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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, guest scholars, research associates, postdoctoral fellows, and predoctoral fellows. In addition, the Center supports approximately fifteen predoctoral fellows who are conducting research both in the United States and abroad. The programs of the Center include fellowships, meetings, research, and publications.
Report on the Academic Year
June 2008 – May 2009
Board of Advisors

C. Jean Campbell  
September 2008 – August 2011  
Emory University

Martin Powers  
September 2006 – August 2009  
University of Michigan

Whitney Davis  
September 2007 – 2010  
University of California – Berkeley

Richard Shiff, *chair*  
September 2006 – August 2009  
The University of Texas at Austin

Hal Foster  
September 2007 – 2010  
Princeton University

Carl Strehlke  
September 2008 – August 2011  
Philadelphia Museum of Art

Michael Koorthbojian  
September 2007 – 2010  
The Johns Hopkins University

Jeanette Favrot Peterson  
September 2008 – August 2011  
University of California – Santa Barbara

Curatorial Liaison

Peter Parshall  
September 2008 – August 2009  
Curator of Old Master Prints  
National Gallery of Art

Special Selection Committees

*Ailsa Mellon Bruce Predoctoral Fellowship for Historians of American Art to Travel Abroad*

Michael J. Lewis  
Williams College

James Meyer  
Emory University

Gwendolyn DuBois Shaw  
University of Pennsylvania

*A. W. Mellon Postdoctoral Fellowship*

Michael Cole  
University of Pennsylvania

Michael Fried  
The Johns Hopkins University

Mariët Westermann  
New York University, Institute of Fine Arts
Staff

Elizabeth Cropper, Dean
Therese O’Malley, Associate Dean
Peter M. Lukehart, Associate Dean
Helen Tangires, Center Administrator
Kenneth Baksy, Assistant Administrator for Budget and Accounting

Research Associates

Janna Israel
Anne Nellis (to August 2008)
Jill Pederson
Jessica N. Richardson
Naoko Takahatake (to August 2008)
Sara M. Taylor

Program Assistants

Susan Cohn, Fellowships
Elizabeth Kielpinski, Regular Meetings
Emma Millon, Research
Laura Plaisted, Regular Meetings and Publications
Jessica Ruse, Research
Mattie M. Schloetzer, Research
Bailey Skiles, Special Meetings and Publications

Research Assistant

Rachel Middleman (to December 2008)

Project Staff

Karen Binswanger, Project Manager for Center Reports
The Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts welcomed professors and senior, visiting senior, and postdoctoral fellows from Australia, the Czech Republic, France, Georgia, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States, as well as predoctoral fellows from universities in the United States. The topics of their research ranged from contemporary abstract painting in Korea to the historiography of ancient sculpture in Britain, from devotion to the Virgin of Loreto in colonial Mexico to the perception of ethnic difference in the art of late medieval Central Europe, and from architectural decoration in early Renaissance Venice to the lithographs of Achille Devéria in nineteenth-century Paris. Miguel Falomir completed the first year of his two-year stay as Andrew W. Mellon Professor, continuing his work on the catalogue of paintings by Titian in the Museo del Prado, from which he is on leave for the period of this appointment. We are most grateful to the Ferris Baker Watts Foundation for a grant that made it possible for the fellows to travel together to the Philadelphia Museum of Art to see the exhibition Cézanne and Beyond in the company of Joseph Rishel, curator of European painting and sculpture at the museum; Richard Shiff, chair of the casva Board of Advisors; and John House, Samuel H. Kress Professor.

In the program of publications, two volumes appeared in the course of the year in the series Studies in the History of Art. Both celebrate special anniversaries. The first, A Modernist Museum in Perspective:
In the program of special meetings, the second part of the symposium “Modernism and Landscape Architecture, 1890–1940” was held in collaboration with the Zentrum für Gartenkunst und Landschaftsarchitektur of the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Universität Hannover and the Stiftung Bauhaus Dessau, with special visits to the Bauhaus and to the gardens at Wörlitzer Park. The Center also sponsored a two-day symposium, “Rediscovering the Ancient World on the Bay of Naples,” in conjunction with the National Gallery’s exhibition *Pompeii and the Roman Villa: Art and Culture around the Bay of Naples*, and cosponsored, with the University of Maryland, the thirty-ninth Middle Atlantic Symposium in the History of Art.

This year’s biennial Wyeth Conference, supported by the Wyeth Foundation for American Art and cosponsored by the National Museum of the American Indian, was dedicated to the topic “Images of the American Indian, 1600–2000.” The conference was held in connection with the contemporaneous exhibitions *George de Forest Brush: The Indian Paintings* at the National Gallery of Art and *Fritz Scholder: Indian / Not Indian* at the National Museum of the American Indian, and represented a historic collaboration with our neighbors across the Mall.

The purpose of two colloquies held this year was to bring a group of emerging scholars and curators to the National Gallery and casva to share the rich resources available at the gallery in conservation and art
history for the understanding of modern and contemporary art. Nancy J. Troy, University of Southern California, and the Center’s sixth Edmond J. Safra Visiting Professor, led an Edmond J. Safra Colloquy entitled “Condition, Conservation, Interpretation: Case Studies in Twentieth-Century Art.” The Phillips Collection and the Hirshhorn Museum most generously loaned works by Piet Mondrian from their collections for comparative study. Several experts, including Harry Cooper, curator of modern and contemporary art, and Jay Krueger, senior conservator of modern paintings, discussed works in the Gallery’s collection (notably paintings by Piet Mondrian, Ad Reinhardt, Arshile Gorky, and László Moholy-Nagy) with a group of scholars, curators, and conservators under ideal conditions in a closed gallery.

The second A. W. Mellon Curatorial / Conservation Colloquy in Modern and Contemporary Art was dedicated to the topic “The Process of Painting: Manet in the 1860s.” The opportunity to spend two and a half days paying close attention to Manet’s The Old Musician, recently cleaned, was enhanced by the simultaneous presence in the conservation studio of The Ragpicker, from the Norton Simon Museum, and by a display of prints from the Gallery’s collection in the Print Study Room. Ann Hoenigswald, senior conservator, who was responsible for the cleaning of The Old Musician, led discussions, together with Kimberly Jones, associate curator of French paintings. Curators from Baltimore, Chicago, New York, Pasadena, Philadelphia, Copenhagen, and elsewhere joined the group. John House, Samuel H. Kress Professor, provided a concluding reflection for Gallery staff on the potential of such meetings to overcome disciplinary divides. His presence has brought new energy to the study of the Gallery’s collection, and his has been an active and welcome voice in many discussions throughout the year.

T. J. Clark of the University of California – Berkeley delivered the fifty-eighth A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, on “Picasso and Truth.” The audience filled the East Building auditorium to overflowing, and Professor Clark generously agreed to allow the lectures to be podcast after the event (www.nga.gov/podcasts). If issues concerning the reproduction of images can be surmounted, this year’s lectures may eventually be videocast on the Web, in addition to their usual publication in Bollingen Series xxxv by Princeton University Press.
The Center’s three ongoing research projects, designed to provide primary research materials and tools for the field, are described on pages 38–41. A full description of the fellowship program and a complete list of publications may be found at the conclusion of this volume. The entire contents of Center 29—as well as archived reports from the last five years—continue to be accessible and searchable online at www.nga.gov/resources/casva.shtm.

Elizabeth Cropper
Dean
**Members**

John House, Courtauld Institute of Art  
Samuel H. Kress Professor, 2008 – 2009

Miguel Falomir, Museo Nacional del Prado  
Andrew W. Mellon Professor, 2008 – 2010

Nancy J. Troy, University of Southern California  
Edmond J. Safra Visiting Professor, fall 2008

T. J. Clark, University of California – Berkeley  
Fifty-eighth A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts, spring 2009

**Senior Fellows**

Luisa Elena Alcalá, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid  
Paul Mellon Senior Fellow, 2008 – 2009  
*The Virgin of Loreto and the Jesuits in Colonial Mexico*

Andrew Carrington Shelton, The Ohio State University  
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, 2008 – 2009  
*Achille Devéria: Art, Identity, and Commerce in Early Nineteenth-Century Paris*
Michael Fried and T. J. Clark

Jonathan Unglaub, Brandeis University
Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow, 2008 – 2009
*Painting as Parthenogenesis: Raphael’s Sistine Madonna*

Heghnar Zeitlian Watenpaugh, University of California – Davis
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, 2008 – 2009
*The City and Its Reverse: Performing Space and Gender in Islamic Urbanism*

Nino Zchomelidse, Princeton University
Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow, 2008 – 2009
*The Medieval Image and Concepts of Authenticity*

Rebecca Zorach, University of Chicago
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, 2008 – 2009
*Passionate Angles: The Triangle in Renaissance Culture*

**Visiting Senior Fellows**

Jaynie Anderson, The University of Melbourne
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, May 1 – June 30, 2008
*An Intellectual Biography of Giovanni Morelli*
Doris Carl, Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz
Guest Scholar, March 1–April 30, 2009
The Early Work of Andrea Sansovino

Viccy Coltman, University of Edinburgh
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, July 1–August 31, 2008
A Mania for Marble: The Art History and Historiography of Ancient Sculpture in Britain

Dario L. Gamboni, Université de Genève
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, December 22, 2008–February 6, 2009
Gauguin “in the Heart of Thought”

Verena Gebhard, Bibliotheca Hertziana, Max-Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte, Rome
Guest Scholar, July 16–August 31, 2008
A Review and Update of Online Resources at the NGA Library and Consultation on the ArsRoma and the Accademia di San Luca Projects

Pavel Kalina, Czech Technical University, Prague
Podhorsky Guest Scholar, July 1–August 15, 2008
Following Saint Jerome: Humanism and Mysticism in Late Fifteenth-Century Art

Miguel Falomir
Olivier Lugon, Université de Lausanne
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow,
January 15 – February 28, 2009
Learning from Photographs: Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown, and Photography

Emily Ballew Neff, Museum of Fine Arts, Houston
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow,
July 1 – August 31, 2008
Revolutionary Paintings by West, Copley, and Trumbull

Lisa Pon, Southern Methodist University
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow,
November 1 – December 31, 2008
Forlì’s Madonna of the Fire: Image, Cult, Community

Nino Simonishvili, Georgian National Museum, Tbilisi
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, March 1 – April 30, 2009
Images of Identity at the Crossroads: Georgian Medieval Art, a Comparative Study
Luigi Sperti, Università Ca’ Foscari di Venezia
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow / Millon Architectural History Guest Scholar, September 2 – October 15, 2008
Architectural Decoration and Classical Tradition in Early Renaissance Venice

Postdoctoral Fellow

Douglas Brine
A. W. Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow, 2007 – 2009
The Content and Context of Wall-Mounted Memorials in the Burgundian Netherlands

Predoctoral Fellows (in residence)

S. Adam Hindin [Harvard University]
Samuel H. Kress Fellow, 2007 – 2009
Knowledge, Memory, and Ethnic Commitment in Bohemian Visual Culture, 1200 – 1450

Ashley Elizabeth Jones [Yale University]
David E. Finley Fellow, 2006 – 2009
“Lord, Protect the Wearer”: Late-Antique Numismatic Jewelry and the Image of the Emperor as Talismanic Device

Fellows’ tour of the exhibition
Pride of Place: Dutch Cityscapes of the Golden Age with curator Arthur K. Wheelock Jr.
Joan Kee [New York University, Institute of Fine Arts]  
Andrew W. Mellon Fellow, 2007–2009  
*Points, Lines, Encounters: The Paintings of Lee Ufan and Park Seobo*

Michele Matteini [New York University, Institute of Fine Arts]  
Ittleson Fellow, 2007–2009  
*Painting in the Age of Evidential Scholarship (Kaozheng): Luo Ping’s Late Years, c. 1770–1799*

Cammie McAtee [Harvard University]  
Wyeth Fellow, 2007–2009  
*The “Search for Form” in Postwar American Architecture*

Kristin Romberg [Columbia University]  
Paul Mellon Fellow, 2006–2009  
*Gan’s Constructivism*

Joyce Tsai [The Johns Hopkins University]  
Twenty-four-Month Chester Dale Fellow, 2007–2009  
*Painting after Photography: László Moholy-Nagy, 1921–1936*
Predoctoral Fellows (not in residence)

Sinem Arcak [University of Minnesota]
Andrew W. Mellon Fellow, 2008–2010
*Gifts in Motion: Ottoman-Safavid Cultural Exchange, 1501–1639*

Marisa Bass [Harvard University]
*A Circle Apart: Jan Gossaert and the Scope of Humanist Painting in the Netherlands*

Wen-shing Chou [University of California–Berkeley]
Ittleson Fellow, 2008–2010
*Where Our Journeys End: Visions, Exchanges, and Encounters in Early Modern Representations of Mount Wutai*

Ivan Drpić [Harvard University]
David E. Finley Fellow, 2007–2010
*Kosmos of Verse: Art and Epigram in Late Byzantium*

Christina R. Ferando [Columbia University]
David E. Finley Fellow, 2008–2011
*Staging Neoclassicism: Exhibitions of Antonio Canova’s Sculptures*

George F. Flaherty [University of California–Santa Barbara]
Twenty-four-Month Chester Dale Fellow, 2008–2010
*Mediating the Third Culture at Tlatelolco, Mexico City*
Beatrice Kitzinger [Harvard University]
Paul Mellon Fellow, 2008–2011
Real Presence and Ritual Presence: The Early Medieval Processional Cross and Its Representations

Albert Narath [Columbia University]
Paul Mellon Fellow, 2007–2010
Rediscovering the Baroque: Architecture, History, and Politics in Austria and Germany

Andrei Pop [Harvard University]
Samuel H. Kress Fellow, 2008–2010
Neopaganism: Henry Fuseli, Theater, and the Cultural Politics of Antiquity

Catherine Walden [University of Virginia]
Twelve-Month Chester Dale Fellow, 2008–2009
Redemption and Remembrance: The English Episcopal Tomb in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries

Tobias Wofford [University of California – Los Angeles]
Wyeth Fellow, 2008–2010
Constructing Africa: The Visualization of Homeland and Diaspora in African-American Art of the 1960s and 1970s

Ailsa Mellon Bruce Predoctoral Fellowships for Historians of American Art to Travel Abroad

Dana Byrd
[Yale University]

Maggie Cao
[Harvard University]

Jessica Horton
[University of Rochester]

Hannah Wong
[The University of Texas at Austin]
Meetings

Symposia

October 17 – 18, 2008

MODERNISM AND LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, 1890 – 1940: PART 2

Cosponsored with Zentrum für Gartenkunst und Landschaftsarchitektur, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Universität Hannover and Stiftung Bauhaus Dessau

Thursday, October 16, 2008

Leibniz Haus, Hannover
Stefan Schwerdtfeger
“Das Reflektorische Farblichtspiel” von Kurt Schwerdtfeger am Bauhaus Weimar
Friday, October 17, 2008

**Morning session**

Erich Barke, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Universität Hannover
Elizabeth Cropper, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Kirsten Baumann, Stiftung Bauhaus Dessau

*Opening Remarks*

Steven Mansbach, University of Maryland

*Welcome*

Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn, Zentrum für Gartenkunst und Landschaftsarchitektur

*Introduction*

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

**Modernism in Landscape Architecture and Garden Design: A Historiographic Overview**

Gert Gröning, Universität der Künste, Berlin

*Obstacles to Modernism in Landscape Architecture in Germany around 1900*

Sonja Dümpelmann, University of Maryland

*“Per la difesa del giardino”: Gardens, Parks, and Landscape between Tradition and Modernism in Early Twentieth-Century Italy*

**Afternoon session**

Johannes Stoffler, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich

*Parkbäder des Neuen Bauens in der Schweiz*

Christian Wagner, Fachhochschule Anhalt

*Hannes Meyer — Volksbedarf und Volksgärten*

Alan Powers, University of Greenwich

*The Re-Enchantment of Nature in British Landscape Theory and Practice, 1890–1940*

Dorothea Fischer-Leonhardt, Fachhochschule Anhalt

*Die Gärten des Bauhauses in Dessau*
Saturday, October 18, 2008, and Sunday, October 19, 2009

Excursions to the Bauhaus Dessau Foundation (including the school, the masters’ houses, and Dessau Törten Estate, by Walter Gropius, and the Knarrberg Estate, by Leopold Fischer), and to Wörlitzer Park

January 30 – 31, 2009

Rediscovering the Ancient World on the Bay of Naples

Friday, January 30, 2009

Morning session

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

Carol Mattusch, George Mason University
Moderator

Alain Schnapp, Université Paris 1
Naples as a Laboratory of Ideas in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries
Nancy H. Ramage, Ithaca College
*Flying Maenads and Cupids: Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Eighteenth-Century Decorative Arts*

Sophie Descamps, Musée du Louvre
*The Ferdinand IV Donation to the First Consul and His Wife: Antiquities from the Bay of Naples at Malmaison*

**Afternoon session**

Christopher Parslow, Wesleyan University
*Moderator*

Carlo Knight, Società Nazionale di Scienze, Lettere e Arti, Naples
*Artists and Comedians of the Neapolitan Regency: Unpublished Correspondence of Charles III and the Prince of San Nicandro, 1759–1767*

John E. Moore, Smith College
*“To the Catholic King” and Others: Bernardo Tanucci’s Correspondence and the Herculaneum Volumes*

Bruce Redford, Boston University
*“Grecian Taste and Neapolitan Spirit”: Joshua Reynolds’ Portraits of the Society of Dilettanti*

Steffi Roettgen, Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz
*German Painters in Naples from 1760 to 1799 and Their Contribution to the Revival of Antiquity*

Saturday, January 31, 2009

**Morning session**

Alain Schnapp, Université Paris 1
*Moderator*

Thomas Willette, University of Michigan
*Stones of Contention: The Disputed History of Excavations at Resina before 1738 and the Discovery of the Theater at Herculaneum*

Jens Dachner, J. Paul Getty Museum
*The Herculaneum Women and Eighteenth-Century Europe*

Eric M. Moormann, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen
*Literary Evocations of Herculaneum*
Eugene J. Dwyer, Kenyon College
_Pompeii versus Herculaneum_

Afternoon session

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

Christopher Parslow, Wesleyan University
_The Sacarium of Isis in the Praedia Iuliae Felicis in Pompeii in Its Archaeological and Historical Contexts_

John Pinto, Princeton University
_“Speaking Ruins”: Piranesi and Desprez at Pompeii_

Mary Beard, Cambridge University
_Taste and the Antique: Pompeii and the Nineteenth-Century Tourist_

March 6–7, 2009

MIDDLE ATLANTIC SYMPOSIUM IN THE HISTORY OF ART, THIRTY-NINTH ANNUAL SESSIONS
Cosponsored with the Department of Art History and Archaeology, University of Maryland

Friday, March 6, 2009

Evening session

William Pressly, University of Maryland
_Welcome_

James F. Harris, University of Maryland
_Greeting_

Meredith J. Gill, University of Maryland
_Introduction_

George Levitine Lecture in Art History

Patricia Fortini Brown, Princeton University
_Venice outside Venice: Toward a Cultural Geography of the Venetian Republic_
Saturday, March 7, 2009

**Morning session**

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

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

Ben C. Tilghman  
[The Johns Hopkins University]  
*A Sketch of Salvation: The Genealogy of Christ in the Book of Kells*  
Professor Herbert Kessler: *introduction*

Anne H. Muraoka  
[Temple University]  
*Tangible Presence and Dirty Feet: The Confluence of Gabriele Paleotti’s Discorso and Caravaggio’s Plebeian Style*  
Professor Marcia Hall: *introduction*

Molly Medakovich  
[University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill]  
*Between Friends: Matriarchal Utopia and Female Intimacy in Marguerite Gérard’s L’Enfance de Paul et Virginie*  
Professor Mary Sheriff: *introduction*

Jennifer Van Horn  
[University of Virginia]  
*Unmasking Civility: Portraits of Colonial Women and the Transatlantic Masquerade*  
Professor Maurie D. McInnis: *introduction*

**Afternoon session**

Yui Suzuki, University of Maryland  
*Moderator*

Adam Greenhalgh  
[University of Maryland]  
*Counting George Bellows’ Forty-two Kids*  
Dr. Franklin Kelly: *introduction*

Faye Gleisser  
[The George Washington University]  
*Toward a New American Unconscious: Abstract Expressionism, Advertising, and the Rise of Consumer Culture*  
Professor Alexander Dumbadze: *introduction*
Rebecca Dubay  
[Bryn Mawr College]  
Anne Truitt and the Legacy of Postwar American Painting  
Professor Lisa Saltzman: introduction

Ellie Pinzarrone  
[American University]  
The Re-creation of Memory as a Practice of Resistance: Faith Ringgold, Betye Saar, and Carrie Mae Weems  
Professor Norma Broude: introduction

Tasha Parker  
[Howard University]  
The Writing’s on the Web: Intertextuality and Dialogism in Street Art  
Professor Gwendolyn H. Everett: introduction

Conference

December 4–5, 2008

IMAGES OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN, 1600–2000  
A Wyeth Foundation for American Art Conference  
Cosponsored with the National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution  
Thursday, December 4, 2008  
National Museum of the American Indian
Afternoon session

Kevin Gover, National Museum of the American Indian
Welcome

Nancy Anderson, National Gallery of Art
Moderator

Paul Chaat Smith, National Museum of the American Indian
Who’s Afraid of Fritz Scholder?

Leah Dilworth, Long Island University
A Present Absence: Cliff Dwellers in the American Imagination

Michael Gaudio, University of Minnesota
Speaking Images: Picturing Native American Dance, 1592/1894

William Truettner, Smithsonian American Art Museum
Painting Indians and Building Empires in North America, 1710–1840

Friday, December 5, 2008
National Gallery of Art, Washington

Morning session

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

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

Nancy Anderson, National Gallery of Art
Life Studies: The Indian Paintings of George de Forest Brush

Ned Blackhawk, University of Wisconsin–Madison
Surviving the American Conquest: A New History of America’s Indians over Four Centuries

Katherine Manthorne, The City University of New York
“Art Women” and Native Peoples, c. 1876

Afternoon session

Paul Chaat Smith, National Museum of the American Indian
moderator

Kate Flint, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Photography, Modernity, and the American Indian in Britain, 1840–1905

Philip Deloria, University of Michigan
*Toward an Indian Abstract: The Outsider Art of Mary Sully*

Jolene Rickard, Cornell University
*Visions from within Indigenous America*

**Colloquies**

December 8–10, 2008

**Condition, Conservation, Interpretation: Case Studies in Twentieth-Century Art**

Edmond J. Safra Colloquy
Nancy J. Troy, University of Southern California
Edmond J. Safra Visiting Professor, fall 2008

**Participants**

Graham Bader, *Rice University*
Yve-Alain Bois, *Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton*
Harry Cooper, National Gallery of Art
Elizabeth Cropper, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Stephanie D’Alessandro, The Art Institute of Chicago
Isabelle Duvernois, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
Valerie Fletcher, Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden
Susan Greenberg Fisher, Yale University Art Gallery
Ruth Hoppe, Stichting Gemeentemuseum Den Haag
Joan Kee, University of Michigan, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Jay Krueger, National Gallery of Art
Allison Langley, The Art Institute of Chicago
Peter M. Lukehart, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Rachel Middleman [University of Southern California], Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Therese O’Malley, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Laura Rivers, The Menil Collection
Kristin Romberg [Columbia University], Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Kate Smith, Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum
Elizabeth Steele, The Phillips Collection
Joyce Tsai [The Johns Hopkins University], Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
May 18–20, 2009

THE PROCESS OF PAINTING: MANET IN THE 1860S
A. W. Mellon Curatorial/Conservation Colloquy in Modern and Contemporary Art

Participants

Bridget Alsdorf, Princeton University
Sarah Betzer, University of Virginia
Helen Burnham, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
Elizabeth Cropper, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
André Dombrowski, University of Pennsylvania
Patti Favero, The Phillips Collection
Jay Fisher, Baltimore Museum of Art
Joseph Fronek, Los Angeles County Museum of Art
Charlotte Hale, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
Ann Hoenigswald, National Gallery of Art
John House, Courtauld Institute of Art, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Kimberly Jones, National Gallery of Art
Irene Konefal, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
Sara Lees, The Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute
Leah Lehmbeck, Norton Simon Museum
Nancy Locke, The Pennsylvania State University
Martha Lucy, The Barnes Foundation
Peter M. Lukehart, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Therese O’Malley, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts
Peter Parshall, National Gallery of Art
Line Clausen Pedersen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen
Elizabeth Rudy, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
Mary Schafer, Nelson Atkins Museum of Art
Kim Schenck, National Gallery of Art
George Shackelford, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
Juliet Wilson-Bareau, London
Faye Wrubel, The Art Institute of Chicago

Colloquia CCXXIV–CCXXX

October 23, 2008
John House, Samuel H. Kress Professor
“Realism” and Nineteenth-Century French Painting

November 20, 2008
Heghnar Zeitlian Watenpaugh, Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow
*The City and Its Reverse: Performing Space and Gender in Islamic Urbanism*

December 11, 2008
Andrew Carrington Shelton, Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow
*Achille Devéria: Art, Identity and Commerce in Early Nineteenth-Century Paris*

January 15, 2009
Nino Zchomelidse, Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow
*The Aura of the Numinous and Its Reproduction: Medieval Paintings of the Savior in Rome and Latium*

February 12, 2009
Jonathan Unglaub, Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow
*Painting as Miraculous Birth: Raphael’s Sistine Madonna*
March 12, 2009
Luisa Elena Alcalá, Paul Mellon Senior Fellow
Redefining the Marian Landscape: The Virgin of Loreto and the Jesuits in Colonial Mexico

April 16, 2009
Rebecca Zorach, Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow
Passionate Triangles: Art, Geometry, and Subjectivity in Renaissance Italy and France

Shoptalks 148–155

October 30, 2008
Ashley Elizabeth Jones, David E. Finley Fellow
Roma Aeterna, Italia Limenalis: Romans, Barbarians, and Coin-Set Jewelry on the Peninsula

December 15, 2008
Kristin Romberg, Paul Mellon Fellow

January 29, 2009
S. Adam Hindin, Samuel H. Kress Fellow
Church Architecture and Ethnic Identity in Later Medieval Bohemia

February 9, 2009
Douglas Brine, A. W. Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow
Jan van Eyck and the Art of Commemoration

February 19, 2009
Joyce Tsai, Twenty-Four-Month Chester Dale Fellow
Repair and Revision: László Moholy-Nagy

March 16, 2009
Michele Matteini, Ittleson Fellow
The Landscape of Culture: Luo Ping’s The Sword Terrace (1794) or the Brotherhood of Art

April 9, 2009
Joan Kee, Andrew W. Mellon Fellow
Painting Takes Exception: Park Seobo’s Écriture in Yushin Korea

April 30, 2009
Cammie McAtee, Wyeth Fellow
Philip Johnson’s Roofless Church and the Content of “Pure Form”
Lectures

The Fifty-eighth A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, 2009

T. J. Clark, University of California – Berkeley

Picasso and Truth

March 22  Object
March 29  Room
April  5  Window
April 19  Monster
April 26  Monument
May  3  Mural
Publications

Two publications appeared in 2009. The first, *A Modernist Museum in Perspective: The East Building, National Gallery of Art*, volume 73 in the series Studies in the History of Art, was edited by Anthony Alofsin. It gathers papers by ten scholars that were delivered at a symposium in 2004 on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the opening of the East Building. It also includes a portfolio of architectural materials drawn from the archives of the National Gallery of Art with an introduction by Maygene F. Daniels. The second, *Dialogues in Art History, from Mesopotamian to Modern: Readings for a New Century*, volume 74 in Studies in the History of Art, was edited by Elizabeth Cropper. It includes twenty essays that were first delivered at a symposium in 2005 celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts. The volumes are distributed by Yale University Press.

Six new Studies volumes are in preparation. Also forthcoming is the second in the Seminar Papers series, *The Accademia Seminars: The Accademia di San Luca in Rome, c. 1590–1635*. A complete list of Center publications appears at the end of *Center 29*. 
Research

Three 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 European 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*, by Carlo Cesare Malvasia (1616–1693), is one of the most important critical texts on Italian art. Indeed, it may be considered the seventeenth-century equivalent of Vasari’s *Lives*, whose Florentine premises it challenges. Malvasia wrote in an unusually difficult Italian, and the *Felsina*, first published in 1678, has never been translated in full. It has not been published as an Italian edition in its entirety since 1841. This English translation, undertaken by a team of scholars, will appear in a series of individual monographic volumes. Each volume will include transcriptions of Malvasia’s manuscript notes now in the Archiginnasio in Bologna as well as a modern edition of the Italian text, making it valuable not only for teaching purposes, but also for all specialists in Bolognese painting. With the exception of material relating to the lives of the Carracci, which will be edited by Giovanna Perini of the Università degli Studi di Urbino, the texts and notes will be transcribed and edited by Lorenzo Pericolo of the University of Montreal.

Research by Elizabeth Cropper, assisted by Giancarla Periti and Jessica N. Richardson, has hitherto focused on the first of four parts of Malvasia’s text and on providing basic tools for the translators, annotators, and editors of the subsequent volumes. Their annotated edition of the first part of the *Felsina* will include accompanying essays on Malvasia’s treatment of the “primi lumi” of Bolognese painting from the twelfth to
the fifteenth century. An archive of relevant images is being compiled. Naoko Takahatake is completing her translation of Malvasia’s important survey of Bolognese printmakers, and Anne Summerscale is working in a similar way on the translation and annotation of the life of Domenichino. Lorenzo Pericolo will complete the volume on Guido Reni. Additional translators have been identified and have begun work.

Research Associates: Naoko Takahatake (to August 2008) and Jessica N. Richardson
Program Assistant: Mattie M. Schloetzer

Keywords in American Landscape Design, 1600–1850

Keywords in American Landscape Design, 1600–1850 is in production at its copublisher, Yale University Press, and will be available in spring 2010. This historical and visual reference work is the result of a project to compile a photographic corpus and historical textual database documenting landscape design in North America during the colonial and antebellum periods. Through texts and images, the book 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. Under Associate Dean Therese O’Malley’s direction, researchers 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. One thousand of these illustrations and hundreds of citations are collected in the volume. Each of one hundred 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 a comprehensive photographic archive of antebellum American garden and landscape design.

In addition to 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.

Research Associates: Anne Nellis (to August 2008) and Sara M. Taylor
Program Assistant: Jessica Ruse

The Early History of the Accademia di San Luca, c. 1590–1635

The aim of this research project, under the direction of Associate Dean Peter M. Lukehart, is to create the first institutional history of the foundation of the Accademia di San Luca. Drawing from original statutes, adunanze (records of the proceedings of meetings of the academy), ledger books kept by the treasurers, and court records, the project brings together a large number of new and previously unpublished documentary materials with relevant secondary sources. Conceived as two complementary tools, an online database of documentation and a printed volume of interpretive studies, the project sheds light on the foundation, operation, administration, and financial management of the fledgling academy from its origins in the late sixteenth century to its consolidation as teaching institution in the 1630s.

The first component of the project is a reference database, “The History of the Accademia di San Luca, c. 1590–1635: Documents from the
Archivio di Stato di Roma,” which will be searchable on the Web and will provide access to a systematic and complete transcription of every extant notarial record identified by the project team, as well as a digital image of the original document, the two viewable side by side. The project is in its second year of a three-year grant from the Getty Foundation that will support completion of the markup of the text following standards of the text encoding initiative, the transfer of documents onto a Web site, the beta testing of the reference database, and the response to inquiries and comments from scholars. Hiring of experts to assist with each of these parts of the project is under way. At present, roughly half of the documents have been made available to the project’s advisory committee. Launch of the publicly accessible Web site with the entire selection of documents is scheduled for late 2009.


*Research Associate: Jill Pederson*

*Project Art Historian: Geoffrey Taylor (to September 2008)*

*Program Assistant: Emma Millon*

*Text-encoding (TEI) Consultant: David Seaman, Dartmouth College Library*
Research Associates’ Reports

Research associates engaged in long-term Center projects also pursue independent research.

Janna Israel, “As though another Byzantium”: Representation and Cultural Memory in Early Modern Venice

My research explores fundamental changes to the perceived and projected image of Venice around the time of the fall of Constantinople in 1453. I focus on the debates that took place under Doge Christoforo Moro (reigned 1462–1471) concerning an appropriate Venetian response to the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople. Merchants with trading interests in the East were more reluctant to break diplomatic ties with the Ottoman Turks than those Greek immigrants to Venice who were anxious about the fate of their cultural patrimony. In the face of these political, religious, and cultural tensions, I examine how the artistic and architectural patronage of the doge and his circle expressed nostalgia for the lost relationship with Constantinople.


My book manuscript examines the learned circle around Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519) during his years in Sforza Milan. As a point of departure, Henrico Boscano’s courtly vernacular text Isola beata (c. 1513) serves in part to reconstruct the names of the members of this group, which the author terms his “academy.” This year I have turned my at-
tention to the historiography of Leonardo’s academy. Specifically, I have focused on the nineteenth-century Italian scholar Gustavo Uzielli (1839–1911), whose post-Risorgimento politics played a role in the construction of Leonardo’s identity for modern scholars. Uzielli first challenged the existence of the academy in his authoritative *Ricerche intorno a Leonardo da Vinci* (1872)—a text that looms large in the historical understanding of Leonardo and that still shapes scholarship today.

Jessica N. Richardson, *Prisoners, Charity, and Holy Liberations: Saint Leonard of Noblat and the Construction of Saintly Identity in Late Medieval Italy*

My research considers how images were used to formulate and reformulate saintly identity by examining the cult of the sixth-century French saint Leonard of Noblat in Italy, from the twelfth to fifteenth century. Particular attention is devoted to the relationship between the images of the saint and the miracles for which he was most celebrated: the rescue and release of prisoners. The surviving Italian images from the period—of which there are more than 160—demonstrate the cult’s appeal to a variety of institutions and individuals. I am currently preparing two studies that address the links between local devotion to Leonard, charitable behavior toward prisoners, and the artistic commissions of lay religious confraternities in Assisi and Venice.
My research concerns a series of unpublished testaments from Oaxaca, Mexico. These legal documents, which were created by individuals to bequeath their material possessions to their designated heirs, have recently begun to be mined as fertile sources for colonial historians. Embedded within the testaments are inventories that describe the images owned by men and women of all classes and ethnicities in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. I use these documents to consider what images were collected and how images were appreciated in Oaxaca. My working thesis is that images were not merely devotional items; they were portable vehicles used to store, display, and maintain personal wealth in late colonial Mexico.
Research Reports of Members
The Virgin of Loreto and the Jesuits in Colonial Mexico

In the early modern period, the sanctuary of the Virgin of Loreto in the Marches of Italy emerged as one of the most important international centers of Marian pilgrimage in Europe. Devotion revolved around an image of the Virgin—supposedly made by Saint Luke, a provenance that lent it the prestigious status of some of the oldest Marian icons—and also around the original House of the Virgin, reportedly transported there from Nazareth by angels in 1294. Although the identification of the Loreto chapel with the House of the Virgin in the Holy Land was constantly challenged throughout the centuries, its devotional following, among both the masses and renowned princes and churchmen, persisted and continued to flourish well into the last third of the eighteenth century. For devotees, visiting Loreto was a way of visiting the Holy Land, the house where the Incarnation took place and where the Christ Child spent his early years: powerful geographic and spiritual associations unparalleled anywhere in Europe. As hopes of recovering the Holy Land from Ottoman rule faded, Loreto’s prestige increased, in part because of continued papal support. In 1554 Pope Julius III asked the newly founded Society of Jesus to serve as apostolic confessors at the sanctuary. Although other religious orders, such as the Capuchins, did much to develop the cult in Central and Eastern Europe, it was the Jesuits who spread it globally to Asia and Latin America and who adopted Loreto as a symbol of their missionary enterprise and corporate identity.
In the 1670s a pair of young Italian Jesuits had a copy of the original sculpture in Italy brought to Mexico. It was installed in the church of San Gregorio in Mexico City, dedicated exclusively to educating and catechizing the local indigenous population. At the same time, another copy was placed in the Jesuits’ novitiate church of San Francisco Javier in Tepotzotlán, a small town outside the viceregal capital. This church and the indigenous village that harbored it increasingly drew illustrious visitors from the city, who saw it as a place of spiritual retreat. The Jesuits also had replicas of the House of the Virgin built in both churches, creating a new kind of chapel and chapel experience for the inhabitants of the viceroyalty of New Spain.

The book manuscript I have been writing investigates the development of the cult of the Virgin of Loreto in Mexico City during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It analyzes the way in which Jesuits implemented images, objects, and words to promote Marian devotion among both the Spanish and Creole elite and the indigenous population. While part of my work examines how the replicas of the House of the Virgin were used and decorated, I also focus on the images of the Virgin herself. One of the issues that I am investigating is blackness, in the sense both of skin color and of material blackness.

The original image of the Virgin of Loreto belongs to the broader category of Black Madonnas. Because this circumstance was deemed problematic by the Jesuits in Mexico, they had the copy imported from Italy secretly whitened before placing it in the altar in San Gregorio. Surprisingly, there has been little academic attention to the perception and reception of dark-toned Virgins in the early modern period. Most of the literature has focused on the origins of associated medieval cults and their relationship to pagan deities and occult practices. Many of these theories are not helpful for the later period, from the sixteenth century onward, as they do not take into consideration how ideas of blackness evolved over time or responded to local situations and different geographies. The decision of the Jesuits to compromise the authenticity of the copy in Mexico was guided by concerns that the local population, especially the common people, might be unreceptive to the cult because of widespread negative associations of blackness with slaves. Some members of the Creole elite, however, preferred to have representations that were black-toned for private devotions in their homes. The issue
of the Madonna of Loreto’s color in Mexico opens a window for a re-
examination of the problem of skin color in representations of Marian
devotions in general. Furthermore, it constitutes an example of the way
in which European ideas about images, religion, and race were negotiated
on the other side of the Atlantic in response to local conditions.

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
Paul Mellon Senior Fellow, 2008–2009

In 2009–2010 Luisa Elena Alcalá will hold a research fellowship at Dumbarton Oaks.
Giovanni Morelli is remembered as the most influential Italian art historian of the nineteenth century, whose biography provides an unusually revealing history of the politics of art, the creation of national museums and their collections, conservation, the growth of private collections, and many other subjects. His name may be more readily associated with a scientific method of attribution—the Morellian method—than with museology or politics or with the art market in Risorgimento Italy. Yet the very titles of his legendary books, critical studies on Roman princely collections, the Doria and Borghese galleries, and the public galleries of Munich, Dresden, and Berlin, should have alerted art historians to one of his main concerns as a politician and writer; that is, how to regulate (officially) and manipulate (unofficially) the art market of the Risorgimento. His aims, which he made clear in a speech to the Italian parliament in 1861, shortly after unification, were to reorganize existing museums and to create new ones to represent the Renaissance past. It was a time when ideas counted: politicians elected ministers of culture who were authors of significant books, such as Francesco de Sanctis and Pasquale Villari. Morelli’s closest friends were involved in rewriting the political history of the Renaissance: Gino Capponi in his *Storia della Repubblica di Firenze* (1875) and Pasquale Villari in his life of Savonarola (1859). Both emphasized that they were Italians writing to correct foreign interpretations of their own history. For patriotic Italians it was important to repossess the Renaissance past not only as history,
but also visually, and Morelli’s view of museology was equally Italian in orientation.

That Morelli’s name is allied with the art market is due partly to accidents of survival and partly to the role he played in the art politics of the Risorgimento. His unpublished correspondence contains unparalleled documentation of important personalities involved in the creation of major museums in Italy, England, and Germany. His real employment was always as a politician; he was never employed as an art critic, art historian, or museum director, although he was offered such appointments, namely, chairs in aesthetics in Switzerland and the directorships of museums such as the Uffizi. Instead he chose politics: from 1860 to 1872 he sat in the Camera dei Deputati as the elected member for Bergamo, and from 1874, when he was elected a senator, he spent a considerable part of every year in Rome.

Although art historians have always wished to see Morelli’s political and artistic careers as divided, his political life for some forty years was mostly concerned with the conservation of the artistic heritage of Italy. In the mere first five years of his political career (1861–1866) he sat on no fewer than twenty-five government commissions concerned with museology, legislation to control the export of works of art, and the restoration of works of art (often in a sorry state after years of warfare and neglect). Unpublished sources—and his books—reveal that Morelli’s connoisseurship (the famous method of attribution) was intimately allied with a systematic attempt to develop new programs for Italian museums after unification. For example, in 1862 he proposed the first museum of Lombard sculpture in Milan, which was finally realized almost four decades later with the opening of the Castello Sforzesco in 1900.

Regionalism was an important component of Morelli’s view of the Renaissance. He believed that every region had its own characteristic physiognomy and concept of beauty, which local museums should primarily represent, while in Florence there should be a great national gallery, with the best examples of all the regional schools. In an age when the government failed to supply public funding, Morelli also saw the importance of the interrelationship between public and private collections, often encouraging his friends to form collections of Renaissance art in the hope that they would eventually be left to museums.
During my two months at the Center I began writing a biography of Morelli along these lines. I also consulted an archive at Duke University, the papers of the Leonardo scholar Jean Paul Richter and his wife, Luise Richter, constituting some forty-six boxes acquired by the university from a Pennsylvania bookseller, Geoffrey Steele, in 1966. Richter was a colleague and friend to Morelli, and his wife was the first person to translate Morelli’s writings into English. The diaries kept by husband and wife are independent of one another and are extraordinarily detailed, with frequent reference to Morelli.

University of Melbourne
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, May 1 – June 30, 2008

Jaynie Anderson returned to her position as Herald Chair of Fine Arts at the University of Melbourne and continues as president of the International Committee for the History of Art (CIHA), a post to which she was elected for 2008–2012.
The story of Hercules and Deianira unfolds on the bank of a rushing river, where a centaur takes the hero’s bride captive and flees. In pursuit, Hercules boldly swims the river and shoots down the creature with a poisoned arrow, tinged by the blood of the Hydra (a monstrous serpent he had defeated during his earlier exploits). The dying centaur gives his bloodied cloak to Deianira with the false promise that it can revive a waning love. Years later, Deianira hears a rumor of Hercules’ infidelity and desperately sends him the cloak. The hero nearly dies from the poison but is saved by the gods in his final hour. Deianira, guilt-ridden, commits suicide.

In contrast to the myth itself, the painting Hercules and Deianira by the Netherlandish artist Jan Gossaert (c. 1478–1532) is dominated by sensual bodies and the lovers’ intertwining embrace. Only the white cloak behind Deianira’s back foreshadows the tragic events to come, albeit ambiguously, since the garment shows no trace of the centaur’s blood. Gossaert counterbalances the cloak in Deianira’s hand with the gnarly club Hercules grips by his side, which both alludes to his masculine prowess and recalls his past labors, three of which (including his defeat of the poisonous Hydra) are depicted in the sculpted relief below the figures.

Gossaert further heightens the resonance of his image by ensconcing Hercules and Deianira within a shallow stone niche, far removed from the locus and temporality of narrative. Within this spare rhetorical space,
the viewer is free to make associations across past and present. The lovers’ elaborately intertwined limbs at the composition’s center suggest a similar interpretive potentiality. The tangled legs not only embody the painting’s inescapable erotic appeal and, by extension, the skillful artifice of Gossaert himself, but also invite a more complex mode of viewing, encouraging learned beholders to weave together disparate strands of knowledge in their exploration of the painting’s full range of meaning.

Although Hercules was the most ubiquitous hero of antiquity and was perennially evoked as an exemplum by Renaissance rulers, his relevance for Gossaert’s contemporary Netherlandish patrons was decidedly local. An extended account of their romance appears in Raoul Lefèvre’s *Le Recueil des Histoires de Troyes* (c. 1464), a work written at the court of Burgundy and highly popular among Gossaert’s early sixteenth-century patrons. Lefèvre portrays Hercules as the founder of the Burgundian realm, describing his loves and labors as a form of territorial conquest.

Just three years preceding the date of 1517 inscribed in the lower left corner of Gossaert’s *Hercules and Deianira*, the artist’s patron Philip I V of Burgundy (1465–1524) found an ancient inscription dedicated to Hercules washed up on the shore of the Netherlandish province of Zeeland. This archaeological evidence attesting to a local and pre-Christian devotion to the hero was immediately published by two humanists from Gossaert’s close circle, Gerard Geldenhouwer (1482–1542) and Maarten van Dorp (1485–1525). They were already engaged in the study of the Batavians, the ancient, warlike inhabitants of the Low Countries known from Tacitus and other classical sources to have worshipped Hercules as their patron deity. Geldenhouwer himself discovered an ancient epitaph honoring a Batavian soldier named Soranus, who swam rivers in full armor and displayed unsurpassed skill with bow and arrow—a description that closely recalls Hercules’ mythical rescue of Deianira.

Gossaert’s extant *Hercules and Deianira* is quite intimate in scale (thirty-six and one-half by twenty-six centimeters), but a life-size painting of the couple is documented in 1517 at the sumptuous palace of Henry of Nassau (1483–1538), governor of Holland and Zeeland, who was also among the artist’s prominent patrons. Henry, whose military successes had earned him the epithet “glory of our Batavia,” must have
recognized within the painting a heroic model for making both love and war, one that was tied to his own history.

Previous scholarship has confined interpretation of Gossaert’s mythological images to discussions either of their obvious erotic appeal or, less convincingly, of their presumed moralizing treatment of the nude body. While it has long been acknowledged that Gossaert drew on diverse stylistic sources—from the ancient monuments of Rome to the models of Jan van Eyck and his other fifteenth-century Netherlandish predecessors—the broader context to which the artist’s paintings belong, and their fundamental ties to local history, remain unexplored. My dissertation situates Gossaert’s mythological images within the distinctly Netherlandish revival of antiquity cultivated among the artist’s small circle of patrons and humanists. Close analysis of Gossaert’s paintings in relation to sixteenth-century historiography of the Low Countries reveals a nascent conception of national identity, grounded in a complex and ever-changing understanding of the historical past.

[Harvard University]  

During the 2009–2010 academic year, Marisa Bass will be a Theodore Rousseau Fellow at the Metropolitan Museum of Art.
My second year as Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow was divided between two projects: continued work on my book manuscript, “Piety and Purgatory: Wall-Mounted Memorials in the Burgundian Netherlands,” and related publications; and fulfilling the teaching requirements of the Mellon Postdoctoral Fellowship.

The fellowship provided two teaching opportunities: a weeklong seminar for the predoctoral fellows at the Center in June 2008, and a semester-long course at The Johns Hopkins University in fall 2008. The seminar I developed for the Center’s predoctoral fellows, entitled “Displaying Art in the Museum,” considered how works of art are installed and presented within museum contexts. Drawing on the rich resources of local institutions, the seminar used a series of readings, site visits, and encounters with museum professionals to reflect upon a variety of strategies, issues, and problems in the display of art in museum settings. With invaluable assistance from staff in the Gallery’s archives and curatorial, design, and painting conservation departments, the seminar initially focused on display approaches at the National Gallery of Art and then explored related issues in other museums on the Mall and beyond. Each participant analyzed a museum installation in Washington or Baltimore relevant to his or her own research field and presented observations and responses to the rest of the seminar group as the basis for discussion. An anthology of readings, selected to inform and advance our dialogues, and a general bibliography were also provided.
The graduate seminar I taught at The Johns Hopkins University in fall 2008, entitled “Jan van Eyck and His Legacy,” investigated the life, work, and reputation of Van Eyck (c. 1395–1441) and his place within the history of Western art. Encompassing a range of methodological approaches, the course considered the intended audience, function, and meaning of Van Eyck’s paintings, the later history of their reception, and the mythologization of their creator. Of particular concern were the range and character of the available written sources pertaining to Van Eyck and the ways in which art historians have subsequently interpreted this material. Primary documents, key secondary commentaries, and the texts inscribed on Van Eyck’s pictures all featured as subjects for discussion.

Van Eyck and the broader questions of audience, function, and meaning explored in both courses I taught are central to my book on wall-mounted memorials in the Burgundian Netherlands. These memorials (or “epitaphs,” as they are often termed) were installed above graves in churches and cloisters and served to preserve the memory of those interred there, reminding the living to pray for their souls. They were especially popular in the southern Netherlands, and remarkably, given the alarming rates of loss and destruction that have afflicted the region, a sizable number—well over two hundred—still survive. The overwhelming majority of extant memorials are sculptures, but there is clear evidence that they could also take the form of panel paintings.

Although the form and function of artworks have been recurrent themes in the literature on early Netherlandish art, memorial paintings have only just begun to figure in these studies, even though many of the most celebrated artists—Rogier van der Weyden (c. 1399–1464), Hugo van der Goes (c. 1440–1482), and Simon Marmion (c. 1425–1489) among them—were closely involved in the creation of such works. Notably, though, several paintings by Van Eyck—including *The Arnolfini Portrait* (1434, National Gallery, London)—have recently been reinterpreted in terms of their possible, or probable, memorializing functions.

In the light of these discussions, the final chapter of my book reassesses one of the most unambiguously commemorative of Van Eyck’s pictures: *The Virgin and Child with Canon Joris van der Paele* (1436; Groeningemuseum, Bruges), completed in 1436 and installed in the church of Saint Donatian in Bruges. Commissioned to mark the insti-
tution of Van der Paele’s pious foundations, Van Eyck’s painting was undoubtedly an exceptional work, even in its own time, but it has too often been viewed simply as an altarpiece, a kind of northern *sacra conversazione*. In fact, the picture can be firmly located within the visual culture of commemoration in the Netherlands, and specifically within the indigenous tradition of erecting a wall-mounted memorial to mark one’s burial place, or—as my research has also demonstrated—the site at which a pious foundation was to be enacted. Recent archival work has helped clarify both the circumstances in which Van der Paele commissioned his panel and the question of its original location against one of the nave piers (and not in a side chapel, as is commonly assumed), within the now-destroyed church of Saint Donatian. By re-examining written sources and making new comparisons with contemporary memorials, my book seeks to reconsider many of the assumptions that have been made about *The Virgin and Child with Canon Joris van der Paele* and to better understand how it would have been perceived by its intended audience in late medieval Bruges.

Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow, 2007 – 2009

*In fall 2009 Douglas Brine will take up a position as assistant professor of medieval art in the department of art and art history at Trinity University, San Antonio.*
The Early Works of Andrea Sansovino

Andrea Sansovino (1468/1470–1529) belonged to the interesting generation of artists whose works completed the transition from Early to High Renaissance art. However, our understanding of his career is hindered by the obscurity of his early years and of the sources of his artistic development. Scholars disagree about the attribution of his early works, and there is no general consensus about their execution dates. These difficulties are intimately connected with Giorgio Vasari’s report that Sansovino spent nine years in Portugal and entered into the service of the king on the recommendation of Lorenzo the Magnificent. According to Vasari’s chronology, this sojourn took place in the 1490s. Sansovino’s presence in Portugal was confirmed by the discovery in 1992 of a document that proved that he did indeed travel to Lisbon in December 1492. Yet there is still no certainty about the length of his stay, whether he may have traveled to Portugal more than once, or what he did there. Attempts to attribute to Sansovino works that may have been produced during his Portuguese period have so far been unconvincing.

Another crucial problem for our understanding of Sansovino’s early career is the series of unanswered questions concerning what circumstances brought him from his provincial hometown of Monte San Savino to Florence and who his Florentine supporters and patrons may have been. Vasari mentions that Simone Vespucci discovered the young talent and introduced him to the artistic circle around Lorenzo the Magnificent. This connection would have enabled him to study ancient works.
of art under the guidance of Bertoldo di Giovanni (c. 1440–1491), in the company of Michelangelo (1475–1564), Giovanni Francesco Rustici (1474–1554), Baccio da Montelupo (1469–1535), and others in the famous Medici garden near San Marco. However, Vasari’s report of the young sculptor’s “discovery” has not been taken seriously by scholars because of its strong anecdotal character and the sense that Vasari modeled it on his life of Giotto.

I focused my investigation during the two months of my residence at the Center on these two major problems. Research on the important and influential colony of Florentine merchants in Lisbon suggests that someone from within those circles may have played an intermediary role in inviting Sansovino to Portugal—and it need not have been Lorenzo the Magnificent. Significantly, the contract between Sansovino and the king of Portugal was drawn up in Florence in the home of Chimente Sernigi, a leading merchant in the Portuguese capital and a confidant of the king. Especially interesting in this context is the close connection to these circles of Francesco Corbinelli, a member of the family that commissioned Sansovino’s major early work: the Altar of the Sacrament in Santo Spirito in Florence. Corbinelli’s presence in Lisbon is documented precisely during the early 1490s, when the king of Portugal called the young sculptor into his service. If it was indeed Francesco Corbinelli who recommended Sansovino to the Portuguese king, one might conclude that he did so on the basis of the impressive demonstration of Sansovino’s talent in the work in Santo Spirito. This would mean that we have for the first time a reliable terminus ante quem of 1492—the known date of his trip to Portugal—for the beginning of work on Sansovino’s early masterpiece.

The second problem, concerning Sansovino’s early supporters, was clarified by my discovery during my fellowship period of hitherto unstudied documents regarding the Vespucci family in the Library of Congress. Although they provide no evidence for a direct connection between the Vespucci and the sculptor, these documents are nevertheless of great significance in elucidating the political and cultural importance of the Vespucci family and the role of its most prominent members: Guidantonio, the patron of Sandro Botticelli (1444/1445–1510) and Piero di Cosimo (1462–1521); and Giorgio Antonio, the learned canon and follower of Savonarola. They also show that Niccolò, the son of
Simone Vespucci, was a friend of Vasari and hosted the biographer in his house when the latter first came to Florence. Their lifelong friendship is evident in their correspondence. Vasari described explicitly several works by Sansovino in Niccolò’s house: a now lost drawing, *The Flagellation*, and two works executed in glazed terracotta: a head of Nero and one of Galba. They eventually came into Vasari’s possession, and the head of Galba can still be seen today in Vasari’s house in Arezzo.

Given the close contacts between Niccolò Vespucci and Vasari, we can conclude, first, that Niccolò must have been one of Vasari’s sources for Sansovino’s biography and, second, that Vasari’s report that Niccolò’s father Simone “discovered” Sansovino may very well be based on fact. Although, as my research revealed, Simone was condemned for corruption in 1485 while he was a member of the Otto di Guardia and the Balìa and was thereby excluded from holding public office for ten years, this does not rule out his having earlier played an important role in Sansovino’s life and having helped him start his artistic career.

Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz, Max-Planck-Institut
Guest Scholar, March 2 – April 30, 2009

*Doris Carl has returned to Florence and continues her research on Andrea Sansovino.*
At the auction of the Lansdowne collection of ancient marble sculptures in London in March 1930, the prize lot was *Wounded Amazon*, which sold for a then record price of twenty-seven thousand guineas. This sculpture had been acquired by the first marquis of Lansdowne in 1773 for two hundred pounds from the dealer Gavin Hamilton and is now in The Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. In the century and a half that had elapsed since its excavation in Tor di Colombaro outside Rome and acquisition by an aristocratic English politician, this restored ancient sculpture had been identified as one of the finest and best-preserved “masterpieces” of the canon of Greco-Roman art. Following a passage in Pliny’s *Natural History* (xxxiv, 53), the Lansdowne *Wounded Amazon* was identified as a type executed by the Greek sculptor Polykleitos (fifth century BCE). “It is as like the head of the Doryphoros by Polykleitos as sister to brother...an excellent translation into marble of the characteristics of a bronze original,” expounds the sale catalogue, whose entries were based on the 1889 catalogue *Ancient Marbles at Lansdowne House*, edited by British Museum curator A. H. Smith. Smith’s catalogue in turn acknowledges his debt to the pioneering account *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain* (Cambridge, 1882) by Adolf Michaelis, professor of archaeology at the University of Strasbourg.

In spite of the sculpture’s later archaeological prestige, Hamilton’s letters to Lansdowne reveal the collector’s dissatisfaction with it on the basis of its subject matter: it was a duplicate of one already in his pos-
session. Hamilton’s letters document his repeated attempts to sell the Amazon to his other British clients, George Grenville and James Hugh Smith Barry, and, through their fellow collector, Charles Townley, to Thomas Mansel Talbot. With the British market apparently disinterested, Hamilton negotiated with the marchese Obizzi to exchange a painting from his collection in Padua for Lansdowne’s unwanted Amazon. By December 1786, Hamilton wrote that Lansdowne was “quite impatient to get rid of the Amazon,” and a year later it was sent back to Rome. Though Hamilton endeavored to find a buyer, the sculpture returned to Lansdowne House in Berkeley Square, London, and remained part of the collection until the whole was dispersed in 1930.

Taking the fate of the Wounded Amazon—from unwanted repetition to prized Polykleitan copy—as its starting point, the book that I completed while a visiting fellow at the Center explores the diverse and often conflicting meanings conferred by contemporary collectors and imposed by later scholars on the ancient and modern marbles formerly in private collections in Britain. It investigates the phenomenon of the late eighteenth-century sculpture collection through a critique of the ways in which the ancient artifacts in these collections have been studied and published. Michaelis’ Ancient Marbles in Great Britain catalogued over two thousand specimens of ancient sculptures according to the pioneering science of nineteenth-century archaeology. But while Michaelis’ work and that of his successors placed ancient marbles in Great Britain within the corpus of Greek and Roman sculpture—and in doing so put them on the academic agenda—their strictly archaeological approaches consistently failed to represent the collections within their specific art-historical contexts. In dealing with a timeframe of over two centuries, Michaelis ignored the vastly different social, economic, and intellectual climates in which the sixty-six private collections represented in his study were accumulated. In addition, by privileging ancient sculptures above and beyond any pieces executed by contemporary sculptors, including Bartolomeo Cavaceppi (c. 1716–1799), Joseph Nollekens (1737–1823), and Antonio Canova (1757–1822), Michaelis and others misrepresented the collections they characterized themselves as “excavating” from the English country house.

Having established how far our understanding of sculpture collections in Britain has been based on such misrepresentation, my book,
then, seeks to redress this disparity. Rather than marginalizing the contents of eighteenth-century collections as the archaeological trash of Greco-Roman sculpture, it situates the collections of Charles Townley and his contemporaries within the context of a neoclassical culture of collecting. According to the discipline of art history, rather than the expectations of classical archaeology, the Wounded Amazon and other sculptures are given a radically different academic profile, one in which they are seen to be as much a product of modernity as a form of reference to and reverence for Greek and Roman antiquity.

University of Edinburgh
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, July 1–August 31, 2008

Viccy Coltman was awarded visiting fellowships at the Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities at the University of Edinburgh, UK; the Yale Center for British Art; and the Whitney Humanities Center, Yale University, for academic year 2008–2009. In September 2009 she will return to her permanent position as senior lecturer in the history of art department at the University of Edinburgh.
Over the last decade, museums in Europe and the United States have been producing what can be called a new generation of catalogues raisonnés, more comprehensive and ambitious in both content and format than earlier counterparts. The one I am preparing on paintings by Titian (c. 1488–1490–1576) in the Museo del Prado attempts to fulfill those standards while addressing the specific nature of the collection.

The most distinctive aspect of my project is that it is both a museum catalogue and an artist monograph. Although this combination is unusual, it perfectly suits the Titian collection of the Prado, which one nineteenth-century French traveler characterized as a museum of painters rather than paintings. With forty-two paintings, the Prado owns the best and largest collection of Titians in the world. These will constitute the core of the catalogue, but it will also include several sixteenth-, seventeenth-, and eighteenth-century copies after originals in the former Spanish royal collection, some of great interest because of their quality or because they are the only surviving copies after lost originals. In addition to quantity and quality, the collection is also exceptional for the indisputable provenance of the works. The forty-two original paintings were in Madrid by 1650, and half of them were directly commissioned from the painter by the Spanish kings or members of the Spanish nobility. For all these reasons this collection is an excellent tool for studying Titian’s reception in Spain as well as the last thirty years of his career, when he painted almost exclusively for Spanish patrons. I have devoted
my first year at the Center to studying these aspects of Titian’s work, now the subjects of two introductory essays in the catalogue.

The first of these revisits Titian’s privileged relationship with Emperor Charles V and his son Philip II, a commonplace in the history of Western art that, in much of the historiography, has operated as a statement rather than a question inviting deeper analysis. The relationship of patron and painter has traditionally been seen as linear and progressive, with Titian “teaching” his patrons how to understand his late manner while they accepted his paintings passively. The relationship between Titian and his Spanish patrons was, however, much more complex. Titian knew that the Spanish court was his most important source of income and prestige, and he managed to secure the relationship and extend it to his son and heir Orazio, keeping potential competitors at bay. Jacopo Tintoretto (1519–1594) and Paolo Veronese (1528–1588) both would have to wait until the deaths of Titian and Orazio in 1576 to receive commissions from Philip II. In order to maintain this special relationship, Titian not only adjusted his work to the precise demands of the Spanish court, especially in the representation of religious and political subjects, but also employed gifts to maintain favor with the crown and government officials in charge of Italian affairs.

Titian’s ties with Spain achieved their greatest strength after 1548, coinciding with what is called his late manner. In fact, the paintings he did for Philip II at this time constitute the only documented and coherent corpus of his late activity. Titian’s late manner, especially in the period after 1565, is highly controversial among scholars, just as it was for his contemporaries. In his final years, he could barely paint, and his works were executed almost entirely by assistants. His Spanish patrons knew this but were ambivalent about it. While they continued to consider Titian the finest painter in Europe, they were aware that his best days had passed and directed their attention to collecting his earlier works. One of the aims of this first essay is to provide a comprehensive approach to Titian’s late manner and the problems it poses, using both contemporary sources and technical documentation on the paintings.

The second essay in the catalogue deals with Titian’s impact in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain, his key role in the development of collecting and art criticism, and his deep influence on Spanish artists. As the first painter whose works were collected by the Spanish monarchy,
Titian remained central to the royal collection, which was built up around those artists whose style was closest to his, starting with Veronese, Tintoretto, and Jacopo Bassano (c. 1510–1592) and continuing with Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640), Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641), and Diego Velázquez (1599–1660). By the mid-seventeenth century, however, Titian’s primacy in Spain began to give way to other artists, and mostly to Raphael, pointing to the beginning of a shift in taste that would become more evident in the eighteenth century.

Museo del Prado
Andrew W. Mellon Professor, 2008–2010

In the coming year Miguel Falomir will continue his term as Andrew W. Mellon Professor at the Center before returning to his position as head curator of Italian Renaissance painting at the Museo del Prado in 2010.
At the end of his life, Paul Gauguin (1848–1903) criticized the impressionists for searching “around the eye and not in the mysterious heart of thought.” Following up on my work on the artistic use of visual ambiguity around 1900, I have started to explore systematically Gauguin’s interest in mental images and his way of stimulating the spectator’s imaginative response to his works. My research examines Gauguin’s strategies for visualizing inner processes of vision and the relevance of developments in psychology to his reflection and self-observation. I have explored the variety of his technical means for producing ambiguity and indeterminacy and the importance of this goal for his unorthodox handling of artistic techniques. Also part of my study are the extent of his anthropological interest in, and knowledge of, pre-Christian and non-Western modes of thought and image making and their bearing on his choice of locations and on his interpretation and appropriation of older art, as well as the programmatic thematization of these issues in his work. My research has already led to the publication of articles focused on specific works and texts and will conclude with the writing of a book.

The visiting fellowship at the Center enabled me to take crucial steps in this direction. First, I recapitulated the research already accomplished and outlined the book. Second, I took advantage of the library facilities of the National Gallery of Art and augmented my bibliographic research and my reading on Gauguin and on Oceanic art and culture. Third, I
studied the more than 175 works by Gauguin in the collections of the National Gallery of Art, an aspect of my research plan that proved to be immensely pleasurable and even more fruitful than I had imagined.

The paintings in the Gallery’s collection, especially *Fatata te Miti* and *Parau na te Varua ino* of 1892, are important for my project. Among the drawings, the sheets of the sketchbook published in 1962 by Raymond Cogniat and John Rewald provided invaluable insights into Gauguin’s work from nature and his use of imaginative perception in depicting his Breton subjects. The proofs he made of his own wood engravings, compared with those printed later by his son Pola and with one of his woodblocks, confirmed the extent to which his technical innovations aimed at courting chance and heightening ambiguity. A climax of this tendency in Gauguin’s oeuvre is the series of so-called monotypes, a few of which are in the Gallery’s collections. Finally, a small but distinguished group of sculptures and objects proved equally rewarding, all the more as I could see them in the round rather than from the limited vantage point allowed by the case in which they are presented to the public in the galleries. The sculpture titled *Eve*, seen from the back, gives a sense of how Gauguin harnessed clay, fire, and glaze to produce an inchoate and metamorphic form—a form that seems to be changing before our eyes, even when we look at it from a single viewpoint.

The knowledge I gained from a close examination of these works was greatly enhanced by access to curatorial and conservation files and by extended discussions with curators and conservators in the Gallery’s departments of European paintings (Kimberly Jones), prints and drawings (Peter Parshall), and painting conservation. Among the conservators, Carol Christensen shared with me the insight she obtained into Gauguin’s materials and technique at the time of the Gallery’s major exhibition *The Art of Paul Gauguin* (1988), and Ann Hoenigswald helped me acquire a deeper understanding of the contrasting approaches to texture and color employed by Gauguin and Vincent Van Gogh.

Université de Genève
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, December 22, 2008 – February 6, 2009

*Dario Gamboni returned to his position as professor of art history at the Université de Genève for the spring semester 2009. As a research fellow at the Henry Moore Institute, Leeds, in January–February 2010, he will focus on Gauguin’s sculpture.*
Conceived in 2001 by Sybille Ebert-Schifferer, the director of the Bibliotheca Hertziana (Max-Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte, Rome), the ArsRoma Research Database deals primarily with the production of art in Rome from 1580 to 1630, a pivotal period when painting and the visual arts in general developed in innovative ways. During the fifty-year period encompassed by the database, a new artistic language emerged. This new language was crucial for the formation of style in courtly and religious art in Europe and in the catholicized colonies over the subsequent decades. The project’s intent is to show the mechanisms by which this style was formed during this important period of transition: not only the processes of painters’ artistic choices, but also the formation of social networks around 1600.

Preceding the creation of an international artistic language was a period of individual artistic experimentation that led to a plurality of competing aesthetic approaches. Out of this diversity a few stylistic options crystallized in the first three decades of the Seicento, when the political and cultural map of Europe changed and Roman art of the early baroque period became one of the most important sources of artistic inspiration. Assessing the reasons why certain stylistic considerations were accepted and adopted while others were not is one of the goals of the ArsRoma database. The project asks why certain stylistic elements became predominant and what the reasons were, whether inherently artistic, sociological, cultural, historical, or political.
The database merges extensive quantities of information that, because of its volume, cannot be captured by the conventional media of research: data about the formation of style, the reception of role models, the motivations of patrons and the art market, and the creation of social and political networks of patrons and painters. At the moment, ArsRoma contains data for over 4,000 works of art and over 7,000 artists. Together with Lineamenta, another database project of the Bibliotheca Hertziana, which focuses on eighteenth-century Italian architectural drawings, Ars-Roma is part of a general repository called ZUCCARO. Its name is not only an acronym (spelled out as “ZOPE-based Configurable Classes for
Academic Research Online”) but also refers to the Italian painter and art theorist Federico Zuccaro (1542–1609), whose former house is now the seat of the institute. The sophisticated data model of Zuccaro covers three main categories: general historical objects and personages, specific art-historical objects, and documentary material. The central data class called “historic event” documents historical facts by linking objects at a specific moment in history: an artist is born in a town, a painting is bought by a cardinal, a building is described in a book, a merchant is elected consul of a guild. Documentary evidence for the fact can be attached to the particular “historic event.” By splitting up data in this way, it is possible to examine historic facts from different points of view, following paths that could hitherto be traced only with great effort.

During my time at the Center I exchanged ideas and discussed methods for improving the ArsRoma database with Associate Dean Peter Lukehart. His online reference database project, The History of the Accademia di San Luca, c. 1590–1635: Documents from the Archivio di Stato di Roma, is virtually identical to the ArsRoma project in chronological and geographical parameters and shares many of its goals and challenges. We are following up this initial collaboration with further discussions, scheduled to take place in Rome in April 2010.

Having attended a postgraduate library studies course at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, I also used my time at the Center to study the American library system more closely. For the National Gallery of Art Library, I contributed to the online resources page of the library’s online computer system, Mercury, concentrating on lacunae in the area of European databases and Web sites and sharing the results of my research with Lamia Doumato, head of reader services.

Bibliotheca Hertziana, Max-Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte
Guest Scholar, July 16 – August 31, 2008

Verena Gebhard returned to her position as research assistant to Sybille Ebert-Schifferer and coordinator of the ArsRoma database project at the Bibliotheca Hertziana, Max-Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte in Rome.
In recent decades, scholarship on medieval Europe in a number of disciplines has devoted increasing attention to questions surrounding ethnic identity. Historians and archaeologists, in particular, have joined other social scientists in acknowledging that, like other aspects of human subjectivity, ethnicity is socially constructed and provisional. In contrast, recent writing about medieval art has largely retained older paradigms that take ethnicity to be an immutable, inborn trait, manifested visually through preference for a particular style. For example, Arab Muslim builders employed by late medieval Spanish patrons are said to work in a Mudéjar style that reveals their “true” identity, and early medieval pagans wore fibulae whose formal and ornamental modulations purportedly announced their owners’ ethnic affiliations. Similar claims have been made for works of art and architecture in the Mediterranean basin, where various Roman Catholic, Orthodox Christian, and Muslim cultures came into contact. Such analyses typically collapse ethnic and religious identity: stylistic and iconographic conventions associated with particular religious systems are mobilized as surrogates of ethnic affiliation, eliding the fact that religion and ethnicity, though sometimes imbricated, are not synonymous concepts. A more troubling implication is that medieval Catholics themselves lacked ethnic identities, even though contemporary texts indicate that they distinguished one another by ethnic labels that both subtended and transcended political boundaries.
In reconsidering works of painting, sculpture, and architecture from the ethnically diverse but thoroughly Catholic region of later medieval Central Europe, my dissertation proposes new methods of examining the ways in which the visual arts were strategically commissioned, selectively displayed, and socially (re)interpreted to produce and sustain perceptions of ethnic difference within a single religious and cultural sphere. An ideal body of material comes from the urban centers of Bohemia, the easternmost kingdom of the Holy Roman Empire and, after about 1250, arguably its most politically, economically, and artistically important region. Bohemia was inhabited by Slavic-speaking peoples who by the eleventh century had adopted Catholicism and had come to identify themselves as Czechs (Bohemi). From the mid-twelfth century onward they were joined by growing numbers of German-speaking immigrants (Teutonici) from other parts of the empire, summoned to Bohemia by local landowners seeking to increase their tax base. Both newly founded towns and older urban centers like Prague became home to mixed German and Czech populations with shared religious beliefs and a functional bilingualism. Yet despite daily interactions in the streets and marketplaces, churches and law courts, town residents continued to perceive themselves, and each other, as either “Czech” or “German,” never both. I believe that the visual and spatial experiences of the urban environment they inhabited proved crucial in shaping these perceptions. Patterns of dwelling and discrete spaces of religious devotion reified and naturalized imagined ethnic categories; iconographic and stylistic features of illustrated books, public sculpture, and architectural design referred strategically to the past in order to cultivate collective memories of a shared historical and cultural trajectory, essential to sustaining an ethnic consciousness over time.

An exemplary monument to which I have devoted part of my time at the Center is the Týn Church (begun c. 1370), whose enormous western facade looms over the central plaza of Prague. Unlike Prague’s two dozen or so other parish churches, Týn Church was not under the legal control of clerics, but rather of a group of wealthy ethnic German laypeople, who paid for it to be rebuilt during the later fourteenth century as the largest parish church in all of Bohemia. Significantly, they instructed its anonymous architect to include a series of formal features that alluded to the first parish church of the Prague German community, which had been built outside the city walls two centuries earlier, then abandoned.
when the community relocated to the city center. A hallmark of this original church was its imposing two-tower western facade, utterly atypical of local parish churches. This was copied at the Týn Church, even though its main entrance was on another side of the building, facing onto a narrow alley. In turn, this main portal was lavishly decorated with sculpture—also anomalous for local parish churches—whose iconography alluded to certain customs of the German community that had been enacted at their original church. These calculated allusions established Týn Church as a specifically “German” monument, in contrast to other churches where Germans worshipped, but that were not ethnically marked. At the same time they reminded viewers of the collective history of the German community of Prague, reinforcing ethnic boundaries that by the fourteenth century had begun to be eroded by centuries of coexistence.

[Harvard University]
Samuel H. Kress Fellow, 2007 – 2009

S. Adam Hindin has been awarded a Davis Center Dissertation Completion Fellowship from Harvard University for 2009–2010. After submitting his dissertation, he will begin his next book, which investigates the visual rhetoric of municipal governance in medieval Central Europe.
I have had a long-term project to write a book about French realism, or, to put it more precisely, about the different ways in which painters in France tackled the challenge of painting contemporary subjects from around 1840 to 1870. A number of years ago I accumulated a large body of research material on this topic, but other projects intervened, and the book itself remained unwritten. The year as Samuel H. Kress Professor gave me the clear period of time that allowed me to reactivate this project and to draft extensive parts of the book itself.

I am seeking not to propose a definition of realism in nineteenth-century French painting, but rather to explore the variety of devices used to persuade viewers of paintings that they were observing something “real” and “truthful,” and to identify the values that lay behind these various rival visions of the “real.” The term realism is part of the historical problem, not its solution.

I would like to break down the binary distinction between the aesthetic and the social in painting in order to discuss the ways in which “style”—or rather the choices artists made about the manner of painting—carried meanings and values: if you like, the ideology and politics of style. I argue that works of fine art made to be viewed in the institutional contexts of the fine art world (especially the Paris Salon) inevitably invited comparison with other works of art. Artists were well aware of these potential comparisons and often more or less explicitly invited them. But at the same time, paintings that claim to represent
“real” life were also locked into the broader social debates of the time about the experience of everyday life and the state of society. Indeed, the question of making sense of the experience of the world “out there” became especially urgent in these years, in the face of the accelerating changes brought about by industrialization and, especially, by the railway. It was not just a question of these material, physical changes, but of the sense that people made of them—the ways in which they were understood, and the values that underpinned the criteria by which they were classified.

To explore these questions, I am examining the work of a very wide range of artists—not just the textbook realists such as Gustave Courbet (1819–1877) and Jean François Millet (1814–1875), but also painters such as Jean-Léon Gérôme (1824–1904), who claimed an “ethnographic” approach to subjects of Muslim life, and Alfred Stevens (1823–1906), specialist in images of the Parisian bourgeoisie. Comparison and contrast are fundamental to the project: on the one hand, painters established their artistic identities in relation to the other contemporary pictorial modes; on the other, critics made sense of the diversity of contemporary painting by analyzing it in comparative terms. Indeed, the published art criticism of the period forms the central body of documentary evidence in the book, since the extended discussions of the paintings in question often offer crucial access to the wider structures of belief that lay behind specific commentaries.

The structure of the book is thematic, exploring first the frameworks, both conceptual and institutional, within which the paintings were made, and then the processes by which nineteenth-century viewers interpreted paintings. The core of the book is an extended analysis of the treatment of three key types of subject matter: the French countryside, the “Orient,” and the city. This will be followed by a chapter on the relationships of nineteenth-century painters to the art of the past, and, in conclusion, a consideration of the characteristics of the modern urban viewpoint (the paintings were made for display and sale in an urban context), which stands in such marked contrast to the subject matter of most of the paintings.

A final happy event was that my year at the Center coincided with the completion of NGA conservator Ann Hoenigswald’s cleaning and conservation of Edouard Manet’s The Old Musician of 1862, in the
Gallery’s collection; it was fascinating to watch the stages of unveiling of this remarkable canvas, to discuss it with Ann and other visiting scholars, and to participate in the Center’s colloquy on it and the broader implications of technical analysis of Manet’s work. In its new, luminous guise, *The Old Musician* will play a significant part in my book.

Courtauld Institute of Art  
Samuel H. Kress Professor, 2008–2009

*John House returned to his position as Walter H. Annenberg Professor at the Courtauld Institute of Art.*
Late Antique Numismatic Jewelry and the Image of the Emperor as Talismanic Device

The history of late antique numismatic jewelry is the history of the unofficial reception of an official image: the imperial portrait. Nearly four hundred gold coins set in jewelry survive from the third through the sixth century CE. These coins are invariably framed in such a way as to display the imperial portrait. Coin-set objects have been found throughout the territory of the Roman Empire, notably in Egypt, Britain, and the northern and eastern provinces bordering the Rhine and Danube rivers.

The use of coins, “set like gems,” as Sextus Pomponius (second century CE) states in a legal note (Digesta 7.1.28), is considered by archaeologists to be one of the defining developments and most pervasive fashions of Roman jewelry from about 200 to 600 CE. While the use of coins in jewelry could be subject to different motivations in diverse times and places, the imperial portrait was both visually and conceptually central to the construction of coin-set objects. Almost all clearly identifiable pieces of late antique numismatic jewelry share three essential characteristics: they display the imperial portrait, are made of gold, and are designed to be worn on the body.

In both pagan and Christian antiquity, the imperial portrait was considered to be imbued with immanence, an icon that could provide direct access to the power of the actual emperor. It could thus serve as an effective and protective personal talisman. An increasing stylization of the imperial image in late antiquity was paralleled by the development
of the conception of the imperial portrait as a full substitute for the presence of the emperor. The blurring of distinction not only between the person and the portrait of the current emperor, but also between the persons and the portraits of different emperors is exemplified in coin jewelry. Objects containing old coins continued to be used for many generations after their original manufacture, and old coins could be mingled with new coins. In some cases, pseudo-coins or medallions depicting an unidentifiable imperial “portrait” are set side by side with genuine coins. What was valued in a coin selected for setting and inclusion in jewelry seems most often to have been a generic imperial image, an image of the emperor, rather than of a specific emperor.

The power of the imperial portrait augmented the pre-existing amuletic power of gold as a material. Roman society tended to be ambivalent about the un-Roman values represented by luxury objects, but even traditionalists such as Pliny the Elder (23–79 CE) valued gold for its supposed medicinal uses (*Historia Naturalis* 33.84). That value seems to have derived from the metal’s perceived incorruptibility, a property that could be transferred to the flesh of the wearer through the principles of sympathetic magic. The imperial portrait, stamped in gold, framed, and worn on the body, was not only an image of power, but also a powerful image, capable of directly affecting the well-being of the wearer.

Numismatic jewelry could be worn by men as a symbol of power, but it was more frequently worn by women, as a protective emblem as well as a display of wealth. It could also be included in the mortuary trousseaux of young girls. These ensembles—whether real, in the form of grave goods, or fictive, in the form of funerary portraits—commemorated the young deceased as the brides they had not lived to become. Coin-set jewelry could be dedicated in temples in place of prefabricated votive plaques, or, in Christian times, inscribed with verses of scripture.

The coins and medals used in jewelry worn by both Roman and Germanic elites in the third and fourth centuries were often imperial gifts. The ornaments themselves were crafted in different workshops on either side of the frontier, but previously unrecognized stylistic links between objects of Roman and barbarian production indicate a degree of cultural interaction that illustrates models such as “the pull of the frontier,” which posits a wide frontier zone distinct from hinterlands on
either side of the border, providing an alternative to traditional conceptions of center and periphery.

An abundance of finds of numismatic jewelry from fifth- and sixth-century Italy, following a near absence of earlier finds, suggests that the increase was in part determined by the location itself, by the fraught attempts of post-Roman elites to assert their authority and legitimacy in the heartland of the former empire. Coins, which preserved established symbols of empire, such as ruler portraits, were potent symbolic currency. Their framing and display augmented the prestige of their issuers as well as their wearers, demonstrating their wealth and proximity not only to contemporary rulers, but also to the empire itself.

[Yale University]
David E. Finley Fellow, 2006 – 2009

In the coming year Ashley Elizabeth Jones will be a postdoctoral fellow at the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz, Max-Planck-Institut.
My project was part of broader, long-term research into relationships between art and mysticism in early modern Europe. During my stay in Washington, I focused on a detailed study of *Saint Jerome Reading* (1505) by Giovanni Bellini (c. 1430/1435–1516) in the National Gallery of Art, which serves as a perfect example of both a devotional image of its time and the difficulties of interpreting such paintings.

The Washington picture is, in fact, not a homogeneous whole. Its foreground was taken from paintings by Bellini of the same subject, which date from about two decades earlier, one in the Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence, and the other in the National Gallery, London. The horizontal layers of rock at the upper right clearly indicate a relationship to Flemish painting, especially to Jan van Eyck’s (c. 1390–1441) *Stigmatization of Saint Francis* (nearly identical versions in the Galleria Sabauda, Turin, and the Philadelphia Museum of Art). The popular and rather anecdotal imagery of a lizard, a squirrel, and a bird of prey, which form an attractive group of animal symbols in the painting, were all inherited from older versions of the subject. The seated Saint Jerome is a mirror-reversed version of the figure depicted in *Saint Jerome Reading in the Wilderness*, by Giovanni’s father, Jacopo (sketchbook in the British Museum, 87v), which Giovanni simply moved from the left to the lower right corner. (Similar recourse to seemingly obsolete, “primitive” forms may be found in the work of Michelangelo.)
The patchwork character of the picture should warn against overly systematic readings. There are, in addition, motifs that do not appear in Giovanni’s earlier depictions of the saint. The distinctive pair of hares in the composition’s center is also found in his *Resurrected Christ* (Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth), which probably predates the Washington image. Likewise two other motifs: the well in the foreground and the strange, screwlike movement of Jerome’s body. This movement, together with his almost closed eyes, suggests that the saint has stopped reading the book, in all likelihood the Bible, and is now contemplating the text with his inner vision. What is the content of his meditation?

This mixture of sources — together with the inaccurate perspective rendering of the well — shows that the modern notion of Renaissance art is inadequate even when applied to works of such well-known painters as Giovanni Bellini. This notion is a result of our (subconscious) totalizing tendency to see the world as an organized whole and to overlook its heterogeneity. Heterogeneity, however, is a key feature of Bellini’s painting.

My analysis concentrates on the most important visual signs in the picture — the well, the rock, and the cave. The well is mentioned in Saint Jerome’s *Vita Pauli* and in his *Vita Hilarionis* as indispensable to a hermit’s dwelling. The well, source of life, together with the rock and the cave, which are also discussed in Jerome’s work on hermitism, should be read both historically and allegorically — as existential symbols. Thus, I argue, the fundamental framework of the picture is to be interpreted on the basis of Jerome’s own texts. The hares in both *Resurrected Christ* and *Saint Jerome Reading* could, on the contrary, be inspired by Augustine’s exegesis of Psalm 104: 18. Jerome’s Vulgate translated this verse “Montes excelsi cervis, petra refugium ericiis” (in the English Vulgate [Psalm 103], “The high hills are a refuge for the harts, the rock for the irchins”), interpreting the Hebrew *safan* as *ericius*, or hedgehog (rendered in English by the archaic equivalent). Augustine, however, used a pre-Vulgate text that adds a translation: “hericiis et leporibus” — for hedgehogs and hares. According to Augustine, the rock symbolizes Christ. We are the hedgehogs, covered in sin, but we are also the timid hares, who can turn to Christ, the Rock. Thus, the viewer of the Washington panel is invited to enter inside it, to identify himself or herself with the humble hare in turning to Jesus. Bellini’s attempt to reconcile Augustine with
Jerome is not surprising, as the two saints were often viewed together. It is interesting that the hares of this pre-Vulgate tradition found their way into later translations of the Bible, including not only the King James Version (as “conies”) but also Luther’s German Bible and the Czech Bible of the Moravian Unity—in both cases as rabbits.

Bellini’s *Saint Jerome* could have been created as a mnemonic device for its donor, either a layperson or a cleric from the milieu of Venetian or Ferraran devotees. On the basis of this and similar analyses I contend that we should not interpret Renaissance humanism and the traditional penitential spirituality of the Middle Ages as substantially different and rival concepts. They were by no means monolithic entities: they could be mixed, and they could inspire pictures of similarly composite character.

Czech Technical University, Prague
Podhorsky Guest Scholar, July 1 – August 15, 2008

*Pavel Kalina returned to his position as associate professor at the faculty of architecture of Czech Technical University. He is working on a monograph on art and mysticism in early modern Europe.*
My book addresses the emergence of a group of abstract paintings long regarded as central to the history of contemporary art in Korea. Known as *tansaehwa*, literally, “monochrome painting,” it came to prominence in Japan and Korea during the first half of the 1970s.

Despite its name, *tansaehwa* covered a broad spectrum of works ranging from monochromes to polychromatic compositions. Among its most significant examples were the Écriture series of Park Seobo (b. 1931), the Conjunction works of Ha Chonghyun (b. 1935), the Umber Blue paintings of Yun Hyongkeun (1928–2007), and the concurrent series of works titled From Line and From Point by Lee Ufan (b. 1936). Most featured repetitive mark making and a support that was either left unpainted or painted in white and neutral tones. All eschewed uniformity, consistency, and the prioritization of allover color in favor of irregularity, unpredictability, and the importance of the mark. *Tansaehwa* artists approached painting not as a medium necessarily possessing a given set of characteristics but as a process of negotiation evidenced by convertibility, or the artwork’s capacity to shift among different depictions, representations, and subjectivities.

All *tansaehwa* works, moreover, were committed to investigating the broader question of painting’s relevance. Their commitment may be inferred through the energy with which their creators dealt with the materiality of painting and its responsiveness to other bodies of work. Many *tansaehwa* artists and viewers regarded the physical artwork as
an opportunity through which to respond to the larger social domain extrinsic to the more specific one identified as the “art world.”

Indeed, what sustained this exploration were trajectories of belief and desire that shaped the artistic environments in which tansaekhwa artists worked. Most tansaekhwa artists were based in South Korea, although a handful, including Lee Ufan, resided in Europe and Japan. Tansaekhwa’s promotion, however, critically depended on the efforts of a number of Japan-based artists, critics, and institutions. This promotion was part of a Korean art world increasingly defined by differing rates of change. Following the political rapprochement between South Korea and Japan in 1965, artistic production and the art market in Korea expanded at an accelerated rate because of the surge of interest in Korean art expressed by Japanese critics and collectors. At the same time, Korean artists and critics harbored misgivings about what they saw as the backwardness of Korean art, which they considered a symptom of the deleterious and enduring effects of Japanese colonial rule from 1910 to 1945. That they believed Korean art to be marginal vis-à-vis an international art world whose “center” implicitly included Japan was itself a manifestation of what might be described as anxiety over the possibility of being seen as lagging behind in relation to artistic developments in Europe and the United States.

Complicating the emergence of tansaekhwa was the almost simultaneous implementation of martial law in South Korea in 1972. On the face of it, tansaekhwa’s adamant refusal of illusionism, figuration, or any trace of representational imagery seemed to have nothing to do with the authoritarian state. But where the state imposed a paternalistic view of visual production that denied the agency of the viewer, the raw materiality of tansaekhwa framed the viewing encounter as one governed by terms of parity among the artist, the artwork, and the viewer. Tansaekhwa seemed thus to take exception to the world as it was envisioned through the projects of the state.

At the same time, the promotion of tansaekhwa coincided with the state’s efforts to envision a culturally distinct Korean nation. Here Japanese reception played a crucial role. From the mid-1970s, critics and curators in Japan praised tansaekhwa works as exemplars of Korean-ness. They did so partly out of a broader interest in defining a field of contemporary Asian art, in contradistinction to what they saw as an
excessive focus internationally on developments in a few cities in Western Europe and North America.

The emergence of *tansaekhwa* is necessarily contingent on other, often conflicting trajectories of belief and lines of activity, that is, on a web of interrelated “points,” “lines,” and “encounters.” Its relevance extends beyond the time of its initial ascent. Although this book is meant as a historical account, it is also intended as a point of departure from which to consider how to address contemporary art and contemporaneity as a condition intrinsically defined by myriad connections, imbrications, and contradictions, and by how we choose to approach these encounters.

University of Michigan at Ann Arbor
Andrew W. Mellon Fellow, 2007–2009

*Joan Kee will return to her position as assistant professor in the history of art department at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.*
Like most architects of the twentieth century, Robert Venturi (b. 1925) and Denise Scott Brown (b. 1931) have paid great attention to photography and made extensive use of it to communicate their ideas. But in their case, the significance of the medium has gone beyond merely documentary or illustrative use to inform the very conception of their art. Even though modernist architects used photographs extensively, they nevertheless pretended to reject images and symbols in their work. Venturi and Scott Brown wanted precisely to reaffirm the iconic dimension of architecture. Photography suited their objectives perfectly because they regarded buildings as images and signs as much as structures, it could be accepted as a fully adequate medium for recording and studying architecture. Moreover, Venturi and Scott Brown rejected the tabula rasa principle of modernism and promoted what they called a more “permissive,” “nonjudgmental,” and “nondirective” attitude toward even the most ordinary, vulgar, and boring aspects of the built environment. Here again, photography, as permissive medium par excellence and one that necessarily confronts reality, became crucial for their project.

Above all, it was in the photobooks created in the 1960s by Ed Ruscha (b. 1937) that Venturi and Scott Brown found the model for their “nonjudgmental” description of the everyday American environment. What Scott Brown called the “deadpan” manner of Ruscha’s work had a direct impact on their research on Las Vegas and their book *Learning from Las Vegas* (1972). Very soon, however, critics such as Kenneth Frampton ques-
tioned the assumed neutrality of Venturi and Scott Brown’s depiction of the American commercial roadside landscape and denounced their record of it as a mere celebration of the ugly and the alienating. Once again, photography was part of the debate: it was seen here as an active force in its ability inevitably to aestheticize what it shows and potentially to transform anything into an object of interest or beauty.

The thin line between neutral record and celebration in the depiction of the ordinary contemporary landscape was also a significant issue for American photography of the early 1970s, when Venturi and Scott Brown’s work was much discussed and exchanges between photographic practices and architectural debates were more important than is generally acknowledged. Critics of the time especially underlined the affinity between Venturi and Scott Brown’s ideas and the work of the young photographer Stephen Shore (b. 1947). He also depicted, without apparent judgment, the world of ordinary architecture, gas stations, motels, and signs. But he soon shifted from the explicitly “deadpan” attitude of his first road trip snapshots of 1972–1973, in which he recorded almost everything without hierarchy, to a more contemplative approach, producing in subsequent years beautiful and perfectly handcrafted color views that some critics compared to masterpieces by Johannes Vermeer or Edward Hopper.

It was precisely at the time of this shift that Venturi, Scott Brown, and their associate Steven Izenour invited Shore to collaborate on the national bicentennial exhibition Signs of Life: Symbols in the American City, held in 1976 at the Renwick Gallery in Washington. In 1975 Shore traveled for several months throughout the country to take pictures for the show. Some of his most famous photographs were made for this assignment, functioning both as architectural arguments at the Renwick and as works of art (Shore selected some of them for his first solo show at the Museum of Modern Art in fall 1976). In both cases, the “ugly and ordinary,” to quote Venturi and Scott Brown’s famous slogan, found their way into major cultural institutions.

My research at the Center was devoted to the reconstruction of both this collaboration and of Shore’s contribution to Signs of Life. But it also attempted, through this case study, to examine more broadly the exchanges between Venturi, Scott Brown, and the photography world in the first half of the 1970s. Finally, I tried to read the Renwick exhibition
in the context of the history of the display of photography. *Signs of Life* was indeed important from this perspective, because its main presentation forms would soon become formats of art photography: color prints, backlit transparencies, and huge enlargements. But this example reminds us that in the 1970s, such features were not yet associated with art photography. On the contrary, in accordance with the very message of the show, they were specifically introduced into the gallery space as vulgar forms of commercial photography, from which high culture was meant to learn—an intention that would soon perfectly succeed.

Université de Lausanne  
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow, January 15—February 28, 2009

*Olivier Lugon returned to his position as professor in the department of history and aesthetics of film at the Université de Lausanne, Switzerland.*
The cultural and artistic profile of late eighteenth-century Beijing as revealed by new scholarship appears increasingly diversified. While the court remained the main catalyst for bringing to the capital ancient and contemporary artworks, artists, and intellectual resources, high-ranking officials, illustrious émigrés, and members of the Manchu nobility gave life to a refined urban culture. Patronage of the arts, collecting, and renewed engagement with China’s past coalesced with political aspirations, career advancement, and new forms of social definition. The consolidation of evidential scholarship (*kaozheng*), with its rejection of sophistic theorizations in lieu of praxis and “objective” scrutiny, was the defining intellectual force of the time, progressively revealing its political dimension with the institutional crisis that accompanied the end of the long reign of the Qianlong emperor (1736–1795). My dissertation, centered on the late activity of the painter Luo Ping (1733–1799) and his exchange with the Beijing scholarly world, explores the ways in which *kaozheng*-inspired antiquarian studies entwined with the production of artworks and informed the interpretation of painting in particular.

Scion of the waning bohemia of the southern metropolis of Yangzhou and devoted pupil of one of its most radical representatives, Jin Nong (1687–1765), Luo Ping sojourned in Beijing during three distinct periods from 1771 to 1798. There, he established himself as leading cultural authority, unfolding his many talents for the exclusive demimonde of the Xuannan district. This area, south of the imperial gates, had
become the empire’s social and cultural heart because of its thriving art market, private libraries and collections, and lively entertainment industry. Through a series of collaborations with towering intellectual personalities like Weng Fanggang (1733–1818), Hong Liangji (1746–1809), and Fashishan (1753–1815), Luo embodied a modernized version of the ideal of the classic scholar (wenren). His highly personal exploration of the medium of painting and its potential for self-expression paralleled, in strictly pictorial terms, the quest for “authenticity” and truth that underpinned the text-based inquiries of kaozheng scholarship. Whereas Jin Nong had problematized the validity of the scholarly painting canon by incorporating references to contemporary “low” or marginalized visual traditions, Luo looked back into the history of painting to investigate the process that brought that canon into existence and guaranteed its transmission into the present. I contend that Luo’s retrieval of art-historical sources coincided with the need for a new definition of the historical prerogatives of the scholar-official elite in a time fractured by profound transformations, internal factionalism, and political uncertainties.

My study draws an ideal trajectory that follows Luo’s shifting formulations of the notion of artistic individuality, from his most radical claim to originality (qi) with the ghost scenes of c. 1766 to his late interest in copying ancient masterpieces, particularly in the modes of the close copy (lin) tradition. Arguably conceived as a final homage to his deceased mentor, the ghost scenes manifested Luo’s “authentic” voice through an innovative technique of accidental blotting that paradoxically undermined the artist’s mediation in the making of the image. Rather than representation, a commentator of the time remarked, these were truthful records of visionary encounters, translated to tangible paper through a rhetorical effacement of the artist’s hand. This critical reformulation of the role of the artist as medium would have enduring resonance in Luo’s late production, in which the earlier performative brushwork and theatrical presentation characteristic of his Yangzhou-centered formation gave way to a painstakingly finished surface and conspicuous use of washes.

_Su Shi and the Two Miao_ (1795) is representative of Luo’s late reflections on the nature of painting. The ambiguous casting of the subjects in textured, erudite allusions and personal recollections is enhanced by a seemingly handleless execution and absence of inscription as key
to the interpretation of the painted image. Luo’s late paintings stand unmediated, almost as found objects, before the viewer and engender a multiplicity of possible meanings, recorded in the textual commentaries appended along the painting’s mounting. Calling into question the classical primacy of calligraphic gesture and text as site for the artist’s self-affirmation through painting, Luo’s late production turned toward the purely visual dimension of the painting, defying interpretive conventions. Considering Luo’s work against the backdrop of the Qing court’s political exploitation of images, I contend that, by the late eighteenth century, the “ideology of the brush,” the system upon which scholarly painting had been structured since its inception, came under scrutiny and gave way to a new formulation of painting in terms of image, opening up new conceptual possibilities for the later development of the ink painting tradition.

[New York University, Institute of Fine Arts]
Ittleson Fellow, 2007–2009

In fall 2009 Michele Matteini will take up a position as visiting assistant professor in East Asian art at Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.
In March 1954 Philip Johnson invited fellow architects Gordon Bunshaft, I. M. Pei, Paul Rudolph, Eero Saarinen, John Johansen, and Harry Weese to his Glass House in New Canaan, Connecticut, for a weekend retreat to discuss their current projects. However, it soon became clear to the guests that Johnson had another agenda. Weese recalled that “Philip was plotting a funeral for functionalism and drafting us as pallbearers.” The weekend culminated with the presentation of a Deco-style maquette, which Johansen paraded through the Glass House while Johnson intoned the sound of drums and made the pronouncement that “functionalism is dead.”

If somewhat apocryphal, this story describes a symbolic moment in the rejection of the maxim “form follows function,” the leitmotif of modern architecture in the United States during the 1930s and 1940s and its replacement by “form follows form,” as it was phrased by the architect Matthew Nowicki in 1951. By the end of the 1950s, the “search for form” had become a catchphrase of architectural culture and was popularly associated with an extremely diverse group of architects classed together as “form givers,” their contributions enshrined in a major exhibition of the same title in 1959. Yet despite its centrality to the discourse and practice of American architecture in the postwar period, the issue of form has never been the subject of a thorough study. My work redresses this omission by examining the sources and manifestations of the “search for form” in American architectural culture from
the late 1940s to the mid-1960s and by investigating how this concern was expressed in exemplary projects by three of the period’s leading architects: Eero Saarinen (1910–1961), Philip Johnson (1906–2005), and Louis Kahn (1901–1974).

What form meant to American architects in the 1950s was far from monolithic. Late works by modern masters as different as Le Corbusier, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, and Frank Lloyd Wright were heralded for their formal innovations, contributing to the resonance of form within architectural culture. Critics and architectural historians brought forth stimulating yet divergent notions, like Vincent Scully’s “very ‘formal’ forms” or Sigfried Giedion’s “feeling for form,” the Formgefühl of German empathy theory. But form also acquired a complex set of meanings from discourses external to architecture: Jungian psychoanalysis and Gestalt psychology explored meaning in myths and archetypes, and cultural anthropology investigated the significance of form making. Through her widely popular books, including Feeling and Form (1953), philosopher Susanne Langer offered an interpretation of form that privileged both immediacy of expression and symbolic meaning for all art forms, including architecture. The 1948 English edition of art historian Henri Focillon’s influential study, The Life of Forms in Art, disseminated ideas about the creation and relations of form as well as its autonomy. A revival of interest in Clive Bell and Roger Fry’s aesthetics saw their key phrase “significant form” relaunched into architectural as well as popular discourse. Finally, Clement Greenberg’s formalist art criticism introduced the idea that art could be self-critical and that form was autonomous. My work shows that it is this rich network of ideas, at once complementary and competing, that informed the architectural “search for form” of the postwar period, a phenomenon I examine in more detail through three case studies.

My chapter on Philip Johnson examines the architect’s engagement of form making in his Roofless Church in New Harmony, Indiana (1957–1960). Supported by a sympathetic but challenging client, Jane Blaffer Owen (b. 1915), the commission proved a fertile ground for formal invention. While Johnson did not conceal his many sources of inspiration—the temenos of ancient Greece, the Indian stupa, the stave churches of Norway, the central plans of Bramante—he was adamant that the shrine was “pure form—ugly or beautiful—but pure form.”
Following Johnson’s example, the critical reception also focused on formal precedents, eschewing any association of symbolism or signification with the design. But a close examination of this complex project reveals that Johnson’s formal abstractions were not devoid of meaning; rather, they uncovered the unexpected content of “pure form.”

The 1950s “search for form” proved central to the theoretical explorations of following decades. As Robert Venturi wrote in the second edition (1977) of his groundbreaking 1966 manifesto, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, “I now wish the title had been *Complexity and Contradiction in Architectural Form*. . . . In the early ’60s form was king in architectural thought, and most architectural theory focused without question on aspects of form.” My work highlights an unforeseen continuity within architectural culture in the postwar period, thus questioning anew the accepted narrative of the rupture between modern and postmodern architecture in America. Concepts such as the subjectivity and autonomy of architecture and architectural design as a self-critical practice are shown to be already present in the work of Saarinen, Johnson, and Kahn in the 1950s. It was this generation of modern architects who first confronted the multifaceted conceptions of form and form making, preparing the terrain for the “formalist” revolution of the 1960s.

[Harvard University]
Wyeth Fellow, 2007 – 2009

In the coming year Cammie McAtee will continue as a PhD candidate in the department of history of art and architecture, Harvard University.
My project at the Center concerned the research and development of the first major exhibition on the subject of modern history painting and its American innovators: Benjamin West (1738–1820), John Singleton Copley (1738–1815), and John Trumbull (1756–1843), to be shown at the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, in 2012. During the period of American painting that bridged colony and nation, provincial painters West, Copley, and Trumbull articulated the American colonial and national relationship to the British Empire in remarkable paintings that struck a chord among critical and popular audiences on both sides of the Atlantic. This exhibition examines the ways in which the particular status of these artists as Americans helped propel them to the center of the international artistic stage and charts the connections between their artistic innovations and art history, history, politics, and economics, and, more specifically, globalism and colonialism.

In the eighteenth century, these artists were celebrated internationally for their large and complex canvases, in which they painted compelling stories based on historical fact. Iconic paintings such as West’s *The Death of General Wolfe* (1770), Copley’s *Watson and the Shark* (1778), and Trumbull’s *Declaration of Independence* (1787) gave contemporary heroes a status normally reserved for biblical, classical, and historical subjects. By elevating figures of their time (and, conversely, leveling traditional ones), these artists pointed to a strikingly new direction in history...
painting that accompanied the growing popular sense of a rising new breed: the colonial American.

In contrast to the more usual approach to these artists, which is confined to their contributions to colonial and early American culture, the exhibition views familiar works in a transatlantic perspective of close relationships between the colonial Americas, Europe, and Africa, by including more than a hundred works of art that cross national boundaries and media. In this context, visitors to the exhibition will come to know and understand the fluidity of intellectual and artistic ideas between nations and colonies; the representation in painting of a rich material culture that developed from gift exchange and treaty negotiations between the Iroquois and Algonquian communities and Britain; the role of exploration and natural history in visualizing the West Indies; and the impact of the mob and the crowd on the eighteenth-century development of group portraits of large political bodies.

In addition, the exhibition considers the roles that West, Copley, and Trumbull played in the artistic, political, and social circles of the period by comparing their career trajectories to those of their contemporaries. Works by Matthew Pratt (1734–1805) and Joseph Wright of Derby (1734–1797), for example, provide context for understanding the artists’ progress in the academy; paintings by Gilbert Stuart (1755–1828) and Agostino Brunias (1730–1796) reveal opportunities an expanding empire provided for artists looking for novel subject matter. Later works by such artists as Jacques-Louis David (1748–1825), Baron François Gérard (1770–1834), and J. M. W. Turner (1775–1851) show the artistic impact of West, Copley, and Trumbull on the development of their own history paintings. The exhibition also includes works from antiquity and by European old masters who were influential in the late eighteenth century, when some artists, like West, acquired such works and displayed them in their studios. West’s art collection figures in a partial re-creation of his studio, reconstructed in this exhibition for the first time from an early nineteenth-century architectural plan, accounts from visitors to the artist’s studio in his lifetime, and meticulous provenance research. The painter owned works by Fra Bartolommeo (1472–1517), Titian (c. 1485/1490–1576), Rubens (1577–1640), and Jean-Antoine Houdon (1741–1828), among others, as well as Native American objects that he
used in such paintings as *The Death of General Wolfe* and *Colonel Guy Johnson and Karonghyontye* (Captain David Hill) of 1776.

During my two months at the Center, my research followed the international approach of the exhibition, extending to subjects such as the art and natural history of New Spain and the West Indies; ancient Rome and Naples and the history of eighteenth-century archaeological excavations; Grand Tour itineraries; and trade items in Native American diplomacy. I refined the ideas and concepts of the exhibition, examined artworks for the working checklist, discussed the exhibition with curatorial and academic colleagues; and conducted research in primary and secondary sources at the National Gallery of Art, the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian Archives of American Art, and at the Smithsonian American Art Museum and National Portrait Gallery, including its conservation laboratory.

Museum of Fine Arts, Houston
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow, July 1 – August 31, 2008

*Emily Ballew Neff returned to her position as curator of American painting and sculpture at the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston.*
In 1428 an early woodcut survived a fire and became a miraculous image that for centuries to follow galvanized a sense of communal identity. This print, known as the *Madonna of the Fire* of Forlì, became the local cult icon through which that small city negotiated its sociopolitical identity, both regionally and transnationally. Although *Madonna of the Fire* is well known to print scholars, it has been studied primarily in terms of its potentially unique dating: is it or is it not the earliest single-sheet woodcut made in Europe? The project I undertook during my tenure at the Center joins the inquiry into its origins with a consideration of this print in terms of art and the religious icon, visual culture and identity, locality and collective memory. The resulting book will bring together traditional connoisseurial issues and an interdisciplinary inquiry exploring how images work in the formation of local identities.

My last book, *Raphael, Dürer, and Marcantonio Raimondi: Copying and the Italian Renaissance Print*, explored the idea of works of art created “di sua mano,” in senses ranging from that of contractual oversight to that of the authentic touch of a master. Here I am interested in miraculous images, especially those considered to be “acheiropoietic” (that is, made without human hands) and how that type of image production was indeed inflected by human interactions. Hans Belting has asserted that “in the Renaissance, two kinds of images, the one with the notion of the work of art and the other free of that notion, existed side by side.” Going beyond this duality, I examine pictures that were...
simultaneously both: miraculous images made by known and named artists, such as *Madonna and Child* by Nicolo di Pietro (active thirteenth century) in Venice, and miraculous images remade by known artists, such as the Orsanmichele icon by Bernardo Daddi (active c. 1280–1348) in Florence. Fifteenth-century printed religious images in general are quasi-acheiropoietic, and the *Madonna of the Fire* in particular is the prime example of a religious print that is itself both a humanly created object and miraculous.

Another aspect of this project concerns the visual culture—the prints and illustrated books, the painted and sculpted as well as printed copies, the permanent and ephemeral architecture—that were a response to Forlì’s *Madonna of the Fire*. These visual artifacts effected the recognition of the *Madonna of the Fire* as a miraculous image, and they are still made today in Forlì, where the woodcut remains enshrined in the city’s cathedral. One event of the early modern period that prompted a great flowering of such works was the procession of 1636, which brought the *Madonna of the Fire* from its provisional housing in the cathedral, paraded it around the city of Forlì, and returned it to the cathedral and its then newly completed chapel there. Working with early printed and archival documents, including Giuliano Bezzi’s 1637 account of the procession (a copy of which is in the National Gallery of Art Library), I have reconstructed the route of the procession, and I am continuing research on the private and public buildings and spaces along that path to trace the overlap between Forlì’s urban fabric and its sacred geography as highlighted by the procession.

A third aspect of the project analyzes how the Forlivesi used the *Madonna of the Fire* to present a communal identity and to relate to the city’s neighbors and overlords. Forlì’s incorporation as one of the Papal States in 1506 marked not only the end of a chaotic century riven by Guelph-Ghibelline rivalries, but also the beginning of ongoing negotiations about its new identity as a political as well as religious subject of the pope. At first denied papal permission to build a chapel dedicated to the *Madonna of the Fire*, the city council eventually resolved to petition Rome repeatedly until permission was finally obtained in 1618. The *Madonna of the Fire* was thus a focal point in negotiations with Rome, as it was with Faenza, a neighboring papal state, and Cervia, a nearby territory coveted by both the Venetian Republic and the pope.
Even Napoleon, on his early Italian campaigns, understood the power of the *Madonna of the Fire* over the Forlivesi and sought to make it his own. He timed his triumphal entry into the city for the anniversary of the fire on February 4, 1797.

Southern Methodist University
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, November 1 – December 31, 2008

Lisa Pon returned to her position as associate professor of art history at Southern Methodist University. In April 2009 she was a visiting scholar at the American Academy in Rome, and she received a Franklin Research Grant from the American Philosophical Society for 2009.
АЛЕКСЕЙ ГАН
КОНСТРУКТИВИЗМ
Aleksei Gan’s Constructivism

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of Russian constructivism is that it produced some of the most stunning forms of the twentieth century while attempting to liquidate art as such. The now well-worn mantra of scholarship on constructivism, “art into life,” gives glamorous finish to a rather gritty project of abandoning artistic work for work within modernity’s prosaic mass cultural forms, such as film, magazines, low-cost housing complexes, and mass-produced consumer goods. My dissertation is the first monographic treatment of the figure who was both constructivism’s most constant advocate across disciplines and the most committed, in theory and in practice, to the dissolution of art as an autonomous category. I reconstruct and analyze the oeuvre of this figure, Aleksei Gan (1887–1942), as a way of expanding constructivism’s significance within the aesthetics of modernism and as a symptom of larger social trends within early Soviet Russia.

Toward the end of Gan’s most famous work, the booklet *Constructivism*, which he wrote and designed in 1922, he states, “Constructivism without the tectonic is like painting without color.” This formulation is more characteristic of modernist writing about art than what one expects from Gan. Having developed his ideological orientation during his years working in trade union and Red Army cultural and political enlightenment organizations, Gan is known for a politicized style of writing and for militantly anti-art slogans. The more often cited line from the book is the one with which it opens: “Constructivism declares
uncompromising war on art!” Despite their contradictory tenors, these two pronouncements in combination aptly lay out the basic task at the heart of Gan’s project: to develop a socialist aesthetic foundation for a set of constructive practices that would supplant bourgeois art forms.

In this pursuit, the tectonic was an important concept for Gan. It was one of a triad of terms—tectonic, faktura, and construction—that he used to break down the constructivist endeavor of organizing materials with the greatest economy according to their physical properties. If construction and faktura described the material properties and relations internal to the object, the tectonic referred to the way in which those material properties are historical—that is, dependent on their moment’s social, psychological, political, and economic norms and on its technological know-how. For Gan, the way in which a constructivist object worked with and within its surrounding conditions was an essential component of its form, “like color to painting.” Pulled from their context, his objects lose more than the usual layer of historically embedded meaning; they also lose their formal foundation.

Constructivism, which I had the opportunity to examine closely while at the Center, is an anomalously self-contained work within Gan’s oeuvre. With the exception of the cover, the page layouts were constructed solely of type in a way that balances an efficiency of means with an efficacy of visual impact. The interior layout became the canonical example of constructivist design in typesetters’ handbooks produced in the Soviet Union in the mid-1920s. The objects that seem to me more representative of Gan’s larger program, however, were his journal projects, newsreel films, kiosks, and agitational texts. Mass media forms, these works are more distribution devices than self-contained objects, and I discuss them in terms of the aesthetics of constructing and distributing information and images within historically specific technological and social conditions. Constructivism’s most ephemeral and immaterial objects, they also afford the opportunity to think about the meaning of constructivism as a materialist practice. The version of constructivism that emerges from my study interweaves a practice of construction with physical materials and one of construction with social norms, ideology, and information.

With its devotion to modern technology and materialism, constructivism has often been seen as an objective, rational (and good) movement whose activity was cut short by the imposition of ideologically driven,
irrational (and bad) Stalinist cultural forms such as the cult of labor and socialist realist figuration. From the very beginning, however, Gan’s thinking about constructivism was integrally bound up with related ideas about propagandistic persuasion and the scientific organization of labor. Thus I also consider the ways in which Gan’s materialist aesthetic was an ideological formation that held together its own set of contradictions within a larger early Soviet imaginary.

[Columbia University]
Paul Mellon Fellow, 2006 – 2009

In the coming year Kristin Romberg will continue as a PhD candidate in the department of art history and archaeology at Columbia University.
Although largely forgotten today, Achille Devéria (1800–1857) is arguably the most important—and certainly one of the most prolific—lithographers of the romantic era. His oeuvre, estimated to include well over three thousand prints and illustrations, encompasses virtually every category of pictorial representation of the Bourbon Restoration (1814/1815–1830) and July Monarchy (1830–1848), from historical and religious subjects to modern-life genre scenes; from portraits and political caricatures to fashion plates and erotica. In perfect accord with the resolutely commercial nature of early nineteenth-century French lithography, almost all of Devéria’s prints were destined for dissemination to a large pool of mid- to low-end consumers. Individual lithographs could be purchased in the print shops and bookstalls of Paris for as little as two or three francs; multiplate lithographic albums, which were all the rage as Christmas and New Year’s gifts in the period around 1830, could be had for approximately twelve to sixteen francs. These relatively modest prices made Devéria’s works easy purchases for members of the upper and middle classes and splurges for almost everyone else; only the most destitute worker or peasant would have found possession of one of Devéria’s prints financially unattainable.

Despite the unabashedly commercial nature of this production as well as its dissemination among a large, heterogeneous audience of aesthetically untutored viewers and consumers, Devéria’s lithographs are not without aesthetic ambition and sophistication. At their best,
the artist’s meticulously detailed narrative scenes feature impeccably drawn, emphatically monumentalized figures circulating within thick, moody atmospheres constructed out of carefully nuanced contrasts of light and shade. His more broadly executed portraits and fashion plates, in contrast, feature a brilliant pictorial shorthand offering a kind of monochromatic, graphic equivalent to the lush colorism characterizing the paintings of the most talented members of the emergent romantic school, with whom Devéria was closely allied both socially and ideologically. Devéria’s lithographs might therefore be regarded as embodying a kind of romantic pictorial vernacular—one that fully eschews the stylistic and technical crudities of contemporary “popular” or “folk” art (such as the celebrated images d’Epinal) in order to familiarize a broad art-viewing public with the conventions of the most advanced art of the day.

While attending closely to the technical and stylistic particularities of Devéria’s prints, my study ultimately focuses on exploring the ways in which the artist’s lithographs—specifically as an early form of mass-produced, mass-consumed visual imagery—intervened in the rapidly transforming social and cultural worlds of early nineteenth-century France. Most of all, I am interested in charting the means by which Devéria’s prints contributed to the establishment, perpetuation, and ultimate complication of ideals of bourgeois masculinity and femininity at what was arguably the most crucial phase in the formation of these powerful and still quite pertinent social constructs. For even though many of the artist’s prints reinforce what might be regarded as hegemonic ideals of bourgeois masculinity and femininity of the 1820s and 1830s, a considerable number of his works can also be implicated in challenging or even subverting these ideals. The artist’s self-consciously glamorized portraits of male cultural celebrities in the years around 1830, for instance, offer fully viable alternatives to the dominant postrevolutionary masculine stereotype of the aggressive, militarized hero. Lithographs parodying (however gently) maternal themes or celebrating the erotic prowess of contemporary parisiennes likewise subvert the prostitute/domestic goddess dichotomy generally believed to have structured nineteenth-century discourses on femininity.

My book addresses each of the major pictorial categories in which Devéria touches upon themes of modern life: political prints and carica-
tures; portraits of cultural celebrities; fashion plates; nudes and erotica; and scenes of contemporary domestic and social life. While attempting to place these images in dialogue with both classic and contemporary philosophical and theoretical texts on such issues as class, taste, identity, consumerism, gender, and sexuality, I regard a complete understanding of the historical import of Devéria’s highly topical prints to be dependent upon an exacting excavation of the particular social, political, and cultural contexts in which they were initially produced and consumed. Much of my time at the Center has therefore been devoted to conducting research into the various sociological and historical phenomena treated more or less explicitly in Devéria’s prints: the parliamentary debates and political conspiracies of the early Restoration; developments in male and female fashion around 1830; the image of the dandy; the evolution of domestic and family life; literary, artistic and musical salons; and the burgeoning cult of celebrity. My ultimate goal is to enlist Devéria’s imagery in the creation of a rich and nuanced picture of the social and cultural life of Paris in the age of high romanticism.

The Ohio State University
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, 2008 – 2009

*After a two-month research trip to Paris in June–July 2009, Andrew Carrington Shelton will return to his post as associate professor and chair of the department of history of art at The Ohio State University.*
My work during my fellowship is part of an interdisciplinary exploration of the social dynamics of images. Considering medieval Georgia as an example, this study will explore the processes and effects of cross-cultural exchange. It will analyze the use of texts and images as instruments of the establishment of identity, the consequent emergence of national consciousness, and the process of cultural transformation as evidenced by particular local developments.

At the Center I focused on the second half of the tenth century, the period of the foundation of the Georgian feudal state and the beginning of unification of the country. As an example, I analyzed the decorative program of the main church of the monastery of Oshki (963–976) in the historic southwestern region of Georgia, formerly the principality of Tao and now part of northeastern Turkey. The building was constructed under the patronage of the brothers David Magistros and Bagrat, Duke of Dukes, of the Bagrationi ruling family, who had ascended to power with Byzantine support as reliable allies against Arab expansion. They appear in three sets of paired sculpted portraits in Oshki.

The church of Oshki, dedicated to Saint John the Baptist, is a domed cruciform structure of limestone masonry. Roman Hellenistic influence can be seen in the construction technique as well as in the church’s architectural details, including its paired windows and its column capitals, and in its exterior sculptural decoration. Among the most spectacular elements are four columns of different types and unusual decoration in a
space along the south wall of the west arm of the church. As Wachtang Djobadze has noted, the masons may have been inspired by antique or early Christian models such as columns dating from the reign of Justinian in Diyarbakir, Turkey; the soffits of the Trinity Basilica of the monastery of Saint Simeon west of Antioch (Antakya, Turkey); or the paired colonnettes of the Umayyad palace in Khirbet-al-Mafjar.

The most impressive of the columns is octagonal and has unique decoration representing saints whose identities have been variously interpreted as a reference to the apotheosis of the Bagrationi family, to intercession for the rulers as well as the triumph of divine power and protection, and to the apotheosis of Saint Simeon Stylites. On the basis of my research at the Center I argue that the column may be read as containing multiple allusions that promoted the legitimacy of the Bagrationi dynasty.

The narrative of the Christian conversion of Georgia as recounted in the history known as the Georgian Chronicles promotes a particular agenda: the construction of the kingdom’s principal church under royal patronage. According to this account, in the fourth century the king of Georgia was directed by Saint Nino, the woman who converted Georgia to Christianity, to build a church in the ancient capital of Mtskheta. The church was given the name Svetitskhoveli (“life-giving pillar”), from a miraculous central column that was said to have been set in place through the saint’s prayers. Its significance lay in an association of Svetitskhoveli Cathedral with the Holy Sepulcher; according to legend, the church was built over the burial place of the coat of Christ, which had been brought to the capital after the Crucifixion. The combination of images on the column—Saint Nino, the heavenly hierarchy, and the Grapevine Cross, which, according to traditional accounts, was kept at Svetitskhoveli Cathedral until 541—suggest that the column was conceived as the “life-giving-pillar,” linking the new monarchy to the old through multiple associations. The theme of dynastic kingship is emphasized in the image of Constantine the Great behind the Cross of Golgotha. Wearing a jeweled crown similar to those worn by Bagrat and David in the sculpted donor portraits in Oshki, Constantine appears as an imperial prototype, symbolizing the imperial legitimacy and identity of the Bagrationi family. The image of Saint Simeon Stylites, the Syrian ascetic with whom Georgian monasticism is closely associated, on the octago-
nal column, in combination with a second representation, on the west facade, of Saint Simeon on his column—that is, the original column in the monastery of Saint Simeon—clearly indicates additional layers of meaning: the spiritual importance of the octagonal column as well as the old connection of the Georgian church to the patriarchate of Antioch. Finally, the images of the physician saints and twin brothers Cosmas and Damian on the column could suggest their intercession for the brothers David and Bagrat, who ascended to power after their father’s death by force in 961, two years before the construction of Oshki began.

Georgian National Museum, Tbilisi
Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellow, March 1 – April 30, 2009

Nino Simonishvili has returned to her position as head of a research group to continue her work on an exhibition on the history of medieval Georgia at the Georgian National Museum.
It is well known that in Venice the progress of the Renaissance was slow, and that the Gothic tradition in art and architecture died hard. The new architectural style, launched in Florence in the early fifteenth century, was adopted in Venice only in the second half of the century: one of the earliest examples of true Renaissance architecture was the gateway of the Arsenal (1460), attributed to Antonio Gambello (died after 1479). The monument was surely intended as a restatement of one of the most famous themes of classical architecture—the Roman triumphal arch—and it was probably modeled on a surviving antique model, the Arco dei Sergi in the Istrian town of Pola.

Unlike Renaissance buildings erected in Florence and in many other Italian cities, this first Venetian example of the revival of antiquity shows a peculiar taste for richly decorated marble surfaces as well as a unique approach to the classical architectural tradition. We find the same characteristics in many monuments erected in Venice from about 1470 to 1530, particularly those attributed to Pietro Lombardo (1430/1435–1515) and his sons Tullio (c. 1455–1532) and Antonio (c. 1458–1516): a family, or better, a dynasty of architects and sculptors who played an important role in building in Venice over this time. My research focuses on the period that begins with the construction of the Arsenal gateway and the early works of Pietro Lombardo and extends to the 1530s.

The use of classical imagery in Venetian Renaissance architecture has often been noted, but a comprehensive survey of the topic is lacking. The
aim of my research is to examine how Venice interpreted Renaissance classicism in the architectural decoration of buildings and monuments such as churches, *scuole grandi* (buildings for religious confraternities), private and public palaces, and funerary monuments. In the first stage of my research I focused on a single monument, the courtyard facade of the east wing of the Palazzo Ducale. The facade has never been the subject of a publication, except for the Scala dei Giganti, which has been studied by Anne Markham Schulz and others. This part of the Palazzo Ducale was completely rebuilt after 1485, when a fire destroyed the dogal apartments. Some documents testify that the *protomaestro* (superintendent) of the work was Antonio Rizzo (c. 1430–1499), one of the most famous architects of the period; for the facade, however, Rizzo was assisted from the outset by several Lombard stonemasons, probably under the direction of Pietro Lombardo.

One of the main issues of my research is to identify motifs and themes inspired by antiquity. Among major Italian cities, Venice was the only one that had no classical past. Sometimes Venetian artists could find inspiration in ancient architecture and sculpture preserved in extant Roman towns of the Venetian dominion, such as Padua or Verona. But more often the design of architectural ornament was taken from drawings and *taccuini*, such as the so-called Codice del Mantegna (Destailleur 0Z 111, Staatliche Museen, Kunstbibliothek, Berlin), the Codex Escorialensis (Biblioteca del Monasterio de El Escorial, Madrid), and the Zichy Codex (Fovarosi Svabó Erwin Königtvár, Budapest). The attitude toward ancient models is varied. True quotations, for example, are uncommon. More often the borrowings from the antique are transformed or mixed with motifs that do not belong to the classical vocabulary, for example, *grottesche* and images of sea creatures, which, not surprisingly, were popular in Venice.

Most of these complex iconographical programs (at least those for the major public buildings) were created to glorify the maritime and military power of the republic. But it is difficult for us to appreciate their symbolism, especially in the case of huge architectural complexes. Ornamental details without particular significance (such as candelabrum motifs or acanthus scrolls) are often repeated in different parts of a building. But there are also recurring combinations that are not fortuitous. For example, coats of arms and inscriptions containing the names of
doges are always linked to motifs that bear a particular meaning for the political propaganda of the period: weaponry in Roman style (and sometimes even Turkish scimitars and shields), the Roman eagle, heads of Roman emperors. Usually these motifs are placed symmetrically to decorate important parts of the facade, such as the main balcony of the doge’s apartment. We cannot say that such associations constituted a figurative program, but they are not meaningless, even though they may seem incoherent to us.

The crisis of the “Lombardesque” tradition in early Renaissance architecture started after the 1530s when the sculptor and architect Jacopo Sansovino (1486–1570) fled to Venice following the Sack of Rome in 1527. Supported by the ambitious doge Andrea Gritti and his cultural circle, Sansovino provided the city with the new architectural language of the so-called Roman Renaissance.

Università Ca’Foscari di Venezia
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellow / Millon Architectural History Guest Scholar, September 2 – October 15, 2008

Luigi Sperti returned to his position as associate professor at the Università Ca’Foscari di Venezia.
My projected book, entitled “The Afterlife of Piet Mondrian,” examines the ways in which this artist’s work circulated through elite and popular cultural domains after his death in New York in 1944. I demonstrate that the understanding of Mondrian (1872–1944) was shaped or transformed, and in some cases his work itself was physically changed, as it was conserved, copied, displayed, studied, described, marketed, and publicized in a wide variety of venues ranging from art museum exhibitions to the pages of women’s magazines. Thus, while Mondrian’s international reputation as a master of high modernism was being secured in posthumous exhibitions and publications, his work simultaneously followed a parallel trajectory in the realm of popular culture, where his signature abstract style became instantly recognizable as a result of its appropriation by graphic designers, couturiers, and hotel owners, among many others. Thus the actual and discursive construction—and reconstruction—of Mondrian’s oeuvre should be attributed not only to the artist but also, and arguably just as importantly, to the many others (myself included) who have engaged with his work in scholarly, elite, commercial, or popular contexts during the sixty-five years since his death.

The first chapter of my book focuses on Mondrian’s last, unfinished painting, *Victory Boogie Woogie*, beginning with the uproar, widely reported in the Dutch press, that greeted the picture’s acquisition in 1998 by a foundation, with funds provided by the Bank of The Netherlands,
for the unprecedented sum of eighty million guilders (approximately forty million dollars). I discuss at length the extraordinarily high value (aesthetic and monetary) that has consistently been attached to this work and show that this estimation prompted the making of several posthumous copies that were occasionally exhibited in place of the original. The celebrity of the painting arguably results as much from its circulation in popular culture (for example, in the form of a jigsaw puzzle produced in an edition of fifty thousand copies) as from its appreciation by scholars and admirers of Mondrian’s art.

*Victory Boogie Woogie* features prominently in a widely distributed photograph of Mondrian’s New York studio, an environment designed by the artist that included numerous pieces of furniture that he made from fruit crates and other discarded materials. These furnishings and the studio environment more generally are the focus of the book’s second chapter, which explores how the functional status of these objects was gradually transformed, enabling their presentation as works of art—that is, as sculptures and so-called wall works. I show how museum and gallery exhibitions as well as scholarly publications reinforced the legitimacy of these and related objects, thereby enhancing their market value.

The next chapter, researched and written during my time at the Center, examines several early, posthumous publications devoted to Mondrian, revealing the ways in which each was shaped by personal relationships and petty rivalries among the artists who had been closest to Mondrian during his New York years. Once again, money and influence are shown to have played a significant role in forging the art-historical narrative of Mondrian’s life and work. The last chapter, also drafted at the Center, examines the profound impact that Mondrian had on several generations of American artists, while looking further at the way in which his work was taken up in popular culture. I examine various episodes in which artists and dress designers appropriated Mondrian’s style, which by the 1960s functioned in much the same way as a brand; it actually became a brand in the 1980s with the opening in Los Angeles of the hotel Le Mondrian.

This project is the culmination of more than thirty-five years during which I have intermittently focused my scholarship on one or another aspect of Mondrian’s work and influence. Even before embarking on a career as an art historian, as a college undergraduate I studied the
responses Mondrian elicited from a circle of younger American painters with whom he was friendly during the last few years of his life. As I now find evidence of my own interventions in the historical archive, I find it necessary not simply to acknowledge my prior contributions to the scholarly literature, but rather to examine, evaluate, and critique my changing investments in the process through which Mondrian’s work has entered into history.

University of Southern California
Edmond J. Safra Visiting Professor, fall 2008

Nancy J. Troy returned to her position as professor of art history at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles.
The Hungarian-born American artist László Moholy-Nagy (1895–1947) has been best known to his contemporaries and to subsequent generations of commentators as a photographer and avant-garde theorist of new media. Within a few short years of joining the faculty of the Bauhaus in 1923, he became notorious for his advocacy of fusing technology with art. Both privately and publicly, Moholy predicted the impending obsolescence of easel painting, arguing that in the future, photography, film, and other new media would offer the most productive avenues for unlocking the full potential of human creativity. Because of this advocacy, many saw Moholy as painting’s gleeful pallbearer, all the more so because he actually stopped painting in 1928.

Yet what has generally been overlooked is that by 1930 Moholy returned to painting while continuing his exploration of photography and film. By that time, he had become increasingly aware of how baffling his recourse to painting appeared to an audience who knew him almost exclusively through his work as a theorist and advocate of new media. How can we understand both his departure from and his return to painting? More broadly, how can we understand the persistence of painting for Moholy?

To answer these questions, my dissertation insists on the necessity of examining the broad range of Moholy’s activities from the 1920s well into his final years. I argue that Moholy’s own understanding of the interrelatedness of painting and photography as well as of the relation-
ship of painting to his other experimental projects—indeed, of painting’s significance for his artistic undertaking more generally—became apparent to him in retrospect. Specifically, the stakes of his initial turn to photography in the early twenties could be understood only after he abandoned painting in the late twenties, returned to it in the early thirties, and embarked on his experiments with color photography in the mid-thirties.

In the first two of four chapters, I examine two projects that helped to cement Moholy’s reputation as painting’s antagonist. The first chapter centers on his factory-produced enamel paintings, \textit{EM 1}, \textit{EM 2}, and \textit{EM 3} (1922), more commonly known as his Telephone Pictures. The second concentrates on the development of his \textit{Light Prop for an Electrical Stage} (1930), a kinetic light display machine designed in collaboration with industry for a new kind of theater. Both chapters examine how these particular projects contributed to the perception that Moholy’s artistic development was marked by a progressive turn away from painting toward technology. This telos, however, cannot explain why Moholy returned consistently to painting. My first two chapters relate these two renowned experiments in technology to Moholy’s struggle with abstract painting throughout the twenties. Far from having a blind faith in technology, Moholy worked in a manner that acknowledged the limitations and possibilities of his various projects—be it in new technological media such as film and photography or in painting—and sought ways to bring these various practices into a productive relationship with one another.

My third chapter centers on a damaged and subsequently repaired and reworked painting, \textit{z vii} (1926), recently acquired by the National Gallery of Art. This painting figured prominently as a color photographic reproduction on the cover of a special issue of the journal \textit{Telebor} (1936), which served as Moholy’s first retrospective monograph. Drawing on conservation reports, technical studies, Moholy’s writings, and work in other media, I argue that this painting and its reproduction exemplify his attempt to articulate the inseparability of his many artistic practices. Moholy’s revision and publication of \textit{z vii} carved out a new space for painting, one that served as a laboratory for color photography, a technology he actively explored around the same time. In this manner, Moholy mobilized painting both as a means to pursue color
photography and as a way to paint in the aftermath of photography. My 
final chapter focuses on his late paintings on plastic, works that seek to 
occupy the interstices of painting, color film, and sculpture.

[The Johns Hopkins University] 
Twenty-four-Month Chester Dale Fellow, 2007 – 2009

Joyce Tsai will take up a position as research assistant to the Edmond J. Safra Visiting 
Professor at the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts.
Raphael (1483–1520) painted the *Sistine Madonna* in 1512/1513 at the behest of Pope Julius II for the church of San Sisto in Piacenza, yet the work has always resonated beyond its liturgical purpose and provincial locale. Scholarship has long recognized its seminal role in redefining the altarpiece in the Renaissance, establishing new visionary iconographies of the Virgin, and dissolving the boundaries between the beholder and the holy image.

My project investigates the illusionistic structure of the *Sistine Madonna* and the way in which it embodies the doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ, both ontologically, in constructing a threshold, and exegetically, through mediating a miraculous passage. The curtains and the cherubs at the ledge establish a liminal zone, which the striding Virgin and Christ Child and Saint Sixtus’ pointing gesture transgress. The picture plane is thus physically integral as a surface and virtually pierced as an illusion. Patristic and medieval exegesis explained the virgin birth with images of a sealed surface permeable to light. In the Renaissance, Albertian perspective transformed the picture plane into a notional window, often described as transparent glass, intersected by light rays. Daniel Arasse, Louis Marin, and Georges Didi-Huberman have demonstrated that this projection of pictorial space became a potent metaphor in Annunciation scenes. The perspectival construction of the Virgin’s bedchamber as a threshold transmitting rays of light figures the impossible boundary traversed during the Incarnation. Raphael’s composition,
in referring to Annunciation motifs in the poses of the saints and the framing curtains, reinvents this dynamic. The picture plane is transformed from a surface permeable to light rays in Annunciation scenes to one spawning projecting forms. The curtains part to reveal a nebulous vision of heaven, whence figures issue.

Patristic and medieval Mariology, and the Madonna icons thereby informed, visualized the Incarnation and virgin birth in ways that resonate with Raphael’s image. The curtains of the *Sistine Madonna* signal the Virgin’s status as tabernacle of the new covenant, as in earlier images that feature this motif, including depictions of the Nativity and the *Madonna del Parto*. Augustine (354–430) interprets the bridegroom emerging from a tabernacle curtain in Psalm 19:5 as Christ “coming forth from out of the Virgin’s womb, where God was united to man’s nature as bridegroom to a bride.” The church fathers often employed fabric metaphors to visualize the Incarnation, since Christ was clothed in flesh “woven” from the pure matter of the Virgin’s womb. Proclus (d. 446) compared this gestation to a work of art, mirroring nature, coming into being: “An infant has come forth, leaving the curtains of the womb intact, leaving behind the workshop of nature.”

For Julius II, the concept of the virgin birth was inextricably linked to his promotion of that of Mary’s immaculate conception. Raphael’s figure of Saint Sixtus, though portraying Pope Julius, venerates Julius’ uncle Sixtus IV, who promulgated this controversial doctrine endowing Mary with eternal purity as the vessel of God. Christ’s virgin birth was a prominent theme in the preaching and poetry of the Julian court, especially at the crucial moment of the Fifth Lateran Council (1512–1513). In works preceding the *Sistine Madonna*—the Goritz chapel in Sant’Agostino (1510/1511) and the *Madonna of the Aracoeli* (1512)—Raphael fuses natal imagery and a mortuary context, expounding the analogy of Christ’s issuance from an intact womb at birth and from a sealed tomb during the Resurrection. This association also pertains to the *Sistine Madonna*, whose composition derives from Michelangelo’s tomb designs for Julius II. Though interpretations of the painting as a catafalque surmounting the deceased pope, toward whom the Virgin descends, have been dismissed as overly literal, such readings intuit the pictorial transitivity of Raphael’s heavenly vision. Miraculous passage animates both Christ’s birth and resurrection as the promise for salvation.
The research I conducted at the Center on pictorial ontology and Marian doctrine in the *Sistine Madonna* forms the core of a monograph on the artistic antecedents, patronage, theological significance, artistic legacy, and remarkable reception history of Raphael’s masterpiece. The last encompasses its immediate impact on Marian altarpieces by Andrea del Sarto (1486–1530), Parmigianino (1503–1540), and Titian (c. 1488–1576); its import for the codification of immaculate conception iconography in the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries; and its ultimate canonization as the pinnacle of ideal artistic creation in Enlightenment and romantic aesthetics. For Walter Benjamin, the *Sistine Madonna* exemplified the irreproducible aura of the artwork, its once-alleged funerary context rendering it uniquely site specific in its “exhibition value.” Yet the work’s pictorial transitivity is as much an expression of what Benjamin termed cult value in embodying the virgin birth. The *Sistine Madonna* pictorially manifests not only the physical advent of Christ through a virgin’s womb, but also the no less miraculous vision of the artist. Seeing becomes being through illusory depth and volume that simultaneously affirm and negate a surface and thereby proclaim the spirit made flesh.

Brandeis University
Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow, 2008–2009

*Jonathan Unglaub returned to his position as associate professor of fine arts at Brandeis University.*
Dating from the mid-twelfth century, the low-relief bishop’s tomb in the chancel at Exeter Cathedral is representative of the modest beginning of a trend toward increasingly grand and personalized funerary monuments that was embraced with great enthusiasm by the European elite in the later medieval period. By about 1300, members of the royalty, nobility, and higher clergy were sparing no expense to distinguish their burials with highly visible tombs in choice locations. Ambitious monuments showcased a life-sized effigy of the deceased on a decorated tomb chest crowned by a canopy in the latest architectural style. Colored stones and metals gleamed, and figural and foliate sculpture were enlivened by gilding and paint. Recent scholarship has contributed much to our understanding of these later tombs, but the origins of the trend remain relatively obscure. I am interested in the early manifestations of the trend and in understanding why a conspicuous tomb with an effigy was thought to be advantageous to the deceased.

My dissertation focuses on twelfth- and thirteenth-century tombs in England, where a relatively large sample of monuments survives. Study of these monuments as a group immediately revealed that the first known raised tombs with effigies were made for members of the higher clergy. Ecclesiastical patrons seem to have enjoyed exclusive use of the form for approximately eighty years (c. 1150 – c. 1230), and their patronage continued to dominate production until about 1300. In a scholarly discourse that traditionally has privileged tombs of the laity, the formative
role of the clergy in the development of tomb design has not been widely acknowledged. Backed by research into contemporary commemorative ritual and opinions regarding death, burial, and resurrection, my study of fifty English ecclesiastical tombs from the mid-twelfth century to the end of the thirteenth assesses tomb design and meaning in light of the concerns of ecclesiastical patrons.

During the fellowship period, I completed three major aspects of my study. As a necessary first step toward analysis, I compiled a catalogue that includes a description of each tomb and an assessment of its physical history and historiography. Most of the monuments have been moved or altered over time, and in many cases we no longer know the identity of the person for whom the tomb was made. Surviving medieval documentation is spotty at best, and historians’ accounts through the nineteenth century are often unreliable. Gathering together for the first time the existing information on each of these tombs has permitted me to establish a more informed chronology of development.

A second facet of the project considers the geography of episcopal burial within the spatial and political complexities of the cathedral church. Using the cathedrals in Ely, Hereford, and Salisbury as case studies, I document trends in tomb location and form over time and investigate possible motivations that may have informed a bishop’s choice for his burial. The reality of the sociopolitical situation, however, meant that a bishop’s preference for burial—notably, near an altar—was tempered by the needs of the monks and canons who used the church daily. The investigation reveals a system of exchange and compromise from which both the religious community and the individual could benefit. My findings support the hypothesis that design and placement of the tomb were considered important factors in the deceased’s progress toward salvation, but just as crucial was the development of an amicable relationship with the chapter, the prayers of its members being indispensable to the bishop for the salvation of his soul.

Most innovative in late medieval funerary art was the reintroduction of an image of the deceased, an element commonly incorporated in monuments during the Roman Empire but almost completely absent in medieval Europe before the twelfth century. The third part of my study documents the effigy’s early appearance in England and discusses interpretations of the imagery. These life-sized figures were not exact
likenesses, but rather generalized representations of a person vested with insignia denoting ecclesiastical rank. Official seals used similarly generalized imagery to express identity based in institutional authority, but the funerary context of an effigy begs alternative interpretations of the medieval “self.” Associated with a moment of extreme spiritual anxiety and accompanied by additional imagery of censing angels, a beast underfoot, and a canopy above, the effigies represent an aspect of “self” that is steeped in contemporary beliefs about the fate of the body and soul. Scholars have recognized a growing interest in corporeality in theology and worship during the twelfth century; the emergence of imagery of the body on medieval tombs is therefore no coincidence. The fact that in England the clergy were the first to adopt and foster the effigy only heightens the likelihood that spiritual meaning is embodied in this form.

[University of Virginia]
Twelve-Month Chester Dale Fellow, 2008–2009

In the upcoming year Catherine Walden will complete her dissertation and will contribute to a Web-based archive of images and texts related to Salisbury Cathedral hosted by the University of Virginia.
PLAN
DE LA VILLE DE HHALEB
et de ses Environs,
Dressé de 1811 à 1818.
In the late sixteenth century, a group of “deviant dervishes” squatted at the edge of Aleppo, a prosperous mercantile city in the Ottoman empire. These wandering religious Muslims, led by their saint, Shaykh Abu Bakr, formed an upside-down community whose transgressive behavior inverted legal, religious, social, and sexual norms. Their extreme asceticism and spectacular antinomianism risked persecution by the Ottoman state. The dervishes violated Islamic law in ways that included consuming alcohol and psychotropic drugs, attacked and ridiculed figures of authority, and made a mockery of conventional domesticity. They also inverted normative gender hierarchies by forming a homosocial community and referring to themselves and others as women. The saint Abu Bakr simultaneously inspired both disgust and awe in the inhabitants of Aleppo, who took his offensive behavior as a sign of his closeness to God’s truth and revered him for his ability to bestow blessing. Yet by the early seventeenth century, the dervishes changed into a respectable brotherhood of Sufi mystics and received the patronage of powerful Ottoman officials. On the tomb of Abu Bakr rose a dervish lodge, one of Aleppo’s most important religious institutions, which spurred the development of a suburb. The dervishes who had shared the saint’s anticonformist ways became salaried members of the religious hierarchy, accepting its norms along with its rewards. They allowed themselves to be co-opted into the urban social network and in turn transformed their wilderness retreat into a settlement. Paradoxi-
cally, then, the very individuals who had rejected society pioneered urban development.

My projected book, “The City and Its Reverse: Performing Space and Gender in Islamic Urbanism,” explores the dervish community’s transformation and its relationship to concepts of space and gender as practiced in early modern Islamic society. The book places this marginal group at the center of the study of the city.

The study of popular culture relies on innovation in the choice and interpretation of sources. In urban history, one must study not just built structures, but urban development—visible in cartography. Building on my previous field and archival research and using the libraries and archival resources of the National Gallery and neighboring institutions, I compiled evidence of urban change through visual sources, such as an early nineteenth-century map of Aleppo by J. B. L. J. Rousseau, probably the earliest “accurate” cartographic effort focusing on this area. When nonelite groups have left no textual sources, one must read the dominant sources for the trace of the nondominant. My primary sources include early modern biographies, found in extensive biographical dictionaries, a popular textual genre in the early Islamic world. Often focusing on a specific city, leading Muslim jurists compiled the lives of notable citizens and visitors. Reading these biographies critically allows one to reconstruct aspects of urban history and of the early modern perception and practice of space. The succession of biographical dictionaries from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century presents an evolving image of the saint Abu Bakr that parallels the transformation of the deviant community into an institutionalized brotherhood and of its squatter settlement into an architectural complex.

Conversations with scholars at the Center and members of the intellectual community beyond also enabled me to think critically about methodology. My goal in this book is not only to present a specific case study in all its complexity, but also to introduce a new method for the study of Islamic cities. The historiography of Islamic visual culture has emphasized the study of the city, of its institutions and architectural monuments, often creating an image of the Islamic city as stable and ordered, leaving out the documented presence of contrarian and dissident social groups. My study is part of a recent revision of this view. In addition, architectural history traditionally considers the meaning of
architecture primarily for those who construct buildings—patrons and architects. By contrast, recent architectural history, not limiting itself to the investigation of the conception, building, and original use of structures, also attends to the manner in which architecture is used, interpreted, and remembered. I conceive of the users of architectural spaces, whether newly built or old, as active agents in shaping their meaning. To support this approach, I privilege space and spatial practice rather than architecture. Through my emphasis on marginal groups and their social practice, I hope to uncover competing meanings for the city and its central monuments as well as its nondominant sites and its edges: its “reverse.”

University of California–Davis
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, 2008–2009

Heghnar Zeitlian Watenpaugh will return to her position as associate professor of art history at the University of California–Davis.
From the rise of Christianity, image making in the realm of the new religion had to be positioned between the prohibition against images (Second Commandment) and the idolatry of pagan cults. The reservations of early Christian theologians with regard to mimetic images, an attitude rooted in persistent neoplatonic tradition, prompted a search for new paradigms of representation. At the Center I conducted research for a book that investigates the construction, reception, and theoretical grounding of authenticity in connection with medieval images: icons, head reliquaries, and imprints on cloth or seals. These objects illustrate the shift from mimesis as the main concept in the creation of an “authentic” image in antiquity to other strategies of representation in the Middle Ages, such as stylization, abstraction, and bricolage—a shift that would be reversed in the early modern period. Beyond this, it is guided by the following questions: Under what historical conditions and in what context did the shift from mimesis to other forms of the authentic originate? Can we discern a general theoretical discourse that finds its visual expression in the production of artworks? Of particular interest for the terminological basis of my book is the question of how “truth” was constituted in relation to the concept of similitudo (likeness), seen both on a more general philosophical and theological level and as a formal category.

At the Center I focused on metal head reliquaries of Christian saints, which show mostly stylized features or resemble masks. The composite...
character of these heads, which combined shining precious metals and jewels (bricolage), emphasized the formal quality of their outer shells. The dazzling face, enhanced by the glimmering light of candles in a church, created a supernatural “aura” and visually confirmed the authenticity of the image. The bone hidden inside also authenticated the reliquary because it transmitted the presence of the figure represented through its own physical material. Thus in these metal head reliquaries abstraction replaced *similitudo* as a visual strategy for representation, in both the physical reduction of the saint’s body in the bone and the “deconstructed” features of the face.

Another important part of my research this year centered on icons that were considered authentic, such as the sixth-century painting of the enthroned Christ as Savior in the Lateran Basilica in Rome, the so-called Acheiropita. Although of a local provenance, the panel alludes to contemporary images in Byzantium, such as the Mandylion from Edessa. The authenticity of contemporary Byzantine acheiropoietic icons was constructed through textual narratives of their “miraculous” fabrication. Moreover, they worked as powerful protective devices in the event of military threat, a function that the Acheiropita also fulfilled. Finally, liturgical acts of veiling and revealing the image enhanced the mysterious aura of the Byzantine Mandylion. This strategy of authentication was likewise applied to the Roman counterpart.

The growing apparatus of tools for veiling and revealing the Lateran Savior icon in its liturgical context coincided, on the other hand, with its demystification in the intellectual discourse around the image. In the thirteenth century, for example, the eyewitness testimony of the painter replaced “miraculous” fabrication and efficacy as parameters of authentication. Connected with this shift are the proliferating legends about the artist-saints Luke and Nicodemus, then believed to have personally witnessed biblical events. Despite the change in its reception and status, from 1100 onward the Lateran Savior icon became the model for a series of medieval copies in smaller cities around Rome, including one in the cathedral of San Lorenzo in Tivoli. Important criteria for the efficacy of the replicas were phenotypical references and measurements, as well as the imitation of the sophisticated paraliturgical ceremonial apparatus that had been developed around the prototype. The insertion of relic particles into some of the replicas further “authenticated” the copies.
Their makers did not intend to distinguish between the veneration of relics and that of images. And it is precisely this fusion of image and relic that determined the power and aura of the copies.

The broader methodological aim of this study is to explore the conceptual character of medieval art through the application of more recent approaches from the fields of anthropology, social history, and visual studies. These are complemented by an evaluation of historical sources and by reflections on art history as a discipline. Rather than studying different modes of representation, my book is dedicated to the very validity of representation in the Middle Ages. With this focus, I intend to contribute to the ongoing discourse on representation and truth in the arts.

Princeton University
Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow, 2008 – 2009

Nino Zchomelidse will return to her position as assistant professor in the department of art and archaeology at Princeton University.
A history of the triangle is an impossible history: because triangles are everywhere, it could be argued that they are in fact nowhere. In the case of the oft-mentioned but little analyzed “triangular composition” of Renaissance paintings, how can we tell which arrangements are significantly triangular and which are only accidentally so? For example, does Perugino’s Crucifixion (National Gallery of Art, Washington) manifest the triangle more or less completely than Raphael’s Transfiguration? The assertion of triangularity seems to rely on an excess of either creativity or dogged single-mindedness on the part of the art historian.

Yet the triangle has a surprisingly rich pedigree in Renaissance texts on mathematics, theology, philosophy, and psychology. Using it as Renaissance authors did—as a tool for thinking—I reconsider ideas about the human, the individual, and the category of art without assuming a particular modern teleology for them. Among its many manifestations, the triangle grounded the atomic structure of the physical world, according to Plato; it was the first plane figure; and it was the basis for vision and for navigation, mapping, and military surveying. Leon Battista Alberti (1404–1472) drew substantially on these techniques—along with theories of vision, perception, and memory based on triangles—in his formulation of a theory of perspective. The mundane and the metaphysical combined in medieval and Renaissance geometry, and in the fifteenth century mathematics gained a new status as a kind of language specific to the mind. Mathematics generally, and the triangle in particular, were
essential to philosophical approaches to the human that developed in the Quattrocento under the renewed influence of Plato and neoplatonism.

Aside from composition, what do these ideas have to do with art? The project began with three types of images: printed diagrams from around 1500 that put the triangle to surprising heuristic uses; paintings and prints dealing with the love triangle of Venus, Vulcan, and Mars; and images of Melancholy as a triangular figure. Over the course of this year, I have studied how artists in the fifteenth century developed the visual convention of a hierarchical, central triangle for paintings and other two-dimensional images.

The grounded, symmetrical orientation of an equilateral or isosceles triangle is an aesthetic choice; there is nothing inherently hierarchical about a three-sided figure. But the hierarchical type of triangle resonates in the writings of Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499); he repeatedly described the human soul as a triangle, emphasizing its connectedness to both immaterial spirit (the elevated vertex) and physically extended, mundane earth (the base). With melancholy, another obsession of Ficino, the aspiration to transcend the material, to reach to the skies, was brought back down to earth. The triangular form of melancholic figures is an apt representation of the pain of this middle condition, and a few other key figures, also triangularly composed, such as the Madonna of the Meadow of Giovanni Bellini, offer rich reflections on the relationship between melancholy and mathematics.

Love triangles represent some of disordering effects of the triangle, drawing on an erotics of the triangle that has roots in neoplatonic authors from Alexandria to Byzantium to France (where the triangle flourished in the first half of the sixteenth century as the most “mystical” and “fecund” figure in the writings of Charles de Bovelles [c. 1475–c. 1566]). Written in the Counter-Reformation, Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo’s Trattato (1584) hints at this association of the triangle with Eros but normalizes it. Lomazzo’s triangular mirror of Venus, derived from a creatively misread classical reference, represents the ideal beauty of the figura serpentinata.

This year I have had the opportunity to extend my work to images of the Trinity and other significant triadic relationships. At the beginning of my residency I had completed substantial portions of two chapters, but the introduction and first chapter remained to be researched, con-
ceptualized, and written. It was already clear that they would shape the revisions of the existing portions, but I had no idea how much: my three long chapters have developed into seven shorter ones. At the Center, I studied medieval diagrams, trinitarian theology, and their “intersection” in triangular diagrams of the Trinity; I attempted to trace the historical development of triangular composition, its later theoretical formulation (for instance, in the writings of Heinrich Wölfflin), and its popularization in mid-twentieth-century textbooks. I tackled the complicated scholarship on perspective and read theorists from Ernst Cassirer (1874–1945) to Hubert Damisch (b. 1928). This year has provided many special opportunities: to explore the Gallery’s collections as well as others nearby; simply to have the time to read German scholarship and Latin primary texts; and, most important, to benefit from the knowledge, insights, and generosity of members of the Center and Gallery staff. The book has been immeasurably enriched by these opportunities.

University of Chicago
Ailsa Mellon Bruce Senior Fellow, 2008–2009

Rebecca Zorach will return to her position as associate professor of art history at the University of Chicago in fall 2009, after serving as visiting professor at the École des hautes études en sciences sociales in Paris.
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Fellows’ tour of the exhibition *Pompeii and the Roman Villa: Art and Culture around the Bay of Naples* with curator Carol C. Matrusch
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Emily Ballew Neff and speaker Eric M. Moormann, “Rediscovering the Ancient World on the Bay of Naples,” symposium, January 30–31, 2009

Fellows’ tour of the exhibition Looking In: Robert Frank’s “The Americans” with curator Sarah Greenough
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