HISTORY: Although Masaccio's authorship of the mural has never been questioned, no documents concerning its commission or execution are known. According to Modesto Biliotti, a sixteenth-century Dominican chronicler, an altar dedicated to the Trinity was erected at the behest of Fra Lorenzo Cardoni during his priorate of the convent of Santa Maria Novella (December 1422 until June 1426). Masaccio's fresco is mentioned near it, but the exact location of the altar (i.e. whether it was free-standing or set against the wall) in relation to the painting is not specified. The altar and the mural were certainly part of the same complex, whether they were paid for by the same donors or not.2 The donors portrayed in the fresco are laymen. The man wears a red robe and hat appropriate to the office of gonfaloniere di giustizia—the highest civil officer in the Florentine republic, whose term lasted two months.3 A tombstone existed at the foot of the fresco inscribed: “Domenico di Lenzo et suorum 1426”.4 Although five members of the Lenzi family were gonfalonieri, the highest office ever held by Domenico was only that of prior. But a cousin, Lorenzo di Piero Lenzi, was gonfaloniere during August and September 1425 and it was during his term that the feast of Corpus Domini was adopted as a communal celebration with a great procession to Santa Maria Novella as its goal.6 Such an event might have justified a commemorative image in this church. Yet, despite all these circumstances, it remains an open question whether it was really this Lenzi who was commemorated in the fresco, because eventually he was buried, not here, but in Ognissanti in 1442.7 However, there are other cases in Florence where a cenotaph originally planned as a sepulchral monument was painted for a man whose bones were laid to rest elsewhere: e.g. Uccello’s fresco of John Hawkwood.8

Iconographically, Masaccio’s Trinity could well have been intended to commemorate the institution of Corpus Domini as a municipal feast. The Eucharistic significance of the sacrifice performed at the Mass is made visible: the crucified Saviour embodies Christ's sacrifice for mankind which is presented as the hope for salvation and resurrection.9 Situated as it is in front of a triumphal arch, it is also a triumphal cross and, as such, it occupies the appropriate liturgical place in the middle of the church where all could see it.10 In a unique way, the themes of the Eucharist, Trinity, and Last judgement here merge into a single image.11

Although the Trinity is invoked with every sacrament, its history as a cult in its own right was then a rather recent development. 12 Unofficially, it had been celebrated for several centuries before it was finally placed on the Church calendar among the canonical feasts in 1334.13 Thereafter, it became a theme more frequently used for the names of churches, altars, and subsequently as a subject for altarpieces as well.14 Probably the motivation behind the cult of the Trinity (just as for the cults of the Eucharist [Corpus Domini], the Holy Spirit, and the Immaculate Conception) during the later Middle Ages was that these supernatural ideas, which were fundamental notions of the Roman Church, became vulnerable to heretical attack and the Dominicans, as militant defenders of the Faith, had a particular interest in representing many of these dogmas.15

SCHEME: Besides serving as a kind of monumental altar piece for a no longer extant altar, and possibly as a cenotaph as well, the presence of the memento mori beneath the kneeling donors contributes to the fresco's funerary significance even though no trace of a tomb remains.16 It is a scheme not unlike Maso di Banco’s fresco inside an actual tomb niche at Santa Croce painted a century earlier,17 here expanded in scale and addressed, not only to the specific donor, but to mankind in general. Hope for redemption and resurrection is implicit in this scheme where mortal and immortal are juxtaposed. 18 It has been pointed out by von Simson that the Trinity became a favourite theme in sepulchral art from the beginning of the fifteenth century and that its formulation as the “Throne of Mercy” (or Gnadenstuhl) found its earliest monumental expression in Masaccio's fresco.19 In the context of its chancel-like setting, it is interesting that the mercy seat in the Eastern Church was commonly associated with the chancel and altar which commemorated Christ's manger, tomb, and the table of the Last Supper.20

Almost everything about Masaccio’s treatment of the Trinity is unconventional. Instead of being placed against a gold ground, amidst clouds or a landscape, 21 here the holy group is enclosed by a mighty structure of what appears to be a deliberately ambiguous type: at once a church, a chapel, a mausoleum, a triumphal arch. Ursula Schlegel argues persuasively that this structure was based upon another memorial monument—the most celebrated in all Christendom: the chapel erected over the rock of Golgotha in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.22 Like its prototype, Masaccio's version of it is located on the left side of the church not far from the entrance to the old monks’ choir, in a position analogous to that of the Anastasis in Jerusalem. 23 It was before the Golgotha Chapel there that Masses were said for prominent laymen. During the Middle Ages, popular belief regarded the place as the centre of the earth—the point of departure for either Heaven or the underworld.24 Thus Masaccio’s kneeling donors await their fate praying to their Maker and to their intercessors, while below them lies the corpse symbolic of human mortality with its ominous message: “I
was that which you are, and that which I am you will become” (I0. FV. G][JA. QVEL. CHE. VOL S][]ETE: E QVEL. CHI SON. VOL. A [N] CO SARETE).

The object upon which God the Father stands has been the subject of recent speculation. Janson interpreted it as a piece of church furniture supporting Christ's tomb.25 John Shearman has generously pointed out to me that this object is probably the Ark of the Covenant used here in the context of the Throne of Mercy or judgment Seat (Gnadenstuhl).26 Just such a composition with the Almighty standing upon the Ark while holding up the Cross with both hands was described by the Abbot Suger in the twelfth century.27

Another aspect of the scheme which broke with tradition is the unprecedented scale, not only of the donors with respect to the sacred figures, but of the composition as a whole. To enhance the realism of the subject, all the figures, even the skeleton, are life-size. Some are painted as if seen from below 28 and the perspective of their setting has a vanishing point roughly corresponding to the eye of the beholder standing in the aisle.29 The Virgin's glance and gesture are further details designed to involve the observer. Many scholars have been reminded here of Alberti's recommendation that such pointing figures be introduced to history scenes.30 But probably Alberti merely gave voice here to an old custom which preceded even Masaccio's dramatic use of it.31

The architecture is a veritable manifesto of the Classical style introduced to Florence at this time by Brunelleschi. Not only is the membering and ornament Brunelleschian, but the foreshortening of the vault is a demonstration of his theories on perspective rendering.32 However, Brunelleschis's theories did not include directions for regulating the scale of human figures seen at various distances and Alberti's more practical formula had not yet, as far as we know, been defined.33 But the discrepancy between the size of the figures and the architecture may have been deliberate. Had the figures been drawn to the scale of their painted setting, they would have been much smaller than life-size and the forcefulness of their dramatic relation to the observer would have been lost. The arrangement is extremely subtle: Janson has supplied evidence that Masaccio achieved mathematical cohesiveness in his scheme by using as a modular unit the Florentine palmo or half braccia (29.18 cm).34 Seven palmi, for instance, is the measurement between the church floor and that of the fictive chapel enclosing the Trinity; the same distance exists between the chapel floor and the arms of the cross. Likewise, it is the diameter of the barrel vault. Yet again, the perspective projection of the vault is inscribed within a square of seven palmi on the picture plane in what Janson describes as an eloquent attempt to harmonize the illusion of depth with the surface pattern of the fresco.35

The realistic impact of the imagery brings us back to the question of where the lost Trinity altar was located. In its present partly reconstructed state, the fresco gives the misleading impression that an altar table was set against the wall just below the kneeling donors—a liturgically impossible situation.36 Although there are cases, such as the Dragondelli altar in Arezzo, where the table does abut on a tabernacled scene, no donors are present. In earlier funerary complexes wherein altar, tomb, donor portraits, and religious imagery are aligned, the altar is free-standing.37 That this was also the case at Santa Maria Novella is argued by the only known quotation of the scheme carried out in 1451 by Brunelleschi's adopted son (Andrea Cavalcanti known as “il Buggiano”), as an actual funerary chamber for the Cardini family in San Francesco, Pescia.38

TECHNIQUE: The Trinity was painted on top of an earlier fresco representing the Adoration of the Shepherds.39 To gain height for it, part of the window recess was filled in.40 An explanation given for the non-axial alignment of the fresco within the bay is that it had to be set in line with the altar.41 The destruction of the arriccio beneath the fresco during its detachment in the last century removed any evidence there might have been of a sinopia -- the possible existence of which has been rejected by several scholars, mainly because no traces of any were found beneath the memento mori in 1951-52.42

The visible remains of the fresco (excluding the area of the corpse) was, according to Tintori, carried out on about twenty-six giornate.43 As in the Brancacci frescoes, Masaccio first painted in the outer framework and then proceeded downwards from left to right. Notwithstanding the complexity of the scheme, the giornate are large. The elaborately coffered and foreshortened vault, for instance, was carried out in only two sessions. Recent studies have concluded that Masaccio planned everything on a small modello and then transferred the composition to full scale on the wall, either via a modular system (Janson) or by the preparation of cartoons for each giornata (Polzer).44 The only evidence visible on the surface today for Masaccio's use of either cartoons or a squared modello are the spolveri for an insignificant ornament in the entablature (the pseudomeander frieze) and the incised grid across the Virgin's face.45 Although almost every student (including Procaccio, who at first resisted the idea) has accepted Oertel's interpretation of this grid as a precocious use of squaring for enlargement from a modello,46 it still seems to me more likely that it was used as a device for rationalizing the proportions of the foreshortened features of the Virgin's face. The grid here does not consist of uniform squares, as has been noticed on more than one occasion, but of squares and rectangles.47 Grid-like schemes for the purpose of arriving at the proper proportions of heads, foreshortened and unforeshortened, existed in illustrated treatises from Villard d'Honnecourt to Luca Pacioli, Daniele Barbaro, and others.48 Barbaro includes an example for heads seen from below.49 The features of Masaccio's Madonna are slanted sharply downwards from left to right from the nearest parts to those turned further away. The degree of foreshortening is plotted out, for instance, by the horizontal incision which touches the lid of the nearer eye and intercepts the socket of the further one. If Masaccio used squaring here for pantographical enlargement, why then was it not used for the entire composition, which is full of difficult foreshortening?50 Masaccio's experiment with the grid for the Virgin's face was not a complete success. The expression is tragic, but the foreshortened view is achieved at the cost of a curiously misshapen face. In no other frescoed head did Masaccio ever again try to represent a turned head seen from below, or with features foreshortened according to an arbitrary system. Thereafter, there was an aversion among theorists as well to the view seen di sotto in sù.51 Although Janson and Polzer have explained the mechanics for the foreshortening of the vault, they note that several of the foreshortened architectural details-such as the roundel
rosettes and the abacus of one of the columns were improvised on the spot, with Masaccio's efforts plainly recorded in the rough incisions scratched into the hardening plaster.52

CONDITION: Despite his admiration of Masaccio's fresco, Vasari hid the Trinity behind an enormous altar-piece and tabernacle of his own making, dedicated to the Rosary, which was completed in 1570 for a member of the Cappon family.53 The fresco remained in this obscurity until about 1860, when it was taken down together with the intonaco, placed inside a wooden frame, and set up between the east and centre doors of the entrance wall.54 Then, between 1950 and 1951, Procacci, following one of his celebrated intuitions, uncovered the lower section of the fresco which had remained in situ: this is the memento mori mentioned by the early commentators.55 Subsequently this area was surrounded by a reconstruction carried out under the supervision of Procacci and two architects (Baroni and Morozzi).56 Original are the cadaver, most of its catalafaique, and the pair of columns on the right (excluding the capitals). Forthwith, in August 1952, Vasari's altar was removed and the Trinity was returned to its original site. Tintori was greatly helped in his relocation of the migrant fresco by a crucial fragment from the top of the entablature which had remained in place. It included compass marks at the top of the central plumb line.57 The Trinity on its intonaco and the nineteenth-century reconstruction of most of the entablature and the outer areas of the arch were kept together and reset in the wall.58 Ursula Schlegel has noticed an original fragment of the vertical stringcourse which probably surrounded the entire composition.59

The lower areas of the donors' robes also suffered because of the gilt ornaments and ex-voto offerings formerly affixed to them.60 Some kind of gold ornament was also applied to the architecture.61 Widespread flaking of the paint was caused by the glue left on the surface by the facing canvases used during the transfer in the last century.62 Since the completed re-installation in 1954, the mural has been inspected and cleaned again by Tintori in 1969.63
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Loc. cit. and Marcia B. Hall, “The Ponte in S. Maria Novella: the Problem of the Rood Screen in Italy”, JWCI, xxxvii (1974), 170, Pl. 36, Fig. d. The Trinity Chapel in Pescia is likewise on the left side of the church, as is the altar in Santo Spirito in Florence where it is situated next to a Sacrament altar.
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