Over the past few months, when I have mentioned the new installation of musical instruments as one of the most exciting current projects at the Museum, this information has been greeted with interest but usually with the polite question, “Why are musical instruments in an art museum?” The question can be answered by the instruments themselves – by the jolting starkness of the primitive marouanne on the cover or by the subtle intricacies of the soundhole rose shown opposite. In shaping these pieces the craftsmen were concerned not with distinctions between art and technology, but with matching quality of sound with quality of form. And their form is as much of a delight as their music.

Four thousand musical instruments are in the Museum’s collection. The majority are part of a great gift received between 1889 and 1904, The Crosby Brown Collection of Musical Instruments of All Nations. They have long been a “buried treasure,” shown only in small groups or in short-term special exhibitions. Part of the reason for this has been the Museum’s perennial lack of gallery space, part is the fact that their delicacy requires accurate – and costly – control of the temperature and humidity of their surroundings. For years Dr. Emanuel Winternitz, a historian of music and art who is Curator of Musical Instruments, has dreamed and schemed about putting them on exhibition, but the funds for this sort of installation were simply not available. Then, several years ago, Mrs. André Mertens, widow of the well-known impresario, came to the Museum to discuss with me one of the paintings in her collection. When she learned that the Metropolitan’s superb musical instruments lay huddled in permanent storage, she decided that a fitting memorial to her husband would be to make possible new galleries for musical instruments in his name. And the six André Mertens Galleries for Musical Instruments that will open in November are indeed an appropriate tribute to Mr. Mertens, whose lifelong involvement with music and musicians enabled him to bring to this country, for the first time, such leading artists as Charles Munch, Renata Tebaldi, and Cesare Siepi.

In planning the galleries, Dr. Winternitz has worked closely with Stuart Silver, Administrator for Design, and with Vincent Ciulla, Associate Manager of the Museum’s Design Department. The resulting exhibition is among the most powerful in the Museum. The instruments are arranged to intrigue the layman as well as the scholar, in dramatic groupings against richly colored backgrounds, eventually to be accompanied by recordings that demonstrate their sound. The André Mertens Galleries magnificently present a magnificent collection.

Accompanying the opening will be a symposium for international specialists, a number of lectures, and a concert series that will include performances on some of the instruments in the collection, beginning with one of the earliest surviving pianofortes. All these activities indicate the Museum’s interest in becoming an international clearing house for information about musical instruments and their study. But, to begin with, come to visit the galleries, and let these splendid objects show you why musical instruments deserve to be in an art museum.

Thomas Hoving, Director
For the Love of Leda

James David Draper
Assistant Curator of Western European Arts

Our new Leda and the Swan (Figures 1, 2), a little-known work by the great French classicist Michel Anguier, is a most important addition to the growing list of sculptures bought with the help of the foundations headed by Colonel C. Michael Paul. It has been convincingly identified as one of the limestone sculptures Anguier made for the Château of Saint-Mandé, a residence of the powerful Superintendent of Finances of the young Louis XIV, Nicolas Fouquet. The rock beneath the swan’s foot (Figure 10) bears the date 1654, a precious piece of information. A much later, probably nineteenth-century, inscription on the base identifies the artist and his dates. The lively grace of the piece is as appealing as its great fullness and height are impressive.

Although the story of Leda is so famous that it is practically emblematic, it is known more completely through pictorial sources than through literary ones. Homer, Euripides, and Ovid all make fleeting references to the affair of Leda and Jupiter, but such uses of the story occur because they give automatic illustration of the divine power of love, as Falstaff’s lines in The Merry Wives of Windsor (V:v, 6-7): “You were also, Jupiter, a swan for the love of Leda; O omnipotent love!”

A complete telling of the Leda story would emphasize a number of amusing details. Leda was the daughter of Thesitius and Eurythemis, monarchs of Aetolia. She wed Tyndareus, King of Lacedaemon, and had conceived his child at the time of our story. One day Jupiter spied Leda bathing in the river Eurotas and became enamoured of her. Venus transformed herself into a conspiratorial eagle, while crafty Jupiter took the disguise of a helpless swan pursued along the river by the eagle. Feigning fright, the swan sought refuge in the arms of the beautiful bather and obtained her favors. Leda gave birth to two eggs containing four infants of human aspect, Castor and Pollux and Helen and Clytemnestra.

The square base of Anguier’s group is decorated with watery forms, an enchanting river’s edge. Leda steps on stones at the river’s edge. Her generically classical draperies expose her bosom and do not conceal her delicate condition. She wears an aigrette attached by a ribbon threaded through her tumbling hair. The swan is settled on a rocky ledge beneath which cattails grow. This is the first moment of their intimacy: Leda greets the wily but ingratiating look of the bird with an enraptured, hypnotized gaze. She extends a sportful hand to stroke the bird’s neck, bending it back the better to see, while her other hand, a marvel of expression, conveys better than any words the essence of delight. For his part, the bird ventures to wrap a wing around her hip.

The Leda story is the most frequently illustrated of Jupiter’s loves, perhaps because of the perfect simplicity demanded of the composition, two forms intertwined in a closed shape. When Anguier designed his Leda, there were basically two pictorial traditions from which to choose. The one he did not choose was Leda and the swan in a horizontal and heartily more dignified position, a “private apotheosis” as it has been called. That type of composition, very well known through antique gems, was used by Michelangelo in a famous picture now lost. Anguier’s approach along the lines of the second, more narrative tradition with the lovers standing, had an equally glorious ancestry. Standing figures of Leda welcoming the swan to her bosom and protecting him from the eagle abounded in antiquity. Anguier surely remembered one of these (Figure 3) from his years of study in Rome. A second most persuasive influence on Anguier’s work came from Leonardo da Vinci’s Leda and the Swan that hung at Fontainebleau until it disappeared some time after 1694. Leonardo’s was a starkly nude, Venus-like Leda whose embrace of the swan seems in all the numerous copies somehow remote and even chaste. The swan perches on a rocky ledge in most of the copies, as for example the anonymous drawing in the Louvre (Figure 4). Anguier also used the ledge to raise the swan but converted Leonardo’s bullrushes into suggestive cattails.

Anguier enlivened his traditional subject with the compelling attraction of the lady to the swan, an attitude that would grow increasingly coy in eighteenth-century Ladas. One such, Jean Thierry’s of 1717 (Figure 5), is clearly indebted to Anguier’s image, where love remains far more dignified and courtly. For Anguier’s Leda has above all the stateliness that forever marks French high classicism. The mood is tender and it is expressed wittily but grandly and mysteriously, much in the spirit of some lines penned by La Fontaine in a poem for Fouquet (from Le Songe de Vaux, my translation):

1. Michel Anguier’s Leda and the Swan is only one of the superb sculptures that have come to the Museum through the foresight and generosity of Colonel C. Michael Paul, president of the two foundations that supplied the funds for their acquisition. Purchase, funds given by The Josephine Bay Paul and C. Michael Paul Foundations, Inc., and Charles Ulrick and Josephine Bay Foundation, Inc., and Rogers Fund, 1970.140
Having left the heavens to dwell with her,
Made himself swanlike white and came
in sight
of Leda of the charming eyes.
What would the soul make of it all,
After 2,000 years gone by?
Michel Anguier was born at Eu in
Normandy in about 1612 according to most
authorities, or in 1614 according to his
earliest biographer, Guillet de Saint-Georges.
Michel’s brother François was also a sculptor
and seems to have been the elder. Both
came as youths to Paris and worked in the
busy atelier of Simon Guillain, an official
artist of high accomplishment. Michel is said
to have entered the Guillain studio at the
age of fifteen, but nothing is really known of
his work before 1641, when both brothers
went to Rome. The central difference in
their subsequent development arises from
the fact that François Anguier stayed only
two years in Italy, and always retained a
conservative Gallic Renaissance manner after
his return, while Michel remained for ten
years, returning to France only in 1651, a
full-fledged classical baroque sculptor.
In Rome, Michel Anguier worked mainly
in the studio of Alessandro Algardi, the
leading exponent of the classical style in
sculpture, and imbibed the spirit of the
antique more deeply than any Frenchman
before him except Poussin. He was also listed
among those employed in 1648 under
Bernini for reliefs on the pilasters of the
nave of St. Peter’s, testimony that he had a
broader practical experience of styles in
Rome than has been hitherto believed. He
brought with him on his return to France his
own copies after the antique and after
Algardi. In his embrace of the antique,
Anguier followed the example of a senior
sculptor, Jacques Sarrazin, who worked in
Rome between 1610 and 1628. Both be-
longed to a vanguard of sorts, for their
successive accomplishments helped establish
the grand classical style, a style that migrated
from Rome to Paris and dominated French
sculpture for two centuries.
When Anguier returned from Italy,
France was still feeling the pangs caused by
the civil wars known collectively as the
Fronde (1648-1653). It took several years
for the government of the young Louis XIV

2. The Leda and the Swan, carved in pierre
de Tonnerre, is 86 inches high
factions
betrays
of
his
joyed
putting
were
Ceres.
the
and
classicism,
in
series,
(Figure
One
in
mind
the
return
king's
statuette
the
figures
and
the
gods
How
eighteenth-century
to
Leda.
the
Leda.
Indeed,
his
culpture
strong
nostalgia
for
the
arts
of
Italy,
as
in
Leda,
with
her
recall
of
the
antique
and
the
Italian
Renaissance.

One
of
the
first
things
Anguier
did
after
his
return
was
to
model
a
group
of
statuettes
of
the
gods
in
1652
for
Tessier
de
Montarsis,
the
king's
jeweler,
who
had
tem
cast.
These
were
described
as
a
Jupiter
thundering,
a
jealous
Juno,
an
agitated
Neptune,
a
tranquil
Amphitrite,
a
melancholy
Pluto,
Mars
putting
aside
his
arms,
and
a
distressed
Ceres.
How
a
style
was
established
in
these
figures
can
be
seen
in
the
Amphitrite
(Figure
8)
carved
from
an
enlarged
model
of
the
statuette
and
coming
from
the
same
series
as
our
Leda.
Anguier
concentrated
much
more
than
any
of
his
peers
on
a
clausal
purity
of
silhouette
and
allowing
the
subject
to
emerge
as
a
flesh-and-blood
characterization.
Artists
like
Girardon,
who
in
turn
eclipsed
Anguier
in
royal
commissions,
owed
to
him
the
establishment
of
the
firm,
containing
silhouette
that
marks
French
classicism,
while
the
wit
and
warmth
of
personality
in
Leda
and
Amphitrite
have
a
wholly
eighteenth-century
ring.
Indeed,
they
fit
easily
among
the
great
train
of
French
beauties
that
leads
through
Renoir
and
Maillol.

Besides
paying
attention
to
classic
form,
Anguier
as
a
man
of
his
time
owed
much
of
his
success
to
the
study
of
classical
theory.
In
a
lecture
to
the
Academy,
"On
the
Way
of
Representing
the
Gods
According
to
Their
Temperaments"
1676,
Anguier
stated
that
the
body
of
man
is
composed
of
four
basic
elements,
the
warm,
the
cold,
the
dry,
and
the
humid.
Amphitrite,
for
example,
must
have,
beyond
"a
beautiful
and
elegant
proportion,"
"flesh
that
is
convincingly
"cool,
delicate,
and
transparent.
"Unfortunately,
Leda
was
not
one
of
his
subjects
in
the
lecture,
but
there
can
be
little
doubt
that
her
essence
proceeds
from
a
mixture
of
the
warm
and
the
humid.

In
the
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the
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Our
Leda
is
the
earliest
known
large
independent
work
by
Michel
Anguier.
Like
all
his
figures,
this
"Leda
of
the
charming
eyes” has great breadth, always kept delightfully in proportion, an easy grace of gesture, and diagonal rhythms that seem in the process of unwinding. His figures also show an admirable consideration for the treatment of individual surfaces, whether the smooth glowing marble of the Nativity group, or the roughened limestone of Leda. The surface of the yellow-gray stone is tooled so that every part is caught in flickering light or cast in deep shadow, above all the head, where the textures create a lively speaking presence typical of his best pieces.

Marguerite Charageat first published our Leda together with the Amphitrite and Apollo still in the possession of a dealer, and a Pluto said to be severely damaged and presumably now destroyed. She believed that the four belonged originally to the Gallery of Saint-Mandé, an interior that does not survive but which, judging even from the scant mentions of La Fontaine and his contemporaries, was a landmark in the history of French classicism.

Nicolas Fouquet steadily developed his property of Saint-Mandé near Vincennes during the early years of his power as finance minister, and had constructed its chief ornament, the “galerie des dieux et déesses,” where figures by Anguier stood among bronze and marble busts, antique and modern. The earliest account of the Gallery is the inventory of the contents of Saint-Mandé drawn up in 1666 that cites the antique busts and “fourteen figures of pierre de Tonnerre representing the gods and goddesses, lifesize, at 100 livres each.” Five of the figures eventually owned by Garnier d’Isle were identified in a 1725 guidebook as Laocoon, Hercules, Flora, Juno, and Jupiter, said to be six feet tall and “copied after the most beautiful antiques of Rome.” It is to be noted that the dimensions in the inventory and guidebook are less than Leda’s actual measurement (seven feet two inches), but they seem mere estimates. The remains of a thin coating of patinated plaster, now yellowed but clearly visible over Leda’s surface, suggest that Anguier’s figures were intended to give the impression of marble statuary, a concept befitting a sculpture gallery. In 1659, there were added to the Gallery two celebrated Egyptian sarcophagi now in the Louvre, for Foucquet as a collector sought the rare and the curious. Anguier also executed a Charity group with the features of Mme Foucquet and her children for the cabinet of the Orangerie at Saint-Mandé, but no trace of it remains.

Nicolas Foucquet may well have been a thoroughly venal as well as a humanistic finance minister. His downfall is usually identified with the construction of Vaux-le-Vicomte, a second and much grander château built soon after Saint-Mandé. To open his new château, in August of 1661 Foucquet gave a huge fête, inviting Louis XIV, who was incensed by the grandeur of the building and the lavishness of the entertainment. Within a month, Foucquet was seized at Nantes and imprisoned for life after a long and sensational trial. At Vaux Foucquet had overstepped himself, but with far-reaching effect. The young king learned from a commoner to behave royally, and Vaux-le-Vicomte contributed inevitably to the production of Versailles.

If Vaux was pure show, Saint-Mandé was Foucquet’s intimate residence: it has been called his office, library, and bedchamber. Foucquet kept the one-story buildings low, with costly but tastefully restrained gardens and decorations, and an enormous library. The king visited Saint-Mandé, without displeasure, in 1657 with Mazarin. There is no difficulty in imagining Leda lending her ample charms to the delights of the place.

After his trial in 1666, Foucquet’s goods were seized by his creditors. Many of the best furnishings of Saint-Mandé and Vaux, including most of the library, all the fine tapestries, and a great Poussin, were bought by Louis XIV. Of the statues in the Gallery at Saint-Mandé, eight were bought by the Marquis de Louvois, whose widow moved them to the Château de Choisy in 1696 when Louis XIV traded her Choisy (later a
8. Amphitrite, from the same mythological series as Leda. On the New York art market

9. The Nativity in the Chapel of the Virgin, Saint-Roch, Paris, Anguier’s most brilliant sculpture, in which the forms are designed with monumental gravity and the details with scintillating exactness

favorite estate of Louis XV) for Meudon. These eight presumably included Leda, the Apollo and Amphitrite, and the ruined Pluto, and were still in the gardens at Choisy in 1779. The three that survive belonged most recently to the Comtesse de Couvelet, Château de Garges. Garnier d’Isle, the architect who acquired five others of the suite, had them placed in his garden in the rue de la Couture Sainte-Catherine (now rue de Sévigné), Paris, but they have not been seen since the eighteenth century. Saint-Mandé itself was bought by Titon du Tillet, the king’s secretary, and given to a group of nuns, the Hospitalières de Gentilly, who still had it in 1785. Today entirely remodeled, it houses a boys’ school on the rue de la République.
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For the Museum’s Centennial, the European Paintings Galleries – the largest and perhaps the most handsome exhibition space in the building – were used for a series of special shows. Some of our pictures were crowded into eight temporary galleries, others were in storage. But during these two years we had the opportunity to work out a new approach to displaying the collection and to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses – what should be featured and what was less important.

When the Centennial was over and the last show taken down, we had, as it were, a blackboard that had been erased, allowing us to make a fresh start. After a busy month of decoration, re-framing, and re-hanging, on October 30 we will reopen the thirty-nine galleries as the showcase for the Metropolitan’s renowned collection. The pictures are now presented as national schools, each of which is set apart in a suite of galleries, all painted the same color: the rooms devoted to the Italians are red, the Dutch green, and so forth. The colors are deep, saturated hues – a bold departure from the pastels used in the past. Dark-colored walls reflect less light than pale ones, particularly in daylight, which tends to make light walls glare, so that the paintings seem dark by comparison. Saturated wall colors eliminate this contrast. Indeed, most of the pictures look as if they had been recently cleaned, but this is an optical illusion. In reality, the painted highlights no longer compete with the brilliance of the surrounding walls.

Under the old installation formula, the paintings were arranged chronologically, but the progression was interrupted here and there by galleries set aside for stylistic groupings, such as neoclassicism and rococo, or for collections bequeathed by Michael Friedsam, Jules S. Bache, and Benjamin Altman. Works by one painter could be scattered in as many as four different sections of the exhibition area. Now, thanks to the understanding and cooperation of the foundations and heirs involved, we have integrated to the extent that each one is now adjacent to the rooms containing related paintings from the Museum’s collection. With the new arrangement, the visitor will discover in one suite of galleries all the paintings of a given artist or school in chronological order. For instance, Rembrandt’s early canvas the Noble Slav (1632) hangs in the midst of contemporary works by Frans Hals and other Dutch artists, and its dramatic lighting can be seen as part of a general trend. In the next gallery, visible through the doorway, is Rembrandt’s Aristotle with a Bust of Homer. Painted in 1653, its mature style contrasts with the boisterous works in the earlier Dutch room and takes on greater meaning in its historical setting.

Because pictures of each national school are no longer segregated according to style, there are fascinating juxtapositions throughout the galleries. For example, François Boucher’s Toilet of Venus hangs together with Jean-Baptiste-Marie Pierre’s Death of Harmonia. The Boucher was executed for Mme de Pompadour in 1751. The Pierre was painted and exhibited at the Salon of that same year, but its subject and grandiloquent style, which look ahead to the classicizing painters of the Revolution, are strikingly different from Boucher’s voluptuous masterpiece. The two pictures represent the contrasting fibers woven into the fabric of eighteenth-century French art.

In order to help the visitor draw such comparisons, we have installed display tables and more informative labels on the walls. In addition to giving the artist’s dates, the new labels tell whether the work is firmly dated and give a scholarly approximation if it is not. Two rooms have been set aside for special purposes. The first functions as an information center and reading room, where catalogues and articles on the Museum’s paintings are available and where visitors can find the location of the works they wish to see. The second room will house temporary exhibitions drawn from the Museum’s collections, organized alternately by the departments of European Paintings and Twentieth Century Art. Each show will examine a theme or even an individual painting: it will be an educational supplement to the permanent exhibition.

When all is said and done, it is the pictures that really matter. We have merely provided a new context for viewing them, and we hope the innovations will provide more intelligible and stimulating ways of sharing our holdings with our ever-increasing public.

Everett Fahy
Curator in Charge of European Paintings

Photograph: Cheryl Rossum
Gunsmithing has always been a profession for the artistically inclined. In studying the mechanisms one sees the gunmaker's ingenuity in solving intricate mechanical problems, and in studying the ornament one sees how skillfully the design was adapted to the structural features—often a decorative scroll added strength to the delicate reverse-curved cock of the lock. The achievements of the master gunsmith can be found in an exhibition of 220 firearms from the collection of Clay P. Bedford, presented in the Museum's Central Armor Hall. Representing the work of about a hundred leading British and Irish gunmakers during a period when they were world-renowned for their skill, the exhibition spans about three centuries, the earliest pieces dating from the time of Elizabeth I.

Fifteen categories of weapons are included. Among the most sumptuous are the silver-mounted English pistols whose decoration was a product of the collaboration of silversmith and gunmaker, and dueling pistols with steel furniture skillfully engraved. The barrels of these pistols are of “Damascus” steel, so called because a pattern like that of damask silk appeared during the etching process, and they usually have a handsome hardwood case with accessories.

There is also a group of military pistols and guns from the reign of all the British monarchs from Elizabeth I to George III. In examining these military pieces one will see the vast difference in the degree of skill required to make a military musket and a precision shotgun, such as the sporting and custom-built officers' firearms that form the heart of the exhibition. The finest specimens of flintlock guns were made in England in the latter third of the eighteenth century and the first part of the nineteenth. They are appreciated for the strength of the metal used in the barrels, the reliability of performance of the locks, the excellent quality of workmanship, and their attractive appearance.

In the history of gunmaking, the period 1805-1835 was a critical one, for then all gunmakers were experimenting with improvements. During this period, English gunsmiths made contributions that revolutionized the art of gunmaking. Indeed, some of the great nineteenth-century firms whose work is represented in the exhibition continue to make superior firearms today.

Stephen V. Grancsay
Curator Emeritus of Arms and Armor

Exhibition catalogue: Early Firearms of Great Britain and Ireland. 272 pages. 288 black and white illustrations. 8½ x 11 inches. Clothbound, $17.50; paperbound, $4.95.

Silver furniture from a bolster pistol by Joseph Griffin of London, stamped with the mark of Jeremiah Ashley and the date letter for 1762.
Josef Albers has said that his great negative ambition has always been to do work that didn’t look like anyone else’s. In this, of course, he has succeeded. And curiously enough the place he has carved for himself has been resistant to direct imitation. Albers’s uniqueness resides in the parallel paths his work has taken along roads marked Science and Poetry. In the late fifties and early sixties there was much panic-stricken thought abroad that these roads were mutually exclusive, even antagonistic. But there has always been art that made nonsense of this false duality, and Albers’s art is a contemporary refutation of it.

The scientific aspect of his researches lies in his color theories dealing both with light and with paint, but primarily with what the eye is capable of distinguishing. The Homage to the Square series, which makes up the largest group in his work since the early fifties and on which much of his international reputation depends, is his major concern not so much because of any compulsive need to project the same image again and again, but because it provides a controlled structure for his ideas about color—like the controlled factor in a scientific experiment by which one measures all the others.

While this may have a ring of coldness or even sterility in its apparent insistence on a theoretical framework, anyone’s direct experience with the paintings and prints gives such an impression the lie. The strictness of the man and his theories are at every point tempered by his passion and warmth, by his dedication to communicating a wide range of humanistic moods and feelings to his audience. A painter who repeats himself meaninglessly and emptily is trying to remember how it felt to paint a picture last year. That doesn’t work. The great men remain in touch with the wellsprings of their own creativity, and thus the energy that informs the work is theirs, in their mind and hand. The problem of a maintained level of inspiration and execution is acute in the stripped and repeated images of today’s painting, because in the self-limiting vocabulary of shapes and relationships in each artist’s work there is no place for him to hide. This is the strength of the art and its emptiness when it goes bad. All is out in the open for everyone to see.

Albers’s goal has always been the invention of new and intense visual statements presented with traditional standards of craftsmanship. These statements include not only his paintings but also one of the twentieth century’s truly original bodies of prints. The Metropolitan Museum is proud to exhibit the works, both paintings and graphics, that demonstrate his achievement. He is now in his eighty-fourth year and there is more work to come. Congratulations to the stern but joyous Josef Albers!

Henry Geldzahler
Curator of Twentieth Century Art


This text has been adapted from the catalogue issued by the Metropolitan Museum to accompany this exhibition: Josef Albers at The Metropolitan Museum of Art. 84 pages. 16 color plates, 44 black and white illustrations. 10 x 10 inches. Paperbound, $4.95.
Albrecht Dürer
Closes November 14, 1971

The Metropolitan Museum of Art in observing the five-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Albrecht Dürer has drawn outstanding works from its collection – examples in every print technique that Dürer explored, along with two actual woodblocks, eight rare drawings, Italian majolica plates, and his illustrated books.

Albrecht Dürer is generally considered to be Germany's greatest artist. He began his work as a member of the provincial Gothic school of Nuremberg, and became one of the most important artists of the Renaissance. Dürer was equally at home in many media: he worked in pen, silverpoint, and chalk, in watercolor and oil, in engraving, etching, drypoint, and woodcut.

In his early years, Dürer was drawn to classical art and to the new humanism emanating from Italy, and he set his sights on mastering the perfect proportional canon for rendering the human figure. Dürer's mature work, reflecting his assimilation of Renaissance ideals of beauty, had tremendous impact on his contemporaries and on later artists throughout Europe. Exhibited next to the Dürer prints they depend upon are several copies and derivations by Italian sixteenth-century printmakers. Some are nearly line-for-line copies, others show that Dürer's masterpieces were used as a source for both specific details and technical and compositional ideas. Copied by his contemporaries (about which he himself complained), he also has inspired a host of decorative artists – carvers, jewelers, armorers, enamilers, and potters – down through the centuries.

The prints in this exhibition have been grouped by subject matter or by theme. As a result one can see how Dürer developed a particular subject in several techniques over a period of time. One can also see how themes such as violence and death recur in many guises in his work. Among others, the exhibition contains groups of peasants, horses, nudes, and portraits, and an unusual group of coats of arms including a rare example of Dürer's own arms.

The Riders on the Four Horses, from the Apocalypse, by Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528), German. Woodcut, 15 1/4 x 11 inches. Gift of Junius S. Morgan, 19.73.209
In Quest of Comfort: The Easy Chair in America
Opens November 24, 1971

This show is the first of a series dealing with different forms or themes represented in the American Wing’s furniture collections.

In the eighteenth century an “easie” chair seems almost always to have meant what is today popularly called a “wing” chair – that is, a fully upholstered chair with rounded “wings” projecting from the sides of the back above the arms.

The easy chair’s purpose has changed over the years. Today we put it in the best parlor for display, but inventories of eighteenth-century households prove that most were originally placed in bedchambers. They were for use by the sick and the aged – people who might not move from their chairs all day. Hence, the commodious seats and the wings on which to lean. “Easy” referred to comfort, but it had another meaning as well. The majority of easy chairs were originally furnished with a “close stool” or chamber pot placed beneath a removable seat; “to do one’s ease” was a contemporary idiom referring to the use of such hardware.

The easy chair was an English invention, originating in the 1670s during the middle of Charles II’s reign. It was brought to the American colonies directly by the many chairmakers and upholsterers who emigrated there and continued in their trade. An advertisement in a Philadelphia newspaper, The Pennsylvania Packet, for August 1, 1739, is typical: “Plunket Fleeson, Upholsterer, lately from London and Dublin, at the Sign of the Easy Chair, near Mr. Hamilton’s in Chestnut-Street; makes all kinds of Upholsterers Work after the best manner…” But the earliest known reference to an easy chair on these shores occurs in the inventory of a New York City estate back in 1708.

English furniture styles have always been dependent upon London, but in America independent “style centers” emerged as early as the beginning of the eighteenth century. Boston, Newport, and Philadelphia became leaders by mid-century, and cabinetwork in each center is different in style and in construction from that made elsewhere.

The design of the legs and seat rails of easy chairs naturally parallels that of contem-
porary sidechairs and armchairs (although the structure supporting the upholstered part remained unchanged until after the Revolution). Thus, a fine chair that descended in the McIlvaine family of Philadelphia, here exhibited with its upholstery removed to show how it was made (Figure 1), has all the characteristics of Philadelphia chairs in the Queen Anne style: stylistically, the slipper foot ornamented only with a raised “tongue” on its upper surface and the rear legs cut as octagonally sectioned “stump” feet; structurally, the thick seat rails laid horizontally and joined to the front legs by means of a dovetail-shaped extension of the leg. Compare this construction with that of a Newport-made chair (Figure 2). The thin rails of the latter are placed vertically, and mortised into the top of the front legs.

The regional differences are legion, and not restricted to the visible parts of the frame. Note how on the Philadelphia chair the armrest ends in the shape of a curving C. In New England a vertical arm termination was preferred, as can be seen in the most remarkable of all surviving American easy chairs, made in Newport and upholstered by one “Gardner Junr” in 1758 (Figure 2). In form alone this is one of the loveliest American chairs, but it has the added interest of an inscription with the name of the upholsterer and the date he did it, and the original upholstery entirely intact. Front, sides, and cushion are covered in colorful flamestitch needlework; the back – visible when the chair was pulled up before a fireplace – has a charming arcadian scene, complete with romping deer, in crewelwork.

The wing-type easy chair lost favor in England when the elaborately carved Chippendale style was introduced in the 1740s and 1750s. But in America it continued in fashion until the 1790s; chairs were made at the same time in either the Queen Anne or Chippendale styles – the one with plain walnut legs, the other (at slightly greater cost) with mahogany legs enriched with claw and ball feet and carved foliage upon the knees. At the century’s end the English designer Hepplewhite introduced the “saddle cheek” type, which gave the easy chair a new lease on life both in England and America.

The easy chair represents a union of the crafts of chairmaker and upholsterer. In order to demonstrate materials and methods of construction as well as regional styles and upholstery, the present exhibition juxtaposes stripped-down examples of the major types of easy chairs with upholstered examples of similar chairs, providing a hitherto unknown dimension to one of the classic forms of American furniture.

Morrison H. Heckscher
Assistant Curator, The American Wing


Drawings: Gillian Wilson
Pleasing Eye & Ear Alike

Emanuel Winternitz
Curator of Musical Instruments

A motto frequently painted on keyboard instruments of the Renaissance says: "Pleasing to ear and eye alike." This sums up two aspects inherent in musical instruments: their function as machines producing organized sound, and their aesthetic appeal to the eye, as treasures of art.

The Metropolitan Museum possesses a famous collection of 4,000 musical instruments, of which the main part, the Crosby Brown Collection of Musical Instruments of All Nations, was donated to the Museum between 1889 and 1904. Numerous exhibitions in the past presented segments of this collection, especially from the European section. Now, for the first time in many years, a systematically chosen and representative selection from the Museum's entire collection will be placed on exhibition.

The choice of instruments and the ways of grouping them presented a number of problems and alternatives, especially in view of the various types of visitors to be expected.

Some would be professional musicians; others, music students, amateurs, historians of music, collectors, and laymen intrigued by the bizarre or beautiful shapes, or, as art lovers, by the manifold types of decoration that ornament the instruments. Ethnologists and ethnomusicologists would be interested in the relation between the instruments and the many other tools produced in the same cultural orbit. Psychologists and cultural historians would like to explore the symbolism of the instruments used in religious ceremonies in old civilizations, such as those of India, Indochina, and China. Physicists and historians of technology, again, would focus on the functional aspects of the tools of music as machines producing certain tone colors.

How, then, should an exhibition satisfy and anticipate these various tastes, experiences, and interests? Many methods are available to the curator. One could stress the functional approach or the aesthetic appeal. One could group instruments into families of different sizes (as they were built in the high and late Renaissance in Europe) to show the evolution of technical construction, or one could combine instruments of different kinds, such as wind and string and percussion, as they were traditionally played in ensembles. The alternatives are infinite, and the following illustrations will exemplify, better than words, the variety of approaches attempted in the present exhibition.

For acoustical reasons, stringed instruments require resonators—that is, hollow bodies that reinforce by their resonance the sound of vibrating strings. The variety of the shapes of resonators is astounding. One striking example is the marouane or valiba from Madagascar reproduced on the cover. This instrument consists of a tube of bamboo carrying twenty wire strings, their tiny sound greatly reinforced by the palm-leaf hood functioning as a resonator.

Numerous other examples of resonators made from natural products are found all over the world. In India, for instance, the vina (technically a stick zither) has resonators made from gourds. The sīna has a long history and countless varieties exist, of which two are shown at the upper right. Three or two large gourds were first used; later, only one, the other being transformed into an artfully fashioned lute body.

Sometimes the resonator is formed not by a natural object but by a sculpted hollow representation of the body of an animal, as in the mayuri (the Sanskrit word for "peacock") on the right, a bowed instrument that originated as early as A.D. 500.
Like many other instruments of the Renaissance and early baroque, string as well as wood, the deep-bodied, many-stringed viols with their silvery, subdued sound were built in families reaching from high treble to bass, reflecting the earlier practice of having the various voices of the chorus, from high soprano to low bass, accompanied by their instrumental counterparts. The specimens illustrated below were not all built at the same time, but have been combined to impress on the visitor the principle of the instrumental family.

The period from Bach to Wagner witnessed a rapid evolution of the mechanics of brass instruments, from the natural horn and the natural trumpet to the valve instruments. Numerous technical improvements, some long forgotten, originated during this fertile span of time. For instance, many experiments with methods of coiling were made, designed to compress a long tube into a compact and handy form (below). Other experiments concerned extra loops of tubing for changing the pitch (opposite). An important phase in this evolution was the "invention horn," using interchangeable "crooks" added to the main body of the instrument to permit playing in different keys. A short-lived experiment was the cor omnitonique, which used a slide to select any one of a permanently attached set of crooks. The final solution was the invention of valves in their various forms (piston, rotary, and others). Apart from their functional interest, these instruments are often of great visual appeal as well.
Frequently the same traditional style of decoration is applied to musical instruments of quite different function, as it is to other tools of the same tribe. A simple example is found in instruments of New Guinea. There, the typical spiral patterns incised on the surface and intensified by white lime filled into the grooves, are found on bull-roarers and on time markers (left). The bull-roarer is a flat piece of wood, whirled through the air by means of a string and spinning at the same time around its axis. The eerie noise, loud and frightening, that it produces is believed to be the voice of the ancestors. The time marker, a spatula made of dark wood, is used by the natives to mark time in their chants by striking the palm of the hand. Apart from this musical function, it also is used to stir the lime they mix with betel nuts, which they chew like tobacco.

Often one single instrument partakes of many different kinds of embellishments. The magnificent spinettina (back cover), made in 1540 for Eleonora d’Este, the Duchess of Urbino, presents a veritable catalogue of fashionable styles of decoration prevailing at the time: carving (as in the walls protecting the ends of the keyboard, showing a dragon intertwining its tail with that of a dolphin, and a goat-footed, winged female monster riding on the dolphin’s snout), subtle intarsia in wood and mother-of-pearl, certosina work, and painted arabesques—all absorbed into one pleasing, homogeneous decorative scheme. It also has an exquisite soundhole rose made of several layers of parchment in flamboyant Gothic tracery (frontispiece).

An especially intriguing phenomenon is the symbolic form of instruments, particularly those in animal shape. One striking example in the Far East is the wooden fish (mu yu in Chinese, mo kugyo in Japanese), actually a slit drum (the slit is on its underside), illustrated at the lower right. It is hit with a long-shafted hammer to mark certain moments in Buddhist and Taoist services. In most early societies, the fish stands for water: water means birth and also, because of the sea’s periodic tides, is symbolic of the moon and of the recurrent cycles in a woman’s life. And because of its association with water, a fish-shaped instrument would also be used in prayers for rain.

The little ball moving freely in the mouth of these drums has been connected with resurrection myths, comparable to the Biblical story of Jonah, who survived being swallowed by the whale. Other drums vaguely retain elements of the fish body—so stylized, however, that the original shape of the fish retained in the mu yu is not easily noticeable. The ball between the jaws forms a clue for the observer.

The bat—according to folklore, the bringer of luck—often decorates the heads of Chinese and Japanese lutes (upper right). Such bats range from realistic representations to ornamental versions resolving the animal body into patterns—some resembling butterflies, while others are seemingly free ornaments recognizable as bats only to the knowing eye.

In Northwest American Indian art, we find many examples of the reduction of animal depictions to semi-ornamental designs in their characteristic linear idiom. The illustration at the right shows one of the ingenious stopped pipes traditional in the Queen Charlotte Islands of British Columbia (Haida tribe). Beneath the mouthpiece is carved a bear, one of the totemic emblems of the Haida, its snout, nostrils, teeth, eyes, and claws clearly discernible in spite of the restrictions of the available surface.

Left: Bull-roarer and time marker, from New Guinea. The Crosby Brown Collection, 89.4.3625,767

Right: Stopped flute, from British Columbia (Haida tribe). The Crosby Brown Collection, 89.4.2778

Far right, above: Bats decorating the heads of Chinese lutes. The Crosby Brown Collection, 89.4.32; Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 50.145.74

Far right, below: Japanese slit drums. The Crosby Brown Collection, 89.4.1711,2838,72
Still life of instruments from the new André Mertens Galleries for Musical Instruments, photographed by Lee Boltin, and selected and arranged by the Museum's Design Department. From left: Chinese lute of the Ming dynasty, 17th century, Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 50.145.74. Vina, from India, Gift of Alice Getty, 46.4.3. German horn made of pottery, 18th century, The Crosby Brown Collection, 89.4.115. Norwegian hardanger fele, 19th century, Gift of the University of Pennsylvania Museum, 53.36.4. Burmese horn, The Crosby Brown Collection, 89.4.1752. German guitar, 18th century, Rogers Fund, 69.29.
An “inconspicuous mound” at Hacilar in southwestern Turkey yielded extraordinary finds that were anything but inconspicuous from the very first excavating season, 1957, through the last, 1960, four campaigns later. The quantity and quality of architectural remains, painted pottery, and other artifacts at this neolithic site amazed archaeologists and laymen alike. Of more historical and artistic value than any other objects excavated at Hacilar, however, are the many solid terracotta figurines of women found within the houses. They are usually represented standing but sometimes sitting or lying on their stomachs, with both hands either holding the breasts or held at the sides; sometimes they are shown with animals. Most of the figurines are steatopygous (that is, they have great concentrations of fat in their buttocks), and they all exhibit...
exaggeration of the breasts, stomach, and thighs; the genitalia, however, apparently were never marked off. In size the figurines vary from about five and a half inches to twelve inches. The painted decoration is usually burnished red and cream slip, while sometimes it is plain monochrome.

Male figurines were not found at Hacilar, although there are several examples of a boy clinging to a woman (at least these “youths” are smaller than the females). They apparently represent either children or young lovers of the females they accompany. At a site to the east of Hacilar called Chatal Hüyük, however, excavators found not only similar female figurines but also male ones, usually made of stone rather than terracotta. We do not know whether the occurrence of males at one site and their absence from another is culturally significant or is simply an archaeological accident.

With the help of comparative archaeology and carbon-14 analysis of other material found at Hacilar, it has been concluded that most of the figurines were manufactured sometime in the sixth millennium B.C., that is, over 7,000 years ago. In addition, the figurines are an important source of information about neolithic religion. Even with conservative interpretation – which is mandatory when one is dealing with material that has no written accompanying texts and that originated in a time and culture so far removed from one’s own – we are impressed by the exaggerated attributes of “womaness” in these little figures. And it is reasonable to assume that they represent some abstraction of female attributes or power, power over love, fertility, and birth. Indeed, most scholars consider the figurines to be portrayals of fertility or mother goddesses, and I see no reason to disagree, but none of the experts will hazard a guess as to whether the figurines all represent one particular goddess or many different goddesses. Nor are we able to know whether steatopygy was a typical feature of southwest Anatolian ladies during the neolithic period. But even if steatopygy was prevalent, I doubt that the figurines were simple dolls or toys, merely depicting local women. In any event, the terracotta ladies are beautiful works of art, and they illustrate for us the high technical and aesthetic level of neolithic artists.

Because of the great interest aroused by the first publication of the figurines in 1958, antiquities dealers began to acquire and sell them. Many museums and private collectors in Europe and the United States bought figurines and the lovely painted pottery vessels allegedly from Hacilar, and they exhibited and published them. Within a short period of time, however, some scholars realized that many of the objects offered for sale or already in collections were forgeries. Some were crudely made, others less so, and every knowledgeable curator had a private list of forgeries, the dealers that sold them, and the collections that exhibited them. But “Hacilar” objects did not come on the market only from dealers – people with Turkish names living in Europe offered figurines they claimed they found personally at Hacilar, which, because there was no middleman, they could sell cheap. I saw a letter supposedly from a Turk living in Paris who was “working his way through college”: he was willing to part with his valuable Hacilar collection found, of course, by him and his family. His photographs showed badly made forgeries, some in crudely rendered erotic situations, not one of which looked like any figurine excavated at Hacilar.

As a result of the onslaught of forgeries, curators, collectors, and honest dealers were on guard. But the forgers were not to be outwitted: they became quite skilled after some time, and more natural and better-made figurines were put on the market – and bought. One of these found its way into the collection of The Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1964 (Figure 1).
The purchase was made in good faith from a reputable dealer after careful examination, and all concerned in its purchase accepted the figurine as genuine. Fortunately, in the last few years—since the time the figurine was purchased—two sources of information have developed that now enable us to know whether a Hacilar ceramic figurine is authentic. One is the notes taken by an archaeologist, David Biernoff, who worked at Hacilar and there made a study of the excavated figurines. Thanks to his study, we have been able to learn something about the technique used to manufacture the Hacilar figurines, about which nothing had been published up to the time of this writing (February 1971). The second, and ultimately more important, development was the application of thermoluminescent analysis (starting in the early sixties) to baked clay objects, which has become a reliable dating method. To this point I will speak first, and only briefly.

All clays contain certain minerals that absorb and store energy when exposed to radiation. This radiation comes from the decay of radioactive elements that are always present in small concentrations. When the clay is originally fired, its stored energy is released—erased, as it were—but immediately after firing, energy is again gradually stored up. This accumulated energy can be measured: upon heating, it is released in the form of light, whose intensity is proportional to the number of years since the clay was fired (among other factors). Simply stated, a small sample of recently baked terracotta would yield a low light intensity when measured for thermoluminescence (indicating a short time period for the storage of energy), but clay baked centuries ago would yield a high light intensity. The accuracy of thermoluminescent dating is approximately ten per cent, and although research is still going on, this method has already established itself as reliable for dating and authentication.

In 1967, we first became interested in testing our figurine by the new thermoluminescent process. When we learned in August 1969 that Dr. Martin Aitken of the Research Laboratory for Archaeology and the History of Art at Oxford was interested in testing objects, we asked him to examine our piece to determine its authenticity. At this time we believed the piece to be ancient but we wanted corroboration from the
scientific community. He accepted our request and gave detailed instructions about getting a sample for testing.

We separated the figurine along a break that had been repaired across its middle to get a sample from the interior. It was at this point that I became worried. For the first time we were able to see how the figurine had been made: it was modeled in one piece – sculpted rather than formed from separate lumps of clay (Figure 6). As we know from Biernoff’s Hacilar notes, the figurines excavated there were made by first fashioning a core to which pieces of clay were added until the desired body shape was achieved. (Fragments of female figurines found years ago at neolithic Thespiai in Greece exhibited the same construction.) Subsequently arms, legs, thighs, buttocks, breasts, and head were added as separate units. In cross section the body has a spiral-like effect (Figure 5). This effect, of course, would be visible only on fragments. Thus, when we saw that the cross section of the Museum figurine formed a solid unit, I was prepared to hear from Aitken that it was not ancient. In January 1970 we received Aitken’s report, which frankly stated that the figurine “was fired during the last 200 years and probably much more recently.”

During the year in which we bought the first figurine, 1964, a friend of our department gave us two others. One was a fragment consisting of the torso and upper thighs of a female; the head, arms, and legs were missing (Figures 2, 3). We considered this fragment to be genuine. It exhibited the technical characteristics of the excavated examples from Hacilar – it was built up from pieces, not sculpted from a single lump of clay (Figure 5). The second figurine had been bought from a dealer as a forgery, that is, both the buyer and seller knew it was not genuine, and we gladly accepted it as a study piece (Figures 4, 7).

At the same time that samples were taken for thermoluminescent testing from the figurine we had purchased, we decided to take a sample from the spiral-like core of the torso fragment as a check on our conclusion that it was genuine. (We did not take a sample from the second complete figurine, as we already knew it to be false and did not wish to clutter up Aitken’s laboratory.) The results of this test came in the same letter that condemned the first lady: our fragment passed the test and was indeed ancient, thus justifying our observations about technique.

Now that we had a confirmed ancient figurine in our collection, albeit a fragment, we decided to exhibit it. First we had to clear away the earth that encrusted its surface. A surprise awaited us: there was a join along the upper belly and, in fact, the upper and lower fragments did not fit neatly together. Moreover, the cleaned surface showed conclusively that we actually had fragments of two figurines of slightly different color that had been joined together – the earth encrustation was applied in modern times to mask the join (Figure 3). On separating the fragments, we found that the cores of both had been filed smooth by a modern workman to make the join fit better; and adhesive was then applied, followed by the application of the earth. Because of the filing, we were not able to see if the upper fragment exhibited the spiral-like effect denoting great age. Yet I am inclined to think it is genuine and that the person who joined the fragments together had two odd but authentic pieces in his collection. He thought that a larger fragment would look better than two small ones and so put them together. If he had wished to create a new top for the genuine belly and thigh fragment, I think he would have added a section with a head. In any event, the upper part has not been analyzed so we cannot be certain.

One more test remained. This would be to cut or, better, to break our known
5. View of the interior of our authentic Hacilar figurine (Figures 2, 3), showing the spiral-like core that proves it was built up from pieces of clay in the ancient technique. The gouging in the center resulted from acquiring a sample for thermoluminescent testing.

Forgery in half at the belly in order to see what technique was used to make it. I consulted members of the Conservation Department, who had worked with me on all matters discussed in this article. Master Restorer Ed Rowe agreed to break the figurine — cutting with a saw would make a smooth surface and probably render the spiral-like effect, if it existed, invisible. The figurine was broken in half and its core, in cross section, documented the fact that the figurine had been sculpted (Figure 7), just like the other forgery (Figure 6), verifying our observation that genuine figurines and modern ones are not made in the same way.

Thermoluminescent testing has justified and supported conclusions based on observations of artistic technique. It is important to stress the fact that with technical information at hand, we were able to make judgments that were not forthcoming through art-historical analysis alone. Art historians are more aware now than they were even five or ten years ago that studying the technique of the artist or artisan is essential if one wishes to understand a work of art. It is certainly crucial for detecting forgeries. Fortunately, art historians and scientists are cooperating more than ever before to solve problems of manufacture and of authenticity, and thermoluminescent testing is only one of many analytic tools now available.

The Museum has lost one of its favorite objects, an object considered to be one of the earliest works of art in the collection. But at the same time it is pleasing to remember that another lady — at least her belly and upper thighs — takes its place. And we may now confidently refer to our Hacilar lady from the sixth millennium B.C., one of the earliest objects in the Museum.
6, 7. Views of the interiors of the two forgeries (Figures 1, 4), which were sculpted in one piece, an indication of their recent manufacture.

Notes
It was James Mellaart of The Institute of Archaeology, London, who led the Hacilar expeditions and who found the male stone figures at Chatal Hüyük, not far from Hacilar.

In the course of our discussions concerning the Metropolitan's figurine, Dr. Martin Aitken of Oxford and I agreed to share the publication of his tests in the August issue of Archaeometry (a magazine in which the method and several applications have been described since 1962) and in this Bulletin. I wish to thank him publicly for his cooperation and achievements.

At first I was inclined not to publish all the observations set forth here concerning the techniques of the ancient and modern manufacturers of Hacilar figurines lest it help the forger. But it seems to me that it would have been hard to discuss the problem of forgeries on the basis of scientific testing alone. Furthermore, with the existence of thermoluminescent analysis, terracotta forgery now becomes more difficult, perhaps even impossible. It is doubtful that forgers will be encouraged to change their manufacturing techniques in order to fool sophisticated clients. No one should buy a terracotta object without getting it tested. Better still, no one should buy objects unless they have been scientifically excavated and passed on by the local authorities. The only good object is an excavated one.
A Sculpture by Agnolo di Polo

John Goldsmith Phillips
Curator Emeritus of Western European Arts
In the spring of 1970, Wildenstein & Company offered the Metropolitan, as a gift, a lifesize polychromed terracotta figure of a standing lady (Figure 1). Although Leo Planiscig had described it in 1939 as a “very important work” by Benedetto da Maiano (1442-1497), there were serious doubts about its authenticity in the minds of many.

In an effort to determine whether it was made during the Renaissance or much later, two specimens of terracotta taken from the sculpture were subjected to thermoluminescent tests at the Research Laboratory for Archaeology and the History of Art in Oxford. The conclusion arrived at was that the sculpture was made between 475 and 710 years ago – 1260-1495. Dr. Stuart Fleming of the Oxford Laboratory noted in a letter to Dr. Pieter Meyers, Research Chemist in the Metropolitan’s Conservation Department, that “the most favored date for the ‘Majano’ lady is 485 years old,” that is to say, 1485.

Although 1485 corresponds to a year when Benedetto was active, evidence of style did not recommend the attribution of the sculpture to him. Late in October, Dr. Ulrich Middeldorf, Director of the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence, was in New York. He looked at the terracotta, and in a dazzling display of instantaneous recollection of a related object, identified it as the work of Agnolo di Polo.

Little enough is known about Agnolo di Polo. He was born in Florence in 1469 or 1470, son of the painter Polo di Agnolo dei Vetri. The time of his death is unrecorded. Vasari described him as a pupil of Verrocchio “who worked quite proficiently in clay, filling the city of Florence with works by his hand; and if he had wanted to apply himself properly to his art, he would have made very beautiful things.”

By 1495 Agnolo was getting work from nearby Pistoia. He made a Magdalen and, probably, a St. Anthony for Pistoia’s Ospedale della Morte. Both sculptures are recorded as lost in recent literature. In 1498, Agnolo made a terracotta bust of the Savior for the Sapienza of Pistoia (Figure 3). It remained there until recently and is presently exhibited in the local Museo Civico. Until now it has been the only sculpture that could be assigned to Agnolo – and it is the piece remembered by Middeldorf.

It no longer stands alone. For when the Savior and the terracotta standing lady are compared, there are found in both the same curiously egg-shaped head, the same treatment of features and of the locks framing them, and a like management of hairline over brow. These two sculptures are, it would seem, the work of a single modeler in clay, and since one of the two – the Savior – is clearly by Agnolo di Polo, the other – the standing lady – must also be his.

Something of the manner of Verrocchio is to be discerned in both the Pistoia Savior and the Museum’s lady. Agnolo’s contacts with Verrocchio must, however, have been limited – if indeed there were such contacts. From a tax report of Agnolo’s father, it is known that the son was born in 1469-1470. If, as would have been normal, Agnolo was about fourteen when he entered Verrocchio’s shop as an apprentice, this would have happened in 1483-1484. But Verrocchio left Florence about 1483 to establish himself in Venice. From about 1483 until his death in Venice in 1488, he spent most if not all of his days in that then distant city.

Nevertheless, his shop in Florence did not cease operating. According to Vasari, “when Andrea [del Verrocchio] went to Venice . . . he left to Lorenzo [di Credi] the whole management and administration of his revenues and affairs, and likewise all his drawings, relief, statues, and art materials. Lorenzo . . . also went more than once to Venice to see [Verrocchio] and to render him an account of his good administration.”
While Agnolo was receiving his training in Verrocchio’s shop, his actual master was Lorenzo di Credi. As for Lorenzo, it need only be said that he followed Verrocchio’s style—softly.

Agnolo was, of course, aware of what was happening in the world of art in Florence. Perhaps the most exciting of contemporary commissions in painting was that awarded in 1485 to Domenico Ghirlandaio for a cycle of frescoes to be executed in the Church of Santa Maria Novella. Giovanni Tornabuoni, head of the Tornabuoni family and uncle of Lorenzo de’ Medici, desiring a family chapel, gave the order, and work was completed by 1490. It is a matter of intense interest that when Agnolo modeled the standing lady, he based his figure on a lady who holds the center of the stage in one of these frescoes by Ghirlandaio, the Birth of the Baptist (Figures 5, 10).

From evidence presented up to this point, we may suggest as a working hypothesis that the date for Agnolo’s lady lies somewhere between the earliest date for the Ghirlandaio, 1485, and the latest date as given in the Oxford report, 1495.

Who is the attractive woman portrayed by Agnolo? If the period we have just proposed, 1485-1495, is correct, she may well be the St. Mary Magdalen made for the Ospedale della Morte in 1495, and presumed to be lost. The Pistoia Magdalen? Though this may sound like a wild surmise, there is evidence—in the Sapienza documents, in the history of Pistoia, and from further scientific examination of the sculpture itself—to support such a claim. But first let us show that she is a Magdalen.

In the early 1500s, the Magdalen was included in several glazed terracotta altarpieces by Giovanni della Robbia, a sculptor who certainly knew Agnolo well; the two men may have collaborated at times, although there is no documentary evidence to support such an assumption. In the altarpieces, the Magdalen uniformly represents a successful sinner who will sin no more. These Magdalens may be said to have been inspired, if indirectly, by the sculpture of Agnolo di Polo; the calendar is witness to this hypothesis, for neither these nor any others conceived in this manner are as early as 1495. Agnolo’s Magdalen is therefore a work of iconographical significance, his manner of portraying the saint as a suave and resplendent person being entirely new. Like the earlier figure, each of Giovanni’s is good looking; her hair falls to her shoulders in parallel braids; fashionable garments are partly hidden by a cloak over her shoulders. Most of them carry a box of unguents in the right hand and some a book in the left; the Magdalen at Santa Croce carries both (Figure 7).

All that Agnolo’s figure lacks for proof positive of her identity is the unguent jar in her right hand. Since that hand was broken off long ago, such evidence is denied us. As a replacement there is a cumbersome hand—without unguent jar—surely old, but carved in wood!

Support for our contention that the sculpture is the Magdalen modeled by Agnolo di Polo exists in documents from the archives at Pistoia, published by Peleo Bacci in 1905, a summary of which follows:

On August 16, 1495, the officers of the Sapienza in Pistoia decided to order a terracotta figure of St. Mary Magdalen for the oratory attached to the Ospedale della Morte, and on the following September 1 Agnolo di Polo received first payment for work on this figure; final payment came on October 12. The Magdalen was, therefore, modeled between August 15 and October 12, 1495. On October 15 the officers appropriated the funds required for its installation in the Ospedale. The sculpture was delivered to Pistoia unpainted, for on March 31, 1496, a local master, Bernardino del Signoraccio, was paid for painting it.
Sometime between March 31, 1496, and June 23, 1498, the Magdalen met with an accident, for on the later date it was described as all broken (tutta rota). On June 27, 1498 Agnolo was paid for repairing it.

Ill luck seems to have followed this sculpture, for on April 26, 1500, Agnolo was again paid to repair it. Restoration of the terracotta also required renewal of Signoraccio’s painted surfaces. On April 8, 1503, Tommaso di Talento received cash for the purchase of colors and gold for painting the Magdalen, and fastening her to the tabernacle in the Ospedale. This niche must have been well up on a wall, possibly over a door, for on the same April 8 a foreman, Bartolommeo di Filici, stated that he had spent a certain sum for taking down the scaffolding and closing the holes (presumably those made in the wall to receive the scaffolding’s supports).

The history of Pistoia as given in the Dizionario Geografico Storico della Toscana, published in Florence in 1841, throws light on the meaning of these documents. We read that after having occupied Pistoia for two years, 1494-1496, the French troops of Charles VIII withdrew. Two local families – the Pantiacchi and the Cancellieri – thereupon vied for control of the city. Pistoia was split into two factions, and civil war, marked by insensate slaughter, broke out and continued for several years. In 1499 the city was described as having the aspect of an ancient Roman center that had been invaded by barbarian hordes. Through Florentine mediation, peace came on October 12, 1501.

Although funds had been appropriated in 1495 to place the Magdalen in a tabernacle, because of the disruption caused by civil war, this was evidently not done. There is no record of payment actually being made for this work at that time. The Magdalen may have been kept within the confines of the Ospedale, perhaps in a vulnerable spot. It was damaged and was repaired in 1498. It was again damaged, and again repaired, in 1500. Two years after the arrival of peace in 1501, the Magdalen was repainted and at long last placed in the tabernacle prepared to receive it.

While the Museum was awaiting formal reports from Oxford as to the age of the terracotta, the sculpture was examined in the Metropolitan’s Conservation Department under x-rays. The following conditions were reported: there was a separation clear across the waist and one at the right shoulder, both being stabilized by metal clasps, either of bronze or iron. The separation at the waist probably dates to the time of its construction in 1495, for large terracottas were normally baked in two sections, an upper and a lower one, the division occurring at the waistline. The separation at the shoulder may have been accidental, for the right side of the figure has obviously suffered. The break at the right wrist is clearly accidental. Since the terracotta hand was replaced by one of wood, it seems that the former was damaged beyond salvage. X-rays indicate that there was probably a separation at the neck, for beneath the surface is a nail that could have been used when repairs were made (Figure 8). In that location a nail is otherwise meaningless. The repairs at shoulder (possible), neck (probable), and wrist (certain) can be credited to Agnolo (1498 and 1500).

The evidence of the x-rays is consonant with that of the documents of 1495-1503. Both indicate that damage was done and that repairs were made. X-rays suggest the nature of the damage, documents establish when it occurred. The history of Pistoia during these years confirms these findings. Hence we may safely conclude that the figure is the Magdalen made by Agnolo di Polo for the Ospedale della Morte.

Why, one asks, should Agnolo have selected the eminently secular figure in the fresco at Santa Maria Novella as the model for his Magdalen?
5. As a model for his standing lady, Agnolo used this figure from Domenico Ghirlandaio's fresco of the Birth of the Baptist (Figure 10). Photograph: Alinari – Art Reference Bureau
The following theory could account for his choice, although it is no more than a theory. Since many of the prominent figures in the Ghirlandaio frescoes were likenesses of living or recently dead Florentines (identifications of the women remain nebulous; men fare better), Agnolo would have known that the young lady in the Birth of the Baptist was named Maddalena and was the daughter of Lorenzo de’ Medici. If this identification is correct, she was the granddaughter of Lucrezia Tornabuoni who, it is generally agreed, appears in the fresco as one of her companions. It would have been natural for a Medici daughter to figure in such a fresco, for Tornabuoni and Medici were intimately related by blood, friendship, and finance.

The fresco of the Birth of the Baptist is the twin of the Birth of the Virgin (Figures 10, 11), in which a young lady often thought to be Ludovica Tornabuoni – surely a member of that family – plays a similar role. These two frescoes could, according to this theory, be said to do honor to two glamorous creatures of quattrocento Florence: Maddalena and Ludovica.

Even if it should become evident that the young lady in the Birth of the Baptist is not Maddalena de’ Medici, she remains the model for Agnolo’s St. Mary Magdalen. The sculptor’s choice of a model would then have to be classed as a random one, rather than one making iconographical sense.

A last point bears indirectly on the terracotta Magdalen and directly on Ghirlandaio’s Birth of the Baptist. A terracotta relief by Benedetto da Maiano at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London follows the proper ecclesiastical tradition for the representation of the subject and includes an angel dictating to Zacharias who writes St. John’s name (Figure 9). Zacharias and the angel were summarily erased from the scene in the fresco, which now serves as a pious backdrop for what is no less than a quattrocento fashion parade. Contemporary characters – women only – who have no real part in the sacred story take over.

Whereas an artist could enliven (or distort) a sacred theme by the addition of figures of secular currency and by the subtraction of figures of religious meaning, it would have been virtually impossible for another artist to restore such a revised composition to acceptable ecclesiastical norms. It follows, then, that the sculpture predates the fresco. If this is so, it would seem that the London relief was a model made for Ghirlandaio’s use. Ghirlandaio and Benedetto were friends and collaborators, so it may be assumed that the former commissioned the model of the latter. Hence the relief may be dated just about 1485.

So we are presented with an orderly sequence: Benedetto’s relief: about 1485; Ghirlandaio’s fresco: 1485-1490; and Agnolo di Polo’s commanding Magdalen, the subject of this study: 1495.
7. Here Mary Magdalen holds the saint’s traditional symbols, a book and a box of unguents. This suave and resplendent representation by Giovanni della Robbia harks back to Agnolo’s portrayal. Santa Croce, Florence. Photograph: Alinari – Art Reference Bureau
Technical analyses, such as the x-ray above, showing a nail in the neck that is probably evidence of an early repair, support the conclusion that the Museum’s statue is the Magdalen that once stood in the war-battered Ospedale della Morte in Pistoia.
9. Top: This terracotta relief by Benedetto da Maiano, to whom the Museum's standing lady was once attributed, is an iconographically “correct” representation of the Birth of the Baptist. Victoria and Albert Museum, London

10, 11. Center, below: In these frescoes by Domenico Ghirlandaio, the subjects – the Birth of the Baptist and the Birth of the Virgin – are pious backdrops for what is actually a quattrocento fashion parade, many of the prominent figures being likenesses of contemporary Florentines. Santa Maria Novella, Florence. Photograph: Alinari – Art Reference Bureau
Presenting Stefano della Bella, Seventeenth-Century Printmaker

For size and complexity, one of Della Bella’s most impressive achievements is his view of Paris across the Pont Neuf from a point between the buildings bounding the Place Dauphine. Besides the well-known landmarks – the Hôtel de Nevers, the Tour de Nesle, the church of St. Germain l’Auxerrois, and, at the center, the bronze equestrian statue of Henri IV by the Florentines Giovanni Bologna and Pietro Tacca – the print provides a microcosm of Paris in transit across the Seine. With a glass one can compile a census of 451 people, thirty-eight horses, nineteen dogs, three donkeys, and one lamb. All but lost in the vast scene, nevertheless all contributing to it, are duelists, men fighting with staffs, brawlers routing passers-by, a tooth-puller making an extraction, sellers of sweetmeats and fruits, falconers, hunters with a pack of dogs, a legless cripple, many begging gypsies (one of them telling a fortune), and a hurdy-gurdy player with an audience. Moving among the splendid carriages is a humble water cart, and back among the market stands at the right is an early Seine-side bookstall.

The text above is from Presenting Stefano della Bella, Seventeenth-Century Printmaker, an account of the work and career of an artist quick to record the goings-on of his lavish and turbulent century. The text, some of which first appeared in the December 1968 Bulletin, is by Phyllis Dearborn Massar, a former J. Clawson Mills Fellow in the Museum’s Department of Prints and Photographs. 144 pages. 172 illustrations. 8 1/2 x 11 inches. Clothbound, $12.95.

Right: Pont Neuf and detail, by Stefano della Bella. Etching, 14 3/4 x 27 1/2 inches. The Eliza Whittelsey Fund, 67.684.16
The desolation of John's exile is strongly evoked. The isolation of the cloudlike island of Patmos is expressed by the waters that completely envelop the land, while the diapered background suggests the openness, the infinity of space. A ship seems to be raising anchor, in preparation for departure. On the island, John is completely alone: even a seabird perches on a smaller island offshore.

Paint on parchment, 5 3/16 x 6 1/2 inches. The Cloisters Collection, 68.174, fol. 3r

This caption has been adapted from The Cloisters Apocalypse, a book just published by the Museum, which goes on to show how this beautiful manuscript may be an important link between south German and French painting in the third decade of the fourteenth century. Two volumes: 80 pages of facsimile color reproductions, and 104 pages of commentary by three of the Museum's curators — Florens Deuchler, Jeffrey M. Hoffeld, and Helmut Nickel — and the complete text of the Revelation of St. John. 8 5/8 x 12 3/8 inches. Clothbound, in slipcase. $25; after January 1, 1972, $35.
Prints and People: A Social History of Printed Pictures

Why were prints made? How? Who bought them? How did they travel? What became of them? What new techniques were devised and how were they affected by costs? What new subject matter appeared? How did print publishers attract new publics? What printmakers discovered new ways of seeing? What resulted from innovations?

Even though guesses must serve for answers to some of these questions, the questions themselves help art history to astonish by making it part and parcel of human history. As Emerson said, “There is properly no History; only Biography.” Approached from this angle, familiar facts regroup into unexpected patterns, like the tiles on the bathroom floor, especially when you try to see recent prints as the outcome of old traditions, and old prints as though their ink still smelled.

Almanacs for wall and pocket
We slaves of the clock jot engagements in calendars that regulate our minutes like school bells. Medieval man, reminded of vaguer calls by cockcrow and church chime, referred to almanacs to know the seasons for sowing and harvesting and being bled, the saints’ days, and above all the astrologers’ predictions. Beginning in the 1470s, wall almanacs as large as today’s bank calendars printed the saints’ days in red: red-letter days. Almanacs also appeared as small sheets folded in pocket-size envelopes and as booklets that must have been given as New Year presents the way we now give Christmas subscriptions to magazines. The almanac cuts often show the occupations of the months (Figure 1), familiar from reliefs on cathedral doors. For anxious reference, the
cut of a naked man in almanacs and prayer books (Figure 2) showed which veins were safe to open under each zodiac sign. Under Louis XIV, over half a dozen yearly wall calendars served the king’s absolutism with big engravings of last year’s royal christening or wedding. Lacking such headline events (they were rarely lacking in so amorous a royal family), the calendar might celebrate the visit to Paris of Spanish musicians (Figure 3). To show that they came from the first empire on which the sun never set, the quartet of girls in this touring group dressed their hair in the styles of the four parts of the world. In England in 1674 the Oxford University Press began to decorate calendars with college buildings in a series that continues to this day. Wall calendars, being bulky to store and too big for scrapbooks, were usually discarded after the year’s exposure had yellowed and flyspecked them. At the other extreme of size, 18th-century courtiers at Versailles pocketed almanacs too tiny to bulge a fitted coat, where they lurked at hand to verify the hours of opening of the king’s library and who was who at court and in the army. The fragility of their painted, gilded, and spangled bindings (Figure 4) had to be protected by slipcases.

These extracts are taken from an extraordinary book just published by the Museum – Prints and People: A Social History of Printed Pictures. Written by A. Hyatt Mayor, Curator Emeritus of Prints, it surveys the history of prints from the standpoint of people – the people who made, sold, and bought them – with breadth of learning and grace of style. 496 pages. 752 illustrations. 10 x 7½ inches. Clothbound, $20.

1. February. Woodcut in Kalendar Deutsch, Augsburg (Schönsperger), 1484. Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 26.56.1
2. Timetable for venesection. Metal cut in heures, Paris (Pigouchet), 1498. Rogers Fund, 18.60
4. Gilt and mica binding on almanac, Etrennes Mignonnes, Paris, 1771. Bequest of Mary Strong Shattuck, 35.64.23
Outstanding
Recent
Accessions

This animal-shaped support for a royal throne continues, in the Muslim period, a Sasanian tradition that had used winged horses, eagles, and lions for this purpose. All these animals are royal symbols, and the winged ones may also have implied the ascension or apotheosis of the incumbent of the seat of power. The griffin – a combination of eagle and lion – was particularly appropriate for such a function. Very few such throne legs from the Sasanian and early Islamic periods have been preserved, and this is one of the monumental examples.

Richard Ettinghausen

Throne leg in the form of the forepart of a griffin. Iranian, early Islamic, 8th century. Bronze, height 20 1/2 inches. Purchase, Joseph Pulitzer Bequest, 1971.143

Opposite:
This monumental indoor wall fountain was executed for the Fossombroni Palace at Arezzo about 1528 by Simone Mosca, praised by Vasari as one of the greatest ornamental sculptors of his time. The sharpness of its details, carved of pietra serena (the cool gray sandstone so typical of Tuscan works), can only be termed exquisite. But even more impressive is the purity and grandeur of its overall architectural design. Conceived as a triumphal arch, it represents a synthesis of elements derived from Antonio da Sangallo the younger and Michelangelo, the two supreme Renaissance architects, with whom Mosca was closely associated.

Olga Raggio

Height about 16 feet 3 inches. Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1971.158
Left:
In Federal Baltimore, English neoclassical furniture styles were carefully emulated not only in fine wood veneers and inlays, but also in the sophisticated painted versions popularized by Hepplewhite and Sheraton. This painted square card table with ovolo corners is closely related in decorative details to a set of furniture made in 1805 for merchant John Morris by the Irish-born cabinetmakers John and Hugh Findlay. In the same year the Findlays advertised that their painted furniture was "ornamented and varnished in a stile not equalled on the Continent – with real Views, Fancy Landscapes, Flowers, Trophies of Music . . . " The center panel of this table bears a picturesque scene of castles and sailing ship – apparently one of their "Fancy Landscapes" rather than the real views of Baltimore found on the Morris set; flanking the scenes are the "Trophies of Music" also mentioned in their advertisement.

Marilynn Johnson

Height 29 3/4 inches. Purchase, Mrs. Russell Sage Gift, 1970.189

Opposite:
This is a masterpiece. Inspired by the wild and fantastic mountains of central China, Hung Jen sets off a rocky monolith with delicate surroundings – pine branches, drifting mist, and a waterfall that courses out of the scroll at the right. The picture is an interplay of contrasts – drama and subtlety, permanence and transience – reinforced by the boldly individualistic painter’s expressive brushwork.

Fong Chow

Scholar Contemplating a Towering Rock, by Hung Jen (1610-1663), Chinese. Ink and slight color on paper, 55 x 33 inches. Dorothy Graham Bennett Fund, 1971.124