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The Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, a research institute that fosters study of the production, use, and cultural meaning of art, artifacts, architecture, and urbanism, from prehistoric times to the present, was founded in 1979 as part of the National Gallery of Art. The Center encourages a variety of approaches by historians, critics, and theorists of art, as well as by scholars in related disciplines of the humanities and social sciences.

The resident community of scholars consists of the Samuel H. Kress Professor, the Andrew W. Mellon Professor, the Edmond J. Safra Visiting Professor, the A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts, and approximately twenty fellows at any one time, including Senior Fellows, Visiting Senior Fellows, Research Associates, Postdoctoral Curatorial Fellows, and Predoctoral Fellows. In addition, the Center supports approximately twelve Predoctoral and Visiting Senior Fellows who are conducting research both in the United States and abroad. The programs of the Center for Advanced Study include fellowships, meetings, research, and publications.
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In its twenty-fourth year the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts at the National Gallery of Art continued to support the study of the visual arts in each of its four major program areas: fellowships, research, publications, and scholarly meetings.

The Center welcomed resident fellows to the National Gallery of Art from eleven countries in the course of the past year. Recently our visitors from abroad have sometimes found the process of applying to enter the United States time-consuming but, fortunately, not impossible. Approaching its quarter centenary, the Center reaffirms a commitment to international scholarship at the highest level, and to the production of knowledge and understanding through the free exchange of ideas. A number of this year’s scholars dedicated their research to the art and architecture of the Americas, as well as to Dutch, Italian, and French painting. Others worked on topics ranging from sixth-century Buddhist art patronage to ancient Mesopotamian and Persian palace decoration, from poetic treatments of ancient Roman sculpture to the role of water in the urban development of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Rome, from the expansion of Italian Franciscan churches as burial sites to the Stalinization of Soviet architecture. As always, those fellows working on subjects outside the National Gallery’s areas of concentration found in Washington, and especially at the Library of Congress, the Sackler and Freer galleries, the Archives of American Art, and the National...
Archives, unparalleled resources for their research. Visits to the Gallery’s collections, exhibitions, and conservation department, as well as to Washington landmarks, old and new, provided informal extensions of our program.

The Center is engaged in a series of long-term research projects intended to provide primary research materials and tools for the field. The five projects currently under way are described in detail below. In the program of publications, two volumes appeared in the course of the year in the symposium series of Studies in the History of Art. The first was Large Bronzes in the Renaissance (2003), edited by Peta Motture, which is the fifth, and concluding, volume in a special group devoted to Renaissance sculpture of all kinds and media. Tilman Riemenschneider, c. 1460–1531 (2004), edited by Julien Chapuis, records the proceedings of a symposium held in 1999, on the occasion of the exhibition at the Gallery devoted to the artist’s work. The Center also coproduced, with the Association of Research Institutes in Art History (ARIAH), Art History in Latin America: Reports of the Latin American Fellowship Program, 1994–2000, a record (with abstracts in Spanish and Portuguese) of a special fellowship initiative undertaken by ARIAH under the leadership of Therese O’Malley, chair of the association during those years.

The Center held several symposia in the program of special meetings. “Romare Bearden, American Modernist” was organized in conjunction with the National Gallery’s historic Bearden exhibition. The papers will be published in the Studies in the History of Art series, with Ruth Fine, curator of the exhibition, and Jacqueline Francis of the University of Michigan serving as scholarly editors. “French Genre Painting in the Eighteenth Century” coincided with the National Gallery’s exhibition The Age of Watteau, Chardin, and Fragonard: Masterpieces of French Genre Painting, and attracted a wide international audience. Philip Conisbee, curator of the exhibition, will serve as scholarly editor of the symposium papers. In celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the opening of National Gallery’s East Building, designed by I. M. Pei, the Center organized “The East Building in Perspective,” the papers of which will also be published in Studies in the History of Art, with Anthony Alofsin, University of Texas at Austin, serving as scholarly editor. In the course of the year
I. M. Pei was awarded the American Institute of Architects’ Twenty-Five Year Award for the East Building, and the Center for Advanced Study was honored by his presence at the symposium. In addition, the Center co-sponsored with the University of Maryland the annual Middle Atlantic Symposium in the History of Art.

With the support of the Wyeth Foundation for American Art, the Center initiated a new lecture program this year. Every other year a distinguished Wyeth Lecturer will be invited to the Center, with a one-day conference on American art being convened in the intervening years. Jules Prown of Yale University delivered the inaugural Wyeth Lecture in American Art on “Friends and Rivals: Copley, West, Peale, Trumbull, and Stuart.” In an incontro at the Center the following day devoted to “Watson and the Shark[s],” Professor Prown discussed this work with fellows, scholars from neighboring institutions, and members of the National Gallery of Art staff, several of whom had proposed very different approaches to Copley’s painting in a similar meeting ten years ago. Two study days, the first devoted to the National Gallery’s exhibition Verrocchio’s David Restored: A Renaissance Bronze from the National Museum of the Bargello, Florence, and the second, to the exhibition of Courtly Art of the Ancient Maya, convened a number of significant contributors to the two fields to debate issues before the works themselves.

Building upon the success of last year’s inaugural Safra prosem-inar, Carel van Tuyll van Serooskerken, the Center’s second Edmond J. Safra Visiting Professor, led a curatorial/conservation colloquy on old master drawings. It was supported by a generous grant from Robert H. Smith, former president of the National Gallery of Art, which will make possible several scholarly initiatives over the next ten years. This first Smith Colloquy was designed to give emerging scholars and new curators from a wide variety of institutions a “hands-on” experience of the possibilities of connoisseurial expertise, and an understanding of the most advanced methods of conservation and technical analysis, all in consort with historical knowledge. The success of this intensive three-day research practicum, and of many other more informal gatherings in the course of the year, relied on the support of members of the curatorial and conservation staff, for whose indispensable contributions the Center is deeply grateful.
Irving Lavin of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, presented to the public the fifty-third A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts under the title of “More Than Meets the Eye.” The Center also hosted the inaugural Washington Collegium for the Humanities Lecture, in close collaboration with other member institutions. Natalie Zemon Davis, University of Toronto, spoke on “Cultural Mixture in a Divided World,” and presented a seminar on theories of cultural mixture at the Folger Institute the following day.

A full description of the fellowship program and a complete list of publications may be found at the conclusion of this volume.

Elizabeth Cropper

Dean
Members
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  Samuel H. Kress Professor, 2003–2004
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  Andrew W. Mellon Professor, 2002–2004
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  Edmond J. Safra Visiting Professor, spring 2004
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  A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts, 2004

Senior Fellows

Anthony Alofsin, University of Texas at Austin
  Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, 2003–2004
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Caroline Bruzelius, Duke University
  Paul Mellon Senior Fellow, spring 2004
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Susana Torre, New York City
  Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, fall 2003
  The Modern Movement in Latin American Architecture and Urbanism — 1920s to 1980s
Danilo Udovički-Selb, University of Texas at Austin  
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, spring 2004  
_The Stalinization of Soviet Architecture in the Early Years of “Socialist Realism”: The Internal Debate_

**Ailsa Mellon Bruce National Gallery of Art Sabbatical Curatorial Fellows, 2003–2004**

E. Melanie Gifford, National Gallery of Art, Scientific Research Department  
**spring 2004**  
_Innovative Painting Techniques as an Expressive Force in the Development of Realist Landscape Painting in the Netherlands, 1600–1700_

Alison Luchs, National Gallery of Art, Department of Sculpture and Decorative Arts  
**fall 2003**  
_“Monstris marinis”: Sea Creatures of the Venetian Renaissance_
**Visiting Senior Fellows**

Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, University of Delaware  
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow  
1 September–31 October 2003  
*Classicism and the European Imaginary in the Late Nineteenth Century*

David Bindman, University College London  
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow  
1 November–31 December 2003  
*Canova, Thorvaldsen, and the Reception of Sculpture in the Early Nineteenth Century*

Thomas J. Brown, University of South Carolina  
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow  
16 June–20 August 2003  
*The Reconstruction of American Memory: Civic Monuments of the Civil War*

Tapati Guha-Thakurta, Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta  
Starr Foundation Visiting Senior Research Fellow  
1 June–31 July 2003 and 1–31 May 2004  
*The Aura and the Authority of Indian Art in the United States of America: Collections, Exhibitions, Personalities*

Michael Roaf, Institut für Vorderasiatische Archäologie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München  
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow  
1 November–31 December 2003  
*The Construction of Ancient Mesopotamian and Persian Palace Decoration*

Paolo Scrivano, University of Toronto  
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow  
1 July–31 August 2003  
*Architecture and Town Planning Exchanges between Italy and the United States, 1945–1960*

**Podhorsky Guest Scholar**

Stanko Kokole, Science and Research Center of the Republic of Slovenia, Koper  
1 May–30 June 2003  
*Classical Tradition in the Urban Centers of the Adriatic Rim: 1400–1700*
Millon Architectural History Guest Scholar
Daniela Lamberini, Università degli Studi di Firenze
5–24 January and 1–31 August 2004
A Sketchbook on Military Architecture and the Frederick Hartt Papers

Maria-Clelia Galassi, Università degli Studi di Genova
Elizabeth Walmsley, National Gallery of Art
Research period: 1 September–31 October 2003
Residency period: 1 July–31 August 2004
Undermodeling versus Underdrawing?: Methods for Constructing Flesh Tones and Draperies in Florentine Paintings of the Early Renaissance, 1400–1460

Predoctoral Fellows
Guendalina Ajello [Institute of Fine Arts, New York University]*
Paul Mellon Fellow, 2001–2004
The Afterlife of Rome’s Ancient Spectator Buildings
Sabina de Cavi [Columbia University]  
Paul Mellon Fellow, 2002–2005  
*Spain in Naples: Building, Sculpting, and Painting for the Viceroy, 1585–1621*

Nina Dubin [University of California, Berkeley]  
David E. Finley Fellow, 2002–2005  
*Monumental Ruins: Hubert Robert, Paris Urbanism, and the Crisis of Revolutionary France*

Talinn Grigor [Massachusetts Institute of Technology]  
Ittleson Fellow, 2003–2005  
*Acculturating the Nation: The “Society for National Heritage” and Public Monuments of Modern Iran, 1921–1979*

Meredith M. Hale [Columbia University]*  
Samuel H. Kress Fellow, 2002–2004  
*Romeyn de Hooghe and the Birth of Political Satire*
Carmenita Higginbotham [University of Michigan, Ann Arbor]*
Chester Dale Fellow, 2003–2004
Saturday Night at the Savoy: Blackness and the Urban Spectacle in the Art of Reginald Marsh

Yu Jiang [University of Pittsburgh]*
Andrew W. Mellon Fellow, 2002–2004
Statecraft and Cemetery in Early Dynastic China: Yu Funerary Arts in the Zhou

Kate Lingley [The University of Chicago]*
Ittleson Fellow, 2002–2004
Negotiating Identity: Social Aspects of Sixth-Century Buddhist Art Patronage

Alison S. Locke [Yale University]
Chester Dale Fellow, 2003–2004
Visuality and Experience in the Twelfth-Century Church of Castel Sant’Elia near Nepi (Viterbo)
Ara H. Merjian [University of California, Berkeley]  
Paul Mellon Fellow, 2003–2006  
*The Urban Untimely: Giorgio De Chirico and the Metaphysical City, 1910–1924*

Amy Powell [Harvard University]  
Chester Dale Fellow, 2003–2004  
*The Fascination of Likeness: Imitation in and of Rogier van der Weyden’s Descent from the Cross*

Shilpa Prasad [The Johns Hopkins University]  
Mary Davis Fellow, 2003-2005  
*Guercino’s “Theatricality”: Performance and Spectatorship in Seventeenth-Century Painting*

Alison Mairi Syme [Harvard University]  
Wyeth Fellow, 2002–2004  
*Hedgewhores, Wagtails, Cockatrices, Whipsters: John Singer Sargent and His Coterie of Nature’s Artful Dodgers*
Wei Yang Teiser [Northwestern University]  
Andrew W. Mellon Fellow, 2003–2004  
*Representations of Gender in Chinese/Mongol Art, 1260–1368*

Hércia Valladares [Columbia University]  
Samuel H. Kress Fellow, 2003–2005  
*Imago Amoris: The Poetics of Desire in Roman Painting*

Adriaan E. Waiboer [Institute of Fine Arts, New York University]  
Mary Davis Fellow, 2002–2004  
*Gabriel Metsu (1629–1667): Life and Work*

Suzanne Jablonski Walker [University of California, Berkeley]  
Robert H. and Clarice Smith Fellow, 2003–2004  
*Acts of Violence: Rubens and the Hunt*

Terri Weissman [Columbia University]  
Wyeth Fellow, 2003–2005  
*Super Sight: The Realisms of Berenice Abbott*

Ashley West [University of Pennsylvania]  
David E. Finley Fellow, 2003–2006  
*Visualizing Knowledge: Prints and Paintings by Hans Burgkmair, the Elder (1473–1531)*

* in residence 15 September 2003–31 August 2004

Fellows’ hard hat tour at the site of the National Museum of the American Indian, under construction
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Predoctoral Fellowship for Historians of American Art to Travel Abroad, 2003–2004

Heidi Applegate
   [Columbia University]

Peter Brownlee
   [The George Washington University]

Mari Dumett
   [Boston University]

Elizabeth Fowler
   [University of Minnesota]

Angela S. George
   [University of Maryland]

Amanda J. Glesmann
   [Stanford University]

Eric F. Gollannek
   [University of Delaware]

Katie Mullis Kresser
   [Harvard University]
Meetings

Symposia

24–25 October 2003

ROMARE BEARDEN, AMERICAN MODERNIST

Romare Bearden and the Literary and Performing Arts

Moderator: Ruth Fine, National Gallery of Art
Rocío Aranda-Alvarado, Jersey City Museum

Heroic Moments: Bearden, Enríquez, and the Poetic Lament

Darby English, The University of Chicago

Ralph Ellison’s Romare Bearden
Jody Blake, McNay Art Museum
*The First World Festival of Negro Art, Dakar, 1966*

Robert G. O’Meally, Columbia University
*The Jazz Sound of Romare Bearden’s Art*

Richard A. Long, Emory University (emeritus)
*Bearden, Theater, and Dance*

**Iconic Investigations**

*Moderator:* Richard Powell, Duke University

Amy H. Kirschke, University of North Carolina, Wilmington
*Bearden in Crisis: Illustrating Identity and Political Action*

Jacqueline Francis, University of Michigan
*Bearden’s Hands*

Kymberly Pinder, School of the Art Institute of Chicago
*Deep Water: Rebirth as Religious and Cultural Motif in Romare Bearden’s Art*

Training and Professionalism

Moderator: Robert G. O’Meally, Columbia University

Ruth Fine, National Gallery of Art
Nurtured and Necessary: Bearden’s Practice

David C. Driskell, University of Maryland (emeritus)
Romare Bearden, an Indelible Imprint

Richard Powell, Duke University
The Woodshed

Bridget R. Cooks, Santa Clara University
Uptown and Downtown: Romare Bearden on View

The Question of the Avant-Garde

Moderator: David C. Driskell, University of Maryland (emeritus)

Camara Dia Holloway, University of Southern California
Bearden Dada: The Projections Series and the Legacy of the Avant-Garde
Patricia Hills, Boston University
*Reappropriation and Transformation of the Cubist Collage Aesthetic by Romare Bearden, Jacob Lawrence, and other African American Artists*

Pepe Karmel, New York University
“The Negro Artist’s Dilemma”: Bearden and Picasso

12–13 December 2003

**French Genre Painting in the Eighteenth Century**

*Genre and Contemporary Life*

*Moderator:* Colin B. Bailey, The Frick Collection

Joan E. DeJean, University of Pennsylvania
*Classifying Watteau: Gendering Genre Painting*

Kevin Chua [University of California, Berkeley]
*Painting Paralysis: Filial Piety in 1763*

Jörg Ebeling [Philipps-Universität Marburg]
*Upwardly Mobile: Genre Painting and the Conflict between Landed and Moneyed Interest*

Ewa Lajer-Burcharth, Harvard University
*Genre and Sex*

*Chardin and Greuze*

*Moderator:* Philip Conisbee, National Gallery of Art

Emma Barker, The Open University
*Greuze: “The Painter of Sentiment”*

Thomas Crow, Getty Research Institute; University of Southern California
*Chardin at the Edge of Belief: Overlooked Issues of Religion and Dissent in Eighteenth-Century French Painting*

Bernadette Fort, Northwestern University
*Jean-Baptiste Greuze and the Aesthetics of Seduction*

Mark Ledbury, Clark Art Institute
*On the Threshold: Greuze, Genre, and the Liminal*
Diffusion and Reception

Moderator: Thomas W. Gaehtgens, Deutsches Forum für Kuntsgeschichte
Christian Michel, Université de Lausanne
La Nature et les mœurs: Reflections on the Reception of French Genre Painting
Julie Anne Plax, University of Arizona
Belonging to the In Crowd: The Bonds of Art and Friendship
Kristel Smentek [University of Delaware], Hobart and William Smith Colleges
Sex and Sensibility: The Market for Genre Prints on the Eve of the Revolution
Richard Wrigley, Oxford Brookes University
Genre Painting with Italy in Mind

Varieties and Boundaries

Moderator: Elizabeth Cropper, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Susan Siegfried, University of Michigan
Hybridity: Genre and Portraiture
Philippe Bordes, Université Lumière Lyon II
*Portraiture in the Mode of Genre: A Social Interpretation*

Melissa Hyde, University of Florida
*This Is Not a History Painting? Boucher and “le genre agréable”*

Michael Fried, The Johns Hopkins University
*Jeff Wall’s Adrian Walker*

2–3 April 2004

**Middle Atlantic Symposium in the History of Art, Thirty-Fourth Annual Session**

Co-sponsored with the Department of Art History and Archaeology, University of Maryland

**Friday afternoon session**

Moderator: Therese O’Malley, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts

Introduction: Sharon Gerstel
Cristina Stancioiu Toma [University of Maryland]
*Staging Transformation: Opus Sectile Pavements in Medieval Byzantium*

Introduction: Dorothy Verkerk
Evan Gatti [University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill]
*Ecclesia and Episcopacy: Liturgical Politics and the Portraiture of Sigebert of Minden*

Introduction: Judith Rohrer
Shelley MacLaren [Emory University]
*Francesco da Barberino’s Allegorical Images: Novelty and Conformity*

Introduction: Jeanne Chenault Porter
Stacey Howell [Pennsylvania State University]
*Frescoes Fit for a Medici Duke: Pietro da Cortona and the Heretical Model of the Universe at the Palazzo Pitti*

Introduction: Charles Dempsey
Susan Ross [The Johns Hopkins University]
*Classicism and Romanticism in 1819: Girodet’s Pygmalion and Galatea*
Friday evening session

Introduction: Joanne Pillsbury, University of Maryland
George Levitine Lecture in Art History
Elizabeth Boone, Tulane University
When Painting Is Writing: Abstraction and Figuration in Ancient Pictographies

Saturday morning session

Moderator: Steven Mansbach, University of Maryland
Introduction: Wendy Grossman
Eric Richter [The George Washington University]
Introduction: Christine Poggi
Mark Levitch [University of Pennsylvania]
Art from the Front: The Aestheticization of War Materiel in Great War France
Introduction: Norma Broude
Laura Brower [The American University]
“The Camouflage of Exaggerated Attire”: Lesbian Identity and Satire in Romaine Brooks’ 1920s Portraits
Introduction: Barbara McCloskey
Annah Krieg [University of Pittsburgh]
“As the blood speaks, so the people build”: King Heinrich I, Heinrich Himmler, and the Construction of the Thousand-Year Reich in Quedlinburg
Introduction: Ann Gibson
Adrian Duran [University of Delaware]
“Scribblings and Monstrous Things”: Abstraction versus the Italian Communist Party, Bologna, 1948

Saturday afternoon session

Moderator: Renée Ater, University of Maryland
Introduction: Raymond Dobard
Jeffreen Hayes [Howard University]
Annunciation/Visitation Iconography and Social Issues in the Work of Romare Bearden

30
Introduction: Howard Risatti
Margaret Richardson [Virginia Commonwealth University]
Living Tradition: A Study of K.G. Subramanyan and Art in Postcolonial India

Introduction: Lisa Saltzman
Maxim Leonid Weintraub [Bryn Mawr College]
Double Visions: Bruce Nauman and His Uncanny Objects

Introduction: Kristine Stiles
Susan Jarosi [Duke University]
Art and Trauma, A Holographic Model

Introduction: Howard Singerman
Monica McTighe [University of Virginia]
Memory Problems in 1990s Installation Art

30 April–1 May 2004

THE EAST BUILDING IN PERSPECTIVE: A TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY SYMPOSIUM

Friday morning session

 Moderator: Barry Bergdoll, Columbia University

Neil Harris, The University of Chicago
Reinventing the National Gallery of Art

Anthony Alofsin, University of Texas at Austin
The Opening of the East Building: Acclaim and Critique

Friday afternoon session

 Moderator: Anthony Alofsin, University of Texas at Austin

Victoria Newhouse, New York City
Pei and Painting: How the East Building Influenced Art

Réjean Legault, Université du Québec à Montréal
I. M. Pei’s East Building and the Postwar Culture of Materials

Barry Bergdoll, Columbia University
“The Eyes Need a Rest”: I. M. Pei, Edward Larrabee Barnes, Marcel Breuer, and the New American Museum Design of the 1960s

Alona Nitzan-Shiftan, Technion Institute of Technology, Haifa
Toward a Modernist Civic Monument: Pei’s East Building and the City of Washington
Saturday morning session

**Moderator:** Mark Leithauser, National Gallery of Art
Rosemarie Haag Bletter, Graduate Center, City University of New York
*America Outside In: Interiority in Public Architecture in the Late Twentieth Century*
Jean-Louis Cohen, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University
*The Paris Grands Projets*
Marc Treib, University of California, Berkeley
*Adding On*

Saturday afternoon session

**Moderator:** Alona Nitzan-Shiftan, Technion Institute of Technology, Haifa
David Brownlee, University of Pennsylvania
*Abstract Abstraction: Modernism at the End of the Twentieth Century*
Andrew Saint, University of Cambridge
*The Walsall Phenomenon*
Study Days

13 February 2004

**VERROCCHIO’S DAVID RESTORED**

*Participants*

Denise Allen, *The Frick Collection*
Fabio Barry [*Columbia University*], *National Gallery of Art*
Kathleen Weil-Garris Brandt, *Institute of Fine Arts, New York University*
Bruce Cole, *National Endowment for the Humanities*
Dario A. Covi, *University of Louisville*
Elizabeth Cropper, *Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts*
Caroline Elam, *Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts*
Volker Krahn, *Staatliche Museen zu Berlin*
Douglas Lewis, *National Gallery of Art*
Alison Luchs, *National Gallery of Art*
Eleonora Luciano, *National Gallery of Art*
Peter M. Lukehart, *Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts*
Christina Neilson [*The Johns Hopkins University*]
Ludovica Nicolai, *Florence*
Therese O’Malley, *Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts*
Judy Ozone, *National Gallery of Art*
Nicholas Penny, *National Gallery of Art*
Debra Pincus, *National Gallery of Art*
Gary Radke, *Syracuse University*
Eike D. Schmidt [*Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg*], *Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts*
Carl Strehlke, *Philadelphia Museum of Art*
Shelley Sturman, *National Gallery of Art*
Carel van Tuyll van Serooskerken, *Teylers Museum, Haarlem*
21 May 2004

COURTLY ART OF THE ANCIENT MAYA

Participants

Ricardo Agurcia, The Copan Association, Honduras
Kathleen Berrin, Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
Anna Blume, Fashion Institute of Technology
Elizabeth Cropper, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Adam Herring, Southern Methodist University
Christopher Jones, University of Pennsylvania Museum
Bryan R. Just [Tulane University], Dumbarton Oaks
Peter M. Lukehart, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Simon Martin, University of Pennsylvania Museum
Mary Miller, Yale University
James Oles, Wellesley College
Therese O’Malley, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Megan O’Neil [Yale University]
Joanne Pillsbury, Dumbarton Oaks and University of Maryland
Jeffrey Quilter, Dumbarton Oaks
Andrea Stone, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Marc Zender, Peabody Museum, Harvard University
Robert H. Smith Curatorial/Conservation Colloquy

17–19 May 2004

Practicum on Old Master Drawings

Participants

Stijn Alsteens, Fondation Custodia
Susan Anderson [New York University]
Julian Brooks, J. Paul Getty Museum
Francesca Consagra, Saint Louis Art Museum
Elizabeth Cropper, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Shelley Fletcher, National Gallery of Art
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COLLOQUIA CLXXXIV–CXCIII

9 October 2003
Virginia Spate, Samuel H. Kress Professor
“Rooted to the Earth”: The Peasant in Nineteenth-Century French Art

29 October 2003
Susana Torre, Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow
6 November 2003
Sally M. Promey, Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow
Seeing the Self “in Frame”: Early New England Material Practice and Puritan Piety

20 November 2003
Katherine Wentworth Rinne, Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow
Ramifications: Hydraulic Infrastructure and Urbanism in Baroque Rome, 1562–1644

4 December 2003
C. Jean Campbell, Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow
By Simone’s Hand: Inscription and Naming in the Work of Simone Martini

22 January 2004
Anthony Alofsin, Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow
Contemporary American Architecture: Taste, Value, and Identity

12 February 2004
Danilo Udovički-Selb, Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow
Deadly Perestroika: The Turning Point, 1929–1933

18 March 2004
Eleanor Winsor Leach, Frese Senior Fellow
Textual Resculpting: Representations of Statues in Roman Literature
8 April 2004
Caroline Bruzelius, Paul Mellon Senior Fellow
Battles for Bodies in the Medieval City

22 April 2004
Caroline Elam, Andrew W. Mellon Professor
Firenze bella: Word and Image in the Representation of Renaissance Florence

SHOPTALKS 112–118

23 October 2003
Guendalina Ajello, Paul Mellon Fellow
From Antique to all’antica: The Afterlife of Rome’s Theater of Pompey

12 November 2003
Carmenita Higginbotham, Chester Dale Fellow
Invisible Victims: Political Rhetoric and the Absent Body in Reginald Marsh’s This Is Her First Lynching

17 December 2003
Adriaan E. Waiboer, Mary Davis Fellow
Foreign Theory versus Local Practice: Gabriel Metsu’s Leiden Period

15 January 2004
Yu Jiang, Andrew W. Mellon Fellow
Personal Choice and Group Identity: Yu Funerary Arts and Mortuary Practice

26 February 2004
Kate Lingley, Ittleson Fellow
The Multivalent Donor: Zhang Yuanfei and the Shuiyusi Cave Temple

24 March 2004
Alison Mairi Syme, Wyeth Fellow
Portrait of the Artist as a Young Ladybird

31 March 2004
Meredith M. Hale, Samuel H. Kress Fellow
Romeyn de Hooghe’s Satires: Raising the Stakes in a War of Ideology
Lectures

The Fifty-Third A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, 2004

Irving Lavin, Institute for Advanced Study

More Than Meets the Eye

18 April  The Story of O from Giotto to Einstein
25 April  Michelangelo, Moses, and the Warrior Pope
 2 May    Caravaggio I: Divine Dissimulation
 9 May    Caravaggio II: The View from Behind
16 May  The Infinite Spiral: Claude Mellan’s Miraculous Image
23 May  Going for Baroque: Observations on the Postmodern Fold
Lecture

27 January 2004

Natalie Zemon Davis, University of Toronto

Cultural Mixture in a Divided World

Co-sponsored with the Washington Collegium for the Humanities

In the decades after World War II, critical social and cultural analysis often made use of polarities, such as assimilation/authenticity and domination/resistance. Recently more attention is being paid to mixed states, “middle grounds,” and processes of exchange. “Cultural Mixture in a Divided World” suggests some reasons for this new interest, and goes on to describe four examples from the speaker’s current research on historical figures who “mix” by moving between divergent worlds. The audience will be introduced to a sixteenth-century Muslim between the worlds of Italy and North Africa, and three inhabitants of eighteenth-century Surinam between the worlds of slave and free and the belief systems of Christianity, Judaism, and Africa. Their practices of cultural movement will be described and assessed. How did their lives turn out and what was their legacy to future generations?
Friends and Rivals: Copley, West, Peale, Trumbull, and Stuart

John Singleton Copley and Benjamin West were born in 1738; Charles Willson Peale, two and one-half years later. Gilbert Stuart and John Trumbull were of the next generation, born in 1755 and 1756, respectively. Their paths crossed and recrossed throughout their uniformly long lives. They formed friendships, influenced each other both through their art and personally, competed for clients, and eventually drifted apart, or in the case of Copley and West, became bitter enemies. This lecture focuses on their personal and professional encounters and interactions to tell the story of how they affected each other’s art and lives.
The punning plural in the title alludes to critical interpreters who have circled around this dramatic painting for many years. The underlying topic of the session is the possibilities of, and limitations on, the interpretation of visual evidence. Is John Singleton Copley’s *Watson and the Shark*: (1) simply a pictorial fiction based upon an actual event? (2) an allegory of salvation, secular or religious, and resurrection? (3) a comment, consciously or unconsciously, on its political and historical context? (4) an expression of democratic egalitarianism with the placement of a black man at the apex of a compositional triangle? or (5) a combination of such elements?

We consider a number of interpretations of the picture and the principle proponents. Most writers touch on multiple issues but are primarily concerned with one particular line of interpretation: aesthetics (Roger Stein), religion (Irma B. Jaffé), politics (Ann Uhry Abrams), and race (Albert Boime). *Watson and the Shark* is deeply infused with Copley’s beliefs and values, and lends itself to a reasonable metaphorical reading consistent with the facts of his life. The painting foregrounds a community of men engaged in a cooperative activity. They had set out from a ship such as the one pictured on the left, anchored in front of the larger community of the city, in a dory—a human construct to carry and protect them from an alien watery environment.

A possible analogy of the figure of Watson is with the condition of America, separated from the community of the British Empire as Watson is separated from his comrades. The shark embodies the destructive force of revolution. The man in the stem with a boat hook is like Saint George, an emblem of England, indicating in this reading that armed might is invoked to subdue revolution. The left side
of the picture perhaps suggests the mercantile ties that bound the empire together, namely the connection from Watson, a prosperous merchant at the time the picture was painted, via the rope to the reaching sailors and ultimately to the large ship and the opening in the mouth of the harbor and worlds beyond—a hint of commerce leading to prosperity. The fact that Copley’s next major history picture, begun in 1778, the year Watson was exhibited, was *The Death of Chatham*, a more direct expression of belief, depicting the Great Commoner stricken in the House of Lords while speaking in favor of reconciliation with the American colonies, reinforces the interpretation of *Watson and the Shark* as embodying, perhaps unconsciously, Copley’s perspective as a colonial American who devoutly wished for America to remain within the empire.
Research Projects

Five long-term research projects are in progress at the Center for Advanced Study.

The Italian Architectural Drawings Photograph Collection (IADPC)

This project was initiated in 1982–1983 by former Dean Henry A. Millon, with a grant from the Graham Foundation, and supported by endowed funds from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Its purpose has been to build an extensive photographic collection of pre-1800 drawings of Italian architecture for the National Gallery of Art’s photographic archives. The project has continued under the direction of Dean Elizabeth Cropper over the past three years. It has enjoyed unique resources, both in terms of funding, and of the scholarly expertise of Sabine Eiche, Senior Research Associate, based in Florence. Now on deposit, after twenty-one years of accumulation, is a critical mass of 44,551 photographs and 289 manuscripts on microfilm. The acquisition of photographs ceased as of August 2004, and a graduate intern checked the inventory. The Center continues to encourage distinguished architectural historians to work with the IADPC, and to advise on how to make it more accessible to researchers. With support from the Lois Roth Foundation, Hans Hubert and, most recently, Daniela Lamberini have consulted on the IADPC as Millon Architectural History Guest Scholars. A brief description of the IADPC appears on the Gallery’s Web site (www.nga.gov/resources/iadpc.htm).

Senior Research Associate: Sabine Eiche
Early Modern Sources in Translation

A new research project under the direction of Dean Elizabeth Cropper will produce translations of important art literature from the early modern period. The initial plan is to prepare an annotated English translation of *Felsina Pittrice*, or Bologna the Paintress, by Carlo Cesare Malvasia (1616–1693). This history of Bolognese painting is one of the most significant art-historical texts devoted to Italian art. First published in 1678, the *Felsina Pittrice* is written in an unusually difficult style, and has never been translated in full. A team of scholars will work on the project, which will also transcribe Malvasia’s manuscript notes in the Archiginnasio in Bologna. Research so far has focused on the first part of Malvasia’s text, and on providing basic digital materials for translators and annotators.

Research Associate: Eike D. Schmidt

Keywords in American Landscape Design

Since 1990 Associate Dean Therese O’Malley has directed the compilation of an illustrated historical dictionary of landscape design terms used in North America between 1492 and 1852. Through both texts and images, the project traces the changing meaning of terms as they were adapted from Old World sources and transformed into an American landscape vocabulary. The goal is to map the growth of a regional vocabulary of design and the transformation of features within the changing environmental and cultural traditions of America, as defined by the current boundaries of the United States.

Researchers have compiled descriptions and references from a wide variety of sources, and the corpus of images is composed of more than eighteen-hundred reproductions, of which over seven hundred will be published. Each of the one hundred and four “keywords” is accompanied by a short historical essay, a selection of
images, and a chronologically arranged section of usage and citations. Three longer interpretive essays provide a broader historical and cultural context for terms, sites, and images. Several further reference tools have resulted from this research, including an extensive bibliography, an analysis of the sales and distribution of books related to garden and landscape design, and a database of images that represents the most complete photographic archive on the subject of American garden and landscape design.

In addition to Center funds, the project has received support from the Getty Grant Program and the Graham Foundation. The Terra Foundation of the Arts has provided a subvention for publication. “Keywords in American Landscape Design” will be published jointly by the National Gallery of Art and Yale University Press.

Research Associate: Elizabeth Pergam

The Accademia di San Luca in Rome, c. 1590–1630

Under the direction of Associate Dean Peter M. Lukehart, this project will bring together a large number of new and previously unpublished documentary materials with the principal secondary sources. The aim is to create the first institutional history of the Roman Academy on the basis of the original statutes, the adunanze (records of
the proceedings of meetings of the academy), ledger books kept by
the treasurers, and references in the civil and criminal court records.

Since the first advisory committee meeting in Washington in 2003,
considerable attention has been given to issues relating to databases
and electronic information systems, in preparation for the ideation
and creation of a Web site that will be useful to art historians, histor-
tors, and economic historians alike. The project continues to gather
bibliography, transcribe documents, and create biographical files on
the artists who participated in the life of the academy. Two seminars
concerning the early years of the Accademia are being organized for
the 2004–2005 academic year, one in Washington, the other in Rome.

Research Associate: Frances Gage

**Historiographic Guide to Andean Sources**

Former Associate Dean Joanne Pillsbury is in the final stages of edit-
ing this three-volume reference work for the support of research on
the pre-Hispanic and colonial periods of the Andean region of South
America, which will make a multitude of sources available to schol-
ars in art history, anthropology, archaeology, history, and other related
disciplines.

The guide has been supported by the Getty Grant Program, The
Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and the British Academy. It contains
contributions from 122 scholars, based in nineteen countries, and
addresses key texts and authors of the sixteenth through the nine-
teenth century, concerning a region defined by the extent of the Inca
Empire (modern Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and parts of Colombia,
Argentina, and Chile). The absence of a tradition of writing in this
area prior to the arrival of Europeans in the sixteenth century means
that such early modern texts provide a critical source of information
on Andean life, but one whose perspectives require close scrutiny.

The guide will be published jointly by the National Gallery of Art
and the University of Oklahoma Press. The translation of entries into
Spanish for the publication of the guide in Latin America will be sup-
ported by the Lampadia Foundation.
Two volumes appeared this year in the symposium series of Studies in the History of Art. These were *Large Bronzes in the Renaissance* (2003), edited by Peta Motture, and *Tilman Riemenschneider, c. 1460–1531* (2004), edited by Julien Chapuis. The Center also co-produced with the Association of Research Institutes in Art History (ARIAH), *Art History in Latin America: Reports of the Latin American Fellowship Program, 1994–2000*, with an introduction by Therese O’Malley. Several other volumes are in preparation. A complete list of Center publications appears at the end of *Center 24*. 
Research Reports of Members
A fourteenth-century representation of Rome in the shape of a lion shows several structures whose labels “thermis” and “theatrum” identify them as ancient monuments. The images that accompany these labels, however, look neither like baths nor like theaters, but are shown as fortifications bristling with towers. These representations are emblematic of the split identity of ancient remains in subsequent periods: the memory of their ancient identities in obvious contrast to their dramatically transformed physical fabric. My study concerns the ways in which Rome’s ancient buildings were reinhabited, transformed, and reimagined over time, and focuses on the cases of the city’s four ancient theaters.

All of Rome’s theaters underwent similar stages of transformation after antiquity. Having lost their intended function, they were unsuitable for other public uses. Instead, their cell-like substructures were easily adapted as individual houses, shops, or small oratories. This is how we find them in the twelfth century, at the time of their first documented reuse. From highly complex, rational architectural forms, the theaters had been disassembled, broken down into the most basic units of urban fabric: single-lot dwellings. These were then bought up piecemeal by a few powerful families over the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, reassembled, shaped into family complexes composed of individual structures loosely arranged

“Roma edificata a mundo de lione,” from Liber Ystoriarum Romanorum, fourteenth century. Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Hamburg
around courtyards, and fortified for defense. The same families still owned the buildings in the late fifteenth century, when the final stage of transformation began. In response to changing architectural ideals, the complexes were adapted to conform to the aesthetic and functional requirements of formal palaces, with varying degrees of commitment and success.

Parallel to their physical evolution, the theaters had another life, in the imaginations of generations of beholders. In the Middle Ages, the perceived identity of theaters was splintered as surely as was their physical fabric. The names by which they were interchangeably called: “palace,” “houses,” “castle,” “temple,” “trullo” (a term used for round ancient buildings), and sometimes “theatrum,” reveal the buildings to be simultaneously singular and plural, generic and specific, ancient and modern. Their visual representations were similarly unstable. Even when they were correctly identified as theaters, it was hardly clear to a medieval observer what an ancient theater was; those theatrical activities that persisted after antiquity took place largely in a religious context.

Much as they were physically reassembled, the ideas and forms of ancient theater were eventually conceptually reunited, this time by contemporary antiquarians who envisioned the resurrection of ancient Rome, the humanists who rediscovered classical plays, the princes who revived all’antica theatrical activities in their palaces, and the architects who were determined to interpret Vitruvius’ instructions, measuring and drawing the remains of the buildings themselves. The activity of putting an ancient theater back together again, however, was typical of the antiquarian project in that its call for literally recreating ancient Rome was largely rhetorical. Theater continued to develop mostly within the confines of the palace halls and courtyards while architects’ recordings and reconstructions of ancient theaters remained on paper, and when the forms of ancient theater reappeared in stone, their disassembled elements were reconfigured as palace façades and courtyards. Even the few attempts to build a theater faithfully all’antica, such as the temporary theater built on the Capitoline (1513), the Teatro Olimpico in Vicenza (1580–1585), or the Farnese theater in Parma (1618–1619), were idiosyncratic and, in any case, concerned only with interiors.
My dissertation follows the two parallel lives of theaters: in the flesh, as it were, and in the mind. One part of the dissertation, based mainly on archival research, is dedicated to reconstructing the stages of reuse of the buildings and the forces that shaped these: owners’ aspirations, the pull of typological innovations, and the difficulties of maintaining family properties over many generations. The other part traces the ever-changing understanding of the buildings’ significance as ancient theaters. These two identities rarely converged; the only attempt physically to restore their unity was in the 1930s when, under Benito Mussolini, the Theater of Marcellus was partly “liberated” of its postantique accretions. The result was the creation of a new identity, as an archaeological artifact celebrating the Fascist regime. The structure of my dissertation reflects the separate tracks of the theaters’ lives, and cuts back and forth between story lines. This juxtaposition (including the compromised attempt to restore the Theater of Marcellus to its original ancient state) embodies an essential aspect of Rome: the tension that is daily negotiated between its needs as a living city and the symbolic historical weight it carries.

[Institute of Fine Arts, New York University]
Paul Mellon Fellow, 2001–2004

In 2004–2005 Guendalina Ajello will head a project to create a new finding aid for the Orsini family archive in the department of special collections at the Charles E. Young Research Library, University of California, Los Angeles.
The issues of how taste, value, and identity affect peoples’ interest in, and responses to, art and architecture span across media and throughout time. My research concerned these issues in the context of contemporary American architecture. I began my investigation by asking how people know what they know about domestic architecture, why they choose the homes they buy, and how the mechanisms of industry and market affect and control their choices. Instead of imposing a personal position with respect to taste, I sought a more scientific approach to investigating the deeper roots of such phenomena as the production of oversized houses on small lots and the incongruity between exterior form and interior appearance.

After assembling a comprehensive bibliography of the literature that bears on housing production, I began looking at the demographics and preferences of clients who are the buyers of houses. Numerous market studies supply profiles that are essential to the builders, agents, and developers of houses, and I focused on a typical study of people born between 1946 and 1964, who are reaching the age of fifty-five at a rate of seven thousand a day. Their responses showed great specificity in the choice of amenities, materials, and even community facilities. Only recently, however, do such studies tend to break down categories by ethnicity, and they often omit the small minority of clients who commission homes from architects.
The next phase of my research involved investigating the operating procedures of developers who provide housing in both small-scale and large-scale operations. Sources on the Internet revealed a broad array of enterprises. Large and regional builders were central to my investigation, but I prepared a case study of a small neighborhood, the area of University Terrace and Chain Bridge Road in Washington, D.C. An affluent neighborhood, it faces the same challenges as many others around the country as homes on large lots are torn down and replaced with multiple houses, and as unbuilt sites with difficult terrain are now being used for new construction. A local developer who lives in the neighborhood explained his methods to produce large speculative houses, but his specialized output is dwarfed by the big builders who have regional and national operations. Large-scale builders either buy their designs from a “plan factory” or have their own operations to produce a line of houses that have a relatively fixed plan, but vary in the selection of details. I discovered that the use of warranties (guaranteed repair periods) limits the options available to clients, and that the sales forces who sell houses efficiently and carefully control marketing. This entire building industry has gone through a fundamental shift in the last forty years: initially providing mass housing for lower- and middle-income families, it now supplies the housing stock for a large contingent of upper-middle-class families, and its markets are continually expanding. During my research I discovered a few reports in the popular press indicating that some people are discontent with the typical overproduced houses available to them. Because the market usually adjusts to client demand, understanding the mechanisms of housing production becomes even more necessary for all parties if clients and designers are to have more influence in changing the models of domestic architecture.

My preliminary conclusions indicate that architects are marginal to the system that currently produces most of the houses in the United States; the latest technological innovations are incorporated into buildings independent of aesthetic and formal considerations; such styles as neocolonial, Tudor, and even contemporary, have become so diluted that they are hardly recognizable as deriving from the precedents that gave them their names; and the concept of styles as
we once knew them are being replaced by a nomenclature of associative themes. The Old World style will increasingly describe generic houses or houses will have no styles attached to them but will represent brands or themes and will be called by such names as “The Zachary” and “The Gregory.” To further this research subsequent study will require developing a careful and detailed sociology of style within an archaeology of knowledge. Framing that archaeology of knowledge is an investigation of the concept of architectural revival itself as well as of the question: what in our culture motivates and demands, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, neocolonial, neo-French, neo-Tudor, neo-Mediterranean, neoclassical, neo-Victorian, and now finally neomodern style itself?

University of Texas at Austin
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, 2003–2004

Anthony Alofsin will resume his research and teaching as Roland Roessner Centennial Professor at the University of Texas at Austin. He is also curating an exhibition on the Price Tower, Frank Lloyd Wright’s only built skyscraper.
Classicism did not die a slow death following its heyday in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, nor did it sink into academic inanity severed from real life. Instead, a new, up-to-date version of the classical aesthetic emerged from the 1860s on, especially in England, France, and Germany. Alternatively Hellenic or Roman, even occasionally Egyptian, this refurbished classicism bore little resemblance to its earlier incarnations, epitomized by artists such as Jacques-Louis David (1748–1825) or Benjamin Haydon (1786–1846). Shedding their abstract idealism and moralizing historicism, it proposed, instead, a domesticated version of antiquity—quotidian, anecdotal, and naturalistic—whose ordinary look, familiar figure types, and accurately rendered settings unfailingly called forth modern analogies. Revitalized, modernized, and enmeshed in contemporary preoccupations, the new classicism defied charges of obsolescence and struck, as critics of the day acknowledged, a note as modern as any of the avant-garde trends.

During my residence I conducted research toward a book that will explore such later transformations of the classical ideal in art in the context of certain cultural shifts particular to the period and to the three countries concerned. I argue that the renewed relevance of classicism and its perceived modernity were largely and implicitly linked to the rise of an imperialist ideology among the dominant
European nations. The expansionist aspirations of these countries converged, both in practice and fictionally, on the Mediterranean seaboard, especially in Greece and Italy, gateways to far-off colonial ventures (in Africa or India), and themselves the sites of an energetic intra-European power-play for political control (“crypto-colonial” in nature) made easier by their persistently unstable internal politics, at once autonomous and foreign-trod (Germans and Austrians in Italy; Germans, French, and British in Greece). Much like Orientalism, then, I see the new classicism in the arts and the critical discourse that accompanied it as an invented narrative meant to ease and ratify foreign political intervention in the Mediterranean nations while also making concrete broader fantasies of worldwide dominance. More and better than Orientalism, the new classicism invited flattering, self-enhancing identification for the ruling nations through the appropriation of the classical heritage of the Mediterranean south, coveted as the essence of European identity (“We are all Greeks” had been the rallying cry of European intellectuals at least since the eighteenth century).

Although the imperialist underpinnings of this late classical aesthetic have long been suspected (and briefly mentioned as an obvious aside in modern scholarship), so far no art-historical study based on precise historical and cultural research has substantiated them or
related them to Mediterranean cultural politics at the time; indeed, with few exceptions, the subject remains a scant preserve among cultural historians as well. Yet artists such as Frederick Leighton (1830–1896) and Lawrence Alma-Tadema (1836–1912) in England, the néo-grec group of which Jean-Léon Gérôme (1824–1904) became the driving force in France, Hans von Marées (1837–1887), Anselm Feuerbach (1829–1880), and Arnold Böcklin (1827–1901) in Germany, along with an international team of photographers stationed around the Mediterranean—William James Stillman (1828–1901), Félix Bonfils (1831–1885), and J. Pascal Sébah (active 1856–1900)—catered to that ideology and invented a form that furthered its wider political, popular, and commercial dissemination. The second part of my project examines the impact of such imagined visions of the past-as-present from the cultural angle of the “host” countries, Greece and Italy. For there, inevitably, an aesthetic underpinned by a nationalistic spirit was formulated in counterdiscursive response to such self-serving foreign constructions. In works still little explored by art historians, Italian and Greek artists of the later nineteenth century—Odoardo Borrani (1832–1905), Silvestro Lega (1826–1895), Nikolaos Gyzis (1842–1901), Nikiforos Lytras (1832–1904)—Polychronis Lembessis (1849–1913) embraced that climate of intent, reclaiming the national territory, its history, and its culture.

My two months at the Center were especially productive. The National Gallery’s rich art library was an immense asset. It was supplemented by an abundance of modern theoretical studies on colonialism from the Library of Congress. I appreciated both the comments and the prolonged subsequent discussions I had with my colleagues from other fields, whose diverse expertise and methodological angles enriched and broadened my own, while also leading me toward a tighter plan that will form the backbone of my book.

University of Delaware
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow, 1 September–31 October 2003

In the spring of 2004 Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer was the Stanley Seeger Fellow in the Hellenic studies program at Princeton University, after which time she returned to her position as professor of art history at the University of Delaware.
My work at the Center has had two separate aspects. The first is the preparation of an exhibition on Antonio Canova (1757–1822) and Bertel Thorvaldsen (1770–1844), involving a close comparison of some of their most characteristic works, within the context of the collecting of antiquities and the cult of the artist that grew around them in Rome in their own time. The exhibition was originally proposed by the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, and is scheduled for 2006. It will be based on substantial loans from the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg, and the Thorvaldsen Museum, Copenhagen, supplemented by major loans from museums in the United States and in Europe. The core of the exhibition will be a series of comparisons of figures by both artists of the same subjects: Hebe, Venus, and the Three Graces. It will also have two supplementary sections, one concerning the Roman background in the collecting of antiquities, and the other concerning paintings and other objects representing the two sculptors as men of superhuman achievement.

The second aspect of my work has been to examine afresh the intellectual background to the sculptural work of Canova and Thorvaldsen, with the principal aim of elucidating the reasons for the enormous esteem in which the artists were held in their own time. In two months at the Center I concentrated more on Thorvaldsen and his intellectual mentors, mainly Danish and German, in his early
years in Rome, from 1797 to about 1810. I had previously worked on the assumption that the key figure in Thorvaldsen’s intellectual milieu was the art critic Carl Ludwig Fernow, who declared himself to be a follower of Immanuel Kant. He sought to apply the idea of a “disinterested” aesthetic to sculpture, and published a book on Canova as early as 1806. However, I was able to establish the comparable importance of Karl Philipp Moritz, a close associate of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, and a philosophical amateur who prefigured many of Kant’s central aesthetic ideas. Moritz was well known to members of Thorvaldsen’s circle, especially Wilhelm and Caroline von Humboldt. He was the author of Götterlehre oder Mythologische Dichtungen der Alten of 1795, which argued that the Greek gods and their mortal servants, like Hebe and Ganymede, should be seen in terms of the transmission of the life-force, an important aspect of “Romantic” nature theory. Thorvaldsen is known to have owned a copy of the book in his early Roman years, and it provides important insights into his choice and interpretation of such subjects as Hebe, Ganymede, and Venus. It also clarifies why German and Danish intellectuals and amateurs, familiar with “advanced” German ideas, were persuaded that Thorvaldsen was a more serious and profound artist than Canova, whom they tended to see as an artist too responsive to sensual pleasures.

In the next stage of research I will look at Canova’s intellectual milieu to see the degree to which the differences in the two sculptors’ work correspond to theoretical differences between them and their admirers. In addition, I want to show that their artistic relationship was a more nuanced one than is often supposed, that they were both influenced (although perhaps not necessarily directly) not only by each other’s work but also by the ideas that the work represented.

University College London
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, 1 November–31 December 2003

David Bindman was a visiting senior scholar at the Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, before returning to his position as Durning-Lawrence Professor of the History of Art at University College London.
From the 1860s until the 1920s, communities throughout the United States dedicated thousands of public monuments to Civil War soldiers. The popular enthusiasm for these projects contrasted sharply with the judgment of many critics that the monuments were, in the words of Truman Bartlett, “the ghastliest army of forms and effigies . . . that has ever inflicted [sic] a people since the earth was made.”

Sharing Bartlett’s disdain, scholars have until recently devoted little attention to the fervent national effort to install a significant part of the American past at the center of the civic landscape. In the last several years, however, interest in the politics of Civil War commemoration has included new research on monuments. One vein of this literature, focused mainly on the North, has traced the rise of a narrative of sectional reconciliation that recalled the Civil War as a display of white martial valor on both sides and shunted aside issues of race and slavery despite the efforts of African Americans and their allies to fix public memory on the principles underlying the sectional conflict. Related literature, focused on the South, has stressed the ways in which celebration of the Confederacy unified whites after the war despite social and cultural fissures along lines of class and gender. In both cases, Civil War monuments figure primarily as instruments intent on hiding conflict and overwhelming alternative perspectives circulating in less privileged forms of political expression.
My book project moves monuments from the endpoint to the center of contests over Civil War commemoration, for Americans vigorously debated specific legacies of the war with visual images as well as words. Departing from the standard emphasis on the reconciliation of North and South, my research looks across both geographical and political entities at the major genres of Civil War monuments: memorials to the dead, models of exemplary citizenship, models of exemplary leadership, and visions of victory. While adding to our understanding of the place of monuments in postwar politics, this approach also brings to the study of Civil War monuments a recognition of themes that have animated the rich literature on European monuments of World War I, particularly the cultural response to a shocking experience of death and the reconstruction of gender roles after the war.

The *Shaw Memorial* (1882–1897) by Augustus Saint-Gaudens (1848–1907), which I visited regularly in its gilded plaster version while in residence at the Center, illustrates the ways in which attention to commemorative genres can shed new light on even the most closely studied of Civil War monuments. The scholarship on the *Shaw Memorial* has almost uniformly begun with its uniqueness as a depiction of African Americans, and the main interpretative issue has been the extent to which Saint-Gaudens avoided racial stereotyping and created a powerful alternative to the northern narrative of reconciliation. The *Shaw Memorial* was far from unique, however, in focusing on the departure of volunteers for the war. In countless literary and artistic representations, the heart of this conventional scene was the soldier’s farewell to his mother or mate. Moses Ezekiel’s (1844–1917) *Confederate Memorial* (1912–1914) in Arlington National Cemetery, for example, featured four melodramatic male-female partings. Saint-Gaudens’ rejection of the perceived sentimentality of the traditional departure scene connected the *Shaw Memorial* to the late Victorian redefinition of masculinity as a suppression of feminine weakness. At the same time, Saint-Gaudens’ avoidance of familial imagery dramatized the new ideas of citizenship embodied by the Fifty-fourth Massachusetts Infantry Regiment. While most regiments were recruited from local communities with dense kinship networks, the Fifty-fourth Massachusetts was a national unit comprising
soldiers from twenty-four states. It represented the country not as an organic community from which the soldier went forth on the basis of a supposed instinctive loyalty, but as a set of principles that individuals chose to realize by their very actions. Following through on this distinction, Saint-Gaudens’ emphasis on the elective, ideological basis of an open, expanding citizenship complemented the sculptor’s unprecedented depiction of individuated, dignified African Americans in the monument.

Although the Shaw Memorial was in many ways an extraordinary Civil War monument, the oft-chronicled complexity of its gestation typified the conviction of artists and sponsors that commemoration of the war was an important public undertaking. Women and men in towns across the country struggled to shape collective remembrance of the dominant event of the American historical imagination and to set that memory prominently in the theater of everyday life. We are well advised to look more closely at the commemorative stage on which we are now the actors.

University of South Carolina
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow, 16 June–20 August 2003

*Thomas J. Brown returns to his position as associate professor of history and associate director of the Institute for Southern Studies at the University of South Carolina. His textbook, The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration: A Brief History with Documents, was published in 2004.*
The dramatic growth of cities in the late thirteenth century reflected a rapidly growing population as well as the expansion of trade and commerce. There was, however, another “population explosion” in the thirteenth-century city: the population of the dead, who began to be buried in large numbers in and around the churches of the new mendicant orders, especially those of the Franciscans and Dominicans. Burial in churches and within the city (as opposed to cemeteries outside the walls) had existed since late antiquity for the elite—the clergy, noble patrons, royalty, and especially saints. But in the thirteenth century, large numbers of laymen, particularly members of the new and increasingly wealthy merchant class, were able to obtain burial in and around the churches and cloisters of the friars.

There are two reasons why this is so: first, the growing emphasis on intercessory prayer for the soul in Purgatory, as the living (families, confraternities, and friars) were ever more engaged in helping to shorten the time of purgation for the deceased. The prayers of the new orders were also held to be more efficacious; a tomb in or near the spaces of the friars could thus shorten the process of redemption. The growing importance of intercessory prayer changed the relation of the living and dead, as the former were now actively engaged with the fate of the deceased.

But why did the friars accept so many tombs in and around their
churches when this was a practice actively discouraged by their own statutes as well as by canon law? Unlike monks and the secular clergy, the friars did not have the traditional sources of income in the form of rents from estates and farms. The Franciscans in particular rejected all forms of property ownership, and were not allowed to touch money. Nonetheless, the administration of the sacraments, especially confession (and penance) and burial, became the primary means of financial support for the new orders; in the Franciscan order various strategies were devised so that donations and contributions would be administered and received by a third party. This intrusion into the traditional domain of the secular clergy caused great tension and conflict throughout Europe, a phenomenon that has been well studied not only for its historical, but also for its literary and juridical consequences.

My research this year has examined the issue of how lay burial affected the character of mendicant architecture, particularly that of the Franciscans. Whereas their churches have usually been understood as large-scale construction projects, like most large medieval churches, I suggest that until 1290 or so Franciscan architecture was typically the result of an ad hoc “process”: the churches consisted of sequences of additions and expansions rather than single, large building campaigns. This can be seen at San Lorenzo Maggiore in Naples, the Santo in Padua, and at any number of other Franciscan monuments. It may be especially true of the large Franciscan study centers (San Francesco in Bologna, the Cordeliers in Paris, and San Lorenzo in Naples), where there were large numbers of masters of theology and many students. The motivation for this additive process was the result not only of changes within the order, such as the clericalization of the friars minor (and the resulting need for numerous secondary altars for daily private masses), but also the pressure exerted by external patrons and donors, who either in wills or as penance made donations and requested burial in church or cloister.

I suspect that the important shift in patterns of piety and bequests during the thirteenth century had a broad impact within the medieval city and upon religious institutions in general. The secular clergy had been hard hit by the loss of income and its traditional prestige and authority. Is it possible that the development of new types of
burial structures within medieval cities, such as the Chiostro del Paradiso at Amalfi, or the Camposanto in Pisa, represent attempts by the communes to “recapture” the lay patron for the cathedral clergy? Can we look at certain construction programs in cathedrals, collegiate and parish churches—such as the new chevet with radiating chapels at Santa Maria Maggiore in Barletta, or the similar extension to the Cathedral of Toulouse—as attempts to integrate the role of burial into the design of churches from the start? These are some of the questions I investigate in this new project. Reconceiving medieval buildings in terms of the dynamic relationships between religious institutions may create a more complete understanding of the forces at work behind the construction projects that shaped the environment of the late medieval city.

Duke University
Paul Mellon Senior Fellow, spring 2004

Caroline Bruzelius will return to her position as A. M. Cogan Professor of Art and Art History at Duke University.
In 1315, when he signed his great Maestà fresco for the Palazzo Pubblico in Siena, Simone Martini (c. 1284–1344) inaugurated a process through which he would make his name as a self-conscious participant in a genealogy of knowledge founded in the moment of the Incarnation. In the context of a painting that launched Simone Martini as a major participant in the effort to embellish Siena’s public spaces, making one’s name surely had several senses. The first of these consisted in advertising the considerable artisanal skills assembled in Simone’s workshop and brought to bear in the portrayal of the dazzling array of materials, bodies, and words that make up the Maestà.

There was, of course, much more at stake in the making of the Maestà than the display of skill as a marketable commodity. In the signature inscription Simone drew attention to his role as maker. Using the small punch tools of a goldsmith, he laboriously worked the letters of his name into the leather-hard plaster. There, those letters came to represent an inscription apparently carved, like a tomb marker, into a simulated porphyry plaque, which had been manufactured using the combined skills of the fresco painter and the lapidary, that is, by polishing the finely ground lime plaster of the fresco’s surface. Thus elaborately wrought, Simone’s name became a synecdoche for the goals and guiding principle of his art. From the point
of view of the modern-day art historian, Simone’s name may therefore be viewed as a self-portrait of the painter’s ontological status, a mirror of a privileged affective relation that Simone, positioning himself in the line of Love’s scribes, would claim to the knowledge he represented.

This relation, the theological foundations for which had been articulated in the preceding century by the notaries of the central Italian cities, was the informing subject of the signature underwriting the Maestà. The signature inscription, which may be reconstructed to read “:S[]: A MANO DI SYMONE,” partakes of a familiar notarial formula, beginning with a notarial signa and identifying Simone’s hand or mano as authentic witness to the loving relations he portrayed between the Virgin and Child and between the Queen of Heaven and her Sienese subjects. Simone’s signature thus accords with a larger picture wherein the advent of the Virgin and the Incarnation of Knowledge are portrayed as a sort of postcard from heaven, complete with fictive replicas of the wax seals of the comune and the capitano del popolo.

Considered as a piece of loving correspondence—an amatory laud to the Virgin—Simone’s Maestà bears comparison to an important Franciscan relic, the so-called chartula. The chartula is a parchment leaf inscribed, in Saint Francis’ hand, with a Laud that was described by Francis’ biographers as the outward manifestation of the knowledge inscribed on the saint’s heart by the hand of God. On its reverse, the parchment is addressed by Francis to his companion, Brother Leo, and signed in the manner of a notarized document, thus becoming the instrument through which his intimate knowledge of the Incarnation was conveyed. Study of the relationship between Simone’s place as a conveyor of knowledge and that of Saint Francis must begin with the observation that Simone was not a saint. Whereas Francis was both inscribed, inside and out, with the truth of the Incarnation and divinely authorized as its scribe, Simone could announce such truths only provisionally, by means of poetic invention.

The contingent value of poetic invention accounts for the obsessive engagement in Simone’s works with the materials, instruments, and acts of inscription. It also underpins Simone’s identification with the figure of Saint Luke as the scribe of the Incarnation, an identifi-
cation that occurs not only in the *Maestà* but also in his polyptych of 1326 for the residence of the *capitano del popolo*. There an elegant Saint Luke once attended the Madonna and Child, suspending his pen over an open book and gazing toward the sacred subject as his ox proffered the inkpot in evident anticipation of the act of writing. Simone here identified his artistic agency with the moment of suspension, when the ink was yet to be inscribed onto the parchment page. The illusory permanence of the fictive porphyry inscription of the *Maestà* is similarly eloquent in this last regard. While fictively engraving his name into imaginary porphyry, Simone foreshadowed an aspect of a complex definition of the poetic authorship that Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–1375) would articulate in the conclusion to the *Decameron*, declaring: “I am not graven (or deadly serious), on the contrary, I float like gall on water,” which is to say, I am like ink before it is dried on the page.

Emory University
Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow, 2003–2004

*C. Jean Campbell will return to her position as associate professor in the art history department at Emory University.*
In 1580 Michel de Montaigne (1532–1592), paying his first visit to Florence, wrote in his travel diary: “I don’t at all know why this city should have the nickname beautiful, by privilege: it is so, but without any special excellence above Bologna, and little above Ferrara, and without comparison below Venice.” Montaigne was here responding to a traditional characterization of Italian cities—Venice the rich, Florence the beautiful, Bologna the fat, Naples the noble, and so on—often cited in the travel literature. He would have found these designations in Sebastian Münster’s *Cosmographia universalis* (1544), a book he regretted not having included in his luggage for his journey across Europe. Returning through Florence on his way back to France the following year, and experiencing the festivities for Saint John the Baptist’s day, Montaigne was reluctantly forced to concede that the designation “Firenze bella” was justified.

Three years later, in 1584, Don Stefano Buonsignori (d. 1589), “cosmographer” to Grand Duke Francesco I de’ Medici, published an engraving in nine sheets with the largest and most elaborate plan of Florence hitherto produced, entitling it with some justice NOVA PVLCHERRIMAE CIVITATIS FLORENTIAE TOPOGRAPHIA ACCVRATISSIME DELINEATA (New topography of the most beautiful city of Florence most accurately delineated). Combining a carefully surveyed outline plan with parallel perspective views of buildings set in...
the urban fabric, it exemplifies a type of city view invented in six-
ten-century Italy. Before publication, Buonsignori tried out vari-
ous texts in Italian and Latin to attach to the plan. They include
standard commonplaces from the traditional eulogies of Florence—
references to the river, the bridges, streets and piazze, paving, notable
buildings—used to justify the popular tag “Firenze bella.” In the
published version of the plan, Buonsignori discards all this and repro-
duces a simple dedicatory letter in Italian to Grand Duke Francesco
I de’ Medici, inviting him to “re-admire,” in one view, a city “so noble
and so illustrious that to celebrate it is superfluous.” In a sense, the
task of listing the city’s topographical features and monuments in
words was now redundant, since they were for the first time fully
visible in delineated form. In fact the superior informativeness of city
maps over descriptions in words had been explicitly articulated in
the introduction to Georg Braun and Franz Hohenberg’s collection
of city views, the *Civitates orbis terrarum* of 1572. In the later six-
ten-century traditional encomiastic descriptions of the “bellezze”
of Florence gave way to more specialist writings such as guide books
focusing on the city’s artistic treasures or treatises in defense of its
nobility.

An exploration of the relationship between written descriptions
in manuscript or print, and drawn, painted, or engraved views,
“Firenze bella: Word and Image in the Representation of Renaissance
Florence” forms the first chapter of the book I am preparing on “The
Urban Face of Renaissance Florence,” the second major project on
which I have been working during my two years at the Center. In
addition to discussing the meaning of these urban representations,
the chapter seeks to bring some degree of precision to their dating,
attribution, and contextualization, while at the same time introduc-
ing themes explored later in the book. Among the book’s principal
concerns will be to return well-known examples of Florentine Renais-
sance architecture to their context as an integral part of the urban
fabric, rather than treat them as isolated monuments, and to trace
the way in which the alternating republican and Medicean govern-
ments of the city attempted to appropriate and shape it to their polit-
cal concerns, not just through architectural and urbanistic projects,
but also through festivals and ephemeral decorations.
Much of this year has also been devoted to my first project, nearing completion, the book on “Roger Fry and Italian Art.” The scanning and transcription of published and unpublished texts by Fry (1866–1934) has been completed, and introductions have been written to Fry’s essays and lectures on individual artists such as Piero della Francesca (1416–1492), Giovanni Bellini (c. 1430–1516), Andrea Mantegna (1431–1506), Paolo Uccello (1397–1475), Vittore Carpaccio (c. 1455–c. 1525), Luca Signorelli (c. 1441–1523), and Alesso Baldovinetti (1425–1499). The overall introduction now includes discussions of Fry’s years at the Metropolitan Museum of Art and of his advice to American collectors such as J.G. Johnson and Henry Clay Frick, as well as of his place in the history of the criticism and connoisseurship of Italian art from John Ruskin to Bernard Berenson.

The Burlington Magazine
Andrew W. Mellon Professor, 2002–2004

In the fall of 2004 Caroline Elam will be teaching at the Courtauld Institute, London University, as a Visiting Reader. In the spring semester of 2005 she will be Visiting Professor at the Harvard University Center for Renaissance Studies at Villa I Tatti, Florence.
The early years of the seventeenth century saw a dramatic change in landscape painting in the Netherlands. The genre of independent landscape, which had developed in Antwerp only a century before, was transformed from the fantastic creations of mannerist landscape into realist landscapes that vividly evoked the Dutch countryside. Sketchy, monochromatic paintings such as the Winter Landscape of Esaias van de Velde (1587–1630) illustrated here, vividly evoked the artists’ direct observation of the indigenous landscape. It is the thesis of this study that artists achieved such radical changes in style by altering aspects of their painting practice: that is, the materials and the techniques they used to create their paintings.

In this period all landscape specialists in the Netherlands were trained in the Antwerp mannerist style of colorful, imagined vistas. Flemish and Dutch painters generally used the same system of meticulous painting techniques to create works of consistent style. But in the first two decades of the century, some Dutch artists diverged into a fundamentally new way of approaching landscape. At first artists in Haarlem and Amsterdam began to make drawings and prints of the indigenous landscape, working in a rapidly notated graphic style. In the 1620s Esaias van de Velde took the radical step of translating that graphic idiom into the far more substantial medium of paint, in the process rupturing the century-old tradition of painting technique.
Van de Velde’s student, Jan van Goyen (1596–1656), built on his teacher’s discoveries in creating the tonal style of landscape. Both painters consolidated the stages of traditional landscape painting practice into a few, quickly executed steps, and worked with a rapid touch that echoed the graphic line. Their subtle painterly effects have not always been recognized or appreciated, or they are assumed to have resulted from defective workmanship; instead, technical study has revealed the artists’ intentional use of visual effects.

My work at the Center has significantly advanced revisions to an early draft of this research for publication as a book/CD-ROM hybrid publication. The book traces the transformation of the Flemish mannerist landscape tradition into the Dutch realist landscape by considering painting practices in the context of artistic influences, the social and political framework, and the art market. The accompanying CD-ROM, which serves as a complementary resource for specialists in painting technique, will offer data from over ninety technical examinations of landscape paintings in a searchable format.

The travel portion of this fellowship permitted me to expand on technical studies for a substantial number of the paintings that I had examined earlier. By considering these paintings in the light of later research, I have refocused the discussion in the text and have further developed the technical dossiers in the electronic material. The resources of the Center proved valuable in converting technical files and visual documentation, such as photomicrographs of paintings, into digital format.

This fellowship also allowed me to place the work of innovators such as Esaias van de Velde and Jan van Goyen into a broader perspective by considering very different artistic choices made by their contemporaries. For example, additional technical studies of paintings by Herman Saftleven (1609–1685) and Jan Both (c. 1615–1652) have confirmed that the elegant painters appreciated by the Utrecht art market were the direct inheritors of the mannerist landscape tradition. Not only did these Italianate landscape painters echo the style and spatial organization of mannerist landscape, but they employed its traditional painting methods as well. Similarly, additional studies of paintings by Joos de Momper (1564–1635) and David Teniers (1610–1690), who maintained the mannerist landscape tradition in
Antwerp, have confirmed that Van de Velde’s and Van Goyen’s new
techniques were motivated by more than economic necessity. It has
sometimes been assumed that economic considerations alone
prompted the artistic innovations through which they developed
tonal landscape. However, while De Momper was able to lower his
prices by working quickly, he nonetheless preserved the older style
by following the established system of mannerist landscape paint-
ing. My research indicates that it was only through new techniques
that tonal landscape painters achieved their innovative style.

National Gallery of Art
Ailsa Mellon Bruce National Gallery of Art Sabbatical Curatorial Fellow,
spring 2004

E. Melanie Gifford will return to her position as research conservator for painting
technology at the National Gallery of Art.
In 1985 the National Gallery of Art hosted what still stands as its sole exhibition dedicated to Indian art. The occasion was the year-long Festival of India in the United States, a historic event co-sponsored by the governments of both countries that generated over a hundred shows and performances, large and small, in thirty-eight museums and in ninety cities. The focus of such a festival, predictably, was on scale and spectacle, as well as on comprehensive coverage of all aspects of Indian art and culture from ancient to contemporary, featuring the “classical” and the “folk,” the high arts of sculpture and painting alongside book illustration, calligraphy, textiles, music, dance, photography, and film. Within this melange the Sculpture of India exhibition at the National Gallery of Art assumed its distinctive status, not merely as the inaugural but also as the highest-profile aesthetic event of the festival, one that offered a privileged art-historical view of nearly five thousand years of the development of sculpture as the exemplary form of the “masterpiece” in Indian art. A hundred works in stone, terracotta, bronze, and ivory, dated from 3000 B.C.E. to 1300 C.E.—with the majority of these traveling for the first time from museums all over India—were laid out on the upper level and west bridge of the National Gallery’s East Building, over ten thousand square feet of exhibition space. The exhibition bore in every detail the mark of expertise and connoisseur-
ship of the show’s curator, Pramod Chandra, the George P. Bickford Professor of Indian Art at Harvard University. Much of its prestige arose from the select venue, with Indian art featured for the first time within the capital’s National Gallery.

My intention here is not to offer a close reading of this exhibition nor of the Festival of India out of which it emerged. The politics of globalization and the demands of international capital that propelled such festivals and their marketing of Indian art and culture will be considered in my broader study. My current concerns lie mainly in locating this show, in its exceptionality, within an ongoing history of the formation of major museum collections and the staging of exhibitions of Indian sculpture in the United States in the prior decades. It is my contention that in the period following India’s independence in 1947, the United States increasingly displaced the United Kingdom as the new and most significant international locus for Indian art. My research project sets out to investigate the ways in which this new international profile of Indian art would revolve around the growth of select North American enclaves of scholarship, collecting, and exhibiting, particularly since the 1960s.

The exhibition brought to a crescendo an increasing focus on sculpture, in both its earliest and later medieval genres, as the prime category of India’s “great art” heritage and as the choicest items for collection and display. In keeping with earlier exhibition practices, it also laid a huge premium on the transportation of a large corpus of objects, including some rare and monumental works, from their home museums in India. In both these trends, Chandra’s show at the National Gallery of Art was conceived as an extension of the pioneering exhibition of “master achievements of Indian sculpture,” held at the Royal Academy of Arts, London, in 1947–1948, to commemorate the Transfer of Power and India’s independence, an exhibition wherein the presentation of the finest specimens of sculpture from India was seen finally to have dispelled longstanding Western prejudices and misconceptions. From 1947 onward the “national” identity of Indian art abroad, we find, would take as its central premise the strength and authority of the nation’s own art establishment; that is, the importance of India’s extensive network of central, provincial, and site museums, without whose cooperation no exhibition
of scale and quality could be mounted in foreign museums. Thriving on a canon of reproducible images in posters, catalogues, and folios, much of the international aura of Indian art objects had also come to rest on the fact that the originals themselves could be made available in different exhibition venues across the world. It is this expectation that would be fulfilled, yet also most bitterly contested, in *The Sculpture of India* exhibition. The event brought to a head incipient tensions between the “national” and “international” custodians of Indian art, pitting the possessive rights of the one against the claims and demands of the other, and calling into question the very legitimacy of the loan and travel of India’s rare and ancient museum resources.

An opportunity to work on the repository of exhibition records and correspondence in the Gallery Archives at the National Gallery of Art during my two months of residency at the Center for Advanced Study allowed me to probe the politics and the bureaucracy of the international transportation of art objects that not only preceded but also spilled over to the very time and space of the exhibition. These records provide a crucial internal, institutional perspective on issues and debates that were also relayed at the time across the Indian media.

The problems would erupt over multiple issues at varying levels, opening up a series of contradictory claims on the objects at stake. One of the most infamous of these controversies surrounded Chandraw’s request for a set of bronze statuary of the Chola period from temples in Tamil Nadu, which was hotly debated in the state parliament and blocked by a writ petition in the Madras High Court, on the grounds that these were religious objects, still in worship, whose travel abroad would offend the sentiments of worshippers. Even as they were replaced by alternative Chola bronzes from museum collections, the aesthetic merit of these substitute objects would remain a point of contention with the exhibition authorities in the United States—while immense tension was also generated over the final release of a prized Shiva-Parvati sculpted pair from the Thanjavur Art Gallery, creating the unprecedented embarrassment of featuring on the exhibition catalogue cover a work that only arrived in the exhibition gallery, after frantic negotiations, almost a month after
the opening of the show. The most acrimonious struggle ensued over
the alleged damage of some of the exhibition objects in the course
of their travel abroad, and the matter provoked great national con-
sternation in India, with mounting pressure brought on the govern-
ment to issue a total ban on the loan and travel of its most antique
and rare historical artifacts.

My point in this study is not to determine responsibilities and
assign blame, nor to distill the apparent “truth” in the flow of alle-
gations and counterallegations that wracked the exhibition from
within. I wish instead to highlight the ways in which traveling art
objects come to embody both international goodwill and a highly
contentious politics of nationhood. I wish also to underline the extent
to which the tide turned with the Festival of India, and how the exhi-
bition and transportation of Indian art in the United States hence-
forth would be severely constrained by the zealousness and obduracy
of the Indian art bureaucracy. In an ironic twist, in the subsequent
exhibition circuit in the United States, the increasing visibility and
aesthetic stature of Indian art objects would go hand-in-hand with
the stigmatization of India itself as an intractable problem entity.

Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta
Starr Foundation Visiting Senior Research Fellow, 1 June–31 July 2003

Tapati Guha Thakurta returns to her position as professor of history at the Centre
for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta. Her book, Monuments, Objects, Histories:
Institutions of Art in Colonial and Postcolonial India, was published in 2004.
Romeyn de Hooghe depicted a wide range of themes during the course of his career, including maps, emblem books, battle scenes, and fashion plates, but it was with a small group of about twenty satires that he revolutionized the political print in the Netherlands. Born in 1645 in Amsterdam and buried in 1708 in Haarlem, de Hooghe’s career spanned a period of dramatic changes in the European political landscape. The murder of the de Witt brothers in 1672 decimated the once-dominant Republican party in the Netherlands; the French invasion of the same year initiated a conflict that continued through the end of the century; and William III’s invasion of England in 1688 had dramatic repercussions both at home and abroad.

Romeyn de Hooghe’s satires were designed for the wealthy merchant classes that inhabited the republic’s cities. As holders of the Dutch purse strings, they were more generally concerned with trade than with William’s foreign campaigns, yet their financial support was essential to his success. De Hooghe’s satires of Louis XIV and James II kept his audience engaged and suggested, through the satirical reduction of his enemies, that William’s success was both forthcoming and inevitable. These large, beautifully executed prints were accompanied by texts presented in the form of poetry or song. Text and image were meant to be read and viewed in tandem, and these narrative prints were produced relatively quickly following current
events as they unfolded. De Hooghe either signed them with a range of pseudonyms and false places of publication or left them unsigned. This claim to anonymity is central to the development of de Hooghe’s political satire. It at once implies a freedom of expression and truth of content and institutes, when paired with his recognizable individual style, a sophisticated game of connoisseurship and “one-upmanship.” De Hooghe emerges in the role of the critic—a seemingly objective third party between the government and the governed, producing propaganda for all sides of the political spectrum. Not surprisingly, there were consequences for de Hooghe’s production of political satire: he was banished from Amsterdam and victimized in a “trial by media,” known as the Pamphlet War of 1690.

One of de Hooghe’s most interesting satires is Pantagruel Agonisant (1690), which refers to a near miss at the Battle of the Boyne in which William was wrongly presumed by his opponents to have
been killed. De Hooghe’s print capitalizes on the humor of the French blunder, showing Louis XIV literally dying of embarrassment upon receiving news of the mistake. He appears in bed, falling back in a swoon and gazing heavenward as his mistresses kneel before the bed sobbing and a nun checks his pulse. The recently deposed James II sits beside him in a defeated slump while a varied cast of characters, including the devil administering the last rites, appears on the far side of the bed. Several gentlemen run to the arched doorway at the right, where William III charges toward them, very much alive and with his sword raised.

At the left stand musicians in front of another arched doorway labeled “The Great Orphans of France,” through which the Hôtel de Ville is seen. Its windows are boarded up and the building is declared “not in use” as crowds surround a platform, upon which stands a conspicuously empty gibbet and torture wheel. This reference to Louis XIV’s abandonment of Paris in favor of his royal retreat at Versailles would have been particularly resonant among the merchant elite in the Netherlands, keen to limit William III’s monarchical ambitions and to emphasize the importance and relative autonomy of the cities.

An image of the print that was published in Paris and contributed to the dissemination of the false news of William’s death appears in the center foreground, underlining the importance of the print medium in a world that had increasing access to, and appetite for, information. Political satires such as Pantagruel Agonisant, with its explicit reference to the print market and its overt campaign to erode the machinery of the Absolute Monarch, were revolutionary and, as de Hooghe implies, potent enough to fell a king. The implications of the emergence, popularity, and effectiveness of political satire are many—for the artist as anonymous political and social commentator, for the audience as a defined and powerful body requiring coercion, and for the nature and dissemination of public knowledge.

[Columbia University]
Samuel H. Kress Fellow, 2002–2004

In 2004–2005 Meredith M. Hale will be the Andrew W. Mellon Fellow in the department of prints and drawings at the Metropolitan Museum of Art.
For urban realist Reginald Marsh (1898–1954), a New York artist often characterized as an American Scene painter of the 1920s and 1930s, the city, as both a physical location and a social space, informed much of the work he produced. Critics and audiences celebrated his crowded, bustling scenes of urban life and his depictions of public amusements frequented by the city’s working-class and poor residents. Even as Marsh painted the city and its inhabitants, in effect rendering the urban environment legible for his viewers, popular conceptions of urban culture at this time were being reshaped by an increasingly perceptible black presence in prominent cities like New York. My project examines Marsh’s imagery from 1928 through 1938 when he produced over forty paintings that include African American figures. These images facilitate and elucidate an analysis of the ways in which Marsh’s complex, contradictory representations of blacks acted as substantive cultural and visual markers—manifestations of concerns about the urban presence of African Americans.

The appearance of African American figures in Marsh’s work coincided with both a changing racial demographic within the city of New York, and a shift in the popular mind toward a definition of “urban” that was integrated and deeply entangled in mass culture. The migration of blacks to northern cities and subsequent interracial interactions altered urban life—American culture could no longer...
be predicated merely on white Americans or on the assimilation of European immigrants into the American collective. Cultural scholars attribute such interracial interaction as a primary element that signaled a social transformation in the United States toward a twentieth-century nation composed of culturally influential urban centers. Yet, the increased visibility of blacks simultaneously created an ambiguity and conflict in the representation of African Americans as artists, advertisers, and filmmakers sought to determine black representation in the early years of the Depression. In dialogues with such tensions, Marsh’s images engage with discussions of urbanization and its effects on racial representation while addressing the extent to which blacks should be assimilated into the country’s changing urban culture.

Central to my analysis are the ways in which Marsh constructed an intricate means for representing African Americans during the late 1920s through the early 1930s. At that time he often relied on contemporary audiences and their knowledge of various visual racial codes to interpret his representations. By negotiating public perception, popular imagery, and his own experience of observing those who comprised the city of New York, Marsh created a pictorial vocabulary engaged with mainstream culture’s attempts to determine America’s new urban and ethnic landscape. Although Marsh’s con-
temporaries often coded his images of African Americans simply as accurate, if not plausible, scenes of black life, a historically specific investigation of the extent to which blackness signified in this period reveals Marsh’s nuanced representations and how his various artistic strategies functioned within contemporary discourse about blackness. Indeed, Marsh’s reputation as an urban realist granted him the authority to exploit a range of representational techniques, from caricature to old-master drawing styles to politically charged visual tropes, in order to interpret the African American urban presence. Aesthetic decisions such as the arrangement of figures and the use of unnatural physical characteristics operate both to distinguish black racial identity or blackness, and to contain its cultural residue. Yet Marsh also struggled, as did many artists of the period, with the means of representing blackness and where, if at all, signs of black should be fixed: on the body (skin color ranges, bestialized features); elsewhere in the painting (setting, narrative, locations within the scene); or even by removing the African American figure altogether.

While in residence this year at the Center, I have focused on the ways in which two diverse popular social practices, slumming and lynching, entered public urban discourse. Operating as transgressive activities that exploited looking across racial and class boundaries, these practices prompted reactions by Marsh and other cultural critics about the status of African Americans within the city and the desire to display the black body. In images such as Savoy Ballroom of 1931, the enticing activities at the popular Harlem nightclub and the painting’s planar composition invite the viewer to enjoy the spectacle of blackness as represented by the black body. Further, as figures gaze out of the image, the intricate exchange of gazes between viewer and subject encourages the viewer to join the spectacle while reaffirming and reasserting dominant racial and social boundaries.

[University of Michigan, Ann Arbor]
Chester Dale Fellow, 2003–2004

Carmenita Higginbotham has received a Professional Development Fellowship from the College Art Association for 2004–2006. She will begin a position as assistant professor of art history and American studies at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, in August 2005.
Recent archaeological exploration both inside and outside the western Zhou (c. 1050–771 B.C.E.) capital area in modern-day Shaanxi has uncovered material culture that allows historians and archaeologists of early China to rethink the traditional view of the “Middle Kingdom.” This model portrays the Zhou as a homogeneous, all-powerful culture in which a universal Zhou king, as Son of Heaven, dominated the land and people of China. My research joins current scholarship by focusing on materials of the Yu group, whose mortuary data was discovered in modern-day Baoji, Shaanxi, about one hundred miles west of the western capital of Zhou near Xi’an.

A comparison of the Zhou and the Yu, as well as of the Zhou’s two feudal states—the Jin and Yan—suggests that the Yu shared with their neighbors several key variables of material culture, particularly burial goods. For instance, similar to the Zhou, Jin, and Yan, the Yu mostly made ding cauldrons and gui containers as their principal forms of bronze vessel: in particular, the ding outnumber any other kind of vessel found in the burials of these peoples. Further, the dominant pattern on the bronzes of the Yu, Zhou, Jin, and Yan is the two-eyed taotie motif in its elaborate form. The Yu thus were reproducing the standard, widely accepted bronze style of the early Zhou society, and in doing so were validating the ritual funerary system of the early Zhou. The bronze vessels as well as weapons were placed out-
side the inner coffin and hence were separated from most jade found on the bodies of the deceased within. This indicates that the bronzes were to perform public ritual duties for the deceased, including heavenly, earthly, and ancestral worship. At the same time, the personal affiliation of the jades with the owners indicates their ornamental function.

Nevertheless, the Yu maintained their own cultural and political distinctions. For example, the majority of the Zhou bronze ge daggers curve along the lower side of the blade, while the Yu ge are mostly triangular. The unique shape of some Yu pottery, such as pots with saddle-shaped handles, suggests that the Yu had a different lifestyle and an independent history from the Zhou. Indeed, the Zhou preferred the ceramic li tripods, while the Yu made pots.

The Yu’s burial customs differed from Zhou practice as well. Unlike the Zhou, the Yu did not put shells in the mouth or hands of the deceased. The Yu also made some bronzes of distinctive or unique styles. The gui vessel, illustrated here with four buffalo-headed handles, a tall-footed gui from the same tomb, two bronze human figures, a human-headed bronze ax, and several animal-shaped zun
containers in the Yu tombs are quite anomalous compared with other Zhou bronzes.

Sometimes bronze inscriptions made by other peoples mentioned the activities of the Zhou king or an award or honor the owner received from the king; however, none of some sixty inscribed Yu bronzes had such recordings. Neither were the Yu recorded in contemporary inscriptions on bronzes and oracle bones, nor in later historical documents.

The Yu suddenly disappeared from the archaeological record toward the middle period of the western Zhou; perhaps they fell prey to an outside invasion. By contrast, invasions into the Yan by peoples from the north were documented in historical records. If the Yu were a feudal state of the Zhou, just as the Yan were, we would have expected similar records within other accounts.

These observations thus offer an alternative view to studies of the statecraft of early China by modern scholars. My research suggests that even though the Yu shared with the Zhou some important aspects of artistic and ritual practice, they still maintained cultural and political independence. We cannot assume that the Yu were a feudal or substate of the Zhou, as most scholars claim, simply because their mortuary practice bore similarities to mainstream Zhou tradition.

This conclusion also challenges the model of a single, unified, and homogeneous Zhou culture: instead, it shows that even close to the capital area of the Zhou, regional variation and cultural diversity existed. Rather than seeking or accepting generalizations, we should therefore address the particular, contingent, and contextual aspects of culture, society, and political history during this formative period in China’s bronze age.

[University of Pittsburgh]
Andrew W. Mellon Fellow, 2002–2004

Yu Jiang will be a Paul Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow at the National Gallery of Art for 2004–2005.
Although perhaps no twentieth-century American artist is as famous as Jackson Pollock (1912–1956), the paintings he executed in the last five years of his life have long proven a critical enigma and, indeed, are themselves not well known. All major scholarship on the artist neglects these late paintings, privileging instead the large, dripped abstractions now indelibly associated with his name. The dissertation I wrote with the support of my fellowship remedies this omission and challenges prevailing narratives of Pollock’s artistic development. By reexamining Pollock’s post-1950 production, with an eye toward the interpretative criticism that has unfailingly dismissed it, my dissertation offers an alternative framework for discussing these late works and, more generally, a new reading of Pollock’s approach to painting.

The reasons for the critical neglect of Pollock’s late paintings are manifold. Perhaps the most important factor is their apparent eclecticism; not only do Pollock’s late paintings look very different from his dripped abstractions, they are themselves tremendously varied. Rather than approach these late works from the point of view of style, this dissertation focuses on the formal operations at work within them. That is, by analyzing how the paintings came to look the way they do, this operational approach privileges procedure and process over style and form, creating an interpretative framework that not
only proposes to accommodate the formal eclecticism of Pollock’s late painting, but also helps to explain it.

Using the artist’s final four solo exhibitions as benchmarks, my dissertation charts the development of these operational procedures. With remarkable consistency, Pollock approached painting in his last five years with a new, intensely self-critical attitude. Systematically working to dismantle the terms of his previous styles, Pollock forged a new painting that acknowledged the radical consequence of his past production without repeating it.

This approach began in late 1950, and my dissertation’s first chapter picks up after Pollock’s last show of dripped abstractions—at the commonly assumed “break point” in his production. Having taken his drip technique to one of its logical conclusions the previous summer, Pollock clearly reached a kind of artistic cul-de-sac—a situation exacerbated by his growing fame and sense that his every move in the studio was being watched. Ironically, through the very success of his dripped abstractions, Pollock had come to a point of painterly paralysis and psychic breakdown. The first chapter sketches the artistic and historical factors that contributed to these twinned crises.

Chapter two begins by detailing the means by which Pollock began to work out of this impasse: coopting his dripped technique for figurative painting, and returning to the kind of totemic imagery
that characterized his works of the early to mid-1940s. These “black pourings,” as they were called, represented the first of many ways that Pollock revamped his signature technique, and this second chapter unravels some of the issues that such a project entailed for his personal and professional identity.

Chapter three examines the ways in which Pollock refigured his drip yet again. Returning to abstraction in 1952, Pollock consciously reworked the terms of his classic dripped abstractions. Rejecting the learned habits (and skills) that had produced their particular brand of pictorial space, Pollock explored the future viability of his abstract idiom, while dissembling the basic terms of his painterly practice. The third chapter demonstrates how such issues of form manifested larger questions about artistic subjectivity.

The fourth and final chapter details the most intense moments of Pollock’s retrospection, and tracks his systematic reappraisal of his various former styles. Taking advantage of the occasion of his first museum retrospective in late 1952, Pollock used his last productive years to reexamine many of the options he had forgone at earlier moments in his career, and tried to reckon with a set of new aesthetic terms he himself had created for all advanced art with his dripped abstractions. The chapter also reconsiders questions of retrospection and artistic influence, more generally, and the dissertation ends with a reconsideration of Pollock’s late works as a whole.

What emerges from this analysis is a very different picture of Pollock than is typically sketched in art-historical accounts. His increased self-consciousness after 1950—while perhaps regretfully occasioned by crisis—led Pollock to work through the consequences of his own dripped abstractions in a systematic and critical manner, presenting a significant early “reception” and criticism of these important earlier paintings. Like all advanced artists in New York at the time, Pollock was trying to forge new ground while remaining conscious of the possibilities these dripped abstractions had simultaneously opened and closed for art generally. Understood in this way, Pollock’s late work unexpectedly begins to approach that of such artists of the following generation as Jasper Johns (b. 1930) or Andy Warhol (1928–1987) than one might have previously imagined possible.
This argument affects not only our critical evaluation of Pollock’s late works, but also those paintings which made him famous and the narrative arc of his career which we think we know so well. Resisting the tendency to resuscitate Pollock’s late paintings in the art-historical terms that created the paradigm to deem them failures in the first place, this dissertation attempts to situate them instead in terms of a working method, and a modernist strategy, entirely consistent with his oeuvre as a whole. The consequences of this are no less than a wholesale reevaluation of Pollock’s career and our understanding of the working principles which guided it.

[Harvard University]
Chester Dale Fellow, 2002–2003

Following the completion of his Ph.D., Jordan Kantor assumed a position as assistant curator of drawings at the Museum of Modern Art, New York.
STANKO KOKOLE

Classical Tradition in the Urban Centers of the Adriatic Rim: 1400–1700

On 3 April 1537 Pietro Bembo wrote from Venice that he was eagerly awaiting a delivery of several ancient silver coins from his nephew, Giovanni Matteo Bembo, who was then serving his term as conte of Zadar (Zara). The letter is a telling reminder that, throughout the Renaissance period, the overlordship of the Serenissima (Venice) exposed the subject territories of its Stato da Mar to the ever-growing demand for portable antiquities. This process accordingly also forms one component of my long-term project to produce a monographic study dedicated to the numerous manifestations of reception and perception of classical heritage on the shores of the Adriatic Sea in the early modern period.

Coins and engraved gemstones were the first victims of the steadily increasing traffic in ancient artifacts. Yet at a comparatively early date, some highly prized objects of this class were also circulating in cast copies which quickly became collectors’ items in their own right, not only on the Apennine peninsula but also in Istria and Dalmatia. At the Center for Advanced Study I have focused on one outstanding case in point, which has, to my knowledge, hitherto escaped the attention of scholars as it was hiding inside the monumental reliquary Shrine of Saint Simeon in Zadar (set up in its present position above the main altar in the Church of Saint Simeon, formerly Saint Stephen, in 1648).
The exterior facing, made of gilt laminated silver worked in repoussé, of the wooden coffer containing the relic was commissioned in 1377 by the Hungaro-Croatian Queen Elizabeth from the goldsmith Francesco da Milano, and was finished in 1380. The silver lining that covers the oblong rectangular surface behind the prophet’s body within the arca, is, on the other hand, the only signed work of the local goldsmith Tommaso di Martino (alias Tomo Martinov or Tomo Martinić), who died in Zadar before 1531. On each side of the central narrative scene of the Presentation at the Temple, two standing figures of the saintly protectors of the city (Saint Donatus and Saint Chrysogonus on the left; Saint Anastasia and Saint Zoilus on the right) are staged under richly articulated arcades all’antica, one of which incorporates the tabula ansata reporting the date of completion—30 April 1497. The spandrels between the arches and the passageways between their supporting piers are adorned with one multfigure medallion and seven small relief busts, the reproductions of which were published in full by Ivo Petricioli only in 1986. By contrast to the rest of the hammered metallic lining, each of these tiny decorative reliefs was cast separately in solid silver before being welded into its embossed circular or ellipsoid frame. In 1893 Alfred Gotthold Meyer noted that the cast medallion showing the triumphant Apollo citharoedus, the vanquished Marsyas, and the supplicating Olympus derived from the famous carnelian intaglio, now in Naples, which was once one of the treasures of Lorenzo de Medici’s collection in Florence. Still, no further attempt has been made to date to identify the prototypes of the remaining set. My investigation has shown that no less than five profile busts in the Shrine of Saint Simeon likewise must derive from ancient gems, which (judging from their numerous extant copies in various materials) enjoyed a popularity almost equal to that of the celebrated Apollo-and-Marsyas intaglio.

Hence it should come as no surprise that profile busts of classical derivation adorning the interior of the Shrine of Saint Simeon also have their counterparts among the bronze plaquettes in the collection of the National Gallery of Art, Washington. The bust of Minerva tallies with the Head of Athena (1957.14.163) known from several exemplars including a fine specimen from the Samuel H. Kress Col-
lection, which—in addition—provides matching replicas for the draped busts of Diana (1957.14.168) and the laureate Julius Caesar (1957.14.176). The face of the long-haired, beardless young man had been cast, in turn, from a mold reproducing the same head of a youth in profile that appears in a plaquette that was once spuriously described as a portrait of Antinous (1957.14.170). Finally, the profile bust of a bald-headed old man (tentatively dubbed “Seneca”) finds its direct match in an oval plaquette currently labeled “The Philosopher Cato” (1992.55.2).

Cumulatively, these telltale correspondences suggest that the now-lost plaquettes, which served as models for the gem-derived profile heads in Zadar, were probably made available to the local goldsmith by a discriminating patron. Circumstantial documentary evidence suggesting that the silver lining for the shrine of Saint Simeon had been envisioned (and perhaps even commissioned) as early as 1493, possibly points to the personal intervention of the humanistically educated Archbishop Maffeo Vallaresso (d. 1495). Vallaresso, who took over the archdiocese of Zadar in 1450, not only offers an out

standing case for a conspicuous display of personal power and private wealth through concerted architectural and artistic patronage; his surviving Latin epistolary also indicates an interest in the collection of coins and other small antiquities. Margaret King, moreover, perceptively drew attention to the fact that Vallaresso often “flattered and petitioned” Pietro Barbo—then cardinal of San Marco and the future pope Paul II—by “studding his verbal expressions of gratitude with gifts from his remote Dalmatian see,” which included “figs and barrels of fish” as well as “medals (Barbo’s special passion).” In 1458, for example, a set of ancient coins was thus brought to Rome by Maffeo’s younger brother, Giacomo Vallaresso (the future bishop of Koper [Capodistria]), who was at that time a member of the cardinal’s household. Seen against this background, it is easy to imagine that Paul II could have reciprocated in kind by presenting his obliging suffragan with a representative set of exquisite metallic casts after some of the most highly valued antique gems known to Quattrocento intendenti. After all, in the words of his contemporary biographer Gaspare da Verona, the Venetian pope was not only an eminent expert on ancient and modern numismatics but also “a most
In sum, there is a distinct possibility that some of the (presumably bronze) plaquettes or medals, from which the *all’antica* silver reliefs were (no later than 1497) cast by the goldsmith Tommaso in Zadar, had reached Dalmatia much earlier; indeed, they even could have been produced in Paul II’s famous Roman “Workshop of S. Marco.” At present this must remain a mere hypothesis, for close technical analysis still lies ahead. Nonetheless, the late-fifteenth-century interior facing of the Shrine of Saint Simeon eloquently bears out Sir John Pope-Hennessy’s claim that “[w]here the source is antique” the Italian Renaissance plaquettes “enjoyed a sort of cultural apostolate far outside the centers in which they were produced.”

Science and Research Center of the Republic of Slovenia, Koper
Podhorsky Guest Scholar, 1 May–30 June 2003

*Stanko Kokole will return to his position at the Science and Research Center of Koper, now a part of the newly founded University of the Slovenian Littoral (Univerza na Primorskem).*
Although relatively short, the period I spent at the Center was not only rewarding but rich in potential for further study, in two fields. First, I worked on the delightful “Sketchbook on military art, including geometry, fortifications, artillery, mechanics, and pyrotechnics” in the Library of Congress (Lessing J. Rosenwald Collection, MS 27; http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.rbc/rosenwald.1363). The early seventeenth-century manuscript is by an anonymous hand, whose author and illustrator I hope to identify, and it contains a great many illustrations, texts prefaced with minute figures, and exquisite pen-and-ink geometrical drawings. A small, heavily didactic codex, a cross between a notebook and a textbook, it is indubitably of Florentine origin. It is likely to be the work of a member of the circle of the architect, engineer, and stage designer Giulio Parigi (1571–1635), produced during the period when he taught mathematics and drawing in conjunction with art and military architecture to the young noblemen at the Medici court. I believe, in fact, that a connection can be made between the sketchbook in Washington and the manuscript of instruments and machines produced by Giulio himself (Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, MS 1292). The manuscript is largely written in Italian, but the occasional use of Spanish would appear to indicate that it was destined for international use, or that the author had some connection with the Iberian peninsula, then in the mili-
tary vanguard. Geometrical and mechanical problems are set and solved in the codex, which provides information about the military arts, the use of machines both on building sites and for theatrical design, and artillery—including the manufacture of bombs and fire-works. The final and most interesting part of the volume deals with problems concerning the gauging of heights, distances, and perspective. The author, an excellent and sophisticated draftsman, reviews all the available military instruments for calculating distances, draw- ing up plans and placing fortresses in perspective, including a very early design for a camera obscura, its lens trained on the cupola of the Florence cathedral.

The highlight of my residency was, however, the discovery of the papers of the American art historian Frederick Hartt (1914–1991), conserved in the Gallery Archives at the National Gallery of Art, recently catalogued and now available to researchers. Hartt’s passion for Italian art and architecture and his knowledge of the lan-
guage and the country really came into play during the Second World War. While serving in the United States Army Air Force he was sent as “Army photo interpreter” to the Mediterranean with the Fifth Army, and was subsequently appointed by the Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives (MFAA) office of the Allied Military Government in Italy to take charge of the Eighth Region, Tuscany, from 1944 to 1945.

A great debt is owed to Hartt and to the knowledgeable and specialized officials on his staff. These included the English architect Cecil Pinsent (1884–1963), designer of the most important Anglo-American villas and gardens around Florence, Roger Enthoven, and Edward Croft-Murray (later keeper of prints and drawings at the British Museum). They worked closely with distinguished members of the Tuscan soprintendenze such as Giovanni Poggi, Ugo Procacci, Filippo Rossi, Piero Sanpaolesi, and Raffaello Niccoli.

Hartt wrote that “every region of Italy is rich in works of art, but none is as rich as Tuscany,” in the introduction to Florentine Art under Fire, published in 1949, an emotional and moving testament to the events of the times. For this book he drew on documents in his personal archive, and he could justly claim to have played a part in the protection of the heritage of “his” region, ravaged like so many others by heavy aerial bombardments and by the ransacking, vandalism, and carnage wrought by fleeing Nazis.

The Hartt Papers, donated to the National Gallery of Art after his death, are a mine of information on Italian art history, and architecture in particular, but also on the history of restoration and the organizations responsible for conservation. They are of major art-historiographical importance as a whole, and the quantity, completeness, and detail of these papers shed light on a little-known, though pivotal period, crucial to understanding the history of twentieth-century values and ideologies, and of Italo-American cultural exchange in particular. A sizable part of the archive also concerns Hartt’s contribution to the Committee to Rescue Italian Art (CRIA), set up by the United States in 1966, to assist Italian institutions in the restoration of works of art and culture damaged by flood in Florence.

But the largest part of the archive, consisting of eight cubic feet of papers, relates to the war period: MFAA correspondence, reports
and official accounts; articles and press cuttings; publications of the time, some of which are now extremely rare; exhibition catalogues; lists of monuments and tourist guides for the soldiers; and above all, a rich photographic record of bombed Tuscan monuments and aerial views of Italian cities. Hartt also saw fit to obtain from the Alinari archives and the offices of the Tuscan soprintendenze numerous photographs of monuments taken before they were bombed, a resource made even more precious by the relative inaccessibility of these archives to scholars.

This amazing set of papers, in which there is still so much to discover—together with the corresponding and equally unexplored papers of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas (the “Roberts Commission,” set up by President Franklin D. Roosevelt during the Second World War), which encompass the whole of Italy and the rest of occupied Europe—constitutes a complete research resource. The papers of the “Roberts Commission,” conserved in the National Archives of the United States, Washington, D.C., have now, sixty years on, been made available to researchers as well.

Università degli Studi di Firenze
Millon Architectural History Guest Scholar, 5–24 January 2004

Daniela Lamberini will return to the Center for Advanced Study in August 2004, after which time she will resume her position as associate professor on the faculty of architecture at the Università degli Studi di Firenze.
A semester in the national capital presents graphic daily reminders of my project, for there is probably no other American civic landscape whose rich endowment of statues so closely approaches that of ancient Rome, and perhaps also no other in which the purpose and significance of statuary installations present so many possibilities of comparison. My project is a book that explores the ways in which Roman writers employed statues as instruments of meaning in literary texts. The importance of statues in ancient Roman culture derives not simply from their aesthetic attractions, but also their capacity for dialogue with the spectator. Within their physical contexts, material statues of wood, stone, or metal purportedly communicate with their viewers through shared understandings of social codes. Confronting a statue, a Roman would see not only a togate senator, a deity, or a Polycleitan athlete but also the interaction between the subject, or donor, or spoliator of this representational object and the institutions of the state. Location is a component of such meanings, that is, a statue decreed for placement within the Forum has very different implications from one dedicated within a vowed temple or placed in a villa garden.

For these reasons statues also are good to write with. Statues situated within written topographies can assume a communicative life no less complex than those within the cityscape. Naturally, physical
description, or *ekphrasis*, can bring an image into focus, but so can rhetorical manipulation of the codes of meaning that govern the function of a statue within its context. From the time of Catullus through the empire, Roman writers frequently appropriate communally accessible signifying language implied by statuary and adapt it to their own argumentative, narrative, celebratory, or denigratory purposes. Such vicarious representations offer opportunities for exploring intersections between literary communication and the visual arts.
Almost everything that the Romans write about statues indicates that the primary criterion by which their efficacy should be measured is their illusion of animate life. Roman writers reflect this principle as governing the interrelationship between statues and the bodies they represent. Although such naturalism undeniably bespeaks the skills of the artist, its effects are various in accordance with the varieties of sculpture represented. For example, the living, breathing portraits that adorn a peristyle garden serving as the setting for one of Cicero’s dialogues communicate an atmosphere conducive to philosophical discourse. Both in public venues and in the homes of their descendants, portraits of redoubtable Romans demand respect for their subjects, participate in political debate, and encourage imitation. In Apuleius’ prose romance, *The Golden Ass or Metamorphoses*, the statuary tableau of Diana and Actaeon positioned in an artificial thicket dramatizes the mythological story in such a way as to implicate the spectator in voyeuristic guilt. And whereas the notoriously lifelike aspect of some female statues—nude Venus or Pygmalion’s ivory image—sparks desire, Ariadne frozen in the posture of a sculpted Maenad conveys the powerless fury of a deserted bride.

During my months at the Center, I have concerned myself primarily with the kind of commemorative portrait statues intended to honor, and indeed to confer, lasting remembrance upon persons whose exercise of *virtus* has significantly contributed to the welfare of the state, through actions of bravery of course, but even through the sponsorship of provident legislation. I have combed texts for bits of theoretical insight into the cultural associations of such statuary. Particularly useful are those chapters of the Elder Pliny’s encyclopedic *Natural History* that intersperse their information on the uses of stone and metal with remarks on the protocols of statuary installation and the symbolisms carried by various genres of representation, as, for example, the equestrian versus the athletic. I have also been looking at images of statues on Roman coins of the late republic for corroborative evidence of these genres. Historical and rhetorical texts are the primary context in which such images figure. Some of the most interesting situations are those in which authorial manipulation of the viewer’s perspective can highlight a basic instability of meaning in the image, turning its own codes of signification against
it and undermining its pretensions to permanence by subversion of its honorific or exemplary claims. The efficacy of statuary communication can be witnessed from misuse, as when Cicero mocks the young Cato for adopting the dress of archaic sculptures to declare his allegiance to pristine morals, or builds his strong case against the corrupt Roman provincial governor Caius Verres by showing that his purportedly tributary statues were financed by extortion. A striking instance of imitation appears in the belief of several historians that statues of Lucius Junius Brutus, who galvanized the expulsion of the Tarquin dynasty from Rome, gave the impetus for Marcus Junius Brutus to assassinate Julius Caesar. If always there exists a discrepancy between the sculpted image and the historical body it instantiates, writing has the opportunity to capitalize upon and intensify this, thinning the boundary between life and representation either by driving these conditions further apart or by pressing them into closer union.

Indiana University, Bloomington
Frese Senior Fellow, spring 2004

_Eleanor Winsor Leach returns to her position as professor of classical studies and director of graduate studies at Indiana University, Bloomington._
During my tenure as the Center’s first Edmond J. Safra Visiting Professor, I wanted to find a topic that would make it possible for obligations resulting from this fellowship to coincide with personal research. Thus, I decided to dedicate my research to European bronze statuettes from the Renaissance and the baroque—a field I have been working on for many decades and one that is well represented in the collections of the National Gallery of Art.

In doing so, I was able to forge connections between the research of the Gallery’s curatorial staff and that of the Center for Advanced Study; that is, to establish and intensify contact between the fellows at the Center, who mostly have a background in the academic world of universities, and the curators and conservators at the National Gallery, particularly with the staff of the sculpture department. Moreover, I was asked to conduct a three-day seminar, for which I chose the format of a practicum. We then invited ten younger scholars to participate. All participants had to document their interest in the field of sculpture by having finished at least a relevant master’s thesis. As I had contributed, at the start of my tenure, a lecture on two Viennese collections of bronze sculptures to the symposium “Collecting Sculpture in Early Modern Europe,” and at the same intended to pursue work on the scholarly catalogue of a private collection of bronze statuettes in New York, it was a natural choice to dedicate
the seminar to a “Practicum on Renaissance Bronze Statuettes.” As indicated by the title, this seminar did not chiefly address theoretical questions of art history, but rather issues that could be dealt with exclusively within the practical work in a museum. Since bronze casting is a reproductive art, emphasis was given to casting techniques, chasing methods, metal analyses, problems of replica research, history of collecting, and the documentation of provenances. Essential for the success of this practicum was the active involvement of all the curators and conservators of the departments of sculpture and object conservation, who kindly contributed by guiding tours and
demonstrating and explaining the methods of x-radiography, x-ray fluorescence spectroscopy (XRF), and thermoluminescence analysis—which can determine the age and material composition of a particular bronze—as well as the casting process of individual bronze statuettes.

The seminar was complemented by a visit to one of the most important private collections of Renaissance bronzes in the western hemisphere, located in Virginia near Washington, D.C., and by a field trip to New York, where we viewed and discussed selected bronzes in the Frick Collection, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and in the aforementioned private collection for which I am preparing a catalogue. For the occasion of the practicum, the owner generously agreed to send ten of her best bronzes to the National Gallery of Art and allowed us to carry out technical examinations. This project not only gave participants the opportunity to synergistically combine theoretical instruction with practical experience, but it also yielded important results and inspiration for my own catalogue entries. I was able to finish these thanks to support from the National Gallery, and in particular the Center. Moreover, during my fellowship I completed an essay based on my earlier lecture, “Bronzes in Two Eighteenth-Century Viennese Collections: Typical or Unusual?,” for the publication of the symposium papers (Studies in the History of Art, volume 70).

Vienna
Edmond J. Safra Visiting Professor, spring 2003

Following retirement from his position as a senior curator of sculpture and decorative arts at the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, Manfred Leithe-Jasper continues to serve on the boards of the Germanisches Nationalmuseum in Nürnberg and of the Fürstlich Liechtensteinschen Sammlungen in Vaduz and Vienna. Among his forthcoming publications is “European Bronzes from the Quentin Collection.”
The Northern and Southern Dynasties period of medieval China (398–589 C.E.) saw the first flowering of Chinese Buddhist art. Images were produced in any number of contemporary media, but surviving examples include small gilt-bronze or carved-stone “altarpieces,” large freestanding stone stelae, and rock-cut cave temples of various types. They are often dated by inscriptions which also include other information about the circumstances of their patronage, while the patrons themselves are often represented in the form of worshipper figures on the sculptures. Since these monuments were large, durable, and usually located in public places, they tend to be the best known and studied, at least since the birth of antiquarian studies in China in the tenth century.

My work at the Center has been to complete the writing of my dissertation, a study of the human figures depicted as worshippers on Buddhist votive sculptures produced in the Henan-Hebei-Shanxi region during the later Northern and Southern Dynasties period (495–577 C.E.). These worshipper images are an important source for the study of a number of subjects, including, in my case, the social significance of Buddhist art patronage in the Northern and Southern Dynasties. I am interested in this period as one in which the conquest of northern China by non-Chinese regimes led to the destabilization of certain traditional Chinese social structures and the introduction

KATE LINGLEY

Negotiating Identity: Social Aspects of Sixth-Century Buddhist Art Patronage
of non-Chinese customs and practices. Historical evidence suggests that various forms of social identity such as class, ethnicity, and gender were renegotiated in northern China during this period of political division. My work allows me to examine the ways in which the patrons’ identity is represented in worshipper figures as compared to other biographical sources of the time, and to understand the social significance of such representations.

The large number of surviving Buddhist votive sculptures means that it is relatively easy to generalize about broad patterns of art patronage in the period, but any attempt to move beyond this demands more intensive study of specific examples. My work consists of a series of detailed case studies of individual Buddhist patrons. These include a female patron from the non-Chinese aristocracy, who used the placement of her own image in the niche she dedicated to revise her subordinate status within her family; a group of patrons from the Chen clan who placed figures representing the elder members of their family in superior positions despite those members’ low official status; the wife of a minor military official, who appears at a single site in three different forms corresponding to three different aspects of patronage; and a late Northern Wei emperor, who is represented as patron of a cave temple by life-size images, not of himself, but of his parents.

Because little has so far been written on the social history of Chinese Buddhist art, the most productive theoretical and methodological models have come from other areas of art history. My residence at the Center has allowed me to complete my project in the company of colleagues from many other fields within the larger discipline, who have introduced me to a wide range of useful material. In particular, the literature on memory and authority in medieval European votive art, and a recent body of work on the archaeology of colonialism, have helped me to consider the ways in which the representations of Buddhist art patrons reflect and define a range of social roles in a period of social and cultural upheaval.

Traditional antiquarian scholarship during the imperial period (before 1911) focused almost exclusively on the inscriptions attached to these images as calligraphic exemplars. After 1911, however, it was Japanese scholars who conducted the first archaeological sur-
veys of Chinese (and Korean) Buddhist monuments, under the auspices of the Japanese colonial administration. Both Japanese and Western twentieth-century studies tend to be interested either in tracing the transmission of styles and motifs across mainland Asia, or in identifying the scriptural sources of sculptural iconography, in order to ascribe particular sculptures to the schools of Buddhism known to later practice. Chinese studies after 1949 were similarly concerned with stylistic transmission and textual sources, but rather in the context of Marxist historical determinism. It is only since about 1980 that scholars in China, Japan, and the West have begun to concern themselves with issues of the patronage and social context of these images. The present study is a contribution to the ongoing project of investigating the circumstances in which medieval Chinese Buddhist images were produced, the motivations of the patrons who chose to be depicted on them, and the function of such representations within their social milieu.

[The University of Chicago]
Ittleson Fellow, 2002–2004

Kate Lingley will assume a position as assistant professor in the department of art and art history at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.
ALISON S. LOCKE

Visuality and Experience in the Twelfth-Century Church of Castel Sant’Elia near Nepi (Viterbo)

The twelfth-century Benedictine church of Castel Sant’Elia stands, together with the scant remains of its monastic precinct, in a picturesque ravine approximately forty kilometers north of Rome. The part-Roman, part-Lombard structure still retains most of its Romanesque fresco program, featuring one of the earliest Apocalypse cycles in Italy, three portals demarcated by marble reliefs, liturgical furnishings, and a cosmati pavement. Previous research on the monument has focused almost exclusively on the stylistic and iconographic genealogies of its frescoes. While this work has identified important connections with Roman painting c. 1100–1130, the implications of these connections have not been sufficiently explored, and significant questions concerning the content, placement, and function of the frescoes remain unasked. The few studies of the architecture and sculpture of the church demonstrate a similar concern with dating and milieu, yet, paradoxically, consideration of its restoration history is almost nonexistent. In short, there has been no serious scholarly attempt to provide an understanding of Castel Sant’Elia as it appeared and as it functioned, visually, spatially, and culturally, within its twelfth-century context.

Close investigation of the building fabric and of twentieth-century restoration reports revealed that the triumphal arch set on columns at the head of the nave and the north portal are modern,
suggesting that the 1856 restoration was more “stylistic” than previously understood and casting as-yet-unresolved doubts upon the authenticity of the liturgical furnishings. A careful survey of relevant medieval documents led to the discovery of errors in the literature and of new references to the monastery, while the reading of archaeological reports from contemporaneous sites offered potential evolutionary patterns for the church. This research enables me to write a tenable historical and architectural chronology. My hypothesis is that the current basilica replaced one that had received a pulpit and ciborium during ninth-century liturgical reforms. Construction in a northern idiom began in the late eleventh century, with the intent of enlarging the church to accommodate pilgrimage; before the project was completed, a new wave of reform emanated from Rome, bringing with it an architecture inspired by early Christianity. The extant church preserves this latter moment in its ground plan, the cosmatesque ciborium, and the finishing on the exterior of the transept.

Unquestionably, many aspects of the frescoes are also of Roman origin. The apse—featuring Christ flanked by the prophet Elijah, saints Paul and Peter, and a fourth, unidentified, figure above a frieze of lamb-Apostles—has long been associated with typical Roman compositions: the framing system of the Apocalypse sequence can be related to Old Saint Peter’s; and the hemicycle program centers on a fresco of the Madonna della Clemenza, the famous Trasteveran icon. This last has spurred me to investigate the problem of frescoed icons within larger painted programs. Whereas the compositional elements bespeak Roman models, the subject of the Apocalypse is unprecedented in Roman narrative painting; it may have been selected as an appropriately visionary pendant to the life of the prophet Elijah, on the western transept wall. Unlike at the Petrine basilica and its descendants, where framed narrative scenes lined the nave walls, at Castel Sant’Elia the medieval frescoes were restricted to the clerical space of the transept. This very un-Roman contrast of painted choir with unpainted nave allowed the monks to open their church to pilgrims even as they emphasized its primary function as a monastic space, a situation analogous to that proposed by Marcia Kupfer for churches in central France. Some images, however, were made
for the laity and its restricted viewing positions: for instance, at the head of the south aisle appears the miraculous death of the community’s founder, Saint Anastasius. These scenes, attesting to the antiquity and sanctity of the monastery, would have been seen by pilgrims as they entered the crypt to venerate his relics.

The façade offers a similar message. Although the north portal, with its spectacular display of Carolingian ciborium fragments, is modern, the central and the south entries mix Carolingian elements with twelfth-century carvings often inspired by earlier medieval or early Christian motifs. An assertion of connections to Rome may also be seen here, for an inscription (now eroded) dating the marbles to the time of Pope Gregory IV (827–844) was preserved in the central portal.

Linked to these expressions of Roman allegiance was a more general concept of continuity between past and present: from frescoes to portals, the basilica of Sant’Elia mirrors the Christian faith in its combination of elements accrued over a long history into something modern. The role of antique and paleo-Christian artifacts in this admixture is a topic much discussed, but the function of altomedievale material has yet to be evaluated. Such reuse, seen in façades and campaniles across central Italy, opens onto questions of contemporary antiquarianism, aesthetics, and uses of memory that will be the subject of a future study.

[Yale University]
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“Monstris marinis”: Sea Creatures of the Venetian Renaissance

The sculpture and decorative arts of Renaissance Venice teem with sea monsters. Beginning with the decoration of early printed books around 1470, Venetian artists who set out to adapt antique imagery to the modern world turned repeatedly to the theme of marine hybrids. Chief among these are graceful creatures human from the waist up, but with the lower body and tail of a fish, dolphin, or sea serpent. Other mammals, denizens of the fields and forests, such as horses, bulls, goats, and panthers, also swim through Venetian art in finned and fish-tailed forms. Pietro Lombardo (c. 1435–1515), head of a leading Venetian architectural and sculptural workshop, reported to a patron in 1486 on the completion of a stone sarcophagus decorated with reliefs of “foyaminibus monstris marinis et aquila [leaves, sea monsters, and an eagle].” The monsters in question, two pensive boy sea-centaurs, can still be seen on the Zanetto tomb in Treviso Cathedral.

Marine hybrids, ancient types by no means confined to Venice in the Renaissance, had a natural relevance for a city whose life and preeminence depended on the sea. My study focuses on the imaginative and poetic approach artists brought to their portrayals of these creatures that make them, even in subordinate or decorative positions, some of the most engaging creations of the Renaissance in Venice, as well as in its subject city Padua, often embodying ideas
that go beyond the generic one of reviving the antique. I am not attempting a complete catalogue, but rather will concentrate on five functional contexts that gave artists the opportunity and inspiration to produce some of the best examples. For mnemonic purposes, the chapters on these contexts are tentatively entitled “Tome” (book decoration of the 1470s); “Tomb” (funerary monuments of the 1480s and 1490s); “Temple” (church decoration of the same years); “Triumph” (public, civic settings in early sixteenth-century Venice and palaces of powerful mainland employers of Venetian artists); and “Table” (Paduan small bronzes for private, domestic settings in the early sixteenth century, including several in the collections of the National Gallery of Art). The proposed book would be generously illustrated with photographs that bring out the ingenious conceptions and superb craftsmanship.

Central to this project, and in large part its inspiration, are the four famous marble reliefs of male and female sea hybrids accompanied by putti on the bases of the triumphal arch piers in Santa Maria dei Miracoli. They originated in the workshop of Pietro Lombardo, who designed the building and oversaw its construction beginning in 1481. In a church resplendent with antiquarian ornament, these reliefs, probably conceived and in part executed by Pietro’s sons Tullio and Antonio, transcend their decorative function. The figures and their interactions suggest meanings related to their place in this uniquely Venetian shrine to a miraculous image of the Virgin. Allusions to the struggle between sensual and spiritual longings emerge in their movements and gestures, sometimes subtle, sometimes emphatic, drawing a viewer who moves through the church into the sea hybrids’ conflicted world. Even in their present worn condition, the beauty and emotional charge of these reliefs invite consideration of the terms of their invention and an exploration of their sources, siblings, and successors. They also make clear the prominent role of the Lombardo family in developing the imagery of fantastic sea creatures.

At the Center I worked especially on a fundamental chapter on the visual and conceptual heritage available to Venetian artists who represented marine hybrids. Images from the ancient world that may have offered inspiration could be found on painted pottery, carved
gems, wall paintings, floor mosaics, architectural friezes, and especially funerary sculpture, both Roman and Etruscan. Evidence has accumulated, however, that the Venetian sea creatures, far from being straightforward antiquarian borrowings, owed much to medieval transmission and adaptation of ancient ideas. The means of such transmission included bestiaries, ecclesiastical sculpture, and manuscript illumination. By demonstrating how such fraught subjects as the mermaid, alternately called Scylla and siren, were handed down and variously interpreted, I hope to shed light on what Venetian artists set out to do, what they actually accomplished, and what it meant to their audience.

National Gallery of Art
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Walter Crane (1845–1915), painter, decorative artist, art theorist, and active socialist, was one of the most important figures in Victorian culture. For his contemporaries, Crane’s artistic practice embodied the ethos of Arts and Crafts eclecticism. As painter Sir William Rothenstein (1872–1945) recalled in 1931, “He was illustrator, painter, designer, craftsman, and sculptor by turn; he poured out designs for books, tapestries, stained glass, wallpapers, damask, and cotton fabrics . . . he could do anything he wanted, or anyone else wanted.”

The history of art, however, has remembered Crane almost exclusively as an illustrator. Considered innovative in both form and content, his children’s books continue to attract critical attention and appraisal. Yet this concentration on a single strand of Crane’s long and diverse career leaves his larger body of work unexamined, including allegorical paintings such as his nearly forgotten *The Renaissance of Venus* (1877), that occupied a central position in his art.

The aim of my project is thus twofold: to obtain a more complete picture of Crane’s work as a painter and to offer an interpretation of this practice. The Chester Dale Fellowship has allowed me both to continue my archival research on Crane’s life and to work and travel in search of his paintings. *The Renaissance of Venus* in the Tate Britain is one of few Crane paintings in public collections worldwide.

For many, Crane’s canvases have been taken to represent the mis-
guided ambition of a talented designer. While allied to the Aesthetic movement and its espousal of “art for art’s sake,” Crane is criticized for his insistence on mythological subjects and moral meaning that drew upon a different, and deeply unfashionable, academic tradition of didactic history painting. Alternately, scholars of the Arts and Crafts tradition have questioned Crane’s commitment to that movement. His pursuit of acclaim as a painter seemingly compromised his status as a champion of decorative art, while his political identity as a vocal socialist can, at first glance, appear secondary and separate from his artistic production: *The Renaissance of Venus*, for example, appears to be an elitist and conservative gesture that contradicts the artist’s professed socialism.

On one hand, this work could be viewed as a history painting envisaged by Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723–1792) in his *Discourses* (1769–1791), the founding manifesto of academic art in Britain: drawing from a timeless, idealized past, elevated through references to old masters, with an inspirational meaning that addressed the rebirth of art. On the other, Crane’s *Venus* is also a radical subversion of history painting: the rough canvas, flattened perspective, and experimental mixture of oil and tempera announce the painting’s status as a decorative object. Like Reynolds, Crane believed in the ameliorative and public function of painting. Yet for Crane, painting achieves this goal when it is considered a decorative art, echoing a position first voiced by John Ruskin (1819–1900) in an 1859 lecture on manufacture and design. Although he is often cast as a reactionary enemy of advanced art, Ruskin was here making radical claims for the status and importance of decorative painting a decade before James McNeill Whistler’s (1834–1903) *Nocturnes*: “Raphael’s best doing is merely the wall-coloring of a suite of apartments in the Vatican.” Crane’s work as a painter, I contend, did not exist in isolation from his career as a designer and illustrator. Rather, he constructed a dynamic exchange among his various fields of production, as he envisioned a world where both wallpaper and painting, for example, could be beautiful things in form as well as content.

Further, I argue that Crane’s paintings, executed throughout his career in concert with his decorative work and political activism, emerge as radical statements that destabilize the codification of “fine
arts” and “decorative arts” to politicize the detached aesthetic object. Crane endowed “painting as a decorative art” with the moral weight of “painting as fine art,” and, in doing so, he gave “art for art’s sake” a political subject. In examining the decorative and political contexts of painting such as The Renaissance of Venus, I detail a new and different understanding of the relationship between painting and decoration by revealing the contested nature of the designation “decorative art” during the late nineteenth century. This examination of Crane’s work and the emergent discourse of decorative painting repositions the relationship between art and politics even as it posits a decorative alternative to social-realist painting.

[Yale University]
Chester Dale Fellow, 2002–2003

For the 2003–2004 academic year, Morna O’Neill was awarded a Yale University Whiting Prize Dissertation Fellowship, during which time she completed her dissertation. She assumes a position as postdoctoral research associate at the Yale Center for British Art.
AMY POWELL

Repeated Forms: Rogier van der Weyden’s *Descent from the Cross* and Its “Copies”

The Descent from the Cross represents the moment when Joseph of Arimathea, having received permission from Pontius Pilate, begins the difficult task of removing Christ’s body from the Cross. It is an event in the narrative of Christ’s Passion; but Rogier van der Weyden (c. 1398/1400–1464) pictured it less as a narrative unfolding than as a stilled moment of presentation. As the main altarpiece for the chapel of the Greater Crossbowmen’s guild of Louvain, Our Lady Outside the Walls, Rogier’s *Descent from the Cross* served as the backdrop for the Mass from the time it was commissioned around 1430/1435 to its purchase by Mary of Hungary about 1548. During this time Rogier’s image of Christ’s body would have been seen in daily proximity to the Holy Sacrament during the Elevation.

Viewing the Host was the climactic moment of Mass—the *manducatio per visum*—for congregants who only infrequently received communion. What people felt they saw in viewing the Host is one of the more perplexing questions of late-medieval scholarship. According to doctrine, the Host was the real presence of Christ, in its every part, both the body and blood of the Savior. Although there are numerous late medieval images and tales in which the Eucharist miraculously becomes the living Christ Child or Man of Sorrows, for the average witness to the Elevation, Christ’s body would have remained veiled behind the appearance of a white wafer. Those who
saw Mass performed in front of Rogier’s Descent would therefore have seen a transubstantiated wafer held before a luminous, nearly life-size, painted image of Christ—a superimposition of two very different “images” of God.

The Host and altarpiece, however, only begin to account for the representations of God that existed around the altar. Crucifixes appeared on or above many altars. The celebrant (the priest or bishop officiating at the Mass), repeating Christ’s words at the Last Supper—Hoc est corpus meum (This is my body)—became himself an image of Christ, not only through his utterances and actions but also by virtue of the crucifix embroidered on his chasuble. In most late medieval churches images could also be found in the form of freestanding sculptures, on decorated rood screens, stained glass, and architectural carvings. If we leave the immediate area of the altar, the number of images of Christ continues to grow to include portal sculptures, the cruciform layout of the church itself, and even the body of the pope, the vicarius Christi.

In his Descent, Rogier seems to anticipate the multiplicity of signs that surrounds the altar, by creating a strangely doubled image. As Christ is removed from the cross, the Virgin collapses into a posture parallel to that of her son. The parallel bodies of the Virgin and Christ suggest the absence of a unique or even primary image of the Godhead, invoking the Incarnation as an imprinting onto, or descent of Spirit into, the material world that is inherently multiple. By making the Virgin a second, competing focal point, Rogier divides the image of Christ even within the frame of his painting.

In his seminal article of 1953, Otto von Simson interpreted this parallel as an illustration of the Virgin’s compassion at the foot of the cross. He concluded that the viewer could look to Rogier’s painting as an exemplum for how to live his or her own life in accordance with Christ’s. Von Simson’s interpretation has received resounding confirmation since its publication, being one of the most frequently cited texts in discussions of Rogier’s Descent. I reinterpret the parallel instead as a “splitting” of the image of the divinity between the figures of the Virgin and Christ. Rather than being an “original” image, which models a relationship of resemblance (between the Virgin and Christ and in turn between the viewer and Christ), Rogier’s
parallel figures can be seen as a bracketing of an absent original.

In my dissertation, completed during the year of my fellowship, this interpretation of Rogier’s *Descent* serves as a basis for considering some of the many “copies” that were made of it in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Rogier’s painting provides what I take to be a methodological lesson for the study of the phenomenon of artistic “copying” insofar as that image resists being easily categorized as a stable model. By frustrating the expectation for a singular image of God, Rogier’s *Descent* requires that we treat its progeny less as copies of a fixed form than as repetitions of an ever-elusive one.

[Harvard University]
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The history I am writing is, in large part, an interpretive survey of attitudes and practices that begins in the founding years of the American republic. Having once made this material from the past accessible, however, my goal is also to invite history to illuminate the contemporary dynamics of public religious display at the beginning of the twenty-first century. As an art historian, I am interested in the ways religion is visually articulated in the American landscape. As a historian of American culture, I am concerned with changing notions of plural religions in the United States, from the eighteenth century’s competing sectarian Protestantisms to the twentieth century’s global migration of world faiths. The public display of religion, firmly lodged between the establishment and free exercise clauses of the First Amendment, is not just something that many people do and see, it is also a constitutive, and frequently contested, dimension of American visual culture. My research carefully examines the debates surrounding government funding, property, and supervision—but does not stop there. Instead, it goes on to consider the visible effects of disestablishment’s constitutional sibling, the free exercise clause. As legal scholar Leonard W. Levy has pointed out, disestablishment notwithstanding, “religion saturates American public life.” My book analyzes the visible contexts and attributes of this public saturation over time.
I have deliberately selected the word “display” in order to describe the widest possible range of experiences while still emphasizing the explicitly visual character of my subject. “Art,” for example, as one category of display, occupies an important and particular place in the public pictorial representation of religion. But for this project’s purposes, art is part of a larger whole constituted by numerous modes of visual communication. I explore the shape and impact of religious broadsides, posters, and signage; the performance of open-air camp meetings and outdoor celebrations (Methodist gatherings in the nineteenth century, for example, and Cambodian-American Buddhist New Year’s observances in the twenty-first); the exterior design and siting of religious buildings (a Hindu temple in the Maryland suburbs, a Muslim Community Center sharing a prominent street corner with Ukrainian Orthodox and Disciples of Christ churches); traveling exhibitions of religious fine art (like Emanuel Leutze’s [1816–1868] *The Iconoclasts* of 1846 and the nineteenth-century genre of large-scale biblical and religious oil panoramas); public sculpture and statues (Augustus Saint-Gaudens’ [1848-1907] *The Puritan* and Rosalie Pelby’s [1793–1857] decades-earlier displays of life-size wax figures representing biblical stories and civic virtues); religious images in public facilities (the Capitol Rotunda murals, the figure of Muhammad in the United States Supreme Court frieze, and John Singer Sargent’s [1856–1925] *Triumph of Religion* at the Boston Public Library); bodily adornment; and the creation of “spontaneous” memorials like those marking roadside accident sites or recollecting victims of the attacks of 11 September 2001. I am writing, in other words, about the phenomenon named in my book’s title: “Religion in Plain View.”

My purpose, in both the historical and contemporary aspects of my work, is twofold. First, I delineate the public display of religion as a category of visual experience open to both academic and civic inquiry. The increasing insistence and frequency with which religious questions, phrasings, and accusations have surfaced in contentions over art and public funding—witness Jesse Helms’ 1989 castigation of artist Andres Serrano’s (b. 1950) work as “blasphemy” in the volley that sparked the culture wars of the 1990s, and the more recent charges of similar trespass leveled at Chris Ofili’s (b. 1968) *Holy Vir-
gin Mary by Rudolph Giuliani in relation to the Brooklyn Museum of Art’s 1999 Sensations exhibition—indicate the timeliness of this study. Second, beyond display’s visual character, my book also considers the kinds of conversations that take place in a display’s literal and remembered presence. Display assists the generation of social spaces for cultural negotiations about individual and collective identities. It is these negotiations, and their roles in shaping visual and mental landscapes over time, that perhaps most fundamentally describe my subject. I am especially interested in the uses and roles of religious variety. (The question of religious “difference” certainly occupied the Protestant painter of The Iconoclasts and his critics, who did not fail to note that, in a period of nativist anti-Catholic agitation: “All the poetry of the picture is, of course, with the Catholics.”) The concluding sections of my book analyze the multiplication of plural religious signs subsequent to the relaxation of immigration regulations in 1965, positing for this public arithmetic of diversity a visual dilution of Christian claims to normative civic status. This assertion does not imply real acceptance or even necessarily toleration of difference, as continuing acts of antisemitism and the desecration of Muslim religious architecture, for example, suggest, but religious pluralism in the United States is no longer something people practice, in large part, in private, hidden from (and sometimes even hidden in) plain view.
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Painting is singular among the visual arts in evoking the immense scale of an imaginary terrain. *Panoramic Landscape with Scattered Hermitages* (c. 1597), a little picture by Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568–1625), is a breathtaking example of the painter’s skill in manipulating distance and scale. We observe in the format of this work on copper the ways in which the painter allowed for the narration of a long journey; travelers cross a stone bridge as they leave a large city for a trek into the wilderness. We are not sure whether they traversed the mountainous landscape that lies beyond a lofty citadel, but we admire the expertise with which the painter brushed the imperceptible transition from earth to sky in the recession of blue mountain ranges. Further on, the travelers face the passage across a natural arch in order to reach an abbey nestled on the rocky summit on the other side. How is the traveler to descend from there to the hermitage on a rocky ledge below? The lowering of a rope by one of its inhabitants suggests the precarious nature of his abode. A richly foliated tree, miraculously rising from the rocky floor, reflects the morning light, as does the rocky face below. Nearby, a ladder leads to the rushing stream that bisects this hermitage landscape or Thebaid. Named after the region in Upper Egypt where Christian hermitage began, the Thebaid came to stand for any place where hermits congregate to pursue the solitary life. Down below, another hermit sets

---

*Jan Brueghel the Elder, Panoramic Landscape with Scattered Hermitages, c. 1597. Pinacoteca Ambrosiana, Milan. Photograph: courtesy of the Biblioteca Ambrosiana*
foot on a low bridge that brings him to the dwelling of a fellow hermit, whose hermitage is doubly marked: first by the curved length of an extraordinarily tall tree, second by a shingle advertising his address. A billy goat alludes to the passions that piety in the wilderness aims to tame. Finally, the visual journey brings us to the most remote location within this hermitage-dotted landscape, which at the same time is closest to our privileged view. There, a bearded sage displays utter devotion at the opening of his simple hut. But the true highlight of this eremitical idyll is the meticulously painted garden imagery at the pictorial sill. The spade set to rest in the soil denotes the pleasure of repose. The desert is converted into paradise as we discover in ascending order, an artichoke plant, flowering ground cover, a melon, a basket of fruit, and assorted flowers, including the *corona imperialis*, a prized cultivar that distinguished the Brussels court.

With what we know about the circumstances of its production, it is clear that this picture did not spontaneously spring from the painter’s mind. Rather, I contend, it was conceived as a compendium of familiar motifs that enrich the literature on the solitary life. The picture was sent as a token of esteem to Brueghel’s patron and protector, Cardinal Federico Borromeo (1564–1632), archbishop of Milan. Groomed to be one of a new crop of highly placed prelates promoting Catholic reform, Borromeo devoted his career to instructing others to perfect themselves by cultivating moments of religious repose. He strongly advocated the use of canonical, yet novel, pictorial images as analogues of meditative prayer. Cardinal Borromeo found in two young Flemings the perfect purveyors of a wide range of pictorial genres that would fit the bill: Paul Bril (1554–1626) and Jan Brueghel. Both take important positions in the history of landscape painting. The former, living in Rome, paved the way for the landscape vision of Claude Lorrain (1600–1682); the latter, in Antwerp, was the brilliant inventor of pictures that situate the humanist topic of the human condition on the roads and river landings of his native Brabant. What has been overlooked is the fact that both painters took their cues from Borromeo. One room in the Pinacoteca Ambrosiana, Milan, commemorates this debt to their shared patron. Here we find Brueghel’s precious *Thebaid* in the company of eleven other landscapes, each as delightful and redolent with meaning as
the picture at hand. Similarly, Paul Bril contributed his own versions of landscapes (seven in all) that take repose as their theme.

Although Borromeo’s role in the formulation of new, yet canonical, pictorial genres has previously been examined, I argue that this single room in the Ambrosiana also speaks volumes about the relationship between landscape and the apologetics of religious repose.

Baltimore

Leopoldine Prosperetti teaches at the University of Maryland Baltimore County, where she is writing a book based on her dissertation.
Fontana in Piazza Colonna
Architect: Giacomo della Porta.
Between 1562 and 1644, after struggling for a thousand years with finite water resources, Rome was transformed from an essentially medieval city into a baroque one. The restoration of three ancient aqueducts during this period played a regenerative role, creating a Rome that was now awash with pure drinking water; concurrently, scores of new public fountains were built to distribute the water. My research this year examined various ways in which these new fountains were employed to optimize urban development in areas where water could be delivered, and to understand how water became a commodity for social control, economic development, and political domination. I examined the fountains through several lenses, topographic, social, technological, and contextual: that is, where they were sited and why; who sponsored them and whom they served; how they worked; and where they fit within Roman urban water infrastructure as a whole. In most studies the fountains are seen as little more than urban ornaments. Here, they emerge as the most visually prominent features of a new, largely hidden, physical order, built upon an integrated water infrastructure system that included aqueducts, conduits, distribution tanks, and sewers. This order existed at the scale of the neighborhood and of the city, as water infrastructure provided an armature with which to organize and control public space, perhaps for the first time since antiquity.
Between the pontificates of Pius V (1562–1570) and Urban VIII (1623–1644), popes, cardinals, and other influential citizens, acting on behalf of themselves, the papacy, or the communal government, pursued aggressive policies to restore ancient aqueducts and build new fountains with the intent of using water infrastructure as a tool to return Rome to its former grandeur, to solidify papal prestige, to shift existing settlement patterns, to stimulate economic development, and to improve public health. Three gravity-flow aqueducts were constructed during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Each tapped ancient sources and restored ancient routes: the Acqua Vergine (the Aqua Virgo restored by Pius V from 1566 to 1570), the Acqua Felice (the Aqua Alexandrina restored by Sixtus V from 1585–1587), and the Acqua Paola (the Aqua Traiana restored by Paul V from 1607–1612).

Because the distribution system relied on gravity, water flowed continuously into the city, where it needed either to be used or to be disposed of efficiently. More than simply providing a technical solution to an infrastructure problem, the reintroduction of these water resources spurred dynamic changes that profoundly influenced urban development in late Cinquecento and early Seicento Rome. Fountains, where water was displayed, used, and enjoyed, became the focal points of public spaces, and in some cases they were essential physical and symbolic linchpins for urban development, as at the Piazza del Popolo. Further transformations ensued, including the restoration of ancient sewers and the construction of new sewer lines that linked to them, which allowed for the flushing of excess water and neighborhood waste. Each fountain marked a nexus between the parallel public and subterranean worlds of water, since wherever water revealed itself above ground in a fountain, access had to be created to a new sewer branch concealed below ground. Streets and piazzas were also regraded and paved in order to lead water to the sewers, to protect the hidden conduits and drains, and to embellish the growing number of piazzas that housed the new fountains.

As water resources grew more abundant, a sophisticated hierarchy of allocation developed—from display, to drinking, to industry, to sewers—that recalled ancient distribution systems. Water was carefully channeled to single- and multipurpose public fountains,
including drinking fountains and animal troughs, as well as to some influential private users. A model of efficiency, run-off water was used either for irrigation or was diverted to the new fulling and laundry fountains before flushing the new and restored sewers. Not surprisingly, many of the public fountains were located directly in front of the palaces of important cardinals, including those who were in charge of the aqueducts. Although their design and construction was administered by a papal congregation, the fountains were often paid for, at least in part, by the public through consumption taxes levied on everything from wine to meat. In addition to the obvious private benefit to the cardinals, such as easy access to water for their palaces, proximity to a fountain was an index of, and reflection upon, the importance of a cardinal and his family, his status within the papal court, and his role in bringing water to Rome. The fountain also expressed the Renaissance idea of magnificenza or public virtue. Paradoxically, less than half of the water was available for public use, as these same persons were able to control the private distribution of water, often as a means to repay debts, solidify alliances, and secure favors. Yet, at times the cardinals’ ability to control water was trumped by the law of gravity and the specifics of topography, both of which limited water delivery. As water supplies increased, architects, engineers, and supervisors of the streets gained a greater understanding of the physical properties of water, hydraulic technology, geology, and Roman topography. This growing technical knowledge underlay many urban planning and design decisions; at times it was used to shape or transform the political or social agendas of individuals—such as papal and civic officials—and organizations that controlled water distribution.

Rome
Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow, 2003–2004

Katherine Wentworth Rinne has received a fellowship from the National Science Foundation to continue archival research on water infrastructure in Rome.
The palaces of the rulers of Assyria and Persia were often extensively adorned with finely carved and painted images depicting the king and his court, as well as scenes of hunting and warfare and various supernatural beings. In addition, some scenes on glazed brick façades and on bronze door panels have survived, evidence of a remarkably rich corpus of artistic production between the ninth and the fourth centuries B.C.E. This is part of a tradition that goes back to the beginning of civilization, when, for the first time, rulers of cities such as Uruk in southern Mesopotamia chose to represent themselves and their deeds in carved stone; it continued until classical Greek artistic concepts were introduced into the Near East following the conquests of Alexander.

In these palaces of the first millennium B.C.E. many scenes were repeated several times in a single room, and similar scenes were carved not only in different rooms of the same building but also in palaces of different periods. Minor variations in the repeated figures allow one to determine which were due to the idiosyncrasies of the craftsmen (sometimes leading to the identification of the different “hands” at work), which to changes in design, and which to the aesthetic preferences of the designers. When only a single example of a composition has survived, it is usually impossible to identify the reasons why a certain feature was depicted in a particular way.
During my time at the Center I studied such details in order to formulate some general principles governing the creation of these works and in some cases to get closer to the creative processes at work. For example, various objects are normally shown in their most characteristic form; thus, legs are shown in side view and heads are depicted in profile, but, as in Egyptian art, the eye is shown frontally. While this simplified the creation of the work for the artist and its comprehension by the observer, the effect can sometimes appear to our modern eyes as somewhat ludicrous. For example, the head of a courtier conversing with the man behind him may have his head turned to face backward while his torso faces forward. This convention also limits the number of acceptable postures for living human beings and animals, though a greater range of possibilities was allowed for corpses.

Another way in which the artists made the compositions more readable was to avoid having one figure obscure another. Thus soldiers crossing a wooded landscape are shown between, and not overlapping, the trees. When figures do overlap, they are often in identical postures with only minor variations, such as the head of one animal being lowered or the weapons of one soldier being held at a different angle.

For the sake of clarity and comprehensibility the most important
elements were typically shown complete and unobscured by other elements of the scene, thus appearing to us to be in the foreground (accustomed as we are to superposition indicating nearness to the observer), when in fact the logic of the composition indicates that this would not be the case. For example, in scenes showing dead lions being carried back from the hunt, as many as six servants unrealistically appear on the “far” side of the lion’s body and none are shown between the lion and the observer. Similarly, sometimes when a scaling ladder is shown, the attacking soldiers appear to be climbing up the underside of the ladder, giving an Escher-like quality to the composition.

Scale, too, was used in order to make clear the content of the scene. A longstanding convention in the ancient Near East was to depict the king larger than his courtiers and his enemies in what has been called hierarchic scaling, thus immediately identifying the most important personage. But this was not the only criterion determining the scale of the figures where other principles were also at work. Sometimes, for the sake of clarity, figures may be of different sizes, thus a groom standing “behind” a horse may be shown at a larger scale than the horse so that less of him is obscured by the horse’s body and the human figure remains easily recognizable. There was as well a tendency to draw figures on a single ground line, and reliefs often consisted of registers each the height of one human being. In a few cases the artists were able to circumvent this restriction by carving a scene set on water or against a mountainous background. There was also a desire to fill the available field, so that a soldier attacking a fortified city was shown taller than the fortification and the dying, or about-to-be-defeated, defenders appear as if they would hardly reach the knees of their attackers. A further consequence of this convention is that sometimes figures climbing a staircase or descending from a citadel are shown at different scales. Thus, at Persepolis one may see giants climbing the stairs behind dwarves, and at Nineveh, in the depiction of the Assyrian capture of a city, one may see figures appearing larger as they descend the ramp from the city gate, in this case giving the unintentional illusion of the use of perspective.

Some of these conventions may seem awkward to us, but there
is no reason to think that, for example, showing hills upside down and trees growing downward in the lower part of the scene as the Assyrian army marched through a mountain valley would have struck a contemporary spectator as absurd. The skilled artists who decorated the palaces were not confined by the straitjacket imposed by modern mechanical ideas of perspective and were able to create images that, using their own logical framework, vividly illustrated the world in which they lived.

Institut für Vorderasiatische Archäologie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow, 1 November–31 December 2003

*Michael Roaf returns to his position as professor of Near Eastern archaeology at the Institut für Vorderasiatische Archäologie, Munich.*
In the years following World War II, Italian architecture and town planning showed particular attention to examples imported from the United States. The “American model” became a reference for many Italian designers, planners, and critics. Undoubtedly American postwar intervention in Italy provided ample institutional support for this process of dissemination: in fact, among the various initiatives sustained by the Americans were publications, exhibitions, and technical exchanges concerning architecture, planning, and civil engineering, as well as housing programs. Nonetheless, the relationship between Italy and the United States was nonlinear: models brought from America were rarely adopted without alteration, and occasionally they met with some resistance. On the other side, the Americanization of Italian architecture was counterbalanced by a somewhat acritical discovery of Italy by American architects. The outcome of these two competing dynamics was an ambiguous yet extremely influential relationship.

The difficulty of the exchange is well illustrated by the fact that architectural and planning models of American origin faced rejection or were subject to hybridization when transferred to Italy; in addition, some projects sponsored by American agencies and based on American examples provoked significant criticism on the American side once they were implemented by Italian designers. Such is
the case of the *villaggio*, or planned community, of La Martella. Built between 1951 and 1954 in the southern region of Basilicata as part of the housing program of the United States–funded United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration–Comitato Amministrativo Soccorso ai Senzatetto (UNRRA-CASAS), La Martella referred distantly to the American debate on regionalism of the 1930s. When it was completed, United States officials criticized the project for being “... based almost entirely on theoretical considerations with insufficient thought as to what was actually required.” Ultimately, the architectural relationship between Italy and the United States remained inconclusive as American models in Italy were subject to deviations and resistance while Italian models exported to the United States were rarely received with a full understanding of their origins and theoretical principles.

The focus of my research is not the compilation of a complete history of the relationship between Italy and the United States in the postwar years; rather, I intend to discuss the general issue of the exchange between countries or cultures in different conditions of power. It is for these reasons that my study has been structured around a series of points of theoretical relevance. For instance, I address the question of the role played by some “actors of the circulation”; that is, by some institutions and individuals whose activity initiated and
promoted the process of exchange. Especially important is the consideration of the presence of “local mediators,” particularly in relation to the reception of American architecture in Italy. In fact, if the government instigated the dissemination of models and examples, it was the response to these initiatives that made possible their propagation. Within the process of the exchange, foreign models assumed symbolic connotations that often surpassed their functional purposes: such is the case of the “mediation” both of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright (1867–1959) by the architect and critic Bruno Zevi (b. 1918) and of the principles of American planning by the Italian Institute of Town Planning (INU). Interestingly, the phenomenon of the local appropriation of architectural knowledge for nationally oriented functions characterized Italy and the United States as well, although the latter to a lesser degree. Also, the chronological context in which the research is situated has important implications. Between the 1930s and the 1960s, both American and Italian societies experienced a dramatic growth in material and cultural consumption. The effect of these transformations altered the dynamics of the inter-Atlantic exchange. The inevitable outcome was that the process of importation and exportation of cultural models increased: not only did the quantity of exchanged information grow, but also the process of assimilation became more effective.

My time at the Center proved to be particularly fruitful for research. Findings at the Library of Congress allowed me to complete an investigation of the institutional involvement of the United States in Italy in the postwar years, based on access to governmental publications and other materials that are hard to locate elsewhere. Even more successful was my research at the National Archives: there I was able to uncover documents concerning various aspects of the relationship between Italy and the United States, such as United States-funded housing programs, technical missions, conferences, and the exchange of scholars.

My goals are to reconsider the means and effects of the circulation of cultural and formal models, to analyze the ways in which these models are developed in one context and then transformed when transferred in a new one, and to examine the forms of the exchange of knowledge in architecture. These are by no means ques-
tions that are limited to the exchange of architectural ideas, models, and images between Italy and the United States.

University of Toronto
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, 1 July–31 August 2003

Paolo Scrivano resumes his position as assistant professor in the department of fine art at the University of Toronto, where he will continue to work on a book on the postwar exchange between Italy and the United States.
Throughout the nineteenth century, French artists and writers found a multiplicity of ways of expressing the oneness of humans with nature. This was not only a matter of art, but a broad cultural phenomenon, manifested in every sphere of contemporary life, for example, to embody distinctions of class and gender, and of conservative and reformist or “leftist” political positions. The central ambition in my book is to understand this desired—and sometimes feared—union between the human body and the natural world.

My interest in what I call “the dream of the body as nature” began as an examination of the survival of the classical myths of metamorphosis in the century of modernity. This research developed into an examination of the relationship between images of the metamorphoses of humans into trees, water, earth, and flowers and the social transformations brought about by capitalism, industrialization, the growth of cities, the massive exploitation of the earth, and by the new natural sciences. Rather than weakening as modernity became dominant, the imagined fusion of the human body with nature became more pronounced as the century advanced, reaching a final paroxysm in symbolist art in the late 1880s and 1890s.

There were, however, many who rejected organicism and who insisted on the inevitable reality of the “second nature” created by humans. Charles Baudelaire (1821–1867) gave eloquent voice to this
view with his insistence on the transcendent artifices of modernity, however perverse. In painting there was a constant tension between the organic and the inorganic—for example, between Gustave Courbet’s (1819–1877) paintings of women bathers and Edouard Manet’s (1832–1883) *Olympia* (1865; Musée d’Orsay, Paris), the epitome of Baudelaire’s “cold and sterile woman,” the prostitute, emblem of the modern city.

My project is informed by ecological, social, and cultural history, by gender studies and psychoanalysis, and it insists on the primacy of the meanings embodied in the pictorial image. I want, for example, to understand the difference of meaning between paintings of female bathers, where strong contours isolate the body from water, and those where broken brushstrokes or patches of light and shadow melt the body into the water.

My first chapter traces the history of the interconnections between the natural sciences and social, literary, and artistic cultures. I do not argue that the natural sciences directly influenced the arts (though this could also happen); rather, I hypothesize a shared cultural context that fostered analogous scientific and cultural manifestations, thus enabling artists and writers to imagine society as a living organism and the human body as sharing the physiology of other animals and plants. Such notions coincided with a fundamental change in the conceptualization of the female body from the traditional belief that it was an imperfect form of the male body to one that was radically different. Although this change consolidated the age-old dualisms of “Man and Culture” and “Woman and Nature,” it required ever-increasing emphasis, since new hypotheses on the cellular structure of living matter, on the origin of life and the evolution of living forms challenged belief in the stability of divinely created forms of life. Awareness of the mutability of living forms had a profound influence on the arts.

This introductory chapter is followed by part one, “Earth, Air, and Water.” The chapter on “Earth” focuses on paintings of peasant labor, which was frequently characterized in sexual terms. Thus Théophile Gautier wrote that Jean François Millet’s (1814–1875) *Sower* (1850; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) was “painted with the earth that he inseminates.” The figure is rooted in the mud of the
plowed field—which is, of course, the paint from which the figure emerges. This is the sacred soil of France, which was fertilized by the sweat and blood of its peasants, as politicians relentlessly declaimed. Prehistoric human bones also emerged from this soil, and the image of the peasant is closely related to later nineteenth-century graphic images of primitive man emerging from the earth. The chapter on “Water” centers on paintings of female bathers, but also discusses works that seem to refer to the theory of successive Deluges or to the spontaneous generation of life from the depths of water. I have only recently realized the necessity of a chapter on “Air,” which I am now in the process of formulating.

In part two, “A Vegetative State,” the two chapters examine the identification of humans with trees and with flowers. Here, too, representations of classical myth interact with paintings that embody developments in modern science and modern distinctions of class and gender. For example, the critic Ernest Chesneau wrote that Gustave Moreau’s (1826–1898) *Galatea* (1880; Musée d’Orsay, Paris) was “the supreme flower of creation” and that Charles Darwin himself would have been interested in “this admirable evocation of the mysteries of life.” In paintings of contemporary life, the *femme-fleur* was almost always envisioned as a bourgeois woman. I argue that this association quarantined the pure woman from the ever-present threat of her animality, a threat that was reinforced by evolutionism. Animal imagery was used to characterize the physiognomy of working-class women; when they were associated with flowers, these were the “flowers of evil,” the rank, corrupting flowers of sexuality.

University of Sydney
Samuel H. Kress Professor, 2003–2004

*Virginia Spate will return to Sydney to complete her book.*
Along with many other nineteenth-century artists, John Singer Sargent (1856–1925) was fascinated by the correspondence between art and vegetal creation. Like his fellow expatriate painter James McNeill Whistler (1834–1903), whose signature was a butterfly copulating with a pansy, Sargent considered the genesis of the work of art an act of pollination, and the artist both a pollinator and a flowering plant. On the basis of contemporary accounts of his painting practices, letters, reviews, and most important, close looking at the paintings themselves, I argue that Sargent envisioned artistic creation in general as cross-fertilization, and painting specifically as a hand-pollination the artist accomplishes with his brush and “pure tact of vision,” as Henry James put it. The hand-pollination of flowers was usually achieved with a small paintbrush.

Sargent’s floral model of artistic creation was a modern variation on the enduring creation-as-procreation metaphor, or the fantasy of artistic parturition. In the early nineteenth century Samuel Taylor Coleridge had figured the artist as a chlorophyllaceous plant; Sargent updated this vegetal identification by focusing on the pollinator-plant relationship and the moment and means of fertilization. His perspective was symptomatic of the age of Charles Darwin, when the concept of coevolutionary relationships was widely disseminated and their erotics celebrated. The move to a poetics of
vegetal procreation to some degree allayed the anxiety stemming from male artists’ physiological incapacity which attended the deployment of the human parturition model—an anxiety that could only have been exacerbated by the typical nineteenth-century invert’s fear of sterility. The floral environment, as various art historians have argued, was central to the elaboration of artistic modernism. For Sargent, the painted garden became a locus wherein modern conceptions of art, sexuality, and nationality, which were ineluctably intertwined for him, could be metaphorically explored, and where the dominant heteronormative rhetoric of reproduction could be eluded.

The paintings I analyze were for the most part uncommissioned works produced between 1880 and 1900. In them, Sargent mobilized the ideas of cross-fertilization and the hermaphroditic sexuality of flowers to “naturalize” sexual inversion—an argument most famously articulated by Marcel Proust in the orchid and bee scene of Remembrance of Things Past. In so doing, the painter was both visually elaborating a period poetics of homosexuality and formulating a new sense of subjectivity. Contextualizing this poetics within its Darwin-informed milieu, my dissertation reevaluates contemporary terms for homosexuals such as “fairies,” “pansies,” and the particularly apropos “horticultural lads.” To return to Sargent’s art, however, the issue of “naturalization” was germane not only to Sargent’s sexuality, but also to his expatriate longing for rootedness, or to be a thriving hybrid. Having left Paris for England after the scandal provoked by his entry for the 1884 Salon, Madame X—which was perceived as too decadent, brutal, contrived, and American—Sargent sought to transplant himself successfully within a new clime. His early English work strives to fuse impressionism and aestheticism, purity and voluptuousness, the fiction of roots and the freedom of flight, parturition and homosexuality.

While in residence at the Center, I have concentrated on Sargent’s paintings of female children in gardens and conservatories, reading these as veiled self-portraits and allegories of the process of painting. Carnation, Lily, Lily, Rose of 1885–1886 is perhaps the most eloquent formulation of Sargent’s botanical fantasy. Moth- and flower-like little girls, figures for the artist, insert paintbrushlike matches
into liliaceous lamps which light up with impressionist sunrises. The strange, almost oneiric image of *Helen Sears* from 1895 can also be seen as a portrait of the artist as a young girl: the child gently explores hydrangea blossoms with her petal-probing, pollen-brushing fingers, literally illustrating the hand-pollination the painter accomplishes. The child, however, is characterized by an almost vegetal vacuity. The painting’s rhetoric seems strained—perhaps unsurprisingly, as 1895 was the year of Oscar Wilde’s trial and conviction, and Alfred Dreyfus’ exile. While avowing the naturalness and fruitfulness of the artist’s creation, *Helen Sears* and other superficially innocent works register to different degrees Sargent’s anxieties and pleasures as he negotiated his artistic, national, and sexual identities through them.

[Harvard University]
Wyeth Fellow, 2002–2004

*Alison Mairi Syme will be teaching at Miami University in Ohio next year.*
The affirmations of national identities by political and literary figures in Latin America at the turn of the twentieth century simultaneously influenced other aspects of culture, including music, the visual arts, and, to a marked degree, architecture. In all the former colonies of Spain throughout the mainland, the centennial of their declarations of independence in 1910 became an occasion for intense debate over the preservation of national identities while participating in a world that was rapidly changing, technologically, economically, and politically. Authors such as the Argentine Ricardo Rojas (1882–1957), the Peruvian José Carlos Mariátegui (1895–1930), and the Mexican José Vasconcelos (1882–1959), among many others, promoted the integration of indigenous cultures in their nations’ emerging modern identities. Others, including the group of intellectuals around Victoria Ocampo (1891–1979) in Argentina, asserted another kind of nationalism, emphasizing their right to participate as equals with the intellectual elites of the world.

Architectural designs exploring a contemporary continuity with the colonial mestizaje of indigenous craft and European iconography were the first to be theorized by Latin American architects and critics at a time when the Spanish regionalist movement was reaching an apogee in Andalusia, particularly in Seville. The Iberian-American Exposition, which opened in that city in 1929 after almost two
decades of planning, provided the opportunity for a display of pavilions of Spain’s former colonies where various versions of architectural *mestizaje*, ranging from pre-Columbian forms to neocolonial façades, were meant to represent their national identities. Debates on the subject of cultural identity and its architectural expression were particularly active in Mexico and Peru, the former seats of colonial power, as governments and intellectuals pondered how—and whether—to integrate their vast and mostly rural indigenous populations into their progressive visions of national modernity. In contrast to Mexico and Peru, where dark-skinned people who did not speak Spanish challenged the established elite’s right to “own” the city and to define its culture and appearance, Atlantic seaboard port cities, especially Buenos Aires and São Paulo, seemed overwhelmed by poor European immigrants, whose great numbers produced chaotic and explosive urban growth. One typical reaction of elites was to reject “foreign” influences by reclaiming their *criollo* (nativist) ancestry in both their city and country homes. They were helped by architects such as the Argentinean Martin Noel (1888–1956), who assimilated the language of vernacular rural structures to Andalusian precedents also valued by architects in California, whose “Spanish-style” design manuals were widely disseminated in Latin America.

During the semester I spent at the Center working on a portion of a multiyear endeavor to write a critical history of architecture and urbanism in Latin America, I looked at the presumed gap between the work and writings of the nationalist architects and the work of architects who identified themselves with the vanguard cosmopolitanism of European capitals, especially Paris, starting in the late 1920s. Existing historiography views these two bodies of work as unrelated, and some English-language scholars have asserted that modernism in architecture was introduced to Latin America by European émigrés, such as Gregori Warchavchik (1886–1972) in Brazil and by Le Corbusier (1887–1965) during his South American lecture tour of 1929. Instead, I found two projects that suggested a more complex and nuanced relationship between traditionalists and the avant-garde. There was no such simple ideological opposition between “return to the past” regionalists and “forward-looking” Eurotropic cosmopolitans, as many authors have tended to assume.
These two projects had never been thoroughly analyzed, perhaps because of the dominant influence on the designs by their clients, Victoria Ocampo, the wealthy Argentine aristocrat and founder of the long-lived avant-garde journal *Sur*, and Frida Kahlo (1907–1954), then a young, emerging artist just married to Diego Rivera (1886–1957). Though in very different ways, each client insisted on a dwelling that would also serve as her workplace. Rather than viewing these original structures as the result of fruitful collaborations, contemporary critics dismissed them because of the presumed limitations on the architects’ autonomy in design imposed by their meddlesome female clients.

In a chapter written at the Center, I argue that both projects had ambitious public goals in spite of their private purposes and that they helped establish the intellectual and aesthetic origins of modernist architecture in Argentina and Mexico, respectively. Further, these public goals were informed by nationalist agendas—although with opposite aims.

The naked, white, purist volumes of Victoria Ocampo’s modernist house, the first in Argentina, were meant to provide an example of public decorum affordable to all social and economic classes, while at the same time burnishing Ocampo’s avant-garde credentials in the
context of her neighborhood’s eclectic mansions designed by Alejandro Bustillo (1889–1982), the same society architect whom she hired. Understanding her agenda, it is easier to understand why she rejected the proposal she had earlier requested of Le Corbusier. His design would have required—through the near absence of a street façade—a public display of domesticity, the very thing that Ocampo disparaged in urban immigrant life.

Kahlo, in contrast, made sure that her architect, Juan O’Gorman (1905–1982), included the strident colors and vernacular forms of indigenous habitation in rural Mexico—down to the organ pipe cactus fences used to corral animals—in the functionalist forms of the separate house-studios for Rivera and herself, which were joined by a bridge. The aggressively populist aesthetics were meant as a deliberate affront to propriety in the elegant suburb of San Angel Inn, an affront happily abetted by O’Gorman, Kahlo’s political comrade and former classmate. They were also a reminder of the peasant population’s unwanted presence in the city.

In their merging of modernist and nationalist beliefs, both Kahlo’s and Ocampo’s houses can be seen as attempts to achieve what I am tentatively calling an “aesthetics of reconciliation” between past and present, and between metropolitan and rural life. As I continue to trace the arc of architectural and urban design in Latin America in the decades that followed, it becomes increasingly obvious that the influences of transnational modernisms introduced through commerce and cultural exchange were always fragmented through the prism of national identity. In successive chapters I will explore how this process evolved in specific times and places, such as the national university campuses and workers’ housing built by the governments of Miguel Alemán in Mexico and Marcos Pérez Giménez in Venezuela from 1944 to 1960.

New York City
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, fall 2003

Susana Torre returned to her architectural and urban design practice in New York City and is teaching a course on the history of twentieth-century architecture and urbanism in Latin America at the school of architecture at Yale University.
My current work encompasses four decisive years in the Soviet Union, beginning in 1928—the time of the fiercely debated national competition for the Lenin Library in Moscow—and ending in 1932—the year of the Central Committee’s decree on the final suppression of any independent modern movement in the arts. This study represents a segment of a broader research project conducted earlier in Moscow on the architectural debates in the Soviet Union, from the official launching of Stalin’s “Perestroika” at the Sixteenth Congress of the Communist Party in 1930, to its culmination in the “Great Purges” of 1937—the year of the founding Congress of the Union of Soviet Architects.

A close reading of Soviet architectural and art journals of the period in light of once-secret Communist Party documents—especially the reports of the meetings of the Moscow Party Committee under Lazar M. Kaganovich—reveals the party’s coordinated moves behind the scenes to thwart intellectual life in response to Joseph Stalin’s first Five-Year Plan, forced collectivization of the peasantry, and accelerated mass purges. These primary sources indicate clearly that on its long journey to achieve exclusive initiative and compliant uniformity in architecture and city planning, the new Stalinist Politbureau launched a pernicious weapon, the All-Union Society of Proletarian Architects (VOPRA), as early as August 1929. In part
owing to Soviet sources themselves, scholars tend erroneously to liken this pseudoarchitectural association with the Proletkult literary association of “proletarian writers” (RAPP) founded under radically different political circumstances. In compliance with the April 1929 Sixteenth Party Conference, Kaganovich was briefly delegated to the Moscow Party Committee to break down its resistance to Stalin’s policies. He placed the leading VOPRA members in strategic positions at various Moscow cultural institutions (including, among others, the Communist Academy at the NARKOMPROS [People’s Commissariat for Public Instruction]), or sent them to various workers’ assemblies to provoke condemnations of the most prominent modernist leaders. The destruction of the avant-garde school of architecture, the VHUTEIN, was part of the same campaign.

Yet, the Stalin-dominated party never systematically imposed an architectural style—even less so a historicist one—a fact commonly overlooked. Instead, at least until 1933 when Stalin expressed an affinity for a version of American skyscrapers, VOPRA—Kaganovich’s Trojan horse among progressive architects—advocated modern, rationalist architecture in all public utterances. What is more, in its denunciation of “reactionary eclecticism” VOPRA at times went so far as to ally itself with the very radical modernist architectural groups it was meant to destroy. This paradox was only an apparent one, however. From 1929 until the final concept of the Palace of Soviets was determined in 1933, it was still difficult to assert that “prole-
tarian architecture” could be anything other than modern, that is, rational and functional. Therefore VOPRA was compelled to develop an elaborate casuistry, arguing simultaneously that those engaged in a long-standing struggle for modern architecture had to go, whereas modern and not historicist architecture was the answer for the proletariat.

By the turn of the decade two overlapping developments that formed a backdrop to the demise of modernism in architecture seem discernible in Soviet society. On the one hand, a parvenu class generated from below by Lenin’s New Economic Policies had found its expression in works such as the 1927 “Byzantine” Palace of the People in Erevan, or the “Moresque” train station in Baku, or even the 1928 “Renaissance” State Bank in Moscow. On the other hand, an equally parvenu Nomenklatura Stalin engendered with his “revolution from above” was elaborating the concept of “socialist realism” in works such as the Palace of the Soviets. The latter eventually eclipsed the former, but both displayed their own ostensible predilection for some form of conservative historicism. Moreover the same pre-revolutionary academic architects who in the late 1920s catered to the taste of the “Nepmen” were now often finding acceptance in the new totalitarian establishment. Yet throughout the decade, fault lines appeared within the discourse of socialist realism itself as architectural production and criticism responded to the whims of various strongmen within the regime—Stalin with his obsessive Americanism and Kaganovich with his sen-

Front cover of Stroitel’stvo Moskvy (Moscow Building), official bulletin of the Moscow Soviet, designed by N. K. Koprivnickij, 1937, number 1. Photograph: Russian State Library, Moscow
timental tyranny of the “beautiful” being among the most important.

Nevertheless, in this deadly struggle for the survival of architecture, and later for the survival of architects themselves, the authentic modernists’ resistance to Stalinist pressure remained vigorous. Indeed, for complex reasons, architecture proved to be the most difficult roadblock in the arts. Kaganovich won his complete victory only in 1937, and even then with lingering ambiguity, as the Vesnin brothers (Viktor and Alexander) were unveiling their radically modernist Palace of Culture at the height of Stalin’s terror.

University of Texas at Austin
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, spring 2004

Following another research trip to Moscow with a grant from the Center for Russian, East-European, and Eurasian Studies at the University of Texas at Austin, Danilo Udovički-Selb will return in the fall to his position as associate professor at the university’s school of architecture.
In order to describe the provenance of the drawings by seventeenth-century Italian masters that have been in the Teylers Museum in Haarlem since 1790, it is necessary to investigate anew a question that has long divided scholars concerned with the history of collecting in Seicento Rome. Did Queen Christina of Sweden take an active interest in the arts of her own day, and was that interest made manifest in a collection of drawings by contemporary artists, or was she, in Francis Haskell’s memorable phrase, “a spiritual exile from the previous century” whose involvement in the artistic world was superficial? The available evidence is scarce, scattered, and often contradictory, and compelling arguments have been put forward to defend both views.

When the Dutch museum acquired the drawings from their penultimate owners, the Odescalchi family, they were said to constitute “the cabinet of Queen Christina,” a provenance adding an undeniable luster to their intrinsic worth. After her abdication in 1654 and her sensational conversion to Roman Catholicism, Queen Christina had settled in Rome, where she surrounded herself with scientists and poets, musicians, actors, artists, and antiquarians. Her palace contained a rich library and an equally impressive collection of works of art. Contemporaries described with admiration the queen’s paintings, her ancient marbles, coins, and medals, as well as her tapestries,
manuscripts, and drawings. Writers celebrated Christina’s taste and her importance as a patron of prominent artists such as Pierfrancesco Mola (1612–1666), whom she is said to have appointed her court painter; Pietro da Cortona (1596–1669); and Gianlorenzo Bernini (1598–1680). These and other contemporary artists’ biographies include numerous anecdotes emphasizing the queen’s high regard for their talents.

Of such friendly contacts, very little concrete evidence survives. Although the queen’s picture gallery has long been dispersed, seventeenth-century inventories show that it included a mere handful of paintings by contemporaries; her alleged court artist, Mola, was present with only two minor works. Christina’s documented patronage was extended to young and untried painters and sculptors, and the extant works they created for her are rarely memorable. By contrast, scholars who defend the traditional image of Christina as a patron have pointed to her perpetual lack of funds and consequent inability to commission works on an appropriately royal scale. In their view, the queen collected drawings precisely because the far more expensive paintings were out of her reach. The collection of seventeenth-century drawings in Haarlem would therefore be a concrete expression of Christina’s taste.

Recent archival discoveries have confirmed that many of the sixteenth-century drawings in the Teylers Museum did indeed belong to the queen: most of these sheets, including the studies by Michelangelo (1475–1564), Raphael (1483–1520), and Giulio Romano (1499–1546) now to be found in Haarlem, came from her albums. However, she acquired these drawings well before her abdication, while still in Stockholm. No documentation has as yet been discovered that links the seventeenth-century drawings in Haarlem with Christina.

Those who deny that Christina had a genuine interest in the art of her contemporaries contend that these latter drawings were collected not by her, but by the man who acquired her collection after her death, Don Livio Odescalchi (1643–1713). Don Livio’s appetite for contemporary art is well attested, and several of the names associated with the Teylers drawings—Guercino (1591–1666), Salvatore Rosa (1615–1673), Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi (1606–c. 1680),
Vincenzo Onofri (1632?–c. 1712)—recur in the inventories of his own picture gallery. Hence, these coincidences strengthen the possibility that it was Don Livio, and not Christina, who added the drawings of these artists now in Haarlem. Such a conclusion would further diminish the queen’s stature as a patron.

Unless fresh archival evidence is discovered, the matter may seem irresolvable. But perhaps the question may be approached from a different angle: Christina was not the only collector in Rome in the late seventeenth century, nor was Don Livio. In recent years, more has become known about the Roman art market of the Seicento, about collectors such as Francesco Angeloni, the Marchese del Carpio, Giovanni Pietro Bellori—who was Christina’s antiquarian and has been credited with assisting in the growth of her drawings collection—and Padre Sebastiano Resta. The way in which they acquired and exchanged drawings and their choices and preferences provide a context in which to define Christina’s taste. One provisional conclusion is that throughout the seventeenth century, the collecting of “old masters”—that is, of paintings and drawings by artists up to and including the generation of Agostino (1557–1602) and Annibale Carracci (1560–1609)—enjoyed far greater esteem than the collecting of contemporary works. A royal collector might be expected to invest more heavily in Cinquecento works, leaving the contemporaries to less august rivals. Another avenue of investigation is to bring together the scattered evidence of Christina’s contacts with the artists of her time and to evaluate how significant these associations might have been. Many of the anecdotes recounted in artist’s biographies, for instance, are clearly topoi that recur in connection with other prominent collectors, such as the Marchese del Carpio. Finally, the contents of the Italian collection in Haarlem need to be analyzed: how does it differ from other collections put together in late seventeenth-century Rome? My time at the Center provided a welcome opportunity to pursue the matter from these various angles, in the hope of finding an answer to an old question.

Teylers Museum, Haarlem
Edmond J. Safra Professor, spring 2004

Carel van Tuyll van Serooskerken will return to his position as chief curator of the Teylers Museum, Haarlem.
During his lifetime, the Dutch painter Gabriel Metsu was in all probability one of Amsterdam’s most successful genre painters. In the eighteenth century, when the international art trade was burgeoning in western Europe, Metsu’s works became increasingly popular, especially among French artists and collectors. It is hard for us to believe now that in 1784 the art dealer Jean-Baptiste-Pierre Le Brun could have changed the signature on Johannes Vermeer’s (1632–1675) Astronomer into that of Gabriel Metsu’s in order to increase his profit. While Vermeer is celebrated nowadays in an abundance of books, articles, novels, and movies, Metsu currently receives much less attention. My dissertation aims to rethink the existing literature and to provide new information and insights about the life and work of this Dutch painter. My work will include a catalogue raisonné and a list of archival documents concerning Metsu’s life and those of his family members.

At the Center I focused primarily on writing the first chapter, entitled “Life and Artistic Development.” Unfortunately, only a handful of archival records mentioning Metsu’s name have come down to us. One of these seems to suggest that Metsu was remarkably precocious, for in 1644 his name appeared on a list of thirty-one Leiden artists in the Schilder-Schultboeck (Painters’ Debt Book), an account book recording mutual sales and purchases. This document refers to
Metsu, then merely fourteen or fifteen years old, as “a painter,” and not, as one would expect, an apprentice.

Although no documents are known that disclose the name of Metsu’s teacher, it is my belief that he received his first artistic education from a Leiden master in the middle of the 1640s. His earliest extant paintings, dating from 1650–1653, do not, however, show the influence of any Leiden artist; rather, they demonstrate a strong dependence on the work of the Utrecht history painter Nicolaes Knüpfer (c. 1603–1655). Most likely, Metsu worked in Knüpfer’s workshop, either as a pupil or a journeyman around 1650/1651. His time in Utrecht did not last long, however, as notarial documents place him in Leiden in 1652 and 1654.

The next time Metsu appears in official records is in the summer of 1657, when he lived on the Prinsengracht in Amsterdam. He had probably moved there by 1654/1655. Even less documentation has survived about Metsu’s Amsterdam period, although we know that in 1658 the artist married Isabella de Wolff, daughter of the painter Maria de Grebber (c. 1602–1680). Metsu was buried in the Nieuwe Kerk in Amsterdam in October 1667 after a short but tremendously fruitful career.

During his years in Leiden in the early 1650s, Metsu painted almost exclusively subjects from the Bible, classical mythology, and literature, which he executed on relatively large canvases. Around the time of his move to Amsterdam, Metsu gradually shifted to smaller genre paintings on panel, and for the first time, his works show that he was looking at painters from Leiden, such as Gerrit Dou (1613–1675) and Quiringh van Brekelenkam (1620–1668). In the second half of the 1650s, Metsu specialized in market scenes, depictions of female domestic virtue, and men and women eating, drinking, and smoking. In addition to his former Leiden colleagues, the main artists from whom Metsu took inspiration at this point of his career were Nicolaes Maes (1634–1693) and Jan Steen (1626–1679).

Around 1660, Metsu began concentrating on musical companies, exchanges of love letters, and aristocratic encounters inspired by Frans van Mieris (1635–1681), Gerard ter Borch (1617–1681), Pieter de Hooch (1629–1684), and Vermeer. A wonderful example of a pic-
ture based on the work of Ter Borch and De Hooch is *The Intruder* of c. 1660 in the collection of the National Gallery of Art (see illustration). During the last years of his life, he continued to paint genre scenes, but joined his contemporaries painting in a more polished style. On occasion, however, he returned to religious imagery, including depictions of female saints.

The second and last chapter of my dissertation, called “Interpretation of the Oeuvre,” for which I have done extensive research during my time at the Center, analyzes Metsu’s artistic production as a whole by approaching it from various viewpoints, such as eclecticism. More than other Dutch painters, he constantly transformed and combined stylistic and iconographical examples into seemingly autonomous creations. The question I attempt to answer is whether Metsu should be criticized for being a *pasticheur*, whose only merit is his superb handling of the brush, or be praised for his flexibility and his wide range of subjects, styles, and painting techniques. Another intriguing topic is Metsu’s subject matter. Like Vermeer, Metsu painted few rare or unique subjects. What primarily distinguishes him from other painters is his endearing approach to daily activities, which is marked by a psychological interest in the people he portrays.

*Adriaan E. Waiboer has been named curator of Northern European art, National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin.*
Early in the seventeenth century, Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640) began to paint large, energetic hunting scenes that transformed the favorite sport of the nobility into violent drama. His innovations quickly became popular with aristocratic collectors, and other Flemish artists adopted Rubens’ approach with remarkable success in a market hungry for hunting scenes. These pictures, which highlight the suffering of the hunted animal and the passionate ferocity of the hunters, are routinely described as celebrating the sport. But it is not immediately obvious how the savage, painful conflicts portrayed in Flemish painting might glorify the chase or the aristocrats who enjoyed it. My project investigates the violence of Flemish baroque hunting scenes. It explores the means by which Rubens and his followers came to portray the hunt as a brutal conflict, and asks what made this vision of an elite pastime so popular with viewers? In considering the question of production, I have tried to define and analyze the visual vocabulary of violence that emerges in Rubens’ early works.

As for the viewers of Flemish hunting scenes, my research suggests that such works participated in upholding aristocratic ideals concerning the role of the nobleman in situations of violent conflict. During the past year, my work has dealt with the relationship between the representation of the hunt and the actual practice of that sport and with Rubens’ revision of such scenes late in his career.
Although Rubens established the conventions of the Flemish hunting scene, his sometime collaborator Frans Snyders (1579–1657) produced the pictures that make the strongest claims of realistically portraying the seventeenth-century chase. Where Rubens tended to populate his hunts with exotic animals and figures in historical costume, Snyders specialized in scenes of the pursuit of familiar European game. Snyders usually shows the moment when the fleeing quarry has been brought to bay by the hounds, immediately before the animal is killed. The elaborate, all-day ritual of the hunt, which typically began with huntsmen collecting animal droppings in the forest and ended with the butchering of the dead animal, is thus condensed into a single dramatic moment. By focusing on the highly charged moment before the kill but never actually representing the death itself, Snyders’ approach parallels the rhetorical strategy of contemporary hunting treatises. Early modern guides to the hunt describe its procedures in numbing detail, with one exception: there is virtually no instruction on how to slay the quarry. Both verbal and visual accounts of the chase deliberately exclude the moment of the kill, even though it is the central act of the hunt. This absence can be explained by the cultural function of the hunt as a performance of aristocratic authority. The death of the animal manifests the noble hunter’s socially sanctioned right to kill. In hunting treatises, the killing escapes the constraints of verbal rules, and is instead left to the absolute freedom of the reader’s imagination. Snyders’ pictures, lingering on the moment immediately before the death, present the vulnerable prey quite directly to the viewer. The viewer is thus placed in the position of the hunter and is granted ultimate, if fictional, power.

While my project deals largely with the implicit glorification of savage conflict in Flemish painting, I have also spent the past year exploring the retreat from violence in Rubens’ late works. In his last hunting scenes, Rubens turned to a more poignant vision of the sport. He repeatedly chose subjects, such as the death of Adonis, in which the hunt somehow goes tragically wrong. Although the narratives of the last hunts are located in the realm of mythology, they bear directly on Rubens’ attitude to the messy politics of his day. Rubens’ increasingly pessimistic attitude toward the hunt corresponds to the
expansion of his own diplomatic duties, as he negotiated for peace at a time when his homeland was suffering from the renewal of war in the Netherlands. The destructive force unleashed against the human victim in Rubens’ last hunts can thus be correlated with the painter’s growing disillusionment with political violence.

Although my work follows typical academic scholarship, closely examining different versions of similar works, for example, and pondering technical questions about the practice of the hunt, I am also interested in a larger issue: the representation of violence, a phenomenon for which art history currently has a relatively impoverished vocabulary. By exploring the representation of suffering and conflict in Flemish hunting scenes, I hope to cast some light on the visual language of violence and the ways that acts of violence were crucial to the maintenance of political and social authority in early modern Europe.

[University of California, Berkeley]
Robert H. and Clarice Smith Fellow, 2003–2004

Suzanne Jablonski Walker received her Ph.D. in art history from the University of California, Berkeley in May 2004.
Description of Programs
Fields of Inquiry

The Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts fosters study of the production, use, and cultural meaning of art, artifacts, architecture, and urbanism from prehistoric times to the present. The Center supports research in the visual arts from a variety of approaches by historians, critics, and theorists of art, as well as by scholars in related disciplines of the humanities and social sciences.

Professors in Residence

Samuel H. Kress Professor

The National Gallery of Art and the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts select annually a distinguished art historian as Samuel H. Kress Professor, a position created by the National Gallery in 1965. Traditionally, the Kress Professor counsels Predoctoral Fellows in their dissertation research. The Kress Professor is the senior member of the Center.

Andrew W. Mellon Professor

The National Gallery of Art and the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts select biennially a distinguished academic or museum professional as Andrew W. Mellon Professor, a position created in 1994. Scholars are chosen to serve two consecutive academic years and are free to pursue independent research.

Edmond J. Safra Visiting Professor

The Edmond J. Safra Visiting Professorship was established in 2002 through a grant from the Edmond J. Safra Philanthropic Foundation. For four years, through 2006, Safra Visiting Professors, selected by the National Gallery of Art and the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, will serve for up to six months each, forging connections between the research of the National Gallery’s curatorial staff and that of visiting scholars at the Center. At the same time, Safra Professors will advance their own research on subjects associ-
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ated with the Gallery’s permanent collection. Safra Professors may also present seminars or curatorial lectures for graduate students and emerging scholars, including curators from other institutions.

**Fellowship Program**

*Paul Mellon, Ailsa Mellon Bruce, Frese, and Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellowships*

Senior Fellowships are awarded without regard to the age or nationality of applicants. Senior Fellowships are limited to those who have held the Ph.D. for five years or more, or who possess an equivalent record of professional accomplishment at the time of application. Awards are usually made for the academic year, although awards for one academic term are also possible. Senior Fellows must reside in the Washington area during the fellowship period, which normally runs from early fall to late spring, and are expected to participate in
the activities of the Center. The Center is able to consider requests for alternative periods of residence in response to individual needs. Senior Fellows may not hold other appointments while in residence at the Center. Individuals currently affiliated with the National Gallery of Art are not eligible for the Senior Fellowship program.

Senior Fellowship grants are based on individual need, with the expectation that applicants will bring sabbatical stipends or research grants from their home institutions. In addition to a stipend, each Senior Fellow receives round-trip travel funds, a supplemental allowance for housing expenses, and a research allowance for photographs, slides, and microfilm. A study is provided for each Senior Fellow. Limited travel funds are available for attendance at a professional meeting.

The application deadline for the Senior Fellowship program is 1 October. Each candidate must submit twelve sets of all materials, including an application form with a project proposal, photocopies of two offprints, biographical data, and a financial statement. The application must be supported by three letters of recommendation.
Paul Mellon and Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellowships

The Center awards Visiting Senior Fellowships for a residence period of up to sixty days during the year, in two periods: (A) September through February, and (B) March through August. Qualifications and conditions of appointment are the same as those for Senior Fellowships. Each Visiting Senior Fellow receives a stipend that includes support for travel, research, and housing. Each Fellow is provided with a study and other privileges while in residence at the Center. The application deadlines are 21 March (for period A) and 21 September (for period B). Candidates for Visiting Senior Fellowships should submit seven sets of all materials, including an application form and photocopies of one article or chapter of a book. Two letters of recommendation in support of the application are required.

Ailsa Mellon Bruce National Gallery of Art Sabbatical Curatorial Fellowships

Two fellowships are reserved for qualified art historians who have served at least three years in a department of the National Gallery and who hold the Ph.D. or an equivalent record of professional achievement at the time of application. Curatorial Fellows may obtain leave from the Gallery for two to nine months in the succeeding academic year to pursue independent research unrelated to Gallery projects. The application deadline is 1 October. Each candidate submits a proposal and an application form similar to those for a Senior Fellowship. The Center provides funds for research travel.

Associate Status

The Center may appoint Associates who have obtained fellowships and awards from granting institutions other than the applicants’ own institutions. These appointments are without stipend and can be made for periods ranging from one month to one academic year. Qualifications and conditions are the same as those for Visiting Senior Fellowships (for residency for up to sixty days) and Senior Fellowships (for residency for the academic year or one term). The application deadline for Associate appointments for the full year or one term is 1 October. The procedures are the same as those for Senior Fellowships.
Fellowships. For appointments of up to sixty days during the period of September through February, the application deadline is 21 March; for appointments of up to sixty days during the period of March through August, the deadline is 21 September.

The Samuel H. Kress and the J. Paul Getty Trust Paired Fellowships for Research in Conservation and the History of Art and Archaeology

Applications are invited from teams consisting of two professionals, one in the field of art history, archaeology, or another related discipline in the humanities or social sciences, and one in the field of conservation or materials science. The fellowship includes a two- to three-month period for field, collections, and/or laboratory research, followed by a two-month residency period at the Center. Each team is required to submit an application with nine sets of all materials, including the application form, a proposal, a tentative schedule of travel indicating the sites, collections, or institutions most valuable for the proposed research project, and copies of selected pertinent

Alison Luchs, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts/ Conservation/ Curatorial Meeting, 19 September 2003
publications. In addition, each team member must provide two letters of recommendation in support of the application, for a total of four letters. Applications are due by 21 March. The fellowships are supported by funds from the Samuel H. Kress Foundation and the J. Paul Getty Trust.

Paul Mellon Postdoctoral Fellowship

Predoctoral Fellows may apply for a Postdoctoral Fellowship if the dissertation has been approved by 1 June of the second fellowship year. Certification of approval is required. The candidate must have graduated or received a certificate of degree by 1 September. During this twelve-month appointment, the fellow is associated with an appropriate Gallery department or museum in the Washington area while preparing the dissertation for publication.

Fellows’ tour of object conservation with Suzanne Lindsay
Predoctoral Fellowships

The Center awards a number of one-, two-, and three-year fellowships to Ph.D. candidates in any field of art history, architectural history, or archaeology who have completed their university residency requirements, course work, and general or preliminary examinations. Students must have certification in two languages other than English. Certain fellowships are designated for research in specific fields; others require a twelve-month period of residency at the Center that may include participation in a curatorial research project at the National Gallery. Nominees must be either United States citizens or enrolled in a university in the United States.

Application for the National Gallery Predoctoral Fellowships at the Center may be made only through graduate departments of art history and other appropriate departments, under the sponsorship of departmental chairs. The nomination deadline is 15 November. Fellowship grants begin on 1 September each year and are not renewable. Nomination forms will be sent to departmental chairs during the summer prior to the fall deadline. Following the deadline, all inquiries about the status of nominations should be made by the departmental chairs.
Predoctoral Fellowship for Historians of American Art to Travel Abroad

The Center awards up to six fellowships to doctoral students in art history who study aspects of art and architecture of the United States, including native and prerevolutionary America. The travel fellowship is intended to encourage a breadth of art-historical experience beyond the candidate’s major field, not for the advancement of a dissertation. Preference will be accorded to those who have had little opportunity for professional travel abroad. Applications may be made only through the chair of a graduate department of art history or other appropriate department, who should act as sponsor. Applications must be received on or before 15 February 2005 for the period June 2005 through May 2006.
Further Information about Tenure and Application

Visiting Senior Fellows may receive an award in three consecutive years, but thereafter must wait three years before reapplying to the Center. Holders of Senior Fellowships and Associate appointments for two terms may reapply after an interval of five years from the completion of the fellowship. Holders of one-term appointments may reapply three years after the completion of the fellowship. National Gallery Curatorial Fellows may reapply five years after the completion of the fellowship. Individuals may not apply for other Center fellowships while an application is pending or while holding a fellowship. The fellowships are not renewable and may not be postponed. Application forms for fellowships and Associate appointments may be obtained by writing to the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, National Gallery of Art, 2000 B South Club Drive, Landover, Maryland 20785. Further information about these fellowships may be obtained from the Assistant to the Fellowship Program: (202) 842-6482. Fellowship information and applications are also available on the National Gallery of Art’s Web site (www.nga.gov/resources/casva.htm).

Facilities

The offices, seminar room, and individual studies of the Center for Advanced Study are located in the East Building of the National Gallery of Art, Washington. These facilities are available to Center members, as is the library of nearly three hundred thousand volumes. The National Gallery’s collections, photographic archives of over 7.5 million images, and other services are accessible during regular business hours. Members of the Center also have access to other libraries in the Washington area, including the Library of Congress, the Folger Shakespeare Library, Dumbarton Oaks, and the libraries and collections of the various museums of the Smithsonian Institution. Lunch is available for fellows and staff in the National Gallery refectory on weekdays.
Board of Advisors and Special Selection Committees

A Board of Advisors, comprising seven art historians appointed with rotating terms, meets annually to consider policies and programs of the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts. The board also serves as a selection committee to review fellowship applications received by the Center. A member of the curatorial staff of the National Gallery is usually present during the interview of applicants for Predoctoral Fellowships. In addition, a separate selection committee, composed of scholars in the field, is appointed for each special-initiative fellowship program. Recommendations for appointment are forwarded to the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art.

Program of Meetings, Research, and Publications

Meetings

The Center for Advanced Study sponsors regular and special meetings throughout the academic year. Meetings held at regular intervals include colloquia presented by the senior members of the Center and shoptalks given by the Predoctoral Fellows. Art historians and other scholars at area universities, museums, and research institutes are invited to participate in these gatherings. Periodic meetings involving participants from the local, national, and international communities of scholars include seminars, symposia, conferences, lectures, incontri, and a curatorial colloquy. Such gatherings, along with the Center’s weekly luncheon and tea, annual reception in honor of new members, and annual introductory meeting with the curatorial departments of the National Gallery of Art, encourage both casual and more formal exchange among the members and help stimulate critical discourse in advanced research in the history of art and related disciplines. A list of the meetings held at the Center in 2003–2004 may be found on pages 24–38.
Research

Each of the deans directs a project designed to produce a research tool of value to the scholarly community. For current research projects, please see pages 44–47. Reports by members of the Center for Advanced Study are published annually (beginning on page 49 for reports written by members in 2003–2004).
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