozornosti, že již 1930 publikoval Otto Benesch [*pozn. 10, obr. 2*] malbu, která je nepochybně druhou polovinou téhož diptychu: *Nesení kříže z Adenauerovy sbírky* v Kolíně nad Rýnem připsal do fondu rakouského (salcburského?) malířství doby kolem 1420–1430. Podrobný rozbor formálních rysů obou desek vede k závěru, že Beneschova atribuce má více oprávnění, což by vedlo k nutnosti odepsat *Nathanovo Ukřižování* z českého malířství. Vzniká však otázka, jak interpretovat ty ikonografické rysy, které mají nespornou souvislost s českou malířskou tradicí. Částečným řešením tohoto problému může být poukaz na existenci poměrně komplexní sítě vzájemných uměleckých vztahů mezi Čechami a Rakouskem v poslední třetině 14. a první třetině 15. století.

Druhým zkoumaným obrazem je poslední atribuce Olgy Pujmanové – *Klanění tří králů*, tzv. *Bucherova Epifanie* [*pozn. 21, obr. 4*]. Formální analýza zjišťuje slabé vztahy k českému malířství. Zároveň upozorňuje na to, že Epifanii – a do značné míry i diptych *Nathanova Ukřižování* a *Adenauerova Nesení kříže* – je třeba zařadit do souboru podobných drobných desek, jež jsou literaturou připisovány do rakouského (salcburského?) malířství kolem 1420–1430 a mj. vykazují shodný princip přechodu malby na vnitřní okraj rámu [*pozn. 22, obr. 5*]. Argumentaci Olgy Pujmanové, založenou zejména na portrétní identifikaci druhého z králů na Klanění, oslabuje upozornění, že tento král je tu zobrazen s odznakem francouzského dauphina na rameni svého pláště, a proto jej patrně nebude možné označit za "sakrální identifikační portrét" Karla IV.

V závěru se studie snaží navrhnout takovou hypotézu, která nebude stavět rakouskou a českou malířskou tradici do pozice nesmiřitelného antagonismu. K dalšímu ověření předkládá možnost rozumět části zjištěných vzájemných vztahů tak, že jsou produktem paralelních vztahů českých i rakouských zemí k západním centrům uměleckého vývoje poslední třetiny 14. století a kolem 1400. Ty by mohly být založeny na rodinných vztazích obou panujících rodů – Habsburků i Lucemburků – k rodu Valois. Dalším specifickým momentem, který bude pro správnější pochopení problému třeba detailněji prostudovat, je skutečná podoba "českého vlivu" kolem a po 1420, kdy z Prahy do blízkého zahraničí odešla řada umělců. Do doby, než budou vztahy českého umění k okolním zemím a zejména k Rakousku přesněji objasněny, bude třeba považovat otázku atribuce studovaných destiček za otevřenou.