

certain negotiations, and the public expression of popular enthusiasm in his favour. On his entrance into Turin, 29th April 1848, there was a general outburst of this enthusiasm, mainly caused, it appears, by his unjust banishment and by the large circulation of his books, especially the *Gesuita Moderno*. The city was illuminated; deputations waited upon him; the king made him senator, but, having been returned both by Turin and by Genoa as deputy to the assembly of representatives, now first meeting under the new constitution, he elected to sit in the lower chamber, for his native town. Previous to the opening he made a tour in various provinces, beginning at Milan and including Rome, where he had three interviews with the liberal pope, who at that moment seemed to be the representative of his ideal imagined in the work *Del Primato morale e civile*, which Pius had read and admired. While he was engaged in this tour, constantly addressing the people publicly, the chamber met and elected him president. In the same parliament sat Azeglio, Cavour, and other liberals, and Balbo was prime minister. At the close of the same eventful year, a new ministry was formed, headed by Gioberti; but with the accession of Victor Emmanuel in March 1849 his active life came to an end. For a short time indeed he held a seat in the cabinet, though without a portfolio; but an irreconcilable disagreement soon followed, and his removal from Turin was accomplished by his appointment on a mission to Paris, whence he never returned. There, refusing the pension which had been offered him and all ecclesiastical preferment, he lived frugally, and spent his days and nights as at Brussels in literary labour. Many other exiles gathered about him, and the Marquis Pallavicino became his bosom friend. He died suddenly, of apoplexy, on the 26th October 1852.

Gioberti's writings are more important than his political career. In the general history of European philosophy they stand apart. As the speculations of Rosmini, against which he wrote, have been called the last link added to mediæval thought, so the system of Gioberti, more especially in his greater and earlier works, is unrelated to other modern schools of thought. It shows a harmony with the Roman Catholic faith which caused Cousin to make the superficial criticism that "Italian philosophy was still in the bonds of theology." Method is with him a synthetic, subjective, and psychological instrument. He reconstructs, as he declares, ontology, and begins with the "ideal formula," "the Ens creates ex nihilo the existent." He is in some respects a Platonist, and transplants certain dogmata from the ancient idealist. He identifies religion with civilization, and arrives in his treatise *Del Primato morale e civile degli Italiani* at the conclusion that the church is the axis on which the well-being of human life revolves. His later works, the *Rinnovamento* and the *Protologia*, are sometimes thought to be less affirmative in this matter, and there is a division in opinion among his critics how far he shifted his ground under the influence of events before he died. His first work, written when he was thirty-seven, had a personal reason for its existence. A young fellow-exile and friend, Paolo Pallia, having many doubts and misgivings as to the reality of revelation and a future life, Gioberti at once set to work with *La Teorica del Sovrannaturale*, which was his first publication (2 vols., 1838). After this the enormous labours of his pen made up for the lateness of his commencement as an author. Philosophical treatises in two or three volumes, which would occupy, generally speaking, half a lifetime, followed in rapid succession, each one being a corollary to the last. The *Teorica* was followed by *Introduzione allo Studio della Filosofia* in three volumes, passing through the press in 1839-40. In this work he states his reasons for requiring a new method and new terminology. Here he brings out the doctrine that religion is the direct expression of the *idea* in this life, and is one with true civilization in history. Civilization is a conditioned mediate tendency to perfection, to which religion is the final completion if carried out; it is the end of the second cycle expressed by the second formula, the Ens redeems existences. Essays on the lighter and more popular subjects, *Del Bello* and *Del Buono*, followed the *Introduzione*, but were not published as a volume till 1846, having first appeared in connexion with the writings of other authors. *Del Primato morale e civile degli Italiani* and the *Prolegomeni* to the same, and soon afterwards his triumphant exposure of the Jesuits, *Il Gesuita Moderno*, in five successive volumes (eight volumes altogether), began to be issued in 1843, and no doubt hastened the transfer of rule from clerical to civil hands. It was, as has been seen, the popularity of these semi-political works,

heightened by other occasional political articles which fill two volumes, and by his *Rinnovamento civile d'Italia*, that caused Gioberti to be welcomed with such enthusiasm on his return to his native country. All these works were perfectly orthodox, and aided in drawing the liberal clergy into the movement which has resulted since his time in the unification of Italy. The Jesuits, however, closed round the pope more firmly after his return to Rome, and in the end Gioberti's writings were placed on the *Index*, although with no unfavourable result as far as their influence is concerned. The remainder of his works need not be particularized, although they give his mature views on many points, especially *La Filosofia della Rivelazione* and the *Protologia*. The entire writings of Gioberti, including those left in manuscript, have been carefully edited by Giuseppe Massari in thirty-six volumes.

See Massari, *Ricordi Biografici e Carteggio* (Naples, 1863); *Lettere di Vincenzo Gioberti e Giorgio Pallavicino* (Milan, 1875); Rev. C. B. Smyth, *Christian Metaphysics* (London, 1851).

GIOJA, MELCHIOR (1767-1828), a distinguished Italian writer on philosophy and political economy, was born at Piacenza in 1767. He was educated at the celebrated college of St Lazare in his native town, and showed special fondness for the philosophical sciences. Apparently he had been destined for the church, but he seems to have given up at an early period the study of theology, and after completing his course at the college spent some years in retirement. His first work was the philosophical treatise *Il nuovo Galateo* (1802), which was followed by the *Logica Statistica*. The arrival of Napoleon in Italy drew Gioja into public life. He advocated warmly the establishment of a republican government, and under the Cisalpine Republic he was named historiographer and director of statistics. After the fall of Napoleon he retired into private life, and does not appear again to have held office. He died in 1828. Gioja's fundamental idea is the value of statistics or the collection of facts. Philosophy itself is with him classification and consideration of ideas. Logic he regarded as a practical art, and his *Esercizioni Logici* has the further title, *Art of deriving benefit from ill-constructed books*. In ethics Gioja follows Bentham, and his large treatise *Del Merito e delle Recompense*, 1818, is a clear and systematic view of social ethics from the utilitarian principle. In political economy this avidity for facts produced better fruits. The *Nuovo Prospetto delle Scienze Economiche*, 6 vols., 1815-17, although long to excess, and overburdened with classifications and tables, contains much valuable material. In particular, Gioja must be credited with the finest and most original treatment of division of labour since the *Wealth of Nations*. Much of what Babbage taught later on the subject of combined work is anticipated by Gioja. His theory of production is also deserving of attention from the fact that it takes into account and gives due prominence to immaterial goods. Throughout the work there is continuous opposition to Smith. Gioja's latest work *Filosofia della Statistica*, 1828, contains in brief compass the essence of his ideas on human life, and affords the clearest insight into his aim and method in philosophy both theoretical and practical.

A notice of Gioja's life is given in the 2d edition of the *Filosofia della Statistica*, 1829. See Ferri, *Essai sur l'histoire de la Phil. en Italie au 19^{me} Siècle*, 1869.

GIORDANO, LUCA (1632-1705), a painter of great immediate celebrity, was born in Naples, son of a very indifferent painter, Antonio, who imparted to him the first rudiments of drawing. Nature predestined him for the art, and at the age of eight he painted a cherub into one of his father's pictures, a feat which was at once noised abroad, and which induced the viceroy of Naples to recommend the child to Spagnoletto. His father afterwards took him to Rome, to study under Pietro da Cortona. He acquired the nickname of Luca Fa-presto (Luke Work-fast). One might suppose this nickname to be derived merely from the almost miraculous celerity with which from an early age and throughout his life he handled the brush; but it is said to

have had a more express origin. The father, we are told, poverty-stricken and greedy of gain, was perpetually urging his boy to exertion with the phrase, "Luca, fa presto." The youth obeyed his parent to the letter, and would actually not so much as pause to snatch a hasty meal, but received into his mouth, while he still worked on, the food which his father's hand supplied. He copied nearly twenty times the *Battle of Constantine* by Julio Romano, and with proportionate frequency several of the great works of Raphael and Michelangelo. His rapidity, which belonged as much to invention as to mere handiwork, and his versatility, which enabled him to imitate other painters deceptively, earned for him two other epithets, "The Thunderbolt" (Fulmine), and "The Proteus," of Painting. He shortly visited all the main seats of the Italian school of art, and formed for himself a style combining in a certain measure the ornamental pomp of Paul Veronese and the contrasting compositions and large schemes of chiaroscuro of Pietro da Cortona. He was noted also for lively and showy colour. Returning to Naples, and accepting every sort of commission by which money was to be made, he practised his art with so much applause that Charles II. of Spain towards 1687 invited him over to Madrid, where he remained thirteen years. Giordano was very popular at the Spanish court, being a sprightly talker along with his other marvelously facile gifts, and the king created him a cavalier. One anecdote of his rapidity of work is that the queen of Spain having one day made some inquiry about his wife, he at once showed Her Majesty what the lady was like by painting her portrait into the picture on which he was engaged. After the death of Charles in 1700 Giordano, gorged with wealth, returned to Naples. He spent large sums in acts of munificence, and was particularly liberal to his poorer brethren of the art. He again visited various parts of Italy, and died in Naples on 12th January 1705, his last words being "O Napoli, sospiro mio" (O Naples, my heart's love!). One of his maxims was that the good painter is the one whom the public like, and that the public are attracted more by colour than by design.

At the present day, when the question is not how quickly Giordano could do his work, but what the work itself amounts to, his reputation has run down like the drops of heavy rain off a window, or like one of the figures in his own paintings, in which he was wont to use an excessive quantity of oil. His astonishing readiness and facility must, however, be recognized, spite of the general commonness and superficiality of his performances. He left many works in Rome, and far more in Naples. Of the latter one of the most renowned is Christ expelling the Traders from the Temple, in the church of the Padri Girolamini, a colossal work, full of expressive lazzaroni; also the frescos of S. Martino, and those in the Tesoro della Certosa, including the subject of Moses and the Brazen Serpent; and the cupola-paintings in the Church of S. Brigida, which contains the artist's own tomb. In Spain he executed a surprising number of works,—continuing in the Escorial the series commenced by Cambiasi, and painting frescos of the Triumphs of the Church, the Genealogy and Life of the Madonna, the stories of Moses, Gideon, David, and Solomon, and the Celebrated Women of Scripture, all works of large dimensions. His pupils, Aniello Rossi and Matteo Pacelli, assisted him in Spain. In Madrid he worked more in oil-colour, a Nativity there being one of his best productions. Another superior example is the Judgment of Paris in the Berlin Museum. In Florence, in his closing days, he painted the Cappella Corsini, the Galleria Riccardi, and other works. In youth he etched with considerable skill some of his own paintings, such as the Slaughter of the Priests of Baal. He also painted much on the crystal borderings of looking-glasses, cabinets, &c., seen in many

Italian palaces, and was, in this form of art, the master of Pietro Garofolo. His best pupil, in painting of the ordinary kind, was Paolo de Matteis.

GIORGIONE (1477-1511), the name adopted both by his contemporaries and by posterity for one of the most renowned of Italian painters, signifies George the Big, or Great, and was given him, according to Vasari, "because of the gifts of his person and the greatness of his mind." Like Lionardo da Vinci, Giorgione appears to have been of illegitimate birth. His father belonged certainly to the gentle family of the Barbarella, of Castelfranco in the Trevisan; his mother, it seems probable, was a peasant girl of the neighbouring village of Vedelago; and he was born in or shortly before the year 1477. In histories and catalogues he is now commonly styled Giorgio Barbarella of Castelfranco; but it seems clear that he was humbly reared, and only acknowledged by his father's family when his genius had made him famous. Twenty-seven years after his death, the brothers Matteo and Ercole Barbarella were glad to inscribe the name of Giorgione among the members of their family in whose honour they built and dedicated a monument in the church of San Liberale in their native town. Presently this church was demolished and replaced by a new one. In the course of this operation the inscription in question perished. Not so a more important memorial of Giorgione's greatness, in the shape of an altar-piece which he painted for the same church on the commission of Tuzio Costanzo. Tuzio Costanzo was a famous captain of free lances, who had followed his mistress, the Queen Cornaro, from Cyprus to her retirement in the Trevisan, and at the beginning of the 16th century was settled at Castelfranco. The altar-piece with which Giorgione adorned the chapel of this patron in the old church of San Liberale, was afterwards transferred to the new church, where it remains to this day, so that there is something more than the mere memory of the great painter to attract the lover of art on a pilgrimage to his native town. Castelfranco is a hill fort standing in the midst of a rich and broken plain at some distance from the last slopes of the Venetian Alps. Giorgione's ideal of luxuriant pastoral scenery, the country of pleasant copses, glades, and brooks, amid which his personages love to wander or recline with lute and pipe, was derived, no doubt, from these natural surroundings of his childhood. We cannot tell how long he remained in their midst, nor what were the circumstances which led him, while still, it seems, a boy, to Venice. Once there, we do not hear of him until his genius is, so to speak, full-fledged. He appears all at once as a splendid presence, the observed of all observers; an impassioned musician, singer, lover; and, above all, as a painter winning new conquests for his art. His progress from obscurity to fame, probably under the teaching of Giovanni Bellini, must have been extraordinarily rapid, as he was still very young when he was employed to paint the portraits of two successive doges, and of great captains and princesses such as Gonzalvo of Cordova and Catharina Cornaro. Giorgione effected, in the Venetian school, a change analogous to that effected by Lionardo in the school of Florence,—a change, that is, which was less a revolution than a crowning of the edifice. He added the last accomplishments of freedom and science to an art that at his advent only just fell short of both. Venetian painting towards 1495 had reached the height of religious dignity in the great altar-pieces of Bellini, the height of romantic sentiment and picturesque animation in Carpaccio's series from the legend of St Ursula. The efforts of the school for nearly half a century had been concentrated on the development, with the help of the new medium of oil, of colour as the great element of emotional expression in painting. Giorgione came to enrich the art with a more faultless

design; with a system of colour yet more ardent, melting, and harmonious; with a stronger sense of life and of the glory of the real world as distinguished from the solemn dreamland of the religious imagination. He had a power hitherto unknown of interpreting both the charm of merely human grace and distinction, and the natural joy of life in the golden sunlight among woods and meadows. His active career cannot have extended over more than fifteen years, since we know that he died in 1511,—according to one account, of a contagious disorder; according to another, of grief at discovering that his mistress had played false with a pupil. But in that brief career he had both deeply modified the older manner of the Venetian school, as represented even by a master so great and so austere as John Bellini, and had prepared the way for its final manner, as represented by the most complete master of all, Titian. Bellini, who outlived Giorgione, had not been ashamed to learn something from the practice of a teacher fully forty years younger than himself, who was probably in the first instance his own pupil. Titian, only ten years younger than Giorgione, succeeded to his conquests, and enjoyed the length of days which was denied him.

A consecutive biography of Giorgione it is impossible to construct, either from literary records or from extant works. The literary records only furnish us with a few general characteristics, and with the mention of a few of his productions, especially the frescos with which he adorned the front of the Fondaco dei Tedeschi or hall of the German traders at Venice, after its destruction by fire in 1504; and the frescos and altar-piece, sometimes attributed to the same year, which he executed for Tuzio Costanzo in his native town. The decorations of the Fondaco dei Tedeschi, which Vasari praises for their design and glowing colour, but blames for their too fantastic and enigmatical invention, have unhappily been utterly destroyed by the combined operation of weather and of reckless architectural changes in the building. The frescos of the chapel of Castelfranco were also sacrificed, while the altar-piece was preserved in the manner we have related. A fragment of a love-madrigal, which was once to be read on the back of this panel, addressed apparently by the painter to his model, is quoted as in character with our traditions of the man. The picture itself represents the Virgin and Child enthroned, with a group of saints, and prominent among them the warrior-saint Liberale, the patron of the church. A small and highly finished study in armour for this figure is now one of the treasures of the National Gallery in London, to which it was bequeathed by Mr Rogers. To Giorgione are also attributed pictures in almost all the public and private galleries of Europe, to a number ten times greater than could possibly be consistent with the short duration of his career, and with the fact that no inconsiderable portion of that career must have been occupied with the production of the perished frescos. These so-called Giorgiones of the galleries may to some extent be recognized and classified as the work of one or another of several groups of painters whose manner was more or less akin to, or influenced by, that of Venice in Giorgione's days. One such group belongs to Bergamo; another to Brescia; another is in alliance with Palma; another with Titian; another, again, consists of the later and looser imitators of the master himself, as Andrea and Schiavone, Pietro della Vecchia and Rocco Marcone. It is probable, indeed, that those distinguished authorities, Messrs Crowe and Cavalcaselle, have gone too far in excluding from the genuine work of Giorgione several of the most famous pictures which have hitherto passed as standards whereby to judge his manner, as, for instance, the Entombment of Christ at Treviso, and particularly the beautiful Concert of the Louvre. Without, however, entering upon disputed ground, there remains a reasonable number of undoubted

pictures of the master, and these, while they possess in common the qualities of feeling and invention which we have above defined, in technical style vary from a minute and painstaking precision, almost like that of Antonello da Messina, or of Bellini in his earlier manner, to a degree of breadth, glow, and softness, which are the qualities more popularly associated with the name of Giorgione, and more commonly attempted by his imitators.

We conclude with a mention of a few of the principal undisputed examples of Giorgione's handiwork, following a chronological order, which, however, it should be understood, is necessarily but approximate and conjectural. Florence, Uffizi: an Ordeal of Moses, and a Judgment of Solomon,—small pictures with rich landscape accessories, and figures of extraordinary grace and delicacy, painted apparently in imitation or in rivalry of the New Testament allegory by Bellini, in the same manner, which is preserved in the same gallery; all three were originally in the summer residence of the Medici at Poggio Imperiale. London, collection of Mr Wentworth Beaumont: Holy Family, with the angel appearing to the shepherds in the background,—again a small picture, very delicately finished; formerly in the possession of Cardinal Fesch. London, National Gallery: the Study for San Liberale above mentioned. Castelfranco, Church of San Liberale: the altar-piece,—figures life size, exhibiting much of the manner of Bellini in his altar-pieces. Vienna, Belvedere Gallery: a Group of Astronomers in a Glade, known as the Chaldeans,—rich sunset landscape, with villages in the distance and trees in the foreground; beside the trees on the left, three figures in Oriental costumes, one-third of life size; formerly in the Taddeo Contarini gallery. Venice, Manfrini palace: man, woman, and child, known as the Family of Giorgione, in a landscape recalling the neighbourhood of Castelfranco,—one of the most beautiful works of the master, formerly in the house of Gabriel Vendramin at Santa Fosca. England, Kingston Lacy, collection of Mr Banks: Judgment of Solomon,—a large unfinished picture of great beauty, of clearer tones and broader treatment than the foregoing, bought, at the suggestion of Lord Byron, from the Marescalchi gallery. Florence, Pitti: Concert,—a monk of the Augustinians, seated at the harpsichord; behind him, a clerk with a viol; on the left a young man with plumed hat and long hair. This is the most perfect of all the works which are assumed to belong to the later time of the master.

See Vasari, *Vite de' più eccellenti pittori*, &c., vol. vii. p. 80, ed. Lemonnier; Ridolfi, *Maraviglie dell'Arte*, vol. i. p. 121; Crowe and Cavalcaselle, *History of Painting in North Italy*, vol. ii. p. 119. (S. C.)

GIOTTINO (1324–1357), an early Florentine painter. Vasari is the principal authority in regard to this artist; but it is not by any means easy to bring the details of his narrative into harmony with such facts as can be verified at the present day. It would appear that there was a painter of the name of Tommaso (or Maso) di Stefano, termed Giottino; and the Giottino of Vasari is said to have been born in 1324, and to have died early, of consumption, in 1357,—dates which must be regarded as open to considerable doubt. Stefano, the father of Tommaso, was himself a celebrated painter in the early revival of art; his naturalism was indeed so highly appreciated by contemporaries as to earn him the appellation of "Scimia della Natura" (ape of nature). He, it seems, instructed his son, who, however, applied himself with greater predilection to studying the works of the great Giotto, formed his style on these, and hence was called Giottino. It is even said that Giottino was really the son (others say the great-grandson) of Giotto. To this statement little or no importance can be attached. To Maso di Stefano, or Giottino, Vasari and Ghiberti attribute the frescos in the chapel of S. Silvestro (or of the Bardi family) in the Florentine church of S. Croce; these represent the miracles of Pope St Sylvester, as narrated in the Golden Legend, one conspicuous subject being the sealing of the lips of a malignant dragon. These works are animated and firm in drawing, with naturalism carried further than by Giotto. From the evidence of style, some modern connoisseurs assign to the same hand the paintings in the funeral vault of the Strozzi family, below the Cappella degli Spagnuoli in the church of S. Maria Novella, representing the crucifixion and other subjects. Vasari ascribes also to his Giottino the frescos of the life of St Nicholas in the

lower church of Assisi. This series, however, is not really in that part of the church which Vasari designates, but is in the Chapel of the Sacrament; and the works in that chapel are understood to be by Giotto di Stefano, who worked in the second half of the 14th century—very excellent productions of their period. It might hence be inferred that two different men produced the works which are unitedly fathered upon the half-legendary "Giottino," the consumptive youth, solitary and melancholic, but passionately devoted to his art. A large number of other works have been attributed to the same hand; we need only mention an Apparition of the Virgin to St Bernard, in the Florentine Academy; a lost painting, very popular in its day, commemorating the expulsion, which took place in 1343, of the duke of Athens from Florence; and a marble statue erected on the Florentine campanile. Vasari particularly praises Giottino for well-blended chiaroscuro. He left behind him various scholars in the art.

GIOTTO (1276–1336), relatively to his age one of the greatest and most complete of artists, fills in the history of Italian painting a place analogous to that which seems to have been filled in the history of Greek painting by Polygnotus. That is to say, he lived at a time when the resources of his art were still in their infancy, but considering the limits of those resources, his achievements were the highest possible. At the close of the Middle Age, he laid the foundations upon which all the progress of the Renaissance was afterwards securely based. In the days of Giotto, the knowledge possessed by painters of the human frame and its structure rested only upon general observation, and not upon any minute, prolonged, or scientific study; while to facts other than those of humanity their observation had never been closely directed. Of linear perspective they possessed few ideas, and those elementary and empirical, and scarcely any ideas at all of aerial perspective or the conduct of light and shade. As far as painting could ever be carried under these conditions, so far it was carried by Giotto. In his choice of subjects, his art is entirely subservient to the religious spirit of his age. Even in its mode of conceiving and arranging those subjects, it is in part still trammelled by the rules and consecrated traditions of the past. Thus it is as far from being a perfectly free as from being a perfectly accomplished form of art. Many of those truths of nature to which the painters of succeeding generations learnt to give accurate and complete expression, Giotto was only able to express by way of imperfect symbol and suggestion. But in spite of these limitations and shortcomings, and although he has often to be content with expressing truths of space and form conventionally or inadequately, and truths of structure and action approximately, and truths of light and shadow not at all, yet among the elements over which he has control he maintains so just a balance that his work produces in the spectator less sense of imperfection than that of many later and more accomplished masters. He is one of the least one-sided of artists, and his art, it has been justly said, resumes and concentrates all the attainments of his time not less truly than all the attainments of the crowning age of Italian art are resumed and concentrated in Raphael. In some particulars the painting of Giotto was never surpassed,—in the judicious division of the field and massing and scattering of groups,—in the union of dignity in the types with appropriateness in the occupations of the personages,—in strength and directness of intellectual grasp and dramatic motive,—in the combination of perfect gravity with perfect frankness in conception, and of a noble severity in design with a great charm of harmony and purity in colour. The earlier Byzantine and Roman workers in mosaic had bequeathed to him the high abstract qualities of their practice, their balance, their impressive-

ness, their grand instinct of decoration; but while they had compassed these qualities at an entire sacrifice of life and animation, it is the glory of Giotto to have been the first among his countrymen to breathe life into art, and to have quickened its stately rigidity with the fire of natural incident and emotion. It was this conquest, this touch of the magician, this striking of the sympathetic notes of life and reality, that chiefly gave Giotto his immense reputation among his contemporaries, and made him the fit exponent of the vivid, penetrating, and practical genius of emancipated Florence. His is one of the few names in history which, having become great while its bearer lived, has sustained no loss of greatness through subsequent generations.

No two men were ever more unlike than the rustic Giotto and the patrician Dante; but among the high places of history, their figures stand side by side on a common eminence. They were contemporaries, Dante being the elder of the two by eleven years, and friends, or, at the least, acquaintances. The poetry of Dante, reporting concerning things unseen with a definiteness not less than that of actual vision, served in many ways, until the days of Michelangelo, not only as an inspiration but as a law to the religious art of Italy. This inspiring and legislating authority of the sacred poet was exercised first of all upon Giotto,—partly, it appears, by means of personal intercourse between the two men. On the other hand, Giotto is celebrated in Dante's verse as the foremost painter of the new age. Nor is this the only tribute to his pre-eminence which we find in contemporary, or almost contemporary, literature. He is from the first a kind of popular hero. He is celebrated by the poet Petrarch and by the historian Villani. He is made the subject of tales and anecdotes by Boccaccio and by Franco Sacchetti. From these notices, as well as from Vasari, we gain a distinct picture of the man, as one whose nature was in keeping with his peasant origin; whose sturdy frame and plain features corresponded to a character, rather distinguished for shrewd and genial strength than for sublimer or more ascetic qualities; a master craftsman, to whose strong combining and inventing powers nothing came amiss; conscious of his own deserts, never at a loss either in the things of his art or in the things of life, and equally ready and efficient whether he has to design the scheme of some great spiritual allegory in colour or imperishable monument in stone, or whether he has to show his wit in the encounter of practical jest and repartee. From his own hand we have a contribution to literature which helps to substantiate this conception of his character. A large part of Giotto's fame as a painter was won in the service of the Franciscans, and in the pictorial celebration of the life and ordinances of their founder. As is well known, it was a part of the ordinances of Francis that his disciples should follow his own example in worshipping and being wedded to poverty,—poverty idealized and personified as a spiritual bride and mistress. Giotto, having on the commission of the order given the noblest pictorial embodiment to this and other aspects of the Franciscan doctrine, presently wrote an ode in which his own views on poverty are expressed; and in this he shows that, if on the one hand his genius was at the service of the ideals of his time, and his imagination open to their significance, on the other hand his judgment was very shrewdly aware of their practical dangers and exaggerations.

Giotto di Bondone (a name, as it happens, also borne in the same generation by a distinguished citizen of Siena) was the son of a poor peasant of Vespignano. He was born in 1276, and drew, we are told, by natural instinct with whatever materials he could lay his hands on. He was ten years old when Cimabue, as the story goes, found him by the wayside, drawing a sheep with a piece of charcoal upon a stone or tile. The master, then at the

height of his fame, took the peasant boy, with the glad consent of his father, to Florence to be his pupil. Of his early career after this we know no more until we find him at work as the foremost among many scholars employed under Cimabue at the interior decorations of the great memorial church of St Francis at Assisi. This church consists of two structures, one superimposed on the other; it is of the upper and not of the lower church that we speak at present. On the walls of this, a great series of frescos, now more than half obliterated, was painted by the primitive masters of the Tuscan school, including some of older and some of younger standing than Cimabue. The series is in three tiers, the uppermost tier containing scenes from the Old Testament; the next, scenes from the New; the lowest, scenes from the life of St Francis. It is in this last tier that we can discern with certainty the hand of the youthful Giotto. The extent of his participation has been much debated. According to the more probable opinion, it can be traced even in the earlier scenes of the history; but it is in the later scenes only that the hand and promise of the master, the presence of a new and vital spirit, reveal themselves with fulness. Some interval (but the chronology of Giotto's career is at all points obscure) would seem to have elapsed between the execution of these frescos and of others, better known than these, which adorn the lower story of the same structure. In four lunette-shaped spaces in the vaulting of this lower church, Giotto has painted four vast compositions, of which the scheme was dictated to him, no doubt, by some pious and learned mouth-piece of the wishes of the order. One of these exhibits the mystical wedding of Francis with Poverty; a second is an allegory of Chastity; a third of Obedience; a fourth shows the saint glorified in heaven among the angels. To describe and explain these famous compositions would be beyond our scope. The ideas they embody cannot but seem strained and cold when we express them in modern language. Strained and cold, indeed, the ideas would have been in any other age of the world; but we must remember that the religious temperament of that age in Italy gave even to pedantry the colours of passion, and an ardent and solemn reality to the most far-drawn fantasies of devotion. And however cool the private judgment of Giotto in such matters may have been, it is not his private judgment which speaks to us from the painted allegories of Assisi; it is the sincere imagination of the men among whom he lived; it is the ardour and solemnity of the devotional spirit of his race. In one of the transepts of the same lower church there are frescos of the Passion of Christ, and others of the life of St Francis, which modern authorities hold against ancient, most likely with justice, to be also from the hand of Giotto.

Assuming that the later work of the master at Assisi belongs to the year 1296 or thereabouts, we have good evidence that two years afterwards he was working at Rome for the Cardinal Stefaneschi, nephew of Pope Boniface VIII. The remains of his industry in this employment may be seen in a mosaic of the *Navicella*, or Christ saving St Peter from the waves, now preserved in the portico of St Peter's at Rome, and in three panels, kept in the sacristy of the canons of the same church, which originally formed part of a ciborium. It is also recorded that Giotto adorned certain MSS. with miniatures for this patron; and in truth there exists in public libraries a very rare class of MSS., in which the miniatures bear the marks, if scarcely of the hand, at any rate of the immediate influence of Giotto. Lastly, a discoloured fragment of a fresco of the church of St John Lateran shows the figure of Pope Boniface VIII. announcing from a balcony the opening of the famous Jubilee of the year 1300. Soon after this, Giotto was once more in his native city. Recent research

has again thrown in doubt the relative cares of the master and of his pupils in the decorations of the chapel, called by Ghiberti the chapel of the Magdalene, in the Bargello or palace of the Podestà at Florence. These were painted to celebrate the pacification between the Black and White parties in the state, effected by the Cardinal d'Acquasparta as delegate of the Pope in 1302, and consisted of a series of Scripture scenes, besides great compositions of Hell and Paradise. It is in the Paradise that the painter has introduced those groups, typical of pacified Florence, in which occur the portraits of Dante, Brunetto Latini, and Corso Donato, and which, amid the emotion of all who care for art or history, were recovered in 1841 from the white-wash that had overlain them.

The whole central period of Giotto's life, from about 1305 to about 1334, is divided between periods of residence at Florence and expeditions, of which we can in very rare instances trace the date or sequence, undertaken in consequence of commissions received from other cities of the peninsula. He was as much or more of a traveller as was Van Eyck a century later; and his travels exercised as much or more of the same fertilizing and stimulating influence on art in Italy as did those of the great Fleming in the north-west of Europe. The familiar story of the O belongs to a journey to France, which was projected by Giotto but never undertaken. Pope Benedict XI., the successor of Boniface VIII., sent a messenger to bring him proofs of the painter's powers. Giotto would give the messenger no other sample of his talent than an O drawn with a free sweep of the brush from the elbow; but the pope was satisfied, and engaged Giotto at a great salary to go and adorn with frescos the papal residence at Avignon. Benedict, however, dying at this time (1305), nothing came of this commission; and the Italian 14th century frescos, of which remains are still to be seen at Avignon, have been proved to be the work, not, as was long supposed, of Giotto, but of the Siennese master Simone Martini, called Simone Memmi. Another certain date in Giotto's career belongs to the close of the period we have defined. In 1328 he had painted in the palace of the Signoria at Florence a portrait (now lost) of Charles of Calabria kneeling before the Virgin. Two years later he was invited by the father of this prince, King Robert of Naples, to come and work for him in that city. Some frescos in the chapel of the Incoronata had been long erroneously supposed, on the authority of Petrarch, to represent a part at any rate of the industry of Giotto during the three years which he spent at Naples. It is the merit of Messrs Crowe and Cavalcaselle, while conclusively setting aside this tradition, to have called attention to a real and very noble work of the master existing in a hall which formerly belonged to the convent of Sta. Chiara in that city. This is a fresco celebrating the charity of the Franciscan order under the figure of the miracle of the loaves and fishes, with the personages of St Francis and St Clare kneeling on either hand.

Between these two dates (1305 and 1330), Giotto is said to have resided and left great works at Padua, Ferrara, Urbino, Ravenna, Rimini, Faenza, Lucca, and other cities; and in several of these paintings are still shown which bear his name with more or less of plausibility. But among them it is at Padua only that his authentic and mature powers can really be studied, and that in perhaps the greatest and most complete series of creations of all that he has left. These are the frescos with which he decorated the chapel built in honour of the Virgin of the Annunciation by a rich citizen of the town, Enrico Scrovegni, and called sometimes the chapel of the Arena, because it is on the site of an ancient amphitheatre. Since it is recorded that Dante was Giotto's guest at Padua, and since we know

that it was in 1306 that he came from Bologna to that city, we may conclude that to the same year, 1306, belongs the beginning of Giotto's great undertaking in the Arena chapel. The scheme includes a Saviour in Glory over the altar, a Last Judgment over the entrance door, and on either side a series of subjects from the Old and New Testaments and the apocryphal Life of Christ, painted in three tiers, and lowest of all, a fourth tier with emblematic Virtues and Vices in monochrome, the Virtues being on the side of the chapel which is next the incidents of redemption in the entrance fresco of the Last Judgment, the Vices on that side which is next the incidents of perdition. There is no other single building, or single series of representations, in which the highest powers of the Italian mind and hand at the beginning of the 14th century may be so well studied as here. In the same city, the great Franciscan church of St Antonio contains also the remains of works by the master. And it was still for the same order, in their renowned church of Santa Croce, that Giotto executed most of the paintings which mark the periods of his residence in Florence. Besides a vast altar-piece or panel for the Baroncelli chapel, he decorated with frescos the walls of a number of private chapels in this church. The Baroncelli altar-piece still exists; the only chapels of which the frescos have been uncovered are those of the Bardi and Peruzzi. Nor are these the only walls in Florence which to this day bear record of the powers of Giotto—without taking into account many that are attributed to him, but are really by the hand of pupils like Taddeo Gaddi or Puccio Capanna, or of weaker followers like Giottino, Giovanni da Milano, or Agnolo Gaddi.

Meantime, Giotto had been advancing, not only in fame, but in years and in prosperity. He was married young, and had, so far as is recorded, three sons, Francesco, Niccola, and Donato, and three daughters, Bice, Caterina, and Lucia. He had added by successive purchases to the plot of land inherited from his father at Vespignano. His fellow-citizens of all occupations and degrees delighted to honour him. And now, in his fifty-eighth year, on his return from Naples by way of Gaëta, he received the final and official testimony to the esteem in which he was held at Florence. By a solemn decree of the Priori (April 12, 1334), he was appointed master of the works of the cathedral of Sta. Reparata (subsequently and better known as Sta. Maria del Fiore), and architect of the city walls and of the towns within her territory. Dying in 1336, he only enjoyed these dignities for two years. But in the course of these two years he had found time not only to make an excursion to Milan, on the invitation of Azzo Visconti and with the sanction of his own Government, but to plan and in part to superintend the execution of two monuments of architecture, of which the one remaining is among the most exquisite in design and richest in decoration that were ever conceived by man. These were, the west front of the cathedral, and its detached campanile or bell tower. The cathedral front was barbarously stripped of its enrichments in a later age, and stood naked until the other day, when the city of Florence undertook to restore it in a modern imitation. The campanile remains, except for inconsiderable repairs, as it was left by the pupils of Giotto after their master's death; and in the consummate dignity as well as consummate delicacy of its design, in its fair proportions and in the opulent but lucid invention and apporportionment of its details, in the thoughtfulness and pregnant simplicity of its sculptured histories, it is the most fitting crown and monument of a strong and memorable career.

A complete bibliography of the earlier as well as the more recent authorities on Giotto would here be out of place. The main materials and references will be found in the following:—Vasari, ed. Lemonnier, vol. i. pp. 309 sqq.; Crowe and Cavalcaselle, *Hist. of*

Painting in Italy, vol. i. chaps. 8 to 11; Ernst Förster, *Geschichte der Italienischen Kunst*, vol. ii. pp. 211 sqq., and E. Dobbert in article "Giotto" in *Dohme's Kunst und Künstler*, vol. iii. (S. C.)

GIOVINAZZO, a town of Italy, in the province of Bari, about 11 miles from Bari, on the railway from Otranto to Bologna. Situated on the coast, it has a small harbour, and carries on an export trade in the olives, almonds, and carobs produced in the vicinity. It is also the seat of a bishop, and possesses a cathedral, a castle, and a famous *ospizio* or poorhouse, which was founded by Ferdinand I. of Naples, and is now used partly for the education of foundlings and orphans, and partly for the reformatory treatment of juvenile criminals. Cloth, carpets, thread, and shoes are among the manufactures of the place, and the children of the *ospizio* are largely trained in such industries. Whether the identification with the ancient town called Netium or Natiolum be well founded or not, it is certain that Giovinazzo was in existence at a very early date, and some portions of its seawall are supposed to belong to the later Roman period. The population of the town in 1875 was 8902, and of the commune 9108.

GIOVIO, PAUL. See JOVIUS.

GIPSIES, a wandering folk scattered through every European land, over the greater part of Asia and North America, and along the northern coast of Africa. Bell of Antermomy speaks in his *Travels* (1763) of meeting at Tobolsk a band of sixty Tziggany on their way to China; Koster describes the Brazilian Ciganos (*Travels in Brazil*, 1816); and at the present day cases of Gipsy emigration to Australia are not unknown. No general estimate can be formed of their numbers outside Europe, but travellers agree that they are very numerous in Persia (3000 families in 1856), Armenia, Asiatic Turkey (67,000 in 1877), and Egypt (one alone of the three chief tribes, the Ghagars, being reckoned at 16,000); whilst in America, besides a multitude of British Gipsies, Gipsies from Spain, France, Germany, and Hungary are not unfrequent. The total, 700,000, at which Miklosich placed (1878) the European Gipsies, fairly agrees with the following fragmentary statistics. Turkey, before its late dismemberment, contained 104,750 (9537 in Bosnia and the Herzegovina in 1874); Servia had 24,691 in 1874, Montenegro 500 in 1873; and in Roumania there are from 200,000 to 300,000, according to the varying estimates of Cretzulesco (1876) and the *Annuaire général officiel de Roumanie* (1874). In 1876 Austria counted about 1000 (13,500 in Bohemia in 1846), and Hungary 159,000 (78,923 in Transylvania in 1850, and 36,842 in Hungary proper in 1864); while Spain is credited with 40,000, France with from 2000 to 6000 (700 in the Basque country), Germany and Italy together with 34,000 (!), and Scandinavia with 1500. In Russia their number in 1834 was stated at 48,247, exclusive of Polish Gipsies, in 1844 at 1,427,539, and in 1877 at 11,654.¹

Names.—Just as in every European land the Gipsy calls "Gentiles" (*i.e.*, non-Gipsies) *gajé*, he calls himself *Rom*, "a man or husband." This word *Rom*, connected by Paspatis with the name of the Indian god *Râma*, is by Miklosich identified with the Sanskrit *doma* or *domba*, "a low-caste musician."² Of names conferred by "Gen-

¹ In England the census of 1871 gives the number of "vagrants and Gipsies" as 2250, in Scotland of "vagrants" as 1793. These figures, however, while they include a good many non-Gipsy tramps and show-people, exclude all house-dwelling Gipsies, besides the Gipsy horse-dealers, basket-makers, hawkers, and tinkers, entered under their several headings, and are therefore utterly valueless.

² *Sinté*, another appellation current among the Gipsies of Germany, Poland, and Scandinavia, and possibly connected with the *Zincalo* of the Gitanos, has been likewise variously derived from the Sanskrit *Sindhu* (Indus), and from the Romani *sindó*, "famous," whilst Bataillard identifies it with the *Sivrius* or *Sivrius* *avôpes* of Homer, Strabo, &c. (*cf.* Pott, i. 32-35).