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FROM THE EDITOR

The Helicon Review has an incredibly difficult time every year in selecting the small amount of essays for publication and every year the task becomes greater and more difficult as the number of submissions increase. We are not, however, complaining! This phenomenon of heightened increase in publishing one’s own work is just another indication of our students’ high level of academic aspirations. It is wonderful and truly refreshing to see how many undergraduates become more and more captivated by our discipline.

This Review and all of the submissions for consideration are not the fruits of solely the students; they are also the product of our truly dedicated department and their sincere interest in supporting the students’ education. I don’t believe that any other department holds as many student/faculty gatherings or informal lectures or has as many students who absolutely love their professor—and want to spend time with them—as much as the History of Art department does. The kind of interactive and engaging community that we promote in this department is truly exceptional and unlike any other that I’ve seen.

This year is my last year as the Editor of the Review and I will definitely miss being a bigger part of the process. I’m grateful for the past two years of being able to engage with my professors and peers outside of the classroom and because of my experiences, it is my belief that our publication will continue its steady increase in the number of submissions and interest that it garners from the History of Art community. I’m excited to see what is to come and how students, faculty, and staff alike will work together to bring the arts to the world! Go Blue!

Thank you,
Gabby Hyunsun Park, Editor
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Andy Goldsworthy’s *Roof*: A Question of Accessibility in Museums

*Courtney Graham*

“It is in the particular use of places by people that other possible meanings emerge, turning place into space.”

—Andrea Witcomb

There is considerable evidence that visitors to the first public museums were able to handle objects regularly.¹ This practice eventually ceased and proximity to works of art decreased dramatically over time. Glass display cases became the norm and “the museum – it was a forbidding place.”² As museums’ need to preserve and restore works of art grew, access to pieces diminished. In his book, *The Museum Interior*, Michael Brawne states: “the two primary activities of any museum – preservation and display – are in a sense contradictory.”³ For the purpose of this paper, I will be utilizing Andy Goldsworthy’s piece entitled *Roof* to discuss the issue of inaccessibility in the gallery setting.

Upon entering the East Building of the National Gallery of Art for the first time, I was struck by a series of looming forms lining the left side of the lobby. I was immediately drawn to the impressive size of the piece. Nine dome-like shapes, each about my height, filled an outdoor terrace that spanned well over one hundred feet. The majority of the work was positioned behind a glass wall, though a few of the domes crossed into the interior of the building, jutting out onto the floor of the lobby. The work’s label, which was positioned on the ground near one of these protrusions, included a ‘please do not touch’ sign, making it clear that visitors should keep their distance.

My first inclination, after approaching *Roof*, was to find out how to get beyond the glass wall separating the work from the public sphere of the lobby. Surely, I would be able to enter from some other point and walk among the mound-like structures, even if I could not put my hands on the work. I asked a security guard how to enter the

exhibition and he responded, ‘you can’t, the best view of the work is at
the Mezzanine level, from above.’ Incredibly disappointed, I walked up
to the second floor, the Mezzanine, to gain the guard’s suggested view
of the work. This new vantage point gave an entirely different
experience to the installation. The aerial view made the work appear
smaller and even further removed than seeing it beyond the glass.
However, from this height I could now see there were holes in the tops
of the domes, suggesting the structures were in fact hollow. The artist,
Andy Goldsworthy, had decided that the ideal height for the forms
would be one that would “just prevent viewers at the ground level
windows from seeing into the oculus at the apex of each dome,” thus
the need for the Mezzanine view. If a visitor were to only experience
the work on one level of the museum, half the piece would be lost. It is
this change in perspective that gives Roof its ability to either “convey
tremendous scale or to seem small and silent, growing and retreating.”

This play on the miniature and gigantic can be easily
recognized through Goldsworthy’s inspiration and plans for Roof. The
slate formations occasionally meet, kissing together like cell walls
under a microscope. Roof can also be likened to a mass of expanding
bubbles crowding their allotted space. Similar forms can be seen on the
scale of the colossal with Descartes’ vortex model of the cosmos. In
both instances, Goldsworthy is drawing on the idea of a collective
group occupying a given area. The most familiar designs suggested by
Roof are probably that of primitive dwellings. The title literally means
the external covering of a house or building, the slate that comprises the
work is a common roofing material. This reference to inhabitable
structures makes the physical inaccessibility even more jarring. Objects
in the museum “embody human purposes and experiences; they invite
us to act towards them in ways which may give us what we desire.”
The viewer is presented with what appears to be house-like structures,
but entrance is strictly prohibited.

Roof speaks to architecture in such a way that it is impossible
to evaluate the work without taking into consideration the National
Gallery’s East Building itself. Designed by Chinese American
architect, I. M. Pei, the National Gallery’s East Building was erected in
the 1970s to accommodate additional gallery space as well as a new

4 Donovan, Molly, and Tina Fiske. The Andy Goldsworthy Project. New York:
Thames & Hudson, 2010. 23.
5 Ibid., 24.
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center for art history research. The building and its site posed a number of challenges. The land was an irregular trapezoid shape, the building had to be monumental to hold its own among the already existing structures on the National Mall, and the museum must provide both public and private spheres. I. M. Pei embraced the shape of the site by cutting the building into two triangles, an isosceles triangle for the public gallery and a right triangle for the research center. A glass-covered atrium unified the two spaces, allowing natural light to flood the building. Triangles served as both the East Building’s main structural and decorative motifs. I. M. Pei’s abundant use of acute and obtuse angles creates a highly unique place in which to showcase art. Goldsworthy’s Roof plays with the strict geometry of the architecture of the building. As Molly Donovan describes them in her essay “Goldsworthy’s Reveal,” the “rounded domical forms press against Pei’s angular asymmetries.”

The geological shapes rippling from out of the outdoor terrace contrast the gallery’s defined vertical and horizontal planes. Yet in other ways, Roof and the gallery in which it is shown beautifully imply one another. The highly reflective quality of the glass wall and marble floor is mimicked in the slate used by Goldsworthy. The reflections in both the slate and the glass make the installation appear to stretch back even further than in reality, multiplying itself when the light is at the correct angle.

The slate also holds connection to architecture in other ways; it is the same Buckingham Virginia slate that was used for the roofs of Washington D.C.’s Smithsonian Castle and Ford’s Theatre, only a few blocks away. The dome, as a roof structure, can be found all over the city. Classic architectural styles, including many domed buildings, dominate the skyline of our nation’s capital. An oculus is the circular opening that often accompanies semi-circular vaulted ceilings. The holes in the tops of Goldsworthy’s structures in Roof can easily be read as such openings. Oculi typically allow light to enter a space, however, “Goldsworthy upends the traditional function of oculi in rooftops… the oculi of ‘roof’ function by presenting only darkness.” Due to the fact that no one can gain access to the hollowed domes’

interiors, it is impossible for the oculi to exist in their intended fashion. Instead, the holes create only an intense black silhouette. The northern light and cantilevered overhang allow for such darkness that one cannot be sure there is a hole, for the dark spots appear as though they could be inky puddles atop the mound-like forms.\(^\text{11}\)

Goldsworthy uses the oculi as a means of playing with the idea of hollow versus solid forms. From the ground or entrance level, the work appears solid, huge masses of stone piled up with an unwavering strength, while the Mezzanine view exposes the oculi. Though the unusually dark oculi may cause the viewer to question the hollowness of the work, it is this investigating that gives the work interaction. The viewer must reevaluate what they had seen earlier and attempt to reconcile the two perspectives. This act of piecing together different views to imagine the larger picture is what artist Anish Kapoor calls “mental sculpture.”\(^\text{12}\) The interaction with the piece is not so much physical as it is mental.

Anish Kapoor challenges his audience in a similar way with his 2008 work entitled \textit{Memory}. Originally exhibited at the Deutsche Guggenheim in Berlin, \textit{Memory} is a raw Cor-ten steel sculpture resembling something along the lines of an ancient war relic or an impossibly heavy blimp.\(^\text{13}\) Though it weighs 24 tons, the work’s focus is its volume rather than mass.\(^\text{14}\) At nearly 50 ft long and 15 ft high, \textit{Memory} is wedged into the museum interior, looking as though it very well might expand, swelling with air and bursting the gallery walls at their seams. The exhibition included a number of entry points, some of which showed different sides of the exterior of the work, and one with a window into the hollow belly of the form itself. Because of the sheer physicality of the work, the viewer is made painfully aware of his or her own position and size in relation to the piece. The tight fit of \textit{Memory} into its setting, denies museum-goers the opportunity to view the work in the round. Instead, the swollen vessel must be experienced in stages, each vantage point providing another piece to the puzzle. This “dismantling vision,” as the Deutsche Guggenheim describes it,
forces a fractured view of the work. Akin to the way in which Roof is experienced, Anish Kapoor’s Memory imposes on its viewers the need to “exert more effort in the act of seeing.” In this process of viewing, the audience must resolve in their minds, both the outer and inner views of the work. After observing the hollow interior, it is impossible to see the exterior of Memory as anything but a shell, allowing volume instead of mass to serve as the means of scale. The boundaries of the gallery also operate in presenting scale. Due to Memory’s form pressing against the walls, the gallery is seen as a barrier to the work’s potential size. The more one observes Memory, the more it becomes physically unwieldy, outgrowing its space.

When looking at the work of artists such as Anish Kapoor and Andy Goldsworthy, it is crucial to look at the larger art historical trajectory they were following. In his book Minimalism: Art and Polemics in the Sixties, James S. Meyer explains that minimalism broke onto the art scene just after pop art had its start in the winter of 1962 with “The New Realists” exhibition at the Sidney Janis Gallery in New York City. Pop art and minimalism shared gallery space and at first, little effort was made to distinguish one from the other. In 1966 the Jewish Museum, also in New York, held a minimalist exhibition called “Primary Structures: Younger American and British Sculpture,” which artist Mark Di Suvero praised as “the key show of the 1960s.” The show featured the work of artists such as Donald Judd and Robert Morris. It was radically different from any show before because it brought about the notion of artist as designer, that an artwork can in fact be fabricated by a team or outside individuals and still be the work of individual artist. Despite the competitive nature of the art world at the time, pop art and minimalism “developed in a symbiotic relation,” providing contrast for one another – pop art was a bright stimulus, minimalism a calm release.

Coined by art historian and critic Robert Pincus-Witten, “post-minimalism” refers to the movement in the late 1960s that pushed

16 Ibid.
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against minimalism’s unilateral use of closed, geometric forms. Instead, post-minimalists focused on the process of art making and openly welcoming soft sculpture and the use of alternative materials – originally disfavored by the minimalists. Overall, post-minimalism is not so much an art movement as an artistic idiosyncrasy. Post-minimalism’s development beyond minimalism and its material sensibility are still employed by many artists today, though presently, it is often categorized as post-modernism. Goldsworthy, and other currently active artists, will always be examined through an art historical perspective, taking into account the artists who were their predecessors.

One such predecessor would be Daniel Buren, whose installations – much like Goldsworthy’s Roof – always kept a vital relationship with the architecture of the museum or gallery in which they were displayed. Buren prided himself on his “in situ” artwork. In 1971, Buren created Peinture-Sculpture (Painting-Sculpture), as part of the Sixth Guggenheim International Exhibition. The piece, a sixty-six by thirty-two foot canvas banner hung from the ceiling, bisecting the open rotunda of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in New York City. As visitors traveled around and up the spiral ramp, they could view the piece from a variety of angles, sometimes seeing it as a flat panel, other times as a thin line running down the center of the building like an axis. Made up of many long stripes, Peinture-Sculpture’s verticality played with the bold horizontal bands of Frank Lloyd Wright’s famous structure. Due to complaints from other artists, the piece was taken down before the opening of the exhibition. Its controversy in no way diminishes its impact; in fact, the other artists saw the work as so altering the gallery that they thought it would overpower the rest of the show. Buren addressed the imposing architecture of the museum and in doing so, radically transformed the way people would experience the space. Daniel Buren describes this transformation: “it is by working for a given exhibition site that the

22 Ibid.
work in situ – and it alone – opens up the field for a possible transformation of the very place itself.”

Another gallery-transforming artist to discuss is Carl Andre. His unassuming works confuses the boundary between viewing space and display space in the museum setting. His piece entitled *Steel-Aluminum Plain*, made in 1969, was a six foot square made up of eighteen pieces of steel and eighteen pieces of aluminum laid out in a checkerboard pattern. Most notable about this artwork is the fact that visitors were encouraged to walk on the thin sculpture. While the work is humble, it greatly impacts the notion of spatial relations in the gallery. Lying flat on the ground, without any sort of pedestal, *Steel-Aluminum Plain* turns the art museum into a hands-on museum. As I can only imagine, standing on the work would be somewhat nerve wrecking – this is not something museum-goers do everyday. While discomfort may be felt initially, placing oneself physically within the work could also bring about ideas of childish play and the thrill of doing something you should not. Standing atop the work also puts scale in the forefront of the viewer’s mind. It would be impossible to stand on Carl Andre’s piece and not evaluate your own size in relation to the square. Furthermore, the alternating tile pattern could give the viewer the sense that they are pawns in a larger-than-life game of chess.

Carl Andre pioneered works that lie flat on the ground. This relationship between sculpture and the floor on which it rests is also worth exploring in Goldsworthy’s *Roof*. As the artist expressed it himself, “instead of being on top of a building, my ‘roof’ would connect to the ground below – a juncture somewhere between architecture and geology.” The mounds rise up out of the ground, feeling more like a part of the earth or the building’s foundation than something installed afterwards. The domes become the ground, a new landscape of rolling hills. But it is exactly this disassociation with the average museum sculpture or artwork that makes the work beg for interaction. There is no pedestal, no velvet ropes holding the viewer back; instead, the piece spills out from behind the glass, pouring onto the floor of the lobby. Goldsworthy likened this “sculptural extension to a caged animal reaching its claws through the bars.” This description of *Roof* brings about the question of enclosure. The physical

---
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extension of the work into the public sphere of the lobby heightens one’s awareness of the unusual presentation method that Goldsworthy is employing. It is as though the outdoors are attempting to leak into the building by means of Roof’s glass-penetrating forms. The artist is stimulating his audience’s feeling of containment by disrupting the conventions of display (i.e. sculptures on pedestals, paintings on walls). By placing the nature-based art behind glass, Goldsworthy is drawing on our desire to interact with the piece, making the viewer more aware of the interior space and its limitations.

For those viewers who are familiar with Goldsworthy’s more ephemeral pieces, Roof evokes nostalgia for the freedom and outdoors that the artist’s other works present. Working with a similar slate as in Roof, Goldsworthy’s Slate Throws are centered on the instantaneousness of nature art, on nature’s ability to change, to be here one moment and gone the next. Also important to this piece is the artist’s participation in the work; without his human interaction there would be no Slate Throws. Of course it would be impossible for the millions of visitors that the National Gallery receives each year to be able to experience the ephemeral works of Andy Goldsworthy in person, which is why pieces such as Roof force the issue of inaccessibility.

Another Andy Goldsworthy piece that also exists in the museum setting, which one might compare with Roof, is the Garden of Stones at the Museum of Jewish Heritage in New York City. Garden of Stones began as a proposal for a living memorial to the Holocaust and was realized over the course of 2003, two years before Goldsworthy’s work at the National Gallery.28 The garden is comprised of a number of large granite boulders taken from Vermont, partially hollowed out, with dwarf oak saplings planted in the top of each one. The work revolves around the idea that though life is fragile, it is able to survive under the most extreme of conditions, such as a small tree growing within a giant stone repository. The most important element of Garden of Stones, for the purpose of this comparison, is its interaction with the public. Not only are visitors permitted to walk among the boulders and view them in the round, but the work in itself was also created in part by the public. On September 16th 2003, the garden was completed when Holocaust survivors and relatives of those who lost their lives in the Holocaust planted the saplings in the holes of the boulders. The trees, with luck, will reach a height of fifteen feet, the roots exerting their own forces on the boulders, possibly breaking them open from the

28 Ibid., 162.
The levels of Goldsworthy’s exhibition do not end there; the Museum of Jewish Heritage website allows viewers from anywhere in the world to track the progress of the trees through weekly photographs. *Garden of Stones* gives its audience the comfort of interaction, but it is the restriction of this participation that creates such complexity in *Roof*.

The scale of each of Goldsworthy’s grand installations can be seen in the amount of physical energy it takes to put together pieces this large. The labor necessary to quarry and transport the slate for *Roof* was immense itself, but the work did not stop there. Once all the materials had arrived it took Goldsworthy, his assistant, and five dry-stone wallers nine long weeks to install the piece.\(^{30}\) Weighing close to five hundred tons, the scope of *Roof* is physically enormous, but its symbolism increases the scale in a whole new way.\(^{31}\) Goldsworthy’s installation at the National Gallery East Building is a symbol of the domed buildings of Washington D.C., of human dwellings, and of microscopic natural forms such as cells – all at once. By means of symbolism the work is abstracted. With so many possible connections and interpretations, the scale of *Roof* becomes almost immeasurable. In relation to the greater art historical context, Andy Goldsworthy’s piece is not just an installation, but also a part of a post-minimalist aesthetic that transcends decades.

In his essay “Function of Architecture,” Daniel Buren states that “the work of art only exists, can be seen, in the context of the museum/gallery surrounding it.”\(^{32}\) Art and its display conditions are unquestionably intertwined, which is why the varying contexts for sculpture discussed here are so crucial to the work that exists within them. When at all possible, artists, and curators alike, should strive for immersion; a gallery space which “takes away the viewing window and allows the public to walk right into the exhibit.”\(^{33}\) There are instances however, when the lack of this immersion can make the art even more compelling. Andy Goldsworthy’s *Roof* dangles nature right in the faces of the audience, and it is through such teasing that we become so

---

\(^{29}\) Ibid.


\(^{31}\) Ibid., 170.


invested in the work – invested enough to travel around the National Gallery in hopes of a better look. Whether it is through what Anish Kapoor calls “mental sculpture” or through forced inaccessibility, when individuals find themselves inside the work, the gallery space is thus transformed into a place of deeper meaning.
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The Muse as a Surrealist

Nina Massad

“Pure surreality!” exclaimed surrealist leader André Breton upon seeing a collection of Frida Kahlo’s paintings. While in Mexico City in 1938, Breton welcomed Kahlo as a surrealist, though Frida protested, “I wasn’t. I never painted dreams. I painted my own reality.” Born in 1907 in Coyoácan, Mexico, Kahlo—self-proclaimed Mexican realist painter—drew inspiration from her heritage and life experiences. Controversial painter Salvador Dalí, born in 1904 Catalonia, spent the bulk of his artistic life as a member of the surrealist group, a post-war cultural movement based in Paris. While the surrealists received endless criticism for their objectification and degrading portrayals of women—some argued they only included women in their circle as muses—many female seemed to draw influence from their work while maintaining independence from the movement’s strong male chauvinism.

Although Frida Kahlo and Salvador Dali differ significantly in the inspiration for their works (Dalí relies heavily on Freudian psychology and the unconscious, while Kahlo depicts her real life experiences and cultural beliefs), the works of Kahlo and Dalí exhibit similar notions and concepts, as is evident in Frida Kahlo’s My Birth (1932) and Salvador Dalí’s The Enigma of Desire (1929). Despite Kahlo’s rejection of any inclusion in the chauvinistic surrealist movement, much of Kahlo’s subject matter indeed reflects that of the surrealists.

Frida Kahlo’s My Birth depicts a nude female very literally giving birth on a large bed. The head of the mother is covered by a single white sheet; above the bed is mounted a portrait of the Virgin Mary, while the rest of the room remains barren. A blank scroll is placed at the bottom of the painting.

My Birth is a realist depiction of a disturbing event. The focus of the painting is placed in the center of the canvas, as is typical with Kahlo’s work. Consistent with her tendency to paint self-portraits, it seems likely that the child emerging from the woman is Frida herself, donning Kahlo’s signature unibrow, “bathed in blood and apparently lifeless.”

weeping and “pierced by daggers”, watches and sympathizes from above the headboard. All three women—child Frida, the mother and the Virgin Mary—are aligned vertically. The centered and symmetrical nature of the painting is quite harmonious, highlighting My Birth’s “horrific stasis”⁴. The otherwise ordinary room, with delicate pink lace decorating the pillow, sends an ironic message and further emphasizes the tragic scene in the center. The scroll, unrolled and cornering the viewer, “stands ready to receive an inscription of supplication and thanksgiving like those found on the retablos that influenced so much of Kahlo’s work”⁵. However, given the tragic nature of the normally joyous event, it is left blank.

The message in the piece references her tragic bus accident in 1925 and its cruel repercussions. During the accident, an iron bar pierced Kahlo’s abdomen and uterus, making it very difficult for her to bear children⁶. Just before painting My Birth sometime in 1932, Kahlo had faced an emotional abortion. Coincidentally, Kahlo’s own mother had died in October of 1932, during the painting of My Birth. Given its context, the mother in the piece represents both Frida and her mother. Kahlo claims the paintings depicts “how I imagined I was born”⁷. Kahlo feels she has been dead since birth, as her physical ailments have greatly restricted her from having a normal life. The scroll at the bottom of the painting draws influence from Mexican folk art. Its presence references the concept of a “retablo—a votive painting, usually on a small sheet of tin, that depicts a person saved from disaster together with the hold agent of salvation. The scrolls of retablos are inscribed with thanks to the Virgin or a saint and with information about the miracle”. Evidently, with the scroll left without an inscription, the message becomes very different. The piece could also be compared to a famous sculpture of the Aztec goddess Tlazolteotl, which depicts her giving birth to a full-grown man with a “grimace of pain”⁸.

Salvador Dalí’s The Enigma of Desire—My Mother, My Mother, My Mother offers a very different outlook on the mother/child dynamic. In the painting, a stiff head resembling an animal carcass lies horizontally on the floor, out of which emerges a large blob, “which

---

⁷ Ibid.
moreover has indentations recalling a slice of cheese’’. Toward the top of the central object rests a tiny grinning face. The background is barren with the exception of a few scattered objects, including snails, eggs and ants.

The main figures in The Enigma of Desire are not easily identifiable. Although some objects often appear warped and bizarre, Dalí’s work is the most technical of all the surrealists. This creates a sharp contrast between the painting’s style and its cryptic message, just as My Birth does. This juxtaposition forces one’s eyes on the piece, mesmerizing the viewer with its oddities. In viewing Dalí’s other works, such as The Great Masturbator and The Persistence of Memory, one can recognize the head lying horizontally on the ground as a representation of Dalí himself; the head is “foetus-like” and is connected to a “biomorphic rock” which “grows from a curly furniture leg”.

Inscribed within the “cavities” of the rock formation is the phrase ma mère. Dalí’s disturbing head appears sullen and lifeless. The “bio-morphic” nature of the formation, and the head being “foetus-like”, could reference the symbiotic relationship between a mother and fetus. The disturbing depiction of Dalí’s head may suggest a conflict in this relationship, perhaps killing the fetus.

In reality, the death of Dalí’s mother in 1921 brought him great pain, claiming it to be the “greatest blow” he had ever experienced. Dalí worshipped her, stating, “I could not resign myself to the loss of a being on whom I counted to make invisible the unavoidable blemishes of my soul”.

Like My Birth, this painting may reflect a loss of self caused by the death of one’s mother. Salvador Dalí, like other surrealists, was heavily influenced by the ideas of Sigmund Freud, famous psychologist and founder of psychoanalysis. Freud’s thoughts on sexuality, dreams and unconscious desires became the inspiration for and central ideas behind the surrealist movement. The Enigma of Desire refers to the Oedipus complex—what Freud calls a crucial stage in development where the child feels sexual desire and love for the opposite-sex parent and simultaneously feels hatred and competition toward the parent of the same sex. The figure behind Dalí’s head “amalgamates an insanely grinning head, an embracing

---

10 Dawn Ades, Dalí and Surrealism (London: Thames and Hudson Limited, 1982), 78.
11 Ibid.
couple, a bleeding egg/head, a leering face of a lion and a hand with a
dagger, all dissolving into and out of each other, simulating the passage
from one image to another in dream experience.”14 Surrealists strived to
reveal the psychological truths in dreams; they felt that the content of
dreams was just as tangible as reality.

Although at first glance they seem very different, Kahlo and
Dali’s paintings have striking similarities. Both paintings are self-
portraits; and though surrealist paintings usually portrayed the
subconscious, Dali was an exception, often including his image
explicitly in his paintings. This tendency is consistent with the belief of
female artists like Kahlo: the self-portrait gives the imagery in the
painting an understandable source.15

Whether or not Kahlo did so deliberately, many of her
concepts mirror those of Salvador Dali. Symbolism was a significant
and recurring component of his pieces. The ants wandering Dali’s
head in The Enigma of Desire are common symbols in his paintings,
representing death and decay. The egg, also present in the piece,
references “pre-natal images and the intra-uterine universe.”16
Although Kahlo claimed the portrait of Madonna above the bed in My
Birth was “part of a memory image, not for symbolic reasons,” it does
serve as a significant allegory of the tragedy below it.17 Furthermore,
after receiving recognition from the surrealists, Frida painted the
heavily symbolic What the Water Gave Me, an even stronger example
of Kahlo’s use of imagery. In defense, both artists claimed that the
inclusion of these objects served as childhood relics. Along with the
pink lace on the pillowcase, the Virgin Mary serves as a “memory
image” and references the manner in which Frida’s mother had
decorated the family home.18 Similarly, Dali’s themes relied heavily on
his childhood memories. The ants were derived from a memory in
which five year-old Dali saw ants swarming an insect, consuming it

and leaving only its shell. In fact, Freud stressed childhood memories as crucial to understanding issues in adulthood.

While the two works depict mother/child relationships, they do so in very different ways. *My Birth* very literally depicts a comprehensible event. *The Enigma of Desire*, on the other hand, is non-pictorial, with an incoherence that is “parallel to that peculiar to collage.” The natures of these mother/child relationships are also very dissimilar. In *My Birth*, the mother and daughter share such an intense partnership that they both represent Frida; the mother and child appear to meld into each other and even die together. Dali’s interpretation of this relationship is very different, referencing a sexual tension between a son and his mother.

Central to both pieces is the focus on contradictions. As Breton wrote in *The Second Surrealist Manifesto*, “Everything leads me to believe that there exists a certain point in the human mind at which life and death, the real and the imaginary, the past and the future, the communicable and the incommunicable, the high and the low cease being perceived as contradictions.” Kahlo would often paint “polarities” of her life, depicting “art and nature, pain and salvation, birth and death”. In point, Frida’s work is filled with contradictions: the exaggerated unibrow in all of her self-portraits, her opposing heritages in *The Two Fridas* all to portray a unifying message between her internal and external. *My Birth* suggests a “coexistent” message of fertile eroticism and death, a strong belief of surrealists Masson and Bellmer, though Kahlo claims influence from her heritage, referencing the Mexican belief in life and death as unified. In similar fashion, the presence of Dali’s image in *The Enigma of Desire* amalgamates the conscious with the subconscious. Drawing influence from Freud’s ideas, Dalí often depicted the dual nature of woman—“her incompatible roles as mother and the bearer of life, and as harbinger of

---

death and destruction”\textsuperscript{24}. In this respect, both paintings break these contradictions, alluding to the complexities of human life.

As André Breton wrote in a 1938 introduction at Kahlo’s New York debut, “My surprise and joy were unbounded when I discovered on my arrival in Mexico, that her work had blossomed,” calling Kahlo’s work typical surrealism, “despite the fact that it had been conceived without any prior knowledge whatsoever of the ideas motivation the activities of my friends and myself.”\textsuperscript{25} While Breton says this patronizingly, the statement does have some truth. Despite the surrealist portrayal of women as passive and male-dependent, Frida Kahlo independently produced significant and powerful work consistent with the male surrealists. There are some significant differences between Kahlo’s \textit{My Birth} and Dalí’s \textit{The Enigma of Desire}, however, both draw similar conclusions. In comparing these two works, one can indeed see a sturdy bridge between the real and the surreal; a bridge that both Kahlo and Dalí cross, undoubtedly meeting in the middle.

\textsuperscript{24} Whitney Chadwick, \textit{Women Artists and the Surrealist Movement} (London: Thames and Hudson Limited, 1985), 16.
\textsuperscript{25} Whitney Chadwick, \textit{Women Artists and the Surrealist Movement} (London: Thames and Hudson Limited, 1985), 90.
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Figure 1. Frida Kahlo, *My Birth* (1932)

Figure 2. Salvador Dali, *The Enigma of Desire—My Mother, My Mother, My Mother* (1929)
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Millet, His Peasants, and their Urban Reception

Sarah Correa

Arousing both fear and reverence, Millet and his peasant subjects were the center of the political struggle consuming 1840s Paris. Each became synonymous with leftist convictions, of which social change was fundamental. It was this social “radicalism” which in 1848 brought the struggle to the point of revolution, as economic decline and an ineffective “Bourgeois King” pushed France’s working class to revolt. The next three years would be marred by further conflict as the poorly organized Second Republic, the left’s replacement to the former Bourgeois King, immediately floundered upon its liberal foundation. In 1851, lacking support from the working class it originally inspired, the ineffective government collapsed and Louis Napoleon ushered in the Second Empire. The response to Millet’s work of the time was determined by these tensions and his choice to depict peasants, the very instruments of insurrection which conservatives most feared, provided ample reason for the works’ poor reception by this group. In equal respect, this depiction worked naturally to ally Millet with the progressive social thought of the left. Millet and his peasants had become active supporters of the revolution.

However this activation of Millet and his subject seems at once a falsity, a myth created by conservatives and leftists alike. The reality was that Millet’s peasants were not revolutionary. Their existence was bound to the soil, and the unchanging nature of this existence stood in marked contrast to the sweeping changes experienced by their urban working class contemporaries. And it was Millet’s conservative belief in this inevitable cycle of country life that made him as unlikely to participate in revolution as his subject. Stated succinctly, “Peasants like his do not raise flags of revolt.” But it was this very choice of subject that the left used to appropriate Millet to their cause, however he may have tried to deny the radical convictions they thrust upon him.

Millet did elevate the peasant, he did display their suffering as heroic, but he did not seek to sow the seeds of change. His realism sought to expose the urban bourgeois to the plight faced by his beloved subject, but concerning the actual implementation of change, that was for others to address. For Millet the task was to describe a situation

1 Fortescue, France and 1848.
2 Herbert, pg. 49.
which he saw as unbearable but, in the end, as cyclic as the rising of the
sun his peasants toiled under each day.

With the unveiling of *The Sower* in 1850 (figure II) Millet’s
adoption by the left was complete. The powerfully striding figure, arm
extended aggressively and ending in a clenched fist, towered upon the
wall of the Louvre. The conservative response at the Salon was
unanimous: This clenched fist was poised to strike the fragile Second
Republic. But if the 1850 Salon fulfilled Millet’s appropriation, the
completion of his *Quarriers* in 1847 could be said to represent its
beginning.

Consumed by the task of their labor, the peasants depicted in
*The Quarriers* (Figure I, oil on canvas, 20” X 30”, 1847) strain to free
a massive boulder from its mooring. They work together in the hopes
that what cannot be done alone may be completed with the aid of
another. A sharp splinter of wood is driven between the boulder and
the earth to wrench it free and the diagonal created is heightened by the
thrust of the workers’ bodies. The man below the wooden lever throws
his entire weight into the task and his face, though obscure like many
others of Millet, nonetheless reveals a grimace of pained resolve: The
work is hard, it is exhausting, but it will be done. The brushstrokes
below the men are applied in an equally aggressive diagonal fashion
and the tension these elements create is palpable. There seems to be no
relief for the viewer in this frontally loaded image except for a small
window to illusionary depth created in the top left corner. However
even there he is confronted with a second image of violent labor.

Compositonally it is clear why this image of rural labor was
feared by conservatives. Here Millet has depicted two peasants who
are firstly, unified, and secondly, appear to be quite powerful. The
source of light in the image, offering an opposing diagonal to the one
created by the laborers, throws the form of the man above into sharp
relief. His muscular torso captures the light and the viewer is
confronted by his brute strength. To read from a conservative lens, this
image of strength and unity was Millet’s metaphor for the bolstering
and rallying of Paris’ working class. Together these laborers would
complete what they had not been able to accomplish alone: An end to
conservative rule.

The situation in 1847 Paris was that of a pot about to boil
over, of a rubber band about to snap, or, even, of a boulder about to be
torn from its secure foundation. To borrow once more from the
conservative, the impossible compositional tension of *The Quarriers*
undoubtedly spoke to the political and social strain in Paris. Something

---

3 Eisenman, pg. 250.
had to give, and just as surely as Millet’s peasants would complete their task, so too would the working class rise against their political leaders.

And so The Quarriers became a rallying point for the left, a role which was to be magnified by The Sower three years later. The activation of Millet and his peasants had begun. However this activation, driven by the artist’s choice of subject and the tensions created by his means of depiction, is largely unmerited for two primary reasons. First, that the peasants he depicted did not equate to the working class revolutionaries in Paris, and second, that in order to pin Millet to a radical agenda, only those works which could be interpreted to express radicalism were considered; the rest of his work, a rather large portion, contained little that could be used to this end and was thus ignored.

That the latter arose is quite understandable. Any group seeking to idealize (or ostracize) an individual will choose to highlight those qualities most attractive (or most dangerous) they perceive the individual to possess. In defending his client, a lawyer will seek to “paint” him in the best light, minimizing any ill characteristics he may have. When perpetuating the supremacy of their Aryan race, the last thing the Nazi party wanted to expose was the controversy surrounding the heritage of their fuehrer himself.4 And from the art world, supporters of Jacques-Louis David’s oppositional program of the late 18th century, which included paintings like The Death of Marat and The Lictors Bringing Brutus the Bodies of His Sons, may choose to overlook that during the reign of Napoleon I this very same artist became the Emperor’s most favored court painter.5

In the same respect select works of Millet’s oeuvre were highlighted. Looking at this limited program of paintings, including The Quarriers, The Sower, and the equally provocative Man with a Hoe, and The Gleaners (figure III), it became easy for critics to conclude that the artist was of radically progressive thought. However there exists a much larger body of work in which no reference to revolution can be sought, no matter where the appropriating viewer chooses to look. It is these works which must also be considered to gain an unbiased understanding of the artist’s possible intent.

In The Angelus (figure IV), Millet’s peasants do not toil under the hot sun, but instead enjoy a moment of rest at sunset, called to prayer by the church bells in the distance. The religious element
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4 The counter-theories surrounding Hitler’s birth are at best speculative. For more information, see Rosenbaum, Explaining Hitler.
5 Eisenman, pg. 47.
completes the image of traditional rural life. Of the response to this work, it was claimed that it could not be saved from its “charge of sentimentality and conventionality.” And in terms of critiquing bourgeois rule it was, to critics, “far more difficult to celebrate” than the work of say, *The Gleaners.* *The Angelus* and *The Gleaners* were completed in 1857, a later date than *The Quarriers,* but nonetheless their chronological proximity to each other proves Millet’s diversity in his portrayal of rural life. Add to *The Angelus* drawings like *The Bather, Shepherdess Leaning Against a Tree* (figure V), and *The Sheepshearers,* which illustrate simply the solemn relation to nature Millet found in his rural subject, and it may be said that the artist’s radical credentials “owed less to the totality of his oeuvre than to a few well-studied images.” In other words, it was only by ignoring the four mentioned works that Millet’s implication with leftist thought could be secured.

But what of Millet’s peasants? How was it that this rural class, so far removed from the urban center and politics of Paris, came to be conflated with the working class population the right feared? It was precisely because many of these urban laborers had, only recently, been peasants themselves. Of the sweeping changes brought about by industrialization, mass emigration from the countryside to the cities was one of the most noticeable. Paris in 1831 was inhabited by around 735,000. By 1861 this number had nearly tripled. Birth rates in the city had not changed; this rapid increase in population was due almost entirely to rural emigration. The poor farmer became the poor urbanite, the man who once worked the fields now worked in Paris’ factories, and the ringing of Church bells to the Angelus was replaced by the factory whistle calling the laborers back to work. The distinction between rural and urban was blurred and to a large extent disappeared: Parisians came to superimpose their own workforce in the place of Millet’s peasants, and so any suspicion aroused by the latter naturally was passed to the former. The peasants in *The Quarriers* were made to double for members of Paris’ working class and read by conservatives, they were dangerous. Simultaneously unified and armed with determination, the two men became direct representatives of the
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6 Fratello, pg. 688. The Angelus prayer structured the workday of French peasants, who paused at the sound of church bells three times daily to recite it.
7 Charles, pg. 168.
8 Fratello, pg. 689.
9 Fratello, pg. 689.
10 Herbert pg. 44.
rallying force building beneath Paris’ unsatisfied poor. They had become one and the same with the insurgents depicted in Daumier’s, *The Uprising* (figure VI).

However the peasants depicted by Millet were not those drawn to the urban centers of Paris or Montmartre. They were the ones left behind. Most noticeably these were the elderly, the very young, and the unfortunates so destitute that even the move to the city represented an impossible cost.\(^{11}\) In this respect Millet’s peasants were bound to the land more than anyone else. They were no more likely to “raise the flag of revolt” than they were to break free of their cyclic existence beneath the scorching of Millet’s sun.

This artist believed in the permanence of this cycle. He respected the solemn dignity with which the peasant faced each day, the resolve his subject possessed knowing that the reward to his labor would be small, and his hardship no less than that faced by his father, and his grandfather, and so on back to the very beginnings of agriculture. Less concerned with change and more concerned with exposure, the motive of Millet’s realism was not to become a focal point for the left but to reveal to the urban Bourgeois the *humanity* of his subject; to destroy the romanticized image which had been constructed around rural life (figure VII\(^{12}\)) and in its place present an image of a brutalized existence. The intent was to force the viewer into confronting the suffering of his subject. But by assuming this task Millet’s landscapes refused to function as the Bourgeois believed they should. Instead of providing a nostalgic escape to France’s pre-industrial past, Millet forced his Bourgeois viewer to recognize the harsh reality his peasants faced each day. For many this was unbearable: Landscape was not created to provoke and peasants were not meant to arouse thought. The conservative critic Léon Lagrange stated this openly, for to him in a good country painting, “the animals who populate the fields become friends, and if the human figure is met with, it plays such an impersonal role that it concerns us only as if were a creature not like ourselves.”\(^ {13}\) Millet’s work should have presented “the countryside that we always desire”\(^{14}\); an urban release to peace and relaxation. Instead he offered the reality of a harsh life, and the incredible humanity required to live it.

\(^{11}\) Herbert, pg. 44.
\(^{12}\) Although completed at a later date than *The Quarriers, The Nut Gatherers* is very reflective of the academic peasant paintings shown contemporary to Millet’s works of the 1840s and 1850s.
\(^{13}\) Wasiutynski, *Decentralising the History of French Art*
\(^{14}\) Wasiutynski, *Decentralising the History of French Art*
Millet was not a social radical. His peasants were not about to overthrow the Bourgeois King. And yet it was this unchanging marginal stance in society which Millet most admired in his subject. You could be no closer to nature, and so no closer to dignity, than you were when you spent each day bound to the earth. To grasp Millet’s true motivation, it is best to consider the voice of the artist himself:

The peasant subjects suit my temperament best; for I must confess, even if you think me a socialist, that the human side of art is what touches me most.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{15} Herbert, 49.
Figure I. Millet, *The Quarriers*, oil on canvas, 1846 - 1847. Toledo Museum of Art.
Figure II. Millet, *The Sower*, oil on canvas, 1850. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
Figure III. Millet, *The Gleaners*, oil on Canvas, 1857. Paris, Musée d’Orsay.

Figure IV. Millet, *The Angelus*, oil on canvas, 1857 – 1859. Paris, Musée d’Orsay.
Figure V. Millet, *Shepherdess Leaning Against a Tree*, charcoal, 1857 – 1860.
Figure VI. Daumier, *The Uprising*, oil on canvas, 1848.

Figure VII. Bouguereau, *The Nut Gatherers*, oil on canvas, 1882. Detroit Institute of Arts.
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Suffering in Art: An Examination of the Self-Portraiture of Frida Kahlo and Nan Goldin

Emily Greer

Portraiture, an art critical to society, has served many purposes: preserving history, illustrating one’s vanity, or showcasing one’s wealth. Self-portraits hold a special place, being a more intimate and vulnerable portrayal of oneself. Frida Kahlo and Nan Goldin made use of the vulnerability and intimacy of self-portraiture in new ways during the last century. Frida Kahlo was involved in the Mexican mural movement and frequently used surrealist elements in her vivid and fantastical oil paintings. Her 1944 self-portrait, *Broken Column*, perfectly captures the essential elements of Kahlo’s style, using paint to create a dream-like landscape filled with symbolism and shocking juxtapositions. This painting captures a Frida that cannot be seen in the real world; she is nude and broken, completely vulnerable. Her invisible emotional and physical pain is externalized through self-portraiture. Working forty years later, Nan Goldin uses color photography to capture a real moment in *Nan One Month After Being Battered*. Like Kahlo, Goldin uses vivid colors and violent imagery to capture herself in a vulnerable and private way. Yet, unlike Kahlo, Goldin’s pain is very visible and external—a shocking reminder of an abusive relationship. Although Kahlo and Goldin’s suffering come from different places, they both use their art as a way to find relief from the pain. Frida Kahlo and Nan Goldin allow viewers to look intimately into their difficult and often violent lives through self-portraiture, but differ widely in their respective approaches—Kahlo paints herself in a vivid and fantastical, surrealist style while Goldin uses graphic color photography and multimedia presentation to capture her moment of pain.

Kahlo’s 1944 self-portrait entitled *Broken Column* shows a nude Kahlo from the waist up, covered partly by a cloth. Her skin is seemingly cut away, revealing a broken classical architectural column in place of her spine. Her torso is encased in a back brace and she is being attacked with small nails that pierce her face and body. In spite
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2 Ibid., 98.
of the tears that stream down her face, she stares defiantly out at the viewer. In the background, a barren and cracked landscape further amplifies the melancholy mood.

Working in New York City in the 1980’s, Goldin uses color photography to capture another type of violence. Her photograph, from *The Ballad of Sexual Dependency* series, shows her swollen and bruised face, framed by her curly hair and dark clothing. Despite her black and bloodshot eyes, she too gazes defiantly at her audience. She is made up and wearing fancy jewelry, the blood in her eye reflected in the red of her lipstick. The flash of the camera lends an added feeling of garishness and violence to the work. Typically, this work would be shown in a museum as part of a series, which features an accompanying soundtrack and deliberate order chosen by Goldin herself.

Although these works are very different in formal style and conception, they are alike on several levels. To begin with, both works show the intimate self-examination of two powerful, yet damaged women. Both Kahlo and Goldin have suffered much physical and emotional pain, yet in the face of that suffering they are defiant. When looking at the painting of Kahlo, the viewer is immediately struck by her eyes, which convey a mixture of sadness and strength. In the portrait of Goldin, her eyes seem to gaze out at the viewer with an identical look of perseverance and bravery in the face of pain and abuse. These gazes of strength are echoed in the bigger picture, that Kahlo and Goldin are putting their wounds on display for the world to see, a daring act in and of itself.

While the gazes of these women are strong, their bodies tell a different story. The images are similar in the sense that they both showcase the artist’s vulnerability through violent imagery. Both can be difficult to look at because of their shocking and confrontational violence. They create uncomfortable feelings in the viewer—Kahlo, through her violent use of symbolism and Goldin, by depicting her actual wounds.

Kahlo and Goldin’s motivations for creating these intimate and violent works are also similar. For each, art is a form of therapy. In an interview, Goldin remarks, “photography helps me survive.”

---

through her artwork that she finds an outlet for the loss and drama in her life. Kahlo has been using her art for the same purpose since the time she was bedridden, following a horrific bus accident. For both Kahlo and Goldin, art offers an escape from the trials they face in their everyday lives.

In a larger historical and societal context, their works are both important for their unique portrayal of women in portraiture. Kahlo’s and Goldin’s depictions of female beauty are radically innovative. Kahlo’s painting is a sort of negation of the female nude, depicting a female portrait that is transcending the genre’s origins in vanity and conventional beauty. Kahlo shows herself not as a beautiful, stoic, European female, but as a naked and emotional Mexican woman. Goldin’s photograph also partakes in this unconventional representation. Her face is battered and bruised; yet Goldin also uses conventional marks of attraction—in the photograph she is made up in red lipstick and jewelry.

Kahlo’s use of surrealist symbolism is one of the most fundamental differences between her work and Goldin’s. Kahlo’s work is dream-like and full of the double-meanings and ambiguous symbolism associated with Surrealism. Her body is encased in a back brace and a broken classical column (as alluded to in the work’s title), which replaces her spine. These images refer to her internal physical pain and suffering, while the nails that pierce her skin, the desolate landscape, and the tear of her flesh represent her emotional pain. In the work of Goldin, the fantastical imagery becomes reality. Goldin’s work embodies a realist style of photography, showing the viewer one actual moment in time. The fleeting instant of “Nan” is also suggestive of the snapshot aesthetic movement, as it captures an ordinary, yet very existent moment with a photograph.

Another key difference in the works is the meaning and history both artists are trying to communicate. Kahlo conveys the internal pain of many events from her past. The broken column and back brace are evocative of several accidental injuries she suffered as a young woman. She was immobilized in a metal brace and bedridden for months, during which she kept busy by painting self-portraits.
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8 Lowe, Sarah M. *University Series on Women Artists: Frida Kahlo*. 36.


11 Ibid., 24.
These injuries, along with a childhood bout of Polio, left Kahlo crippled and in pain for the rest of her life. Twenty years later, as her body glaringly disintegrated, Kahlo demonstrated her pain through *Broken Column.*

In addition to the work’s primary focus on Kahlo’s pain, the painting is also rife with religious allusion and a deeper reference to the emotional anguish she felt during most of her life, sometimes as a consequence of her physical disabilities. Brought up in the Catholic tradition, Kahlo was influenced by religious imagery, particularly Mexican ex-voto paintings, which are painted by an ill or injured person as an offering to a deity in return for recovery. In addition to painting herself using the language of the ex-voto, the nails that pierce her skin and the cloth covering her lower body are symbols alluding to Christ’s death on the cross. Kahlo presents herself as a sort of martyr in this way.

Like Kahlo, Goldin’s work is an icon of her painful past, but instead of speaking about an accidental injury and religion, Goldin reveals her history of domestic abuse and addiction. “Nan” functions as a single piece in a larger multimedia presentation, and reflects the show’s themes of sexual dependency. During this piece, Goldin flashes 700 color photographs on a screen for about 4 seconds each, while a soundtrack plays in the background. Many of these photographs are self-portraits, while the remaining photographs depict her close friends, often in sexual and intimate situations. All of these elements work together to depict the show’s themes of dependence on other people, sexual addiction and the violence that frequently accompanies it. While there are hundreds of images in the series, “Nan one month after being battered” stands out in that it reveals the sexual dependency of the photographer herself in a violent and shocking way.

This shocking violence emphasizes yet another fundamental difference in Kahlo and Goldin’s execution of pain. Kahlo paints in a metaphorical way, painting injuries that are invisible to the naked eye.
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16 Marcus, Greil. "Ballads Left Out of Nan Goldin’s Ballad of Sexual Dependency." 76.
17 Goldin, Nan. "If I Want to Take a Picture, I Take It No Matter What."
Her bodily pain and the accompanying emotional anguish are internal, but through the painting, they become visible to the spectator. Goldin’s pain is more obvious and external, yet with her photograph she makes it explicit. She documents a moment traditionally untouched by photography of the past, and brings her abuse into the realm of the viewer.

Although Nan Goldin and Frida Kahlo use diverse media to illustrate the pain they feel (and have felt), they both make claims that still resonate today. Kahlo, using dream-like surrealist imagery, captures a uniquely intimate portrayal of herself. Through her use of symbolism, Kahlo creates an imaginative narrative of her internal pain. Kahlo’s innovation in the 1940’s opened the door for Goldin to create her own intimate photographic narrative. These artists, in allowing self-portraiture to become a more revealing genre, changed the way the spectator envisions the genre. Through this openness, Kahlo and Goldin show both their vulnerability and strength in the face of misfortune.
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Legitimatizing the Dutch Republic through Artifice

Jodie Gorochow

An important convention in Dutch art of the seventeenth century is the utilization of artifice. The natural settings in Dutch landscape painting may appear as representative of the truth; however, these scenes escape reality and follow the conventions created and acknowledged by the artists and viewers. The cities of the Dutch Republic played an important role in the growth of the new unified nation as they were thriving urban centers of culture, trade, and productivity. Artists depicted specific views of the city to communicate to the viewers the strength, advantages, and reasons for the newly unified republic. Through the manipulation of nature and the emphasis on specific conventions, Dutch artists of the seventeenth century were able to convey the positive aspects of the unified republic, each in a multitude of ways. Three themes are often repeated through numerous urban landscapes. The themes of antiquity, technological developments, and agriculture are depicted in ways that emphasize and create a Dutch national pride. The artists who hone in on these themes are Albert Cuyp, with his renderings of famous ruins and castles, Aert van der Heyden and Jacob Van Ruisdael, who both depicted the veneration of the Dutch invention of the windmill, and lastly Paul Potter and Jan van der Heyden, with Adrian Van de Velde’s portraits of cattle. Through each artist’s techniques, every-day objects are heightened through artifice to function as tropes of pride in the newly formed Dutch nation.

The seventeenth century in the Netherlands is known as a time of great cultural prosperity, due to the formation of the Dutch Republic unifying several provinces. Although there was a central government, the provinces continued to hold the power. This freedom allowed for religious tolerance and cultural diversity throughout the republic. The advantage of the city was in its geographical location as the canals made traveling cheap and accessible. The Dutch took advantage of this access as imports from trading provided the source of an industrial development during the late sixteenth century. The urban city gave rise to population growth, which also contributed to not only the economic growth, but also the cultural growth of the Netherlands. Many Dutch artists lived and worked in the cities, specifically Haarlem.

and Amsterdam. The market and its consumers directly affected the artistic production in the cities. Artists profited by ensuring their work would appeal to the consumers of the market. This need for security gave rise to conventions in the formation of landscape painting.

Dutch landscape was one of the more popular genres of paintings produced for the art market in the seventeenth century. The meaning behind landscape painting is not merely in the place it is representing, but can also be found in the pictorial conventions used by the artist. The conventions are related to such elements as the weather, lighting, setting and the compositional layout purposely included by the artists. These conventions are an important part of landscape painting analysis because they were not only known and used by the artists but they were of public knowledge to the viewers and buyers. As these conventions are repeated through Dutch art, it is obvious that the artists manipulate the real landscape to fit within these formations. Many artists elevated the significance everyday Dutch symbols through artistic techniques of lighting and composition. Dramatizing the landscape by creating historical and allegorical relationship to the cityscapes is one-way artists fit cityscapes into the known conventions. Dutch cityscapes are not a mirror of the urban development manipulate the landscape through artifice to create a “traditional identity for the newly invented Dutch Republic.”

A repeated convention in Dutch cityscapes is the inclusion of antiquated buildings in works of the then present seventeenth century. Artists therefore are looking to the past and as a means of asserting a contemporary claim to legitimacy and justification for the newly unified Republic. One artist who produced many works in this theme was Albert Cuyp. One of his works from 1645 know as Landscape with the Ruins of Rijnsburg Abbey, depicts the deserted and unused Rijnsburg Abbey. In the shaded foreground there appear to be two men and their cattle facing the Abby with admiration. The figures’ gazes in
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the immediate foreground guides the viewer’s eyes to the Abbey. Here the ruins appear between the distant background and the figures. The structure’s composition has a distinct presence of desolation. The entire building lacks a roof and the walls all differ in heights. The windows have formed organic shapes rather than traditional geometric openings. The structure seems to be sinking into the ground and becoming one with the land as if the man-made structure is merging with nature. This same motif occurs simultaneously with another building in the landscape to the left of figures, as vines are overtaking the surface and the structure seems to blend into the background. In the distant background there appears to be another ruin, but the setting sun washes it away from its clarity. The glow over the background hills is a favorite technique of Cuyp that is repeated through many of his landscape paintings. This motif was adapted from Italian painters and adopted to symbolize the Golden Era of the Dutch seventeenth century. The warm glow of the distance contrasts significantly with the storm clouds in the foreground, which cast over the Abbey and the onlookers. The significance of the Abbey is important in the analysis of Cuyp’s work as historical memories are embedded in this building. The Abbey recalls the Spanish destruction on 1573 during their attack on Leiden. In the seventeenth century it became a constant reminder of the Spanish invasion and the destruction that event caused to not only the building but also to the pride of the Dutch. Cuyp references back to this history shared among Dutch citizens in a picturesque manner. The painting is almost ethereal with its organic structures and glow creating a whimsical view of nature. It is also important to point out what is not included in the depiction of the Abbey. After the destruction in 1573, the building was restored; however, this is not evident in Cuyp’s depiction. This exclusion underscores artifice of urban landscape as one can see it is not an accurate up to date view of the landscape. Monumentalized ruins in Dutch landscape are an attempt to share with the new Dutch Republic its past struggles that they overcame together; a history that gathers the people of the seven provinces of the Dutch Republic.

Other works of Cuyp include Dutch monuments that look to the past to assert the future. A favorite subject of Cuyp was the view of
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Nijmegen. In the View of Nijmegen with the Valkhof, 1652-55, the yellow glow of sunlight appears again in the distant background and travels into the foreground where men stand with their cattle. The foreground is compositionally broken by the horizontal and slight diagonal placement of the river. The river brings the viewer vertically across to the sight of the Valkhof, while simultaneously bringing the viewer to the background as the water reflects the glow of the sunlight. Valkhof is located in the middle ground on the right side of the composition and is situated on top of a hill. Although the building is across the water and at a distance from the figures in the foreground, it is highly detailed. As in the depiction of the Rijinsburg Abbey there is significance in the inclusion of the Valkhof, and the town in general. Nijmegen is known as the historical capital of the ancient Batavians. The Valkhof, the fort of this town has always had a strong hold since the medieval times. Nijmegen and the fort of Valkhof call to mind the ancient struggle for Dutch independence. This nationalistic myth reappears not only in painting but also in historical tales of the nation. The story of the Batavian revolt is an effort by the newly formed government to gain legitimacy by linking it to its past of struggles. This ancient Dutch history was used proclaim reason for the Dutch Republic’s presence as it was even commissioned to be rendered in the Town Hall.

The convention of depicting antiquated buildings and relating the stories they tell to the contemporary political structure of the seventeenth century was a key political strategy to provide a shared history of a new nation. This strategy is clearly depicted in Cuyp’s portrayal of the Dutch cities as the specific places included relate to this stories that all seven provinces share. His cityscapes allude to this greatness of the Dutch Republic through artistic techniques rather than creating an exact replica of the actual site. These landscapes clearly diverge from a photographic representation of the view.

Another trope featured in prominent cityscapes is that of depicting the technological inventions, which aided the Dutch cities in becoming a center of prosperity. The main symbol of this development is the inclusion of the windmill. This symbol was purely Dutch and became a reference to Dutch pride. The heightened status of the windmill can be seen through its artistic depiction. Most views of windmills were such that it functioned as the dominant figure or was centrally composed around. Just as the artist altered the viewers of the ruins in order to create a message, so were the landscapes of windmills. Usually, the windmill is depicted in an elevated position or with dramatic lighting. Aert van der Neer’s *Moonlight Landscape with Windmill*, 1650s incorporates these visual elements as the windmill is in the center of the composition and is surrounded by the glow of the moon. Van der Neer is known for representing nocturnal scenes with dramatic lighting and weather conditions.

In this particular painting, the landscape becomes almost monochromatic as it is a night scene and the windmill is obstructing the only source of light. In the foreground, there are two people in the darkness tending to their own land. The figures lead the viewers’ eye through the pictures traveling to the marshlands, ending upon a profile of this larger-than-life windmill. To the left of the windmill there is a city view of a town obscured by a mountain. To the right of the windmill there seems to be another windmill in the distance, but it is hard to make out as the shape is blurred. In the sky covering the marshlands, the layered clouds are only broken directly behind the windmill where the moonlight shines through. The windmill is given an aura as the moonlight composes a halo-like form around the structure. The manipulation of the lighting and placement of the windmill creates a heightened aura of the windmill. Van der Neer manipulates the natural setting to create the aura of the windmill, which became a symbol of pride and productivity in the Dutch nation. Just as artists harness nature to create a new way of looking, so do the windmills which use the power of nature and wind to create new mechanisms of farming, ultimately leading to the economic success of the cities and the republic as a whole.

Many other artists use artifice as a tool to manipulate viewers, which look to highlight a specific aspect. The elevation of the windmill is also clearly evident in Ruisdael’s *Windmill at Wijk*. Ruisdael depicts the windmill from a low vantage point, in turn, stressing the physical monumentality of the windmill. Through this low viewpoint the...
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windmill becomes the focal point of the composition as it overlooks the rest of the landscape. Ruisdael’s image of the windmill is very lively as there is human interaction with the windmill. In the foreground is the start of the path that leads the viewer into the painting and follows along the same path as the female figures, bringing the eye closer to this overpowering windmill. Although there is a path for the viewer to take to the mill, the scale of the figures to the windmill differs greatly, again showing the windmill in a higher position than the human. In Van der Neer’s depiction of the mill, the viewer sees a profile, where as now the viewer sees the back of the mill as the blades are pointing away from the viewer as they catch the wind and create a cyclical motion. The position of the windmill away from the viewer emphasizes the “heroic” presence of the mill and the power of natural forces.  

This force can also be seen visually through the clouds. Just as the clouds in Van der Neer’s painting open behind the windmill, here too the clouds open where the blades are pointing. This communicates God’s power of nature, and man’s ability to harness these forces. This ability to harness power also speaks to the Dutch’s ability to rule a great nation under God’s forces.

The windmill functions as a dominant figure in the composition compared to the church in the background. The comparison of scale between the religious site and the technological development show the importance of national productivity and economic success rather than religious unification. The Dutch Republic was known for religious tolerance as there was no central power to enforce one religion. Additionally, the natural setting in which the windmill is placed is a real location but because of the artist’s manipulation of weather, light, and scale the landscape loses touch with its reality and forms into a Dutch landscape made out of artifice. Once again, the desire to create unifying symbols such as productivity through the windmill is an attempt to underscore the pride of the unification of the Republic to the viewers and citizens. It is obvious that Ruisdael’s depiction of the windmill at Wijk is not representing the actual place, but the ideologies it represents through the artist’s artifice. Windmills are glorified in Dutch art, as they became the symbol for the
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Dutch Republic’s progress, economic success and the connection to a higher power of nature.

Agriculture is another mode of economic development contributing to cities achievements. Therefore the motif of cattle also becomes idealized, as it is a symbol for the Republic and its success. A typical depiction of cattle can be seen in Paul Potter’s *The Bull*, 1647. The animals are placed in a natural setting up on hill with a distant horizon in the background. The prominent figure in the composition is a standing bull, looking at the viewer. The animal’s muscles are so naturalistic that it is possible to see them under the brown and white-striped fur. The composition of the central figure resembles the form of a portrait. The act of creating a portrait brings importance to the figure and heightens its status. To the left of the standing bull are other animals, including another bull, two lambs and a ram. Behind the animals is a standing man who appears to be dressed in peasant clothing with a worker’s hat. Although there are other figures in the portrait of the bull, it still remains the focal point. The cattle industry is important to the Dutch Republic as the dairy industry provided a key economic source of national income.

The national symbol of the cow is juxtaposed with the prosperity of the city in Jan van der Heyden and Adrian Van de Velde’s *Bull in a City Street*, 1670. The bull is centered in the streets of Amsterdam, which in that time was rare to see as animals were prohibited in the city for health reasons. The bull’s neck is tied up, making the vigorous animal turn tame so that the viewer can now look at the bull for what it provides; the artist therefore creates an allegorical meaning where the products of the cow symbolize the success of the city. Van de Velde painted the portrait of the bull, as he became a specialist in depicting animals. Van der Heyden, a renowned cityscape painter, painted the background of the streets of Amsterdam. Viewers are able to locate themselves in Amsterdam as Van der Heyden depicts a recognizable building, the Saint Elizabeth Gasthuis that was behind the Town Hall. However at the time of 1670, this building was no longer there as it was burned down in 1625 and then torn down in the following years and replaced by a more classicized building. Van der Heyden is not only looking back by including an old building he is also looking forward, illustrating to the conscious viewers the ever-changing
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The combination of Van de Velde’s animals and Van der Heyden’s cityscapes, the painting comes together to speak to the prosperous urban world of the Dutch Republic, claiming pride in the nation.  

The three tropes of antiquity, technological advancements, and agriculture, all play a part in Dutch landscape painting to shape the viewer’s ideals of the newly formed Republic. By embedding a shared history, positive outcomes and national pride into the paintings, the Dutch Republic gained approval and legitimacy from the people. These tropes were formed through the artifice in creating urban imagery. Here is where the genius of Dutch art shines, in the artifice of the artists and thee undertones national pride in their emblems. The six works of these prominent Dutch artists all claim a justification for the unification and creation of the Dutch Republic through following set formulas of conventions known to the artist and consumer. In some way, the depictions of urban landscape serve and function as a sort of political propaganda in the seventeenth century Dutch republic.

18 George Keyes, “Adrian van der Velde” in Masters of Dutch Paintings: The Detroit Institute of Arts (Master Paintings from the Detroit Institute of Arts), (London: D. Giles Ltd, 2006), 103-106.
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The cartographic histories of Central Mexico are some of the most stunning examples of Mesoamerican art and served an important purpose for the peoples that created them. Elizabeth Boone puts it succinctly when she writes that the central point of these histories is to “describe the migrations of people from idealized and sacred points of origin to their final homelands and then usually to explain how the people settle, define their territory, and create an independent altepetl.” In short, she stresses how the cartographic histories form a cultural identity.

Indeed, the Mapa de Cuauhtinchan No. 2 of the 16th century exemplifies this idea (see Figure 1). The Mapa de Cuauhtinchan No. 2 (MC2), 109 x 204 cm and made of local paper, tells the migration story of the Chichimeca Cuauhtinchantlaca from their mythical place of origin, Chicomoztoc, to their homeland region of Cuauhtinchan. Like many Mesoamerican histories, this story is told through both text and image, and often the relationship between the two. Yet in the MC2, these two elements work differently on the right and left sides, delineated roughly by the blue river running vertically down the center of the map. In keeping with the respective story of either side, on the left features such as line, space, and composition accommodate and reinforce the Chichimeca Cuauhtinchantlaca history of origin and migration, whereas on the right they change in order to convey the establishment of Cuauhtinchan and substantiate its dominance. Despite this difference, the work remains cohesive; not only is the use of text consistent throughout the map, but the two stories ultimately achieve the same end in shaping the identity of the people of Cuauhtinchan.

Text is key in making certain that the Mapa de Cuauhtinchan No. 2 remains unified, especially since the map is a juxtaposition of two different narratives. Much of the text appears in the form of place
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glyphs. For Mixtecs and Aztecs of Mesoamerica, a major pictorial convention to denote place was a hill; a bell-like shape with a flat bottom, sometimes shown with slight curls on its outline. To create a toponym, or a place name, other images are embedded into the hill. For example, the green hill topped by a white grasshopper on the second yellow path down from the top left of the MC2 is identified by Bente Bittmann Simons as Chapultepec, or Grasshopper Hill. Indeed, text works identically on the right side of the map; a hill interposed with red and white flint knives on the far central right is likely to have been known by the Cuaauhtinchantlaca as something like Place of Flint, or Flint Hill. While the location of Flint Hill is unknown, it is clear that it is a glyph that names a specific location in the same way as Grasshopper Hill.

Date texts as well as toponyms are consistent throughout the MC2. For instance, a split in the yellow footprinted path near the left center is identified with the date 2 Eagle (Boone 2000: 176). This is shown by an eagle’s head and two dots attached to the yellow road by a thin black line, just below the split. Boone confirms that the Mixtecs and Aztecs created a date text by combining one of twenty day signs with a number between one and thirteen. Date signs punctuate migration paths and stops across the entire map; 2 Flint is attached to an event on the far right center involving a seated white-clothed figure atop a flat hill, while 2 Rabbit marks a point in a thin black footprinted line near the top central right. Toponyms on either side adhere to Mixtec and Aztec conventions for denoting place and date signs label events on the left in the same way as they do on the right. This is important in sustaining the map’s wholeness, since two narratives

30 Brittenham, “Aztec Writing in the 16th Century.”
operate side by side through separate visual repertoires on the Mapa de Cuauhtinchan No. 2.

Contours on the right side of the MC2 supplement the mythical origin and migration story of the Chichimeca Cuauhtinchantla. For example, the yellow path imbued with black footprints meanders tightly. Eleanor Wake argues that this “serpent road” is uniquely central to the MC2 in relation to other Mesoamerican cartographic histories.32 Here, the yellow road begins at Cholula, continuing on to Chicomoztoc; the mythical seven caves that represent a place of origin to many post classic Nahua-speaking peoples.33 Descending downward from Chicomoztoc, the road meanders regularly left and right, creating tight contours that are inherently serpentine. What is more, Wake demonstrates that on the right center of the MC2 the road even splits like a bifurcated tongue.34 This division of the road parallels a discordant event involving the Chichimecs happening in the adjacent space; while exchanging “fiery-red words,” or red speech scrolls, the Chichimecs also take down their opponents with arrows.35 Here, Wake clearly reveals how the organization of the road is directly related to the narrative.36 The division and strife of the migration journey is suggested through figures engaged in battle, but the physical split in the road makes this even more visceral for the viewer.

Moreover, contoured components apart from conflict and separation enhance other crucial parts of the mythical migration story on the MC2’s left side. For example, the translucent, black curves emanating from two scenes of Chichimec “transformation” near the lower right of the MC2 echo the serpentine quality of the road and also help to tell the tale of migration.37 According to Florine Asselbergs, the idea of transformation was integral to the Chichimec origin story, and the way the MC2 shows moments of change reveals how the Chichimecs constructed their identity.38 Indeed, the smoky, swirling,

32 “Stories Iconic Coding and the Historical Narrative of the Mapa De Cuauhtinchon No.2.” in Cave, City, and Eagle’s Nest. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 2007), 206.

33 Boone, “Stories of Migration, Conquest, and Consolidation in the Central Valleys,” 175.

34 “Stories Iconic Coding and the Historical Narrative of the Mapa De Cuauhtinchon No.2.” 206.
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wind-like quality of the abovementioned black curved lines conveys confusion, something one would expect to encounter within a story of identity formation. Contours on the right side of the MC2, including the serpentine road and curved winds, support the mythical origin story by visually communicating discord and transformation, respectively. Therefore, discord and transformation were inherent to a Chichimec identity.

In addition to these contours, the MC2’s left side contains little blank space in comparison to the right side. Certainly, this crowded quality is a product of the tightness of the serpent road, yet it also contributes to the cultural history of the Chichimeca Cuauhtinchantlaca. When glancing at the map from a distance, it is clear that the left side boasts much less white empty space than the left, replete with yellow footprinted paths, event scenes, and places. While the right also contains these elements, they are much more spread out. Although this crammed composition is attributed to the fact that the left side was more a lengthy itinerary than a map, this quality also simplifies a complex and long story of migration for the Cuauhtinchantlaca by actually compressing the events of the story.

A tight organization suggests a tangible, comprehensible history whereas a loose composition suggests a history that is hard to pin down. Indeed, this is supported by Dana Liebsohn’s own work on the relationship between cartographic histories and Central Mexican identity. She contends that one of the most important elements of identity is memory; people come to think of themselves, or a community, as an “independent and autonomous entity” through the passage of time and events. Without a doubt, having a well-defined “memory,” or history, of themselves as a people was essential for the Cuauhtinchantlaca to form a group identity. While the MC2’s left side is more of a lengthy historical tour rather than a map, the tightness that results from this aids in memory by physically constricting the history of the Chichimeca Cuauhtinchantlaca. Although constricted, this history still highlights crucial aspects of identity formation, such as the events of transformation and discord discussed before. As a result, the

41 Leibsohn, “Primers for Memory: Cartographic Histories and Nahua,” in Writing Without Words: Alternative Literacies in Mesoamerica and the Andes, 161-162.
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left side of the MC2 provides a manageable yet unique and specific historical memory that the people of Cuauhtinchan could effortlessly incorporate into their identity.

In contrast, the wide blank spaces of the MC2’s right side convey vastness, but not closure. This is because the map’s right side supports a narrative of ongoing establishment, rather than a finite history. In other words, the left side highlights events and places visited in Chichimeca Cuauhtinchantlaca history, while the right side functions more as a map, illustrating the altepetl of Cuauhtinchan as the creators of the MC2 knew it, or wanted it to be known. According to Ann Clair Seiferle-Valencia, the altepetl is the main Mesoamerican political body: a local area, in which the central city and ruler(s) are essential. Additionally, she writes that the altepetl is not “a static, empty construct,” but rather a dynamic structure that encompassed all aspects of life, ceremonial, political and otherwise. Boone observes this in the MC2, arguing that moving from the left to the right the historian of the MC2 “shifts his graphic structure from a tour to a tableau.” To be sure, emphasis on the right side is on the geography, territorial boundaries, and dependent polities. For example, naturalistic mountain ranges are illustrated on the top and bottom of the MC2’s right side, suggesting an attempt to situate Cuauhtinchan’s location in relation to known features of geography. Indeed, Boone confirms that the upper white-peaked mountain is Orizaba, while the lower mountains represent the Tentzon mountain range. In addition, straight, thin, black and red lines parcel the vast space into sections, indicating boundary lines. Finally, thin footprinted lines represent not
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the mythical migration path, but connections between the different polities of Cuauhtinchan.  

While the left side’s tightness provides a concrete mythical history needed for identity formation, the right side’s vastness creates a tableau whose main focus is on the here and now, including geography, boundaries and connections that established and constituted the altepetl. However, I argue that this visual articulation of the present is equally important to Chichimeca Cuauhtinchantlaca identity formation. Images on the right side of the Mapa de Cuauhtinchan No.2 advance an intimate understanding of the altepetl, such that the people of Cuauhtinchan could realize themselves as an “independent and autonomous entity” with a unique cultural identity.  

While the right side includes ample white space, it also employs a centralized composition. This arises from the fact that the altepetl is not a fixed concept, but rather a continually transforming structure embodying the activities of everyday life. In short, the fluid nature of the altepetl makes it susceptible to change and in need of stability. In order to assert and maintain the structure of an altepetl, it would seem that the creators of cartographic histories would place the main city centrally, with lesser cities emanating outwards. Seiferle-Valencia supports this contention, stating that an illustration of a central capital and ruler encircled by places and defined by boundaries is a common way to show the altepetl.  

Without question, “Cuauhtinchan dominates its region visually” in the Mapa de Cuauhtinchan No. 2. The place sign of Cuauhtinchan, an eagle and a jaguar in a cave, is situated in a horizontal, greenish mountain range in the middle of the MC2’s right side, with its dependent polities surrounding it. The right side’s orientation around the city is made plainer when one considers that surrounding polities make a loose square shape with Cuauhtinchan as its center. For example, a yellow footprinted path originating at Cholula in the center descends downward, cuts across the right bottom edge, ascends to the top after meandering briefly, moves horizontally along the top edge, until finally descending downward again in completion of
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a loose square shape. Indeed, the yellow footprinted path’s adherence to edges on the right side is in stark contrast to the serpentine behavior of the yellow footprinted path on the left. Additionally, the mountains of Cuauhtinchan are flanked by several white-robed seated rulers on the right, and because this conglomeration of nobles is not matched anywhere else on the map, it further draws attention to the centrality of the city.

Clearly, the creator(s) of the MC2 desired to accentuate Cuauhtinchan’s centrality, for they did so in many ways. In making Cuauhtinchan the focal point of the right side of the map, they hoped to legitimize the city’s political and religious authority in the region in hopes that it would continue. In doing so, the creators of the MC2 were not only providing additional evidence for the independent agency of Cuauhtinchan, but making a cultural claim about the people who lived there. It is easy to see how any person might incorporate greatness and dominance into their cultural identity by viewing the Mapa de Cuauhtinchan No. 2.

In contrast, the composition of the MC2’s left side is decentralized. This type of layout goes hand in hand with the mythical migration history that the left story presents, for this story is basically linear. While there are clearly elements that are emphasized, such as Cholula and Chicomoztoc, these are merely bigger in scale than lesser places and events, but not central to the left side as Cuauhtinchan is to the right. The decentralized composition, combined with the highlighting of the most important historical events, allows for an easy reading of Chichimec history and therefore facilitates the “memory” that is crucial to realizing one’s ethnic identity. For example, Cholula to the left of the vertical river, the seven caves of Chicomoztoc in the upper left corner, and a new fire drilling ceremony below Chicomoztoc are clearly highlights in the story of the left side because of their bigger size in contrast to other places and events. Again, Boone confirms that that the story begins at Cholula and from there the Toltecs travel to Chicomoztoc to ask for Chichimec aid, just before ceremoniously drilling new fire. Yet, while these events are emphasized, they are not centrally located because the left side’s narrative is linear. This decentralized composition makes a historical reading of the left side easier, thereby further facilitating cultural memory and identity formation.
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The meanings of the Mapa de Cuauhtinchan No. 2, like many Mesoamerican histories, is conveyed largely through text, image, and the interaction between the two. Although all of the map’s text adheres to the conventions of 16th century Mixtec and Aztec writing systems, the MC2 is standout in how it manipulates image to accommodate two different, yet complimentary messages within its borders. The left side’s contoured lines, constricted space, and decentralized composition develop the Chichimeca Cuauhtinchantlaca history of origin and migration, thereby providing a tangible cultural memory required for identity formation. On the other hand, the straight lines, abundant empty space, and centralized composition of the right side aids in a thorough understanding of the establishment of Cuauhtinchan while also defining the city as a religious and political power. Although each side’s visual repertoires accommodate different narratives, they ultimately work towards the same goal. It is only through incorporation of a concrete historical memory, an understanding of their cultural establishment, and a sense of the character of their altepetl that the people of Cuauhtinchan could completely realize themselves as an independent people with a unique identity.

A final thought concerns Elizabeth Boone’s argument that the blank spaces in cartographic histories are “empty moments and empty places in a story, times and places that do not figure in the history.” Yet, in their vastness the blank spaces of the MC2’s right side induce a feeling of incompleteness, begging to be filled. Indeed, the representation of the altepetl of Cuauhtinchan in the MC2 suggests an unfinished story, reminding us that identities are never fixed.
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Figure 1. Mapa de Cuauhtinchan No. 2
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Birth, Death, Rebirth: Shunga, Censorship, Araki

Jessie Lipkowitz

Nobuyoshi Araki is one of Japan’s most famed photographers, notorious and infamous for his provocative, erotic, and highly sexualized images of women. His photographic representations, like the art and iconography of the more ancient Edo period, are highly controversial and in some ways misunderstood. Araki’s socio-political agendas can be observed in his artworks, which are much more complex than they initially appear. Through visual analyses of two of his selected works, one from Araki: Self, Life, Death and another from his series of Koshoku Paintings, juxtaposed with the woodcut The Dream of a Fisherman’s Wife by Katsushika Hokusai, this paper promotes an interpretation of Araki’s work as a revival and reinvention of the ancient art form of Shunga emancipated and advanced in a different artistic medium.

The work of Araki seemingly pays homage to past conventions of Japanese society through the use of traditional elements that include the kimono, personifications of Shinto deities, and tatami flooring. Araki creates his own floating world, through the use of kinbaku (the art of tying knots with ropes), which literally and figuratively elevates his subjects into a virtual world in which the women, the viewer, and Araki with his camera participate. The work of Araki releases Japanese art from the outdated censorship that is symbolic of the country’s recent past by reinstating the sexual freedom indicative of the Edo period. Araki uses both his animosity toward and mockery of this old-school censorship to develop revolutionary and new wave art forms that attempt to disentangle social taboos regarding erotic subject matter. With no concern for his international presence, he submerges himself in the promotion of a quirky culture representative of his personal and national identity, unconcerned with understanding or appeasing Western notions.

Prior to addressing the cunning reaffirmation of Shunga ideals by Araki, it is important to discuss the ancient art form as its own separate entity. The dawn of the Edo period in Japan in the early 1600’s brought with it the advent of erotic and semi-pornographic imagery to which Japanese culture had not previously born witness. This iconography was mainly constrained to the medium of wood block
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culture and collectively became categorized under the name of *Shunga*, literally translating to “*spring pictures*”\(^3\). This visually arresting and crude imagery flourished as a form of visual culture during this era due to the unique backdrop of commercialism and consumerism that the city of Edo itself provided. “*Shunga* can best be understood as one telling manifestation among many of a complex and greatly expanded *circulation of desire* that marks the Edo period, an economy defined by all sorts of material practices in every aspect of life, and not merely by the representation of its sexual practices, narrowly defined as sex acts”\(^4\).

In the pleasure quarters of Edo, the hierarchy of citizens became insignificant. There was a blending of status through means of courtesan-ship and sexuality—sexuality that was not constrained by government or religion\(^5\). There was a large demographic within this un-segmented realm that supported the demand market for the production of *spring pictures*—which was remarkably not limited to male patronage. Edo, as a tangible place rooted in Japan’s topography, transcended itself as a virtual world through the use of licensed pleasure districts. Places like Yoshiwara in Edo provided a safe venue for the visual tradition of *Shunga* to materialize. *Shunga* as an art was an active participant in this inflated floating world.

The woodcut, *The Dream of a Fisherman’s Wife*, crafted and published by Hokusai in 1814, serves as a prime example of the sexual freedom and expressionism inherent to this genre of art and economy of desire that defined the Edo period\(^6\). The artist replaced the male genitalia with a similarly phallic form, the tentacles of the octopus. The geisha is entangled with two octopi, one small and one large. The smaller of the two kisses the woman while seductively wrapping his tentacle around her left nipple. The larger octopus’ role is slightly ambiguous; he is either performing cunnilingus or mating with the constricted woman. The tentacles of the two animals seem to bind the woman, adding to the eroticism and exaggeration of the image, fixing the woman in position while accentuating her feminine forms. The geisha herself, depicted with the contemporary ideal of white skin, grasps the tentacles of the animals, compliantly subjecting herself to the act of bondage. The beauty is locked into position by the physical
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attributes of the beasts, but there is no evocation of brutality, repugnance, or aggressiveness. There is a visual understanding and implication of willingness on the part of all three participants that engage in this multifaceted sex act.

The Dream of a Fisherman’s Wife also encompasses the Shinto religion or kami tradition that made resurgence during the Edo period. The Shinto religion was intrinsically sexually curious in both myth and practice, aiding the exploitation of sexual exploration in Shunga. The kami tradition promoted a playful and whimsical attitude towards sex and sexuality, discarding any attachment of shame culture. This worldview heavily influenced erotic artists and its reflection is clearly seen in woodblock imagery. The use of the octopi by Hokusai reinforces the Shinto belief in animism that spirits exist not only in human form, but also as animals, plants, and other natural phenomena. In Shunga, any representation of spirits, regardless of physical stature or appearance became appropriate material to incorporate into the sexual trials and tribulations innate to these spring pictures.

―Censorship [during the Edo period] did exist, of course, but the government was not after pornography so much as materials it regarded as seditious and capable of leading to social disorder‖. Freedom of sexual expression, whether performed in the pleasure districts or illustrated in art, was not a highly ranked issue of government concern. This dramatically changed when a US senator in the 1870’s declared that Japan was “a country of nudity, lewdity, and crudity”. The Japanese government became convinced that the perceptual image of being a sexually liberated nation was a negative one, subordinate to Western ideologies. Correcting this international appearance became an obsession that spurred the movement towards strict censorship laws that became ever present in issues surrounding Japanese (erotic) art. The morphology of these censorship laws over the decades is too great an issue for this paper to eloquently present or discuss. However, in order to fully understand and appreciate the works of Nobuyoshi Araki, the general existence and motivation
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behind these laws restricting different levels of sexual obscenity are important to identify.

“Araki contends that sexuality is ever linked with the cycle of birth, death, [and] rebirth…”\(^\text{12}\). It is logical that Araki associates sexuality with this inexorably continuous cycle. With the advent of *Shunga*, there was literally a “birth” of explicit sexuality that had never before been expressed in art. This illusionistic sensuality was quickly followed by its “death” that was forcefully induced by government suppression. The blatantly sexual works of Araki nicely complete the third step of the cycle – the “rebirth”. “What [Araki] do[es] with obscenity is in the tradition of the Edo period’s spring pictures [pornographic woodblock prints]…. Maybe the future trend is not for “spring pictures” but for “spring photos”…”\(^\text{13}\).

The works of Araki at their most primitive level can therefore be viewed as the reincarnation of *Shunga* culture and ideology as well as propagation for the rejection of past notions of censorship, which were constructed under the ruse of Westernizing Japan. Araki, in his documentary *Arakimentari*, promotes only the rehabilitation of Japanese (erotic) culture, with no desire to photograph outside the boundaries of his country. Araki encapsulates a sense of cultural heritage and national pride within his works, which are models of resistance, reacting to both government restraint and the assimilation of Japan into Western mentalities.

Araki, in his dialogue of reinventing the sexual expressionism of the past, attempts to work out the social taboos that inevitably coupled with the government regulation of genitalia in art. “[H]e in part [aims] to teach people that genitalia [are] not obscene in themselves; it’s the act of hiding them that is obscene”\(^\text{14}\). In his series of *Koshoku* photographs, Nobuyoshi Araki incorporates abstract and colorful painting into his works. The paint itself was used in various instances to highlight the enhanced vulgarism that results from the act of hiding genitalia. An example of this intentional perversion is seen in the image of the bound woman from the *Koshoku* sequence (image 2).

The object of the picture, the suspended woman, has strokes of red and green paint streaming out of her vagina, both of which seem to recall notions of fertility. The green paint stimulates paradigms of nature and the red alludes to female menstruation. The application of the paint draws the viewer’s attention directly to the genital region of


\(^\text{14}\) Ibid.
the woman. The vantage point of the image was completely changed, due to the masking of the natural feminine form. The outcome of the image is much more crude, especially in contrast to other erotic art forms like the woodblock print by Hokusai and the image from *Araki: Self, Life, Death* (image 3). In fashioning the series of Koshoku prints, Araki used “obscenity laws… to create new art”\(^\text{15}\). The government ban ultimately assisted in Araki’s production of a revolutionary new art form—painted photographs.

The constrained and abstrusely painted woman recalls the form of the octopi in *The Dream of a Fisherman’s Wife*. The ropes used bind the woman in the same way that the tentacles of octopi in the woodcut by Hokusai visually stimulate an act of bondage. The feminine forms of both women are emphasized and heightened due to the agencies of constriction, the tentacles and the rope. The subject of Araki’s photograph, like the geisha in the woodcut, voluntarily surrenders herself to this suspended, hovering sex play.

However, tying up women is more than a simple act of bondage for Araki. “The Kinbaku is the Japanese art of tying knots with ropes. It’s different from bondage [according to Araki]. [He] only tie[s] up women’s bodies because [he] knows that [he] cannot tie up [their] hearts. Only [their] physical parts can be tied up. Tying up a woman becomes an embrace”\(^\text{16}\). The exploit of bondage for Araki is neither brutally violent nor threateningly sadistic, a common misconception of his work. His dialogue in *Arakimentari* as well as the compliance, willingness, and desire of his female models demystifies these universal misinterpretations.

Araki’s motivation behind binding and photographing women is therefore threefold: First, it is a further attempt to mimic and advance the sexual experimentation of the Edo period. Araki takes the sexual liberation of the Edo era to an entirely new level by photographing animate models. The sexual autonomy from the *Shunga* woodblocks that Araki recreates is brought to life through the use of his flesh and blood muses that both advertise and invent a market for this liberation of sexuality. Secondly, the suspension and positioning of the women creates parallelism between the floating world of *Shunga* and a literal floating world constructed by Araki in which he, the subject, and the viewer participate. *Shunga* during the Edo period was an inanimate participant that helped to perpetuate and enhance the fame of the floating world. Araki plays on this notion of virtuality; by suspending women, he ultimately creates a literal floating world that he then

\(^{15}\) Ibid.

photographs. His images, like *Shunga*, become participants in a conceptualized and controlled virtual reality. Lastly, the bondage becomes an incorporation of yet another conventional art form, *kinbaku*.

The image from the collected works of Araki: *Self, Life, Death* (image 3), like the former photograph, is a complex commentary on traditional conventions of Japan’s past. The woman herself has extremely pale skin, playing on the time old notion of beauty, evocative of the floating world of the geisha. The skin tone of the woman parallels the female subject in the woodblock by Hokusai. The positions of the two female figures are also analogous if rotated counterclockwise (approximately 135 degrees). Both characters are willingly submissive, unthreatened by the presence of unusual creatures (arguably *kami* spirits) in their sexual realm. The small lizard placed on the left thigh of the Araki’s subject fulfills the same two roles as the octopi in *The Dream of a Fisherman’s Wife*. The toy lizard is an obviously phallic symbol, replacing the classic icon of the male penis. It is also a reflection of animism stemming from the ancient tradition of *Shinto*. Several works of Araki in his compilation *Desire and the Void* contain similar lizards, snakes, and other monsters, both plastic and real, that aim to allude to these *Shinto* spirits from Japanese antiquity. The woman in the photograph also wears a traditional Japanese *kimono* that has been carefully contorted and artistically placed to expose her genitalia. The bed on which the woman lays covers the majority of the tatami flooring, positioned in even intervals across space, which also nicely characterizes the Edo period.

Nobuyoshi Araki with his explicit, obscene, and controversial photographs of highly eroticized women completes the cycle of birth, death, and rebirth of sexuality. He revives and reinvents the ancient ideals of *Shunga*, through his photography of nude models, progressing the liberation of sexual expressionism to an entirely new and more realistic level. While his photographs don’t perfectly mirror the ancient woodblock art in context or form, they maintain traditional elements including the animism of *Shinto* religion as well as habitual daily items like the *kimono* and tatami flooring that were ever present during the Edo period throughout Japan. In addition to maintaining conventions of Japan’s past, Araki also virtually recreates the floating world of Edo in a modern day context, by suspending women using the art of *kinbaku*. His photographs capture the woman participating in this created world and they promote and sell this reincarnated sexual
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freedom, just as Shunga operated in the economy of desire in antiquity. The motivating forces behind Araki’s work include working out social taboos and superstitions that inevitably bonded with government regulations of obscenity in art. Araki rejects the notion of appeasing Western cultures and promotes both cultural pride and heritage in his work by mainly photographing in Tokyo as well as in other parts of Japan. After visually analyzing a mere two photographs done by this famously contentious artist, it becomes apparent that his inspirations and intentions are much more intricate and versatile than they immediately appear.
Images

Image 1. *The Dream of a Fisherman’s Wife* by Hokusai, 1814

Image 2. *Japan Exposures*. 
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Gender and Genealogy in the Codex Becker II

Galina Stefadu

Codex Becker II (also known as Codex Columbino-Becker) comprised of four pages and thought to be completed in about the eleventh or twelfth century, is a fragment of a screen fold illustrating an “annotated” Mixtec genealogy. This genealogy, divided by a horizontal red line, shows a primary, male line of succession on the bottom half, and a secondary, female line of succession originating in the primary line and crossing to the top half (Fig. 1-4).

The primary line, depicted in color, shows a series of figures grouped by twos: two figures sit face-to-face on a mat pointing at each other, identifying them as a separate entity within the series. In Mixtec art, the placement of two figures on a mat, face-to-face is the pictorial convention for marriage. So, nine sets of married couples horizontally line the codex one after the other, indicating that this text must be read linearly, left to right as Nowotny relays. Adhering to Mixtec conventions, each figure has a personal name glyph and a calendar name attached to him/her by a thin black line. These glyphs vary in size but generally occupy the space between or above each couple. Place glyphs, in this primary line, are unnecessary as the succession of this genealogy is traced in one place.

Two other sets of lines exist. One connects a place glyph with the figure sitting on the right side of the mat. The dress of this figure – a long skirt, a triangular quechquemitl, and a colorful braided hair
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19 On a side note, Monaghan claims that genealogies are performed as “ritualized public readings” – they are guided by established pictorial conventions that help the speaker know what to say and how to say it. This, however, does not seem to apply to the Codex Becker II as the repetition of stock-figures and lack of action would seem to claim that this story is not meant to be acted out.
20 Gestures of pointing can possibly be interpreted as “accepting” – see Troike, 1982 and also, Fig. 10.
23 In speaking of one figure, I am referring to all of them (in this paragraph).
dress – identifies her as female. The footprints, leading from the place glyph to the woman, indicate that the woman originated from that place. The other line, usually between the primary couple on the mat, begins at the feet of a woman and extends past the horizontal red line to the figure of another woman (Fig. 2: second couple). Linking the primary woman, and more so the couple, to the woman above the red line shows that this second woman is the daughter of the couple in the primary line. This woman sits on a mat across from a man – again, suggesting marriage. The mats used in this secondary line of succession combine place glyphs with marriage mats perhaps to conserve space.\(^{24}\) The attached glyphs presumably tell us who she is and where she has gone. As such, two lines of genealogy are presented – one showing the female line of succession, and the other, the primary line, which by virtue of not being the female line, is the line of male succession.

This apparently straightforward genealogy is actually quite complex upon closer look. The appearance of colored and non-colored figures, the gender-ambiguous individual replacing the expected male in the sixth couple of the primary line, the anomaly of the eight couple’s marriage mat – having a green background with blue diagonal lines instead of a blue line above a green line, the omission of the fourth couple’s marriage mat in the secondary line, the inclusion of each couples’ daughter(s), but the exclusion of any male progeny which does not continue the primary line of succession – these are all small, seemingly inconsequential, and easily-overlooked details that when analyzed, complicate and question the construction, purpose, audience, and reading of this manuscript.

Questions of Color and Lack Thereof

As noted, the primary line of succession is shown in color and the secondary in black and white; the line and footprints attaching the wives of the primary line to their respective place glyphs are also black and white. This division between sketched parts of the manuscript and colored parts questions the construction of this manuscript. Was this contrast intended or is it a mark of incompleteness? Were the sketched parts perhaps not completed at the same time as the colored ones?

Certainly, the purpose of having sketched and colored figures could be a means of distinguishing the primary line from the secondary line of succession. Just as well, this dichotomy between sketched and

colored could be a sign of incompletion. However, in looking closely at the manuscript it can be deduced that the sketched and colored figures were not necessarily drawn at the same time. Each couple within the primary line is shown to have its own pictorial space in which the personal name and calendar glyphs of each figure are given enough room so that they do not impose upon the space of any other figure or glyph. The sketched lines, figures, and place glyphs, however, seem to be crowding the space of the colored figures. On the second page the woman of the third couple has a conventional hill-place glyph attached to her by the foot-printed line (Fig. 5 and 5a). This place glyph is wedged between her name glyph (to the point where it even touches the glyph) and the name glyph of the man of the following couple. The proximity between colored figures and non-colored figures as also seen with the other two women of the primary line on page two would seem to indicate that these black and white figures were not accounted for originally (Fig. 2). Comparing the space left for each colored figure to the lack of space each black and white figure is given, shows that the scribe did not foresee the addition of these sketched figures. Moreover, since a primary line of succession must exist before a secondary one, it would be logical to say that the black and white figures came after the colored ones.

In the secondary line of succession it would make sense for the daughters to be directly above the couple from which they descended as an effective visual way of showing her direct succession. Yet, in two of six cases this is not done. The first couple on the third page has two daughters and although the one daughter-couple is drawn directly above the parent couple, there is not enough space for the second daughter-couple, so this secondary couple is thereby spatially between the parent-couple and the next primary line couple (though, of course, above the divisionary red line). Since this second daughter-couple imposes on the space of the next daughter-couple, that one must be moved even further to the right.

In other depictions of succeeding daughter from parents where the daughter-couple is directly above the parent-couple, the line and footprints leading to the daughter should, supposedly, go straight up, were each detail spatially planned out. However, this too is not the case. The line of the first couple connecting the mother and the daughter originates behind the mother and must proceed around her, to the left, before crossing the red line to meet the daughter. In short, if some daughter-couples are moved to the right to make up for the lack of room, this is a case where the line connecting the parent-couple to the daughter-couple is the one making spatial adjustments. These observations clearly indicate that the scribe did not leave room for the
space that would be needed to accommodate these couples comfortably. Thus, the daughter-couples and the wives’ place glyphs were maneuvered and squeezed into where they could be fit after the primary line of succession had been completed.

Another detail of note, regarding the black and white sketches, is seen at the end of page three and on page four of the codex. If previous wives’ place glyphs were fit wherever they could be, crowding the pictorial space, then the seventh, eighth, and ninth couples’ wives’ place glyphs were placed directly next to their respective figures not interfering with any other pictorial figure (Fig. 6). Here, it is evident that the scribe was aware these place glyphs would need room and thus he/she accounted for this space. This, combined with the anomaly of the eight couples’ marriage mat – the difference being the pictorial depiction as already described – suggests that the seventh wife’s place glyph and all the following primary couples were not painted at the same time as the first six couples of the primary line. Furthermore, the room left for the place glyphs implies that the last page of the codex and the black and white sketches were completed at the same time.

Although the significance of the black-and-white figures is unclear, assuming that the variation in spatial dynamics is indicative of them being a later addition and given that most of these figures are female, it would stand to reason that a particular interest in the female figure emerged with these later sketches.

The Female Interest

Certainly, the primary line of succession, by virtue of its inclusion of females, shows that the Codex Becker II has an interest in the female figure. After all, unlike other Mixtec codices, such as Codez Zouche-Nutall which show genealogies through the male line without any depiction of female figures, the Codex Becker presents a balance of equality by depicting both the male and the female. And the fact that both male and female were given the same weight of importance – as evidenced by their similar proportions, the same use of pictorial space, the depiction of both female and male personal names and calendar glyphs – is a show of at least moderate interest in the female. However, given that “Mixtec women …apparently co-ruled the family’s territories…at times, when a Mixtec kind died, his wife thenceforth ruled alone…”25 the genealogy’s illustration of these
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women as equals of these men can hardly be surprising. Moreover, as Elizabeth Boone explains, Mixtec genealogies are documents created for the nobility as a means of asserting legitimacy in the case questions of succession arise. As such, it would be in the interest of Codex Becker II’s patrons to include the wives of the ruling men.

Portraying these details about the daughters’ succession and marriages and showing where the wives came from is not essential to the reading of a principal line of genealogy. So it is this particular attention given to specifically the female succession and female-associated place glyphs that demonstrates a clear interest in the female figure. Besides, the fact that the only male line of succession depicted is the primary one (omitting second or third sons) further highlights this interest in the female figure. This could, of course, be a fact of biology – after all, the interest in having children could abate after a male heir was produced and thus it can be reasoned that all of the daughters would have been older sisters. Nonetheless, it seems highly unlikely for nine consecutive generations to have had only one son. Moreover, the fact that Mixtec rulers could have been women would seem to claim that any of those successive daughters could have continued the primary line of genealogy. The place glyphs, however, maintains otherwise. So, even though it is not evident who would choose to exclude a secondary line of male successors, it can be construed that this exclusion is purposeful and that its effect is one of a particular emphasis on the females of this genealogy.

Female Power

The commission of such a genealogy would require power and wealth, implying that it was produced for a noble family. And the purpose of a royal genealogy is essentially to tell a tale of power – who succeeded whom, who married whom, and which alliances were created. This could be done to form a legal or historical document, to keep the progeny informed of their ancestors, or simply for one’s own self-pride. Such a story can be seen in the Codex Becker II. Codex Becker II, unlike Codex Becker I and Codex Zouche-Nuttall which trace the story of Eight Deer Tiger Claw (Fig. 7), is interested in showing a full-scale genealogy – a story of about power involving multiple individuals. This narrative of power is depicted using female figures. The idea of female power is certainly not a new one as precedence is seen in the in Codex Selden with the story of Lady 6 Monkey (Fig. 8)

told from beginning to end, occupying a whole three pages. Codex Selden explains how Lady 6 Monkey “attacks and captures Lord Six Lizard and Lord Two Crocodile at Hill of the Moon/Hill of the Insect in the year 13 Rabbit, days 3 Grass to 4 Reed” (FAMSI: Codex Selden). As such, the presence of female power elsewhere in Mixtec codices bolsters the reading of this manuscript in terms of the female.

In Codex Becker II, special care is taken in notating where each wife originated from and where/to whom each daughter went, indicative of an interest in “location.” However, the actual interest at stake here is not merely showing where women went and where they came from, but rather showing what alliances they were able to create by going to and coming from different places. Here, the women are shown as the force, by virtue of marriage, behind this dynasty’s succession and thus, its power. Furthermore, the fact that the line of succession is shown precisely from the feet of the female parent to the feet of the daughter (rather than having the line start between the parent couple and lead to the space between the daughter-couple) is another nod to the female interest this text holds.

Why women are so crucial to the formation of this dynasty, or rather, why this manuscript depicts them as such, is left to speculation. Men, after all, could just as easily have gotten married and spread the breadth of this royal lineage’s power. However, the purpose of focusing specifically on women can only be to highlight their importance.

The Case of the Gender-Ambiguous Individual

The interest in gender is not solely limited to the female. The primary line of the genealogy shows two type cast figures standing in for man and woman. The men are depicted with short black hair, and a partly striped red tunic sitting on the left; the women, always sitting on the right, recognizable due to their colorful braided hair dresses, their triangular quechquemilts, and their long partly-striped blue skirts (Fig. 1-4). The individuality of one woman as compared to the next is revealed only through personal name and calendar glyphs. However, the first couple on the third page – incidentally the only couple to have more than one daughter – does not fit this prototype (Fig. 9 – 9a). The figure occupying the left-side position – the one all other couples show as being male – is a bit of a curiosity given that this figure has the hair of a man and the dress of a woman. This figure, like all the other figures, is shown with a calendar glyph and a personal name glyph sitting on a marriage mat with a figure dressed in the established female garb – presumably this figure’s wife. In fact, no differences exist
between this figure and any other, save for this figure’s mixing of male headdress and female costuming.

This particularity brings up several speculations. Is this a scribal error? If not, what is the gender of this individual? Is it a man dressed as a woman? Given that a headdress is more difficult to change than clothing, and given the couples’ two daughters, it would stand to argue that this figure is a male dressed in female costume. As such, what is this gender-ambiguous individual saying about this genealogy and about Mixtec society?

No particular incidents of cross-dressing can visually be found in either the Codex Colombino-Becker or the Codex Zouche-Nutall; nevertheless, a history of gender ambiguity and cross-dressing definitely exists in Mesoamerica. Cecelia Klein provides a line of insight on gender ambiguity of the “Nahua-speaking inhabitants of Central Mexico” in arguing that they “perceived gender as neither immutable nor stable, nor did they see sex and gender an inherently bipolar and necessarily biologically determined.” Matthew Looper claims a “third-gender” exists in Mayan culture – “two spirits…constitute a supernaturally validated and culturally recognized gender status, based on mixed gender roles and attributes.” And the McCaffertys present several interesting theories regarding the possible cross-dressing of figures 6 and 32, the central bird warriors of the Cacaxtla Mural. Although these appearances of ambiguous gender refer to Mayan and Nahuatlan culture, they establish a foundation for gender studies within Mixtec culture, given the similarities between Mesoamerican cultures.

The McCaffertys present the idea that figures 6 and 32 were “male war chiefs portrayed in female costume for the purpose of public humiliation.” However, given Codex Becker II’s attention to women, it would stand to reason that being a woman, or calling someone a woman who was not one, would not be seen as derogatory or weak. Combine this with the lack of change in formal depiction between the cross-dressed or gender ambiguous figure shows gender-ambiguity to
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29 McCafferty, Geoffrey and Sharisse. “The Conquered Women of Cacaxtla: Gender Identity or Gender Ideology?” *Ancient Mesoamerica* 5(2), Cambridge University Press, 1994. 159-172. Fig. 11.
be accepted or integrated into Mixtec culture. The fact that the manuscript does not call any special attention to the gender ambiguous individual, other than the figure’s clothing, confirms that the scribe or patron did not see this individual as needing any more recognition. As such, this particular cross-dressed individual is demonstrative of the possible acceptance and established norm of gender ambiguity within Mixtec culture.

Conclusion

Operating under the assumption that this fragment is a good representation of the entire Codex Becker II, it is evident that understanding the creation, purpose, and effect of this manuscript lies within analyzing the changes it had undergone after first being constructed. The acceptance or relative disinterest of the scribe and/or patron in cross-dressing asserts the embrace of gender-ambiguity in Mesoamerica. Acceptance of one non-male-gendered figure would support the acceptance and even strength of another non-male-gendered figure: the female. As such, one reading of the significance of the possible later addition of the females is that of a commentary on the usefulness and power of the female in dynastic alliances. Although this manuscript is riddled with many unexplainable minutia, the exclusion of a second male line is by no means an ambiguous statement. And although it is impossible to say why or by whom this genealogy and its later additions were commissioned, the female character, after its black-and-white addition, is without a doubt, the primary interest of this genealogy.
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The sculptures of Englishman Henry Moore communicate a keen sense of materiality and an unwavering ability to register as organic, naturalistic, and yet recognizable human figures. Moore’s refined sense of scale allowed him to account for both physical magnitude and small details, which he then projected onto his large sculptures. While scaling his sculptures greater than the human form, Moore was careful to keep their physical size accessible and still at a non-intimidating scale, so that that his viewers could engage directly with them. His works appeal to a universal audience and have found homes in the most prestigious museums, in front of the world’s leading cultural and professional institutions, and among elements of nature in sculptural gardens. Display in both public and private spaces prompts questions of access and the effects that physical situations and diverse audiences may have on the readings of Moore’s works.

For the purpose of this paper, I examine the sculptures of Henry Moore as situated in the urban display environment. Each sculpture reflects Moore’s reoccurring theme of (and arguable obsession with) the human figure, and all pieces are cast in bronze. Each work, however, is displayed in a unique environment. The display spaces are located outside. Yet, the connotations of the environment of each sculpture directly affect the viewer’s reading of the work. The expectations, situations, and surrounding environments each penetrate the viewer’s comprehension and ultimate interpretation of the work. Here, I will examine Moore’s figures at the Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Sculpture Garden at New York’s MoMa and New York’s Lincoln Center, exploring the ways in which each of these unique display environments affects the overall interpretation of Moore’s works.

In 1955, Philip Johnson designed the Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Sculpture Garden at New York’s MoMa to bring sculptures from the collection outside of the walls of the institution and into nature (Figure 1). The intent, as explained by the designer, was to foster a “mutually respectful relationship between architecture, sculpture, and plants” that was complemented by a “fine reciprocity between formality and freedom”. The sculpture garden would still be located
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3 Margaret A. Robinette, *Outdoor Sculpture: Object and Environment* (New
within the confines of the museum space, within a cultural institution, and still beyond the expansive lobby, the ticket takers and security gardens, the docents, and the gift shops. To access the space, one must first visit the museum. The visitor to this space, of course, greets the gallery space with expectations. The viewer is here because he is curious. A student, a professor, an art lover, or a tourist, he enters the doors of the MoMa acknowledging that he is in a museum. He must maintain the behavioral and attitudinal norms of one visiting an art museum: looking curiously at the works, stopping occasionally to thoughtfully ponder, and snapping photos to later reminisce on his intellectual and artistic moments. When he enters the space, he is expecting these works to mean something. The curator had selected these works for a reason, and they are assembled as such and are to be respected. There is an aura of prestige surrounding the works, for these paintings, drawings, and sculptures were selected to join an elite club of artists and their creations. The placement of a work within the collection of New York’s Museum of Modern Art immediately endows the piece with the status of being worthy enough to make it into the institution.

Upon entering the sculpture garden, the viewer leaves the typical white walls and the warm hallways that compose the gallery space. The visitor is surrounded most immediately by an onslaught of sculptures and figures. Just beyond their immediate view, the skyscrapers of Manhattan pierce the sky, creating a background far more complex than the white washed interior walls (Figure 1). Johnson conceived of the garden as an outdoor room, a gallery space complemented by the sun and the sky. In an outdoor space, the natural elements could easily influence the reading of the sculptures. Johnson’s intent parallels Moore’s, as the artist maintained that the sky was the “most fool-proof background for sculpture” because there was no competition for the work. Johnson’s design however, was not necessarily successful in this regard. The space that he designed offers views of the sky, but, in addition to being juxtaposed against it, the sculptures are juxtaposed also against marble walls, a small pool, foliage, and museum visitors (Figure 1). The background of the sky
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may not compete with the works, but the other elements of the contrived natural space do. Even as an intended exterior space, the garden still maintains a sense of interiority. The contrived, overly stylized natural elements that attempt to characterize an outdoor garden make the space feel less like a garden or park and more like a different type of gallery space. The garden is boxed in, and it is glaringly obvious to visitors that they are still within the display space at the MoMa. The space may be quieter or calmer than the interior galleries, thus acting as a respite for over-stimulated museumgoers, but it is still a gallery space.

For many, the garden does evoke an “urban oasis” that Johnson sought to bring to the public space situated in Midtown, Manhattan.\(^6\) Visitors gather in the space, special events are held there, and people often visit the space as an oasis from the chaos of the interior galleries. Yet, Arthur Drexler (Chair of the Ad Hoc Planning Committee on the Garden) may have spoken of an ideal when he exclaimed that visitors were beginning to see the space as a “public park” offering “private contemplation and intellectual sophistication”.\(^7\) The space is situated within a cultural institution, yet one barred by admissions fees. While anyone is allowed to enter the institution, there are certain barriers to entry, like the cost that bar some individuals from visiting. The park is not “public,” and subsequently, reiterates connotations of elitism and prestige. Visitors to the sculpture garden are aware of how rare a space dedicated to greenery and sculpture is in Manhattan, but they are also keenly aware that this is an internationally famous institution that generates income and aims to attract a paying audience. While the outside exhibition space may feel public and natural, the visitors are vaguely aware of the diners seated next to them in the modern, star chef Danny Meyer’s lavish Michelin-star restaurant that combines fine dining with fine art (Figure 3).

When the garden reopened in 2004 after renovations were completed at the site, it displayed thirty-one pieces, three of which were sculpted by Henry Moore. \textit{Family Group} (1948-1949), \textit{Reclining Figure II} (1960), and \textit{Large Torso: Arch} (1962-1963) are situated

\footnote{6}{Peter Shedd Reed, \textit{A Modern Garden: The Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Sculpture Garden at the Museum of Modern Art} (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2007), 14.}

within the garden space. For the purpose of my study, I focus on Family Group (Figure 2). The rigidity of the figures parallels the Manhattan skyline, and the verticality of the figures draws the eye upwards, with postures that feel almost architectural. The linear nature of the steel and glass buildings contrasts with the curvature of the draped garments. It is important to recognize, however, that the display environment directly alters the reading of the work. Indeed, this same sculpture could be displayed in a non-urban sculpture garden, and the connotations and comparisons to the elements of the metropolis would not apply there. The display environment and the connotations of the sculpture’s surroundings have a direct correlation to the inferred meaning and intent of the work.

Compared to Moore’s other works, this sculpture depicts the entire family unit, including a male figure, which Moore rarely includes in this work. His other figure sculptures, like his notorious Reclining Figures, maintain much more fluidity and abstraction. Reclining Figures are typically broken or separated in different segments, featuring openings or cavities in which to invite the viewer to see through—thus invoking natural elements directly into the sculpture. Family Group however, is from an earlier period in the artist’s career and lacks many of the characteristics that are often associated with his later, better known works. Family Group was created in 1948-1949, ten years before the start of Moore’s Reclining Figure period. Prior to Reclining Figure, Moore focused his work around his interests in primitive figures and Grecian themes such as draping. Family Group specifically represents Moore’s interest in garments and draping. He was influenced by ancient Grecian sculptures and from them, developed an interest in the depiction of fabric in hard materials. Moore maintained a keen sense of materiality and challenged himself to represent soft and pliable objects or materials in hard bronze and concrete. The family dynamic is evident, expressing tension between the parents—the mother’s maternal instincts and the father’s desire to be involved and influence the rearing of his young. Both adult faces are solemn and their physical interactions are limited. There is no sense of affection between the parents, nor between the parents and the child.
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8 Ibid.
12 Ibid., 218.
The child does not appear to be squirming or clinging to either parent. Instead there is a sense of calmness that is almost disconcerting (?) for the viewer. There is something completely unnatural about this interaction that is situated in a pseudo-naturalistic environment. The surrounding Sculpture Garden reflects the tone of this work. The family represents the expected dynamic and the natural composition of mother, father, and child. Yet, this dynamic is forced. While it is a natural concept, the ease of an organic and truly natural relationship is missing. In the Sculpture Garden, a natural environment is clearly attempted. There is water, greenery, and sky, yet the space is still confined-- a private room opening up to the public sphere (Figure 1). While it is intended to be a natural space within an institutional setting, the “outdoor room” is still a forced collection of individual works, each inseparable from the larger collection of outdoor sculptures in which it is deeply imbedded. Yet, the contrived setting (and its effect on the sculpture) may not influence the unquestioning museum visitor. As visitors to the museum, the viewers are expecting to view works of art and enjoy them, meaning that they are unlikely to question the organization of the exhibition space as much as they are unlikely to question the ways in which the environment directly affects their interpretation of the works.

Another of Moore’s sculptures is on display further uptown at Lincoln Center, a complex located on the west side of Central Park and dedicated to the performing arts. Reclining Figure (1962-1964) is a two piece, bronze sculpture measuring 28 ft. by 18 ft. (his largest piece at the time) and situated in a reflecting pool in front of the Center’s North Plaza (Figure 4). Similar to MoMa’s Family Group the subject in Reclining Figure maintains a strong vertical presence, drawing the eye up. The sculpture appears to grow up and out of the water in a very natural way to create a center point for the Center’s complex, much like how a tree would grow up to serve as the central point of a courtyard. Doing so, then, draws the viewer’s eye to the vertically linear construction of the complex behind the sculpture. Moore was cognizant of the challenge at hand as he worked to create a piece that would not

15 Ibid., 294.
be dwarfed by the surrounding Philharmonic Hall, Vivian Beaumont Theater, and the Metropolitan Opera House.

Moore’s interest in creating works that played off of architecture began in the 1960’s, just as he was shifting his focus to the reclining figure. In the art world at this time, Pop Art (and its accompanying commercial references) was becoming popular, as was Minimal Art (which focused on industrial forms). These commercial and industrial trends influenced Moore and he began to accept more commissions for “memorials, civic sculptures, and institutional emblems”.16 Most of these commissions were secured through the architects, showing an interesting partnership between Moore’s sculptures and the architecture of the display space in which they were embedded. Through its association with renowned architects and importance as completing pieces for cultural institutions, Moore’s works became culturally and historically significant--

At Lincoln Center, Moore made sure to create a sculpture that would maintain a strong presence when situated against the buildings of magnificent scale that comprised the complex. Looking for a piece to fill the space, board member Frank Stanton explained at the dedication of the work that he selected a sculptor “the silent eloquence of whose work would prove no less moving outside the building than the drama, music, and dance within”.17 Moore, it appears, met the challenge with Reclining Figure, but only through intense studying and scrutinizing during the designing process. He created the sculpture in a studio space with a transparent roof and walls so that he could “consider the various views of the work from afar”.18 He also employed his daughter’s swimming pool in an attempt to better gauge the effects of displaying his work in a water setting.19 Display in the pool altered the presentation of the work, especially because the water would reflect the surfaces that the traditional view in galleries or sculpture gardens would not.

Moore’s embrace of the reflecting pool in 1965 is interesting considering his decline of the proposal to create a piece for a similar display environment outside of Mies van der Rohe’s Seagram Building. At the Seagram Building, the Moore sculpture’s intended placement was between two reflecting pools, thus tripling the perceived size of the
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Gordon Bunshaft, the architect of the Chase Manhattan Bank headquarters, ultimately advised Moore against accepting the commission on the grounds that his work might end up looking like “a candelabrum” as it was reflected across two different pools to flank the building’s façade. Moore was very selective, especially regarding his commissions. If he felt that his work would not be displayed in the most effective manner, he would choose to turn down the opportunity. It is important to note, however, that at the time of the Seagram commission, Bunshaft was also scouting Moore to create a piece for the Chase Bank building. As a private collector and member of many influential arts organizations, Bunshaft most likely recruited Moore away from the Seagram project by framing the Seagram commission as uncomplimentary of the sculptor’s work, in an attempt to convince him that the Chase project was more worthwhile. While there are few documents pertaining to this commission, it appears that David Rockefeller, Moore, and Bunshaft met to discuss placing Moore’s *Double Oval* (1966) on the site in July 1967. Since *Double Oval* was never displayed in the space, the commission was presumably dropped.

Moore’s decline of the Seagram commission shows the artist’s keen understanding of scale and the display environment, especially in an urban setting. He was unwilling to accept any and all commissions, instead choosing only those opportunities that aligned with his aesthetic intent. It is, nonetheless, curious that Moore turned down the Seagram commission but accepted the Lincoln Center commission—a project that displayed his work reflected in a pool just outside of an emblematic Manhattan institution. Assuming that his close personal relationship with Bunshaft directly influenced his decision, it could also be that he turned down the commission for aesthetic reasons, unimpressed by the display environment and the intent associated with such a purely commercial space.

In addition to extending the eye upwards, the disjunction of the two pieces that comprise *Reclining Figure* engages the eye across the piece horizontally. The reflection of the figure in the pool below magnifies its scale, doubling the space taken up by the sculpture. *Reclining Figure* is also exhibited in the round (Figure 5). Viewers are invited to walk around the entire reflecting pool, and the upper ceilings of the cavities are reflected in the pool for easier viewing. Moore even went as far as to paint the bottom and sides of the sculpture black “in
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order to better reflect the lower surfaces of the sculpture." In this way, Moore intended to highlight the body parts of the figure, without invoking an interior/exterior conflict. All of the cavities and openings are guides to help the viewer comprehend the human elements of the figure and make the somewhat abstract behemoth of a sculpture more accessible. None of these spaces, however, were intended to be viewed as interior space. The situation of the sculpture within the reflecting pool reiterates this concept. Anything one might experience as interior, or less accessible, is reflected so that the viewer can more easily comprehend the space.

The figure itself is more abstract than the human figures depicted in *Family Group*, yet there are easily identifiable characteristics which Moore employs so that the viewer can easily identify the figure as a human (and female) form. During his earlier period, his sculptures looked more obviously like people, with easily identifiable human characteristics. In 1959, however, he began his reclining figure period, for which he is best known, creating disjointed, abstract depictions of the human body on a large scale. In a statement from Moore, *Reclining Figure* (Lincoln Center) is the end result of his *Reclining Figures* period, and the sculpture is simply described as a “leg part and a head part and an arm part”. He does not intend to discourage the viewer from engaging with his work, instead giving just enough to allow the viewer to question their view and comprehension, but still feel like they “get it”. The intent and subsequent accessibility of this work parallels the accessibility of the display environment.

At Lincoln Center, *Reclining Figure* takes on the tradition of “allegorical sculpture”; the sculpture itself conveys attributes of the building and the space in which it is located. Frank Stanton specifically commissioned a piece from Moore because he knew that the scale of a Moore sculpture would play off of the scale of the Lincoln Center buildings—and the connotations of a space dedicated to
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the high performing arts. Lincoln Center is a public, civic institution and yet even as such, it maintains a sense of grandeur—an emblem of the philanthropic and culturally elite institutions of New York City. In many ways, the social connotations of the institution magnify the scale of the Center, which parallels the physical size and subsequently assumed scale of the Moore.

Lincoln Center is a cultural institution, just like the MoMa, yet to gain access to this sculpture, the viewer does not need to enter a museum space. Indeed, the reflecting pool is a public space, owned by the city of New York and under the jurisdiction of the Department of Parks. Reclining Figure was commissioned through a private grant on behalf of Lincoln Center and is actually on permanent loan to the city, as opposed to being part of a private or (a museum) permanent collection. The institutional connotation associated with visiting the MoMa is less obvious for the viewer at the Lincoln Center. Anyone can walk the exterior grounds, exploring and comprehending the Reclining Figure. While still situated within the urban landscape of Manhattan, Lincoln Center does not attempt to create an isolated garden or naturalistic space. There is greenery, trees, and a grassy lawn, but these elements help create an entirely naturalistic atmosphere, separate from the sculpture (Figure 5). At the MoMa, on the other hand, the natural elements seem forced and present only to be juxtaposed against the hard materials of the sculptures. At Lincoln Center, the environment feels more like a park or a public space developed for the enjoyment of all those who pass by. At Lincoln Center, sculptures feel more like complements to nature than they do at the MoMa.

The comparisons to the MoMa, however, continue, regarding cuisine and the juxtaposition of fine dining with fine art, especially. Lincoln, the highly conceptual contemporary Italian restaurant of Chef Jonathan Benno, sits right next to the Moore sculpture (Figure 5). The walls of the restaurant are composed of glass panels, and the roof is actually a manicured lawn, making the restaurant appear to be rising from below the ground, directly situating it in a natural (though obviously highly contrived) environment. The restaurant looks out onto the Reclining Figure, a view they proudly proclaim on the website of the high-end restaurant. The viewing of the sculpture by the
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traditional visitor to the space does not appear to be affected. However, for the diners in the restaurant, the visual access to the Moore adds to the prestige of the restaurant experience. This sense of prestige is also evident at the MoMa, yet at Lincoln Center, the diners appear less voyeuristic towards the viewers outside. This may be due to the expanse of the visual plane. While diners at the MoMa look at the sculptures and visitors in the Sculpture Garden, their field of vision is blocked by a wall that encloses the “outdoor room” while diners at the Lincoln Center are looking across the space, through the sculpture, and beyond it into the open space. While there is definitely a sense of prestige for the restaurant, to be able to boast views of a Henry Moore sculpture, the prestigious view is not only accessible for these viewers. Everyone has equal access to the work, from the same visual plane, as the space is completely open and free to all.

This sense of accessibility in the public space is situated nicely with the naturalistic and organic elements of the North Plaza, yet these elements are still forced (though to a lesser degree than at the MoMa). Forced natural elements in the urban display space contrast with the environment at a sculpture garden where various sculptures are exhibited outside of the traditional gallery space and are placed directly juxtaposed with trees, grass, fields, and the open sky. At the Storm King Art Center in upstate New York, a 200-acre estate has been transformed into a “sculptural park—a place where landscape and sculpture are brought together in the most deliberate manner and to the considerable enhancement of both”.

According to the intentions of the Center, both elements (the sculptures and the landscaping) are dependent upon one another. In this type of environment, the sculptures are presented individually, thus allowing viewers to judge them separately and only in relation to the natural space. Situated in nature, the viewer determines if the work succeeds or fails without the influence of a prestigious name or contrived environment. At the MoMa a viewer may accept a work as being successful merely because it had made it into the prestigious collection. A sculpture by an artist whose name he recognizes, next to a Picasso and a Judd is much more likely to be instantly determined to be successful than a sculpture exhibited independently among trees is.

It is interesting to note that the case studies that I have explored were all display spaces within Manhattan: Family Group at the Museum of Modern Art and Reclining Figure at the Lincoln Center. While I explored only two pieces displayed in Manhattan, there are

many other Henry Moore sculptures exhibited in the city. There are ten in the permanent collection at the MoMa alone. The popularity of Moore in such a densely populated and culturally-rich city begs the question of whether Moore intended for his sculptures to be placed in metropolitan settings or whether their presence relates more to the sheer number of cultural and arts-related organizations in the city. Instead of deducing that Moore intended his work as a response to the scale of the metropolitan environment, it seems more logical to think that the scale and magnitude of his works simply appealed to architects and designers in the city. His abstract sculptures stand out against the glass and steel buildings and hold their own. They are not dwarfed by the size of the skyscrapers, but instead act as coherent accompaniments to architects’ intended aesthetics. When selecting pieces of art to complete their designs (and landscaping) it makes sense that the architects would look for works that stand out, prompt conversation, and are imbued with a certain prestige. Moore himself was more at ease in the country, and stood to maintain a strong command of the sculpture garden. With his wife, he developed a keen understanding of how his works related to the natural environment and how they should be displayed in natural settings. Yet, with an increasing interest in his works coming to fruition in major cultural centers, he began accepting commissions for public and private works that would be situated in the built environment.

Ultimately, the issues of environment and exhibition directly relate to intent. The intent for a work ultimately affects the ways in which the viewer creates value judgments and interprets the connotations of the work. Intent, however, does not necessarily derive from the artist or an artist’s official statement. The architect, designer, curator, and commissioner all affect the intent of the piece, especially in the realm of sculpture. While this is also true for works on canvas or paper, the sculpture is a special case because of the very different environments in which it can be situated. Without concern for weather or other natural elements nor need for a wall upon which to hang, the sculpture can be exhibited in more diverse environments, which ultimately affect its interpretation.
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