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The Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts at the National Gallery of Art, 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. 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 in the Visual Arts include fellowships, meetings, research, and publications.
Report on the Academic Year
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This year is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the fellowship program at the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts at the National Gallery of Art. The anniversary has been marked by the realization of a longstanding wish to provide housing to our fellows. The acquisition and furnishing of a group of condominiums within walking distance of the National Gallery has been made possible by Robert H. Smith, president emeritus of the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery, with further support from the Paul Mellon Bequest. The first group of nine apartments will be available in September 2005. We also thank Mr. and Mrs. James S. Smith for their contribution to the furnishing. This is the occasion to record the wider generosity of the former president of the National Gallery of Art in support of the Center’s scholarly activities. The Robert H. and Clarice Smith Predoctoral Fellowship has long supported research by younger scholars in the field of Dutch and Flemish art. In past years Robert H. Smith has provided housing allowances for predoctoral fellows. Over the coming decade his grants will support a series of colloquia, symposia, seminars, and publications. We will note each of these events as they occur, but his broader vision in making it possible for the Center to plan for the future deserves special acknowledgment this anniversary year.

Among the resident members of the Center in 2004–2005 were scholars from Canada, France, India, Italy, the People’s Republic of
China, Poland, Russia, Spain, and the United States. Fellows worked on topics ranging from ancient Egyptian tomb painting to the public monuments of modern Iran, from the art patronage of Madame de Pompadour to the production of bronze sculptures by Henri Matisse. A number of this year’s scholars dedicated their research to American, Dutch, French, and Italian painting. The topic of artists’ workshops emerged as one of several unifying themes during the year, as did research on materials and techniques and on the function and meaning of tombs.

In the program of publications, two volumes appeared. *Nationalism and French Visual Culture, 1870–1914*, volume 68 in Studies in the History of Art, gathers papers from the symposium held at the Center in February 2002. June Hargrove of the University of Maryland, College Park, and Neil McWilliam of Duke University served as the volume’s scholarly editors. *The Dada Seminars*, edited by Leah Dickerman with Matthew S. Witkovsky, inaugurates a new series in the program of publications: the Seminar Papers. The Dada volume represents the exchange of papers and debate by an international group of scholars at three one-day workshops sponsored by the Center between November 2001 and May 2003. Appearing in both softcover and hardcover in advance of the Gallery’s Dada exhibition in 2006, this topographically arranged group of essays will provide a companion publication to the exhibition catalogue.

A second volume of seminar papers is already in preparation in connection with Associate Dean Peter Lukehart’s research project, described in detail below. A seminar at the Center on the topic “The Accademia di San Luca in Rome, c. 1590–1630,” supported by the grant from Robert H. Smith, was the first of three to be dedicated to the early history of the Accademia. A second seminar was held in Rome in June 2005, and a third will take place in Washington next year, in final preparation for the publication of new research presented over the year.

Carl Brandon Strehlke, the Center’s third Edmond J. Safra Visiting Professor, led a Robert H. Smith Curatorial/Conservation Colloquy entitled “Italian Renaissance Painting and the Conservation Laboratory.” This Smith Colloquy was designed to give emerging scholars and new curators from a variety of institutions, large and small, first-
hand experience of the possibilities of scientific investigation, in conjunction with deeper understanding of conservation practices and differing international methods. The meeting concluded with a roundtable discussion of the philosophy and production of collection catalogues. Carl Strehlke, of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and David Alan Brown and Nicholas Penny, both of the National Gallery of Art, had each completed such catalogues in the past year, and each presented different models for incorporating information gained from conservation and scientific analysis within these fundamental reference works.

For its twenty-fifth anniversary, the Center sponsored “Dialogues in Art History,” a symposium focusing on current issues in different areas of the history of art. Scholars who had played a role in the history of the Center or had spent time here were invited to speak on aspects of methodological interest or pressing concern in their own field of expertise. The meeting was organized around a series of speakers paired by field, with special emphasis on areas in which the Center has had a significant role in supporting research by both senior and younger scholars.

This year’s biennial Wyeth conference, supported by the Wyeth Foundation for American Art, was devoted to the subject “The Collector of Art in America.” Irene Winter of Harvard University presented to the public the fifty-fourth A.W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts under the title “‘Great Work’: Terms of Aesthetic Experience in Ancient Mesopotamia.”

The Center also sponsored in collaboration with other member institutions the Washington Collegium for the Humanities Lecture. Anthony Snodgrass, University of Cambridge, spoke on the topic “The Parthenon Divided” at the Library of Congress. His presentation was followed the next day by an incontro at the Center attended by fellows, scholars from neighboring institutions, and members of the National Gallery of Art staff. The Center hosted a second incontro on the subject “Erasable Tablets,” which followed a demonstration at the Folger Shakespeare Library of the function and history of such tablets. Peter Stallybrass, University of Pennsylvania, presented his research on these items at the Center, in conjunction with a viewing of Jan Gossaert’s Portrait of a Merchant, in the Gallery’s collection, in which such a tablet appears.
The Center’s four continuing research projects, intended to provide primary research materials and tools for the field, are described below. A full description of the fellowship program and a complete list of publications may be found at the conclusion of this volume. Beginning with *Center 24* and thanks to the vision and expertise of Associate Dean Peter Lukehart, readers throughout the world may now consult the entire contents of this report online at [www.nga.gov/resources/casva.htm](http://www.nga.gov/resources/casva.htm).

Elizabeth Cropper  
*Dean*
Members

Jonathan J. G. Alexander, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University
   Samuel H. Kress Professor, 2004–2005
Alexander Nagel, University of Toronto
   Andrew W. Mellon Professor, 2004–2006
Carl Brandon Strehlke, Philadelphia Museum of Art
   Edmond J. Safra Visiting Professor, spring 2005
Irene J. Winter, Harvard University
   A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts, 2005

Senior Fellows

Philip Benedict, Brown University
   Frese Senior Fellow, fall 2004
   History through Images in the Sixteenth Century:
   The Wars, Massacres, and Troubles of Tortorel and Perrissin
Betsy M. Bryan, The Johns Hopkins University
   Paul Mellon Senior Fellow, 2004–2005
   Techniques and Organization of Ancient Egyptian Painting

Stuart Lingo and
Philip Benedict
H. Perry Chapman, University of Delaware
Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow, 2004–2005
The Painter’s Place in the Dutch Republic, 1604–1718

A. A. Donohue, Bryn Mawr College
Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow, 2004–2005
Historiographic Structures in the Study of Classical Art

Alden Gordon, Trinity College (Hartford)
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, spring 2005
Madame de Pompadour: Art Patron in the Enlightenment

Susan Niles, Lafayette College
Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow, 2004–2005
Visualizing Inca Architecture
Ailsa Mellon Bruce National Gallery of Art Sabbatical Curatorial Fellow, 2004– 2005

Sarah Greenough, National Gallery of Art, Department of Photographs
The Correspondence of Alfred Stieglitz and Georgia O’Keeffe, 1916–1946

Visiting Senior Fellows

Shyamalkanti Chakravarti, Indian Museum, Calcutta
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow
1 September–31 October 2004
The Elephant of Nine Women: An Unexplored Motif of Indian Art

Stuart Lingo, Michigan State University
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow
1 November–31 December 2004
Federico Barocci and the Alluring Icon: Retrospection and Modernity in Late Renaissance Painting
Christine Mengin, Université de Paris I, Panthémon-Sorbonne, France
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow
1 June–31 July 2004
The Architecture of the Modern Courthouse in the United States and France

Janine Mileaf, Swarthmore College
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow
1 July–31 August 2004
“Please Touch”: The Object in Dada and Surrealism

Jacqueline Marie Musacchio, Vassar College
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow
1 November–31 December 2004
Art, Marriage, and Family Life in the Florentine Renaissance Palazzo

Liubov Savinskaya, State Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow
1 March–30 April 2005
Critical Catalogue of German, Austrian, and Swiss Paintings of the Eighteenth through Twentieth Centuries from the State Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow

David Schuyler, Franklin and Marshall College
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow
1 September–31 October 2004
The Sanctified Landscape: The Transformation of the Mid-Hudson Valley, 1824–1909

Javier Pérez Segura, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow
1 June–31 July 2004
The Impact from Abroad: Picasso, Dalí, and Spanish Modern Painting in the 1928 Pittsburgh International Exhibition

Zygmunt Waźbiński, Nicholas Copernicus University, Poland
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow
1 June–31 July 2004
Paul Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow, 2004–2005

Yu Jiang, National Gallery of Art, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Statecraft and Cemetery in Early Dynastic China: Yu Funerary Arts in the Zhou


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

Ann Boulton, Baltimore Museum of Art
Oliver Shell, Baltimore Museum of Art
  Research period: 1 August–31 October 2004
  Residency period: 1 January–28 February 2005
  The Production of Bronze Sculptures by Henri Matisse


Elizabeth Simpson, The Bard Graduate Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts
Krysia Spirydowicz, Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario
  Research period: 1 June–31 August 2004
  Residency period: 1 November–31 December 2004
  Reconstruction and Interpretation of the Wooden Furniture and Small Objects from Tumulus P, Tumulus W, and the City Mound at Gordion, Turkey

Hérica Valladares and Shilpa Prasad, fellows’ tour of painting conservation
Predoctoral Fellows

Sabina de Cavi [Columbia University]*
Paul Mellon Fellow, 2002–2005
Spain in Naples: Building, Sculpting, and Painting for the Viceroyos (1585–1621)

Karl Debreczeny [The University of Chicago]
Ittleson Fellow, 2004–2006
Ethnicity and Esoteric Power: Negotiating the Sino-Tibetan Synthesis in Ming Buddhist Painting

Carlos Roberto De Souza [University of California, Santa Barbara]
Andrew W. Mellon Fellow, 2004–2006
The Law of the Heart: Narrative and Audience in the Fotonovela from Beginning to End

André Dombrowski [University of California, Berkeley]*
Twelve-Month Chester Dale Fellow, 2004–2005
Sense and Sensation: Experience at the Extremes in the Early Work of Paul Cézanne

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

Robert Glass [Princeton University]
Paul Mellon Fellow, 2004–2007
Filarete’s Sculpture and the Taste for the Antique in Mid-Fifteenth-Century Italy

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

John Harwood [Columbia University]
Twenty-four-Month Chester Dale Fellow, 2004–2006

Aden Kumler [Harvard University]
David E. Finley Fellow, 2004–2007
Visual Translation, Visible Theology: Illuminated Devotional Compendia in Late Medieval France and England
Ara H. Merjian [University of California, Berkeley]
  Paul Mellon Fellow, 2004–2006
  The Urban Untimely: Giorgio De Chirico and the
  Metaphysical City, 1910–1924

Katharina Pilaski [University of California, Santa Barbara]
  Samuel H. Kress Fellow, 2004–2006
  The Munich Kunstkammer: Art, Nature, and the
  Representation of Knowledge in Courtly Contexts

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

Sean E. Roberts [University of Michigan]
  Twelve-Month Chester Dale Fellow, 2004–2005
  Cartography between Cultures: Francesco Berlinghieri’s
  Geographia of 1482

Sarah Gordon Saad [Northwestern University]
  Wyeth Fellow, 2004–2006
  Sanctioning the Nude: The Production and Reception of
  Eadweard Muybridge’s Animal Locomotion, 1887

Natasha Seaman [Boston University]
  Robert H. and Clarice Smith Fellow, 2004–2005
  Archaism, Devotion, and the Critique of Caravaggio in the
  Religious Paintings of Hendrick ter Bruggen

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

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)

Fellows’ tour of the exhibition *Rembrandt’s Late Religious Portraits* with curator Arthur K. Wheelock

**Ailsa Mellon Bruce Predoctoral Fellowship for Historians of American Art to Travel Abroad, 2004–2005**

Doris Chon  
[University of California, Los Angeles]

Rhonda C. Goodman  
[Stanford University]

Linda Kim  
[University of California, Berkeley]

Jason Lafountain  
[University of Maryland, College Park]

Anna O. Marley  
[University of Delaware]

Atsushi Yoshida  
[Washington University in Saint Louis]

Catherine Zuromskis  
[University of Rochester]
Meetings

Wyeth Conference

8 October 2004

THE COLLECTOR OF ART IN AMERICA

Morning session

Elizabeth Cropper, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Welcome

John Wilmerding, Princeton University
Introduction

Dianne S. Macleod, University of California, Davis
American Women Collectors: A Conspiracy of Silence

Linda S. Ferber, The Brooklyn Museum
George Whitney of Philadelphia: A Forgotten American Maecenas

Franklin Kelly, National Gallery of Art
William T. Walters and American Paintings

Joy P. Heyrman, Walters Art Museum [University of Maryland, College Park]
William Walters’ “Greatest Book of the Season”:
Drawing as a Signature in an Antebellum Album
Afternoon session

Nancy Anderson, National Gallery of Art
Kings, Queens, and the Sheriff: George Catlin’s Patronage Trail

Elizabeth W. Hutchinson, Barnard College
Unpacking the Indian Corner

Kirk Davis Swinehart, Wesleyan University
In Mohawk Country

Robert H. Smith Seminar

9–10 December 2004

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

Cristina Acidini Luchinat, Opificio delle Pietre Dure e Laboratorio di Restauro
Federico Zuccari as Principe dell’Accademia: The Florentine Legacy
Patrizia Cavazzini, British School at Rome
*The Painter’s Profession in Early Seventeenth-Century Rome: Pittori grossi, indoratori, and the Rules of the Accademia di San Luca*

Elizabeth Cohen, York University
*An Art/Historians’ Workshop: In Praise of Collaboration*

Charles Dempsey, The Johns Hopkins University
*Disegno as the Foundation for Academies of Art*

Frances Gage, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
*“Fuori della professione”: Gentlemen, Amatori, and Men of Letters in the Accademia di San Luca, 1593–1630*

Monica Grossi and Silvia Trani, Accademia di San Luca
*From Universitas to Academy: Notes and Remarks on the Earliest Documents of the Archives of the Accademia Nazionale di San Luca in Rome*

Matteo Lafranconi, Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Moderna
*“Insegnare, operare, discorrere”: L’Accademia di San Luca di primo Seicento fra responsabilità istituzionale e conformismo corporativo*

Peter M. Lukehart, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
*Visions and Divisions within the Academy: Girolamo Muziano, Federico Zuccaro, Cesare Nebbia, and the Foundation of the Accademia di San Luca*

Christopher L. C. E. Witcombe, Sweet Briar College
*Papal Plans for the Accademia di San Luca in Rome*
Participants

Cristina Acidini Luchinat, Opificio delle Pietre Dure e Laboratorio di Restauro
Renata Ago, Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”
Paul Anderson, Oregon State University
Karen-edis Barzman, Binghamton University
Julian Brooks, J. Paul Getty Museum
Patrizia Cavazzini, British School at Rome
Elizabeth S. Cohen, York University, Toronto
Elizabeth Cropper, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Charles Dempsey, The Johns Hopkins University
C.D. Dickerson, National Gallery of Art
Frances Gage, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Monica Grossi, Accademia Nazionale di San Luca
Matteo Lafranconi, Museo dell’Arte Moderna
Peter Lukehart, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Laurie Nussdorfer, Wesleyan University
Therese O’Malley, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Steven Ostrow, University of California, Riverside
Pietro Roccasecca, Accademia di Belle Arti di Roma
Richard Spear, University of Maryland, College Park
Silvia Trani, Accademia Nazionale di San Luca
Christopher L. C. E. Witcombe, Sweet Briar College

Symposia

1–2 April 2005

Middle Atlantic Symposium in the History of Art, Thirty-Fifth Annual Sessions

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

Friday afternoon session

Moderator: Joanne Pillsbury, University of Maryland, College Park, and Dumbarton Oaks
Introduction: Malcolm Bell III
Justin St. P. Walsh [University of Virginia]
Athenian Pottery in the Sician Heartland
Introduction: Dale Kinney
Benjamin Anderson [Bryn Mawr College]
New Stories from Old Stones: Decorative Spolia and Narrative Abstraction in Late Antique Art

Introduction: Henry Maguire
Kära L. Schenk [The Johns Hopkins University]
Sacrifice and Offerings in the Dura Synagogue’s Tabernacle Panel

Introduction: Karen Gerhart
Naoko Gunji [University of Pittsburgh]
Uncovering Mortuary Art at Amidaji: The Illustrated Story of Emperor Antoku

Friday evening session

Introduction: Sally M. Promey, University of Maryland, College Park

George Levitine Lecture in Art History
Elizabeth Johns, University of Pennsylvania (emerita)
Out of Storage and, Eventually, onto the Walls: Curatorship and Scholarship in Paths to Impressionism: French and American Landscapes from the Worcester Art Museum

Saturday morning session

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

Introduction: Kim Butler
Amanda Salley [American University]
Chi sono questi bambini? Leonardo da Vinci’s Virgin of the Rocks

Introduction: Sally M. Promey
Guy Jordan [University of Maryland, College Park]
“Abel Being Dead Yet Speaketh”: The Talismanic Function of Children’s Portraiture in Early Colonial New England

Introduction: Jeanne Chenault Porter
Ilenia Colón Mendoza [The Pennsylvania State University]
The Jíbaro Masquerade: Luis Paret y Alcázar’s Self-Portrait of 1776
Introduction: Christopher Wilson
Emily Burns [George Washington University]
On the Borders of Art: Women and Nineteenth-Century Natural History Illustration

Introduction: Patricia Leighten
Marco Deyasi [Duke University]
Rodin and the Cambodgiennes: Symbolism, Primitivism, and Colonialism in Rodin’s 1906 Drawings of the Cambodian Ballet

Saturday afternoon session

Moderator: Steven Mansbach, University of Maryland, College Park

Introduction: Clark V. Poling
Helen Dudley [Emory University]
Fascist Regionalisms: Strapaese’s Construction of the Folk

Introduction: Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer
Melody Barnett Deusner [University of Delaware]
De Chirico, Schopenhauer, and the Metaphysical Studio

Introduction: Michael D. Harris
Lindsay Twa [University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill]
Aaron Douglas’ Haiti: An Artistic Transition from Primitivism to Ethnography

Introduction: Christine Poggi
Jeanne Anne Nugent [University of Pennsylvania]
Restoring the Center? Hans Sedlmayr’s Verlust der Mitte and Gerhard Richter’s East German Murals, 1955–1960

Introduction: Eric Garberson
Nicole de Armendi [Virginia Commonwealth University]
Flux-Labyrinth: An Experiential Art Space
21–22 April 2005

DIALOGUES IN ART HISTORY, A TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY SYMPOSIUM

Thursday morning session

Elizabeth Cropper, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Welcome

Moderator: Henry A. Millon, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts (emeritus)

Wanda M. Corn, Stanford University
Modernism Redux, or (Re)Telling Primal Stories

Michael Leja, University of Delaware
American Art History after 1 1/2

Elizabeth H. Boone, Tulane University
When Art Is Writing and Writing, Art

Joanne Pillsbury, University of Maryland, College Park, and Dumbarton Oaks
Test Trenches: The Strata of Images, Text, and Archaeology
Thursday afternoon session

Moderator: Peter Parshall, National Gallery of Art

Charles Dempsey, The Johns Hopkins University
*The Importance of Vernacular Style in Renaissance Art*

C. Jean Campbell, Emory University
*Nature’s Workshop, Venus’ Legacy, and the Poetics of Early Renaissance Art*

Svetlana Alpers, University of California, Berkeley (emerita)
*Taking Dutch Art Seriously: Now and Then*

Mariët Westermann, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University
*Taking Dutch Art Seriously: Now and Next?*

Joseph Connors, Villa I Tatti
*Echoes Sacred and Secular in the Lateran Basilica, Rome*

Louise Rice, New York University
*College Art: The Baroque Contribution*

Friday morning session

Moderator: Margaret Cool Root, University of Michigan

Wu Hung, The University of Chicago
*Rethinking East Asian Tomb Art*

Yukio Lippit, Harvard University
*Amateurism and Literati Graphism in East Asia*

Betsy M. Bryan, The Johns Hopkins University
*Memory and Knowledge in Egyptian Tomb Painting*

Marian Feldman, University of California, Berkeley
*The Lives (and Deaths) of Mesopotamian Monuments*
Finbarr Barry Flood, New York University
*Orthodoxies, Heterodoxies, and the Unstable Terrain of Islamic Art*

David Roxburgh, Harvard University
*Concepts of the Portrait in Islamic Lands*

**Friday afternoon session**

*Moderator: Nancy Troy, University of Southern California*

——

Ewa Lajer-Burcharth, Harvard University
*Image Matters*

Philippe Bordes, Université de Lyon 2
*Interpreting Portraits: Images of Society or the Self?*

——

Yve-Alain Bois, Harvard University
*The Issue of Pseudomorphism: A Challenge to the Formalist Approach*

Marc Gotlieb, University of Toronto
*The Orientalist Sublime*

——

Hal Foster, Princeton University
*Problems in the Narrativity of Twentieth-Century Art: Two Test Cases*

Jeffrey Weiss, National Gallery of Art
*“I Stagger out of This Temple of the Loftiest Pleasures with a Splitting Head”*
Robert H. Smith Curatorial/Conservation Colloquy

2–4 May 2005

ITALIAN RENAISSANCE PAINTING AND THE CONSERVATION LABORATORY

Participants

Barbara Berrie, National Gallery of Art
Pamela Betts, National Gallery of Art
David Alan Brown, National Gallery of Art
David Bull, National Gallery of Art
Caroline Campbell, Courtauld Institute of Art Gallery
Carol Christensen, National Gallery of Art
Daniela Cini, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Elizabeth Cropper, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Angelica Daneo, Denver Art Museum
René de la Rie, National Gallery of Art
Miguel Falomir Faus, Museo Nacional del Prado
Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, Kunsthistorisches Museum
    Gemäldegalerie, Vienna
Sarah Fisher, National Gallery of Art
Morten Steen Hansen, Walters Art Museum
Gretchen Hirschauer, National Gallery of Art
Frederick Ilchman, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
Laurence B. Kanter, Metropolitan Museum of Art
Teresa Lignelli, Philadelphia Museum of Art
Peter Lukehart, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
John Marciari, Yale University Art Gallery
Catherine Metzger, National Gallery of Art
Jeannine O’Grody, Birmingham Museum of Art
Therese O’Malley, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Nicholas Penny, National Gallery of Art
Salvador Salort-Pons, Meadows Museum, Dallas
Karen Serres, National Gallery of Art
Carl Brandon Strehlke, National Gallery of Art
Michael Swicklik, National Gallery of Art
Mark Tucker, Philadelphia Museum of Art
Elizabeth Walmsley, National Gallery of Art
Colloquia CXCIV–CXCIX

21 October 2004
Jonathan J. G. Alexander, Samuel H. Kress Professor
*Portraiture in Italian Renaissance Manuscripts*

4 November 2004
Susan Niles, Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow
*Encountering Inca Architecture*

2 December 2004
Philip Benedict, Frese Senior Fellow
*History through Images in the Sixteenth Century: The Wars, Massacres, and Troubles of Tortorel and Perrissin*

13 January 2005
H. Perry Chapman, Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow
*The Painter, the Model, and the Mannequin: Life in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Studio*

10 March 2005
Alden Gordon, Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow
*Madame de Pompadour: Self-Fashioning in Portraiture and Art Patronage*

14 April 2005
Betsy M. Bryan, Paul Mellon Senior Fellow
*What’s a Painting? Who’s a Painter? The Terminology and Cultural Environment of Tomb Painting in the Mid-Eighteenth Dynasty*
Shoptalks 119–125

12 November 2004
Nina Dubin, David E. Finley Fellow
*Futures, Ruins, Risks: Hubert Robert and the Aesthetics of Speculation*

17 November 2004
Sabina de Cavi, Paul Mellon Fellow
*Palazzo Reale in Naples: A “Spanish” Building (1600/1607)?*

8 December 2004
Talinn Grigor, Ittleson Fellow
*Of Patrimonial (re)Inventions: A Lost Tomb, an Exact Spot, and the Bright Future in 1920s Iran*

25 January 2005
Shilpa Prasad, Mary Davis Fellow
*Ut Color Vox: Guercino’s Shepherds, the Stile Rappresentativo, and the Invention of the Pastoral*

24 February 2005
André Dombrowski, Chester Dale Fellow
*Cézanne, a Thoroughly Modern Manet*

28 February 2005
Hérica Valladares, Samuel H. Kress Fellow
*Fallax Imago: Narcissus and the Seduction of Mimesis*

18 April 2005
Terri Weissman, Wyeth Fellow
*Realism and the Rhetoric of Photography: Berenice Abbott’s Vision for the Twentieth Century*
Lectures

The Fifty-fourth A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, 2005

Irene J. Winter, Harvard University

“Great Work”: Terms of Aesthetic Experience in Ancient Mesopotamia

10 April Mud Brick: Ur, Nineveh, Babylon, and the Aesthetics of Scale

17 April Alabaster: The Warka Vase and the Aesthetics of Abundance

24 April Lapis Lazuli: The Ur Lyre and the Aesthetics of Performance

1 May Bronze: The Bassetki Statue Base and the Aesthetics of the Perfect Body

8 May Ivory: Exotic Furniture and the Aesthetics of Skilled Craftsmanship

15 May Gold: A Nimrud Queen’s Crown and the Aesthetics of Radiance
Washington Collegium for the Humanities Lecture
23 March 2005
Anthony Snodgrass, Clare College, University of Cambridge
The Parthenon Divided

It is widely known that the surviving sculptures from the Parthenon are separated, by distances ranging from 100 yards to 1,500 miles, from the building to which they belonged. Much less familiar are the divisions within the sculptures: often parts of one figure are held in different museums. The two major holders, the Acropolis Museum in Athens and the British Museum in London, each has about forty-nine percent of what survives. Political controversy, now two hundred years old, surrounds this issue. But there is room also for a scholarly investigation: How exactly did the present distribution and condition of the sculptures come about? What steps are other world museums taking in cases of this kind? What is the best long-term solution in the interests of the sculptures themselves?

Incontri

24 March 2005
Anthony Snodgrass, Clare College, University of Cambridge
What Do the Parthenon Sculptures Embody—and for Whom?

The “text” for the seminar was the “Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums” of January 2003, a document signed by the directors of eighteen of the world’s most famous museums (ten of them in the United States) at the original initiative of the British Museum in London. The seminar first examined the assumptions and claims in the document, then its reception in the rest of the museum community. From there it moved on to the Parthenon marbles and the issue of “embodiment.” Is this dispute a tug-of-war over ownership between two kinds of nationalism or the “universality” of the declaration and the “localism” of the Greek claim? Or does it, rather, result from the differences, so far unrecognized by either side, between two kinds of embodiment?
The purpose of this workshop was to share discoveries and speculations concerning the use of tablets and other surfaces designed for drawing, writing, and calculating that could easily be erased. One such tablet has been identified in a Renaissance painting in the collection of the National Gallery of Art, Jan Goessart’s *Portrait of a Merchant*. Many such books and tablets survive (often unrecognized) from the sixteenth and later centuries, and the subject is obviously of interest for art historians, not least because of a close relationship with the techniques for drawing with metal point. In addition, a whole range of poetic metaphor is illuminated by retrieving this nearly eradicated episode—or series of episodes—in the history of how our ancestors worked out their ideas and made memoranda.
Publications

Two volumes appeared during the year. The first, in the symposium series Studies in the History of Art, was *Nationalism and French Visual Culture, 1870–1914 (2005)*, edited by June Hargrove of the University of Maryland, College Park, and Neil McWilliam of Duke University. The second, the inaugural volume in the Seminar Papers series, was *The Dada Seminars (2005)*, edited by Leah Dickerman with Matthew S. Witkovsky. Several other volumes are in preparation. A complete list of Center publications appears at the end of *Center 25*. 
Research Projects

Four long-term research projects are in progress at the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts:

Early Modern Sources in Translation: Carlo Cesare Malvasia’s Felsina Pittrice

As part of a larger research project to publish important art literature from the early modern period in translation, an annotated English translation of this history of Bolognese painting is in preparation under the direction of Dean Elizabeth Cropper. Felsina Pittrice (or Bologna the Paintress), by Carlo Cesare Malvasia (1616–1693), is one of the most important art-historical texts on Italian art. Indeed, it may be considered the seventeenth-century equivalent of Vasari’s Lives. Unlike Vasari, or several other contemporary writers, however, Malvasia wrote quite deliberately in an unusually difficult Italian. The Felsina, first published in 1678, has never been translated in full. This translation, which will be undertaken by a team of scholars, will include transcriptions and translations of Malvasia’s manuscript notes in the Archiginnasio in Bologna. The translation will therefore be valuable not only for teaching purposes, but also for all specialists of Bolognese painting. Anne Summerscale and Giovanna Perini, who have both published substantially on Malvasia, are scholarly advisors to the project. Research has hitherto focused on the first of four parts of Malvasia’s text and on providing basic tools that will be useful for the translators and annotators of the subsequent parts of Malvasia’s Felsina.

Research Associates: Giancarla Periti and Robert LaFrance

Figure representing Bologna, from Carlo Cesare Malvasia, Felsina pittrice (Bologna, 1678). National Gallery of Art Library, Washington
Former Assistant Dean Joanne Pillsbury has submitted the three-volume “Guide to Documentary Sources for Andean Studies, 1530–1900” to its publishers. This three-volume reference work for the support of research on the pre-Hispanic and colonial periods of the Andean region of South America will make a multitude of sources available to scholars 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 nineteenth century concerning a region defined by the extent of the Inca Empire (modern Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and parts of Colombia, Argentina, and Chile). The essays and entries consider the contributions, perspectives, and biases of authors who wrote on the pre-Hispanic and colonial cultures of this region. As there was no tradition of writing in this area before the arrival of Europeans in the sixteenth century, these texts are critical, though problematic, sources of information on Andean life. A smaller number of early republican (nineteenth-century) sources of particular relevance to the study of the Inca and other indigenous cultures are also addressed. The guide will reproduce 150 sample illustrations from these works, including woodcuts, engravings, watercolors, and early photographs.

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 supported by the Lampadia Foundation.

“India del Paraguay de las charruas de guerra,” depiction of an indigenous person from the area that is now Paraguay, from Diego de Ocaña’s manuscript, “Relación del viaje de Fray Diego de Ocaña por el Nuevo Mundo (1599–1605),” 1599–1608, fol. 123v. Courtesy of the Biblioteca de la Universidad de Oviedo [ms. 215]
Keywords in American Landscape Architecture

Associate Dean Therese O’Malley directs a project to compile a photographic corpus and historical encyclopedia documenting landscape design in North America during the colonial and antebellum periods. Through the study of texts and images, the project traces the changing meaning of landscape and garden terminology as it was adapted from Old World sources and transformed into an American landscape vocabulary. The goal is to map the evolution 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 of, and references to, gardens and ornamental landscapes from a wide variety of sources, both published and manuscript, and a corpus of images comprising more than eighteen hundred reproductions. Over seven hundred of these illustrations and hundreds of citations have been collected in a historical and visual reference work to be copublished by the National Gallery of Art and Yale University Press. Each of the 104 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 additional 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 its support from Center funds, the project has received support from the Getty Grant Program and the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts. The Terra Foundation for the Arts has provided a subvention for the publication, which is currently in production.

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 and a collection of secondary sources. The aim is to create the first institutional history of the Accademia on the basis of original statutes, adunanze (records of the proceedings of meetings of the academy), ledger books kept by the treasurers, and references in civil and criminal court records.

In connection with the meeting of participants in the project held at the Accademia di San Luca in Rome in June 2005, Peter M. Lukehart prepared the following report on his research.

Research Associate: Frances Gage
The Accademia di San Luca: New Documents and New Interpretations

My work on the Accademia di San Luca grew out of a thwarted attempt to write a comparative study of Italian artistic education in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. When I was carrying out research in Rome several years ago, I was immediately confronted by the lack of a coherent history of the initial years of the Accademia, before the building of Pietro da Cortona’s magnificent church of Santi Luca e Martina; that is, the years between 1593 and about 1630. The best sources remain Romano Alberti’s *Origine, et progresso dell’Accademia del Disegno de’ Pittori, Scultori, & Architetti . . .* (1604) and especially *Memorie per servire alla storia della romana Accademia di S. Luca . . .* (1823), by Melchior Missirini, on whose account most scholars have assumed that documentation for these years had been lost. These were followed by interesting and important contributions from the archivists or historians of the Accademia. Still, there has been no synthetic study of the Accademia during that early period. We do not know, for example, precisely who the members were, what their duties were, how they or the giovani in their care were trained, or how their lives were shaped by the Accademia.

Some of the most perplexing problems confronting historians of the Accademia concern the precise date and circumstances of the establishment of the existing institution. Before 1593 there were separate guilds for painters (Università or Compagnia di San Luca), sculptors (Università dei Marmorari or Compagnia dei Santi Quattro Coronati), and carpenters (Compagnia di San Giuseppe dei Falegnami). The Compagnia di San Luca, in existence since at least 1478, comprised painters, miniaturists, gold beaters, flag makers, and lace makers. The only institution that brought together artists in both two- and three-dimensional media was the religious confraternity of San Giuseppe di Terrasanta, or the Virtuosi al Pantheon, founded in 1546. This last organization, however, had no explicit pedagogical or professional functions.
The founding of the Accademia di San Luca took nearly two decades. According to the biographer Carlo Cesare Malvasia, whose *Felsina pittrice* was published in 1678, the artist Lorenzo Sabbatini—Bolognese by birth, Florentine by later training—first proposed the Accademia during the 1570s, when he was working in Rome. We know, through various secondary sources, that the idea was well received, but Sabbatini did not live to see the incorporation. Shortly after his death in 1576, Girolamo Muziano (c. 1532–1592), a painter from Brescia who had arrived in Rome in the 1550s, was named superintendent of papal works. As a result of his advocacy, in 1577 Gregory XIII issued a bull that incorporated the Accademia. Addressed to Cardinal Giacomo Savelli, the document specified one of the functions of the Accademia as “educating young boys in the practice of the Arts.”

For approximately eleven years the struggling academy had its home in the church of San Luca, adjacent to Santa Maria Maggiore, with its meeting room in a space nearby. The pope’s demise in 1585, however, halted progress on the Accademia. Further complicating the history, around 1587 both of the edifices that housed it were demolished by Sixtus V during the expansions of Santa Maria Mag-
giore and of the Peretti family palace. In 1588 Sixtus issued a second bull that granted the Accademia a new site in the Campo Vaccino: the derelict church of Santa Martina near the Arch of Septimius Severus.

Just as the Accademia had begun to relocate to its new home, Muziano died (1592). In his last will and testament, he made substantial provisions for the nascent institution, bequeathing to it the income from the sale of the paintings remaining in his studio, in order to provide for the training and lodging of youths who “much too early and without adequate training . . . start on great tasks, because they are forced to do so by economic needs.” Clearly, the studios and botteghe in Rome were not providing, nor were they equipped to provide, training adequate for the influx of young artists arriving from the provinces and from beyond the Alps. Muziano’s will in fact provided for “the young boys who daily, and unexpectedly, arrive in Rome to learn Painting.”

Lacking statutes, a designated successor to Muziano, and the attention of a pope, the Accademia foundered until Clement VIII Aldobrandini was elected in 1592. (Clement’s reign followed those of three short-lived popes, Urban VII, Gregory XIV, and Innocent IX, none of whom served for longer than a few months.) In fact, Muziano’s death could not have come at a less opportune moment, for his vision of the Accademia would have found favor with the recently elected pope, who revealed himself to be a great supporter of the institution. The received history of the Accademia ends abruptly with Muziano’s passing and resumes only on 15 November 1593, when Clement appointed Federico Borromeo cardinal-protector of the new institution and named Federico Zuccaro the first principe. This gap in the history of the Accademia is possibly the result of Zuccaro’s attempts to erase his predecessor’s contributions.

A new chronology as well as new factual material regarding the foundation of the Accademia emerges from my research in the Archivio di Stato, where I located the records—previously thought to have been lost—of one of the Accademia’s notaries, Ottavio Saravezzi. First, Muziano had specified not only that his collection of paintings was to be liquidated in order to provide for the youths, but also that, should his heirs die without successors, his entire estate was to revert to the Accademia to fund the building of a hos-
pice for the young artists who came to Rome from all parts of the world. In fact, no sooner had Muziano died than his heirs consolidated their assets and refused to release them to the Accademia. The bulk of Muziano’s estate, therefore, did not revert to the Accademia for about thirty years. Second, this new series of documents provides an official date of incorporation for the Accademia some six months earlier than Missirini reported: the *congregazione* convened on 7 March 1593 with a fully developed mission statement; hence the academicians wasted little time or momentum following Muziano’s death, perhaps spurred on by his magnanimous, if ill-fated, gift. Subsequent documents from Saravezzi’s notarial office span the first several decades of the Accademia’s existence.

In addition to the documents mentioned here, as part of my research project for the Center, I hope to include in an online database those that have been found and transcribed by colleagues on the advisory board of the Accademia di San Luca research project, Pietro Roccasecca and Matteo Lafranconi. In this way, all of the Accademia’s recorded meetings, as well as the members who attended them, from the 1570s or 1580s through about 1630, will be brought together in a single resource.

During the 2004–2005 academic year, the Accademia di San Luca research project made progress in two principal areas: the creation of a database of documents for the early years of the institution and the production of a volume of essays concerning the history and interpretation of the Accademia. The first initiative is concerned with both the transcription of original and unpublished documentation and with making this material accessible to the scholarly community. Research associate Frances Gage has completed the transcriptions of documents from the Archivio di Stato for the years 1592 through 1625. Since fall 2004 we have worked with a consultant to create a database that will be made fully searchable by means of text encoding.

The second initiative focuses on a seminar that has brought together an international group of historians and art historians with specialized interests in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Rome in general and the Accademia in particular. At the first meeting, held in Washington in December (see pages 25–27), nine papers were presented on topics ranging from institutional history to theory.
There was also ample opportunity for discussion of the Accademia and its place in Cinquecento and Seicento artistic culture. The second seminar, with seven more papers, took place in Rome in June 2005 in collaboration with the Accademia di San Luca. A selection of papers from the two meetings will be gathered for publication in the Center’s new Seminar Papers series, supported by Robert H. Smith.
Fellows’ tour of the exhibition
Dan Flavin: A Retrospective
with curator Jeffrey Weiss
Research Reports of Members
The idea of providing an overview of Italian Renaissance illumination suggested itself to me over ten years ago, when I was doing preparatory research for an exhibition entitled *The Painted Page*, held at the Royal Academy of Arts in London and the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York in 1994–1995. The book has been planned in two parts. The first five chapters provide a narrative of the main schools, artists, and surviving manuscripts, divided according to area and date. While at the Center I completed chapter 5, a mapping of the still underexplored terrain of the sixteenth century. I have also continued to revise and bring up to date the four chapters already written on the fifteenth-century material. The second part of the book, also with five chapters, is more thematic. It concerns the sociocultural aspects of the production of illuminated manuscripts. Chapter 6 describes the illumination by hand of printed books in Italy, especially in Venice, where, in the short period from 1469 to the end of the century, a considerable number of books received illumination by outstanding artists. Chapter 7 deals with the illuminators, especially their methods of work, their status and payment, and their relationships with their patrons. Chapter 8 discusses the style and content of decoration and illustration in relation to different kinds of text, the main division being between liturgical texts intended for use in the Christian Mass and Divine Office, and secular texts, especially the newly fashionable classical and humanist texts. Chapter 9 reviews both the influence
of the humanist interest in classical antiquity on styles of decoration and the issue of antiquity versus modernity in relation to the book and its text. Finally, chapter 10 describes some of the artistic relationships and overlaps between illuminators and artists working in other media. These last five chapters are all now in draft form, leaving only a short epilogue on relations with the rest of Europe still to be written. The most formidable task remaining will be gathering the illustrations.

Two uncompleted projects, which I brought with me when I arrived, are now in press. The first involved descriptions of mainly Italian manuscripts for the catalogue of an exhibition entitled Splendor of the Word, opening on 20 October 2005 at the New York Public Library. The other is a short piece on the humanistic manuscript for the exhibition The Cambridge Illuminations, which runs from 26 July to December 2005 in Cambridge, England.

The Center continues to provide the same invaluable support for the scholar as when I was here twenty years ago. If there seem to be more events and activities of every kind than there were then, that is also true of our professional lives as art historians in general. The growth of the discipline in all its branches—teaching, research, exhibitions, publishing—has been astonishing. We arrived at the beginning of this academic year at a moving moment: the National Mall was filled with Native Americans celebrating the opening of the museum devoted to the art and culture of their nations. It was a testament to the importance of history, and inspirational for those of us who are involved in the study and preservation of human culture, especially visual culture, in all of its innumerable manifestations.

Institute of Fine Arts, New York University
Samuel H. Kress Professor, 2004–2005

Jonathan J. G. Alexander will return to his teaching position as Sherman Fairchild Professor of Fine Arts at the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University.
In 1569–1570, a group of refugee French and Netherlandish artists and entrepreneurs in Geneva produced an unusual series of woodcuts and etchings that they entitled *Premier Volume. CONTENANT QVARANTE TABLEAUX OV Histoires diverses qui sont memorables touchant les Guerres, Massacres, & Troubles advenus en France en ces dernieres annees. Le tout recueilli selon le tesmoignage de ceux qui y ont esté en personne, & qui les ont veus, lesquels sont pour-trais à la verité* (First Volume CONTAINING FORTY PICTURES OR divers memorable histories concerning the wars, massacres, and troubles that have occurred in France in these last years. All gathered from the testimony of those who were there in person and saw them, and truly portrayed). Insofar as I have been able to establish, this work—often known as “Tortorel and Perrissin” after the names of the otherwise obscure Lyon artists chiefly responsible for it—is the first extended print series depicting events from the recent past that was intended not to glorify a ruler’s deeds, but to show a broad general public the events of their time. Although the makers of this series never produced a second volume, their prints were immediately copied in a smaller format by Franz Hogenberg (c. 1540–c. 1590). Hogenberg went on to build up an important print- and map-publishing business in Cologne, one of whose specialties was historical series such as this. The work thus occupies a significant place in the larger story of the use of visual media to report on current events.
During my time at the Center, I made substantial progress in drafting a book that intends to explore the history, contents, and reception of this unusual print series.

Like so many works in the sixteenth century, when printing was still new and the Renaissance and Reformation were destabilizing old cultural forms, “Forty Pictures” was an experimental work. It was experimental in the simple sense that it was created by a group of artists and entrepreneurs with no prior experience in producing such a work. Two textile merchants from Antwerp launched and financed the project. Jacques Tortorel (active 1568–1592) and Jean Perrissin (c. 1536–c. 1611) were young artists who, as far as we know, made no prints previous to undertaking this project and would make few more after they completed it. Together, the group struggled to find the best format for their series, trying different experiments, but
never settled on a single definitive structure for the relationship between text and images. They began to make the prints as woodcuts, shifted to etchings after a few months, and returned to making woodcuts, but never completed all forty sheets in either medium. After producing a few prints with verse captions that were strongly Protestant in sentiment, they settled upon a more dispassionate style of prose captions that enabled the work to be sold to Catholics and Protestants alike. At the same time, they expanded the series in the course of production, adding scenes to buttress a narrative of the years 1559–1570 that justified the Protestant recourse to arms.

The series was also experimental in the more profound sense that no exact generic precedents guided it. Some earlier graphic publications such as the suite of prints on the victories of Emperor Charles V commonly referred to as “The Victories of Charles V,” produced by Hieronymus Cock in Antwerp in 1556, had sought to carry a historical narrative through pictures and accompanying text, but these were typically accounts of the victories of a great ruler containing a strong element of panegyric. In proclaiming their goal to be the presentation of an impartial eyewitness view of the events in question, the authors of “Forty Pictures” took this emerging genre in a new direction, one inspired by both the growing market for single-sheet news prints that claimed to offer true depictions of individual events and the prevailing rhetoric of written historiography in Geneva. The challenge of conveying contemporary events in pictures placed the series within what the great literary critic Mikhail Bakhtin, writing about the early novel, called “the zone of maximal contact with the present,” in turn generative of an indeterminacy or open-endedness in storytelling. It is too simple to claim, as some have done, that “Forty Pictures” is merely a work of propaganda whose subjects are selected to reveal the pattern and extent of Huguenot victimization. Quite unusually in this age of intense partisanship, scenes of Protestants massacring Catholics are interspersed among the more numerous scenes in which Catholics massacre Protestants. One of the prints replicates an earlier news print by a Catholic artist. Others turn out to be extremely accurate when their details are compared with independent evidence from reliable sources to which the makers of the series could not have had access. Yet the creators’ self-
proclaimed goal of offering an impartial eyewitness view of events was recurrently subverted by visual details within the prints and their reliance on Protestant networks of information. For every depiction of an event whose details agree with independent evidence, there is another print in the series whose information can be shown to derive from highly partisan Huguenot accounts of the event in question. The manner in which specific cities or buildings are rendered reveals that they were rarely drawn from life or copied from trustworthy prior depictions. In the final analysis, like virtually any multivalent work of history, the prints offer a complex mixture of partisan spin, artistic license, and accurate information that in some instances is available nowhere else. Examining them minutely to disclose their specific character thus serves to illuminate both the place of visual media within the history of information in sixteenth-century Europe and the character of early Huguenot historiography.

Brown University
Frese Senior Fellow, fall 2004

After completing his fellowship at the Center, Philip Benedict began a new position as professor at the Institut d’Histoire de la Réformation of the Université de Genève.
Research into the Production of Bronze Sculptures by Henri Matisse

The activity of Henri Matisse (1869–1954) as a painter has so overshadowed his sculptural enterprise that one is surprised to learn of his dedication to modeling. For his large sculptures, he would spend several hours a day for years on a single piece, far longer than for any single canvas he painted. Although his aim has been called exploratory rather than monumental, Matisse was not a secretive sculptor in the same sense as Edgar Degas (1834–1917), for whom modeling was genuinely private. Matisse exhibited his sculptures early and prominently, even before they were cast in bronze. Over the course of his career he probably created hundreds of sculptural works in clay, of which eighty-two are preserved in plaster, bronze, and terracotta.

Beginning in 1907, Matisse worked with various foundries to realize bronze casts of his works, generally with the goal of creating numbered editions of ten. Editions were cast sporadically over decades, and the numbering was often not sequential. Most editions remained incomplete at his death and were finished posthumously by his heirs. Even though 744 bronze casts were ultimately realized, there has never been a technical study of Matisse’s sculpture in the art-historical or conservation literature. This study seeks to fill that void.
Recent scholarship has brought to light new information regarding serial casting practices in nineteenth- and twentieth-century France and about Matisse’s sculptural oeuvre—for which the 1997 catalogue raisonné (Claude Duthuit, Henri Matisse, catalogue raisonné de l’oeuvre sculpté) has been a primary tool. The early years of Matisse’s bronze production straddled the transition in French sculpture from general use of sand casting to that of lost wax. Matisse’s early friendship with Aristide Maillol (1861–1944) led him to his first foundry, Bingen and Costenoble, and the sand casting process that Maillol preferred. After World War I, Matisse switched to the Godard foundry but continued with sand casting until the mid-1920s, at which time he again changed foundries and began having his works cast using the lost-wax technique. Almost all of his lost-wax casts were produced by the Valsuani foundry, with which he maintained a relationship for the rest of his life.

Not surprisingly, bronze casts of the same edition, produced over many decades by different foundries using diverse processes, exhibit variations in weight, finishing, patina, and appearance. Our study closely examined bronze casts in the collections of the Baltimore Museum of Art; the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden; the Nasher Sculpture Center; the Museum of Modern Art; the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art; the Philadelphia Museum of Art; the Rosenbach Library; the Weatherspoon Art Museum, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; the Musée National d’Art Moderne, Centre Georges Pompidou; the Musée Matisse, Nice; and the Musée Matisse, Le Cateau–Cambrésis. Special attention was paid to the few surviving plasters—Matisse’s heirs destroyed plasters for completed editions in the 1990s—and to rare terracotta casts and unfired clay works.

Methods included close visual examination under strong light, measurement, base tracing, digital photography, and, where appropriate and practical, x-ray fluorescence spectrometry, x-radiography, and inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICPMS) analysis. These methods made it possible to distinguish sand casts from sculptures made by the lost-wax process and to characterize and compare the bronze alloys used by the various foundries. Zinc concentrations in the alloys rose steadily over the course of the century.
with a corresponding decrease in copper concentration. Differences in patina between the sand-cast works and those made in lost wax were found, in part, to be due to the use of chromium by the Valsuani foundry. It is also likely that Valsuani’s innovative use of the blowtorch for patination accounts for much of the difference in appearance between works of that foundry and those of the earlier sand founders.

Matisse’s interest in process resulted in the decision to retain multiple mold lines that are visible on the surfaces of most of his sculp-

tures. These imprints provide a record of the methods and multiple stages involved in a work’s production. Our study closely evaluated mold lines to learn about Matisse’s use of molding techniques and to gauge relationships between casts. Matisse was not indiscriminate, however, in his retention of mold lines. Plaster works show gelatin mold lines that are cast through into the bronzes along with piece mold lines, but gelatin mold lines that would have resulted from the casting of indirect lost-wax positives have been removed.

Early in his career Matisse made his own molds, a skill he may have acquired while attending evening courses at the École Comunale de la Ville de Paris, or from the sculptor Émile Antoine Bourdelle (1861–1929), with whom he briefly studied. As he became more solvent, he hired a specialist, Léon Bertault, to produce molds and transform his clay creations into plaster. Our study reviewed the Matisse-Bertault correspondence, preserved at the Archives Matisse in Paris, and found that Matisse preferred *bons creux* (piece molds) to *creux perdus* (waste molds), a choice that enabled him to retain the clay original. Evidence suggests that in some instances he had piece molds made from clay models that were not completely dry, allowing him to develop his models further to produce series. Matisse’s interest in evolutionary series began with his two *Madeleine* sculptures (1901–1903) and culminated with his monumental *Backs* (1909–1930).

Baltimore Museum of Art
Samuel H. Kress Foundation Paired Fellows in Conservation and the History of Art and Archaeology, 3 January–28 February 2005

*Ann Boulton will return to her position as objects conservator at the Baltimore Museum of Art.*

*Oliver Shell will return to his position as Samuel H. Kress Curatorial Fellow at the Baltimore Museum of Art, where he is writing a catalogue of the sculpture of the Cone Collection.*
My fellowship has been occupied with writing a study of Egyptian painting in the Eighteenth Dynasty, with an exploration of methods, techniques, and organization. Although dozens of painted tombs from ancient Thebes of this time period (c. 1550–1300 B.C.E.) have been published, the monographic presentation of their chapels has treated the subject of painting itself very narrowly. Scholars have continued to be interested in the scene content nearly exclusively, despite more frequent inclusion of pigment analysis in their publications in recent years. The approach has been that of epigraphy: recording the painted scenes in line drawings and publishing them with photography, both color and black and white, of the walls. Although the best publications of this type often include historical discussion of the tomb and its owner, synthetic discussions of the larger meaning of the scenes have been reserved for other venues. In particular, several German scholars have written on the religious meaning of certain types of scene motifs, and a book by the American scholar Melinda Hartwig, published in 2004, focused on the meaning of various repeated motifs found in painted Theban tombs. Her treatment relied heavily on current understandings of religious symbolism in New Kingdom Egypt. Yet an understanding of the process of tomb painting remains largely neglected as a research field, and in addition, the overall meaning of painting in its cultural context has been entirely disregarded.
Since September 2004 my work has focused on identifying the terminology for painting as a process. Surprisingly, there has never been a published study on this topic, although a number of discussions have addressed the subjects of labor and the economy related to construction, and papyri that represent records of building projects have been published. Since I have placed the unfinished painted tomb of the royal butler Suemniwet (c. 1425 B.C.E.) at the center of my study and will publish it as part of the work, I looked for documentation of contemporary date. What would seem the obvious body of material to look at first, the artisan village of Deir el Medina, which housed the stone sculptors and painters of the tombs of the
Valley of the Kings, represents a later time period. Indeed, although study of the vast Deir el Medina documentation has revealed terms for carving and making details with chisels (and more could probably be clarified with careful attention to the texts), it has yielded few indications of painting as a process, perhaps because these artisans were largely sculptors first, and then draftsmen.

I have been fortunate, however, in identifying a group of documents that refer specifically to painting processes and that are dated entirely to the period 1479–1425 B.C.E., nearly coterminous with the tomb of Suemniwet. These are work records related to the construction of the tomb of Queen Hatshepsut’s royal steward Senenmut, excavated by the Metropolitan Museum of Art in the 1930s. Relevant to these are published records associated with Queen Hatshepsut’s funerary temple and with the temple of her coregent and successor, Thutmose III. So far I have studied terminology from a body of some fifty ostraca, all of which had been published in hieroglyphic hand copy, but not all translated. The results have been striking: it is now possible to identify an ancient Egyptian set of terms to describe a five-step process in wall preparation and painting. These steps can be associated with visible techniques on the walls, all but one of which I had already identified by studying the unfinished paintings alone. Paint colors were applied by artisans, while sketches and final outlines were done by draftsmen, as demonstrated in an unfinished painting from the tomb of Suemniwet, in which a scene was sketched but left uncolored except for one layer of background paint. In addition I have found terms to describe wall sections being decorated (dnj), registers (Smmt), and the distinct operations of tomb artisans (xrtyw-nTr) and draftsmen (sSw-Qd). With permission of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, I have begun to study the photographs and hand copies of more than four hundred ostraca from the 1930s excavation. It is highly likely that more information will emerge from these unpublished examples.

In addition to identifying the terminology for painting processes, I explored the semantic associations of the words involved. The overall cultural meaning of painting as an enterprise has never been discussed, but it is highly relevant to our understanding of the societal role of painters in all periods in ancient Egypt. My work has revealed
interesting connections for these terms that had never been considered but are not unexpected. The words associated with paintings derive from the terminology of medicine and magic, and, when studied in depth, demonstrate that the materials and operations of painting were similar to those of medicine—that is, they created a clean, purified, and healthy environment in which the tomb owner’s body could be made whole and new again. This was indeed the aim of all afterlife preparation. It is hardly a surprise to find that painting itself aided in this endeavor, but it is surprising to see how profound the evidence for its role is. In April I presented my findings in a colloquium at the Center and subsequently at the annual meeting of the American Research Center in Egypt in Boston. The response, from colleagues specializing in the full range of relevant specialties—art history, religion and magic, and Deir el Medina—was overwhelmingly positive. I expect to complete four chapters of the book by the end of the summer, two being now finished.

The Johns Hopkins University
Paul Mellon Senior Fellow, 2004–2005

Betsy M. Bryan will return to her position as the Alexander Badawy Professor of Egyptian Art and Archaeology at The Johns Hopkins University.
Enshrouded in the mysteries of an age-old mythology, the origins and meanings of many of the motifs of Indian art remain enigmatic; some require research to unlock their contexts. One of these is the navanarikunjara—an elephant (kunjara) formed by nine (nava) women (nari). This motif has been favored in Indian art since at least the sixteenth century. It has variously been chiseled in stone; fashioned in baked clay or terracotta panels of late medieval (seventeenth- and eighteenth-century) temples; executed in the painted delights of Mughal, Pahari, Rajasthani, and Deccani miniatures; carved in ivory and wood; and depicted in decorative arts, tablemats, and playing cards. In parts of West Bengal the navanarikunjara images are worshipped to this day as a living tradition.

Expressed not only in art objects, in the mid-seventeenth century the navanarikunjara also had an interesting physical demonstration in the court of a southern Indian king, Abdullah Qutub Shah of Golconda. Jean-Baptiste Tavernier, a French traveler who visited his court in 1648 and subsequently in 1652, recorded an eyewitness account of a royal procession in which nine young girls cleverly represented the form of an elephant.

Composite figures are well known in Indian religious art. For example, hybrid animal compositions, known as vyala, are common in medieval temple decorations. Secular forms, however, as illustrated by the navanarikunjara, the ashtanariratha (chariot of eight women),...
the saptanarituranga (horse of seven women), the shatnaritorana (arch of six women), and the panchanarigeta (knot of five women), are considered to be innovations of Indo-Ceylonese art that spread widely throughout Southeast Asia after the sixteenth century.

The peculiar tradition of composing a figure that is part animal, part human, in an arrangement resembling a jigsaw puzzle is a long-standing one. Like many other elements, this conceit would appear to have arrived in sixteenth-century Bukhara by way of Herat, the center of Timurid culture throughout most of the fifteenth century. It became popular simultaneously in India, presumably as a result of contact with Bukhara.

Although composite animal forms of this type thus appear to have been inspired by Persian counterparts, the motif was quickly integrated into the Indian artistic vocabulary. In the Mughal court of sixteenth-century India, the vyala motif was often found in manuscript illuminations, especially from the ateliers of the regimes of Akbar and Jahangir. Paintings of this period depict a composite elephant led by demons. The animal’s body is an ingeniously interwoven welter of forms: a lion, a tiger, a blue-skinned demon, a leopard, a bear, and a buffalo with splendidly carved horns. The elephant’s head is an intricate interlace of a man, whose flaring lower garments form an ear, with various beasts, a mythical crocodilian creature whose long body and tail form the trunk, and a fish that makes up the tusks. Sometimes crammed with extraordinary flora and fauna as well as demons and odd personages, the elephant is set in a delightful landscape with a fanciful city in the distance. Scholars ascribe such “creature paintings” from Akbar’s court to the well-known painters Miskin and Dharma Das, who were active in the latter part of the sixteenth century.

The images concealed within animals are not mere decorations or amusements for the eye, but rather would seem to be visualizations of earth spirits, perhaps of Sufi inspiration. A clue to spiritual association has been left by the propagator of the composite elephant motif, who included a kneeling figure of a bearded saint toward the center of the arrangement. Whatever the significance of such images, they encouraged the artist, as they continue to encourage the viewer, to explore a subconscious response.

These complex representations were sometimes termed burraq,
meaning concealment, mystery, or disguise. In the Punjab and adjoining hill states such paintings were called *chhalida*, or deceptions, something neither intelligible nor explicable. Such symbolic representations with no literary definition or explanation were until recently considered to be mysterious or anomalous examples of art.

Artistic motifs often are spread to other media by means that are not always explicable. Thus elements that were initially found in painted delights were also used in the panels of baked clay that decorated the walls of temples in Bengal. The *navanarikunjara*, generally
found on the lower middle part of the right pillar of the main entrance of a temple, served as a complementary motif to a rasamandala (dancing maids encircling Krishna) scene on the left pillar. Medieval Vaishnava literature in Sanskrit and Bengali and a Jain manuscript of the fifteenth century provide mythological interpretation and early description of the navanarikunjara motif. Radha, the lady love of the blue god Krishna, with her eight comrades, known as gopinis, playfully deceived the lord by assuming a superb elephantine form. Vivid descriptions of this motif found their place in the literature, tales, and folklore of India. Medieval composers and poets of Orissa, on the east coast of India on the Bay of Bengal, took this visual element as a part of the gajarasalila theme (the dalliance of Krishna with women in the form of an elephant), while choreographers included it in the bandhanritya, a composite dance style of Orissa.

An extended version of Indian navanarikunjara can be found in works by the Dutch painter Willem Schellinks (1627–1678), who painted two oils on panel that portray the three great Mughal princes. In one they ride an imaginary elephant, a horse, and a camel, and in the other they are borne on a palanquin. These paintings, conceived as if on a theatrical stage, describe the successive phases of the Mughal reign set within a division of three time frames.

Calcutta
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, 1 September–31 October 2004

Shyamalkanti Chakravarti, formerly director of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, and the National Library of India, resumed teaching museology at Rabindra Bharati University, West Bengal, and at Calcutta University.
The Dutch Republic was uniquely and quite literally the painter’s place. There, painting reigned as art form and site of cultural discourse, and a new independent, entrepreneurial, professionally self-aware painter emerged as a dynamic force. It has long been recognized that the mercantile Dutch Republic produced a new kind of naturalistic art, in the form of portrait, genre, landscape, and still-life paintings, and that these were displayed and marketed in new ways. More recently this author, among others, has made the case that the Dutch promoted their national identity and novel communal mythologies through their picturing of the familiar and local, as well as through overtly political imagery. The book I am now writing examines how Rembrandt van Rijn (1606–1669), Gerrit Dou (1613–1675), Jan Steen (1625/1626–1679), Johannes Vermeer (1632–1675), and their contemporaries were shaped by and in turn shaped the development of the independent republic, a free market economy, and an artistic culture centered in the painter’s studio.

In the unfolding story of the Western invention of the artist, the seventeenth-century Dutch contribution has been overlooked because the Dutch artist has been “naturalized.” Just as their descriptive art has been seen as lacking the theoretical foundations of Italian painting, so, too, has it been accepted that Dutch painters, in contrast to their Italian counterparts, were relatively un-self-conscious. In challenging these notions, I investigate the Dutch painters’ many places, both
physical and conceptual: Dutch painters actively forged an identity for their new state, its towns and cities, and its domestic culture. In the process, they reimagined their studios and homes, created new strategies for marketing their paintings, redefined their place in society, and rethought their places in relation to antiquity and Italy, in history, and in the imagination. Dutch artists reinvented themselves in the face of ideals of the artist that were no longer viable in the republic. With the development of a complex, highly competitive open market, some Dutch painters reinterpreted the “liberal” in liberal arts to mean “free”: not just from guilds, but from old systems of court and church patronage. Some sought honors in foreign courts. Others positioned themselves at the margins of their profession’s traditional norms; the painter’s place embraced the painter who was “out of place.”

Evidence of Dutch painters’ professional self-consciousness is found in the phenomenal output of, and demand for, pictures of painters—self-portraits and studio scenes—and in the publications of treatises and artists’ biographies. Because the seventeenth century told the history of art in terms of biographies, I bracket the study with two books of artists’ lives: Karel van Mander, in *Het Schilder-Boeck* (Book on Painting) of 1604, writes as a northerner with a mission to elevate northern art and distinguish it from that of the Italians, announces that his culture is pictorial, and sets the stage for the development of a Netherlandish artistic identity; Arnold Houbraken’s *De Groote Schouwburgh der Nederlantsche Konstschilders en Schilderessen* (Great Theater of Netherlandish Painters and Paintresses), Amsterdam, 3 volumes, 1718–1721, provides a retrospective look at how Dutch painters understood themselves and their profession. While the pictorial and literary imagery of the painter is central to my study, I also consider the realities of educating painters, of studio practice, and of the marketing, collecting, and displaying of pictures.

The *schilderkamer* (painting room) is at the heart of my study. My work before I came to the Center focused on ideas conveyed through the remarkable proliferation of seemingly lifelike studio scenes through which Dutch painters radically reconceptualized their profession. *Lute Playing Painter*, by Jan van Swieten (before 1637–1661), speaks, through its juxtaposition of inspired ideal painter in
the foreground and ordinary, mundane painter in the background, to a new self-consciousness about the studio as both real and imagined place.

At the Center, in discourse with generous colleagues at the National Gallery of Art and inspired by this year’s constellation of exhibitions and symposia on Dutch art (Gerard ter Borch [1617–1681], Rembrandt’s Late Religious Portraits, and Jan de Bray and the Classical Tradition), I have taken my research in the direction of studio practice. Specifically, I have examined how a heightened mandate to represent the “visible world” naar het leven, from life, played out as tensions between the ideal of drawing from classical models and the realities of contemporary practices of drawing from life—from the nude, from one’s face in a mirror, from the wooden lay figure—or of not drawing at all. In the studio, stylistic and technical innovations register the newness of the Dutch commitment to attentively observing the here and now, down to earth, and up to date.

In examining the new painters who emerged from the duality of artistic revolt and Dutch Revolt, I ask, where do individual artistic personalities and social processes meet? To what extent was artistic change part of the cultural flow, and to what extent was it driven by singularly creative individuals? The culture’s constructs of painter played out—were enacted or subverted, transformed or transgressed—in specific careers and bodies of work in varied ways. Hence, while I employ strategies of social, economic, political, and intellectual history, the close analysis of specific works by uniquely creative artists is central to my study.

University of Delaware
Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow, 2004–2005

H. Perry Chapman will return to her position as professor of art history at the University of Delaware for the fall semester 2005. In 2006 she will hold a John Simon Guggenheim Foundation Fellowship.
As temporary residents, governors of an occupied territory, and substitutes of the Spanish kings, the viceroys of Naples occupied an unparalleled position among the international elite of early modern monarchical functionaries. Their identity was conceived as the representational face and the material body of the absent monarch. My dissertation sets out to identify and interpret the ways in which the viceroys of Naples and their wives, in constant dialogue with the central government of Madrid and the kings of Spain, bolstered Habsburg rule in southern Italy through official artistic and architectural patronage. Analyzing their strategies, I will suggest that these diplomats were the real mediators and translators of the royal image on foreign soil, and that they actively contributed to the construction of Spanish Habsburg iconography during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The chronological and ideological frame of this research spans the years between the election of Pope Sixtus V (1585–1590) and the death of King Philip III of Spain (1598–1621). Using substantial new archival evidence, my study demonstrates that, far from witnessing a phase of artistic inactivity and slackening political power, the late reign of Philip II and the age of Philip III marked a crucial moment of Habsburg international propaganda. Indeed, it contends that in response to repeated political crises, around 1600 Madrid decided to make the kingdom of Naples the beating heart of its Mediterranean politics.
At the dawn of the new century, Naples “la Fedelissima,” rather than being compartmentalized and isolated as a secondary city, was quickly refashioned, according to contemporary theories of statecraft, into a modern capital, occupied by a coherent series of symbolic landmarks. The modalities in which these new monuments were inserted both into and onto the preexisting fabric of old Naples reveal that the Spanish government relied heavily on the collaboration of the local elite, who supported royal claims in advancement of either personal or group interests. The viceroys were master negotiators of such compromises. Rather than contending that this political program was always successful or long lasting, this study aims to demonstrate that it was only an attempt. It will also show how the attempt failed.

In the early seventeenth century, the Lombard architect Domenico Fontana (1543–1607) was selected as the great choreographer of Spanish-sponsored architecture and scenography. After his Roman tenure as the preferred architect of Pope Sixtus V, in 1592 Fontana
moved to Naples, invited by Juan de Zuñiga, count of Miranda and viceroy from 1586 to 1595. He continued to work there for the kings of Spain under the next three viceroys until he died in 1607. This dissertation examines Domenico Fontana’s late oeuvre and that of his son Giulio Cesare (1580–1627) in the context of their studio. It describes their adaptation to the building industry of late sixteenth-century Naples, as well as their professional achievements and the international character of their training and architectural styles.

The conclusion argues that the patronage given to the Fontanas at the expense of native Spanish architects who were highly esteemed in their homeland was motivated by the crown’s intention to emulate in Naples the architecture, symbolism, and artistic program of Sistine Rome. Moreover, I contend that such an anachronistic choice, combined with the career system established by the Spanish administration to control public commissions, affected and delayed the flowering of the baroque in Naples. My account does not privilege any one artistic medium; rather, it describes and integrates into a larger historical evaluation the overall artistic policies of Habsburg public patronage in this specific province of Spanish Italy. Fundamentally, I contend that in dealing with such an important and historic kingdom, rather than proceeding by damnatio memoriae, iconoclasm, and imposition of rulership, the early Habsburgs and their representatives voluntarily maintained a low political profile and embraced a public rhetoric of self-justification. To this aim, in their “informal” colonialism, the Spanish viceroys also favored linguistic and artistic absorption, as well as reconciliation with the past.

My study thus emphasizes the role played by provincial governments in the creation of a multifaceted political imagery that was used to promote Spanish imperialism worldwide throughout the seventeenth century. My reading of the political and artistic behavior of the Habsburgs in Naples may also provide an interpretive model for a broader understanding of Habsburg cultural colonialism in other “Old World” dependencies.

[Columbia University]
Paul Mellon Fellow, 2002–2005

Sabina de Cavi has received a Rudolph Wittkower Departmental Dissertation Fellowship from Columbia University for 2005–2006.
Édouard Manet’s (1832–1883) paintings of modern life, like Olympia, originated in the complex interplay of new social practices adopted by the inhabitants of the rapidly modernizing metropolis of Paris—especially their attitude of cultivated nonchalance and blasé worldliness—with new formal terms. Paul Cézanne’s (1839–1906) early work, by contrast, offers an alternative modernism of emotional extremity and psychological intensity. Early in his career, Cézanne radically dissented from Manet’s dominant paradigm, yet his self-consciously oppositional works—A Modern Olympia among them—have in our histories lost the sharp slap they once carried. Now dismissed as either juvenilia or as too nakedly psychological and late romantic, Cézanne’s early scenes of murders, orgies, and interiors pregnant with meaning, dating from the late Second Empire and early Third Republic, instead worked to supplant Manet’s refusal of an emotive and narrative idiom with one that is simultaneously more expressive and less anti-authorial without losing any of its avant-garde charge. Two types of ripostes to Manet prevail in Cézanne’s works of the late 1860s: one, best exemplified by The Murder, revels in the most passionate expressions of modern human psychology, not least cruelty; the other, epitomized in Overture to Tannhäuser, parodies the resemblances between blasé sophistication and the prosaic, monotonous, and repressive aspects of modern bourgeois culture.

Central to my argument is that Cézanne’s early paintings are not
explorations of his own psychic disposition, as has often been claimed, but rather are careful orchestrations of subjectivity and interiority, exemplifying contemporary understandings of the formation and representation of the self. Accordingly, I discuss the various intellectual models for representing temperament on which Cézanne drew in formulating modern experience differently from Manet. Mobilizing contexts rarely brought to bear on our understanding of early modernism, I investigate positivist analyses of the human mind and theories of modern sociality; conceptions of authorial function and presence in art, literature, and poetry; and the reception of romanticism in the Second Empire.

While we often credit Émile Zola’s aesthetic theory as influential for both Manet and Cézanne, we ignore the novelist’s equivalent investment in scientific, experimental investigations into the human psyche as a key source for Cézanne’s early work. Cézanne likely shared an interest in the scientific texts Zola read in preparation for his Rougon-Macquart cycle, among them the standard works of Claude Bernard, as well as in less familiar books like Charles Letourneau’s *Physiologie des passions* (1868) or Joseph Moreau de Tours’ *Psychologie morbide* (1859): writings charting extreme cases of human psychology as capable of tearing off the veneer of modern repression and allowing a deeper look at the base mechanics of human desire, need, and loss.

My study pays particular attention to the young Cézanne’s group of friends from Aix-en-Provence and Paris—men who have so far been little credited with the development of his early paintings, although some, including Zola, were their first owners. Among them are the writers Antony Valabrègue and Paul Alexis, whose poem *Les Excessives — À Émile Zola* has never been brought to bear on Cézanne’s important early paintings *The Murder* and *The Orgy*. Early influences also included the anthropological and zoological work of the natural scientist Antoine-Fortuné Marion, whose studies of prehistoric civilization and the animal nervous system, started in the late 1860s, became a medium through which Cézanne imagined contemporary human sociality and psychology. Such a theoretical engagement with subjectivity will help explain why, in his appropriations of Manet’s famous paintings (like *A Modern Olympia* and his own *Déjeuner*
sur l’herbe), Cézanne counteracted the former’s self-effacing tendencies, insisting on his own presence by frequently inserting his self-portrait or by using an overtly expressive paint handling, his “mani ère couillarde.”

My dissertation therefore limns the outlines of an alternative early French modernism—characterized not by the celebration of the eye’s impression, but by an unprecedented psychological intensity. In the face of our unwavering focus, when viewing the paintings of the 1860s and 1870s, on the faculty of vision and its effects, my thesis points to another peculiar strain of avant-garde painting, one more concerned with interiority and psychological experience than with sight. Yet Cézanne’s “psychological” paintings were only briefly and unsuccessfully held up against the model of Manet’s urbane restraint of the 1860s and were more or less abandoned by the mid-1870s. Cézanne’s early work can thus be seen as the pivot, so often omitted in our histories of early modernism, between Manet’s Second Empire achievements and the rise of impressionism. Cézanne’s early paintings, I argue, work toward finding pictorial narratives for modern interiority which refute Manet’s authorial self-restraint, while not yet fully relying on impressionism’s equation of “I” and eye.

[University of California, Berkeley]
Chester Dale Fellow, 2004–2005

In fall 2005 André Dombrowski will assume a position as instructor of modern European art and architecture in the department of art at Smith College.
The visual arts of ancient Greece and Rome occupy a prestigious position in the classical tradition, itself long considered a significant, if problematic, component of Western culture. Their study, however, rests on a body of monuments that is fragmented in every sense of the word and that lacks a secure documentary base. Post-antique scholarship has relied on ancient texts to make sense of both individual works and the corpus as a whole. The surviving written material, itself scarcely less fragmentary than the monuments, has, on the one hand, been used to reconstruct a hypothetical ancient literature on art, and, on the other, been dissected into “testimonia” that provide information about artists, works, and practices.

The authoritative status of the ancient texts rests on the assumption that they preserve essentially reliable information. Frequently, however, the material record does not match the information supplied by texts, and sources often are contradictory or display substantial internal inconsistencies. These and similar difficulties are customarily tackled through rationalization, ingenious reconciliation, and a sheep-or-goat style of Quellenkritik. It is not positivistic inadequacy, however, but the intellectual pedigree of what has long passed as authentic information that accounts for such discrepancies. Historiographic research can accordingly contribute directly to the solution of art-historical problems arising from the nature of the textual record and its application to the monumental corpus.
Archer from the west pediment of the Temple of Aphaia at Aegina, color reconstruction by Vinzenz Brinkmann and Ulrike Koch-Brinkmann. Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptotech, Munich. Photograph: Renate Kühling
Examination of literary, sub-literary, and non-literary texts calls into question the assumption that this material represents the disinterested transmission of accurate information. What was written in antiquity about the visual arts was shaped to a considerable extent by Greek and Roman practices in defining areas of knowledge, pursuing inquiry, and recording and communicating information. The associated historiographic structures are specific with respect to historical, cultural, and intellectual context, and they influenced not merely the organization and presentation of the information in question, but also fundamental aspects of its content. The surviving texts show the effects of political and moralizing agendas; scholarly practices such as research, citation and quotation, and the production and transmission of texts, scholia, commentaries, and reference works; conventional schemata such as inventions, causes (aitia), and organic metaphors for development; conventional organizational schemata such as diadochies, doxographies, and generations and floruits; codification of intellectual patterns in literary genres; commonplace themes and formulations; and, throughout, practices of the extratextual world such as official or otherwise prevailing systems of reckoning time, keeping records, and the like.

The question of the evidentiary status of the textual corpus is thus linked to that of its overall nature. There is good reason to doubt the long-held assumption that the extant texts preserve elements of a lost literature of the visual arts comparable in scope and coherence to our own. It is instead the wider tradition of the history of the technai, the arts of civilization, which offered accounts of rhetoric, history-writing, and even warfare, that served as heuristic and interpretive models for accounts of the visual arts. Art did not enjoy so high a status in classical antiquity as it does now; nor was it always the subject of systematic inquiry. It is likely that not until the Roman confrontation with Greek culture beginning in the late third century B.C.E. did there exist circumstances favorable to bringing the visual arts into the greater historiographic project.

The prestige of classical art may be viewed as a significant historiographic topic in its own right. The ancient textual tradition furnishes richer evidence for Greek art than for Roman, and it is primarily Greek art that has been studied in terms of its capacity to express
important human values. In this connection, the ancient historiographic formulation that has arguably had the greatest impact on modern views of Greek art is the idea that its aim was a naturalism achieved through progressive improvement in representation. Specific formal and stylistic features have accordingly been explained in terms of naturalism and linked with particular social, ethical, and political values. The moral authority thus granted to Greek art is, to some extent, already present in the ancient tradition, and even now it is often used to justify study of the subject. Especially at a time when a prescriptive notion of “values” is becoming increasingly intrusive in the humanities, the imperative to study classical art emerges as an aspect of its reception and authority that repays attention.

Bryn Mawr College
Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow, 2004–2005

In 2005–2006 A.A. Donohue will hold a Frederick Burkhardt Residential Fellowship for Recently Tenured Scholars (American Council of Learned Societies) at the National Humanities Center in Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.
At the Salon of 1781, Hubert Robert (1733–1808) exhibited two paintings that critics attacked as incomprehensible failures. These sizable and rapidly executed works featured pendant views of the fire that had ravaged the Opéra at the Palais-Royal two months earlier, and they were criticized as much for their sloppy handling as for the perversity of their subject matter. Judging from the errors in the paintings, commented one critic, Robert had aimed to render the monument’s destruction as rapidly as the event itself had transpired. That is, the artist had evidently followed less the principles of painting than those of time. Indeed, Robert’s images of “contemporary urban ruins”—Parisian monuments captured at the very moment of their destruction—declared an allegiance to disaster rather than duration, to the unforeseen effects of time rather than the inherited rules of his craft. In the eyes of most critics, Robert’s controversial canvases marked an inauspicious departure from the genre of architectural landscape painting that he had practiced since the time of his eleven-year stay in Rome (1754–1765), the best examples of which epitomized, according to Denis Diderot, the “poetics of ruins.”

Robert’s urban ruins evoke the “fureur destructrice” unleashed by the Paris urban reform movement. His innovation in this genre coincided with a heated battle between reformers, who advocated demolition at the service of modernization, and conservationists, like the architect Charles-François Viel de Saint-Maux, who bitterly fore-
cast the obsolescence of the public monument. My study contextualizes Robert’s production in a wider culture of risk: executed in the prerevolutionary climate of freewheeling economic uncertainty, Robert’s urban ruins glorified the sublime possibilities of destruction at precisely the time when his patrons were investing fortunes in speculative ventures. These financiers, architects, and enterprising state ministers speculated avidly in the volatile market of Paris real estate, profiting from what Viel described as the desacralization of architecture.

No longer, Viel lamented, did urban monuments preserve the terrain of the past as an “indelible book”; architects turned entrepreneurs had rendered them machines for future profit. It is this fundamental shift in the monument’s temporal orientation, enforced by the speculative economy, to which Robert’s paintings proved acutely responsive. His spectacular conjurations of raging fires and demolitions—events that posed investment opportunities for real estate speculators—radicalize the aesthetic of the “unfinished” valorized by Diderot and Friedrich Melchior Grimm. Such works are characterized by a pronounced deferral of resolution, or, to put it differently, by a subscription to an economy of uncertain returns. In their infatuation with the contingencies of “Fortuna,” these paintings exemplify the logic of what J. G. A. Pocock has described as the eighteenth century’s “speculative society,” a risk-taking culture that implicitly disavowed absolutist models of continuity and predictability in favor of an unknowable future.

Through a tripartite structure, my dissertation examines Robert’s “past ruins,” “present ruins,” and “future ruins” in light of Reinhart Koselleck’s thesis that the eighteenth century inaugurated a modern consciousness of time, an awareness of the future as distinct from the past and present. I begin by proposing that Robert’s architectural landscapes marked a convergence of imaginative reconstruction of antiquity à la Piranesi, with a peculiar awareness of the future endemic in eighteenth-century “speculative society.” Robert’s Port Adorned with Architecture, for example—exhibited at the Salon of 1769—mobilizes the sublime perspective and dramatic iconography of the triumphal bridge image popularized by Piranesi. Significantly, the painting was purchased by the duc de Choiseul at the very mo-
ment when the minister was hatching ill-fated plans to build a port city on Lake Geneva, one designed specifically to bring about the economic ruin of the Swiss capital. As thematized by an undated watercolor by Robert, in which the crumbling remains of a fantastical landscape provide the impromptu setting for a group of dice-throwers (Galerie Coatelem, 2005), the cult of ruins in eighteenth-century France was an outgrowth, I argue, of the “age of chance.”

My study concludes with a sustained treatment of Robert’s *Imaginary View of the Grand Gallery of the Louvre in Ruins*, a futuristic vision of the museum that had only recently come into existence. The criticism that Quatremère de Quincy leveled against the institution of the museum—that it killed the work of art by severing it from its natural environment, effectively abolishing the public’s organic connection to the past—recalls the architect Viel’s warning that “speculative society” would corrupt the sacred ties binding monuments, their sites, and the public. The culmination, both of an artistic production in particular, and of late Enlightenment tendencies in general, that hovered perpetually between an ethics of conservation and a fascination with destruction, *Louvre in Ruins* foregrounds the eclipse of an order of continuity by one of contingency.

In examining the future-driven tendencies of Robert’s paintings, my dissertation aims to recover some of the significance of his understudied achievement, as well as to illuminate the relationship between aesthetic theory and economic practice in prerevolutionary Paris.

[University of California, Berkeley]
David E. Finley Fellow, 2002–2005

*Nina Dubin will be a fellow at the Getty Research Institute in Los Angeles in 2005–2006.*
The first half of the Florentine Quattrocento saw a dramatic change in the material appearance of panel paintings. But this evolution cannot be easily charted, since some artists continued to use traditional materials and methods, while others initiated new approaches related both to the development of new theories on the representation of perspective and to the desire to achieve more naturalistic effects in the depiction of light (in particular by the addition of cast shadows on top of local color) and three-dimensional volumes.

These innovations found expression in the physical materials and techniques used to create panel paintings. Infrared reflectography provides a significant means by which to study their production. This photographic technique relies on the increased transparency of most paint layers in the infrared region of the light spectrum; it can reveal the early stages in the creation of a painting, including undermodeling or underdrawing, normally hidden from view. Adopting methodologies that paralleled earlier studies of early Netherlandish painters, art historians and art conservators began to use infrared reflectography only in the 1970s as a means of visualizing the materials and techniques of Italian artists. Nonetheless, relatively few infrared images and only occasional discussions of the preparatory stages are found in the literature. Moreover, since infrared reflectograms originate as digital images, neither the small details printed in books nor the reproduction of an entire painting printed as an eight-by-ten-
inch photograph is as effective as viewing the originals on a computer monitor, whether as a single, fully magnified image or as a series of detail images from multiple paintings.

Our research grew out of an overview of the methods of early fifteenth-century artists with regard to the use of underdrawing in the creation of panel paintings, published by Maria Clelia Galassi (2001). During our fellowship, we carried out new infrared studies of paintings to augment our own archives of results on the use of undermodeling or underdrawing or both during the first stage of the creation of a panel painting. In addition, when possible, we examined the surface of the paintings with a stereomicroscope to understand more precisely the sequence of applying the colored paint layers.

In order to highlight the innovations of the artists, we also included painters working in earlier traditions and focused on the depictions of figures, particularly the Madonna and Child. The list of paintings studied during the fellowship includes works by Cimabue (c. 1240–c. 1300), Giotto (c. 1266–1337), Masaccio (1401–1428), Masolino da Panicale (c. 1403–c. 1447), Parri Spinelli (c. 1387–1453), Fra Angelico (c. 1395–1455), Domenico Veneziano (active 1438–1461), and Fra Filippo Lippi (c. 1406–1469), which are housed at the Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence; the Museo Statale d’Arte Medievale e Moderna, Arezzo; the National Gallery of Art, Washington; the North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh; the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston; and the Frick Collection, New York. Many of our colleagues—both curators and conservators—kindly allowed us to examine the originals of published details. At the Center, we identified paintings...
by additional artists, including Francesco Pesellino (c. 1422–1457) and Lo Scheggia (1406–1486), for comparison with the core group.

During our fellowship, we explored three lines of development. First, we studied the monumental undermodeling style of Giotto, which he achieved by starting with a washed monochrome undermodeling, possibly reinforced by strokes of verdaccio, used as a guide for the later color stage. We carefully studied and repropessed this painting method in the new context of the representation of perspective, as seen in paintings by Masaccio and the early work of Filippo Lippi. Second, we observed the calligraphic underdrawing style, derived from late Gothic tradition, as exemplified fully by Parri Spinelli and, in part, by Masolino and Fra Angelico, particularly in the disposition of their drapery folds. Third, we studied the new approach partially explored by Domenico Veneziano and completely achieved by Fra Filippo Lippi beginning in the 1440s, which entailed, from a technical standpoint, the abandonment of the dark undermodeling; the use of the white of the ground layer (the area beneath the flesh tones sometimes modified with a flat underlayer of verdeterra, or green earth, pigment) as the base for the colored paint layers; the use of a linear underdrawing to fix the internal and external contours of the composition; and the modulation of the local colors in the light by adding, on top, shadows (mostly cast) and highlights in the form of a texture of fine strokes or transparent glazes.

We identified Filippo Lippi as the “key artist” of this dramatic technical change, which, during the second half of the century, was the base for the working method of Florentine painters such as Sandro Botticelli (c. 1444–1510), Antonio Pollaiuolo (c. 1431–1498), and Filippino Lippi (c. 1457–1504). For this reason, a large part of our research focused on Filippo Lippi, including his possible experiences during his stay in Padua in 1433–1434; for this study a comparison of the Lippi underdrawings with the infrared images of Saint Peter (National Gallery of Art, Washington) by Michele Giambono (active c. 1420–1462) proved fruitful. We examined the possible influences of Flemish models and, above all, the connection with the innovative theories set forth in Leon Battista Alberti’s On Painting (1435 and 1436). Starting from the fundamental studies by Marcia Hall (1992), we verified, using the technical methods described here, the way in
which Filippo Lippi was able to render the idea of “circumscription” and “reception of light,” codified by Alberti, by using a new technique in underdrawing and coloring.

We are preparing articles on the techniques of Giotto (in the late work), Parri Spinelli, and Filippo Lippi. Although each paper will focus on a single artist and a restricted number of paintings, we will also discuss the works within the context of our broader approach.

Università degli Studi di Genova
National Gallery of Art, Washington

Maria Clelia Galassi resumes her position as associate professor of methodologies in the history of art and as director of the Scuola di Specializzazione in Storia dell’Arte at the Università di Genova.

Elizabeth Walmsley returns to her position as painting conservator at the National Gallery of Art, Washington.
Jeanne-Antoinette Poisson (1721–1764), marquise de Pompadour, was an exceptional and accomplished woman whose family was allied to the circles of Parisian military contractors and financiers. She married Charles-Guillaume Lenormant d’Etiolles in March 1741. Through her own physical attributes, qualities of mind, and cultivation of her talents in theater, singing, and art, she won the passion and enduring devotion of Louis XV, king of France. In 1745 the king elevated her to the nobility in her own right as a single woman. She was presented to the court as maîtresse en titre and fulfilled the role of hostess and companion to the king in nonofficial settings. She discreetly observed the rigid etiquette of the court and did not infringe upon Queen Marie Leczinska’s prerogatives. Madame de Pompadour developed instead a world of intimacy she shared with the king in settings free of the formal constraints imposed by decorum and precedent. In these places—especially houses which she owned and where she could be identified as the virtual if not actual royal spouse—Madame de Pompadour created constellations of works of art associated directly and personally with herself, Louis XV, and their relationship. The epitome of this idea was achieved most completely at the Château de Bellevue, but later replicated with variations at Champs, Crécy, the Hermitage at Fontainebleau, and elsewhere. These settings were created on the principle that the works of art were to be seen in the animating presence of Madame de Pompadour,
who was, in her own person, the principal work of art to be shown to advantage. Her houses and collections were designed primarily for an audience of one, Louis XV.

That being said, almost every one of Madame de Pompadour’s commissions served a dual purpose. That is, a painting might be part of an iconography based upon her own roles in the Théâtre des Petits Appartements, her private theater at Versailles, but it could also serve
as a design for another commission to the Gobelins tapestry works. She supported the French porcelain manufacture of Vincennes-Sèvres as part of an effort to counter an adverse balance of payments caused by French purchases of Meissen porcelain; but her purchases of Sèvres made them fashionable for utilitarian and decorative purposes and as diplomatic gifts. Sèvres became one of France’s most enduring symbols of excellence in the arts.

Madame de Pompadour’s commissions of portraits functioned in much the same way. During her lifetime only four portrait images of her were exhibited publicly in Salon exhibitions, among them two that are known today and two that are lost. As with the principle of intimacy in her arrangement of her private houses, access to her portraits was closely controlled. Some portraits famous today were all but unknown during her lifetime, seen only by persons she chose, who received coveted invitations to her private homes. Even among those guests, only the most privileged were permitted to enter the increasingly intimate and restricted chambers of those houses. The most important portrait images of all were the smallest, some painted by her own hand and exchanged as gifts or tokens of diplomatic relations. The importance of these portraits was derived not from the breadth of their viewing audience but rather from the selectness of the persons who were permitted to see them as the chosen recipients of the images. In this light, the notion that art criticism or public reception was the most important factor in shaping Madame de Pompadour’s choices when she interacted, as a patron, with professional artists is fundamentally mistaken and anachronistic.

That there was such a thing as opinion—of the general public or the aristocracy or other sectors of society—was a powerful fact. Controversial or conspicuous members of society such as Madame de Pompadour or her friend Voltaire were subject to unregulated verbal, handwritten, and printed commentary in the form of satiric song, defamatory poetry, and anonymous publication. The absence of libel laws, copyright, or civil liability left both the great and the small exposed to exploitation or slander. A significant part of my work has been to trace and evaluate the period sources for the factual or anecdotal history of Madame de Pompadour and to separate the verifiable and the likely from outright slanders, unsubstantiated
r umors, and blatant forgeries. With the help of numerous legal and archival documents, either unpublished or largely ignored by popular biographers, it has been possible to unravel the myth of Madame de Pompadour and to treat its creation as a revealing study of the underside of the French and foreign literary and political worlds of the eighteenth century. From this work, it will be possible to reconstruct a sounder history of Madame de Pompadour’s family and of her own quite restricted significance in French foreign policy. The posthumous treatment of Madame de Pompadour both in the eighteenth century and in the wake of the French Revolution is equally revealing of the political and social forces at work within the declining aristocracy and the ascendant bourgeoisie.

Trinity College (Hartford)
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, spring 2005

Alden Gordon will return to his position as Gwendolyn Miles Smith Professor of Art History and chairman of the department of fine arts at Trinity College.
The correspondence between Georgia O’Keeffe (1887–1986) and Alfred Stieglitz (1864–1946) is the most important body of primary material on these two seminal American artists and one of the most significant repositories of information on early twentieth-century American cultural life. Between 1916, when they met, and 1946, when Stieglitz died, they exchanged more than 17,000 leaves—perhaps as many as 25,000 pages—that described in almost unimaginably rich detail their daily lives in New York, Texas, and New Mexico. In language that is sparse and vivid (O’Keeffe), poetic and passionate (Stieglitz), the letters describe the blossoming of their love; the evolution of their art and ideas; their friendships with many of the most influential figures in early American modernism, including Charles Demuth, Arthur Dove, Marsden Hartley, John Marin, and Paul Strand; and their relationships and conversations with an exceptionally wide range of key figures in American and European art and culture. These include artists such as Marcel Duchamp and Francis Picabia; photographers such as Ansel Adams and Edward Steichen; authors and poets such as Sherwood Anderson and D.H. Lawrence; gallery directors such as Alfred Barr and Duncan Phillips; collectors and impresarios such as Walter Arensberg and Mabel Dodge Luhan; dealers such as Edith Halpert and Julian Levy; historians such as Lewis Mumford; critics such as Waldo Frank, Elizabeth McCausland, and Paul Rosenfeld; and theologians and mystics such as Claude
Bragdon and Swami Nikhilananda. While the letters illuminate every aspect of both artists’ work, ideas, and personalities, the often poignant insights they offer into the impact of larger cultural forces—World Wars I and II, the booming economy of the 1920s, and the depression of the 1930s—on two intensely engaged individuals, and the understanding they provide of America’s vibrant cultural community from the late 1910s through the end of World War II, are richer still.

My project has been to prepare for publication a selection of these letters that fully reflects the scope and character of the correspondence. During my time at the Center I have clarified the objectives I am using to select the letters and honed my choice to include those that reveal significant new information about each artist’s work, ideas, and activities, as well as their lives in general. But I have also noted that the letters are most enlightening when O’Keeffe and Stieglitz carry on a dialogue, responding to and amplifying each other’s ideas. In addition, because their letters are, at times, intensely personal, including intimate details about their sexual relationship as well as critical assessments of each other, my selection has been further sharpened to present a balanced picture of them as human beings.

Further I have addressed several methodological problems and the need for appendices. First, the correspondence is not continuous. From 1916 to 1918 it proceeded with few breaks. However, after O’Keeffe moved to New York in the summer of 1918 to live with Stieglitz, it became episodic. From 1919 through 1928, correspondence was usually triggered by O’Keeffe’s short visits to family and friends; from 1929 to 1946 they wrote each other during the three to four months of every year when O’Keeffe was in New Mexico and Stieglitz remained in New York City or at his summer home in Lake George, New York. Thus the manuscript will include short connective texts to explain events that transpired during the gaps. Second, many of the letters (especially from Stieglitz to O’Keeffe) are very long (in some cases over thirty pages), written over several days, and redundant. For example, one letter may include several “subsections,” written at different points during the day: morning, afternoon, and evening. In such cases, only the most compelling subsection will be selected, but each of these will be included in its entirety. Third,
references to publications, works of art, and exhibitions will be foot-
noted. For clarity, a biographical appendix will be included, identifying
all names mentioned in the letters. Because O’Keeffe frequently in-
dented each new sentence and consistently misspelled many words,
her spelling will be corrected and paragraph breaks imposed. All edi-
torial issues will be explained in a note to the reader. Reproductions
of original autograph letters and of works of art mentioned in the
letters, as well as photographs of O’Keeffe and Stieglitz, will be in-
cluded as illustrations. I now envision the final publication as ap-
proximately eight hundred letters in two volumes.

National Gallery of Art
Ailsa Mellon Bruce National Gallery of Art Sabbatical Curatorial Fellow,
2004–2005

Sarah Greenough returns to her position as curator of photographs at the
National Gallery of Art.
Beginning in 1922, under the auspices of the Pahlavi dynasty (1921–1979) of Iran the tombs of selected historical figures were systematically destroyed to make way for modernistic mausoleums erected as metaphors for an “Aryan” nation in the process of cultural revival. Initiated during the reign of Reza Shah, who ruled the country with an iron fist from 1921 to 1941, all but two of the projects were implemented under his son, Mohammad Reza Shah, between 1941 and the Iranian Revolution of 1979. The monuments were ideologically inscribed commemorations of the leading modernists and reformists of the 1920s who had a decisive impact on the definition and function of high culture in Iran’s twentieth-century history. My dissertation, entitled “Cultivat(ing) Modernities: The Society for National Heritage, Political Propaganda, and Public Architecture in Twentieth-Century Iran,” offers a critical analysis of the political underpinnings, pedagogical aims, racial schemas, and aesthetic ends of propaganda architecture as conceived and constructed under the aegis of Iran’s Society for National Heritage (SNH), founded in 1922. The study’s theoretical premise addresses the multifaceted relationship between notions of collective self-worth and the invention of a national patrimony; between art-historical debates and the fabrication of aesthetic values; between the political propaganda machine and the use of architecture in the symbolic validation of sociopolitical reforms; and between high modernism and the (re)presentation of buildings as instruments of an uneven modernity.
The undertakings of the SNH included the construction of numerous mausoleums, specifically those of Ferdawsi, Hafez, Avicenna, Omar Khayyam, and Phyllis Ackerman/Arthur U. Pope; the negotiation of archaeological monopolies; the supervision of over sixty preservation projects; and the creation of an archaeological museum as well as a national library. As an in-depth study of the SNH’s institutional history, the dissertation demonstrates that in the twentieth century, the project of inventing Iran’s “cultural heritage” as a discourse was not just about erecting a series of public monuments, well-choreographed museums, (in)accurate indexes of historical landmarks, or art exhibitions and congresses. Contemporary modernists saw their country’s relationship to its cultural heritage as connected to Iran’s rightful assumption of an equal place in the network of modern nation-states; as its safest and fastest corridor to a progressive, and at times utopian, modernity; and as its essential ideological justification for the political, and often autocratic, reforms aimed at preserving territorial integrity and national homogeneity. Cultural heritage as a distinct political discourse, I argue, was modern Iran’s ideological raison d’être.

Following the defense of my dissertation in October and the beginning of its editing as a book manuscript, I initiated my next research project at the Center, which resulted in the article “Orient oder Rom? Qajar ‘Aryan’ Architecture and Strzygowski’s Art History.” Described as one of the most heated controversies of modern scholarship, the so-called Orient-or-Rome debate was inflamed by the simultaneous
publication of two books in 1901. On the one hand, Italian archaeologist Giovanni Teresio Rivoira (1849–1919), in his *Le origini dell’architettura lombarda*, argued that the origin of Gothic architecture was to be found in Roman ingenuity. In his *Orient oder Rom*, on the other hand, Austrian art historian Josef Strzygowski (1862–1941) maintained, “The true source of Western artistic genius is located in the Indogermanic Geist,” pointing instead to the Orient. As Annabel Wharton notes, both men insisted that their studies were “utterly objective, utterly scientific, and utterly correct.” Remarkably, decades later, Strzygowski continued to implore enthusiasts and skeptics alike to trace Western architectural connections “not to the ancient Near East . . . not to Persia but to Iran.”

During the ensuing decades, while European art historians clashed over the ostensibly pure origin of European architecture, Iran’s intelligentsia not only appropriated Strzygowski’s argument in asserting that ancient Iran established the prototypes for all subsequent Western forms, but also embarked on a complex project of remaking its built environment by inventing what Strzygowski had called “Aryan architecture.” The resulting hybrid and distinct architecture that shaped colonial and postcolonial cities from the Indian subcontinent to North Africa, therefore, must be read not only as iconic of the “Orient’s” struggles with the often painful and highly complex processes of sociopolitical modernization, but also as rare moments of architectural production that reclaimed the various Western discourses on modernity and universalism. By problematizing the history of the Western canon vis-à-vis non-Western architecture and by going beyond geographical and disciplinary boundaries, my investigation attempts to trace the implicit link between the writing of architectural histories and global power politics, constructs of race in nineteenth-century stylistic revivalism and eclecticism, and the complex workings of modernity in the perception of the various regional antiquities.

[Massachusetts Institute of Technology]
Itleson Fellow, 2003–2005

*During the 2005–2006 academic year, Talinn Grigor will be the Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow at Cornell University.*
These two bronze vessels shown here—types known as *ding* (top) and *gong* (bottom)—were sacred objects used in rituals in ancient China. Both were found in close proximity to the capital (Haojing, near modern-day Xi’an) of China’s third dynasty, the Western Zhou, which was established by the Zhou people in what is now Shaanxi Province. Yet they are significantly different in form and function. The three-legged *ding* is monumental in form, with two U-shaped handles and a heavy cover. By comparison, the *gong* combines a sculptural shape and complex surface decoration. The *ding* held sacrificial food, while the *gong* contained wine.

The two vessels were made at a turning point in the history of China, just after the founding of the Western Zhou, in the eleventh century B.C.E. The Zhou court would lay the cornerstone of Chinese civilization and would be idealized as an integrated and homogeneous cultural paradigm by Confucian scholars beginning in the second century B.C.E.

So how do we explain visual differences and, more important, artistic diversity near the political center of the Zhou? This is one of the questions I address in my current book-length project, entitled “Art, Ritual Practice, and Sociopolitical Function in Western Zhou China.” Here I focus on a bronze cache constructed in 771 B.C.E., at the end of the Western Zhou, west of the Zhou capital in modern-day Shaanxi Province. This cache, one of the most abundant ever
excavated, yielded a total of 103 bronze vessels dating from the eleventh to the ninth century B.C.E. They had belonged to the Wei family, who were descendants of the preceding Shang dynasty, defeated by the Zhou. In using the Wei cache as a case study to investigate the social function of bronze ritual vessels, my approach differs from previous scholarship that has focused on debating whether certain motifs on bronzes embodied symbolic meaning or were pure decoration.

Most of the Wei inscribed vessels were embellished very elaborately. The gong, for instance, has hooked flanges that divide the two-eyed motif on the central panel into compartments. A bird perches on the lid, and a snake arcs across the animal-headed handle, which terminates as an elephant’s trunk. Dragons decorate the foot, rim, and lid. The consistently flamboyant Wei vessels, unrivaled by those of other families, attested to the high political status of the owners, who were scribes, or historians, according to one scholar, “the most powerful ritualist[s] and minister[s] in the king’s service.” They were also wealthy. One Wei family member boasted that his father was “wise and virtuous, engaged in farming and managed well,” while he himself “work[ed] hard all day and night.”

Second, neither the ding cauldron nor the gui container, the most characteristic ritual food vessels in other caches or tombs in the Shaanxi region, figures prominently among the Wei bronzes. The Wei gave greatest attention to wine vessels. Indeed, four of the five generations represented in this cache commissioned virtually no vessels other than wine containers, among them the gong. This distinction can be explained only by the fact that the Wei were descendants of the Shang people. Casting large numbers of wine vessels was a Shang, not a Zhou, tradition. Further, the Zhou sumptuary law decreed that the drinking of alcohol be limited. Yet by law the Zhou did allow other peoples, particularly descendants of the Shang, to imbibe wines.

The Wei, as historians, must have been particularly aware of their own family history and Shang lineage. They recorded specifically that they were outsiders when the Zhou dynasty was established. They used such titles as “Ya Zu,” or “Yi Gong,” a Shang convention that combined celestial signs and posthumous titles in designating their ancestors. Granted tolerance by the Zhou, they also showed their
loyalty to their ancestors by making ritual bronze vessels of a Shang tradition.

Bronze ritual vessels thus commemorated family status and attested to social background. The existence of distinctive visual traditions so close to the Zhou political and cultural center suggests that regional variation and cultural diversity within the political reach of the Zhou kingdom were phenomena of this formative period. The Zhou must have adopted a dual cultural and political strategy to consolidate their newly established dynasty: they propagated a centralized government and at the same time incorporated or adapted to regional or group diversity within its broad confederation. These paired programs would seem to be well illustrated in the production of bronze ritual materials throughout this period, in which patrons of art were able to commission objects in distinctive stylistic traditions within a generally homogenizing artistic and ritual tradition.

During the academic year 2004–2005 I also focused on cataloguing and preparing acquisition reports on a group of Chinese bronze vessels of the Paul Singer Collection, Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution. In addition, I conducted intensive research on a bronze drum in the Smithsonian’s Freer Gallery of Art. Jan Stuart, who directed these projects as associate curator of Chinese art at the Freer and Sackler galleries, served as liaison.

National Gallery of Art
Paul Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow, 2004–2005

In summer 2005 Yu Jiang returned to China for several weeks on a fellowship from the Metropolitan Center for Far Eastern Art Studies, Hosomi Museum, Kyoto, Japan. In August he took up a position as assistant professor in art history at Harriet L. Wilkes Honors College, Florida Atlantic University.
The book I am completing analyzes the altarpieces of Federico Barocci (1535–1612) in the context of the artistic and religious reforms that constitute a critical element of late Renaissance culture in Italy. In an age of religious and pictorial transformation, when artists could be criticized for failing to produce either devout images on the one hand, or artful images on the other, Barocci was celebrated as one of the only painters able to fuse the powers of innovative contemporary art with the devotion requisite for post-Tridentine ecclesiastical painting. His altarpieces are critical to the understanding of late Renaissance religious image making and theory for two fundamental reasons.

First, several of Barocci’s altarpieces exemplify the importance of the archaic in the creation of “modern” styles in early modern Italy. Although Barocci was an ambitious modern artist, he was associated, both by documented devotional inclination and by links of patronage, with a number of religious institutions invested in the revaluation of traditional images. In altarpieces for these patrons, Barocci often transformed archaic image types in order to create highly innovative works of religious painting. We can infer this both from the study of his many surviving preparatory drawings and from documents, in particular the letters he exchanged with the confraternity of the Laici in Arezzo, the patrons of his Madonna del Popolo (1574–1579).

This correspondence indicates that the confraternity wanted
Barocci to produce a Misericordia, an image type of medieval origin that represented a monumental Madonna sheltering diminutive figures of the faithful under her cloak. Barocci initially resisted, writing “the mystery of the Misericordia does not seem apt to make a beautiful painting.” But surviving drawings from these years show him wrestling with the challenges of modernizing the Misericordia composition, and the finished *Madonna del Popolo*—while thoroughly modern in its forms—betrays profound reflection on much older images, particularly representations of the Misericordia found on some fifteenth-century confraternal processional banners, or *gonfaloni*. In several further altarpieces from the 1570s, 1580s, and 1590s, Barocci evolved designs that preserved the frontality, centrality, and hieratic dominance of sacred figures—qualities often associated with archaic images—but represented these qualities as configurations dependent upon the enactment of narrative dramas. Barocci often chose to depict visionary apparitions, a form uniquely equipped to privilege elements both of iconicity and of pictorial modernity. The sacred figures confront us like icons and are raised above us on cloud banks that definitively separate their realm from ours, yet they advance toward us and involve us in the compelling drama of divine revelation.

The powerfully affective quality of Barocci’s paintings, which deeply moved contemporary viewers, alerts us to the second critical characteristic of his art: *vaghezza*. *Vaghezza* was a particularly charged term in period art criticism; strangely, it has never been investigated as a key to Barocci’s art, despite its evident importance for contemporary viewers. The word is usually translated as “loveliness,” but it was related to the verb *vaggheggiare* (to desire, often sexually) and frequently indicated an allure that was highly sensual. Giovanni Baglione encapsulated period appreciation of Barocci’s achievement when he wrote: “In all his works Barocci was both alluring [*vago*] and devout [*divoto*], so that as in one part the eyes delighted, with the other souls were assuaged, and hearts inclined to devotion.” In period writing about painting, *vaghezza* was often identified with the artful representation of lovely bodies—with “figures of young women and men which are a bit more alluring [*vaghe*] than usual,” in Giorgio Vasari’s memorable phrase. But the desire for complex compositions of lithe and frequently nude figures raised grave prob-
lems in the field of religious painting during the latter sixteenth century. In the unequivocal judgment of Giovanni Andrea Gilio, “the painter who delights in making the figures of saints nude . . . takes away . . . a great part of the reverence one owes to them. The allure \textit{[vaghezza]} of art . . . pleases him more than propriety \textit{[onestà]}.”

The ambivalent relationship between the traditional demands of religious decorum and the new demands of artistic virtuosity created a veritable minefield for later Cinquecento artists. Barocci’s remarkable ability to navigate this treacherous terrain was predicated in large part upon his displacement of the sensual allure of painting from the representation of alluring figures into more purely “pictorial” devices. His pictures ravished the viewer’s senses with glowing color and radiant light, and with the rich oil glazes and textures that Venetian critics such as Ludovico Dolce were coming to identify as powerfully sensual elements in their own right. But Barocci employed his distinctive \textit{vaghezza} to allure viewers into contemplation of images that were at their core meditations upon the very traditions of Christian image making. Remarkably, Barocci was able to employ \textit{vaghezza} to articulate a visually persuasive case for the enduring power of traditional image types, “re-seen” for a new age.

The two months I spent in residence at the Center as I completed the draft of my manuscript were particularly fertile. The happy combination of unparalleled bibliographic resources and a remarkably rich and congenial intellectual community provided the ideal environment in which to read, write, and think. My stay at the Center significantly inflected the shape and nuance of my arguments.

Michigan State University
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, 1 November–31 December 2004

\textit{Stuart Lingo will return to his position as assistant professor of Renaissance art at Michigan State University.}
Although judicial architecture includes many buildings of the highest design quality and is currently undergoing a new creative development, the courthouse as a building type has not come under close scrutiny in research. In recent decades, the dramatic increase in judicial activity in the United States and France has impelled both countries to develop ambitious programs of courthouse construction, giving rise to dozens of new buildings, many of which have been designed by leading architects. My research examines and compares these two programs with regard to background, aims, range, and achievements.

In the United States, the explosion of litigation in the 1980s and 1990s in both the federal and state court systems placed enormous stress on existing facilities. Faced with a critical shortage of courtrooms and judicial offices, the federal government launched the largest civilian building program of the second half of the twentieth century—sometimes characterized as the “New Deal” for courthouses—in planning the construction, major renovation, or extension of 165 courthouses at an estimated cost of $10 billion. To manage this challenging program, the General Services Administration (GSA) created, within its Public Buildings Service, the entity now known as the Center for Courthouse Programs (CCP). The CCP’s determination that every new courthouse should contribute to improving the design of federal architecture led to the selection of the best private architects in the country. The firm of Hellmuth, Obata, and Kassabaum; William
Pedersen (Kohn Pedersen Fox); Richard Meier; Thom Mayne (Morphosis); Henry N. Cobb; Robert A.M. Stern; Antoine Predock; and Moshe Safdie are but a few of many noted architects recently commissioned. Today, over forty buildings have been completed and thirty more are being designed. State circuit courthouse building activity is also very dynamic, its motivation stemming from both the National Center for State Courts, which regularly publishes guidelines for courthouse design, and the Committee on Architecture for Justice of the American Institute of Architects, which reviews the projects and gives awards to the most successful ones.

As in the United States, the urgency of addressing the shortage and obsolescence of facilities led France to institute an ambitious courthouse building program in the 1990s. The ministry of justice created a special agency to develop a building plan that would span many years, overseeing the construction of thirty new courthouses and a dozen major renovation works for a budget of approximately
$90 million. As in the United States, free rein was given to architects within well-defined functional requirements. Architects include leading practitioners such as Richard Rogers, Architecture Studio, Christian de Portzamparc, Claude Vasconi, Jean Nouvel, Paul Chemetov, Henri Ciriani, and Henri Gaudin.

I believe that the striking similarities between these architectural programs in the United States and France allow a comparative study that heretofore has been unusual in art or architectural history. In both countries, architects must meet the needs of contemporary justice systems while finding a balance between the solemnity appropriate to the site of judgment and the humanization of the judiciary institution. It is thus possible to compare the architectural forms without misconstruing the actual differences: the French judicial tradition comes from Roman law, codified by the *Code civil*, whereas the United States has a system based on common law in which judicial authority is far more powerful than in France. The American system is characterized by jury trial in both federal and state circuits, whereas in France trial by jury is exceptional. Furthermore, the two building programs differ in scale: more and larger courthouses are built every year in the United States than in France.

Nevertheless, in both countries thought and consideration are given to the appropriate architectural and symbolic expression of justice for buildings in which justice is served. Traditionally, the courthouse is easily identifiable, built on a prominent site and distinguished by monumental features, often classical: stairs, columns and pediment, dome or cupola. Today, the array of new and often remarkable courthouses built in both countries shows a striking diversity. Some architects recycle the traditional features of court architecture, while others concentrate on creating a new public monumentality, although not one specifically judicial in nature. In some cases, architects are faced with a new problem, that of the capability of giant structures to express the dignity of law.

In addressing the question of contemporary judicial architecture in the United States and France, my project should provide new insight into the question of modern monumentality and contribute to our understanding of the functioning of justice in both American and French societies.
During my two months at the Center, I made use of archives; visited selected courthouses; began compiling a large bibliography, including congressional hearings and architectural periodicals; and, finally, held interviews with court planners, architects, and judges involved in judicial architecture.

Université de Paris 1—Panthéon-Sorbonne
Ailsa Bruce Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, 1 June 2004–31 July 2004

Christine Mengin will resume her research and teaching at the Université de Paris 1—Panthéon-Sorbonne (Unité de Formation et de Recherche en Histoire de l’Art et Archéologie).
During the 1940s and 1950s, the American artist Joseph Cornell (1903–1972) developed a series of flat, traylike boxes that were filled with richly colored sand and an array of naturally and artificially manufactured materials. In the glass-topped, wooden-framed boxes, metal coils, ball bearings, marbles, and watch parts butted up against driftwood, seashells, and starfish. Visually understated, the sandboxes were best appreciated when handled by an inquisitive viewer, or, more precisely, user, who could tilt the work against the ground plane, loosening sand and spirals, spheres and stars to spill across the painted interior surfaces of the boxes and produce sounds of sweeping, rolling, and thudding. Thus engaged, the sandboxes rendered more than a thematic reference, whether to the beachfronts and shorelines where Cornell was known to wander, or to the cosmologies that occupied his imagination. They drew on a structure of indeterminacy and horizontality to situate the user within an expansive, yet bounded, field of play. While still tied to constructs of the interwar avant-garde, the sandboxes also anticipate an embodied concept of space developed in the decades following World War I by philosophers such as Gaston Bachelard. Through these works, Cornell positioned a viewer between a manageable enclosure and a discomfitting vastness; operating phenomenologically, his works transported the viewer to an alternative reality, one that, as Cornell’s writings and archives indicate, reflected a haptic notion of memory.
A concurrent investigation by Cornell provides a primer for understanding his technique for producing such palpable memories through art: the dossier entitled *GC 44* (c. 1944–1970). A focused collection of textual, pictorial, and often three-dimensional objects, the dossier was a genre Cornell developed to accommodate less fixed combinations of material than his famed shadow boxes allowed. On a title page for *GC 44*, he listed “a method” as one of the work’s functions. A dossier’s contents, which can be perused in any order, often commemorated specific people or moments in time through a cumulative effect of amassed ephemera. *GC 44* attempted to capture the experiences Cornell had in the summer and early fall of 1944, which he spent working at a garden center in Queens. That time left an indelible impression on Cornell, who remembered it as “a standing upon the threshold of the world of authentic visions and being allowed to linger. . . .” The organization of *GC 44* matched closely Cornell’s own patterns of exploration during these months. Like the sandboxes, his pathways were open-ended and multidirectional while extending across a bounded geography. Enraptured by nature and a feeling of motion, Cornell rode his bike with abandon across the meadows and shorelines of local neighborhoods, identifying a series of locations with which he associated strong, physical experiences of the past “in their original intensity.” Cornell eventually gave the label “extensions” to both these “vivid flashbacks” and the mechanisms for reproducing them in art.

To provoke extensions on the part of the users of *GC 44*, Cornell collected almost a thousand pages of reproductions, found and original texts, brochures, clippings, and diary notes. From these, he selected and archived a core series of images and writings that reflected a range of sources, from *National Geographic* to Jan van Eyck’s *Ghent Altarpiece* of 1432. Each group was organized around a theme related to Cornell’s explorations in 1944—the house on the hill, the floral still life, and the old farm, among others. In his extensive diary entries and notes, Cornell described how repetitive visual cues triggered memory while disordering temporality and evoking tactile sensations of the past. Expanding upon the method introduced in *GC 44*, the sandboxes layered sensory stimuli to instigate, in Cornell’s words, a “renewal of the original magic,” or an extension. In the sandboxes,
the memories were tied less firmly than in GC 44 to a specific moment in the artist’s past and were deployed instead to provoke an embodied sensation of space.

An original yet underappreciated idea, Cornell’s concept of extension may be compared to such landmark avant-garde strategies as André Breton’s (1896–1966) “objective chance” or Marcel Duchamp’s (1887–1968) “readymades.” Yet his claim to a nostalgic position for the artist has led him to be excluded from dominant narratives of modern art. Cornell sought to provoke palpable memory, which was for him one of the most deeply felt sensations. In “‘Please Touch’: The Object in Dada and Surrealism,” the book to which this research will contribute, I argue that this sort of physical engagement should be seen as a central thrust in the modernist trajectory, rather than a marginal aspect of twentieth-century art.
In August 1447, Marco Parenti made plans to marry Caterina Strozzi. Preliminary negotiations established the dowry; once that was set, the two families began to assemble the necessary objects associated with Florentine Renaissance marriages. Caterina’s family provided an assortment of clothing, fabric, linens, and accessories, and Marco responded with a counterdowry of extravagant items to adorn his new bride. He also outfitted their home with a variety of wooden furnishings, including a walnut bed with intarsia heraldry and a pair of historiated marriage chests from the painter Domenico Veneziano (c. 1400–1461), and a Madonna relief from Stefano di Francesco. The couple formally married in January 1448, when Marco gave Caterina a ring and arranged a great feast to celebrate the union with family and friends.

The marriage of Caterina Strozzi and Marco Parenti is just one example of how Florentines used objects to mark key events in their family lives. In most cases, the marriage negotiations, the dowry, the gift exchange, the procession, and the banquet, as well as the births and baptisms of children and their marriages, were accompanied by both ephemeral and more lasting objects. Such objects had, of course, an inherent functionality; this was not a society that accumulated for the sake of accumulation. But these objects also operated on a more symbolic level: they marked the event, celebrated the union,
emphasized family and individual identity, and taught important lessons regarding accepted and expected behavior.

My study examines the intersection of material culture and the marriage ritual in the middle- and upper-class homes of fifteenth-century Florence. I analyze the palazzo, or town house, and its furnishings, and the relationship of this physical setting to the performance of daily life. The book moves from the start of a household at marriage, through its growth and development in childbirth, to its termination and redistribution at death. During my time at the Center I focused on the introductory chapters. These chapters outline marriage from a social perspective, examining the various activities leading up to and surrounding it to underscore the importance of the institution during this period. I also discuss how this bond determined the appearance of the palazzo and the objects that filled it, examining the development of domestic architecture and the role of the bedchamber as the center of both the home and the family.

The resources of the Center also allowed me to finish research on the remainder of the manuscript. Additional chapters concern the bride’s dowry, analyzing not only her dresses, jewels, and accessories but also the various chests and coffers that contained this dowry in its transfer from natal to marital home and then remained as seating and storage following the event. I consider the accumulation of objects before and after marriage, as the family settled into new surroundings. Some were bought through special commissions, some were workshop stock, and others were inherited, borrowed, or purchased secondhand. Among the most important objects were devotional paintings, sculptures, and talismanic devices. But objects of a secular nature also had an important place. A didactic impulse can be seen in the transfer of major civic images to the domestic context; for example, statuettes of the Old Testament hero David, like the one illustrated here, were present in various homes, retaining a traditional civic association together with a new message of domestic virtue. Sentiment often took precedence over financial value, and certain objects gained prestige because of their intimate connections to family life.

My study demonstrates the ways in which material culture—from the palazzo to the portrait, the marriage chest to the birth tray, detachable sleeves to paternoster beads, the Madonna in the bedchamber
to the humanist manuscript in the study—enforced familial and personal identity and social standing in ways that were both recognizable and expected at that time. Both the ubiquitous nature of these objects and their essential uniformity from family to family in the Florentine merchant class indicate their vital role in Renaissance domestic life.

Vassar College  
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow, 1 November–31 December 2004

*Jacqueline Marie Musacchio will return to her position as assistant professor in the department of art at Vassar College.*
Inaccuracies and confusions about the historicity of past art abounded in the period we call the Renaissance. The most famous case—and it has turned out to be typical, not exceptional—is that of the baptistery in Florence, which dates from the eleventh or twelfth century but was believed by virtually everyone in the period, including Filippo Brunelleschi (1377–1446), Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519), and even Giorgio Vasari (1511–1574), to be an ancient Roman building. Indeed, a whole range of artifacts and monuments that are no longer classified as ancient art were considered antiquities in the Renaissance. These include “medieval” sculpture thought to be ancient, Byzantine icons, Cosmatesque pavements, Islamic ceramics and brassware, manuscript illuminations and mosaics of various periods, and a whole range of buildings, from Carolingian to Gothic, celebrated in the Renaissance as models of ancient architecture.

These “mistakes” were not, I believe, due merely to insufficient knowledge. The very variety of cases suggests that they are reflections of a “deep structure.” In collaboration with Christopher Wood of Yale University, I am trying to excavate a model of artifact production, a way of thinking about the historicity of artifacts that was dominant throughout this period and allows and accounts for this sort of temporal confusion. If “anachronistic” suggests mistakes and misdating, the less familiar “anachronic” is intended to emphasize the generative aspects of this temporal dynamism in visual artifacts.
Like texts, images and buildings survived over time by being repeatedly copied. Images of Christ, the Virgin, and saints reached back to prototypes captured in encounters with living personages. Churches and palaces were rebuilt or restored on original, ancient foundations, or they transplanted hallowed prototypes founded elsewhere and thus participated in their antiquity. Any image or monument, religious or secular, whose authority was bound up with a claim to ancient origins functioned within this sort of substitution system. An artifact understood in this way had an unstable temporality, belonging at once to the time of its production and to the time of its prototype.

What may look like medievalism in works of Renaissance art thus comes in for reinterpretation. Michelangelo (1475–1564) modeled works on Romanesque statuary; Giovanni Bellini (d. 1516), Leonardo, and Raphael (1483–1520) made significant use of Byzantine icons; Donato Bramante (c. 1444–1514) adopted Byzantine and Romanesque building types on several occasions and even introduced a Cosmatesque pavement, a type of flooring created in Rome primarily in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, in his Tempietto. These artists and architects were working with an expanded, more flexible conception of antiquity than a view of the period in neoclassical terms is able to recognize.

The book we are writing together studies anachronic structures at work in a range of examples of Renaissance architecture, sculpture, printmaking, and painting.
The project also considers the changes that this model of the temporality of artifacts underwent in the Renaissance, and the ways in which Renaissance art can be understood as a series of responses to those changes. Renaissance artists were themselves coming into awareness of “substitution” as a model of artifact production, one that stood in contrast to a “philological,” or author-based, model, in which each artifact is considered a singular, unrepeatable event in time. The rhetorical complexity of works by Bellini, Botticelli, Michelangelo, Raphael, and others derives in part from the fact that they were responding dynamically to this situation, staging these temporal models in their contention with one another. This self-referential function in turn became a basic feature of a new conception of art. It thus becomes possible to describe the emergence of the modern institution of the work of art as a redirecting of figural anachronism, a series of framing operations in which time-artifact relations are projected and compared.

University of Toronto
Andrew W. Mellon Professor, 2004–2006

In the coming year, Alexander Nagel will continue his term as Andrew W. Mellon Professor at the Center, and will turn to research on religious dissidence and artistic experimentation in early sixteenth-century Italy.
On 23 March 1534 Francisco Pizarro carried out ceremonies to establish the Spanish city of Cuzco. Following the procedure mandated by the crown, he set its jurisdictional limits, designated a place for its church, and inscribed the names of his followers as its citizens. In that act, carried out on the great plaza of the Inca capital within view of the palaces and temples that he and his men would claim, he began the process of transforming the Inca city into a Spanish town and of converting a scruffy band of adventurers into vecinos—responsible landowning citizens—ready to undertake their civic duty.

Spaniards brought to their encounter with Inca architecture assumptions about what towns ought to look like and how citizens ought to act, along with a belief in the power of towns to shape the behavior of townspeople. Some of these ideas are explicit in crown policies that addressed the founding of towns as well as in the requirement that municipal councils be established to keep them orderly. Other assumptions about architecture can be inferred from comments about indigenous towns and buildings made by eyewitnesses to conquest. Still others can be discerned in the debates about where and how to build public structures in the newly founded towns. In those years of transition, beginning with the first forays of Spaniards into South America in the late 1520s and continuing into the era of the codification of town plans for Spain’s overseas empire in 1573, leadership of the newly acquired lands of Peru was still in flux, and shifting...
loyalties and different expectations about the nature of towns shaped the layout and social fabric of Spanish towns in the Andes.

The way in which Cuzco was claimed as a Spanish city in the two decades following its conquest reveals much about the structure of colonial society and the expectations of town life that vecinos brought to the city’s rebuilding. Discussions of how Spanish Cuzco was to be built show that the settlers were not a unified block, nor were they in a hurry to implement crown policies that governed town planning and town life. In these debates we see tensions between ecclesiastical and municipal authority, between people loyal to the crown and those who actively opposed royal interests, and always, in the background of these debates, the tension between indigenous and Iberian cultures. Still, by the end of this period, the colonists had begun to carve out in the former Inca capital a Spanish settlement, using materials and urban plans that incorporated the humanist ideals then being newly mapped onto the towns of Spain and its colonies.

In Cuzco we see the attempt to impose a vision of a sixteenth-century Spanish town onto a space designed and built by the Incas to reflect the political and religious values of their civilization. In its redesign we see accommodations to the existing space built by the Incas. An interesting counterpoint is Urquillos, a settlement planned
as a country retreat for the married vecinos of Cuzco. A traza, or plan for the town—the earliest known extant document of this type for Peru—was drawn in 1550 or 1551, and a complex legal argument justifying its creation was transmitted by the municipal council of Cuzco to the viceroy and, ultimately, to Spain. Both the traza and the argument made in support of its creation incorporate a theory of town planning and of the value of town life that responded to Spanish law and to deeply held royal opinions on morality, faith, and the protection of indigenous interests. At the same time, the tidy traza and the seemingly innocuous legal argument that supported it must be read as parts of a bold maneuver by a locally powerful elite to respond to the crown’s attempts to rein in their economic and social autonomy. Thus, in the plan to build Urquillos, we can discern the growing schism between Iberian and Spanish American identities that would lead, much later, to the wars of independence.

During my time at the Center I plunged headlong into the turmoil of mid-sixteenth-century Peru, reading contemporary accounts of conquest, reports on antiroyalist rebellions, early descriptions of Inca and Spanish colonial architecture, crown opinion offered in royal cédulas, and acts of the municipal and ecclesiastical councils of Cuzco. This immersion in primary sources permitted me to reconstruct the debates about architecture and town planning that shaped towns in the Andes. Set against the remains of Inca and colonial architecture in and around Cuzco and Urquillos, which I had surveyed in previous field seasons, I explore how the debates were given physical form in the rebuilding of Inca towns and their transformation under early colonial rule. My research is in preparation for a book, “Encountering Inca Architecture: Transforming Towns in Early Colonial Peru.”

Lafayette College
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, 2004–2005

Susan A. Niles will return to her position as professor of anthropology at Lafayette College.
Although my dissertation focuses on the Emilian artist Guercino (Giovanni Francesco Barbieri, 1591–1666), it is at least equally concerned with the invention of new theatrical genres in the seventeenth century, and, more precisely, the impact of these new categories of expression on the formal and theoretical structure of contemporary paintings. Previous studies of this period have tended to take genre painting as a synecdoche for genre; for instance, they have defined such painting exclusively as depicting scenes of “everyday life.” Similarly, reinforcing the critical commonplace that baroque art is “theatrical,” art historians have cited details such as costume, lighting, and gesture to explain the affinities between painting and theater. However, my research indicates that the historical and theoretical points of overlap between the two forms of cultural production lie not in these formal details, but rather in a proliferation of new representational genres. It is the attendant emphasis on the position, indeed creation, of a new kind of spectator that unites both enterprises in this period.

The biographer Giovanni Pietro Bellori’s characterization of Nicolas Poussin’s Death of Germanicus as a “tragic subject” (soggetto tragico) in 1672 represents a culmination of ideas about the intersection of painting and theater that had been in circulation for at least a century. This dissertation maps the terrain of that prehistory. Poussin’s famed use of the affetti, or passions, has its roots in Emilian
cultural practices of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and specifically in the first translation and commentary of Aristotle’s *Poetics* into the vernacular by Lodovico Castelvetro of Modena in 1570. The first part of my dissertation, entitled “Staging Culture,” discusses the reception of Castelvetro’s commentary, which sanctioned revisions of Aristotle’s treatise and was used to justify the mobilization of new genres on stage. This section also examines the first theaters and academies in Guercino’s hometown of Cento, exactly contemporary with the artist’s professional rise to fame.

The thesis then unfolds into two main parts. Each takes as its point of departure a painting that corresponds to the invention of a theatrical genre. The first genre, the pastoral, is exemplified by Guercino’s *Erminia and the Shepherd* (1619–1620; City Museum and Art Gallery, Birmingham). The painting reveals an unprecedented blurring of the boundaries between “truth” and “fable,” a dialectic already current in theatrical commentaries of the period. Guercino’s pastoral paintings and drawings are here shown to be inextricably linked to contemporary explorations of a new genre to which the painter was introduced during his artistic formation in Cento. However, rather than reiterate the loose analogy between painting and theater, my account acknowledges the ultimate instability of the terminology at hand. For instance, the recuperation of the term *rappresentazione* to describe a new *stile* (meaning both style and genre in this instance) in music indicates that, for Guercino’s contemporaries, the interdependence of the two concepts was not yet a given. Paintings, staged pastorals, and new genres of music, performed in the newly designated *stile rappresentativo*, are treated for the first time as nascent forms of operatic production.

The second genre, tragedy, is exemplified by Guercino’s *Death of Dido* (1631; Galleria Spada, Rome). I argue that the painting can be fully understood only through a consideration of the theatrical viewing strategies that the depiction of Dido made available to male viewers. The performative qualities of the painting have their roots in Guercino’s early exposure to the first performances of neo-Senecan tragedy in Cento. The most striking of these performative gambits was the identification of male viewer-poets with the protagonist of the painting, a suicidal Carthaginian queen. By ventriloquizing Dido, the poets
who recorded their responses to the painting were reenacting the
new genre of epistolary elegy inaugurated by Ovid’s Heroides, not
the fourth book of Virgil’s Aeneid, which previous scholars have taken
as the textual “source” of the painting. But this reading does not
simply replace one textual source with another. Death of Dido instead
is shown to be a sort of palimpsest that, like Erminia, bears the traces
of its multiple “sources” in a quasi-indexical way that explodes
existing genres and redefines the boundaries of decorum. The only
decorous way to show a noble woman committing suicide “on stage,”
the painting ultimately argues, is to sublimate the act through male
ventriloquization.

While I was finishing my dissertation at the Center this year, the
National Gallery of Art purchased Guercino’s remarkable Self-Portrait
before a Painting of “Amor Fedele” (c. 1650), previously known only
through a copy. This fortuitous acquisition is perhaps the only extant
self-portrait by the artist’s hand, but it should also be understood
within the context of other paintings within paintings. It is the sole
instance in Guercino’s oeuvre in which he presents himself as author
and subject. As such, the reemerged canvas enabled me to refine my
initial conclusions about the displacement of authorial agency from
the artist onto the viewer that characterizes most of Guercino’s works.
Such a reevaluation forms the basis for the epilogue of the disserta-
tion, which argues that it is only by subjecting to critical scrutiny
seventeenth-century genres of performance and spectatorship that
we can recover the “theatricality” of the “baroque” in its historical
complexity.

[The Johns Hopkins University]
Mary Davis Fellow, 2003–2005

Shilpa Prasad will curate an exhibition on Guercino for the Timken
Museum of Art, San Diego.
In its historical situation and historiographic fortunes, Francesco Berlinghieri’s *Geographia* of 1482, an Italian verse description of the known world inspired by Ptolemy’s second-century *Geography* and accompanied by thirty-one engraved maps, has occupied a position that is best described as “in between.” Penned by a Florentine statesman and intellectual who lived from 1440 to 1501, the *Geographia* served as a crucial link in a network of Ottoman and Medici diplomatic contact through the dedication of hand-painted, printed copies of the book to both the sultan Bayezid II and his brother, Cem, pretender to the Ottoman throne. Although the *Geographia* has elicited attention from a wide range of scholars, this study has resulted in its consignment to marginal positions within diverse disciplines rather than in an account of its significance. Only recently, and in the domain of cross-cultural studies (itself often consigned to the disciplinary margins), has the *Geographia* received more substantial analysis, serving as an example of the fluid exchange between East and West in the early modern Mediterranean.

My dissertation, “Cartography between Cultures: Francesco Berlinghieri’s *Geographia* of 1482,” will provide the first comprehensive account of Berlinghieri’s book, arguing that its function as an object of international exchange cannot be separated from consideration of the heterogeneous contextual orbits in which it was conceived and consumed. Concerns often dismissed as parochial by
previous scholarship, such as Florentine print shop practice, vernacular literary convention, and technical analysis of surviving examples of the book, have broad implications for our understanding of the work’s global function. My research has allowed me to examine dozens of copies of the Geographia as well as examples of the products of contemporary cartographic, print, and manuscript cultures that constituted the environment in which these books were produced. Through comparing the Geographia’s engraved maps with prints attributed to Francesco Rosselli (1448–before 1527), often postulated as the author of these plates, I have moved Berlinghieri’s maps outside the ambient of the master. This attribution suggests both a reappraisal of the richness of early Florentine engraving and a somewhat later date for the completion of the Geographia’s plates. Similarly, watermark data gathered from over thirty printed copies of the work in Europe and the United States have allowed me to revise our understanding of the timetable and process of its publication. These findings, in turn, suggest that luxury copies of the book, complete with outstanding illuminated frontispieces, their engraved maps enhanced by the addition of glowing paint and gold leaf, were carefully planned and produced for illustrious dedicatees like the Ottoman princes. Far from an afterthought, the diplomatic potential of Berlinghieri’s work was built into the very circumstances of its production.

Recent scholarship has come to view artistic exchange of the sort exemplified by the Geographia as a conduit through which influence, understanding, and, ultimately, tolerance passed between East and West in the early modern world. In fact, close attention to the material and ideological circumstances of these transactions suggests that such exchanges were a good deal more conflicted and contingent than might be supposed. The environments in which Berlinghieri’s work was produced and received have left unexplained idiosyncrasies, perhaps the most intriguing of which is the explicitly Christian orientation of its maps and verse. Departing from ancient prototypes and modern expectations, the Geographia makes frequent reference to biblical and church history, devoting the majority of its fifth book to a description of the Holy Land. An accompanying map of this territory is based closely on one contained in Marino Sanuto’s crusading
tract of 1321, Liber secretorum fidelium crucis . . . (The Book of Secrets for the True Crusaders . . .), and includes labels ranging from Sodom and Gomorrah to the location of miracles described in the New Testament. My project asks what the inclusion of Christian motifs in a work at least partially intended for an Ottoman audience might tell us about the motivation and practice of diplomacy in the early modern Mediterranean.

During the course of the past year, my research has come to demonstrate just how ambivalent a position the Geographia occupied in this economy of exchange. On the one hand, the conveyance of the book to Cem and Bayezid demonstrated a sophisticated understanding, on the part of Berlinghieri, the Medici, and their agents, of the valences attached to cartographic representation, book culture, and literary world-description in the milieu of the Ottoman court. Both princes would have been familiar with Ptolemy’s description of the world. Their father, Mehmed II, had commissioned its translation into Arabic and owned several manuscript examples, including one received in a similar diplomatic context from the Byzantine imperial family. Further, in his peregrinations across the Mediterranean between Asia Minor and Egypt, Rhodes, France, and eventually Rome,
Cem would have taken more than an armchair traveler’s interest in the world described by Berlinghieri’s verse and maps.

On the other hand, evidence suggests that Berlinghieri himself was far from immune to the crusading mentality that characterized many of his humanist associates. He appears in a vehemently anti-Turkish stance in a fifteenth-century tract advocating holy war against the Ottomans and throughout his writings relies on the trope of Eastern despotism and tyranny as the antithesis of Florentine republican freedom. Indeed, in a contradiction striking to modern readers, the *Geographia* itself praises the Spanish monarchy for having “driven back the beastly ardor of the Turk.” Close attention to the contextual and material complexities of Berlinghieri’s book suggests that intercultural exchange in the early modern Mediterranean was characterized by apparently contradictory constellations of tolerance and hatred, cooperation and deception, personal conviction and political self-interest.

[University of Michigan]
Twelve-Month Chester Dale Fellow, 2004–2005

*Sean E. Roberts will continue his research at the British Library with the assistance of a J. B. Harley Research Fellowship in the History of Cartography. He plans to finish his dissertation in the coming year with the assistance of a Regents Fellowship at the University of Michigan.*
Critical Catalogue of German, Austrian, and Swiss Paintings Dating from the Eighteenth through the Twentieth Century from the State Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow

The collection of German, Austrian, and Swiss paintings dating from the eighteenth through the twentieth century in the State Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow, includes more than three hundred twenty works. The German school was formerly considered to be of less importance than the French or Dutch schools, however, and thus it remains the least studied. The main tasks of a critical catalogue are to change this assessment and to demonstrate the value of the German collection, which includes paintings of excellent quality.

The painting gallery in the State Pushkin Museum was founded in 1924, when German paintings, as well as those of other schools, began to enter the museum from numerous private collections recently nationalized by the state, as well as from the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg (the former imperial collection). During this period museum officials did their best to conceal provenance. The names of the former owners were consciously obscured or were forgotten, so it is difficult to trace the history of transfer of paintings from one collection to another. Establishing provenance for the German paintings was one of the most complicated aspects of my research.

During my residency at the Center I focused my research on works from the nineteenth century, especially those from the collection of the Kharitonenko family. This period marked the blossoming of national art, both in Russia and in Germany. In Russia, for example, a new school of modern painting was formed in Moscow in opposition
to the academy of art in Saint Petersburg. In Germany, by contrast, the academies in Düsseldorf and Munich flourished and were universally recognized as important centers of pedagogy and creativity.

A new generation of Russian art collectors paid attention to both famous masters and modern tendencies in art. Accordingly, many Russian amateurs were primarily interested in French painting. Nevertheless, there was a circle of Russian collectors who acquired German paintings—Nicolaj Kushelev-Bezborodko in Saint Petersburg, Andrej Barishnikov in Smolensk, and Sergej Tretiakov and Pavel Kharitonenko in Moscow—and whose contribution to patterns of collecting should be highlighted.

Pavel Ivanovitsh Kharitonenko (1852–1914) was a leading Russian businessman, nicknamed the “Sugar King.” He was a son of Ivan Kharitonenko (1822–1891), a sugar manufacturer and founder

Ludwig Knaus, Morning after the Celebration, 1853. The State Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow. Photograph: Sergej Yakimenko
of the trade house named for his family. The Kharitonenkos participated in international trade and world exhibitions and traveled in and outside Europe, visiting Paris, Antwerp, Munich, Vienna, and Philadelphia. In 1892, after the death of his father, Pavel became the heir to all of his property.

The first purchases for the collection were made by the elder Kharitonenko in the 1860s, and later, at the turn of the century, Pavel continued that tradition. From study of Russian archival records, I have determined that the Kharitonenko collection contained 70 paintings by European masters, including 17 works by German artists, and 114 works of the Russian school, not including icons. The collection reflects the main tendencies of taste and fashion of the period and includes works by leading painters of the Munich school, such as *Song of Spring* (1876), by Arnold Böcklin (1827–1901), and *Portrait of a Girl* (1898), by Franz von Lenbach (1836–1904). The collection also reflects the personal preferences of Kharitonenko in including works of small dimensions as well as studies and sketches, some of them by prominent painters of the German school. For instance, *Singer* (1886), by Michály Munkácsy (1844–1900), is a study for the great painting *Mozart Directing the First Performance of His Requiem Some Days before His Death* of 1886 (Collection A. Russel Alger, Detroit).

During my time at the Center I also focused my attention on European centers of the international art market that specialized in German painting of the second half of the nineteenth century. The study of contemporary sale catalogues proved that Russian collectors were most active in Paris. Kharitonenko was in constant contact with the famous art dealer Charles Sedelmeyer, who was known for his sales of old master paintings and at the same time tried to promote German artists working in Paris. Munich was Germany’s largest center for the trade of pictures, increasingly integrated into the national and international markets. Modern dealers and auctioneers, such as E. A. Fleischmann, who was under royal patronage, and the former painter David Heinemann, played an important role for the enrichment of Russian collections. They specialized in German and particularly traditional Munich painting, selling numerous pictures by masters of distinct genres, such as portrait painters Franz von De-
fregger (1835–1921) and Eduard von Grützner (1846–1925), Franz von Lenbach, and Friedrich August von Kaulbach (1850–1920), as well as by famous painters outside Munich, such as Ludwig Knaus (1829–1910), Benjamin Vautier (1829–1898), and the Achenbach brothers, Andreas (1815–1910) and Oswald (1827–1905).

Sales and exhibition catalogues were valuable sources for establishing the provenance of some German paintings. In this context the international exhibition of painting organized in 1882 by the group of artists associated with the gallery of Georges Petit in Paris is noteworthy. Russian painter Alexej Bogoljubov (1824–1896) and German painter Ludwig Knaus participated. *Morning after the Celebration* of 1853, now in the collection of the State Pushkin Museum, was one of the paintings Knaus exhibited. It was on loan for the exhibition from the collection of a Madame Planat de La Faye. Thus, the name of the owner and the fact of its presence at the exhibition were rediscovered. The same year Kharitonenko acquired a landscape by Bogoljubov entitled *Evening on the Bank of Alassio* (1882), now in the collection of the State Tretiakov Gallery, Moscow. Bogoljubov lived in Paris and was active also as a collector and art dealer for the Russian imperial family. It is quite probable that he drew Kharitonenko’s attention to the famous work by Knaus, which was awarded the second gold medal in the Salon exhibition in Paris in 1853. Kharitonenko later acquired *Morning after the Celebration*, although the exact date is unknown.

In conclusion, we can now state that German paintings constituted an important part of Russian collections in the nineteenth century, rivaling works by French masters in the attention they received.

State Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow, 1 March–30 April 2005

*Liubov Savinskaya will return to her position as deputy chief of the department of European and American art and curator of German, Austrian, and American painting at the State Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow.*
To many observers in the nineteenth century, the mid–Hudson Valley was a metaphor for America. Here, in the writings of Washington Irving and James Fenimore Cooper, American literature first became embedded in the American landscape. Here, landscape painters who collectively became known as the Hudson River School developed a stylistic idiom that was widely recognized as the first truly national style. Here, through the influence of wealthy individuals who built tasteful houses and ornamental gardens, and through the writings of Andrew Jackson Downing, the Hudson Valley became the iconic American landscape, the model that readers of national publications emulated in building their own dwellings and landscaping their grounds. Here, with the beginnings of historic preservation and the efforts of individuals such as Benson J. Lossing in recording the battles and places of the Revolutionary War, American memory, our self-awareness as a nation, first gained coherent expression.

These crucial developments in the creation of an American culture did not take place in a vacuum: they occurred during a period of tremendous urban and industrial growth in the Hudson Valley that had profound effects on the landscape. One premise of this book project is that even as economic development was transforming the landscape, some nineteenth-century Americans were wrestling with the consequences of the changes wrought by the transportation revolution and industrialization. During the very decades when New York...
City became the dominant American metropolis, artists and writers heralded the Hudson Valley landscape as the source of a distinctive American culture.

My tenure at the Center enabled me to focus on three principal components of the broader study. First, it provided the opportunity to immerse myself in the works of the Hudson River School of landscape painting. In addition to reading extensively in the National Gallery library and studying the collection, I had the opportunity to participate in the study days organized in conjunction with the exhibition *Hudson River School Visions: The Landscapes of Sanford R. Gifford*, and to attend the conference “The Collector of Art in America” and the program “Shaping a Modern History of American Art,” both of which were organized to accompany the exhibition of the John Wilmerding Collection, *American Masters from Bingham to*
I also had the opportunity to speak frequently with curators Franklin Kelly, Nancy Anderson, and Charles Brock about kindred interests.

The second component of the study I was able to develop concerns how nineteenth-century Americans experienced the mid–Hudson Valley. Using the collections of the Library of Congress and online resources, I read virtually every nineteenth-century tourist guidebook and travel account of the area. I was thus able to understand how tourists encountered the valley—how they traveled, where they stopped and stayed, and what they thought of the landscape. Given the transition from sloop to steamboat to railroad as principal means of transportation, as well as the industrialization of river towns, these writings provide an essential perspective on the changing landscape.

Third, at the Center I commenced the study of Washington Irving’s role in the creation of a sense of place in the mid–Hudson Valley. Using the pseudonym Geoffrey Crayon, Irving began A Book of the Hudson (1849) with the sentence: “I thank God I was born on the banks of the Hudson!” The author attributed great importance to the landscape of his childhood in the development of his character and personality. Irving anthropomorphized the Hudson, ascribing to it a soul and other human qualities, and found in the valley’s hollows and mountains inspiration that fired his fertile imagination. In “Rip Van Winkle” and “The Legend of Sleepy Hollow,” the best-known stories from The Sketch-Book of Geoffrey Crayon, Gent. (1819–1820), Irving created a folklore that continues to resonate throughout the Hudson Valley. These tales gave a specificity of time and place to the mid-Hudson region and became favorite subjects of artists and illustrators, a theme I am continuing to explore.

Irving acquired the former Van Tassel cottage near Tarrytown in 1835, and with the help of English-born landscape painter George Harvey transformed it into a comfortable, highly idiosyncratic dwelling “made up of gable ends, and full of angles and corners as an old cocked hat.” Irving also created a landscape that combined ornamental gardens and a working farm. The house and gardens, which he named Sunnyside, were arguably the greatest artistic achievement of the author’s later years and were widely reproduced in engravings
and a Currier and Ives lithograph. Irving delighted in his cottage and the landscape he created. But at midcentury the Hudson River Railroad literally invaded the authorial garden, cutting Sunnyside off from the river its creator loved. T. Addison Richards, who visited Sunnyside in 1855, surely reflected Irving’s sentiments in observing that the railroad had “profaned . . . much of the river shore” and destroyed some of the “sweetest features” of Sunnyside’s landscape.

I became increasingly fascinated by Irving’s role in the creation of a sense of place because it touches directly upon four of the principal themes of the book: the centrality of visual culture in celebrating the landscape of the mid–Hudson Valley; the development of a signature dwelling and its landscape, which surely contributed to the acceptance of a picturesque aesthetic in the middle decades of the nineteenth century; the importance of Irving’s histories and folklore in contributing to the shaping of American memory; and the impact of economic development—the railroad—in transforming the landscape.

Franklin and Marshall College
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow, 1 September–31 October 2004

After continuing his research for “The Sanctified Landscape” as a Robert Gill research fellow at the Winterthur Museum, David Schuyler returns to his position as Arthur and Katherine Shadek Professor of the Humanities at Franklin and Marshall College.
During his twelve-year career, the Utrecht painter Hendrick ter Brugghen (1588–1629) embedded northern archaic content into works otherwise remarkable for their aspirations to contemporaneity and cosmopolitanism. Although ter Brugghen’s archaism has been long noted, its study has been arrested at its diagnosis. My dissertation considers these elements as having an interpretive as well as a formal impact. Ter Brugghen’s secular oeuvre is sizable, but archaism occurs uniquely in his religious works. This specificity of application not only connects these major works to the complex religious climate of Utrecht, well known for its confessional diversity after 1581, but also sheds light on broad questions of the function and form of devotional images in art after the Reformation.

The 1620s in Utrecht, the decade of ter Brugghen’s principal activity, were notable for a widespread interest in the style of Caravaggio (1571–1610), particularly his use of tenebrism, three-quarters-length compositions, and dramatic narratives. This style was brought back to the Netherlands by artists who had recently returned from Rome and was taken up even by those who had not made the journey. Ter Bruggen had returned from Italy in 1614, but he turned afresh to the works of Caravaggio in the 1620s. Unlike other artists, however, in the works in which he most directly approaches Caravaggio—such as Calling of Matthew (1621; Centraal Museum, Utrecht) and Doubting Thomas (c. 1621; Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam)—ter Bruggen...
inserts archaic details. I argue that, along with other paintings that display archaic elements and varying degrees of Caravaggist qualities—such as *The Crucifixion with the Virgin and Saint John* (c. 1625; Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York) and *Crowning with Thorns* (1620; Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen)—archaism in ter Bruggghen’s work amounts to a critique of Caravaggio and Caravaggism in Utrecht.

This critique, I also argue, expresses a theory of religious art that emphasizes the physical presence of the painting rather than the more purely visual appeal of Caravaggio’s work. Caravaggio’s paintings, such as *Conversion of Saul* (1600–1601; Santa Maria del Popolo, Rome), create a strong illusion of reality. The picture plane dissolves as the subjects of the paintings seem to enter into our space, an effect enhanced by strong chiaroscuro and suppressed brush marks. To the extent that the figures are present, the painting disappears. These characteristics were adopted by the Utrecht Caravaggisti, who contributed paintings to the interiors of Utrecht’s hidden Catholic churches. Although ter Bruggghen’s paintings resemble superficially those of his peers, no such provenance is known for his works.

Ter Bruggghen’s manipulations of the objecthood of his paintings clarify the importance of that element in the image debates of the Reformation. The Calvinist rejection of devotional images centered on worshipers’ supposed confusion of the signifier with the signified, in which the spiritual power of the figure depicted was conflated with its depiction. In opposition, Calvinists insisted on the base materiality and thus ineffectiveness of the religious images. Counter-Reformation art theorists, in defending religious art, emphasized its ability to teach and to incite emotion, insisting on the transcendence of the image over its materiality. In Counter-Reformation painters’ works, visual persuasion took precedence over material presence.

Ter Bruggghen’s archaizing paintings reject this solution by reinjecting a sense of objecthood into visually persuasive paintings. For instance, in ter Bruggghen’s *Crucifixion*, Christ is depicted as bleeding copiously from his wounds, which alone is not unusual; but the blood, rather than streaming along his arms and obliging the laws of physics (and contemporaneous artistic practice), drips straight down in pendulous blobs. At first sight it seems caught in a free fall
before dousing Mary and John, who are standing below Christ, but then the viewer realizes that the blood is rather to be understood as dripping on the surface of the picture plane. The drops are simultaneously paint and blood. Ter Brugghen’s picture plane refuses to dissolve; both the real presence of the bleeding Christ and the physical presence of the painting are accentuated.

My research this year has focused broadly on other ways in which the objecthood of works of art, in both Italy and the Netherlands, is suppressed or enhanced, and on the ways in which this quality interacts with the religious environment in which a work is displayed, from an Italian chapel dedicated to a Marian icon to a hidden church in Utrecht. More narrowly, I have isolated some of the other manners in which ter Brugghen creates and manipulates these effects by centering iconic elements of devotion on the picture plane or embedding them within compositional “niches.” These qualities bespeak a painter who sought to explore the possibilities of devotional art after the Reformation in Utrecht.

[Boston University]  
Robert H. and Clarice Smith Fellow, 2004–2005

Natasha Seaman will defend her dissertation at Boston University in fall 2005.
The Pittsburgh International Exhibition of Painting of 1928, organized by the Carnegie Institute, reflected the complex artistic debates of its time. Beginning in 1896 and preceded in its founding only by the Venice Biennale, this series of international exhibitions brought together hundreds of works by the best artists. The principal objective of the Carnegie Institute was exclusively didactic: to create an opportunity for the American people to view the best modern art and, equally important, for American painters to compare their work with that of their European colleagues. American artists could learn without imitating and, as a result, their work would continually improve.

The goal of the Carnegie Internationals, as the exhibitions came to be known, was both to reverse a perceived deficit of American modern painting—a lack of tradition—and to draw attention to individual artists. In the second decade of the twentieth century, the debate on the nature of American art was becoming ever more urgent in a nation that was creating a new civilization based on the myths of unlimited progress and the machine. Moreover, the avant-garde movement had only recently arrived in America, giving primary importance to defining a preexisting idea of modernity, suggested in the work of the Ashcan School, the regionalists, and the precisionists.

When Homer Saint-Gaudens (son of the sculptor Augustus) was elected director of fine arts of the Carnegie Institute in 1922, the em-
phasis of the Internationals completely changed. He often invited European painters to sit on juries and decided to have separate national sections. His strategy allowed better comprehension of national artistic developments, but sometimes it projected a false premise that modern art was a matter of geography rather than a shared spirit.

In 1928 every debate was focused on the authenticity of American modern painting and the position of American artists in relation to foreign trends, especially those from France. In fact, the previous year’s first prize had gone to Henri Matisse, a decision that must be considered in a broader perspective, that of a five-year period (1925–1930) in which the first prize was invariably awarded to a European. In chronological order, the winners were Henri Le Sidaner, Ferruccio Ferrazzi, Henri Matisse, André Derain, Felice Carena, and Pablo Picasso. In 1928 the exhibition included 381 paintings from fifteen countries: the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Spain, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, Holland, Czechoslovakia, the U.S.S.R., and Poland. The representation of the first three—58 percent of the works and 66 percent of the artists—predetermined the outcome of the show.

That year Spain sent seven painters and twenty-one works in varying styles: Enrique Martínez-Cubells (fin-de-siècle regionalism), Santiago Rusiñol (symbolist landscapes), Ramón de Zubiaurre (traditional Basque subjects with expressionist colors), Joaquim Sunyer (Mediterranean neoclassicism), Luis Berdejo (neorealism and art déco), Pere (or Pedro) Pruna (strongly influenced by Pablo Picasso), and Salvador Dalí (who was then inspired by Johannes Vermeer and

Pere (Pedro) Pruna, Still Life, c. 1927–1928. Location unknown; from Catalogue, Twenty-seventh Annual International Exhibition of Paintings, Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, 1928
seventeenth-century Dutch painting). Picasso participated, but in the French section, because his dealer, Paul Rosenberg, believed that Picasso’s paintings would bring higher prices if they were considered Parisian or French rather than Spanish.

The Spanish works found a favorable reception among both the public and the critics. Almost all were sold to museums and private collectors. De Zubiaurre, with his brother Valentín, had already exhibited his works in New York galleries. Sunyer and Berdejo offered the retour à l’ordre that then characterized most European figurative painting and had American followers such as Maurice Sterne and Eugene Speicher. Most successful were Pruna and Dalí. Pruna received second prize with a still life that combined School of Paris classicism and surrealist echoes. His painting was illustrated in leading newspapers and magazines, which brought him additional recognition. Pruna’s fame led to solo exhibitions in New York, where his works were acquired by prestigious collectors such as Chester Dale. Dalí was introduced to a nation that would come, a decade later, to admire his works as icons of surrealism. His Basket of Bread (1926) was purchased by H.K. Siebeneck and is now one of the masterpieces in the collection of the Salvador Dalí Museum in Saint Petersburg, Florida.

In sum, the impact of the Spanish group was comparable to that of the British, French, and Italians, emphasizing the fundamental role of the Carnegie Internationals in forming modern taste among the American public and in suggesting new ways of introducing modernism to painters in the United States. In fact, the maturation and originality of American art would soon find expression in the adoption of precisionism and social realism in the 1930s.

Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow, 1 June–31 July 2004

Javier Pérez Segura returns to his position as professor of modern art at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
Between 1950 and 1973 archaeological excavations were carried out at the site of Gordion in central Turkey by researchers from the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, under the direction of Rodney S. Young. Gordion was the capital of the ancient kingdom of Phrygia, ruled at the height of its power in the eighth century B.C.E. by the renowned King Midas. The excavation of three royal tombs, dating from the period of Midas and his immediate predecessors, yielded an extraordinary collection of Phrygian furniture and wooden objects, among a rich cache of artifacts. Known as Tumulus MM, Tumulus P, and Tumulus W, the tombs contained sumptuous grave offerings, including bronze and pottery vessels, jewelry, bronze and leather belts, many small wooden artifacts, and more than fifty pieces of fine wooden furniture. Much of the furniture was exceptionally well preserved because of the relatively stable environments within the tomb chambers. The design of the pieces was highly imaginative, unlike that of any other extant ancient furniture, and the workmanship was of the highest quality. During the excavation of the site of the ancient city, excavators found charred fragments of similar pieces in a destruction level that has been dated to the late ninth or the eighth century B.C.E.

The furniture and wooden objects from the three tombs were published in Young’s posthumous volume, *Three Great Early Tumuli*, in 1981. Errors in the preliminary interpretation of these objects and
the discovery that the wood was deteriorating at an alarming rate led to the establishment of the Gordion Furniture Project with conservation, research, and publication as its primary goals.

Conservation treatment of the furniture and wooden objects was carried out under the supervision of the project in 1981–2000 at the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara. Over forty conservators, scientists, and graduate interns contributed to the successful conclusion of the treatment phase of the project. The methods developed and refined by project members are now considered standard for the conservation of dry archaeological wood.

Our fellowship at the Center allowed us to undertake a research season at the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations during the summer of 2004. The study of many previously catalogued fragmentary objects and hundreds of unattributed fragments led to the repair and reconstruction of numerous important pieces from Tumulus P and to the preparation of new reconstruction drawings. Thirty-five pieces were drawn correctly for the first time.

We carried out research, conservation, and drawing in conjunction with a comprehensive reassessment of the collection of wooden objects from Tumulus P. We prepared a new catalogue of all the wooden objects from the tomb, with updated descriptions, notes on the combination of newly attributed fragments, and indications of where the pieces were illustrated in earlier publications. Funding from the paired fellowship enabled us to purchase archival storage boxes to house the small wooden objects and fragments from Tumulus MM, Tumulus P, and Tumulus W. Custom mounts were constructed for the well-preserved pieces, made from Ethafoam and covered with Gore-tex. This initiative significantly enhanced the protection of the objects and improved access to the collection.
Our subsequent time in residence at the Center allowed us to collaborate on the text of a second monograph on the Gordion furniture, which will present new interpretations, photographs, and drawings of the furniture and wooden objects from Tumulus P, Tumulus W, and the City Mound. (The furniture from Tumulus MM is the subject of an initial volume, now in press.) We revised and finalized the catalogue of objects from Tumulus P and identified the pieces whose wood species have yet to be determined. A large part of the appendix detailing the conservation of the furniture and wooden objects was also completed. We shared files and drawings, reassessed details of design and construction, conferred at length about the work of previous seasons, and discussed future publications. The residency also allowed us the opportunity to meet with conservation scientists at the Smithsonian Institution who are currently engaged in the analysis of Gordion textile remains associated with the furniture. Their work will add yet another dimension to the interpretation of the tomb finds.

Studies contained in the previous volume on the furniture from Tumulus MM have situated the pieces within their cultural and material contexts. Scientific and technical analyses have determined the identity of the woods used and the tools and materials employed. The interpretation of the furniture from Tumulus MM has significantly expanded our knowledge of, and appreciation for, the sophisticated design sense and complex artistic intellect of the Phrygians. The study, analysis, and interpretation of the wooden objects from Tumulus P, Tumulus W, and the City Mound is now yielding equally exciting results, in terms of both the objects themselves and what they reveal about the civilization of the ancient Phrygians.

Bard Graduate Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts
Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario

Elizabeth Simpson, director of the Gordion Furniture Project, returns to her position as professor of ancient art and archaeology at the Bard Graduate Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts, New York.

Krysia Spirydowicz, senior conservator for the Gordion Furniture Project, returns to her position as director of the art conservation program and as professor of artifact conservation at Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario.
In 1411 Lluís Borrassà (first documented 1380, died 1424/1425), Barcelona’s principal painter, purchased an African slave, named Jordi, from Jaume Gras, a painter from Perpignan in the kingdom of Navarre. The common profession of the buyer and seller, but also their geographical distance, suggests that Borrassà’s interest in Jordi was related to his skill in the craft of painting. In 1419 Borrassà worked on a retable with a Tartar slave named Lluc, who is documented as a painter. A few years earlier, Lluc had escaped from Borrassà with the help of a Franciscan friar, but Borrassà was assiduous in tracking him down and even sued his accomplice’s convent. In the use of skilled slave labor (from Africa, the Crimea, and the Greek islands), Borrassà was like any other Barcelonan businessman. His dependency on slaves for artistic projects illuminates the economics of running a workshop in Barcelona in the early fifteenth century, when there was a high demand for painters of retables. Even though Borrassà ran a large family workshop, he relied on slave labor to support the enterprise. His clients usually paid 100 to 325 Aragonese florins for one of his retables, well above the approximately sixty florins he paid for Jordi.

Barcelona belonged to the kingdom of Aragon, then comprising Aragon, Catalonia, and Valencia, as well as the Mediterranean outposts of Naples, Sicily, Majorca, and Sardinia. Aragon’s other principal cities were Valencia, Girona, Zaragoza, Palma, Cagliari, Naples, and
Palermo. From 1412 the kingdom was ruled by Ferran d’Antequera, Alfons (also king of Naples), and finally, until 1479, for the Spanish lands, Alfons’ brother Joan II. All three monarchs and their queens—Leonor Urraca, María of Castile, and Blanche of Navarre—commissioned paintings and were intensely interested in the visual arts as patrons and collectors. Alfons was a protector of the arts from the time he was infante, and from Italy he frequently wrote to Spain about the availability of artisans, knowing precisely what they were working on. He also negotiated with Spanish merchants for prized works such as Jan van Eyck’s Saint George (lost). Spanish painters—in particular, from Valencia—followed Alfons to Naples; but, despite the prestige of royal patronage, most seemed eager to return to their native cities, as there was more work for them at home. In fact, no Italian work by Alfons’ Spanish court painters survives. Commissions not only from the royal families, but also from popes (Benedict XIII de Luna of Zaragoza and Calixtus III Borja of Valencia), cardinals, bishops, saints’ families (Vicente Ferrer), aristocrats, merchants, and artisans survive in record numbers. Only the major Italian centers rival the amount of painting undertaken in the kingdom of Aragon.

The United States is the biggest repository of this material outside Spain. In the early twentieth century, Americans enthusiastically collected Spanish painting of this period (though often mistakenly as French Provençal), and the seminal study of the subject is the fourteen-volume history (1930–1966) by an American scholar, Chandler R. Post. The Philadelphia Museum of Art, where I work as a curator, is particularly rich in works by the Valencian artists Miguel Alcanyís (documented 1421–1434), Joan Reixach (documented 1437–1484), and Roderic de Osona (documented 1464–1484). These holdings have provided me with a basis for planning an exhibition of fifteenth-century painting in the kingdom of Aragon. At the Center I have collected documentary evidence about the period and have identified works in the United States and abroad—largely in Spain and France—that will form the core of such an exhibition. Despite the strength of the collections in the United States, many artists remain largely unknown. Besides the ones mentioned above, I plan to include Gonçal Peris Sarria, Pere Nicolau, Andrés Marçal de Sas, Pere Serra, Joan
Mates, Jaume Cabrera, Joan Antigò, Ramon de Mur, Bernat Martorell, Jaume Baço (called Jacomart), Jaume Ferrer II, Lluís Dalmau, Jaume Huguet, the Vergós family, and Bartolomé Bermejo.

Recent exhibitions (in Madrid, Valencia, Barcelona, Bilbao, and Bruges) have addressed this material within the traditional stylistic categories of Spanish art as either Italian or Netherlandish in origin. Such categorization is certainly valid, and outside influences cannot be underestimated. Indeed, the kingdom of Aragon extended well beyond its own lands in southern Italy to the eastern Aegean. And the impact of Netherlandish art on Spanish painters and collectors was enormous: not only did King Alfons own works by van Eyck; the painter Joan Reixach owned one of that artist’s paintings as well. While not denying cross-cultural influences, I have attempted to look at the art of this region and period as a body of work with subjects, stylistic traditions, practices, and artistic forms that should be investigated on their own terms.

As Edmond J. Safra Professor I also worked closely during my time at the National Gallery with the departments of painting conservation and Italian painting. The culmination of these discussions was the Robert H. Smith Curatorial/Conservation Colloquy for emerging curators and scholars. The colloquy concluded with a roundtable discussion of collection catalogues, with contributions by curators David Alan Brown and Nicholas Penny, who, like myself, have recently authored such catalogues.
My project analyzes the treatment of mythological love stories in both Roman painting and Latin poetry. Given the contingencies of archaeological preservation, the chronological and geographical scope of this study has been limited to production by painters in Rome and around the Bay of Naples between about 20 B.C.E. and 79 C.E. More than a useful bracket, this is also a significant period in the development of Western concepts of desire, marked by the emergence and crystallization of a new romantic ideal. The widespread interest in stories of ephemeral pleasure and unfulfilled desire manifest in the work of painters and poets from this period must be seen as reflective of a larger cultural phenomenon. In order to reconstruct the associative patterns and emotional responses elicited by these paintings, I locate the development of a visual vocabulary of longing and tender intimacy in a contemporary debate on the nature of desire and the power of representation. Finally, I demonstrate how images of fervent passion were interwoven with the fabric of domestic decoration, modulating the repressive tenets of Roman familial ideology by transporting the viewer to a world of fantasy and intense emotion.

As the paintings from the House of Livia and the Villa Farnesina (both in Rome) and those from the villa in Boscoreale on the Bay of Naples make clear, in the last quarter of the first century B.C.E., artists moved away from the purely architectural fantasies seen in earlier styles to develop a corpus of figurative paintings often related
to well-known myths. Executed in fresco, these wall paintings consciously evoke the form of *pinakes*, or panel paintings, creating the illusion that one is looking either at a framed masterpiece or at a fantastical world discontinuous with the wall’s fabric. Immediately striking is the predominance of mythological love stories among these tableaux. Almost all present compositional schemes that show lovers in the act of looking—either at the object of desire or at one another—in a moment when erotic action is suspended and their gaze is the sole cue to a narrative of longing and short-lived satisfaction.

In the work of the Latin poets, vision’s power of enchantment and the brevity of pleasure appear as essential characteristics of love affairs. Catullus, Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid gave form to a conception of love that was significantly different from that of their Greek predecessors: essentially heterosexual, the love affairs they describe are centered on a single, elusive object, whose frequent absence inspires their laments and exaltations of an experience seen as uniquely subjective and often narrated in a self-consciously personal voice. Vision is for these poets the primary means of enthrallment. Echoing Lucretius’ “scientific” theories, which explain vision as triggered by...
objects, they describe desire as being ignited and sustained by the sight of the beloved. Furthermore, they extol the lover’s position of erotic subjection and idealize the pleasures of amatory gazing, ultimately putting forth the act of viewing itself as a new form of erotic fulfillment.

The myth of Narcissus, by far the most frequently represented in Campanian wall painting, offers concrete proof of the close connection between painting and poetry in the first century C.E. Relatively unknown before Ovid’s Metamorphoses, which was completed by 8 C.E., this tale of a self-enamored youth became thenceforth a widely recognized symbol of the power of mimesis. By turning Narcissus’ erotic drama into a study of the mechanisms of artistic illusion, Ovid wittily fused contemporary discourses on the persuasiveness of pictorial representation and the effects of love. Narcissus’ sensual beauty and the tale’s central analogy between looking at images and falling in love made this myth a favored example of the Roman poetics of desire—a metaphorical frame of thinking that gained greater immediacy in the painted interiors of Roman houses, where such images often served as the backdrop for poetic recitations. In such contexts, the self-conscious play between Narcissus’ pool and the art of painting was an effective stimulus for literary and visual associations, which blurred the boundaries between art and experience.

By emphasizing a metaphorical language common to first-century literary and visual forms of representation, I aim to contribute a model for more nuanced readings of poetry and painting, and a more profound understanding of the complex web of associations evoked by Roman pictorial ensembles. Through this project, I hope also to further our understanding of how Romans conceived and visualized desire. Finally, I show how Roman domestic ideology, which proclaimed and validated the authority of the dominus, was modulated by the presence of art that depicted a world where all that mattered was that one loved and passion burned.

[Columbia University]
Samuel H. Kress Fellow, 2003–2005

Hérica Valladares will take up a position as assistant professor of classics at The Johns Hopkins University in September 2005.
The aim of my research project is to establish the historical context of the appearance of the shortened version of the *Trattato della pittura*, by Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519). I propose that its creation was triggered by the establishment of the Accademia del Disegno in 1563. My project will allow us to see how Leonardo’s treatise influenced the artistic milieu in Florence and, more specifically, academic education at an early stage in its history. I believe that the importance of the Accademia makes what happened in Florence fundamental to the history of art since the Renaissance.

A short passage in the second edition of Giorgio Vasari’s *Le vite de’ più eccellenti pittori, scultori et architetti* (1568) constitutes the starting point for this project. I am convinced that the following enigmatic information from the biography of Leonardo has not been fully interpreted: “Come anche sono nelle mani di —— [name missing] Pittor Milanese alcuni scritti di Lionardo, pur di caratteri scritti con la mancina a rovescio, che trattano della pittura, & de’ modi del disegno, e colorire; costui non è molto, che venne a Fiorenza vedermi, desiderando stampar questa opera. . . .” The passage concerns a visit by an unnamed Milanese painter who showed Vasari a text on painting, drawing, and color by Leonardo, asking for help with its publication.

A number of manuscript copies of Leonardo’s *Trattato della pittura* were created in Florence in the second half of the sixteenth century. Research by Carlo Pedretti, eminent scholar of Leonardo’s
literary works, established the number of these as well as a list of their owners. Some of the copies belonged to members of the literary Accademia Fiorentina, some to members of the Accademia del Disegno (including Niccolo Gaddi, one of the leaders of that institution), and others to artists, among them Francesco Furini (1603–1646).

Pedretti proved that the Florentine copies were based on the simplified version of the treatise, also written in Florence, compiled by Francesco Melzi (Vatican Library, Cod. Urb. Lat. 1270). Pedretti did not, however, determine the circumstances in which this modified version was created, the name of the patron, or the aim of the endeavor. Two dates have been proposed for the appearance in Florence of Melzi’s abridged version: either before 1547 (Pedretti) or in the 1560s (L. H. Heydenreich).

Three questions arise: Who was the visitor from Milan? What was the date of his visit? And whom may he have visited apart from Vasari? To answer the first question, three names have been suggested: Francesco Melzi (1493–c. 1570), his apprentice, and Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo (1538–1600). The second seems to me the most probable. As far as the date of the visit is concerned, it must have been sometime in the period from July 1564 (the date of the commemoration of Michelangelo) through 1566, the year of Vasari’s two-month tour of historic monuments in Lombardy, Emilia, and Veneto to collect data necessary to finish the second edition of the Lives. It may well have been the establishment of the Accademia del Disegno that induced the unnamed Milanese painter to visit Florence. He could cer-
tainly have learned about its founding from the publications on the funeral celebrations for Michelangelo (14 July 1564), which had appeared a few weeks before the momentous event. Vasari gave additional information on the subject to inhabitants of Milan and Venice during his tour of northern Italy in 1566. In addition, the passage from the biography of Leonardo suggests that the visit coincided with the period of Vasari’s intense editorial work on the second edition of *Lives* (1564–1566). It reveals the haste (and fatigue) of the author, who could recall neither the name of the visitor from Milan nor the title of the text that had been shown to him.

As to the third question, it seems likely that the visitor also encountered Vincenzo Borghini, Vasari’s closest collaborator and alter ego and the director of the Accademia del Disegno. Borghini would have realized the importance of the Milanese painter’s offer. Most likely he carefully studied Melzi’s text (the visitor must have had the text with him) and decided that it could be useful in practical instruction at the Accademia. It is known that Borghini, as the head of the institution, was burdened with teaching at the new school. He wrote about it in his letters to Cosimo I and Vasari and mentioned it in his lectures.

Manuscripts of Borghini’s lectures exist in the Archivio degli Innocenti, the Biblioteca Moreniana, and the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence. A lecture from October 1564 seems of particular importance for our considerations, as its author outlined in it the aims of the new school, insisting that it was “un’Accademia di FARE et non di RAGIONARE” (an academy of DOING rather than DISCUSSING). The head of the academy vehemently criticized discussions of the *paragone*, calling it “una filosofia boschereccia” (a “forest,” that is, primitive, philosophy).

This hypothesis may explain why book I of the *Trattato*, devoted to the discussion of the *paragone*, was eliminated from Melzi’s version, which became the prototype for all the copies collected in sixteenth-century libraries in Florence. The aim of this transformation was to create a manual of painting and drawing for the use of students in the new academy. Borghini’s intention was probably to publish this treatise as a companion to Vasari’s *Lives* as realized by Cosimo Bartoli, with Alberti’s treatises on architecture (1550, 1565) and on painting and sculpture (1568).
After two years as the head of the Accademia, Borghini resigned, and his successors, among them Niccolo Gaddi and Baccio Valori, made no attempt to continue his project. The treatise was not published until nearly a century later, in 1651, when it appeared in Paris, as a result of the efforts of another academic circle, the newly established French Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture (1648).

My research will allow me to verify the documents that could contribute to answering questions on the reception of Leonardo’s artistic ideas in Florence in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Nicolas Copernicus University, Torun, Poland
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, 1 June–31 July 2004

Zygmunt Wazbiński returns to his position as professor in the department of art history at Nicolas Copernicus University, where he will continue working on a book on artists’ academic education in Florence in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
My project tells a story of early twentieth-century America and the institutionalization of modern photography; it is told within a story, that of Berenice Abbott’s historical experience, with the goal of bringing to life the meaning and politics of Abbott’s realist visions. Berenice Abbott (1898–1991), best remembered for her documentary photographs of New York in the thirties, believed that photography should provide the general public with realistic images of a changing world. Her insistence on a “straight,” or objective, approach to the photographic image, one that minimizes any trace of the photographer’s individualistic expression, has led historians to view her primarily as a proponent of what is now considered a simplistic or naive understanding of photography’s ability graphically to inscribe an objective world. Challenging this interpretation, I reexamine Abbott’s idea of realism, analyze why she made some unfashionable artistic choices, and consider how her commitment to a realist and communicatively oriented aesthetic led to her alienation from institutionalized modernism. As I explore Abbott’s realist choices, I also seek to repudiate a history of the avant-garde that positions realism as, a priori, a “conservative” artistic approach.

Although my dissertation, which I completed while in residence at the Center, is structured as a monograph, much of it relies on projects that Abbott planned, and in some instances began, but for a variety of reasons—such as patronage problems or institutional
limitations and censorship—was never able to complete. For this reason, I have come to think of my project as a monograph in the negative: the reference, metaphorically, is to a photographic negative; theoretically, to negative dialectics. My premise is that failures, frustrations, and obstacles can tell as much about a period’s context as can its successes, if not more. Thus, although Abbott’s failures and frustrations tell a compelling biographical story, they also reveal much about the politics of art production in the mid-twentieth century. For example, Abbott’s best-known project, Changing New York, a photo-book that records the reconfiguration of urban space in New York, only vaguely resembles the design she and her collaborator, Elizabeth McCausland (1899–1965), proposed. Utilizing archival material such as rejected design proposals, early mockups, and correspondence between Abbott and McCausland and their publishers, I reconstruct and analyze the project they envisioned and question why and how the final product was transformed and, ultimately, domesticated.

Sponsored by the Works Progress Administration (WPA) and the Museum of the City of New York and published by E. P. Dutton and Company in 1939, Changing New York records New York’s spectacular transformation from a nineteenth-century city to a twentieth-century megalopolis. In its images of abandoned buildings and old tenement housing, street peddlers, city crowds, and newly ascending skyscrapers, the book seems to tell a story about the painful process of urban development and the rise of corporate power in America. But as my analysis turns toward Changing New York’s unpublished, unedited, but originally intended version it becomes apparent that Abbott and McCausland also wanted their book to emphasize the contingent and serial structuring of visual information in such a way that the city was presented as anarchically heterogeneous and in a perpetual state of disintegration and renewal. In other words, the lost version of Changing New York traces not only the new (melancholic) spaces of everyday life, but also, correspondingly, a new space in art, or, at least, in photography, one that would reject the distanced space of the bourgeois observer in favor of new forms of collectivity and solidarity. Changing New York’s lost version, as well as other projects planned but never completed by Abbott and McCausland,
demonstrates how, for Abbott, realism was more about representing social relations than about objectivity for objectivity’s sake.

The story of Changing New York also reveals how Abbott, once embraced by modernists, came to operate outside modernism’s limited framework. To some extent, the choice was conscious and self-imposed. Indeed, Abbott believed in a form of representation and practiced a type of realism that, in a variety of ways, deliberately detached itself, as did the Russian avant-garde, from modernism’s traditional authorial voice and rigid agenda in order to lay the foundations of an art production that would be legible, communicative, civic minded, and collectively oriented.

The ramifications of this redefinition of Abbott’s photographic realism extend beyond the photographer, however. By repositioning Abbott’s mode of aesthetic production in terms of its communicative function, my project’s larger theoretical goal is to show how the fetishization of certain forms of avant-garde aesthetics led to the depoliticization of modern art and the depoliticization of art criticism in the latter half of the twentieth century.

[Columbia University]
Wyeth Fellow, 2003–2005

In fall 2006 Terri Weissman will take up a position as assistant professor of modern and contemporary art at the University of Notre Dame.
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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 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 may 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.
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Meetings
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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 41–49.

Reports by members of the Center are published annually. (An index of reports written by members in 2004–2005 begins on page 189.)
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