



MyArtsLab™

Volume I

Fifth Edition

ART HISTORY

MARILYN STOKSTAD MICHAEL W. COTHREN

ART HISTORY

This page intentionally left blank

Volume I

Fifth Edition

ART HISTORY

MARILYN STOKSTAD

Judith Harris Murphy Distinguished Professor of Art History Emerita
The University of Kansas

MICHAEL W. COTHREN

Scheuer Family Professor of Humanities
Department of Art, Swarthmore College

PEARSON

Boston Columbus Indianapolis New York San Francisco Upper Saddle River
Amsterdam Cape Town Dubai London Madrid Milan Munich Paris Montréal Toronto
Delhi Mexico City São Paulo Sydney Hong Kong Seoul Singapore Taipei Tokyo

Editorial Director: Craig Campanella
Editor in Chief: Sarah Touborg
Senior Sponsoring Editor: Helen Ronan
Editorial Assistant: Victoria Engros
Vice-President, Director of Marketing: Brandy Dawson
Executive Marketing Manager: Kate Mitchell
Marketing Assistant: Paige Patunas
Managing Editor: Melissa Feimer
Project Managers: Barbara Cappuccio and Marlene Gassler
Senior Operations Supervisor: Mary Fischer
Operations Specialist: Diane Peirano
Media Director: Brian Hyland
Senior Media Editor: David Alick
Media Project Manager: Rich Barnes
Pearson Imaging Center: Corin Skidds
Printer/Binder: Courier / Kendallville
Cover Printer: Lehigh-Phoenix Color / Hagerstown



This book was designed by
Laurence King Publishing Ltd, London
www.laurenceking.com

Editorial Manager: Kara Hattersley-Smith
Senior Editor: Clare Double
Production Manager: Simon Walsh
Page Design: Nick Newton
Cover Design: Jo Fernandes
Picture Researcher: Evi Peroulaki
Copy Editor: Jennifer Speake
Indexer: Vicki Robinson

Cover image: Exekias (potter and painter), *Ajax and Achilles Playing a Game*, c. 540–530 BCE. Black-figure painting on a ceramic amphora, height of amphora 29" (61 cm). Photo: Vatican Museums.

Credits and acknowledgments borrowed from other sources and reproduced, with permission, in this textbook appear on the appropriate page within text or on the credit pages in the back of this book.

Copyright © 2014, 2011, 2008 by Pearson Education, Inc.

All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. This publication is protected by Copyright and permission should be obtained from the publisher prior to any prohibited reproduction, storage in a retrieval system, or transmission in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or likewise. To obtain permission(s) to use material from this work, please submit a written request to Pearson Education, Inc., Permissions Department, One Lake Street, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458 or you may fax your request to 201-236-3290.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Stokstad, Marilyn

Art history / Marilyn Stokstad, Judith Harris Murphy Distinguished Professor of Art History Emerita, The University of Kansas, Michael W. Cothren, Scheuer Family Professor of Humanities, Department of Art, Swarthmore College. -- Fifth edition.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN-13: 978-0-205-87347-0 (hardcover)

ISBN-10: 0-205-87347-2 (hardcover)

1. Art--History--Textbooks. I. Cothren, Michael Watt. II. Title.

N5300.S923 2013

709--dc23

2012027450

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Prentice Hall
is an imprint of



www.pearsonhighered.com

ISBN 10: 0-205-87348-0
ISBN 13: 978-0-205-87348-7

Books à la carte

ISBN 10: 0-205-93840-X
ISBN 13: 978-0-205-93840-7

Brief Contents

Contents vii • Letter from the Author xiv • What's New xv • MyArtsLab xvi • Pearson Choices xviii • Acknowledgments and Gratitude xix • Use Notes xxi • Starter Kit xxii • Introduction xxvi

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----|----|--|-----|
| 1 | Prehistoric Art | 1 | 11 | Chinese and Korean Art before 1279 | 330 |
| 2 | Art of the Ancient Near East | 26 | 12 | Japanese Art before 1333 | 360 |
| 3 | Art of Ancient Egypt | 48 | 13 | Art of the Americas before 1300 | 382 |
| 4 | Art of the Ancient Aegean | 80 | 14 | Early African Art | 408 |
| 5 | Art of Ancient Greece | 100 | 15 | Early Medieval Art in Europe | 428 |
| 6 | Etruscan and Roman art | 156 | 16 | Romanesque Art | 458 |
| 7 | Jewish and Early Christian Art | 214 | 17 | Gothic Art of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries | 494 |
| 8 | Byzantine Art | 232 | 18 | Fourteenth-Century Art in Europe | 530 |
| 9 | Islamic Art | 264 | | | |
| 10 | Art of South and Southeast Asia before 1200 | 294 | | | |
- Map 562 • Glossary 563 • Bibliography 572 • Credits 584 • Index 586

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Letter from the Author xiv • What's New xv • MyArtsLab xvi • Pearson Choices xviii •
Acknowledgments and Gratitude xix • Use Notes xxi • Starter Kit xxii • Introduction xxvi

CHAPTER 1 Prehistoric Art 1

THE STONE AGE 2

THE PALEOLITHIC PERIOD 2

- Shelter or Architecture? 4
- Artifacts or Works of Art? 5
- Cave Painting 8
- Cave Sculptures 11

THE NEOLITHIC PERIOD 12

- Architecture 13
- Sculpture and Ceramics 20

NEW METALLURGY, ENDURING STONE 23

- The Bronze Age 23
- Rock Carvings 24

BOXES

ART AND ITS CONTEXTS

- The Power of Naming 6
- Intentional House Burning 16

A BROADER LOOK

- Prehistoric Woman and Man 22

A CLOSER LOOK

- A House in Çatalhöyük 15

ELEMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE

- Early Construction Methods 19

TECHNIQUE

- Prehistoric Wall Painting 8
- Pottery and Ceramics 20

RECOVERING THE PAST

- How Early Art is Dated 12

CHAPTER 2 Art of the Ancient Near East 26

THE FERTILE CRESCENT AND MESOPOTAMIA 28

- Sumer 28
- Akkad 35
- Ur and Lagash 37
- Babylon 37

THE HITTITES OF ANATOLIA 37

ASSYRIA 38

- Kalhu 38
- Dur Sharrukin 41
- Nineveh 42

NEO-BABYLONIA 44

PERSIA 44

BOXES

ART AND ITS CONTEXTS

- Art as Spoils of War—Protection or Theft? 34
- The Code of Hammurabi 39

A BROADER LOOK

- A Lyre from a Royal Tomb in Ur 32

A CLOSER LOOK

- Enemies Crossing the Euphrates to Escape Assyrian Archers 42

TECHNIQUE

- Cuneiform Writing 30

CHAPTER 3 Art of Ancient Egypt 48

THE GIFT OF THE NILE 50

EARLY DYNASTIC EGYPT, c. 2950–2575 BCE 50

- The God-Kings 50
- Artistic Conventions 51
- Funerary Architecture 53

THE OLD KINGDOM, c. 2575–2150 BCE 56

- The Great Pyramids at Giza 56
- Sculpture 58
- Pictorial Relief in Tombs 61

THE MIDDLE KINGDOM, c. 1975–c. 1640 BCE 62

- Portraits of Senusret III 62
- Rock-Cut Tombs 62
- Funerary Stelai 63
- Town Planning 65

THE NEW KINGDOM, c. 1539–1075 BCE 65

- The Great Temple Complexes 65
- Hatshepsut 67
- The Tomb of Ramose 69
- Akhenaten and the Art of the Amarna Period 70
- The Return to Tradition: Tutankhamun and Ramses II 73
- The Books of the Dead 77

THE THIRD INTERMEDIATE PERIOD, c. 1075–715 BCE 77

LATE EGYPTIAN ART, c. 715–332 BCE 78

BOXES

ART AND ITS CONTEXTS

- Egyptian Symbols 51

A BROADER LOOK

- The Temples of Ramses II at Abu Simbel 74

A CLOSER LOOK

- The Palette of Narmer 52

ELEMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE

- Mastaba to Pyramid 55

TECHNIQUE

- Preserving the Dead 53
- Egyptian Pictorial Relief 64
- Glassmaking 76

RECOVERING THE PAST

- How Early Art is Dated 79

THE BRONZE AGE IN THE AEGEAN 82**THE CYCLADIC ISLANDS 82****THE MINOAN CIVILIZATION ON CRETE 84**

The Old Palace Period, c. 1900–1700 BCE 84

The New Palace Period, c. 1700–1450 BCE 85

The Spread of Minoan Culture 90

THE MYCENAEAN (HELLADIC) CULTURE 92

Helladic Architecture 92

Mycenaean Tombs 97

Ceramic Arts 99

BOXES**A BROADER LOOK**

The Lion Gate 95

A CLOSER LOOK

The “Flotilla Fresco” from Akrotiri 92

TECHNIQUE

Aegean Metalwork 90

RECOVERING THE PAST

Pioneers of Aegean Archaeology 85

The “Mask of Agamemnon” 97

THE EMERGENCE OF GREEK CIVILIZATION 102

Historical Background 102

Religious Beliefs and Sacred Places 102

GREEK ART c. 900–c. 600 BCE 102

The Geometric Period 102

The Orientalizing Period 105

THE ARCHAIC PERIOD, c. 600–480 BCE 105

The Sanctuary at Delphi 107

Temples 108

Free-standing Sculpture 114

Painted Pots 117

THE EARLY CLASSICAL PERIOD, c. 480–450 BCE 120

Marble Sculpture 120

Bronze Sculpture 120

Ceramic Painting 126

THE HIGH CLASSICAL PERIOD, c. 450–400 BCE 127

The Akropolis 128

The Parthenon 129

The Propylaia and the Erechtheion 135

The Temple of Athena Nike 137

The Athenian Agora 137

City Plans 138

Stele Sculpture 139

Painting 140

THE LATE CLASSICAL PERIOD, c. 400–323 BCE 141

Sculpture 142

The Art of the Goldsmith 145

Painting and Mosaics 145

THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD, 323–31/30 BCE 147

The Corinthian Order in Hellenistic Architecture 147

Sculpture 149

BOXES**ART AND ITS CONTEXTS**

Greek and Roman Deities 104

Classic and Classical 120

Who Owns the Art? The Elgin Marbles and the Euphronios Krater 133

Women at a Fountain House 139

Greek Theaters 148

The Celts 150

A BROADER LOOK

The Tomb of the Diver 124

A CLOSER LOOK

The Death of Sarpedon 119

ELEMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE

The Greek Orders 110

TECHNIQUE

Color in Greek Sculpture 113

Black-Figure and Red-Figure 118

“The Canon” of Polykleitos 134

RECOVERING THE PAST

The Riace Warriors 127

THE ETRUSCANS 158

Etruscan Architecture 158

Etruscan Temples 158

Tomb Chambers 160

Works in Bronze 164

THE ROMANS 166**THE REPUBLIC, 509–27 BCE 166**

Portrait Sculpture 167

Roman Temples 171

THE EARLY EMPIRE, 27 BCE–96 CE 171

Art in the Age of Augustus 172

The Julio-Claudians 172

Roman Cities and the Roman Home 176

Wall Painting 179

The Flavians 184

THE HIGH IMPERIAL ART OF TRAJAN AND HADRIAN 190

Imperial Architecture 190

Imperial Portraits 200

THE LATE EMPIRE, THIRD AND FOURTH CENTURIES CE 202

The Severan Dynasty 203

The Soldier Emperors 205

Constantine the Great 207

Roman Art after Constantine 211

BOXES

■ ART AND ITS CONTEXTS

- Roman Writers on Art 167
- Roman Portraiture 168
- August Mau's Four Styles of Pompeian Painting 182
- A Painter at Work 183

■ A BROADER LOOK

- The Ara Pacis Augustae 174

■ A CLOSER LOOK

- Sarcophagus with the Indian Triumph of Dionysus 202

■ ELEMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE

- Roman Architectural Orders 161
- The Roman Arch 170
- Roman Vaulting 187
- Concrete 194

■ TECHNIQUE

- Roman Mosaics 199

■ RECOVERING THE PAST

- The Capitoline She-Wolf 165
- The Mildenhall Treasure 212

CHAPTER

7

Jewish and Early Christian Art 214

JEWS, CHRISTIANS, AND MUSLIMS 216

JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY IN THE LATE ROMAN WORLD 216

- Early Jewish Art 216
- Early Christian Art 220

IMPERIAL CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE AND ART 223

- Rome 223
- Ravenna and Thessaloniki 227

BOXES

■ ART AND ITS CONTEXTS

- The Life of Jesus 230

■ A BROADER LOOK

- The Oratory of Galla Placidia in Ravenna 228

■ A CLOSER LOOK

- The Mosaic Floor of the Beth Alpha Synagogue 219

■ ELEMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE

- Longitudinal-Plan and Central-Plan Churches 225

■ RECOVERING THE PAST

- Dura-Europos 221

CHAPTER

8

Byzantine Art 232

BYZANTIUM 234

EARLY BYZANTINE ART 235

- The Golden Age of Justinian 235
- Objects of Veneration and Devotion 244
- Icons and Iconoclasm 246

MIDDLE BYZANTINE ART 248

- Architecture and Wall Painting in Mosaic and Fresco 248
- Precious Objects of Commemoration, Veneration, and Devotion 255

LATE BYZANTINE ART 258

- Constantinople: The Chora Church 258
- Icons 262

BOXES

■ ART AND ITS CONTEXTS

- Naming Christian Churches: Designation + Dedication + Location 239
- Scroll and Codex 245
- Iconoclasm 247

■ A BROADER LOOK

- The Funerary Chapel of Theodore Metochites 260

■ A CLOSER LOOK

- Icon of St. Michael the Archangel 257

■ ELEMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE

- Pendentives and Squinches 238

CHAPTER

9

Islamic Art 264

ISLAM AND EARLY ISLAMIC SOCIETY 266

THE EARLY PERIOD: NINTH THROUGH TWELFTH CENTURIES 268

- Architecture 269
- Calligraphy 275
- Lusterware 276

THE LATER PERIOD: THIRTEENTH THROUGH FIFTEENTH CENTURIES 277

- Architecture 277
- Luxury Arts 283
- The Arts of the Book 284

ART AND ARCHITECTURE OF LATER EMPIRES 286

- The Ottoman Empire 286
- The Safavid Dynasty 289

THE MODERN ERA 291

BOXES

■ ART AND ITS CONTEXTS

- The Five Pillars of Islam 271

■ A BROADER LOOK

- The Great Mosque of Cordoba 272

■ A CLOSER LOOK

- A Mamluk Glass Oil Lamp 279

■ ELEMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE

- Arches 274

■ TECHNIQUE

- Ornament 268
- Carpet Making 292

Art of South and Southeast Asia before 1200 294

GEOGRAPHY 296

ART OF SOUTH ASIA 296

- The Indus Civilization 296
- The Vedic Period 299
- The Maurya Period 299
- The Period of the Shunga and Early Satavahana 301
- The Kushan Period 306
- The Gupta Period and its Successors 308
- Other Developments, Fourth–Sixth Century 312
- The Pallava Period 315
- The Seventh Through Twelfth Centuries 317
- The Chola Period 320

ART OF SOUTHEAST ASIA 321

- Early Southeast Asia 321
- Sixth to the Ninth Century 323
- Tenth Through Twelfth Centuries 327

BOXES

ART AND ITS CONTEXTS

- Buddhism 301
- Mudras 308
- Hinduism 309

A BROADER LOOK

- Shiva Nataraja of the Chola Dynasty 322

A CLOSER LOOK

- The Great Departure 304

ELEMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE

- Stupas and Temples 302

Chinese and Korean Art before 1279 330

THE MIDDLE KINGDOM 332

NEOLITHIC CULTURES 332

- Painted Pottery Cultures 332
- Liangzhu Culture 332

BRONZE AGE CHINA 334

- Shang Dynasty 334
- Zhou Dynasty 335

THE CHINESE EMPIRE: QIN DYNASTY 336

HAN DYNASTY 338

- Philosophy and Art 338
- Architecture 341

SIX DYNASTIES 341

- Painting 341
- Calligraphy 343
- Buddhist Art and Architecture 344

SUI AND TANG DYNASTIES 345

- Buddhist Art and Architecture 345
- Figure Painting 347

SONG DYNASTY 348

- Northern Song Painting 351
- Southern Song Painting and Ceramics 354

THE ARTS OF KOREA 356

- The Three Kingdoms Period 356
- The Unified Silla Period 357
- Goryeo Dynasty 358

BOXES

ART AND ITS CONTEXTS

- Chinese Characters 337
- Daoism 338
- Confucius and Confucianism 342

A BROADER LOOK

- The Silk Road during the Tang Period 349

A CLOSER LOOK

- A Reception in the Palace 340

ELEMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE

- Pagodas 351

TECHNIQUE

- Piece-Mold Casting 335

Japanese Art before 1333 360

PREHISTORIC JAPAN 362

- Jomon Period 362
- Yayoi Period 362
- Kofun Period 362

ASUKA PERIOD 364

- Horyuji 365

NARA PERIOD 367

HEIAN PERIOD 369

- Esoteric Buddhist Art 369
- Pure Land Buddhist Art 371
- Secular Painting and Calligraphy 373

KAMAKURA PERIOD 376

- Pure Land Buddhist Art 377
- Zen Buddhist Art 381

BOXES

ART AND ITS CONTEXTS

- Writing, Language, and Culture 365
- Buddhist Symbols 368
- Arms and Armor 377

A BROADER LOOK

- Daruma, Founder of Zen 380

A CLOSER LOOK

- The Tale of Genji* 374

TECHNIQUE

- Joined-Block Wood Sculpture 372

RECOVERING THE PAST

- The Great Buddha Hall 370

THE NEW WORLD 384**MESOAMERICA 384**

- The Olmec 384
- Teotihuacan 387
- The Maya 390

CENTRAL AMERICA 396**SOUTH AMERICA: THE CENTRAL ANDES 397**

- Chavin de Huantar 398
- The Paracas and Nazca Cultures 399
- The Moche Culture 399

NORTH AMERICA 401

- The East 401
- The North American Southwest 404

BOXES**■ ART AND ITS CONTEXTS**

- Maya Writing 390
- The Cosmic Ballgame 395

■ A BROADER LOOK

- Rock Art 406

■ A CLOSER LOOK

- Shield Jaguar and Lady Xok 394

■ TECHNIQUE

- Andean Textiles 397

THE LURE OF ANCIENT AFRICA 410**AFRICA—THE CRADLE OF ART AND CIVILIZATION 410****AFRICAN ROCK ART 410**

- Saharan Rock Art 411

SUB-SAHARAN CIVILIZATIONS 412

- Nok 412
- Igbo-Ukwu 414
- Ife 415
- Benin 416

OTHER URBAN CENTERS 419

- Jenné 422
- Great Zimbabwe 423
- Aksum and Lalibela 424
- Kongo Kingdom 425

EXPORTING TO THE WEST 427**BOXES****■ ART AND ITS CONTEXTS**

- The Myth of "Primitive" Art 412
- Southern African Rock Art 414

■ A BROADER LOOK

- A Warrior Chief Pledging Loyalty 420

■ A CLOSER LOOK

- Roped Pot on a Stand 416

■ TECHNIQUE

- Lost-Wax Casting 418

THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES 430**THE ART OF THE “BARBARIANS” IN EUROPE 431**

- The Merovingians 431
- The Norse 433
- The Celts and Anglo-Saxons in Britain 433

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN ART OF THE BRITISH ISLES 435

- Illustrated Books 435

MOZARABIC ART IN SPAIN 439

- Beatus Manuscripts 439

THE VIKING ERA 441

- The Oseberg Ship 441
- Picture Stones at Jelling 442
- Timber Architecture 442

THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE 444

- Carolingian Architecture 444
- Illustrated Books 448
- Carolingian Metalwork 450

OTTONIAN EUROPE 452

- Ottonian Architecture 452
- Ottonian Sculpture 454
- Illustrated Books 456

BOXES**■ ART AND ITS CONTEXTS**

- Defining the Middle Ages 431
- The Medieval Scriptorium 438

■ A BROADER LOOK

- The Lindisfarne Gospels 436

■ A CLOSER LOOK

- Psalm 23 in the Utrecht Psalter 450

■ RECOVERING THE PAST

- Sutton Hoo 434

EUROPE IN THE ROMANESQUE PERIOD 460

- Political, Economic, and Social Life 460
- The Church 460

ROMANESQUE ART 461**ARCHITECTURE 462**

- “First Romanesque” 463
- Pilgrimage Churches 463
- Cluny 465
- The Cistercians 468
- Regional Styles in Romanesque Architecture 469
- Secular Architecture: Dover Castle, England 477

ARCHITECTURAL SCULPTURE 478

- Wiligelmo at the Cathedral of Modena 478
- The Priory Church of Saint-Pierre at Moissac 479
- The Church of Saint-Lazare at Autun 482

SCULPTURE IN WOOD AND BRONZE 485

- Christ on the Cross (Majestat Batlló) 485
- Mary as the Throne of Wisdom 485
- Tomb of Rudolf of Swabia 486
- Renier of Huy 487

TEXTILES AND BOOKS 487

- Chronicling History 487
- Sacred Books 490

BOXES**■ ART AND ITS CONTEXTS**

- The Pilgrim’s Journey to Santiago 464
- Relics and Reliquaries 467
- St. Bernard and Theophilus:
 - The Monastic Controversy over the Visual Arts 470
- The Paintings of San Climent in Taull:
 - Mozarabic Meets Byzantine 473
- Hildegard of Bingen 492

■ A BROADER LOOK

- The Bayeux Embroidery 488

■ A CLOSER LOOK

- The Last Judgment Tympanum at Autun 483

■ ELEMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE

- The Romanesque Church Portal 478

THE EMERGENCE OF THE GOTHIC STYLE 496

- The Rise of Urban and Intellectual Life 496
- The Age of Cathedrals 497

GOTHIC ART IN FRANCE 497

- The Birth of Gothic at the Abbey Church of Saint-Denis 498
- Gothic Cathedrals 499
- Art in the Age of St. Louis 514

GOTHIC ART IN ENGLAND 515

- Manuscript Illumination 515
- Architecture 518

**GOTHIC ART IN GERMANY AND THE HOLY
ROMAN EMPIRE 520**

- Architecture 521
- Sculpture 523

GOTHIC ART IN ITALY 525

- Sculpture: The Pisano Family 525
- Painting 527

BOXES**■ ART AND ITS CONTEXTS**

- Abbot Suger on the Value of Art in Monasteries 497
- Master Masons 504
- Villard de Honnecourt 511

■ A BROADER LOOK

- The Sainte-Chapelle in Paris 512

■ A CLOSER LOOK

- Psalm 1 in the Windmill Psalter 516

■ ELEMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE

- Rib Vaulting 499
- The Gothic Church 503

■ TECHNIQUE

- Stained-Glass Windows 501

FOURTEENTH-CENTURY EUROPE 532**ITALY 533**

- Florentine Architecture and Metalwork 533
- Florentine Painting 536
- Sieneese Painting 542

FRANCE 548

- Manuscript Illumination 549
- Metalwork and Ivory 554

ENGLAND 554

- Embroidery: Opus Anglicanum 554
- Architecture 556

THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE 557

- Mysticism and Suffering 557
- The Supremacy of Prague 559

BOXES**■ ART AND ITS CONTEXTS**

- A New Spirit in Fourteenth-Century Literature 533
- The Black Death 550

■ A BROADER LOOK

- An Ivory Chest with Scenes of Romance 552

■ A CLOSER LOOK

- The Hours of Jeanne d'Évreux 551

■ TECHNIQUE

- Buon Fresco* 539
- Cennino Cennini on Panel Painting 546

Map 562 • Glossary 563 • Bibliography 572 •
Credits 584 • Index 586

Letter from the Author

Dear Colleagues

Energized by an enthusiasm that was fueled by conviction, I taught my first introductory art history survey course in the late 1970s, soon after the dawn of a period of crisis and creativity in the discipline of art history that challenged the fundamental assumptions behind the survey and questioned the canon of works that had long served as its foundation. Some professors and programs abandoned the survey altogether; others made it more expansive and inclusive. We all rethought what we were doing, and the soul searching this required made many of us better teachers—more honest and relevant, more passionate and convincing. It was for the subsequent generation of students and teachers, ready to reap the benefits of this refined notion of art history, that Marilyn Stokstad conceived and created her new survey textbook during the 1990s, tailored for students whose lives would unfold in the twenty-first century. It is a humbling honor to have become part of this historic project.



Reconsidering and refining what we do as professors and students of art history, however, did not cease at the turn of the century. The process continues. Like art, our teaching and learning changes as we and our culture change, responding to new expectations and new understandings. Opportunities for growth sometimes emerge in unexpected situations. Recently, while I was inching through sluggish suburban traffic with my daughter Emma—a gifted fifth-grade teacher—I confessed my disappointment in my survey students' dismal performance on the identification portion of their recent exam, lamenting their seeming inability to master basic information about the set of works I expected them to know. "Why," I asked rhetorically, "was it so difficult for them to learn these facts?" Emma's unexpected answer, rooted in her exploration of Grant Wiggins and Jay McTigue's *Understanding by Design* during a graduate course on curriculum development, shifted the question and reframed the discussion. "Dad," she said, "you are focusing on the wrong aspect of your teaching. What are you trying to accomplish by asking your students to learn those facts for identification on the exam? Question and explore your objectives first, then determine whether your assessment is actually the best way to encourage its accomplishment."

Emma's question, posed while I was planning this fifth edition of *Art History*, inspired me to pause and reflect more broadly on what it is that we seek to accomplish in art history survey courses. I initiated a series of conversations with professors across the country to take me beyond my own experience and into a national classroom. Many of you provided illuminating feedback, sharing goals and strategies, searching with me for a way of characterizing a shared set of learning outcomes that underlie the survey courses we teach as a way of introducing our students in the present to the study of art from the past. Talking with you helped me formulate language for the essential ideas we want our students to grasp, and characterize succinctly the kinds of knowledge and skills that are required to master them. From these conversations and your feedback, I developed a set of four fundamental outcomes envisioned for the book as a whole, outcomes that would be reflected within each chapter in four coordinated learning objectives at the beginning, and four assessment questions at the end. These overall learning outcomes aim to encompass the goals we share as we introduce the history of art to beginners. Thinking about them has already helped me refocus on what it is I am trying to accomplish in my own classroom. It certainly has alleviated the frustration I shared with Emma about my students' performance on slide IDs. I am now working on new ways to assess their engagement in relation to two fundamental goals—the "big ideas" that are embodied in these learning outcomes: building a knowledge base to anchor cultural understanding, and encouraging the extended examination of works of art, what I call "slow looking."

I hope these ideas, goals, and outcomes resonate as much with you as they have with me, that they will invite you to continue to think with me about the reasons why we believe the study of art history is meaningful and important for our students. After all, our discipline originated in dialogue, and it is rooted in the desire—maybe even the need—to talk with each other about why works of art matter and why they affect us so deeply. I would love to hear from you—mcothre1@swarthmore.edu.

Warm regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael Cothren". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being more prominent.

Michael Cothren

What's New

WHY USE THIS NEW EDITION?

Art history—what a wonderful, fascinating, and fluid discipline that evolves as the latest research becomes available for debate and consideration. The fifth edition of *Art History* has been revised to reflect these new discoveries, recent research and fresh interpretive perspectives, and also to address the changing needs of the audience—both students and educators. With these goals in mind, and by incorporating feedback from our many users and reviewers, we have sought to make this fifth edition an improvement over its earlier incarnations in sensitivity, readability, and accessibility without losing anything in comprehensiveness, in scholarly precision, or in its ability to engage readers.

To facilitate student learning and understanding of art history, the fifth edition is centered on four key Learning Outcomes. These overarching outcomes helped steer and shape this revision with their emphasis on the fundamental reasons we teach art history to undergraduates:

LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR ART HISTORY

Explore and understand the developing traditions and cultural exchanges represented by major monuments of world art by

1. Identifying the hallmarks of regional and period styles in relation to their technical, formal, and expressive character;
2. Understanding the principal themes, subjects, and symbols in the art of a variety of cultures, periods, and locations;
3. Probing the relationship of works of art to human history by exploring their cultural, economic, political, social, spiritual, moral, and intellectual contexts, and
4. Recognizing and applying the critical thinking, creative inquiry, and disciplined reasoning that stand behind art-historical interpretation, as well as the vocabulary and concepts used to describe and characterize works of art with clarity and power.

Each chapter opens with **Learn About It** objectives to help students focus on the upcoming chapter material and ends with corresponding **Think About It** assessment questions. These tools are rooted in the four learning outcomes stated above and help students think through, apply the chapter material, and synthesize their own viewpoints.

OTHER HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NEW EDITION INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:



- The chapters are coordinated with significantly expanded MyArtsLab resources that enrich and reinforce student learning (see p. xvi).
- Crosscurrent Questions at the end of each chapter encourage students to compare works from different chapters and probe the relationship of recurrent themes across cultures, times, and places.
- Enriched **Recovering the Past** boxes document the discovery, re-evaluation, restoration, or conservation of works of art, such as the bronze She-Wolf that was once considered Etruscan and has recently been interpreted as medieval.
- **Closer Look** features appear in each chapter, guiding students in their exploration of details within a single work of art and helping students to understand issues of usage, iconography, and style. Each Closer Look is expanded and narrated within MyArtsLab to explore technique, style, subject matter, and cultural context.
- **Broader Look** boxes in each chapter offer an in-depth contextual treatment of a single work of art.
- **Global coverage has been deepened** with the addition of new works of art and revised discussions that incorporate new scholarship, especially in the area of South and Southeast Asia, whose chapters have been expanded.
- Throughout, **images have been updated** whenever new and improved images were available or works of art have been cleaned or restored.
- **New works have been added** to the discussion in many chapters to enhance and enrich what is said in the text. For example, the Disk of Enheduanna, Sphinx of Taharqo, garden mural from Livia's villa at Prima Porta, and monastery of St. Catherine's on Mount Sinai. In addition, the following artists are now discussed through new, and more representative, works: Bihzad, Giovanni Pisano, Duccio, Verrocchio, Giambologna, Bronzino, Gentileschi, Hals, Steen, Rubens, Sharaku, Turner, Friedrich, Monet, Degas, Gauguin, Cézanne, and Warhol.
- **New artists have been added**, notably, Sultan Muhammad, Joan Mitchell, Diane Arbus, and Ed Ruscha.
- The **language used to characterize works of art**—especially those that attempt to capture the lifelike appearance of the natural world—has been **refined and clarified** to bring greater precision and nuance.
- In response to readers' requests, **discussion of many major monuments** has been revised and expanded.
- **Byzantine art** has been separated from the treatment of Jewish and Early Christian art for expanded treatment in a new chapter (8) of its own.

MyArtsLab lets your students experience and interact with art

This program will provide a better teaching and learning experience for you and your students. Here's how:


The new MyArtsLab delivers proven results in helping individual students succeed. Its automatically graded assessments, personalized study plan, and interactive eText provide engaging experiences that personalize, stimulate, and measure learning for each student.

- ▶ The Pearson eText lets students access their textbook anytime, anywhere, and any way they want—including downloading to an iPad or listening to chapter audio read by Michael Cothren and Brian Seymour. Includes a unique scale feature showing students the size of a work in relation to the human figure.
- Personalized study plan for each student promotes critical-thinking skills. Assessment tied to videos, applications, and chapters enables both instructors and students to track progress and get immediate feedback.



- **New:** Henry Sayre's *Writing About Art* 6th edition is now available online in its entirety as an eText within MyArtsLab.
- ▶ **New and expanded:** Closer Look tours—interactive walkthroughs featuring expert audio—offer in-depth looks at key works of art. *Now optimized for mobile.*
- **New and expanded:** Over 75 in total, 360-degree architectural panoramas and simulations of major monuments help students understand buildings—inside and out. *Now optimized for mobile.*

- **New:** Students on Site videos—over 75 in total, produced and edited by students for students, these 2–3 minute videos provide “you are there” impressions of major monuments, reviewed and approved by art historians. To learn more about how your students can participate, please visit www.pearsonfreeagent.com



BREAK THROUGH TO A NEW WORLD OF LEARNING

MyArtsLab consistently and positively impacts the quality of learning in the classroom. When educators require and integrate MyArtsLab in their course, students and instructors experience success. Join our ever-growing community of 50,000 users across the country giving their students access to the high quality rich media and assessment on MyArtsLab.

“Students who use MyArtsLab perform better on their exams than students who do not.”

—Cynthia Kristan-Graham, Auburn University

“MyArtsLab also makes students more active learners. They are more engaged with the material.”

—Maya Jiménez, Kingsborough Community College

“MyArtsLab keeps students connected in another way to the course material. A student could be immersed for hours!”

—Cindy B. Damschroder, University of Cincinnati

“I really enjoy using MyArtsLab. At the end of the quarter, I ask students to write a paragraph about their experience with MyArtsLab and 97% of them are positive.”

—Rebecca Trittel, Savannah College of Art and Design

Join the conversation!

www.facebook.com/stokstadcothren

Give Your Students Choices

ORDERING OPTIONS

Pearson arts titles are available in the following formats to give you and your students more choices—and more ways to save.

MyArtsLab with eText: the Pearson eText lets students access their textbook anytime, anywhere, and any way they want, including listening online or downloading to an iPad.

MyArtsLab with eText Combined: 0-205-88736-8

MyArtsLab with eText Volume I: 0-205-94839-1

MyArtsLab with eText Volume II: 0-205-94846-4

Build your own Pearson Custom e-course material. Pearson offers the first eBook-building platform that empowers educators with the freedom to search, choose, and seamlessly integrate multimedia. *Contact your Pearson representative to get started.*

The **Books à la Carte edition** offers a convenient, three-hole-punched, loose-leaf version of the traditional text at a discounted price—allowing students to take only what they need to class. Books à la Carte editions are available both with and without access to MyArtsLab.

Books à la Carte edition Volume I: 0-205-93840-X

Books à la Carte edition Volume I plus MyArtsLab: 0-205-93847-7

Books à la Carte edition Volume II: 0-205-93844-2

Books à la Carte edition Volume II plus MyArtsLab: 0-205-93846-9

The **CourseSmart eTextbook** offers the same content as the printed text in a convenient online format—with highlighting, online search, and printing capabilities. **www.coursesmart.com**

Art History Portable edition has all of the same content as the comprehensive text in six slim volumes. If your survey course is Western, the Portable Edition is available in value-package combinations to suit Western-focused courses (Books 1, 2, 4, and 6). Portable Edition volumes are also available individually for period or region specific courses.

Book 1 – Ancient Art (Chapters 1–6): 978-0-205-87376-0

Book 2 – Medieval Art (Chapters 7–9, 15–18):

978-0-205-87377-7

Book 3 – A View of the World, Part One (Chapters 9–14):

978-0-205-87378-4

Book 4 – Fourteenth to Seventeenth Century Art (Chapters 18–23):

978-0-205-87379-1

Book 5 – A View of the World, Part Two (Chapters 24–29):

978-0-205-87380-7

Book 6 – Eighteenth to Twenty-first Century Art (Chapters 30–33):


978-0-205-87756-0

INSTRUCTOR RESOURCES

All of our instructor resources are found on MyArtsLab and are available to faculty who adopt *Art History*. These resources include:

PowerPoints featuring nearly every image in the book, with captions and without captions.

Teaching with MyArtsLab PowerPoints help instructors make their lectures come alive. These slides allow instructors to display the very best rich media from MyArtsLab in the classroom—quickly and easily.



Instructor's Manual and Test Item File

This is an invaluable professional resource and reference for new and experienced faculty.

The Class Preparation Tool collects these and other presentation resources in one convenient online destination.

Acknowledgments and Gratitude

Art History, which was first published in 1995 by Harry N. Abrams, Inc. and Prentice Hall, Inc., continues to rely, each time it is revised, on the work of many colleagues and friends who contributed to the original texts and subsequent editions. Their work is reflected here, and we extend to them our enduring gratitude.

In preparing this fifth edition, we worked closely with two gifted and dedicated editors at Pearson/Prentice Hall, Sarah Touborg and Helen Ronan, whose almost daily support in so many ways was at the center of our work and created the foundation of what we have done. We are continually bolstered by the warm and dedicated support of Yolanda de Rooy, Pearson's President of the Social Sciences and the Arts, and Craig Campanella, Editorial Director. Also at Pearson, Barbara Cappuccio, Marlene Gassler, Melissa Feimer, Cory Skidds, Brian Mackey, David Nitti, and Carla Worner supported us in our work. At Laurence King Publishing, Clare Double, Kara Hattersley-Smith, Julia Ruxton, and Simon Walsh oversaw the production of this new edition. For layout design we thank Nick Newton and for photo research we thank Evi Peroulaki. Much appreciation also goes to Brandy Dawson, Director of Marketing, and Kate Stewart Mitchell, Marketing Manager extraordinaire, as well as the entire Social Sciences and Arts team at Pearson.

FROM MARILYN STOKSTAD: The fifth edition of *Art History* represents the cumulative efforts of a distinguished group of scholars and educators. Over four editions, the work done in the 1990s by Stephen Addiss, Chutsing Li, Marilyn M. Rhie, and Christopher D. Roy for the original book has been updated and expanded by David Binkley and Patricia Darish (Africa); Claudia Brown and Robert Mowry (China and Korea); Patricia Graham (Japan); Rick Asher (South and Southeast Asia); D. Fairchild Ruggles (Islamic); Claudia Brittenham (Americas); Sara Orel and Carol Ivory (Pacific Cultures); and Bradford R. Collins, David Cateforis, Patrick Frank, and Joy Sperling (Modern). For this fifth edition, Robert DeCaroli reworked the chapters on South and Southeast Asia.

In addition, I want to thank University of Kansas colleagues Sally Cornelison, Susan Craig, Susan Earle, Charles Eldredge, Kris Ercums, Sherry Fowler, Stephen Goddard, Saralyn Reece Hardy, Marsha Hauler, Marni Kessler, Amy McNair, John Pulz, Linda Stone Ferrier, and John Younger for their help and advice. My thanks also to my friends Katherine Giele and Katherine Stannard, William Crowe, David Bergeron, and Geraldo de Sousa for their sympathy and encouragement. Of course, my very special thanks go to my sister, Karen Leider, and my niece, Anna Leider.

FROM MICHAEL COTHREN: Words are barely adequate to express my gratitude to Marilyn Stokstad for welcoming me with such trust, enthusiasm, and warmth into the collaborative adventure of revising this historic textbook, conceived and written for students in a new century. Working alongside her—and our extraordinary editors Sarah Touborg and Helen Ronan—has been delightful and rewarding, enriching, and challenging. I look forward to continuing the partnership.

My work was greatly facilitated by the research assistance and creative ideas of Moses Hanson-Harding, and I continued to draw on the

work of Fletcher Coleman and Andrew Finegold, who helped with research on the previous edition. I also have been supported by a host of colleagues at Swarthmore College. Generations of students challenged me to hone my pedagogical skills and steady my focus on what is at stake in telling the history of art. My colleagues in the Art Department—especially Stacy Bomento, June Cianfrana, Randall Exon, Laura Holzman, Constance Cain Hungerford, Patricia Reilly, and Tomoko Sakomura—have answered all sorts of questions, shared innumerable insights on works in their areas of expertise, and offered unending encouragement and support. I am so lucky to work with them.

Many art historians have provided assistance, often at a moment's notice, and I am especially grateful to Betina Bergman, Claudia Brown, Elizabeth A.R. Brown, Brigitte Buettner, David Cateforis, Madeline Harrison Caviness, Sarah Costello, Cynthia Kristan-Graham, Joyce de Vries, Cheri Falkenstien-Doyle, Sharon Gerstel, Kevin Glowaki, Ed Gyllenhaal, Julie Hochstrasser, Vida J. Hull, Penny Jolly, Barbara Kellum, Alison Kettering, Benton Kidd, Ann Kuttner, Anne Leader, Steven A. LeBlanc, Cary Liu, Elizabeth Marlowe, Thomas Morton, Kathleen Nolan, David Shapiro, Mary Shepard, Larry Silver, David Simon, Donna Sadler, Jeffrey Chipps Smith, and Mark Tucker.

I was fortunate to have the support of many friends. John Brender, David Eldridge, Stephen Lehmann, Mary Marissen, Denis Ott, and Bruce and Carolyn Stephens, patiently listened and truly relished my enjoyment of this work.

My preparation for this work runs deep. My parents, Mildred and Wat Cothren, believed in me from the day I was born and made significant sacrifices to support my education from pre-school through graduate school. From an early age, Sara Shymanski, my elementary school librarian, gave me courage through her example and loving encouragement to pursue unexpected passions for history, art, and the search to make them meaningful in both past and present. Françoise Celly, my painting professor during a semester abroad in Provence, by sending me to study the Romanesque sculpture of Autun, began my journey toward art history. At Vanderbilt, Ljubica Popovich fostered this new interest by teaching me about Byzantine art. My extraordinary daughters Emma and Nora remain a constant inspiration. I am so grateful for their delight in my passion for art's history, and for their dedication to keeping me from taking myself too seriously. My deepest gratitude is reserved for Susan Lowry, my wife and soul-mate, who brings joy to every facet of my life. She is not only patient and supportive during the long distractions of my work on this book; she has provided help in so very many ways. The greatest accomplishment of my life in art history occurred on the day I met her at Columbia in 1973.

If the arts are ultimately an expression of human faith and integrity as well as human thought and creativity, then writing and producing books that introduce new viewers to the wonders of art's history, and to the courage and visions of the artists and art historians that stand behind it—remains a noble undertaking. We feel honored to be a part of such a worthy project.

Marilyn Stokstad Michael W. Cothren
Lawrence, KS Swarthmore, PA
Spring 2012

IN GRATITUDE: As its predecessors did, this fifth edition of *Art History* benefited from the reflections and assessments of a distinguished team of scholars and educators. The authors and Pearson are grateful to the following academic reviewers for their numerous insights and suggestions for improvement: Kirk Ambrose, University of Colorado, Boulder; Lisa Aronson, Skidmore College; Mary Brantl, St. Edward's University; Denise Budd, Bergen Community College; Anne Chapin, Brevard College; Sheila Dillon, Duke University; William Ganis, Wells College; Sharon Gerstel, University of California, Los Angeles; Kevin Glowacki, Texas A&M University; Amy Golahny, Lycoming College; Steve Goldberg, Hamilton College; Bertha Gutman, Delaware County Community College; Deborah Haynes, University of Colorado, Boulder; Eva Hoffman, Tufts University; Mary Jo Watson, University of Oklahoma; Kimberly Jones, University of Texas, Austin; Barbara Kellum, Smith College; Sarah Kielt Costello, University of Houston; Cynthia Kristan-Graham, Auburn University; Paul Lavy, University of Hawaii at Manoa; Henry Luttkhuizen, Calvin College; Elizabeth Mansfield, New York University; Michelle Moseley Christian, Virginia Tech; Eleanor Moseman, Colorado State University; Sheila Muller, University of Utah; Elizabeth Olton, University of Texas at San Antonio; David Parrish, Purdue University; Tomoko Sakomura, Swarthmore College; Erika Schneider, Framingham State University; David Shapiro; Richard Sundt, University of Oregon; Tilotama Tharoor, New York University; Sarah Thompson, Rochester Institute of Technology; Rebecca Turner, Savannah College of Art and Design; Linda Woodward, LSC Montgomery.

This edition has continued to benefit from the assistance and advice of scores of other teachers and scholars who generously answered questions, gave recommendations on organization and priorities, and provided specialized critiques during the course of work on previous editions.

We are grateful for the detailed critiques from the following readers across the country who were of invaluable assistance during work on the third and fourth editions: Craig Adcock, University of Iowa; Charles M. Adelman, University of Northern Iowa; Fred C. Albertson, University of Memphis; Kimberly Allen-Kattus, Northern Kentucky University; Frances Altwater, College of William and Mary; Michael Amy, Rochester Institute of Technology; Susan Jane Baker, University of Houston; Jennifer L. Ball, Brooklyn College, CUNY; Samantha Baskind, Cleveland State University; Tracey Boswell, Johnson County Community College; Jane H. Brown, University of Arkansas at Little Rock; Stephen Caffey, Texas A&M University; Charlotte Lowry Collins, Southeastern Louisiana University; Roger J. Crum, University of Dayton; Brian A. Curran, Penn State University; Cindy B. Damschroder, University of Cincinnati; Michael T. Davis, Mount Holyoke College; Julie Decker, Georgetown College; Laurinda Dixon, Syracuse University; Rachael Z. DeLue, Princeton University; Anne Derbes, Hood College; Caroline Downing, State University of New York at Potsdam; Laura Dufresne, Winthrop University; Suzanne Eberle, Kendall College of Art & Design of Ferris State University; April Eisman, Iowa State University; Dan Ewing, Barry University; Allen Farber, State University of New York at Oneonta; Arne Flaten, Coastal Carolina University; John Garton, Cleveland Institute of Art; Richard Gay, University of North Carolina, Pembroke; Regina Gee, Montana State University; Rosi Gilday, University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh; Mimi Hellman, Skidmore College; Julie Hochstrasser, University of Iowa; Eunice D. Howe, University of Southern California; Phillip Jacks, George Washington University; Evelyn Kain, Ripon College; Nancy Kelker, Middle Tennessee State University; Patricia Kennedy, Ocean County College; Jennie Klein, Ohio University; Katie Kresser, Seattle Pacific University; Cynthia Kristan-Graham, Auburn University; Barbara Platten Lash, Northern Virginia Community College; William R. Levin, Centre College; Susan Libby, Rollins College; Henry Luttkhuizen, Calvin College; Lynn Mackenzie, College of DuPage; Elisa C. Mandell, California State University, Fullerton; Pamela Margerm, Kean University; Elizabeth Marlowe, Colgate University; Marguerite Mayhall, Kean University; Katherine A. McIver, University of Alabama at Birmingham; Dennis McNamara, Triton College; Gustav Medicus, Kent State University; Lynn Metcalf, St. Cloud State University; Janine Mileaf, Swarthmore College; Jo-Ann Morgan, Coastal Carolina University; Johanna D. Movassat, San Jose State University; Beth A. Mulvaney, Meredith College; Dorothy Munger, Delaware Community College; Jacqueline Marie Musacchio, Wellesley College; Bonnie Noble, University of North Carolina at Charlotte; Leisha O'Quinn, Oklahoma State University; Lynn Ostling, Santa Rosa Junior College; Willow Partington, Hudson Valley Community College; Martin Patrick, Illinois State University; Ariel Plotek, Clemson University; Patricia V. Podzorski, University of Memphis; Albert Reischuck, Kent State University; Margaret Richardson, George Mason University; James Rubin, Stony Brook University; Jeffrey Ruda,

University of California, Davis; Donna Sandrock, Santa Ana College; Michael Schwartz, Augusta State University; Diane Scillia, Kent State University; Joshua A. Shannon, University of Maryland; Karen Shelby, Baruch College; Susan Sidlauskas, Rutgers University; Jeffrey Chipps Smith, University of Texas, Austin; Royce W. Smith, Wichita State University; Stephanie Smith, Youngstown State University; Stephen Smithers, Indiana State University; Janet Snyder, West Virginia University; Laurie Sylwester, Columbia College (Sonora); Carolyn Tate, Texas Tech University; Rita Tekippe, University of West Georgia; James Terry, Stephens College; Michael Tinkler, Hobart and William Smith Colleges; Amelia Trevelyan, University of North Carolina at Pembroke; Julie Tysver, Greenville Technical College; Jeryln Woodard, University of Houston; Reid Wood, Lorain County Community College. Our thanks also to additional expert readers including: Susan Cahan, Yale University; David Craven, University of New Mexico; Marian Feldman, University of California, Berkeley; Dorothy Johnson, University of Iowa; Geneva Kornbluth, University of Maryland; Patricia Mainardi, City University of New York; Clemente Marconi, Columbia University; Tod Marder, Rutgers University; Mary Miller, Yale University; Elizabeth Penton, Durham Technical Community College; Catherine B. Scallen, Case Western University; Kim Shelton, University of California, Berkeley.

Many people reviewed the original edition of *Art History* and have continued to assist with its revision. Every chapter was read by one or more specialists. For work on the original book and assistance with subsequent editions thanks goes to: Barbara Abou-el-Haj, SUNY Binghamton; Roger Aiken, Creighton University; Molly Aitken; Anthony Alofsin, University of Texas, Austin; Christiane Andersson, Bucknell University; Kathryn Arnold; Julie Aronson, Cincinnati Art Museum; Michael Auerbach, Vanderbilt University; Larry Beck; Evelyn Bell, San Jose State University; Janetta Rebold Benton, Pace University; Janet Berlo, University of Rochester; Sarah Blick, Kenyon College; Jonathan Bloom, Boston College; Suzaan Boettger; Judith Bookbinder, Boston College; Marta Braun, Ryerson University; Elizabeth Broun, Smithsonian American Art Museum; Glen R. Brown, Kansas State University; Maria Elena Buszek, Kansas City Art Institute; Robert G. Calkins; Annmarie Weyl Carr; April Clagget, Keene State College; William W. Clark, Queens College, CUNY; John Clarke, University of Texas, Austin; Jaqueline Clipsham; Ralph T. Coe; Robert Cohon, The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art; Alessandra Comini; James D'Emilio, University of South Florida; Walter Denny, University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Jerrilyn Dodds, City College, CUNY; Lois Drewer, Index of Christian Art; Joseph Dye, Virginia Museum of Art; James Farmer, Virginia Commonwealth University; Grace Flam, Salt Lake City Community College; Mary D. Garrard; Paula Gerson, Florida State University; Walter S. Gibson; Dorothy Glass; Oleg Grabar; Randall Griffey, Amherst College; Cynthia Hahn, Florida State University; Sharon Hill, Virginia Commonwealth University; John Hoopes, University of Kansas; Reinhild Janzen, Washburn University; Wendy Kindred, University of Maine at Fort Kent; Alan T. Kohl, Minneapolis College of Art; Ruth Kolarik, Colorado College; Carol H. Krinsky, New York University; Aileen Laing, Sweet Briar College; Janet LeBlanc, Clemson University; Charles Little, The Metropolitan Museum of Art; Laureen Reu Liu, McHenry County College; Loretta Lorange; Brian Madigan, Wayne State University; Janice Mann, Bucknell University; Judith Mann, St. Louis Art Museum; Richard Mann, San Francisco State University; James Martin; Elizabeth Parker McLachlan; Tamara Mikailova, St. Petersburg, Russia, and Macalester College; Anta Montet-White; Anne E. Morganstern, Ohio State University; Winslow Myers, Bancroft School; Lawrence Nees, University of Delaware; Amy Ogata, Cleveland Institute of Art; Judith Oliver, Colgate University; Edward Olszewski, Case Western Reserve University; Sara Jane Pearman; John G. Pedley, University of Michigan; Michael Plante, Tulane University; Eloise Quiñones-Keber, Baruch College and the Graduate Center, CUNY; Virginia Raguin, College of the Holy Cross; Nancy H. Ramage, Ithaca College; Ann M. Roberts, Lake Forest College; Lisa Robertson, The Cleveland Museum of Art; Barry Rubin; Charles Sack, Parsons, Kansas; Jan Schall, The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art; Tom Shaw, Kean College; Pamela Sheingorn, Baruch College, CUNY; Raechell Smith, Kansas City Art Institute; Lauren Soth; Anne R. Stanton, University of Missouri, Columbia; Michael Stoughton; Thomas Sullivan, OSB, Benedictine College (Conception Abbey); Pamela Trimpe, University of Iowa; Richard Turnbull, Fashion Institute of Technology; Elizabeth Valdez del Alamo, Montclair State College; Lisa Vergara; Monica Visoná, University of Kentucky; Roger Ward, Norton Museum of Art; Mark Weil, St. Louis; David Wilkins; Marcilene Wittmer, University of Miami.

Use Notes

The various features of this book reinforce each other, helping the reader to become comfortable with terminology and concepts that are specific to art history.

Starter Kit and Introduction The Starter Kit is a highly concise primer of basic concepts and tools. The Introduction explores the way they are used to come to an understanding of the history of art.

Captions There are two kinds of captions in this book: short and long. Short captions identify information specific to the work of art or architecture illustrated:

- artist (when known)
- title or descriptive name of work
- date
- original location (if moved to a museum or other site)
- material or materials a work is made of
- size (height before width) in feet and inches, with meters and centimeters in parentheses
- present location

The order of these elements varies, depending on the type of work illustrated. Dimensions are not given for architecture, for most wall paintings, or for most architectural sculpture. Some captions have one or more lines of small print below the identification section of the caption that gives museum or collection information. This is rarely required reading; its inclusion is often a requirement for gaining permission to reproduce the work.

Longer, discursive captions contain information that complements the narrative of the main text.

Definitions of Terms You will encounter the basic terms of art history in three places:

In the Text, where words appearing in boldface type are defined, or glossed, at their first use.

In Boxed Features, on technique and other subjects, where labeled drawings and diagrams visually reinforce the use of terms.

In the Glossary, at the end of the volume (p. 563), which contains all the words in boldface type in the text and boxes.

Maps At the beginning of each chapter you will find a map with all the places mentioned in the chapter.

Boxes Special material that complements, enhances, explains, or extends the narrative text is set off in six types of tinted boxes.

Art and Its Contexts and A Broader Look boxes expand on selected works or issues related to the text. A Closer Look boxes use leader-line captions to focus attention on specific aspects of important works. Elements of Architecture boxes clarify specifically architectural features, often explaining engineering principles or building technology. Technique boxes outline the techniques and processes by which certain types of art are created. Recovering the Past boxes highlight the work of archaeologists who uncover and conservators who assure the preservation and clear presentation of art.

Bibliography The bibliography at the end of this book beginning on page 572 contains books in English, organized by general works and


by chapter, that are basic to the study of art history today, as well as works cited in the text.

Learn About It Placed at the beginning of each chapter, this feature captures in bulleted form the key learning objectives, or outcomes, of the chapter. They point to what will have been accomplished upon its completion.

Think About It These critical thinking questions appear at the end of each chapter and help students assess their mastery of the learning objectives (Learn About It) by asking them to think through and apply what they have learned.

MyArtsLab prompts These notations are found throughout the chapter and are keyed to MyArtsLab resources that enrich and reinforce student learning.

Dates, Abbreviations, and Other Conventions This book uses the designations BCE and CE, abbreviations for “Before the Common Era” and “Common Era,” instead of BC (“Before Christ”) and AD (“Anno Domini,” “the year of our Lord”). The first century BCE is the period from 99 BCE to 1 BCE; the first century CE is from the year 1 CE to 99 CE. Similarly, the second century BCE is the period from 199 BCE to 100 BCE; the second century CE extends from 100 CE to 199 CE.



Circa (“about”) is used with approximate dates, spelled out in the text and abbreviated to “c.” in the captions. This indicates that an exact date is not yet verified.

An illustration is called a “figure,” or “fig.” Thus, figure 6–7 is the seventh numbered illustration in Chapter 6, and fig. Intro-3 is the third figure in the Introduction. There are two types of figures: photographs of artworks or of models, and line drawings. Drawings are used when a work cannot be photographed or when a diagram or simple drawing is the clearest way to illustrate an object or a place.

When introducing artists, we use the words *active* and *documented* with dates, in addition to “b.” (for “born”) and “d.” (for “died”). “Active” means that an artist worked during the years given. “Documented” means that documents link the person to that date.

Accents are used for words in French, German, Italian, and Spanish only. With few exceptions, names of cultural institutions in Western European countries are given in the form used in that country.

Titles of Works of Art It was only over the last 500 years that paintings and works of sculpture created in Europe and North America were given formal titles, either by the artist or by critics and art historians. Such formal titles are printed in italics. In other traditions and cultures, a single title is not important or even recognized.

In this book we use formal descriptive titles of artworks where titles are not established. If a work is best known by its non-English title, such as Manet’s *Le Déjeuner sur l’Herbe* (*The Luncheon on the Grass*), the original language precedes the translation.


Starter Kit

Art history focuses on the visual arts—painting, drawing, sculpture, prints, photography, ceramics, metalwork, architecture, and more. This Starter Kit contains basic information and addresses concepts that underlie and support the study of art history. It provides a quick reference guide to the vocabulary used to classify and describe art objects. Understanding these terms is indispensable because you will encounter them again and again in reading, talking, and writing about art.

Let us begin with the basic properties of art. A work of art is a material object having both form and content. It is often described and categorized according to its *style* and *medium*.

FORM

Referring to purely visual aspects of art and architecture, the term *form* encompasses qualities of *line*, *shape*, *color*, *light*, *texture*, *space*, *mass*, *volume*, and *composition*. These qualities are known as *formal elements*. When art historians use the term *formal*, they mean “relating to form.”



Line and **shape** are attributes of form. Line is an element—usually drawn or painted—the length of which is so much greater than the width that we perceive it as having only length. Line can be actual, as when the line is visible, or it can be implied, as when the movement of the viewer’s eyes over the surface of a work follows a path determined by the artist. Shape, on the other hand, is the two-dimensional, or flat, area defined by the borders of an enclosing *outline* or *contour*. Shape can be *geometric*, *biomorphic* (suggesting living things; sometimes called *organic*), *closed*, or *open*. The *outline* or *contour* of a three-dimensional object can also be perceived as line.

Color has several attributes. These include *hue*, *value*, and *saturation*.

Hue is what we think of when we hear the word *color*, and the terms are interchangeable. We perceive hues as the result of differing wavelengths of electromagnetic energy. The visible spectrum, which can be seen in a rainbow, runs from red through violet. When the ends of the spectrum are connected through the hue red-violet, the result may be diagrammed as a color wheel. The primary hues (numbered 1) are red, yellow, and blue. They are known as primaries because all other colors are made by combining these hues. Orange, green, and violet result from the mixture of two primaries and are known as secondary hues (numbered 2). Intermediate hues, or tertiaries (numbered 3), result from the mixture of a primary and a secondary. Complementary colors are the two colors directly opposite one

another on the color wheel, such as red and green. Red, orange, and yellow are regarded as warm colors and appear to advance toward us. Blue, green, and violet, which seem to recede, are called cool colors. Black and white are not considered colors but neutrals; in terms of light, black is understood as the absence of color and white as the mixture of all colors.



Value is the relative degree of lightness or darkness of a given color and is created by the amount of light reflected from an object’s surface. A dark green has a deeper value than a light green, for example. In black-and-white reproductions of colored objects, you see only value, and some artworks—for example, a drawing made with black ink—possess only value, not hue or saturation.



Value scale from white to black.



Value variation in red.

Saturation, also sometimes referred to as *intensity*, is a color’s quality of brightness or dullness. A color described as highly saturated looks vivid and pure; a hue of low saturation may look a little muddy or grayed.



Intensity scale from bright to dull.


Texture, another attribute of form, is the tactile (or touch-perceived) quality of a surface. It is described by words such as *smooth*, *polished*, *rough*, *prickly*, *grainy*, or *oily*. Texture takes two forms: the texture of the actual surface of the work of art and the implied (illusionistically described) surface of objects represented in the work of art.

Space is what contains forms. It may be actual and three-dimensional, as it is with sculpture and architecture, or it may be fictional, represented illusionistically in two dimensions, as when artists represent recession into the distance on a flat surface—such as a wall or a canvas—by using various systems of perspective.

Mass and volume are properties of three-dimensional things. Mass is solid matter—whether sculpture or architecture—that takes up space. Volume is enclosed or defined space, and may be either solid or hollow. Like space, mass and volume may be illusionistically represented on a two-dimensional surface, such as in a painting or a photograph.

Composition is the organization, or arrangement, of forms in a work of art. Shapes and colors may be repeated or varied, balanced symmetrically or asymmetrically; they may be stable or dynamic. The possibilities are nearly endless and artistic choice depends both on the

time and place where the work was created as well as the objectives of individual artists. Pictorial depth (spatial recession) is a specialized aspect of composition in which the three-dimensional world is represented on a flat surface, or *picture plane*. The area “behind” the picture plane is called the *picture space* and conventionally contains three “zones”: *foreground*, *middle ground*, and *background*.




Various techniques for conveying a sense of pictorial depth have been devised by artists in different cultures and at different times. A number of them are diagrammed here. In some European art, the use of various systems of *perspective* has sought to create highly convincing illusions of recession into space. At other times and in other cultures, indications of recession are actually suppressed or avoided to emphasize surface rather than space.

TECHNIQUE | Pictorial Devices for Depicting Recession in Space



overlapping

In overlapping, partially covered elements are meant to be seen as located behind those covering them.



diminution

In diminution of scale, successively smaller elements are perceived as being progressively farther away than the largest ones.




vertical perspective

Vertical perspective stacks elements, with the higher ones intended to be perceived as deeper in space.




atmospheric perspective

Through atmospheric perspective, objects in the far distance (often in bluish-gray hues) have less clarity than nearer objects. The sky becomes paler as it approaches the horizon.




divergent perspective

In divergent or reverse perspective, forms widen slightly and imaginary lines called orthogonals diverge as they recede in space.



intuitive perspective

Intuitive perspective takes the opposite approach from divergent perspective. Forms become narrower and orthogonals converge the farther they are from the viewer, approximating the optical experience of spatial recession.



linear perspective

Linear perspective (also called scientific, mathematical, one-point and Renaissance perspective) is a rationalization or standardization of intuitive perspective that was developed in fifteenth-century Italy. It uses mathematical formulas to construct images in which all elements are shaped by, or arranged along, orthogonals that converge in one or more vanishing points on a horizon line.

CONTENT

Content includes *subject matter*, but not all works of art have subject matter. Many buildings, paintings, sculptures, and other art objects include no recognizable references to things in nature nor to any story or historical situation, focusing instead on lines, colors, masses, volumes, and other formal elements. However, all works of art—even those without recognizable subject matter—have content, or meaning, insofar as they seek to communicate ideas, convey feelings, or affirm the beliefs and values of their makers, their patrons, and usually the people who originally viewed or used them.

Content may derive from the social, political, religious, and economic *contexts* in which a work was created, the *intention* of the artist, and the *reception* of the work by beholders (the audience). Art historians, applying different methods of *interpretation*, often arrive at different conclusions regarding the content of a work of art, and single works of art can contain more than one meaning because they are occasionally directed at more than one audience.

The study of subject matter is called *iconography* (literally, “the writing of images”) and includes the identification of *symbols*—images that take on meaning through association, resemblance, or convention.

STYLE

Expressed very broadly, *style* is the combination of form and composition that makes a work distinctive. *Stylistic analysis* is one of art history’s most developed practices, because it is how art historians recognize the work of an individual artist or the characteristic manner of groups of artists working in a particular time or place. Some of the most commonly used terms to discuss *artistic styles* include *period style*, *regional style*, *representational style*, *abstract style*, *linear style*, and *painterly style*.

Period style refers to the common traits detectable in works of art and architecture from a particular historical era. It is good practice not to use the words “style” and “period” interchangeably. Style is the sum of many influences and characteristics, including the period of its creation. An example of proper usage is “an American house from the Colonial period built in the Georgian style.”

Regional style refers to stylistic traits that persist in a geographic region. An art historian whose specialty is medieval art can recognize Spanish style through many successive medieval periods and can distinguish individual objects created in medieval Spain from other medieval objects that were created in, for example, Italy.

Representational styles are those that describe the appearance of recognizable subject matter in ways that make it seem lifelike.

Realism and **Naturalism** are terms that some people used interchangeably to characterize artists’ attempts to represent the observable world in a manner that appears to describe its visual appearance accurately. When capitalized, Realism refers to a specific period style discussed in Chapter 31.

Idealization strives to create images of physical perfection according to the prevailing values or tastes of a culture. The artist may work in a representational style and idealize it to capture an underlying value or expressive effect.

Illusionism refers to a highly detailed style that seeks to create a convincing illusion of physical reality by describing its visual appearance meticulously.

Abstract styles depart from mimicking lifelike appearance to capture the essence of a form. An abstract artist may work from nature or from a memory image of nature’s forms and colors, which are simplified, stylized, perfected, distorted, elaborated, or otherwise transformed to achieve a desired expressive effect.

Nonrepresentational (or Nonobjective) Art is a term often used for works of art that do not aim to produce recognizable natural imagery.

Expressionism refers to styles in which the artist exaggerates aspects of form to draw out the beholder’s subjective response or to project the artist’s own subjective feelings.

Linear describes both styles and techniques. In linear styles artists use line as the primary means of definition. But linear paintings can also incorporate *modeling*—creating an illusion of three-dimensional substance through shading, usually executed so that brushstrokes nearly disappear.

Painterly describes a style of representation in which vigorous, evident brushstrokes dominate, and outlines, shadows, and highlights are brushed in freely.

MEDIUM AND TECHNIQUE

Medium (plural, *media*) refers to the material or materials from which a work of art is made. Today, literally anything can be used to make a work of art, including not only traditional materials like paint, ink, and stone, but also rubbish, food, and the earth itself.

Technique is the process that transforms media into a work of art. Various techniques are explained throughout this book in Technique boxes. Two-dimensional media and techniques include painting, drawing, prints, and photography. Three-dimensional media and techniques are sculpture (for example, using stone, wood, clay or cast metal), architecture, and many small-scale arts (such as jewelry, containers, or vessels) in media such as ceramics, metal, or wood.

Painting includes wall painting and fresco, illumination (the decoration of books with paintings), panel painting (painting on wood panels), painting on canvas, and handscroll and hanging scroll painting. The paint in these examples is pigment mixed with a liquid vehicle, or binder. Some art historians also consider pictorial media such as mosaic and stained glass—where the pigment is arranged in solid form—as a type of painting.

Graphic arts are those that involve the application of lines and strokes to a two-dimensional surface or support, most often paper. Drawing is a graphic art, as are the various forms of printmaking. Drawings may be sketches (quick visual notes, often made in preparation for larger drawings or paintings); studies (more carefully drawn analyses of details or entire compositions); cartoons (full-scale drawings made in preparation for work in another medium, such as fresco, stained glass, or tapestry); or complete artworks in themselves. Drawings can be made with ink, charcoal, crayon, or pencil. Prints, unlike drawings,

are made in multiple copies. The various forms of printmaking include woodcut, the intaglio processes (engraving, etching, drypoint), and lithography.

Photography (literally, “light writing”) is a medium that involves the rendering of optical images on light-sensitive surfaces. Photographic images are typically recorded by a camera.


Sculpture is three-dimensional art that is *carved*, *modeled*, *cast*, or *assembled*. Carved sculpture is subtractive in the sense that the image is created by taking away material. Wood, stone, and ivory are common materials used to create carved sculptures. Modeled sculpture is considered additive, meaning that the object is built up from a material, such as clay, that is soft enough to be molded and shaped. Metal sculpture is usually cast or is assembled by welding or a similar means of permanent joining.

Sculpture is either free-standing (that is, surrounded by space) or in pictorial relief. Relief sculpture projects from the background surface of the same piece of material. High-relief sculpture projects far from its background; low-relief sculpture is only slightly raised; and sunken relief, found mainly in ancient Egyptian art, is carved into the surface, with the highest part of the relief being the flat surface.

Ephemeral arts include processions, ceremonies, or ritual dances (often with décor, costumes, or masks); performance art; earthworks; cinema and video art; and some forms of digital or computer art. All impose a temporal limitation—the artwork is viewable for a finite period of time and then disappears forever, is in a constant state of change, or must be replayed to be experienced again.


Architecture creates enclosures for human activity or habitation. It is three-dimensional, highly spatial, functional, and closely bound with developments in technology and materials. Since it is difficult to capture in a photograph, several types of schematic drawings are commonly used to enable the visualization of a building:

Plans depict a structure’s masses and voids, presenting a view from above of the building’s footprint or as if it had been sliced horizontally at about waist height.




Plan: Philadelphia, Vanna Venturi House

Sections reveal the interior of a building as if it had been cut vertically from top to bottom.




Section: Rome, Sta. Costanza

Isometric drawings show buildings from oblique angles either seen from above (“bird’s-eye view”) to reveal their basic three-dimensional forms (often cut away so we can peek inside) or from below (“worm’s-eye view”) to represent the arrangement of interior spaces and the upward projection of structural elements.



Isometric cutaway from above: Ravenna, San Vitale



Isometric projection from below: Istanbul, Hagia Sophia

Introduction

Intro-1 • Mark Rothko **MAGENTA,
BLACK, GREEN, ON ORANGE**
(NO. 3/NO. 13)

1949. Oil on canvas, 7'1 $\frac{3}{8}$ " × 5'5" (2.165 × 1.648 m). Museum of Modern Art, New York.



The title of this book seems clear. It defines a field of academic study and scholarly research that has achieved a secure place in college and university curricula across North America. But *Art History* couples two words—even two worlds—that are less well focused when separated. What is art? In what sense does it have a history? Students of art and its history should pause and engage, even if briefly, with these large questions before beginning the journey surveyed in the following chapters.

WHAT IS ART?

Artists, critics, art historians, and the general public all grapple with this thorny question. The *Random House Dictionary* defines “art” as “the quality, production, expression, or realm of what is beautiful, or of more than ordinary significance.” Others have characterized “art” as something human-made that combines creative imagination and technical skill, and satisfies an innate desire for order and harmony—perhaps a human hunger for the beautiful. This seems

LEARN ABOUT IT

- I.1** Explore the methods and objectives of visual analysis.
- I.2** Assess the way art historians identify conventional subject matter and symbols in the process called iconography.
- I.3** Survey the methods used by art historians to analyze works of art and interpret their meaning within their original cultural contexts.
- I.4** Trace the process of art-historical interpretation in a case study.

 **Listen** to the chapter audio on myartslab.com

relatively straightforward until we start to look at modern and contemporary art, where there has been a heated and extended debate concerning “What is Art?” The focus is often far from questions of transcendent beauty, ordered design, or technical skill, and centers instead on the conceptual meaning of a work for an elite target audience or the attempt to pose challenging questions or unsettle deep-seated cultural ideas.


The works of art discussed in this book represent a privileged subset of artifacts produced by past and present cultures. They were usually meant to be preserved, and they are currently considered worthy of conservation and display. The determination of which artifacts are exceptional—which are works of art—evolves through the actions, opinions, and selections of artists, patrons, governments, collectors, archaeologists, museums, art historians, and others. Labeling objects as art is usually meant to signal that they transcended or now transcend in some profound way their practical function, often embodying cherished cultural ideas or asserting foundational values. Sometimes it can also mean they are considered beautiful, well designed, and made with loving care, but this is not always the case. We will discover that at various times and places, the complex notion of what is art has little to do with standards of skill or beauty. Some critics and historians argue broadly that works of art are tendentious embodiments of power and privilege, hardly sublime expressions of beauty or truth. After all, art can be unsettling as well as soothing, challenging as well as reassuring, whether made in the present or surviving from the past.

Increasingly, we are realizing that our judgments about what constitutes art—as well as what constitutes beauty—are conditioned by our own education and experience. Whether acquired at home, in classrooms, in museums, at the movies, or on the Internet, our responses to art are learned behaviors, influenced by class, gender, race, geography, and economic status as well as education. Even art historians find that their definitions of what constitutes art—and what constitutes artistic quality—evolve with additional research and understanding. Exploring works by twentieth-century painter Mark Rothko and nineteenth-century quilt-makers Martha Knowles and Henrietta Thomas demonstrates how definitions of art and artistic value are subject to change over time.

Rothko’s painting, **MAGENTA, BLACK, GREEN, ON ORANGE (NO. 3/NO. 13)** (Fig. Intro-1), is a well-known example of the sort of abstract painting that was considered the epitome of artistic sophistication by the mid-twentieth-century New York art establishment. It was created by an artist who meant it to be a work of art. It was acquired by the Museum of Modern Art in New York, and its position on the walls of that museum is a sure sign of its acceptance as art by a powerful cultural institution. However, beyond the context of the American artists, dealers, critics, and collectors who made up Rothko’s art world, such paintings were often received with skepticism. They were seen by many as incomprehensible—lacking both technical skill and recognizable subject matter, two criteria that were part of the general public’s

definition of art at the time. Abstract paintings soon inspired a popular retort: “That’s not art; my child could do it!” Interestingly enough, Rothko saw in the childlike character of his own paintings one of the qualities that made them works of art. Children, he said, “put forms, figures, and views into pictorial arrangements, employing out of necessity most of the rules of optical **perspective** and geometry but without the knowledge that they are employing them.” He characterized his own art as childlike, as “an attempt to recapture the freshness and naiveté of childish vision.” In part because they are carefully crafted by an established artist who provided these kinds of intellectual justifications for their character and appearance, Rothko’s abstract paintings are broadly considered works of art and are treasured possessions of major museums across the globe.

Works of art, however, do not always have to be created by individuals who perceive themselves as artists. Nor are all works produced for an art market surrounded by critics and collectors ready to explain, exhibit, and disperse them, ideally to prestigious museums. Such is the case with this quilt (Fig. Intro-2), made by Martha Knowles and Henrietta Thomas a century before Rothko’s painting. Their work is similarly composed of blocks of color, and like Rothko, they produced their visual effect by arranging these flat chromatic shapes carefully and regularly on a rectangular field. But this quilt was not meant to hang on the wall of an art museum. It is the social product of a friendship, intended as an intimate gift, presented to a loved one for use in her home. An inscription on the quilt itself makes this clear—“From M.A. Knowles to her



**Intro-2 • Martha Knowles and Henrietta Thomas
MY SWEET SISTER EMMA**

1843. Cotton quilt, 8'11" × 9'1" (2.72 × 2.77 m). International Quilt Studies Center, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.

This book contains much more than paintings and textiles. Within these pages you will also encounter sculpture, vessels, books, jewelry, tombs, chairs, photographs, architecture, and more. But as with Rothko's *Magenta, Black, Green, on Orange (No. 3/No. 13)* (see FIG. Intro-1) and Knowles and Thomas's *My Sweet Sister Emma* (see FIG. Intro-2), criteria have been used to determine which works are selected for inclusion in a book titled *Art History*. Architecture presents an interesting case.

Buildings meet functional human needs by enclosing human habitation or activity. Many works of architecture, however, are considered "exceptional" because they transcend functional demands by manifesting distinguished architectural design or because they embody in important ways the values and goals of the culture that built them. Such buildings are usually produced by architects influenced, like painters, by great works and traditions from the past. In some cases they harmonize with, or react to, their natural or urban surroundings. For such reasons, they are discussed in books on the history of art.

Typical of such buildings is the church of *Nôtre-Dame-du-Haut* in Ronchamp, France, designed and constructed between 1950 and 1955

by Swiss architect Charles-Edouard Jeanneret, better known by his pseudonym, Le Corbusier. This building is the product of a significant historical moment, rich in international cultural meaning. A pilgrimage church on this site had been destroyed during World War II, and the creation here of a new church symbolized the end of a devastating war, embodying hopes for a brighter global future. Le Corbusier's design—drawing on sources that ranged from Algerian mosques to imperial Roman villas, from crab shells to airplane wings—is sculptural as well as architectural. It soars at the crest of a hill toward the sky but at the same time seems solidly anchored in the earth. And its coordination with the curves of the natural landscape complement the creation of an outdoor setting for religious ceremonies (to the right in the figure) to supplement the church interior that Le Corbusier characterized as a "container for intense concentration." In fact, this building is so renowned today as a monument of modern architecture, that the bus-loads of pilgrims who arrive at the site are mainly architects and devotees of architectural history.



Intro-3 • Le Corbusier
NÔTRE-DAME-DU-HAUT
Ronchamp, France. 1950–1955.

Sweet Sister Emma, 1843.” Thousands of such friendship quilts were made by women during the middle years of the nineteenth century for use on beds, either to provide warmth or as a covering spread. Whereas quilts were sometimes displayed to a broad and enthusiastic audience of producers and admirers at competitions held at state and county fairs, they were not collected by art museums or revered by artists until relatively recently.

In 1971, at the Whitney Museum in New York—an establishment bastion of the art world in which Rothko moved and

worked—art historians Jonathan Holstein and Gail van der Hoof mounted an exhibition entitled “Abstract Design in American Quilts,” demonstrating the artistic affinity we have already noted in comparing the way Knowles and Thomas, like Rothko, create abstract patterns with fields of color. Quilts were later accepted—or perhaps “**appropriated**”—as works of art and hung on the walls of a New York art museum because of their visual similarities with the avant-garde, abstract works of art created by establishment, New York artists.

Art historian Patricia Mainardi took the case for quilts one significant step further in a pioneering article of 1973 published in *The Feminist Art Journal*. Entitled, “Quilts: The Great American Art,” her argument was rooted not only in the aesthetic affinity of quilts with the esteemed work of contemporary abstract painters, but also in a political conviction that the definition of art had to be broadened. What was at stake here was historical veracity. Mainardi began, “Women have always made art. But for most women, the arts highest valued by male society have been closed to them for just that reason. They have put their creativity instead into the needlework arts, which exist in fantastic variety wherever there are women, and which in fact are a universal female art, transcending race, class, and national borders.” She argued for the inclusion of quilts within the history of art to give deserved attention to the work of women artists who had been excluded from discussion because they created textiles and because they worked outside the male-dominated professional structures of the art world—because they were women. Quilts now hang as works of art on the walls of museums and appear with regularity in books that survey the history of art.

As these two examples demonstrate, definitions of art are rooted in cultural systems of value that are subject to change. And as they change, the list of works considered by art historians is periodically revised. Determining what to study is a persistent part of the art historian’s task.

WHAT IS ART HISTORY?

There are many ways to study or appreciate works of art. Art history represents one specific approach, with its own goals and its own methods of assessment and interpretation. Simply put, art historians seek to understand the meaning of art from the past within its original cultural contexts, both from the point of view of its producers—artists, architects, and patrons—as well as from the point of view of its consumers—those who formed its original audience. Coming to an understanding of the cultural meaning of a work of art requires detailed and patient investigation on many levels, especially with art that was produced long ago and in societies distinct from our own. This is a scholarly rather than an intuitive exercise. In art history, the work of art is seen as an embodiment of the values, goals, and aspirations of its time and place of origin. It is a part of culture.

Art historians use a variety of theoretical perspectives and a host of interpretive strategies to come to an understanding of works of art within their cultural contexts. But as a place to begin, the work of art historians can be divided into four types of investigation:

1. assessment of physical properties,
2. analysis of visual or formal structure,
3. identification of subject matter or conventional symbolism, and
4. integration within cultural context.

ASSESSING PHYSICAL PROPERTIES

Of the methods used by art historians to study works of art, this is the most objective, but it requires close access to the work itself. Physical properties include shape, size, materials, and technique. For instance, many pictures are rectangular (e.g., see FIG. Intro-1), but some are round (see page xxxi, FIG. C). Paintings as large as Rothko’s require us to stand back if we want to take in the whole image, whereas some paintings (see page xxx, FIG. A) are so small that we are drawn up close to examine their detail. Rothko’s painting and Knowles and Thomas’s quilt are both rectangles of similar size, but they are distinguished by the materials from which they are made—oil paint on canvas versus cotton fabric joined by stitching. In art history books, most physical properties can only be understood from descriptions in captions, but when we are in the presence of the work of art itself, size and shape may be the first thing we notice. To fully understand **medium** and technique, however, it may be necessary to employ methods of scientific analysis or documentary research to elucidate the practices of artists at the time when and place where the work was created.

ANALYZING FORMAL STRUCTURE

Art historians explore the visual character that artists bring to their works—using the materials and the techniques chosen to create them—in a process called **formal analysis**. On the most basic level, it is divided into two parts:

- assessing the individual visual elements or formal vocabulary that constitute pictorial or sculptural communication, and
- discovering the overall arrangement, organization, or structure of an image, a design system that art historians often refer to as **composition**.

THE ELEMENTS OF VISUAL EXPRESSION Artists control and vary the visual character of works of art to give their subjects and ideas meaning and expression, vibrancy and persuasion, challenge or delight (see “A Closer Look,” page xxx). For example, the motifs, objects, figures, and environments within paintings can be sharply defined by line (see FIGS. Intro-2, Intro-4), or they can be suggested by a sketchier definition (see FIGS. Intro-1, Intro-5). Painters can simulate the appearance of three-dimensional form through **modeling** or shading (see FIG. Intro-4 and page xxxi, FIG. C), that is, by describing the way light from a single source will highlight one side of a solid while leaving the other side in shadow. Alternatively, artists can avoid any strong sense of three-dimensionality by emphasizing patterns on a surface rather than forms in space (see FIG. Intro-1 and page xxx, FIG. A). In addition to revealing the solid substance of forms through modeling, dramatic lighting can also guide viewers to specific areas of a picture (see page xxx, FIG. B), or it can be lavished on every aspect of a picture to reveal all its detail and highlight the vibrancy of its color (see page xxxi, FIG. D). Color itself can be muted or intensified, depending on the mood artists want to create or the tastes and expectations of their audiences.

A CLOSER LOOK | Visual Elements of Pictorial Expression: Line, Light, Form, and Color



LINE

A. Carpet Page from the Lindisfarne Gospels
From Lindisfarne, England.
c. 715–720. Ink and tempera
on vellum, 13³/₈" × 9⁷/₁₆" (34 ×
24 cm). British Library, London.
Cotton MS Nero D.IV fol. 26v



Every element in this complicated painting is sharply outlined by abrupt barriers between light and dark or between one color and another; there are no gradual or shaded transitions. Since the picture was created in part with pen and ink, the linearity is a logical extension of medium and technique. And although line itself is a "flattening" or two-dimensionalizing element in pictures, a complex and consistent system of overlapping gives the linear animal forms a sense of shallow but carefully worked-out three-dimensional relationships to one another.


LIGHT

B. Georges de la Tour *The Education of the Virgin*
c. 1650. Oil on canvas, 33" × 39¹/₂" (83.8 × 100.4 cm).
The Frick Collection, New York.

The source of illumination is a candle depicted within the painting. The young girl's upraised right hand shields its flame, allowing the artist to demonstrate his virtuosity in painting the translucency of human flesh.

Since the candle's flame is partially concealed, its luminous intensity is not allowed to distract from those aspects of the painting most brilliantly illuminated by it—the face of the girl and the book she is reading.



 **View** the Closer Look for visual elements of pictorial expression: line, light, form, and color on myartslab.com

FORM

C. Michelangelo *The Holy Family (Doni Tondo)*

c. 1503. Oil and tempera on panel, diameter 3' 11¹/₄" (1.2 m). Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



The actual three-dimensional projection of the sculpted heads in medallions around the frame—designed for this painting by Michelangelo himself—heightens the effect of fictive three-dimensionality in the figures painted on its flat surface.

The complex overlapping of their highly three-dimensionalized bodies conveys the somewhat contorted spatial positioning and relationship of these three figures.

Through the use of modeling or shading—a gradual transition from lights to darks—Michelangelo imitates the way solid forms are illuminated from a single light source—the side closest to the light source is bright while the other side is cast in shadow—and gives a sense of three-dimensional form to his figures.

In a technique called **foreshortening**, the carefully calculated angle of the Virgin's elbow makes it seem to project out toward the viewer.



COLOR

D. Junayd *Humay and Humayun*, from a manuscript of the *Divan of Kwaju Kirmani*

Made in Baghdad, Iraq. 1396. Color, ink, and gold on paper, 12⁵/₈" × 9⁷/₁₆" (32 × 24 cm). British Library, London. MS Add. 18113, fol. 31r



Junayd chose to flood every aspect of his painting with light, as if everything in it were illuminated from all sides at once. As a result, the emphasis here is on jewel-like color. The vibrant tonalities and dazzling detail of the dreamy landscape are not only more important than the simulation of three-dimensional forms distributed within a consistently described space; they actually upstage the human drama taking place against a patterned, tipped-up ground in the lower third of the picture.

Thus, artists communicate with their viewers by making choices in the way they use and emphasize the elements of visual expression, and art-historical analysis seeks to reveal how artists' decisions bring meaning to a work of art. For example, in two paintings of women with children (see FIGS. Intro-4, Intro-5), Raphael and Renoir work with the same visual elements of line, form, light, and color in the creation of their images, but they employ these shared elements to differing expressive ends. Raphael concentrates on line to clearly differentiate each element of his picture as a separate form. Careful modeling describes these outlined forms as substantial solids surrounded by space. This gives his subjects a sense of clarity, stability, and grandeur. Renoir, on the other hand, foregrounds the flickering of light and the play of color as he downplays the sense of three-dimensionality in individual forms. This gives his image a more ephemeral, casual sense. Art historians pay close attention to such variations in the use of visual elements—the building blocks of artistic expression—and use visual analysis to characterize the expressive effect of a particular work, a particular artist, or a general period defined by place and date.


COMPOSITION When art historians analyze composition, they focus not on the individual elements of visual expression but on the overall arrangement and organizing design or structure of a work of art. In Raphael's **MADONNA OF THE GOLDFINCH** (Fig. Intro-4), for example, the group of figures has been arranged in a triangular shape and placed at the center of the picture. Raphael emphasized this central weighting by opening the clouds to reveal a

patch of blue in the middle of the sky, and by flanking the figural group with lacelike trees. Since the Madonna is at the center and since the two boys are divided between the two sides of the triangular shape, roughly—though not precisely—equidistant from the center of the painting, this is a bilaterally symmetrical composition: on either side of an implied vertical line at the center of the picture, there are equivalent forms on left and right, matched and balanced in a mirrored correspondence. Art historians refer to such an implied line—around which the elements of a picture are organized—as an **axis**. Raphael's painting has not only a vertical, but also a horizontal axis, indicated by a line of demarcation between light and dark—as well as between degrees of color saturation—in the terrain of the landscape. The belt of the Madonna's dress is aligned with this horizontal axis, and this correspondence, taken with the coordination of her head with the blue patch in the sky, relates her harmoniously to the natural world in which



Intro-4 • Raphael MADONNA OF THE GOLDFINCH (MADONNA DEL CARCELLINO)
1506. Oil on panel, 42" × 29½" (106.7 × 74.9 cm).
Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.

The vibrant colors of this important work were revealed in the course of a careful, ten-year restoration, completed only in 2008.



Intro-5 • Auguste Renoir
MME. CHARPENTIER AND HER CHILDREN
1878. Oil on canvas, 60½" × 74⅞" (153.7 × 190.2 cm).
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

she sits, lending a sense of stability, order, and balance to the picture as a whole.

The main axis in Renoir's painting of **MME. CHARPENTIER AND HER CHILDREN** (Fig. Intro-5) is neither vertical, nor horizontal, but diagonal, running from the upper right to the lower left corner of the painting. All major elements of the composition are aligned along this axis—dog, children, mother, and the table and chair that represent the most complex and detailed aspect of the setting. The upper left and lower right corners of the painting balance each other on either side of the diagonal axis as relatively simple fields of neutral tone, setting off and framing the main subjects between them. The resulting arrangement is not bilaterally symmetrical, but blatantly asymmetrical, with the large figural mass pushed into the left side of the picture. And unlike Raphael's composition, where the spatial relationship of the figures and their environment is mapped by the measured placement of elements that become increasingly smaller in scale and fuzzier in definition as they recede into the background, the relationship of Renoir's figures to their spatial environment is less clearly defined as they recede into the background along the dramatic diagonal axis. Nothing distracts us from the bold informality of this family gathering.

Both Raphael and Renoir arrange their figures carefully and purposefully, but they follow distinctive compositional systems that communicate different notions of the way these figures

interact with each other and the world around them. Art historians pay special attention to how pictures are arranged because composition is one of the principal ways artists charge their paintings with expressive meaning.

IDENTIFYING SUBJECT MATTER

Art historians have traditionally sought subject matter and meaning in works of art with a system of analysis that was outlined by Erwin Panofsky (1892–1968), an influential German scholar who was expelled from his academic position by the Nazis in 1933 and spent the rest of his career of research and teaching in the United States. Panofsky proposed that when we seek to understand the subject of a work of art, we derive meaning initially in two ways:

- First we perceive what he called “natural subject matter” by recognizing forms and situations that we know from our own experience.
- Then we use what he called “**iconography**” to identify the conventional meanings associated with forms and figures as bearers of narrative or symbolic content, often specific to a particular time and place.

Some paintings, like Rothko's abstractions and Knowles and Thomas's quilt, do not contain subjects drawn from the world around us, from stories, or from conventional symbolism, but Panofsky's scheme remains a standard method of investigating

A CLOSER LOOK | Iconography

The study and identification of conventional themes, motifs, and symbols to elucidate the subject matter of works of art.

These grapes sit on an imported, Italian silver *tazza*, a luxury object that may commemorate northern European prosperity and trade. This particular object recurs in several of Peeters's other still lifes.

An image of the artist herself appears on the reflective surface of this pewter tankard, one of the ways that she signed her paintings and promoted her career.

Luscious fruits and flowers celebrate the abundance of nature, but because these fruits of the earth will eventually fade, even rot, they could be moralizing references to the transience of earthly existence.



These coins, including one minted in 1608–1609, help focus the dating of this painting. The highlighting of money within a still life could reference the wealth of the owner—or it could subtly allude to the value the artist has crafted here in paint.

Detailed renderings of insects showcased Peeters's virtuosity as a painter, but they also may have symbolized the vulnerability of the worldly beauty of flowers and fruit to destruction and decay.

This knife—which appears in several of Peeters's still lifes—is of a type that is associated with wedding gifts.

A. Clara Peeters *Still Life with Fruit and Flowers*
c. 1612. Oil on copper, 25 $\frac{1}{8}$ " × 35" (64 × 89 cm). Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

Quince is an unusual subject in Chinese painting, but the fruit seems to have carried personal significance for Zhu Da. One of his friends was known as the Daoist of Quince Mountain, a site in Hunan Province that was also the subject of a work by one of his favorite authors, Tang poet Li Bai.



The artist's signature reads "Bada Shanren painted this," using a familiar pseudonym in a formula and calligraphic style that the artist ceased using in 1695.

This red block is a seal with an inscription drawn from a Confucian text: "Teaching is half of learning." This was imprinted on the work by the artist as an aspect of his signature, a symbol of his identity within the picture, just as the reflection and inscribed knife identify Clara Peeters as the painter of her still life.

B. Zhu Da (Bada Shanren) *Quince (Mugua)*
1690. Album leaf mounted as a hanging scroll; ink and colors on paper, 7 $\frac{7}{8}$ " × 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ " (20 × 14.6 cm). Princeton University Art Museum.

 **View** the Closer Look for iconography on myartslab.com

meaning in works of art that present narrative subjects, portray specific people or places, or embody cultural values with iconic imagery or allegory.

NATURAL SUBJECT MATTER We recognize some things in works of visual art simply by virtue of living in a world similar to that represented by the artist. For example, in the two paintings by Raphael and Renoir just examined (see FIGS. Intro-4, Intro-5), we immediately recognize the principal human figures in both as a woman and two children, boys in the case of Raphael's painting, girls in Renoir's. We can also make a general identification of the animals: a bird in the hand of Raphael's boys, and a pet dog under one of Renoir's girls. And natural subject matter can extend from an identification of figures to an understanding of the expressive significance of their postures and facial features. We might see in the boy who snuggles between the knees of the woman in Raphael's painting, placing his own foot on top of hers, an anxious child seeking the security of physical contact with a trusted caretaker—perhaps his mother—in response to fear of the bird he reaches out to touch. Many of us have seen insecure children take this very pose in response to potentially unsettling encounters.

The closer the work of art is in both time and place to our own situation temporally and geographically, the easier it sometimes is to identify what is represented. But although Renoir painted his picture over 125 years ago in France, the furniture in the background still looks familiar, as does the book in the hand of Raphael's Madonna, painted five centuries before our time. But the object hanging from the belt of the scantily clad boy at the left in this painting will require identification for most of us. Iconographic investigation is necessary to understand the function of this form.

ICONOGRAPHY Some subjects are associated with conventional meanings established at a specific time or place; some of the human figures portrayed in works of art have specific identities; and some of the objects or forms have symbolic or allegorical meanings in addition to their natural subject matter. Discovering these conventional meanings of art's subject matter is called iconography. (See "A Closer Look," opposite.)

For example, the woman accompanied in the outdoors by two boys in Raphael's *Madonna of the Goldfinch* (see FIG. Intro-4) would have been immediately recognized by members of its intended early sixteenth-century Florentine audience as the Virgin Mary. Viewers would have identified the naked boy standing between her knees as her son Jesus, and the boy holding the bird as Jesus' cousin John the Baptist, sheathed in the animal skin garment that he would wear in the wilderness and equipped with a shallow cup attached to his belt, ready to be used in baptisms. Such attributes of clothing and equipment are often critical in making iconographic identifications. The goldfinch in the Baptist's hand was at this time and place a symbol of Christ's death on the cross, an allegorical implication that makes the Christ Child's retreat

into secure contact with his mother—already noted on the level of natural subject matter—understandable in relation to a specific story. The comprehension of conventional meanings in this painting would have been almost automatic among those for whom it was painted, but for us, separated by time and place, some research is necessary to recover associations that are no longer part of our everyday world.

Although it may not initially seem as unfamiliar, the subject matter of Renoir's 1878 portrait of *Mme. Charpentier and her Children* (see FIG. Intro-5) is in fact even more obscure. There are those in twenty-first-century American culture for whom the figures and symbols in Raphael's painting are still recognizable and meaningful, but Margu rite-Louise Charpentier died in 1904, and no one living today would be able to identify her based on the likeness Renoir presumably gave to her face in this family portrait commissioned by her husband, the wealthy and influential publisher Georges Charpentier. We need the painting's title to make that identification. And Mme. Charpentier is outfitted here in a gown created by English designer Charles Frederick Worth, the dominant figure in late nineteenth-century Parisian high fashion. Her clothing was a clear attribute of her wealth for those who recognized its source; most of us need to investigate to uncover its meaning. But a greater surprise awaits the student who pursues further research on her children. Although they clearly seem to our eyes to represent two daughters, the child closest to Mme. Charpentier is actually her son Paul, who at age 3, following standard Parisian bourgeois practice, has not yet had his first haircut and still wears clothing comparable to that of his older sister Georgette, perched on the family dog. It is not unusual in art history to encounter situations where our initial conclusions on the level of natural subject matter will need to be revised after some iconographic research.

INTEGRATION WITHIN CULTURAL CONTEXT

Natural subject matter and iconography were only two of three steps proposed by Panofsky for coming to an understanding of the meaning of works of art. The third step he labeled "iconology," and its aim is to interpret the work of art as an embodiment of its cultural situation, to place it within broad social, political, religious, and intellectual contexts. Such integration into history requires more than identifying subject matter or conventional symbols; it requires a deep understanding of the beliefs and principles or goals and values that underlie a work of art's cultural situation as well as the position of an artist and patron within it.

In "A Closer Look" (opposite), the subject matter of two **still life** paintings (pictures of inanimate objects and fruits or flowers taken out of their natural contexts) is identified and elucidated, but to truly understand these two works as bearers of cultural meaning, more knowledge of the broader context and specific goals of artists and audiences is required. For example, the fact that Zhu Da (1626–1705) became a painter was rooted more in the political than the artistic history of China at the middle of the seventeenth century. As a member of the imperial family of the Ming dynasty,

his life of privilege was disrupted when the Ming were overthrown during the Manchu conquest of China in 1644. Fleeing for his life, he sought refuge in a Buddhist monastery, where he wrote poetry and painted. Almost 40 years later, in the aftermath of a nervous breakdown (that could have been staged to avoid retribution for his family background), Zhu Da abandoned his monastic life and developed a career as a professional painter, adopting a series of descriptive pseudonyms—most notably Bada Shanren (“mountain man of eight greatnesses”) by which he is most often known today. His paintings are at times saturated with veiled political commentary; at times they seek to accommodate the expectations of collectors to assure their marketability; and in paintings like the one illustrated here (see page xxxiv, FIG. B), the artist seems to hark back to the contemplative, abstract, and spontaneous paintings associated with great Zen masters such as Muqi (c. 1201–after 1269), whose calligraphic pictures of isolated fruits seem almost like acts of devotion or detached contemplations on natural forms, rather than the works of a professional painter.

Clara Peeters’s still life (see page xxxiv, FIG. A), on the other hand, fits into a developing Northern European painting tradition within which she was an established and successful professional, specializing in portrayals of food and flowers, fruit and reflective objects. Still-life paintings in this tradition could be jubilant celebrations of the abundance of the natural world and the wealth of luxury objects available in the prosperous mercantile society of the Netherlands. Or they could be moralizing “*vanitas*” paintings, warning of the ephemeral meaning of those worldly possessions, even of life itself. But this painting has also been interpreted in a more personal way. Because the type of knife that sits in the foreground near the edge of the table was a popular wedding gift, and since it is inscribed with the artist’s own name, some have suggested that this still life could have celebrated Peeters’s marriage. Or this could simply be a witty way to sign her picture. It certainly could be personal and at the same time participate in the broader cultural meaning of still-life paintings. Mixtures of private and public meanings have been proposed for Zhu Da’s paintings as well. Some have seen the picture of quince illustrated here (see page xxxiv, FIG. B) as part of a series of allegorical “self-portraits” that extend across his career as a painter. Art historians frequently reveal multiple meanings when interpreting single works. Art often represents complex cultural and personal situations.

A CASE STUDY: ROGIER VAN DER WEYDEN’S PHILADELPHIA *CRUCIFIXION*


The basic, four-part method of art historical investigation and interpretation just outlined and explored may become clearer when its extended use is traced in relation to one specific work of art. A particularly revealing subject for such a case study is a

seminal and somewhat perplexing painting now in the Philadelphia Museum of Art—the **CRUCIFIXION WITH THE VIRGIN AND ST. JOHN THE EVANGELIST** (FIG. Intro-6) by Rogier van der Weyden (c. 1400–1464), a Flemish artist who will be featured in Chapter 19. Each of the four levels of art-historical inquiry reveals important information about this painting, information that has been used by art historians to reconstruct its relationship to its artist, its audience, and its broader cultural setting. The resulting interpretation is rich, but also complex. An investigation this extensive will not be possible for all the works of art in the following chapters, where the text will focus only on one or two facets of more expansive research. Because of the amount and complexity of information involved in a thorough art-historical interpretation, it is sometimes only in a second reading that we can follow the subtleties of its argument, after the first reading has provided a basic familiarity with the work of art, its conventional subjects, and its general context.

PHYSICAL PROPERTIES

Perhaps the most striking aspect of this painting’s physical appearance is its division into two separate tall rectangular panels, joined by a frame to form a coherent, almost square composition. These are oak panels, prepared with chalk to form a smooth surface on which to paint with mineral pigments suspended in oil. A technical investigation of the painting in 1981 used infrared reflectography to reveal a very sketchy under-drawing beneath the surface of the paint, proving to the investigators that this painting is almost entirely the work of Rogier van der Weyden himself. Famous and prosperous artists of this time and place employed many assistants to work in large production workshops, and they would make detailed under-drawings to ensure that assistants replicated the **style** of the master. But in cases where the masters themselves intended to execute the work, only summary compositional outlines were needed. Modern technical investigation of Rogier’s painting also used **dendrochronology** (the dating of wood based on the patterns of the growth rings) to date the oak panels and consequently the painting itself, now securely situated near the end of the artist’s career, c. 1460.

The most recent restoration of the painting—during the early 1990s by Mark Tucker, Senior Conservator at the Philadelphia Museum of Art—returned it, as close as possible, to current views of its original fifteenth-century appearance (see “De-restoring and Restoring Rogier van der Weyden’s *Crucifixion*,” page xxviii). This project included extensive technical analysis of almost every aspect of the picture, during which a critical clue emerged, one that may lead to a sharper understanding of its original use. X-rays revealed dowel holes and plugs running in a horizontal line about one-fourth of the way up from the bottom across the entire expanse of the two-panel painting. Tucker’s convincing research suggests that the dowels would have attached these two panels to the backs of wooden boxes that contained sculptures in a complex work of art that hung over the altar in a fifteenth-century church.



Intro-6 • Rogier van der Weyden CRUCIFIXION WITH THE VIRGIN AND ST. JOHN THE EVANGELIST
 c. 1460. Oil on oak panels, 71" × 73" (1.8 × 1.85 m). John G. Johnson Collection, Philadelphia Museum of Art.

FORMAL STRUCTURE

The visual organization of this two-part painting emphasizes both connection and separation. It is at the same time one painting and two. Continuing across both panels is the strip of midnight blue sky and the stone wall that constricts space within the picture to a shallow corridor, pushing the figures into the foreground and close to the viewer. The shallow strip of mossy ground under the two-figure group in the left panel continues its sloping descent into the right panel, as does the hem of the Virgin's ice-blue garment. We look into this scene as if through a window with a mullion down

the middle and assume that the world on the left continues behind this central strip of frame into the right side.

On the other hand, strong visual forces isolate the figures within their respective panels, setting up a system of "compare and contrast" that seems to be at the heart of the painting's design. The striking red cloths that hang over the wall are centered directly behind the figures on each side, forming internal frames that highlight them as separate groups and focus our attention back and forth between them rather than on the pictorial elements that unite their environments. As we begin to compare the two sides,

RECOVERING THE PAST | De-restoring and Restoring Rogier van der Weyden's *Crucifixion*

Ever since Rogier van der Weyden's strikingly asymmetrical, two-panel rendering of the *Crucifixion* (see FIG. Intro-6) was purchased by Philadelphia lawyer John G. Johnson in 1906 for his spectacular collection of European paintings, it has been recognized not only as one of the greatest works by this master of fifteenth-century Flemish painting, but as one of the most important European paintings in North America. Soon after the Johnson Collection became part of the Philadelphia Museum of Art in 1933, however, this painting's visual character was significantly transformed. In 1941, the museum employed freelance restorer David Rosen to work on the painting. Deciding that Rogier's work was seriously marred by later overpainting and disfigured by the discoloration of old varnish, he subjected the painting to a thorough cleaning. He also removed the strip of dark blue paint forming the sky above the wall at the top—identifying it as an eighteenth-century restoration—and replaced it with gold leaf to conform with remnants of gold in this area that he assessed as surviving fragments of the original background. Rosen's restoration of Rogier's painting was uncritically accepted for almost half a century, and the gold background became a major factor in the interpretations of art historians as distinguished as Erwin Panofsky and Meyer Schapiro.

In 1990, in preparation for a new installation of the work, Rogier's painting received a thorough technical analysis by Mark Tucker, the museum's Senior Conservator. There were two startling discoveries:

- The dark blue strip that had run across the top of the picture before Rosen's intervention was actually original to the painting. Remnants of paint left behind in 1941 proved to be the same azurite blue that also appears in the clothing of the Virgin, and in no instance did the traces of gold discovered in 1941 run under aspects of the original paint surface. Rosen had removed Rogier's original midnight blue sky.
- What Rosen had interpreted as disfiguring varnish streaking the wall and darkening the brilliant cloths of honor hanging over it were actually Rogier's careful painting of lichens and water stains on the stone and his overpainting on the fabric that had originally transformed a vermilion undercoat into deep crimson cloth.

In meticulous work during 1992–1993, Tucker cautiously restored the painting based on the evidence he had uncovered. Neither the lost lichens and water stains nor the toning crimson overpainting of the hangings were replaced, but a coat of blue-black paint was laid over Rosen's gold leaf at the top of the panels, taking care to apply the new layer in such a way that should a later generation decide to return to the gold leaf sky, the midnight tonalities could be easily removed. That seems an unlikely prospect. The painting as exhibited today comes as close as possible to the original appearance of Rogier's *Crucifixion*. At least we think so.

it becomes increasingly clear that the relationship between figures and environment is quite distinct on each side of the divide.

The dead figure of Christ on the cross, elevated to the very top of the picture, is strictly centered within his panel, as well as against the cloth that hangs directly behind him. The grid of masonry blocks and creases in the cloth emphasizes his rectilinear integration into a system of balanced, rigid regularity. His head is aligned with the cap of the wall, his flesh largely contained within the area defined by the cloth. His elbows mark the juncture of the wall with the edge of the hanging, and his feet extend just to the end of the cloth, where his toes substitute for the border of fringe they overlap. The environment is almost as balanced. The strip of dark sky at the top is equivalent in size to the strip of mossy earth at the bottom of the picture, and both are visually bisected by centered horizontals—the cross bar at the top and the alignment of bone and skull at the bottom. A few disruptions to this stable, rectilinear, symmetrical order draw the viewers' attention to the panel at the left: the downward fall of the head of Christ, the visual weight of the skull, the downturn of the fluttering loin cloth, and the tip of the Virgin's gown that transgresses over the barrier to move in from the other side.

John and Mary merge on the left into a single figural mass that could be inscribed into a half-circle. Although set against a rectilinear grid background comparable to that behind Jesus, they contrast with, rather than conform to, the regular sense of order.

Their curving outlines offer unsettling unsteadiness, as if they are toppling to the ground, jutting into the other side of the frame. This instability is reinforced by their postures. The projection of Mary's knee in relation to the angle of her torso reveals that she is collapsing into a curve, and the crumpled mass of drapery circling underneath her only underlines her lack of support. John reaches out to catch her, but he has not yet made contact with her body. He strikes a stance of strident instability without even touching the ground, and he looks blankly out into space with an unfocused expression, distracted from, rather than concentrating on, the task at hand. Perhaps he will come to his senses and grab her. But will he be able to catch her in time, and even then support her, given his unstable posture? The moment is tense; the outcome is unclear. But we are moving into the realm of natural subject matter. The poignancy of this concentrated portrayal seems to demand it.

ICONOGRAPHY

The subject of this painting is among the most familiar themes in the history of European art. The dead Jesus has been crucified on the cross, and two of his closest associates—his mother and John, one of his disciples—mourn his loss. Although easily recognizable, the austere and asymmetrical presentation is unexpected. More usual is an earlier painting of this subject by the same artist, **CRUCIFIXION TRIPTYCH WITH DONORS AND SAINTS** (FIG. Intro-7), where he situates the crucified Christ at the center



Intro-7 • Rogier van der Weyden CRUCIFIXION TRIPTYCH WITH DONORS AND SAINTS
c. 1440. Oil on wooden panels, 39¾" × 55" (101 × 140 cm). Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.

of a symmetrical arrangement, the undisputed axial focus of the composition. The scene unfolds here within an expansive landscape, populated with a wider cast of participants, each of whom takes a place with symmetrical decorum on either side of the cross. Because most crucifixions follow some variation on this pattern, Rogier's two-panel portrayal (see FIG. Intro-6) in which the cross is asymmetrically displaced to one side, with a spare cast of attendants relegated to a separately framed space, severely restricted by a stark stone wall, requires some explanation. As does the mysterious dark world beyond the wall, and the artificial backdrop of the textile hangings.


This scene is not only austere and subdued; it is sharply focused, and the focus relates it to the specific moment in the story that Rogier decided to represent. The Christian Bible contains four accounts of Jesus' crucifixion, one in each of the four Gospels. Rogier took two verses in John's account as his painting's text (John 19:26–27), cited here in the Douai-Reims literal English translation (1582, 1609) of the Latin Vulgate Bible that was used by Western European Christians during the fifteenth century:

When Jesus therefore had seen his mother and the disciple standing whom he loved, he saith to his mother: Woman, behold thy son. After that, he saith to the disciple: Behold thy mother. And from that hour, the disciple took her to his own.

Even the textual source uses conventions that need explanation, specifically the way the disciple John is consistently referred to in this Gospel as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." Rogier's painting, therefore, seems to focus on Jesus' call for a newly expanded relationship between his mother and a beloved follower. More specifically, he has projected us slightly forward in time to the moment when John needs to respond to that call—Jesus has died; John is now in charge.

There are, however, other conventional iconographic associations with the crucifixion that Rogier has folded into this spare portrayal. Fifteenth-century viewers would have understood the skull and femur that lie on the mound at the base of the cross as the bones of Adam—the first man in the Hebrew Bible account of creation—on whose grave Jesus' crucifixion was believed to have taken place. This juxtaposition embodied the Christian belief that Christ's sacrifice on the cross redeemed believers from the death that Adam's original sin had brought to human existence.

Mary's swoon and presumed loss of consciousness would have evoked another theological idea, the *co-passio*, in which Mary's anguish while witnessing Jesus' suffering and death was seen as a parallel passion of mother with son, both critical for human salvation. Their connection in this painting is underlined visually by the similar bending of their knees, inclination of their heads, and closing of their eyes. They even seem to resemble each other in facial likeness, especially when compared to John.



Intro-8 • VIEW OF A MONK'S CELL IN THE MONASTERY OF SAN MARCO, FLORENCE

Including Fra Angelico's fresco of the *Annunciation*. c. 1438–1445.

CULTURAL CONTEXT

In 1981 art historian Penny Howell Jolly published an interpretation of Rogier's Philadelphia *Crucifixion* as the product of a broad personal and cultural context. In addition to building on the work of earlier art historians, she pursued two productive lines of investigation to explain the rationale for this unusually austere presentation:

- the prospect that Rogier was influenced by the work of another artist, and
- the possibility that the painting was produced for an institutional context that called for a special mode of visual presentation and a particular iconographic focus.

FRA ANGELICO AT SAN MARCO We know very little about the life of Rogier van der Weyden, but we do know that in 1450, when he was already established as one of the principal painters in northern Europe, he made a pilgrimage to Rome. Either on his way to Rome, or during his return journey home, he stopped off in Florence and saw the **altarpiece**, and presumably also the frescos, that Fra Angelico (c. 1400–1455) and his workshop had painted during the 1440s at the monastery of San Marco. The evidence of Rogier's contact with Fra Angelico's work is found in a work Rogier painted after he returned home, based on a panel of the San Marco altarpiece. For the Philadelphia *Crucifixion*,

however, it was Fra Angelico's devotional frescos on the walls of the monks' individual rooms (or cells) that seem to have had the greatest impact (**FIG. Intro-8**). Jolly compared the Philadelphia *Crucifixion* with a scene of the Mocking of Christ at San Marco to demonstrate the connection (**FIG. Intro-9**). Fra Angelico presented the sacred figures with a quiet austerity that recalls Rogier's unusual composition. More specific parallels are the use of an expansive stone wall to restrict narrative space to a shallow foreground corridor, the description of the world beyond that wall as a dark sky that contrasts with the brilliantly illuminated foreground, and the use of a draped cloth of honor to draw attention to a narrative vignette from the life of Jesus, to separate it out as an object of devotion.

THE CARTHUSIANS Having established a possible connection between Rogier's unusual late painting of the crucifixion and frescos by Fra Angelico that he likely saw during his pilgrimage to Rome in 1450, Jolly reconstructed a specific context of patronage and meaning within Rogier's own world in Flanders that could explain why the paintings of Fra Angelico would have had such an impact on him at this particular moment in his career.

During the years around 1450, Rogier developed a personal and professional relationship with the monastic order of



Intro-9 • Fra Angelico MOCKING OF CHRIST WITH THE VIRGIN MARY AND ST. DOMINIC

Monastery of San Marco, Florence. c. 1441–1445.



Intro-10 • DETAIL OF FIG. Intro-6 SHOWING PART OF THE LEFT WING

the Carthusians, and especially with the Belgian Charterhouse (or Carthusian monastery) of Hérrines, where his oldest son was invested as a monk in 1450. Rogier gave money to Hérrines, and texts document his donation of a painting to its chapel of St. Catherine. Jolly suggested that the Philadelphia *Crucifixion* could be that painting. Its subdued colors and narrative austerity are consistent with Carthusian aesthetic attitudes, and the walled setting of the scene recalls the enclosed gardens that were attached to the

individual dormitory rooms of Carthusian monks. The reference in this painting to the *co-passio* of the Virgin provides supporting evidence since this theological idea was central to Carthusian thought and devotion. The *co-passio* was even reflected in the monks' own initiation rites, during which they re-enacted and sought identification with both Christ's sacrifice on the cross and the Virgin's parallel suffering.

In Jolly's interpretation, the religious framework of a Carthusian setting for the painting emerges as a personal framework for the artist himself, since this *Crucifixion* seems to be associated with important moments in his own life—his religious pilgrimage to Rome in 1450 and the initiation of his oldest son as a Carthusian monk at about the same time. Is it possible that the sense of loss and separation that Rogier evoked in his portrayal of a poignant moment in the life of St. John (**Fig. Intro-10**) could have been especially meaningful to the artist himself at the time this work was painted?

A CONTINUING PROJECT The final word has not been spoken in the interpretation of this painting. Mark Tucker's recent work on the physical evidence revealed by x-ray analysis points toward seeing these two panels as part of a large sculptured altarpiece. Even if this did preclude the prospect that it is the **panel painting** Rogier donated to the chapel of St. Catherine at Hérrines, it does not negate the relationship Jolly drew with Fra Angelico, nor the Carthusian context she outlined for the work's original situation. It simply reminds us that our historical understanding of works such as this will evolve when new evidence about them emerges.

As the history of art unfolds in the ensuing chapters of this book, it will be important to keep two things in mind as you read the characterizations of individual works of art and the larger story of their integration into the broader cultural contexts of those who made them and those for whom they were initially made. Art-historical interpretations are built on extended research comparable to that we have just summarily surveyed for Rogier van der Weyden's Philadelphia *Crucifixion*. But the work of interpretation is never complete. Art history is a continuing project, a work perpetually in progress.


THINK ABOUT IT

- I.1** Analyze the composition of one painting illustrated in this Introduction.
- I.2** Characterize the difference between natural subject matter and iconography, focusing your discussion on a specific work of art.
- I.3** What are the four separate steps proposed here for characterizing the methods used by art historians to interpret works of art? Characterize the cultural analysis in step four by showing

the way it expands our understanding of one of the still lifes in the Closer Look.

- I.4** What aspect of the case study of Rogier van der Weyden's Philadelphia *Crucifixion* was especially interesting to you? Why? How did it broaden your understanding of what you will learn in this course?

✓ [Study and review on myartslab.com



1-1 • SPOTTED HORSES AND HUMAN HANDS

Pech-Merle Cave. Dordogne, France. Horses 25,000–24,000 BCE; hands c. 15,000 BCE. Paint on limestone, individual horses over 5' (1.5 m) in length.

Prehistoric Art

The detail shown at left features one of two horses, positioned back to back on the wall of a chamber within the Pech-Merle Cave, located in the Dordogne region of modern France (**FIG. 1-1**). The tapering head of this horse follows the natural shape of the rock. Black dots surround portions of its contours and fill most of its body, a striking feature that was once believed to be decorative, until DNA analysis of the remains of prehistoric horses, published in 2011, proved that one species flourishing at this time actually was spotted. In this instance, at least, prehistoric painters were painting what they saw. At a later date, a large fish (58 inches long and very difficult to see) was painted in red on top of the spots. Yet the painters left more than images of horses and fish; they left their own handprints in various places around the animals. These images, and many others hidden in chambers at the ends of long, narrow passages within the cave, connect us to an almost unimaginably ancient world of 25,000 BCE.

Prehistory includes all of human existence before the emergence of writing, and long before that people were carving objects, painting images, and creating shelters and other structures. Thirty thousand years ago our ancestors were not making “works of art” and there were no “artists” as we use the term today. They were flaking, chipping, and polishing flints into spear points, knives, and scrapers, not into sculptures, even if we find these artifacts pleasing to the

eye and to the touch. And wall paintings must have seemed equally important as these tools to their prehistoric makers, in terms of everyday survival, not visual delight.

For art historians, archaeologists, and anthropologists, prehistoric “art” provides a significant clue—along with fossils, pollen, and other artifacts—to help us understand early human life and culture. Specialists continue to discover more about when and how these works were created. In 2012, for instance, an international team of scientists used a refined dating technology known as the uranium-thorium method (see “How Early Art is Dated,” page 12) to prove that some paintings in a Spanish cave known as El Castillo are at least 40,000 years old—probably much older—raising the possibility that they could have been painted by Neanderthals rather than *Homo sapiens*.

We may never know exactly why these prehistoric paintings were made. In fact, there may be no single meaning or use for any one image on a cave wall; cave art probably meant different things to the different people who saw it, depending on their age, their experience, or their specific needs and desires. And the sculpture, paintings, and structures that survive are but a tiny fraction of what must have been created over a very long time span. The conclusions and interpretations we draw from them are only hypotheses, making prehistoric art one of the most speculative, but dynamic and exciting, areas of art history.

LEARN ABOUT IT


- 1.1** Explore the variety of styles, techniques, and traditions represented by what remains of prehistoric art and architecture, and probe its technical, formal, and expressive character.
- 1.2** Survey the principal themes, subjects, and symbols in prehistoric painting, sculpture, and objects.
- 1.3** Investigate how art historians and anthropologists have speculated on the cultural meanings of works for which there is no written record to provide historical context.
- 1.4** Grasp the concepts and vocabulary used to describe and characterize prehistoric art and architecture.

 **Listen** to the chapter audio on myartslab.com

THE STONE AGE

How and when modern humans evolved is the subject of ongoing debate, but anthropologists now agree that the species called *Homo sapiens* appeared about 400,000 years ago, and that the subspecies to which we belong, *Homo sapiens sapiens* (usually referred to as modern humans), evolved as early as 120,000 years ago. Based on archaeological evidence, it is now clear that modern humans spread from Africa across Asia, into Europe, and finally to Australia and the Americas. This vast movement of people took place between 100,000 and 35,000 years ago.

Scholars began the systematic study of prehistory only about 200 years ago. Nineteenth-century archaeologists, struck by the wealth of stone tools, weapons, and figures found at ancient sites, named the whole period of early human development the Stone Age. Today, researchers divide the Stone Age into two parts: Paleolithic (from the Greek *paleo-*, “old,” and *lithos*, “stone”) and Neolithic (from the Greek *neo-*, “new”). They divide the Paleolithic period itself into three phases reflecting the relative position of objects found in the layers of excavation: Lower (the oldest), Middle, and Upper (the most recent). In some places archaeologists



1-2 • RAINBOW SERPENT ROCK

Western Arnhem Land, Australia.

Appearing in Australia as early as 6000 BCE, images of the Rainbow Serpent play a role in rituals and legends of the creation of human beings, the generation of rains, storms, and floods, and the reproductive power of nature and people.

can identify a transitional, or Mesolithic (from the Greek *meso-*, “middle”) period.

The dates for the transition from Paleolithic to Neolithic vary with geography and with local environmental and social circumstances. For some of the places discussed in this chapter, such as Western Europe, the Neolithic way of living did not emerge until 3000 BCE; in others, such as the Near East, it appeared as early as 8000 BCE. Archaeologists mark time in so many years ago, or BP (“before present”). However, to ensure consistent style throughout the book, which reflects the usage of art historians, this chapter uses BCE (before the Common Era) and CE (the Common Era) to mark time.

Much is yet to be discovered about prehistoric art. In Australia, some of the world’s very oldest images have been dated to between 50,000 and 40,000 years ago, and the tradition of transient communities who marked the land in complex, yet stunningly beautiful ways continues into historical time. In western Arnhem Land (**FIG. 1-2**), rock art images of the Rainbow Serpent have their origins in prehistory, and were perhaps first created during times of substantial changes in the environment. Africa, as well, is home to ancient rock art in both its northern and southern regions. In all cases, archaeologists associate the arrival of modern humans in these regions with the advent of image making.

Indeed, it is the cognitive capability to create and recognize symbols and imagery that sets us as modern humans apart from all our predecessors and from all our contemporary animal relatives. We are defined as a species by our abilities to make and understand art. This chapter focuses primarily on the rich traditions of prehistoric European art from the Paleolithic and Neolithic periods and into the Bronze Age (**MAP 1-1**). Later chapters consider the prehistoric art of other continents and cultures, such as China (Chapter 11) and sub-Saharan Africa (Chapter 14).

THE PALEOLITHIC PERIOD

Human beings made tools long before they made what today we call “art.” Art, in the sense of image making, is the hallmark of the Upper Paleolithic period and the emergence of our subspecies, *Homo sapiens sapiens*. Representational images appear in the archaeological record beginning about 38,000 BCE in Australia, Africa, and Europe. Before that time, during the Lower Paleolithic period in Africa, early humans made tools by flaking and chipping (knapping) flint pebbles into blades and scrapers with sharp edges. Dating to 2.5 million years ago, the earliest objects made by our human ancestors were simple stone tools, some with sharp edges, that were used to cut animal skin and meat and bash open bones to reveal the marrow, and also to cut wood and soft plant materials. These first tools have been found at sites such as Olduvai Gorge in Tanzania. Although not art, they document a critical development in our evolution: humans’ ability to transform the world around them into specific tools and objects that could be used to complete a task.



MAP 1-1 • PREHISTORIC EUROPE

As the Ice Age glaciers receded, Paleolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age, and Iron Age settlements increased from south to north.

By 1.65 million years ago, significant changes in our ancestors' cognitive abilities and manual dexterity can be seen in sophisticated stone tools, such as the teardrop-shaped hand-axes (**FIG. 1-3**) that have been found at sites across Eurasia. These extraordinary objects, symmetrical in form and produced by a complex multistep process, were long thought of as nothing more than tools (or perhaps even as weapons), but the most recent analysis suggests that they had a social function as well. Some sites (as at Olorgesailie in Kenya) contain hundreds of hand-axes, far more than would have been needed in functional terms, suggesting that they served to announce an individual's skills, status, and standing in his or her community. Although these ancient hand-axes are clearly not art in the representational sense, it is important to see them in terms of performance and process. These concepts, so central to modern Western art, have deep prehistoric roots.

Evolutionary changes took place over time and by 400,000 years ago, during the late Middle Paleolithic period, a *Homo sapiens* subspecies called Neanderthal inhabited Europe. Its members used a wider range of stone tools and may have carefully buried their dead with funerary offerings. Neanderthals survived for thousands of years and overlapped with modern humans. *Homo sapiens sapiens*, which had evolved and spread out of Africa some 300,000 years after the Neanderthals, eventually replaced them, probably between 38,000 and 33,000 BCE.

Critical cognitive abilities set modern humans apart from all their predecessors; indeed *Homo sapiens sapiens*, as a species, outlasted Neanderthals precisely because they had the mental capacity to solve problems of human survival. The new cognitive abilities included improvements in recognizing and benefiting from variations in the natural environment, and in managing



1-3 • PALEOLITHIC HAND-AXE

From Isimila Korongo, Tanzania. 60,000 years ago. Stone, height 10" (25.4 cm).



1-4 • DECORATED OCHER

From Blombos Cave, southern Cape coast, South Africa. 75,000 years ago.


social networking and alliance making—skills that enabled organized hunting. The most important new ability, however, was the capacity to think symbolically: to create representational analogies between one person, animal, or object, and another, and to recognize and remember those analogies. This cognitive development marks the evolutionary origin of what we call art.

The world's earliest examples of art come from South Africa: two 77,000-year-old, engraved blocks of red ocher (probably used as crayons) found in the Blombos Cave (FIG. 1-4). Both blocks are engraved in an identical way with cross-hatched lines on their sides. Archaeologists argue that the similarity of the engraved patterns means these two pieces were intentionally made and decorated following a common pattern. Thousands of fragments of ocher have been discovered at Blombos and there is little doubt that people were using it to draw patterns and images, the remains of which have long since disappeared. Although it is impossible to prove, it is highly likely that the ocher was used to decorate peoples' bodies as well as to color objects such as tools or shell ornaments. Indeed, in an earlier layer on the same site, archaeologists uncovered more than 36 shells, each of which had been perforated so that it could be hung from a string or thong, or attached to clothing or a person's hair; these shells would have been used to decorate the body. An ostrich eggshell bead came from the same site and would have served the same purpose. The Blombos finds are enormously important. Here our early ancestors, probably modern humans but possibly even their predecessors, used the earth's raw materials to decorate themselves with jewelry (made of shells) and body art (using the ocher).

SHELTER OR ARCHITECTURE?

"Architecture" usually refers to the enclosure of spaces with some aesthetic intent. People may object to its use in connection with prehistoric improvisations, but building even a simple shelter requires a degree of imagination and planning deserving of the name "architecture." In the Upper Paleolithic period, humans in some regions used great ingenuity to build shelters that were far from simple. In woodlands, evidence of floors indicates that our ancestors built circular or oval huts of light branches and hides that measured as much as 15–20 feet in diameter. (Modern tents to accommodate six people vary from 10- by 11-foot ovals to 14- by 7-foot rooms.)

In the treeless grasslands of Upper Paleolithic Russia and Ukraine, builders created settlements of up to ten houses using the bones of the now extinct woolly mammoth, whose long, curving tusks made excellent roof supports and arched door openings (FIG. 1-5). This bone framework was probably covered with animal hides and turf. Most activities centered around the inside fire



1-5 • RECONSTRUCTION DRAWING OF MAMMOTH-BONE HOUSES

Ukraine. c. 16,000–10,000 BCE.



pit, or hearth, where food was prepared and tools were fashioned. Larger houses might have had more than one hearth, and spaces were set aside for specific uses—working stone, making clothing, sleeping, and dumping refuse. Inside the largest dwelling on a site in Mezhirich, Ukraine, archaeologists found 15 small hearths that still contained ashes and charred bones left by the last occupants. Some people also colored their floors with powdered ochre in shades that ranged from yellow to red to brown. These Upper Paleolithic structures are important because of their early date: The widespread appearance of durable architecture concentrated in village communities did not occur until the beginning of the Neolithic period in the Near East and southeastern Europe.

ARTIFACTS OR WORKS OF ART?

As early as 30,000 BCE small figures, or figurines, of people and animals made of bone, ivory, stone, and clay appeared in Europe and Asia. Today we interpret such self-contained, three-dimensional pieces as examples of **sculpture in the round**. Prehistoric carvers also produced relief sculpture in stone, bone, and ivory. In **relief sculpture**, the surrounding material is carved away to form a background that sets off the projecting figure.

THE LION-HUMAN An early and puzzling example of a sculpture in the round is a human figure—probably male—with a feline head (FIG. 1-6), made about 30,000–26,000 BCE. Archaeologists excavating at Hohlenstein-Stadel, Germany, found broken pieces of ivory (from a mammoth tusk) that they realized were parts of an entire figure. Nearly a foot tall, this remarkable statue surpasses most early figurines in size and complexity. Instead of copying

1-6 • LION-HUMAN

From Hohlenstein-Stadel, Germany. c. 30,000–26,000 BCE. Mammoth ivory, height 11 $\frac{5}{8}$ " (29.6 cm). Ulmer Museum, Ulm, Germany.

Words are only symbols for ideas, and it is no coincidence that the origins of language and of art are often linked in human evolutionary development. But the very words we invent—or our ancestors invented—reveal a certain view of the world and can shape our thinking. Today, we exert the power of naming when we select a name for a baby or call a friend by a nickname. Our ideas about art can also be affected by names, even the ones used for captions in a book. Before the twentieth century, artists usually did not name, or title, their works. Names were eventually supplied by the works' owners or by art historians writing about them, and thus often express the cultural prejudices of the labelers or of the times in which they lived.

An excellent example of such distortion is the naming of the hundreds of small prehistoric statues of women that have been found. Earlier scholars called them by the Roman name Venus. For example,

the sculpture in FIGURE 1-7 was once called the *Venus of Willendorf* after the place where it was found. Using the name of the Roman goddess of love and beauty sent a message that this figure was associated with religious belief, that it represented an ideal of womanhood, and that it was one of a long line of images of “classical” feminine beauty. In a short time, most similar works of sculpture from the Upper Paleolithic period came to be known as Venus figures. The name was repeated so often that even experts began to assume that the statues had to be fertility figures and Mother Goddesses, although there is no proof that this was so.

Our ability to understand and interpret works of art responsibly and creatively is easily compromised by distracting labels. Calling a prehistoric figure a woman instead of Venus encourages us to think about the sculpture in new and different ways.

what he or she saw in nature, the carver created a unique creature, part human and part beast. Was the figure intended to represent a person wearing a ritual lion mask? Or has the man taken on

the appearance of an animal? Archaeologists now think that the people who lived at this time held very different ideas (from our twenty-first-century ones) about what it meant to be a human and how humans were distinct from animals; it is quite possible that they thought of animals and humans as parts of one common group of beings who shared the world. What is absolutely clear is that the Lion-Human shows highly complex thinking and creative imagination: the uniquely human ability to conceive and represent a creature never seen in nature.



1-7 • WOMAN FROM WILLENDORF
Austria. c. 24,000 BCE. Limestone, height 4 $\frac{3}{8}$ " (11 cm).
Naturhistorisches Museum, Vienna.

FEMALE FIGURES While a number of figurines representing men have been found recently, most human figures from the Upper Paleolithic period are female. The most famous of these, the **WOMAN FROM WILLENDORF** (FIG. 1-7), Austria, dates from about 24,000 BCE (see “The Power of Naming,” above). Carved from limestone and originally colored with red ocher, the statuette’s swelling, rounded forms make it seem much larger than its actual 4 $\frac{3}{8}$ -inch height. The sculptor exaggerated the figure’s female attributes by giving it pendulous breasts, a big belly with a deep navel (a natural indentation in the stone), wide hips, dimpled knees and buttocks, and solid thighs. By carving a woman with a well-nourished body, the artist may have been expressing health and fertility, which could ensure the ability to produce strong children, thus guaranteeing the survival of the clan.

The most recent analysis of the Paleolithic female sculptures, however, has replaced the traditional emphasis on fertility with more nuanced understandings of how and why the human figure is represented in this way, and who may have had these kinds of objects made. According to archaeologist Clive Gamble, these little sculptures were subtle forms of nonverbal communication among small isolated groups of Paleolithic people spread out across vast regions. Gamble noted the tremendous (and unusual) similarity in the shapes of figures, even those found in widely distant parts of Europe. He suggested that when groups of Paleolithic




1-8 • WOMAN FROM DOLNÍ VĚSTONICE
Moravia, Czech Republic. 23,000 BCE. Fired clay, 4¼" × 1⅞"
(11 × 4.3 cm). Moravske Museum, Brno, Czech Republic.

hunter-gatherers did occasionally meet up and interact, the female statues may have been among several signature objects that signaled whether a group was friendly and acceptable for interaction and, probably, for mating. As symbols, these figures would have provided reassurance of shared values about the body, and their size would have demanded engagement at a close personal level. It is not a coincidence, then, that the largest production of these types of Paleolithic figurine occurred during a period when climatic conditions were at their worst and the need for interaction and alliance building would have been at its greatest.

Another figure, found in the Czech Republic, the **WOMAN FROM DOLNÍ VĚSTONICE** (FIG. 1-8), takes our understanding of these objects further still. The site of Dolní Věstonice is important because it marks a very early date (23,000 BCE) for the use of fire to make durable objects out of mixtures of water and soil. What makes the figures from this site and those from other sites in the region (Pavlov and Předmostí) unusual is their method of manufacture. By mixing the soil with water—to a very particular recipe—and then placing the wet figures in a hot kiln to bake, the makers were not intending to create durable, well-fired statues. On the contrary, the recipe used and the firing procedure followed indicate that the intention was to make the figures explode in the kilns before the firing process was complete, and before a “successful” figure could be produced. Indeed, the finds at these sites support this interpretation: There are very few complete figures,

but numerous fragments that bear the traces of explosions at high temperatures. The Dolní Věstonice fragments are records of performance and process art in their rawest and earliest forms.

Another remarkable female image, discovered in the Grotte du Pape in Brassempouy, France, is the tiny ivory head known as the **WOMAN FROM BRASSEMPOUY** (FIG. 1-9). Though the finders did not record its archaeological context, recent studies prove it to be authentic and date it as early as 30,000 BCE. The carver captured the essence of a head, or what psychologists call the memory image—those generalized elements that reside in our standard memory of a human head. An egg shape rests on a long neck. A wide nose and strongly defined browline suggest deep-set eyes, and an engraved square patterning may be hair or a head-dress. The image is an abstraction (what has come to be known as **abstract art**): the reduction of shapes and appearances to basic yet recognizable forms that are not intended to be exact replications of nature. The result in this case looks uncannily modern to contemporary viewers. Today, when such a piece is isolated in a museum case or as a book illustration we enjoy it as an aesthetic object, but we lose its original cultural context.



1-9 • WOMAN FROM BRASSEMPOUY
Grotte du Pape, Brassempouy, Landes, France. Probably
c. 30,000 BCE. Ivory, height 1¼" (3.6 cm). Musée des Antiquités
Nationales, Saint-Germain-en-Laye, France.

TECHNIQUE | Prehistoric Wall Painting

In a dark cave, working by the light of an animal-fat lamp, artists chew a piece of charcoal to dilute it with saliva and water. Then they blow out the mixture on the surface of a wall, using their hands as stencils. This drawing demonstrates how cave archaeologist Michel Lorblanchet and his assistant used the step-by-step process of the original makers of a cave painting at Pech-Merle (see FIG. 1-1) in France to create a complex design of spotted horses.

By turning himself into a human spray can, Lorblanchet produced clear lines on the rough stone surface much more easily than he could with a brush. To create the line of a horse's back, with its clean upper edge and blurry lower one, he blows pigment below his hand. To capture its angular rump, he places his hand vertically against the wall, holding it slightly curved. To produce the sharpest lines, such as those of the upper hind leg and tail, he places his hands side by side and blows between them. To create the forelegs and the hair on the horses' bellies, he fingerpaints. A hole punched in a piece of leather serves as a stencil for the horses' spots. It took Lorblanchet only 32 hours to reproduce the Pech-Merle painting of spotted horses, his speed suggesting that a single artist created the original (perhaps with the help of an assistant to mix pigments and tend the lamp).

Homo sapiens sapiens artists used three painting techniques: the spraying demonstrated by Lorblanchet; drawing with fingers or blocks of ocher; and daubing with a paintbrush made of hair or moss. In some places in prehistoric caves three stages of image creation can be seen: engraved lines using flakes of flint, followed by a color wash of ocher and manganese, and a final engraving to emphasize shapes and details.



CAVE PAINTING

Art in Europe entered a rich and sophisticated phase well before 40,000 years ago, when images began to be painted on the walls of caves in central and southern France and northern Spain. No one knew of the existence of prehistoric cave paintings until one day in 1879, when a young girl, exploring with her father in Altamira in northern Spain, crawled through a small opening in the ground and found herself in a chamber whose ceiling was covered with painted animals (see FIG. 1-13). Her father, a lawyer and amateur archaeologist, searched the rest of the cave, told authorities about the remarkable find, and published his discovery the following year. Few people believed that these amazing works could have been made by “primitive” people, and the scientific community declared the paintings a hoax. They were accepted as authentic only in 1902, after many other cave paintings, drawings, and engravings had been discovered at other places in northern Spain and in France.

THE MEANING OF CAVE PAINTINGS What caused people to paint such dramatic imagery on the walls of caves? The idea that human beings have an inherent desire to decorate themselves and their surroundings—that an aesthetic sense is somehow innate to the human species—found ready acceptance in the nineteenth century. Many believed that people create art for the sheer love of beauty. Scientists now agree that human beings have an aesthetic impulse, but the effort required to accomplish the great cave paintings suggests their creators were motivated by more than simple visual pleasure (see “Prehistoric Wall Painting,” above). Since the discovery at Altamira, anthropologists and art

historians have devised several hypotheses to explain the existence of cave art. Like the search for the meaning of prehistoric female figurines, these explanations depend on the cultural views of those who advance them.

In the early twentieth century, scholars believed that art has a social function and that aesthetics are culturally relative. They proposed that the cave paintings might be products both of rites to strengthen clan bonds and of ceremonies to enhance the fertility of animals used for food. In 1903, French archaeologist Salomon Reinach suggested that cave paintings were expressions of sympathetic magic: the idea, for instance, that a picture of a reclining bison would ensure that hunters found their prey asleep. Abbé Henri Breuil took these ideas further and concluded that caves were used as places of worship and were the settings for initiation rites. During the second half of the twentieth century, scholars rejected these ideas and rooted their interpretations in rigorous scientific methods and current social theory. André Leroi-Gourhan and Annette Laming-Emperaire, for example, dismissed the sympathetic magic theory because statistical analysis of debris from human settlements revealed that the animals used most frequently for food were not the ones traditionally portrayed in caves.

Researchers continue to discover new cave images and to correct earlier errors of fact or interpretation. A study of the Altamira Cave in the 1980s led anthropologist Leslie G. Freeman to conclude that the artists had faithfully represented a herd of bison during the mating season. Instead of being dead, asleep, or disabled—as earlier observers had thought—the animals were dust-wallowing, common behavior during the mating season. Similar thinking has led to a more recent interpretation of cave art by archaeologist

Steve Mithen. In his detailed study of the motifs of the art and its placement within caves, Mithen argued that hoofprints, patterns of animal feces, and hide colorings were recorded and used as a “text” to teach novice hunters within a group about the seasonal appearance and behavior of the animals they hunted. The fact that so much cave art is hidden deep in almost inaccessible parts of caves—indeed, the fact that it is placed within caves at all—suggested to Mithen that this knowledge was intended for a privileged group and that certain individuals or groups were excluded from acquiring that knowledge.

South African rock-art expert David Lewis-Williams has suggested a different interpretation. Using a deep comparative knowledge of art made by hunter-gatherer communities that are still in existence, Lewis-Williams argued that Upper Paleolithic cave art is best understood in terms of shamanism: the belief that certain people (shamans) can travel outside of their bodies in order to mediate between the worlds of the living and the spirits. Traveling under the ground as a spirit, particularly within caves, or conceptually within the stone walls of the cave, Upper Paleolithic shamans would have participated in ceremonies that involved hallucinations. Images conceived during this trancelike state would likely combine recognizable (the animals) and abstract (the nonrepresentational) symbols. In addition, Lewis-Williams interprets the stenciled human handprints found on the cave walls (see FIG. 1-1) as traces of the nonshaman participants in the ritual reaching toward and connecting with the shaman spirits traveling within the rock.

Although the hypotheses that seek to explain cave art have changed and evolved over time, there has always been agreement that decorated caves must have had a special meaning because people returned to them time after time over many generations, in some cases over thousands of years. Perhaps Upper Paleolithic cave art was the product of rituals intended to gain the favor of the supernatural. Perhaps because much of the art was made deep inside the caves and nearly inaccessible, its significance may have had less to do with the finished painting than with the very act of creation. Artifacts and footprints (such as those found at Chauvet, below, and Le Tuc d'Audoubert, see FIG. 1-14) suggest that the subterranean galleries, which were far from living quarters, had a religious or magical function. Perhaps the experience of exploring the cave may have been significant to the image-makers. Musical instruments, such as bone flutes, have been found in the caves, implying that even acoustical properties may have had a role to play.

CHAUVET One of the earliest known sites of prehistoric cave paintings, discovered in December 1994, is the Chauvet Cave (called after one of the persons who found it) near Vallon-Pont-d'Arc in southeastern France. It is a tantalizing trove of hundreds of paintings (FIG. 1-10). The most dramatic of the images depict grazing, running, or resting animals, including wild horses, bison, mammoths, bears, panthers, owls, deer, aurochs, woolly rhinoceroses, and wild goats (or ibex). Also included are occasional humans, both male and female, many handprints, and hundreds



1-10 • WALL PAINTING WITH HORSES, RHINOCEROSSES, AND AUROCHS
Chauvet Cave. Vallon-Pont-d'Arc, Ardèche Gorge, France. c. 32,000–30,000 BCE. Paint on limestone.

 **Watch** a video about cave painting on myartslab.com