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REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND DIRECTOR

The 1994-95 fiscal year was a busy and exciting one for the Smart Museum, with the arrival of the museum's new director, Kimerly Rorschach, in August 1994 and the recognition of the museum's twentieth anniversary. We celebrated our first two decades with a variety of events, including twentieth-anniversary exhibitions that focused on particular aspects of the permanent collection, and the Museum's first-ever gala benefit, the Joseph R. Shapiro Award Dinner, held on 11 October 1995 and attended by 300 people. Other initiatives included a season of lively exhibitions with strong interdisciplinary focus, such as From the Ocean of Painting: India's Popular Painting Traditions, 1589 to the Present and Madness in America: Cultural and Medical Perceptions of Mental Illness before 1914, both of which enriched the intellectual life of the University of Chicago community through scholarly symposia and lecture series while drawing strong public interest from outside Hyde Park. Other notable exhibitions included the nationally recognized Post-War Chicago Works on Paper and Sculpture, which showcased the extraordinary strength of the Museum's collection in this area; and Literary Objects: Flaubert, organized by Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures Philippe Desan and his students under the aegis of our Andrew W. Mellon Foundation faculty grant program, which promotes innovative teaching through closer collaboration between professors, students, and the Museum.

We also presented a variety of exciting programs last year, including Popular Painting Traditions in India and Their Impact on Contemporary Art and Culture, an international symposium held in conjunction with our Indian painting exhibition and co-sponsored by the University of Chicago's Committee on South Asian Studies and the Trustees of the ILA Foundation; our first Collectors' Series event for members, on the connoisseurship and collecting of prints and drawings by contemporary Chicago artists; and Family Day, a fun- and activity-filled afternoon for children, co-sponsored this year by the Hyde Park Art Center. In these days of shrinking resources, we have found co-sponsorship to be an especially fruitful strategy for doing more ambitious and creative programming and for reaching new audiences; look for more co-sponsored events in the future.

Our terrifically successful educational outreach programs continued, anchored by our award-winning Docent for a Day program and made possible by a large multi-year grant from the Sara Lee Foundation. This year, we began a new program, Museum in a School for high school students, which introduced participants to various aspects of museum work and culminated in student-organized exhibitions of their own artworks. It was also a very good year for new acquisitions at the Smart Museum. We added to the collection well over eighty works by gift and six by purchase. The year's highlights include the Edward Stowe Akeley Collection, containing wonderful impressions of German Expressionist prints by Käthe Kollwitz, Max Pechstein, and Oskar Kokoschka as well as fine eighteenth- and nine-
teenth-century Japanese prints and a powerful painting by Diego Rivera; twentieth-century American sculpture by John Storrs and Robert Laurent; and an important group of Chinese Neolithic ceramics.

This year we also began preliminary planning, including intensive research and curatorial travel to Brazil, England, and Korea, for several important exhibitions that will be presented during the next few seasons. In the fall of 1996, we will host an exhibition of Korean literati paintings of the Chosón dynasty (1392–1910) from the collection of Korea University in Seoul. Never before seen in the United States, these works will also be shown at other university museums, including UCLA, Columbia, and the University of Oregon. In 1997, we will present From Blast to Pop: Aspects of Modern British Art, 1915–1965, which features our rarely exhibited collection of twentieth-century British art. This show will be the focus of extensive interdisciplinary programming on campus, including related films, theatrical performances, and an exhibition of associated literary materials in the Department of Special Collections at the University's Regenstein Library. Later that same year, we will open the exhibition Still More Distant Journeys: The Artistic Emigrations of Lasar Segall, featuring the work of an artist who is well known abroad but not in the United States. Born in Vilnius, Lithuania, Segall studied art in Berlin after World War I and later emigrated to Brazil, where he became the “father of modern Brazilian art.” His work was included in Hitler’s 1937 Degenerate Art exhibition; many of his paintings, drawings, and prints are now held by the Lasar Segall Museum in São Paulo, Brazil, from which our exhibition is drawn. Organized by the Smart Museum, Still More Distant Journeys will travel to the Jewish Museum in New York in 1998. These exciting shows will follow our well-established tradition of presenting high-quality, sharply focused exhibitions on topics of serious interdisciplinary interest that could not otherwise be seen in the Chicago area.

Finally, in 1994–95 the Smart Museum received a grant from the federal Institute of Museum Services for general operating support. This grant of $56,000 per year over two years, secured through the leadership of Smart Museum Curator Richard Born, helped to give us the financial base to make the exhibitions and programs described above possible. As federal support for the arts shrinks, our innovative and effective museum programming will be at risk. We are confident, however, that our private and individual supporters will sustain us through these difficult times ahead, so that we can continue to serve our diverse and ever-growing audiences as a meaningful and lively center for the appreciation and understanding of the visual arts.

Richard Gray Kimerly Rorschach
Chair, Board of Governors
Director
A twelfth-century ink rubbing of an ancient Chinese bas-relief has recently been added to the Smart Museum’s Asian art collection (fig. 1a). The scene is well-known. In fact, it belongs to the most famous group of Han dynasty pictorial images created around the mid-second century C.E., known collectively as the carvings of the "Wu Family Shrines," preserved at Jiaxiang in present-day Shandong province (fig. 2). The fame of the carvings rests not only on the sophistication and richness of their engraved images, but also on the long tradition of scholarship they have engendered. Since they were first recorded in the twelfth century, these decorated stone slabs from a number of destroyed mortuary buildings have been reproduced in numerous books and discussed by scholars all over the world. But despite this long history of scholarship, new observations and interpretations continue to be made by scholars who challenge us to see and think things that have not been seen and thought before. In studying the Smart Museum image, therefore, three methods of interpretation will be integrated into a coherent and new analysis of Han art. Although these methods have often been used separately for divergent purposes, together they will guide the reading of the rubbing in three consecutive stages: iconography will identify the individual motifs of the composition, contextualization will reinstall the composition back into its architectural setting, and iconology will relate the composition—not only its content but also its manner of representation—to a specific symbolic system of Han art.

THE RECTANGULAR COMPOSITION (fig. 1b) is divided into four tiers of equal width, which function as four horizontal "scrolls" exhibiting divinities, mythical animals, and celestial chariots in rhythmic movement. (For convenience, in the following discussion I will refer to these four registers, from top to bottom, as scenes one through four.) Showing little interest in representing depth, the artist depicted objects mostly in profile and rarely overlapped them. Like shadow puppets projected on a screen, their silhouettes highlight their features. One of the most important is scale: each register contains a large figure whose dominant position is reinforced by the motion and gestures of the secondary figures. These large figures can be identified as anthropomorphized versions of the Gods of Wind, Thunder, and Stars.

Starting at the top register (scene one), two figures of extraordinary size frame the horizontal picture. The figure on the right bends his knees while vigorously blowing air—a conventional Han image of the God of Wind. Here, however, the deity is not a self-contained icon for worship—rather, his role lies in producing clouds. The wind blown from his mouth transforms itself into a series of fantastic images moving toward the left side of the image. Greeted by a celestial official, these wind-made figures resemble animals with winged riders and a chariot driven by fairies, and symbolize clouds in their adoption of various patterns: the chariot's canopy and wheels, for example, are composed of spiral forms while the flying animals have whirlwindlike bodies. With such ela-
sive forms, the image in this register embodies the Han impulse to identify figures and things in the ever-changing shapes of clouds (yunqi). A clear indication of this tendency is discussed by the early first-century B.C.E. historian Sima Qian. In his Shi ji (Historical Records), he writes that yunqi could appear as animals, boats, chariots, banners, and pavilions; by observing these shapes, a royal astronomer could predict the future.3

Figures in scene two move in the opposite direction towards the right. The principal figure sits on a sled, pulled and pushed by a team of assistants. Holding a hammer in his right hand, he prepares to beat the two drums that flank him. This image is based on a passage from the Lun heng (Disquisitions), a work compiled by Wang Chong (c. 80–155 C.E.) in the first-century C.E. Historian Sima Qian referred to this text, of controlling thunder and lightning, are

divided in the carving and attributed to different figures. Reducing the Duke's role only to generating thunder, the artist portrayed him holding a hammer to beat the drums. His second role is transferred to two smaller figures running ahead of him. Possibly the Duke's heavenly soldiers, they strike chisels with hammers. Interestingly, their action seems to be directed toward a man who kneels underneath—a detail which is represented more explicitly in another Wu Family Shrine carving (figs. 3a and 3b). Both carvings feature rain goddesses wearing elaborate headdresses and holding water containers (urns or bowls) in their hands. But the second image has an addition—a rainbow in the form of a two-headed, upside-down, U-shaped dragon under a flying rain goddess.

Scene three resembles the composition in the top register with the God of Wind again positioned on the right, producing clouds. But unlike the clusters of clouds shaped like animals, immortals, and a chariot in the first scene, here spiral-patterned clouds constitute the waves of a single, sweeping movement. Tiny fairies, birds, and beasts emerge throughout the image, and their uniform orientation reinforces a sense of motion. The central theme of this scene is not so much the imaginary cloud-images as the force of the wind, a sense of which is given in a poem by Liu Bang, the founder of the Han dynasty, which begins with the plain but powerful line, "Great wind arises, oh! Clouds fly..."5

The main deity in the fourth scene turns to face right and thus echoes the pose of the Duke of Thunder in scene two. He is identified by his heavenly vehicle, which is formed by the seven stars of the Big Dipper. Sima Qian referred to this image, writing that "[t]he bowl of the Big Dipper is the carriage of the god. It moves in the middle of the sky, commanding the heavenly fields in the four directions."6 Interestingly, the carving also has an eighth star, the smaller ball held up by a winged figure near the end of the Big Dipper's handle. This isolated star must thus be Fu or γ Bootis, believed by the ancient Chinese to be a primary assistant of the God of Stars.7 Three celestial officials, each wearing a strange cap with "horns" and holding a ceremonial lao-table, follow the star deity obediently. To the right, a procession moves towards the Big Dipper: a rider leads a covered chariot on its way to the celestial court while four standing or kneeling figures enter the god's domain to be received by him. No extant Han dynasty documents offer a textual identification of these figures; here, the iconographer seems to have come to the limits of the methodology.

THE FIRST PERSON to challenge a purely iconographic study of Han art's meaning was Wilma Fairbank, who wrote in 1941 that "the interrelationships and positional significance of the engraved stones is lost when they are studied as scattered slabs or rubbings."8 This recognition resulted from a long period of research started in 1934, when Fairbank first visited the Wu Family Shrines in Shandong. She wrote:

When, after a long walk across the village-dotted plain south of Chia-hsiang [i.e. Jiaxiang], I entered the dark building which housed the slabs and saw inset in the walls the many gable-topped stones, the various border patterns which matched from slab to slab, and the free-standing pillars and prism-shaped stones scattered about an adjoining small building in the same compound, I could see at once that these were constituent parts of buildings. My curiosity was piqued. What sorts of buildings? How many? Where had they stood, above or under the ground? Would underground tomb chambers have been gabled? By matching the gables and linking the borders might it be possible to reconstruct them and set this jumble to rights? This impulse, which I can only describe as housewifely, gripped me forcibly that day and returned to haunt me in the months and years that followed.9

Fairbank's questions, certainly not "housewifely," finally led to her 1941 article, "The Offering Shrines of 'Wu Liang Ts'u,'" which the eminent French sinologist Paul Pelliot hailed as "among the most interesting American research papers published during the war time."10 Fairbank began her reconstruction of the abandoned ritual buildings from the records of Huang Yi and Li Kezheng, two Qing dynasty officials who rediscovered the Wu Family carvings in four isolated locations in 1786 and 1789.11 Reproduced from Fairbank's original article, figure 4 identifies these groups, along with some scattered slabs, as the Wu Liang Group, the Front Group, the Left Group, and the Rear Group. The rubbing in the Smart Museum's collection was made from the fourth stone in the Rear Group.
Traditionally, scholars considered each group to be the remains of an individual mortuary shrine. The four shrines were attributed to four male members of the Wu Family, whose names appear on the stone pillar-gate at the entrance of the family’s graveyard. Fairbank’s work both confirmed and rejected this hypothesis: she could only reconstruct three shrines out of the materials contained in the four groups of slabs (figure 5 shows her reconstruction of the Front Shrine). She was most troubled by not being able to find places for five rectangular and exceedingly beautiful carvings in the Rear Group (numbers one through five in Fairbank’s diagram), which include the scene in the Smart Museum rubbing. Regrettably she wrote that these carvings “...must represent parts of one or more additional shrines, the structure of which will, it is hoped, be understood on further study.

This “further study” was carried out by two Chinese scholars, Jiang Yingju and Wu Wenqi, in 1981. Their method was similar to that of Fairbank. The only difference, and one that placed their investigation on more solid ground, was that they observed, measured, and diagrammed all the slabs in every dimension after they were dug out of the walls of an old exhibition hall for better preservation in 1972. They were also able to test their reconstruction plan by matching the stones together physically. One of their most important discoveries was that the five Rear Group slabs, which Fairbank left unidentified, have sculpted tiles on the back. This feature, which Fairbank could not possibly have known because the stones were then built into the walls of the exhibition hall, clearly indicates that these slabs functioned as roof stones. Furthermore, Jiang and Wu noticed that among the five slabs, numbers four and five were placed side by side in their original setting.

These two stones are similar in size (number four is 59 1/2 x 84 5/8 inches [151 x 215 centimeters]; number five is 59 1/2 x 87 1/2 inches [151 x 222 centimeters]), identical in shape, and both bear square holes on the borders—“mortises” which would have been locked with “tenons” on a shrine’s side walls and partition gable. After matching these two stones with the three reconstructed shrines, Jiang and Wu determined that they originally covered the front part of the Front Shrine. The back slope of the roof is still missing (fig. 6).

The reconstruction of this shrine, started by Fairbank and completed by Jiang and Wu, is vital to a deeper understanding of its pictorial carvings. When a composition is identified for a particular place in a ritual structure, not only does its content contribute to its meaning, but also its position. A short look at the Front Shrine reveals an overall symbolic structure that underlies the shrine’s decoration. This structure’s three integral elements correspond to the shrine’s three architectural units: the walls, gables, and ceiling. The walls are the domain of men. A broad decorative band divides the three walls into upper and lower zones. In the upper section of a side wall (fig. 7), the top register is dedicated to Confucius: flanked by his seventy-two disciples, the ancient sage inquires
about ritual affairs from Laozi. A large chariot procession advances below these Confucian icons; most scholars believe that such a procession depicted in a funerary shrine reflects the social prestige of the deceased. The lower zone beneath the decorative band contains a wide array of scenes—historical stories, Confucian paragons, auspicious omens, a banquet, music and dance performances, and a battle over a bridge. These scenes surround a focal image on the back wall, in which a royal figure gives an audience in an elaborate pavilion (fig. 8).

The other two sections of the pictorial program are not concerned with human affairs.
Immortality and eternal happiness are the central themes of the gable carvings; they are expressed primarily by the presence of the Queen Mother of the West and the King Father of the East. Accompanied by dragons, phoenixes, and fairies, these two legendary figures were believed to be masters of paradies lying in the East and West. Their placement on the two opposing gables, therefore, attests to a pattern firmly established in ancient Chinese thinking: that East and West were places of refuge and immortality. In this way, these two triangular pictures also distinguish themselves from the scenes on the ceiling, which represent the heavens or the sky. While the carvings on one ceiling slab (shown in the Smart Museum rubbing) have already been identified as symbolic representations of clouds, thunder and lightning, the wind, and stars, additional mythological figures appear on the other surviving ceiling stone (figs. 9a and 9b). Except for the couple in the second register united by their intertwining serpentine bodies, most of these figures cannot be precisely identified. The couple, however, is composed of Fuzi and Niwa, the primary embodiments of the yin and yang forces in ancient China. Their visual similarity to plant roots also suggests why they were considered the first ancestors of the human race, and why they hold a compass and a carpenter’s square—symbols of the two sexes as well as the ability to design the world.

This pictorial program, therefore, is based on the principle of correlation, which Dong Zhongshu, the head theologian in Emperor Wu’s court during the second century B.C.E., claimed to be the primary feature of the Universe:

> In all things there must be correlates. Thus if there is the upper, there must be the lower. If there is the left, there must be the right....

> The yin is the correlate of the yang, the wife of the husband, the subject of the sovereign.

The same sets of correlations govern the Front Shrine carvings: upper and lower, Heaven and man, east and west, male and female. The significance of the sky scenes in the Smart Museum rubbing thus lies in constituting this symbolic structure and in transforming the ritual structure into a microcosm of the universe.

SUCH AN INTERPRETATION, however, leaves an important question unanswered: the conceptual correlations in Han thinking can only set a basic framework for shrine decoration; what factors, then, determined the specific forms of pictorial motifs? In other words, a general concept such as Heaven can be represented by different images; what are these images and why do they appear on different shrines? This question implies a twofold motivation in designing or selecting pictorial motifs for a shrine. First, as an integral element of a large symbolic structure, a motif must have been conventionally associated with a fundamental concept (such as Heaven, earth, or immortality) and was thus a readily understood symbol. Second, as the decoration on a personal monument, the motif often reflected the patron’s or the artist’s ideas, tastes, and other personal preferences. Therefore, although the wall carvings of Han funerary shrines conventionally represent the human world, some shrines have more historical scenes while others favor colorful entertainment. Likewise, although the ceiling carvings normally depict Heaven, these images vary in every case. By exploring such variations, not only the general conception implied in the Smart Museum rubbing but also the peculiarity of its celestial scene can be understood.

Three or four Wu Family shrines have been completely or partially reconstructed. Their ceilings depicted heavenly scenes of different sorts. A visitor to the Wu Liang Shrine during the Eastern Han dynasty would have found that its ceiling was covered with unconnected images—hybrid animals and birds, unusual plants, ritual objects, and so on—organized in a cataloguing format (figs. 10a–d). The drawing style is schematic and diagrammatic; the images are flat and isolated, with no suggestion of background or physical context. A short cartouche, inscribed in a vertical strip near each picture, identifies each image as a particular heavenly omen and specifies the political condition for its manifestation. For example, “[the Jade Horse:] it arrives when a ruler is pure and incorrupt and honors worthies;” “[the Intertwining Tree:] its intertwining branches grow when a ruler’s virtue is pure and harmonious, and when the eight directions are unified into a single state;” “[Birds Joined at the Wing:] they appear when a ruler’s virtue reaches far and wide;” and “Fish Joined at the Eye: they appear when the virtue of a ruler extends to those who live in reclusion and retirement.”

Such pictures and inscriptions (two aspects of Han omen motifs) are rooted in the Confucian theory of the “heavenly mandate,” which provided a foundation for Han political rhetoric. This theory emphasized two essential links between Heaven and the emperor: first, Heaven bestows its mandate on the emperor to rule the world; and second, Heaven constantly evaluates and responds to the emperor’s behavior. Both links were established by omens. Dong Zhongshu thus stated that “[w]hen a king is about to rise to power, beautiful signs of good omens will first appear.” There are also numerous instances in which emperors used omens to prove their rule was good. Meanwhile, Confucian scholars such as Wu Liang himself employed omens to express their view of ideal government and to criticize the current regime.

What the viewer perceives in the omen images on the Wu Liang Shrine, therefore, is a Heaven that possesses purpose, will, and intelligence: it responds to human activities and guides them, and it blesses the virtuous and benevolent and warns the evil and corrupt. But this Heaven is neither a theistic nor anthropomorphic deity—omnipresent but invisible, it manifests its presence only through concrete omens.

These omen images differ markedly from another depiction of Heaven found in the Wu Family cemetery (figs. 11a and 11b), which, according to Jiang Yingju and Wu Wenqi, once embellished the ceiling of the Left Shrine. At the bottom of the composition, a funerary procession has arrived at a graveyard (an architectural com-
plex consisting of a shrine, a que-pillar, and several tomb mounds). The chief mourner, an official wearing a gentleman's cap, has just descended from a chariot. Following his two assistants, he approaches the tumuli. The assistants, leaving their horses behind, carry funerary banners to lead the way. While the second assistant converses with the official, the first assistant turns his eyes to the sky and seems to be startled by a miracle. Following his gaze and raised arm, we find a cloud emerging from the tomb mounds. It rises upwards and forms the path for two covered horse-drawn chariots. The chariot to the right has a female driver, while the one to the left is driven by a man. Winged fairies and celestial officials appear here and there along the cloud-path, welcoming the chariots on their heavenly journey. Each chariot heads toward a principal deity, portrayed in a frontal, iconic pose close to the upper edge of the picture. The female-driven chariot stops in front of a female deity, possibly the Queen Mother of the West; while the male-driven chariot is parked next to a male deity, probably the King Father of the East. This composition, therefore, depicts a journey from the earth to the domain of immortality.

An important inscription found in a Han tomb at Cangshan in Shandong offers an invaluable clue for understanding the religious significance of this picture. In describing a funerary narrative represented in a series of tomb carvings, the inscription identifies a scene as a funerary procession to deliver the deceased to his tomb, which is symbolized by a building with half-opened gates (fig. 12). Significantly, the presence of the deceased is symbolized by a covered chariot, similar to those engraved on the ceiling of the Left Shrine. In fact, what the picture represents is two consecutive stages of the soul's transformation. The carvings in the Cangshan tomb depict the ritual process in which the deceased is transported from the living world to the threshold of his underground home; this journey thus ends at the tomb gate. On the other hand, the picture on the Left Shrine describes the soul's rebirth in the immortal world, an event that happens on the other side of the que-gate and in the wishful imagination of the mourners.

Unlike the isolated, two-dimensional omen images on the Wu Liang Shrine, the ceiling of the Left Shrine is transformed into a reachable celestial kingdom. While the Confucian Heaven symbolized by the Wu Liang omen images is Absolute and self-sustaining, here the immortal realm of the Queen Mother and the King Father inspires a journey. That people can reach this place through certain mysterious channels holds out the hope of transcending the imperfect, mundane world. In Han art, this hope is realized by transforming the structure into an immortal world. When Xiang Wuhuan and his younger brother were preparing a tomb site for their deceased parents, they inscribed these words on the mortuary shrine:

We worked in the open air in our parents' graveyard, even early in the morning and even in the heat of summer. We transplanted soil on our backs to build the tumulus and planted pine and juniper trees in rows. We erected a stone shrine, hoping that the souls of our parents would have a place to abide.

Though they did not mention whether they had the Queen Mother's immortal land carved on the shrine, one can imagine that a shrine exhibiting such images would be an ideal place for the soul to abide.

Returning to the heavenly image in the Smart Museum rubbing, we find yet a third conception and representation of Heaven. Here, it is neither an invisible political and moral authority nor an immortal land governed by the King Father and the Queen Mother. Rather, Heaven is conceived as a collection of natural deities—the Duke of Thunder, the Lord of Wind, the God of the Big Dipper, and others. Instead of constituting a hierarchical pantheon, these deities are portrayed in parallel registers and seem to be responsible for their own duties which include the normal workings of the natural world as well as rewarding good and pun-
ishing evil. Such a concept is at work in scene two, where the two soldiers of the Duke of Thunder produce lightning to hit the man kneeling underneat. This scene documents a widespread belief during the Han period, acknowledged by Wang Chong:

In midsummer, thunder and lightning, rapidly following in succession, split trees, demolish houses, and sometimes kill men. Common people believe that when a person is killed by lightning, it is for his secret faults. 26

This heavenly punishment is balanced by a scene of rewarding people for good behavior. As stated above, the covered chariot in scene four is a symbol of the deceased. But the destination of the soul is neither a graveyard nor an immortal paradise; it is the Big Dipper. According to "scattered slabs from the site originally belonged to a second-century B.C.E. funerary structure normally erected at the entrance of a Han cemetery. See Zeng Zhaoyue et al., Yinan guhuaxiang shimu fajue baogao (Excavation report on an ancient carved stone tomb at Yinan) (Shanghai: Cultural Administrative Bureau, 1956), plate 50. 27

It was generally believed during the Han dynasty that the Queen Mother's paradise was on top of Kunlun Mountain, but some texts also mention Kunlun as a transitional stage to Heaven. A passage from the Hanxin ji, a second-century B.C.E. text, describes three stages in the quest for eternal happiness: "He who climbs onto the Chilly Wind peak will achieve deathlessness; he who climbs twice as high onto the Hanging Garden will become a spirit...he who climbs twice as high again will reach Heaven and become a god." See John S. Major, Heaven and Earth in Early Han Thought (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), 158.

25. Luo Fuyi, "Xian Tajun shicang jieshi" (An explanation of the inscription on the stone shrine of Xiang Taji in Gugong wenyuan yuan ku 1960 (2): 178-80; emphasis added.

26. Wang, 294; see also Forke, 285.


28. Tao, 190.

29. See Jiang Xiaoyuan, Xingdianwan yu chuantong wenhua (Astrology and traditional culture) (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1992), 119.


All translations are by the author unless otherwise noted.


2. Ibid., 113-14.


5. See Sima Qian, 389.

6. Ibid., 1291.

7. See Jiang Xiaoyuan, Xingdianwan yu chuantong wenhua (Astrology and traditional culture) (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1992), 119.


The author attributes the Front Shrine to Wu Rong, the Left Shrine to Wu Ban, and the Rear Shrine to Wu Kaiming. See Liu Xingchun, Han Dynasty Stone Reliefs (Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1991).

13. Fairbank, 82.


15. See for example, Li Faling, Shandong Han hua-xiangshi zhangju (A study of pictorial carvings from Shandong) (Jinan: Qilu shushe, 1982), 28-29.


17. The Japanese scholar Hayashi Minao has identi-
The Thrill of the Threshold: Robert Nickle's #12

What defines a collage is, quite simply, that it is a collection and arrangement of pasted materials. But within this fairly straightforward definition lurks a rich and varied history that encompasses several radically different aesthetic and political programs, all the while remaining inscribed by the limits of the medium. #12 (fig. 1), a 1962 collage by Robert Nickle in the collection of the Smart Museum of Art, synthesizes these various strains of historical incident and inflects them with personal presence. Both as a medium and as an individual work, collage comes about through an additive process in which the placement of each piece is as deliberate and meditated as a chess move. And like the game of chess, the moves in constructing a collage are frankly declared, leaving the viewer the opportunity to reconstruct the process. Deceptively simple and finely wrought, #12 brings together many of the seminal features of the medium’s history as it works within the boundaries of balance and equilibrium, the formal threshold that so thrilled Nickle. As his collage can be reconstructed, so can his references to the peculiar and fascinating trajectory of the medium itself.

Throughout the history of twentieth-century art, the medium of collage has been adopted for vastly different purposes, and therefore, attached to several different histories. The most notable moments in these histories include the radical cubist experiments carried out in Paris by Pablo Picasso and Georges Braque some time around 1912; some historians argue that the cubists began using pasted paper to emphasize the flatness of elements of color and texture connects his work to Picasso and Georges Braque some time around 1912; some historians argue that the cubists began using pasted paper to emphasize the flatness of two-dimensional support on which painting had depended for centuries. Just a few years later, such dada artists as Hans Arp in Zurich and John Heartfield in Berlin were assembling cutouts from magazines and illustrated newspapers, not in an effort to understand the basic conditions of illusionistic representation but instead to express the clamor and the vacuity of modern commercial life. These two seminal moments in the history of collage have been actively debated by art historians, who have tried to read each one in terms of the other. At issue is the attempt to look at dada collage politically, as a response to the increasingly intense situation in Paris as France prepared to go to war; alternately is the attempt to look at dada collage formally, as an aesthetic program (a concept the dadaists themselves vociferously opposed).

Somewhere in between the two poles of formal detachment and social engagement stands Nickle’s #12. Produced in 1962, at a great temporal remove from these early manifestations of collage, the work nonetheless encapsulates their histories. While it is difficult to see tendencies toward either the cubist or dadaist strain in #12, it is equally impossible to ignore references to the movements in this work. For example, Nickle’s insistence on using only “found” scraps for his works—paper not shaped or formed specifically for a collage, but instead found in the graveyard of urban paper detritus—reiterates the dadaist imperative to make use of modern culture’s disposable elements. At the same time, however, Nickle’s strict formal arrangement using basic elements of color and texture connects his work to the experiments of the cubists in their attempts to pare down the process of image making.

But there is still another moment in the history of collage at play; one that links the projects of the cubists and dadaists by a feeling for and an interest in the modern industrial world, combined with an inquiry into the fundamental principles of design and form. This attempt to incorporate aesthetic principles into the industrial age was promoted by the Bauhaus, a collective art education program founded in Germany. Under the leadership of the architect Walter Gropius, who assumed his duties after World War I in 1919, the school quickly became known as the vanguard of art education. During its fourteen-year life span, the Bauhaus had four different directors and three different locations, a tumultuous history that came to an end when the Nazis closed it down in 1933. Wassily Kandinsky and Paul Klee were both instructors there and the Bauhaus system is considered to be one of the cornerstones of visual education as it is practiced today. Expounding the union of an aesthetic program, cooperative living, and a belief in the inherent formal qualities of everything from teapots to skyscrapers, and textiles to doorknobs, the students and teachers of the Bauhaus radically altered the conception of arts education. While Robert Nickle only briefly attended an American reincarnation of the Bauhaus, it is nonetheless in terms of its legacy that #12 needs to be understood.

One of the major pedagogical achievements of the Bauhaus was the requirement of a Vorkurs, or preliminary course of instruction—a kind of artistic boot camp—for all incoming students. Young artists could not continue their studies at the Bauhaus without passing this course, which originated with Johannes Itten, a mystical quasi-guru who was appointed by Gropius to head the Vorkurs. The course was designed to test not only an incoming student’s potential as an artist but also his or her ability to think, to understand the basic conditions of illusionistic representation and to move beyond them to the exploration of the formal threshold that is an end when the Nazis closed it down in 1933. Wassily Kandinsky and Paul Klee were both instructors there and the Bauhaus system is considered to be one of the cornerstones of visual education as it is practiced today. Expounding the union of an aesthetic program, cooperative living, and a belief in the inherent formal qualities of everything from teapots to skyscrapers, and textiles to doorknobs, the students and teachers of the Bauhaus radically altered the conception of arts education. While Robert Nickle only briefly attended an American reincarnation of the Bauhaus, it is nonetheless in terms of its legacy that #12 needs to be understood.

One of the major pedagogical achievements of the Bauhaus was the requirement of a Vorkurs, or preliminary course of instruction—a kind of artistic boot camp—for all incoming students. Young artists could not continue their studies at the Bauhaus without passing this course, which originated with Johannes Itten, a mystical quasi-guru who was appointed by Gropius to head the Vorkurs. The course was designed to test not only an incoming student’s potential as an artist but also his or her ability to think, to understand the basic conditions of illusionistic representation and to move beyond them to the exploration of the formal threshold that is an end when the Nazis closed it down in 1933. Wassily Kandinsky and Paul Klee were both instructors there and the Bauhaus system is considered to be one of the cornerstones of visual education as it is practiced today. Expounding the union of an aesthetic program, cooperative living, and a belief in the inherent formal qualities of everything from teapots to skyscrapers, and textiles to doorknobs, the students and teachers of the Bauhaus radically altered the conception of arts education. While Robert Nickle only briefly attended an American reincarnation of the Bauhaus, it is nonetheless in terms of its legacy that #12 needs to be understood.

One of the major pedagogical achievements of the Bauhaus was the requirement of a Vorkurs, or preliminary course of instruction—a kind of artistic boot camp—for all incoming students. Young artists could not continue their studies at the Bauhaus without passing this course, which originated with Johannes Itten, a mystical quasi-guru who was appointed by Gropius to head the Vorkurs. The course was designed to test not only an incoming student’s potential as an artist but also his or her ability to think, to understand the basic conditions of illusionistic representation and to move beyond them to the exploration of the formal threshold that is an end when the Nazis closed it down in 1933. Wassily Kandinsky and Paul Klee were both instructors there and the Bauhaus system is considered to be one of the cornerstones of visual education as it is practiced today. Expounding the union of an aesthetic program, cooperative living, and a belief in the inherent formal qualities of everything from teapots to skyscrapers, and textiles to doorknobs, the students and teachers of the Bauhaus radically altered the conception of arts education. While Robert Nickle only briefly attended an American reincarnation of the Bauhaus, it is nonetheless in terms of its legacy that #12 needs to be understood.

One of the major pedagogical achievements of the Bauhaus was the requirement of a Vorkurs, or preliminary course of instruction—a kind of artistic boot camp—for all incoming students. Young artists could not continue their studies at the Bauhaus without passing this course, which originated with Johannes Itten, a mystical quasi-guru who was appointed by Gropius to head the Vorkurs. The course was designed to test not only an incoming student’s potential as an artist but also his or her ability to think, to understand the basic conditions of illusionistic representation and to move beyond them to the exploration of the formal threshold that is an end when the Nazis closed it down in 1933. Wassily Kandinsky and Paul Klee were both instructors there and the Bauhaus system is considered to be one of the cornerstones of visual education as it is practiced today. Expounding the union of an aesthetic program, cooperative living, and a belief in the inherent formal qualities of everything from teapots to skyscrapers, and textiles to doorknobs, the students and teachers of the Bauhaus radically altered the conception of arts education. While Robert Nickle only briefly attended an American reincarnation of the Bauhaus, it is nonetheless in terms of its legacy that #12 needs to be understood.

One of the major pedagogical achievements of the Bauhaus was the requirement of a Vorkurs, or preliminary course of instruction—a kind of artistic boot camp—for all incoming students. Young artists could not continue their studies at the Bauhaus without passing this course, which originated with Johannes Itten, a mystical quasi-guru who was appointed by Gropius to head the Vorkurs. The course was designed to test not only an incoming student’s potential as an artist but also his or her ability to think, to understand the basic conditions of illusionistic representation and to move beyond them to the exploration of the formal threshold that is an end when the Nazis closed it down in 1933. Wassily Kandinsky and Paul Klee were both instructors there and the Bauhaus system is considered to be one of the cornerstones of visual education as it is practiced today. Expounding the union of an aesthetic program, cooperative living, and a belief in the inherent formal qualities of everything from teapots to skyscrapers, and textiles to doorknobs, the students and teachers of the Bauhaus radically altered the conception of arts education. While Robert Nickle only briefly attended an American reincarnation of the Bauhaus, it is nonetheless in terms of its legacy that #12 needs to be understood.

One of the major pedagogical achievements of the Bauhaus was the requirement of a Vorkurs, or preliminary course of instruction—a kind of artistic boot camp—for all incoming students. Young artists could not continue their studies at the Bauhaus without passing this course, which originated with Johannes Itten, a mystical quasi-guru who was appointed by Gropius to head the Vorkurs. The course was designed to test not only an incoming student’s potential as an artist but also his or her ability to think, to understand the basic conditions of illusionistic representation and to move beyond them to the exploration of the formal threshold that is an end when the Nazis closed it down in 1933. Wassily Kandinsky and Paul Klee were both instructors there and the Bauhaus system is considered to be one of the cornerstones of visual education as it is practiced today. Expounding the union of an aesthetic program, cooperative living, and a belief in the inherent formal qualities of everything from teapots to skyscrapers, and textiles to doorknobs, the students and teachers of the Bauhaus radically altered the conception of arts education. While Robert Nickle only briefly attended an American reincarnation of the Bauhaus, it is nonetheless in terms of its legacy that #12 needs to be understood.
who dressed in monk's robes and insisted on the importance of garlic in the diet. Itten connected design principles to spirituality, the imposition of colors were connected to particular shapes and moods; in this sense, Itten and Kandinsky were proponents of a kind of color mysticism. Itten in particular emphasised the relationship between colors and shapes, local colors, and shapes and spaces. As he described it, "[t]he basis of my theory of composition was the general theory of contrast.

The chiaroscuro (brightness-darkness) contrast, the material and texture studies, the theory of forms and colors, the rhythm and the expressive forms were discussed and demonstrated in terms of their property that he began his Vorkurs, supplemented by the theoretical teachings of Klee and Kandinsky, both of whom later taught the course at the Bauhaus. The professor promoted the belief that colors were connected to particular shapes and moods; in this sense, Itten and Kandinsky were proponents of a kind of color mysticism. Itten in particular emphasised the relationship between colors and shapes, local colors, and shapes and spaces. As he described it, "[t]he basis of my theory of composition was the general theory of contrast.

The chiaroscuro (brightness-darkness) contrast, the material and texture studies, the theory of forms and colors, the rhythm and the expressive forms were discussed and demonstrated in terms of their contrast effect. An example of the type of exercises that Itten assigned to his Vorkurs students can be seen in figure 2: the assignment required that students construct a composition purely through zones; thus the tonal values of the composition must be mediated by and adjusted to the sizes of the areas composed. In this way, Itten demonstrated how the careful balance between tonal values (light and dark) had to be enhanced, not obliterated, by the compositional structure of the work. This rigorous examination of the basic principles of presenting visual data—from painting and drawing to photography and typography—was a hallmark and a legacy of the Bauhaus curriculum.

Itten exerted a tremendous influence on the Bauhaus students, enlisting them in Mazdaznan, a religious sect of which he was a member, and converting the Bauhaus cafeteria kitchen to a macrobiotic laboratory. When Itten resigned in 1923 under pressure from various Bauhaus administrators, a self-taught Hungarian artist was hired to replace him as instructor of the basic Vorkurs. This artist was László Moholy-Nagy, and it was he who would eventually lead several versions of the Bauhaus in the United States. The most sustained of these manifestations was at the Institute of Design in Chicago, where Robert Nickle was both a student and teacher in the 1940s.

In 1937, while working on various film, theater, and display projects in London, Moholy-Nagy received a telegram from a group called the Association of Art and Industries in Chicago, inviting him to be the director of an as-yet-unnamed design school. The Association consisted of the biggest names in Chicago business and philanthropy, including Marshall Field II, Walter Paecke of the Container Corporation of America, and the leaders of companies such as Montgomery Ward and Kohler in Wisconsin. Fueled by the enthusiasm of this group and by the interest of Walter Gropius, then teaching at the Illinois Institute of Technology, Moholy-Nagy signed a five-year contract and the New Bauhaus (as it was officially called) opened in October of 1937 in a renovated Marshall Field mansion on Prairie Avenue. Moholy-Nagy employed professors, adjusted the Bauhaus curriculum—though retaining the Vorkurs—to collegiate standards, and began seeking industrial sponsors for projects and design research to be undertaken by students in cooperation with manufacturers. By 1938, however, the school was in dire financial straits. Moholy-Nagy was forced to take hat in hand and approach other national industry captains to secure funding for the continuation of the school. He extracted pledges for commissions and raw materials by promoting the idea of industrial design, a concept which was still viewed with a fair amount of suspicion.

When Moholy-Nagy returned to Chicago, however, he found a letter from the President of the Association of Arts and Industries informing him that the school would not reopen in the fall of 1938. Meetings with the executive committee of the Association were fruitless and the former director of the New Bauhaus accepted a job with Spiegel, designing hardware (such as the "Six-In-One Saw") and catalogs for the company. By saving $2,500 and keeping his full-time job, Moholy-Nagy was able to open a new School of Design with the support of previous faculty members. The professors agreed to work without pay for a semester, and figures like Gropius, John Dewey, and the publisher W. W. Norton lent their names and moral support to the new institution. Unlike the New Bauhaus, the School did not depend on a fickle board of directors who could complain of Moholy-Nagy's extravagance, and within several years, it had a healthy enrollment and a growing reputation. It became involved with fascinating projects, such as the workshop begun in 1941 when Moholy-Nagy was appointed to the mayor of Chicago's personal staff in charge of camouflage. By 1944, the community of Chicago industrialists renewed its interest in the educational venture and formed a new board of directors headed by Paecke. Free from the pressures of fund-raising and day-to-day administrative projects, Moholy-Nagy was able to devote himself entirely to teaching. The school's name was once again changed, this time to the Institute of Design.

As his sheer perseverance in reestablishing the school suggests, Moholy-Nagy was a versatile and tireless artist. Educator, photographer, author, typographer, painter, and sculptor, he, like Itten, believed in the investigation of elemental forms; his belief, however, took the form of practical con-
structivism rather than mystical idealism. Moholy-Nagy had faith in the rational and industrial mind, and though he quickly eliminated Itten's breathing exercises and spiritual program from the Vorkurs while a Bauhaus instructor, he maintained its focus on fundamentals. Moholy-Nagy was diagnosed with leukemia and died in 1946, just at the point when Robert Nickle was involved with his work.

Unlike the internationalist Moholy-Nagy, Nickle was basically a career Midwesterner. He was born in Saginaw, Michigan in 1919 and attended the University of Michigan, receiving a bachelor's degree in 1942. Like many aspiring artists throughout the centuries, Nickle headed to the big city—Chicago—to pursue his artistic career. His affiliation with Moholy-Nagy and the Institute of Design included time as both a student and a teacher; after completing his studies at the Institute in 1946, he stayed on after Moholy-Nagy's death to be an instructor until 1948. Nickle continued to teach, spending most of his career as a professor in the studio art department of the University of Illinois at Chicago, a position he held until shortly before his death in 1980.7

Nickle's work should be seen in the context of some of the principles espoused by Moholy-Nagy and his peers, including Piet Mondrian, the Dutch utopian artist after whom Nickle named his son.8 This biographical detail is far from coincidental: by giving his son the name of Piet, Nickle demonstrated and affirmed the relevance of Mondrian's life and work for his own. Mondrian, Moholy-Nagy, and Nickle all worked with elemental forms, most notably the rectangle and the square, and for all three artists color, line, and composition were inseparably and seamlessly joined. An example of Moholy-Nagy's early work is K VII from 1922 (fig. 3). In this complex arrangement of lines and planes, depth is established through overlapping elements and transparency rather than through traditional means of denoting volume by shading or modeling; this emphasis similarly can be seen in Mondrian's grid paintings of the late 1920s and early 1930s. Moholy-Nagy's painting draws on the fundamental and rationalist shape of the rectangle—elongated, compressed, distorted—that simultaneously echoes the frame of the composition and orders the canvas through relation and symmetry. The shapes in the left foreground, bisected by a dark line both at the bottom and on the right side of the pair, are repeated and modified in the right background. Intensity, color, and size have been revised, but the formal proposal of two lines, a square, and a rectangle has been retained and adjusted.

Nickle's #12 is an investigation carried out in ways similar to the early Bauhaus assignments and the inquiry of Moholy-Nagy. Despite their humble origins, the pieces of paper and paperboard are shaped as fairly regular rectangles. The color scheme is muted and subtle, and the work itself takes place within the simple but simultaneously limitless area of a square. Balance and equilibrium, formal rigor that were so important to artists such as Mondrian, are made manifest in #12. The work is carefully weighted through different and various contrasts—between light and dark, large and small, grainy and smooth, and opposing shapes that echo and modify each other in the structure of the work. Negotiating all of these positions at once, #12 emerges as a complex and nuanced machine, wherein opposition and its resolution are consistently stressed and silently demonstrated.

The various levels on which contrast is introduced and woven into the work itself give a sense of the delicate balance with which Nickle plays. Explaining this balance, he once said that "the very thin line that separates right from wrong in a work is as filled with wonder and fragility as life itself...I search out that line moving as closely as possible to it as I work...Safe areas beyond this threshold have little meaning for me."9 The different levels of contrast make this work "dangerous" in the sense that Nickle desires; that he is so often successful in treading this line between right and wrong is a testament to the attention and detail with which he works. A misplacement or misstep would throw the work off balance and into confusion.

Within the work, large blocks compete with smaller ones, and darker with lighter. These visual contrasts are emphasized by their placement at the corners: the largest and darkest rectangles are similar in shape and hue and are placed diagonally across from each other, anchoring these two corners. Their opposites—the pieces that Nickle placed in the other two corners—are lighter and similarly balanced. Such lighter tones, almost tan in color, are picked up in the other scraps of paper and cardboard, moving from corner to corner and surfacing in between.

In each corner, two rectangular pieces form a similar L-shape that is likewise echoed throughout the collage. By using this shape, Nickle was able to nest the pieces into one another, as in the lower left corner where a dark gray, inverted L-shape fits into a lighter gray, backwards L. These large nested areas give way around the top of the composition to the piece of paper with text printed on it; that particular area of the work, in which smaller pieces are juxtaposed rather than fitted together, balances the larger, heavier pieces in the corners. Demonstrating that this heaviness or darkness is, in fact, entirely relative, Nickle placed colors near their tonal opposites: the anchoring corners are contrasted with pieces of differing degrees of lightness or surface relief.

The fact that Nickle designed his own frames, and that these frames were constructed to hang from any orientation,10 signals that his collages maintain their equilibrium from all sides. In #12, Nickle composed an arrangement that does not follow any traditional and shopworn pattern of what constitutes a picture: there is no fore-, middle-, or background, and there is no single point of entry into the work from which all the other elements make sense. Instead, and this is the point of the frame, all of the elements work intrinsically and relationally but not necessarily with ready reference.
to a center. From all sides and from all angles, the arrangement keeps itself level, without emphasis or recession.

This desire for unilateral balance can be most clearly seen in Nickle’s choice of text for #12. The piece at the top of the composition, perhaps a laundry ticket or parking stub, announces itself as yet another anonymous piece of pre-printed modern litter, and yet its characters are oddly significant. Read from either a horizontal or a vertical orientation, the stub is legible as both “L 89” or “68 7,” the versatility and reflexivity of the text intact. Replace the 6 with a 2 or a 4, and the illusion of balance disappears. Nickle carefully works the collage’s fabric, the “L” or “7” character echoing the shape created throughout the collage. Far from being an anonymous and obtrusive entry point, this small scrap demonstrates the finer points of the work.

Reagan Upshaw wrote of Nickle’s fascination with solving compositional problems with prescribed elements—again, the game of chess in which a player is required to mate in a required number of moves with a particular number and arrangement of pieces on the board. “Making a successful collage with only three pieces” or “creating works with crossed diagonals” is an idea reminiscent of the rigorous training and sheer pleasure and delight in formal problems for their own sake inherited from the legacy of Moholy-Nagy.

But to restrict an interpretation of #12 to the influence of this Hungarian teacher would be to neglect the former student’s witty and complex comments on another history of collage, one that was articulated most emphatically during Nickle’s career by the American art critic Clement Greenberg.

Greenberg returned to the cubists and their influence of ridding canvases and surfaces of the illusion of depth.” Greenberg enumerated the various steps on the road to collage: the first was the use of stenciled letters and numbers in the traditional still-life paintings of Picasso and Braque. The critic explained that, “[t]he first and, until the advent of pasted paper, the most important device that Braque discovered for indicating and separating the surface was imitation printing, which automatically evokes a literal flatness...the imitation printing spills out the real paint surface and thereby prises it away from the illusion of depth.” From these stenciled letters and numerals, the cubists moved to cuttings and scraps of newspapers and typography which were placed directly on the surface of the work itself, thus immediately calling attention not only to the figurative representation of the surface qua surface, but also to the literal face of the surface itself. Picasso’s Guitar of 1913 (fig. 4) stands as an example of the textures and pieces that the cubists incorporated into traditional representation, in this case the image of a guitar. The three-dimensional form of the guitar has been replaced by hins or suggestions of its constituent features such as the curve of the body, the mouth, and the frets. Newsprint serves to keep the guitar’s “real” three dimensions at bay by forcing the viewer’s eyes perpetually back to the surface of the work, thereby asserting the work’s two dimensions. In these cubist works, the placement of paper or newspaper directly on the support was a means of affirming that representation in painting and drawing took place on a two-dimensional surface. Thus, collage functioned as one means of establishing the flatness and completeness of a two-dimensional site of representation. In Greenberg’s view, this aspect of cubist innovation was not entirely successful; the use of pasted paper within a field of shattered and splin-
Because of the size of the areas it covers, the pasted paper establishes undepicted flatness bodily, as more than an indication or sign. Literal flatness now tends to assert itself as the main event of the picture, and the device boomerang: the illusion of depth is rendered even more precarious than before....The actual surface becomes both ground and background, and it turns out—suddenly and paradoxically—that the only place left for a three-dimensional illusion is in front of, upon, the surface. 15

This phenomenon can be observed in "Guitar," where the newspaper pages seem to serve as background and the "chess" of the guitar appear in front of those pages, projecting out from the background established by the newprint. It is here that Greenberg acknowledged that collage's efforts to separate the idea and the manifestation of depth in two-dimensional representation ultimately promoted depth: this new depth did not recede with the representation, instead it emerged from the surface of the canvas or board into a kind of trompe l'oeil.

During the 1950s and 1960s, these ideas exerted a powerful influence on artists who responded in either a negative or positive way. While some strove to unite paint and canvas, thereby ensuring that their work would serve as the ground-zero of flatness and as an affirmation of two-dimensionality, others ridiculed Greenberg. 16 Regardless of the position of individual artists, the critic's ideas exerted a tremendous influence on those working in this period. Robert Nickle produced #12 four years after "Collage" was originally published as "The Pasted Paper Revolution," and one year after Greenberg included the essay in his seminal book, Art and Culture. 17

While Nickle's engagement with some of the issues that Greenberg raised in "Collage" can only be speculated upon (one example is the artist's use of printed paper), it is interesting to look at the odd and complicated construction of the frame of the collage. Because of its, #12 could be read as pun on all the questions of space and depth that occupied artists in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Historically, collage has disrupted notions of painting and representation by calling attention to the fact that, no matter how convincing a window has been constructed, viewers and artists are still working with a two-dimensional space. What Nickle did with his frame, however, was precisely to engage these issues: he fashioned a collage that exists in depth, in a liminal space that represents two dimensions yet exists empirically in three. In #12 these two dimensions are tempered by the presentation of the work within the frame. The glass on which the paper is itself mounted is in turn elevated from the base of the support (the matt), setting up a number of levels. Proceeding almost down into the work, the viewer moves from the surface glass to the paper layer, to the glass beneath which is its support, and finally to the backboard, from which protrude four small armatures that hold out the glass. Looking at the work, the viewer has a sense of descending into it, moving through a "real" three-dimensional arrangement to arrive at the collage itself, giving an intermingling and complex depth to the entire arrangement.

Nickle used the medium of collage to highlight the exact property (depth) that the medium was supposed to have annihilated. And the artist utilized the idiosyncratic self-construction of the frame and the support to connect the work to the grand tradition that collage inaugurated—the purification of painting itself. Robert Nickle's pieces of paper, loosely arranged upon the glass support and with slight variation in tone and intensity, suggest an artist's palette or, more specifically, a painter's palette. With this gesture Nickle both pointed to and engaged himself with this process of modernity.

The collage to palette analogy is one method by which Nickle made reference to the act of painting. Another connection might possibly be found in the artist's insertion of his photograph into the back of the collage's support, an aspect of the work that is not noticeable when it is hung on a museum wall. Through a round hole cut in the back of the frame, the viewer sees Nickle's face and the tattered and faded label that originally identified the work and its gallery (fig. 5). Quite intentionally, Nickle took his creation of prefabricated papers and connected it to the individual responsible for this collection. Within this odd nebulous zone between dynamic process and static installation, Nickle inserted himself as active agent in both stages. As creator and as the builder of the frame, Nickle refused to let go of his work at any stage of the process, invoking his own image as artist and as installer.

Though for the most part it remains hidden, this photograph introduces us to an element of collage that remains hidden as well—the artist's presence. Nickle's art was an art of self-construction, particularly his time at the Institute, were simultaneous with what was heralded as the most individual and expressive art movement that the United States had yet witnessed. Abstract Expressionism. The large-scale gestural painting that came to be identified as the style of the "New York School" in the 1940s stressed the absolute primacy of the artist's presence and individual touch, a concern that seems very far from the disembodied medium.
of collage, which effaces the artist's hand just as gestural painting heralds its presence. When viewed from the front, Nickle's #12, constructed from pre-fabricated bits and scraps and pasted onto a support, does not necessarily include evidence of the artist's presence, no mark of individuality or autobiography. Collage can flatten out or obliterate the artist by not making visible the process of making, normally seen in the brushstroke, chiar, signature, or mark.

Nickle's photograph in the back of the work mitigates this condition of absence, however, and draws attention to the artist as collector, creator, and agent. The connection between collage and collection is one of recent interest to art historians, that collage has warranted can be found in the issue of The Painted Word (New York: Bantam, 1975), 42.

15. Greenberg, "Collage," 7% emphasis in original. 16. Although not himself a professional artist, the author Tom Wolfe drew a cartoon showing an artist attending to his painting with a finely calibrated compass to measure in millimeters how far off the canvas the pigment rose. This cartoon is entitled "When Flat was God. Using the Impastometer." (Impasto is the term used to refer to the thickness of the pigments applied to the canvas.) See Tom Wolfe, The Painted Word (New York: Bantam, 1975), 42.

There is some confusion regarding the publication date of the essay. In Art and Culture, Greenberg notes that "Collage" was originally published in 1959. However, "The Painted Paper Revolution," the article that was revised into "Collage," is listed in Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism as appearing in the September 1958 issue of Art News. See John O'Brien, ed., Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism, vol. 4 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

18. The influence of Kurt Schwitter on Nickle is interesting in this regard. Schwitters, a German artist, "collected" papers and trash from the streets of Hanover in the 1920s and fashioned these bits into smaller individual collages, called "Merzzeichnungen" (Merz drawings) and "Merzbilder" (Merz pictures). Schwitters's work also includes the gigantic architectural construction he built from urban waste, the "Merhau" (Merzhaus) (construction). Filling every room in his house and spilling out onto the roof, the Merhau is a testament to the collage artist's role as collector and agent. See Roger Cardinal, "Collecting and Collage-Making: The Case of Kurt Schwitters" in The Cultures of Collecting, ed. John Elster and Roger Cardinal (London: Reaktion Books, 1994), 68-96.


14. As part of the body contended history of collage discussed earlier in this article, the use of text in collage works has been a sore spot for art historians and the cause of much gleeful disagreement. While Greenberg suggested that printed text was used to direct viewers to the surface of the work, other scholars now argue that the particular texts used in cubist collages—the newspaper articles that were cut up and glued down—point to a more politically informed and historically significant interpretation of collage. For a discussion of this tendency in scholarship see Patricia Leighton, "Editor's Statement: Revising Cubism" Art Journal 47 (Winter 1988): 269-76. Rosalind Krauss, in a semiotically engaged reading of cubist collage, argues that neither Greenberg nor Leighton has correctly understood the significance of the printed pieces of paper. She considers the papers to be signs or representational notations of such artistic techniques as shading and atmospheric rendering. Krauss argues that the cubists were using collage to invent an entirely new language of representation that depended not on representational techniques but on the structure of those techniques. See Krauss, "In the Name of Picasso" in The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1985), 23-41 and "The Motivation of the Sign" in Picasso and Braque: A Symposium (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1992), 261-86.
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Objects listed below entered the permanent collection from 1 July 1994 through 30 June 1995. Dimensions are in inches followed by centimeters in parentheses; unless otherwise indicated, height precedes width precedes depth.

EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN

Paintings

PHYLIS BRAMSON
American, born 1941
The Existentialist Witness (for P. Adams) Stage 2, 1982
Oil and collage on canvas and wood, 61 3/4 x 73 1/2 x 3 1/2
Gift of Edward Stowe Akeley, estate executed by his widow, 1995.36

HERMAN MENZEL
Study for the Black Grouper, n.d.
Oil on canvas, mounted on board, 9 1/8 x 11 9/16 (23.2 x 29.3)
Gift of Dr. Sewall H. Menzel, 1994.78

HERMAN MENZEL
Study for The Black Grouper, n.d.
Oil on canvas, mounted on board, 9 1/8 x 9 1/2 (23.2 x 24.1)
Gift of Dr. Sewall H. Menzel, 1994.79

HERMAN MENZEL
Study for The Black Grouper, n.d.
Oil on canvas, mounted on board, 16 5/8 X 23 1/2 (42.2 x 59.7) (sheet)
Gift of Edward Stowe Akeley, estate executed by his widow, 1995.36

RAFAEL FERRER
Puerto Rican, born 1933
La Luna Campana, 1977
Charcoal on wove paper, 9 3/16 x 8 1/16 (23.3 x 20.4)
Gift of Dr. Sewall H. Menzel, 1994.77

JOHN STORRS
American, 1885–1956
Three Nudes, 1934
Oil on masonite, 18 x 12 (45.7 x 30.5)
Gift of John N. Stern, 1994.115

SCULPTURE

French
Says, Nymph, and Cupid
Late 18th century
Cast bronze plaque, 2 3/8 x 3 5/8 x 6 (9.2)
Gift of Cathleen W. Tracy, 1995.6

DON BAUM
American, born 1922
A Fine Romance, 1986
Canvasboard, wood and linoleum, 23 1/17 x 24 1/24 (58.5 x 44.4 x 61.6)
Purchase, Gift of The Richard Florschuetz Art Fund, 1995.43

ROBERT LAURENT
American, 1885–1956
Head of a Woman, 1920s
Carved limestone, h. 8 7/8 (22.2)
Gift of John N. Stern, 1994.114

LORNA SIMPSON
American, born 1960
Lit, 1994
Wood box, lithograph on felt, unglaized ceramic, rubber and cast bronze, edition of 5000,
2 1/16 x 5 3/8 x 13 9/16 (5.2 x 13.7 x 34.5)
Gift of the Peter Norton Family, 1994.94

STEFEN (STEFAN or ISTVAN) SCHWARTZ
Austrian, 1851–1924
Allergy of Emperor Franz Joseph I and Industry, 1884
Commemorative medallion celebrating the 40th anniversary of the reign of Austrian Emperor Franz Josef I
Smock bronze, diam. 2 1/12 (6.3)
Gift of Cathleen W. Tracy, 1995.5

LOSS SIMPSON
American, born 1960
Lit, 1994
Wood box, lithograph on felt, unglaized ceramic, rubber and cast bronze, edition of 5000,
2 1/16 x 5 3/8 x 13 9/16 (5.2 x 13.7 x 34.5)
Gift of the Peter Norton Family, 1994.94

JOHN STORRS
American, 1885–1956
Female Torso, circa 1927
Charcoal on paper, 11 1/2 x 13 3/8 (29.2 x 34) (sheet)
Gift of Edward Stowe Akeley, estate executed by his widow, 1995.18

CARL HOFFER
German, 1878–1955
Reclining Female Nude, n.d.
Charcoal on wove paper, 16 3/8 x 23 1/2 (42.2 x 59.7) (sheet)
Gift of Edward Stowe Akeley, estate executed by his widow, 1995.36

KATHE KOLLWITZ
German, 1867-1945
Gift of Edward Stowe Akeley, estate executed by his widow, 1995.52.

ROBERTO MONTENEGRO
Mexican, 1887-1968
Indifference (Indiferencia), 1934-37.
Gift of Edward Stowe Akeley, estate executed by his widow, 1995.20.

ROBERTO MONTENEGRO
Outdoor Market Scene, n.d.
Acrylic (?) on paper, 14 1/8 x 11 7/8 (35.9 x 30.2) (sheet).

LESLIE DILL
A Ward Made Flesh...Back, 1994
Lithograph and etching, ed. IV, 25 3/4 x 21 1/2 (64.7 x 54.6) (plate),
20 x 22 7/8 x 55.9 (sheet).

LESLIE DILL
A Ward Made Flesh...Throat, 1994
Lithograph and etching, ed. IV, 25 3/4 x 21 1/2 (64.7 x 54.6) (plate),
30 x 22 7/8 x 55.9 (sheet).

LESLIE DILL
A Ward Made Flesh...Arms, 1994
Lithograph and etching, ed. IV, 25 3/4 x 21 1/2 (64.7 x 54.6) (plate),
30 x 22 7/8 x 55.9 (sheet).

GEORGE GROSZ
German, 1893-1959
Eise Hama, 1923
Bound portfolio with paper covers consisting of 84 black-and-white offset lithographs
and 16 colored offset lithographs, edition C, 13 7/8 x 10 3/8 (35.8 x 25.3) (each sheet),
Published by Malik-Verlag, Berlin

JOSEPH HIRSCH
American, 1916-1981
The Peasants' Revolt (Bauemkrieg), 1923
Etching and soft-ground etching, ed. I, 22 1/4 x 28 3/4 (56.5 x 73) (sheet),
Wingler-Welz 138 III/II
Gift of Edward Stowe Akeley, estate executed by his widow, 1995.29.

KÄTHE KOLLWITZ
German, 1867-1945
Shakespearean Visions (Shakespeare-Visionen), 1926

KÄTHE KOLLWITZ
German, 1867-1945
Masked Dancers (Pulqueria), 1926
Lithograph, ed. 21/100, 36 3/16 x 24 7/16 (91.9 x 62.1) (sheet),
Wingler-Welz 141

SCHIEFLER 85 b

JOSE CLEMENTE OROZCO
Mexican, 1883-1949
Soldier's Wife (Soldadina), 1926
Lithograph, edition of 100, 15 3/4 x 10 1/8 x 12 (40 x 25.6 x 30.5) (composition),
22 1/2 x 16 1/16 x 36 3/16 (57.2 x 40.6 x 60.6) (sheet),
Hopkins 1

JOSE CLEMENTE OROZCO
Mexican, 1883-1949
Machete Dancers (Pulp הקר), 1928
Lithograph, edition of 100, 13 x 16 3/8 x 13 1/16 (34.1 x 41.6 x 33.7) (composition),
17 1/4 x 22 7/8 (43.8 x 55.9) (sheet),
Hopkins 11
Gift of Edward Stowe Akeley, estate executed by his widow, 1995.28.

JOSE CLEMENTE OROZCO
Mexican, 1883-1949
Veudeille du Harlem (Teatro de Varaesadas en Harlem), 1928
Lithograph, edition size unknown, 11 5/8 x 17 7/8 (29.5 x 44.8) (composition),
16 1/8 x 22 5/8 (40.8 x 57.5) (sheet),
Hopkins 13
Gift of Edward Stowe Akeley, estate executed by his widow, 1995.34.

MAX PECHSTEIN
German, 1881–1955
Somar (Leau), 1907
Lithograph, 13 1/4 x 5 3/4 (33.7 x 40) (composition),
15 3/16 x 19 (38.9 x 48.3) (sheet),
Krueger L26.
Gift of Edward Stowe Akeley, estate executed by his widow, 1995.17.
GEORG PENCZ
German, 1500–1550
The Triumph of Chastity Over Love, n.d.
Engraving and drypoint, from the series, "The Triumphs of Petrarch"
Gift of Jeffrey, Nan, and Zachary Sloan, 1994.108

ACTIVITIES AND SUPPORT

LESLEY SCHIFF
American, born 1929
Eye and Barbed Wire, 1939 (negative)
Gelatin silver print, 7 3/4 x 13 1/4
Gift of Susan and Charles P. Schwarcz, Jr., 1994.100

DECORATIVE ARTS

POLIA PILLIN
American, born Poland, 1909–1992
Cylindrical Vessel (painter's"
Earthenware with slip-painted decoration, h. 8 3/4 (22.2)
Gift of Mrs. Geraldine Schmitz-Poor and Dr. Robert J. Poor, 1994.100

Chinese: Ceramics
Chinese, Neolithic period, Gansu Yangshao culture phase
Bowl, circa 2500 B.C.E.
Unglazed earthenware with slip-painted decoration, h. 3 5/8 (9.2), diam. of mouth 7 1/2 (19.2)
Gift of Mrs. Geraldine Schmitz-Poor and Dr. Robert J. Poor, 1994.100

Chinese, Neolithic period, Gansu Yangshao culture phase, Bandan-Machang style
Bowl with handles, circa 2500–2200 B.C.E.
Unglazed earthenware with slip-painted decoration, h. 5 1/2 (14.3), diam. of mouth 2 3/4 (6.1)
Gift of Mrs. Geraldine Schmitz-Poor and Dr. Robert J. Poor, 1994.100

Chinese, Neolithic period, Gansu Yangshao culture phase, Bandan-Machang style
Bowl with handles, circa 2500–2200 B.C.E.
Unglazed earthenware with slip-painted decoration, h. 5 1/2 (14.3), diam. of mouth 2 3/4 (6.1)
Gift of Mrs. Geraldine Schmitz-Poor and Dr. Robert J. Poor, 1994.100

Chinese, Neolithic period, Gansu Yangshao culture phase, Bandan-Machang style
Bowl with handles, circa 2500–2200 B.C.E.
Unglazed earthenware with slip-painted decoration, h. 5 1/2 (14.3), diam. of mouth 2 3/4 (6.1)
Gift of Mrs. Geraldine Schmitz-Poor and Dr. Robert J. Poor, 1994.100

Chinese, Neolithic period, Gansu Yangshao culture phase, Bandan-Machang style
Bowl with handles, circa 2500–2200 B.C.E.
Unglazed earthenware with slip-painted decoration, h. 5 1/2 (14.3), diam. of mouth 2 3/4 (6.1)
Gift of Mrs. Geraldine Schmitz-Poor and Dr. Robert J. Poor, 1994.100

Chinese, Neolithic period, Gansu Yangshao culture phase, Bandan-Machang style
Bowl with handles, circa 2500–2200 B.C.E.
Unglazed earthenware with slip-painted decoration, h. 5 1/2 (14.3), diam. of mouth 2 3/4 (6.1)
Gift of Mrs. Geraldine Schmitz-Poor and Dr. Robert J. Poor, 1994.100

Chinese, Neolithic period, Gansu Yangshao culture phase, Bandan-Machang style
Bowl with handles, circa 2500–2200 B.C.E.
Unglazed earthenware with slip-painted decoration, h. 5 1/2 (14.3), diam. of mouth 2 3/4 (6.1)
Gift of Mrs. Geraldine Schmitz-Poor and Dr. Robert J. Poor, 1994.100
Chinese, Neolithic period, Gansu Yangshao culture phase, Banshan-Machang style
Bowl with Handles, circa 2500–2200 B.C.E.
Unglazed earthenware with slip-painted decoration, h. 3 1/8 (7.9), diam. of mouth 2 3/8 (6.2)
Gift of Jeffrey, Nan, and Zachary Sloan, 1994.106

Chinese, Neolithic period, Gansu Yangshao culture phase, Banshan-Machang style
Bowl with Handles, circa 2500–2200 B.C.E.
Unglazed earthenware with slip-painted decoration, h. 2 3/8 (6), diam. of mouth 6 3/8 (16.2)
Gift of Dr. Abraham Hoffer, 1994.87

Chinese, late Qing dynasty
Dish, 19th century
Cased, cut glass with translucent ivory color (mounting), h. 1 1/8 (2.8), L 9 15/16 (25.2)
Gift of Dr. Abraham Hoffer, 1994.86

Japanese: Prints
UTAGAWA HIROSHIGE
Japanese, 1797–1858
Hashioka Ferry and Tōki Lake, Sumida River, 1857
From the series, One Hundred Famous Views of Edo, 1856–58
Color woodblock (block), 13 5/8 x 8 7/8 (34.6 x 22.5) (block)
Gift of Edward Snowe Akeley, estate executed by his widow, 1995.22

KATSUMI HOKUSAI
Japanese, 1760–1849
Three Female Figures, n.d.
Color woodblock (surimono), 9 3/8 x 8 9/16 (23.8 x 21.7) (sheet)
Gift of Edward Snowe Akeley, estate executed by his widow, 1995.24

T. IZUMI
Japanese, dates unknown (Showa era)
Seated Woman (Musings), 1980
Woodblock (from six blocks), ed. 13/30, 27 7/16 x 56 7/16 (68.7 x 143.4) (image), 35 7/16 x 70 7/16 (90 x 178.9) (sheet)
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Michael R. Cunningham in memory of Germaine Fuller (U.C., Ph.D.'84), 1994.72

TORII KYONOBUI
Japanese, active circa 1720–circa 1760
Kabuki Actor (Segawa Kikunojo I) Looking at Flowering Trees, 1830
Color woodblock (from six blocks), ed. 13/30, 27 7/16 x 56 7/16 (68.7 x 143.4) (image), 35 7/16 x 70 7/16 (90 x 178.9) (sheet)
Gift of Dr. Abraham Hoffer, 1994.88

KATSUKAWA SHUNSHO
Japanese, 1797–1832
Courtesan, 1826
Color woodblock (from six blocks), ed. 13/30, 27 7/16 x 56 7/16 (68.7 x 143.4) (image), 35 7/16 x 70 7/16 (90 x 178.9) (sheet)
Gift of Edward Snowe Akeley, estate executed by his widow, 1995.41


Japanese: Works on Paper
PERSIAN
Kabuki Actor in the Role of a Samurai, probably 17th century
Ink and color on wave paper, 8 5/8 x 6 3/4 (21.9 x 17.1) (sheet)
Gift of Wallace P. Rusterholz, 1994.90

Persian
Men with a Bird Perched on a Vase, early 20th century
Ink and light color on wave paper, 8 5/8 x 6 3/4 (21.9 x 17.1) (sheet)
Gift of Wallace P. Rusterholz, 1994.91

PERSIAN
A Party Group in a Garden, early 20th century
Ink and light color on wave paper, 10 x 6 3/8 (25.4 x 16.2) (image)
Gift of Wallace P. Rusterholz, 1994.92

PERSIAN
I HAJI MOUSAVIR
Persian, dates unknown
The Allied Powers Respecting the Axis Powers, 1944
Color offset lithograph, 10 3/8 x 13 7/8 (26.4 x 35.3) (sheet)
Gift of Wallace P. Rusterholz, 1994.93

South Asian: Paintings
TIBETAN OR NEPALI
Thanka, probably late 19th or early 20th century
Ink and color on cloth, 28 1/2 x 21 1/2 (72.4 x 54.6) (painting), 44 x 32 1/8 (111.8 x 82.5) (mount)
Gift of Mrs. Geraldine Schmitt-Poor and Dr. Robert J. Poor, 1994.106

Chinese: Glass
Chinese, late Qing dynasty
Vase, probably mid- to late 19th century
Cased, cut glass of translucent ivory ground with orange overlay, h. 9 1/2 (24.1)
Gift of Dr. Abraham Hoffer, 1994.86

Chinese: Glass
Chinese, late Qing dynasty
Vase, probably mid- to late 19th century
Cased, cut glass of translucent ivory ground with orange overlay, h. 9 1/2 (24.1)
Gift of Dr. Abraham Hoffer, 1994.86
Loans from the Permanent Collection

Exhibitions to which works of art from the permanent collection have been lent are listed alphabetically by the city of the organizing institution. Dimensions are in inches followed by centimeters; height precedes width preceded by depth. Loans listed date from 1 July 1994 through 30 June 1995.

Greek, Hellenistic, Workshop of the Kallirhoe Painter
Kallirhoe Box: Oplontis' Men Before Cress. Two Combatants, circa 500 B.C.-200 B.C.
Oil on earthenware, h. (restored) 21 1/4 (54.5) (each sheet)
Gift of Katharine Kuh, 1969.1

JANUARY TO JUNE 1995

The F. B. Tarbell Collection, Gift of E. P. Warren, 1902, 1967.115.276
John Francis, designer
American, born 1922
Barrel Arm Chair, 1900
Oak, 51 7/8 x 20 5/8 x 19 1/4 (132.5 x 52.4 x 49.2) (overall)
Designed for the Frederick C. Robie Residence, Chicago University Transfer, 1967.83
Gift of Katharine Kuh, 1969.2

CARLOS MIRIDA
Mexican, born in Guatemala, 1891-1984
Abstraction, Mayan Theme, 1934
Pen and ink, watercolor and/or gouache, and pencil on wove paper, 13 1/2 x 9 7/8 (34.6 x 25.1) (sheet)
Gift of Katharine Kuh, 1968.2

Nassau County Museum of Art, Roslyn Harbor, New York
Surrealism
15 January-16 April 1995
FRANCIS PIGARIA
French, 1879-1953
Money is the Reason for Work (Le salaire est la raison du travail), 1949
Oil on paperboard, 21 1/4 x 14 (54 x 35.6)
Gift of Stanley G. Harris, Jr., 1972.1

KURT SELGIMANN
Swiss, 1900-1962
The Harpist (Joueuse de harpe), 1933
Oil on board, 32 1/4 x 41 4/5 (81.9 x 104.8)
The Mary and Edgar Ludgin Collection, 1981.78

Soudo Art Gallery, Wilkes University, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania
Guy Peu du Bois: The Twenties at Home and Abroad
21 May-13 August 1995
TRAVELED TO: Westmorland Museum of Art, Greensburg, Pennsylvania, 10 September-5 November 1995
FRANZ KLINE
American, 1910-1962
Pencil on wove paper, three sheets, 6 1/16 x 4 (15.6 x 10.1) (each sheet)
Gift of Katharine Kuh, 1969.1

American, 1913-1980
Portrait of Leonascha and Kuh, circa 1940
Pencil on wove paper, three sheets, 6 1/16 x 8 (15.6 x 20.3) (each sheet)
Gift of Katharine Kuh, 1969.2

American, 1910-1962
Unidentified, circa 1950
Ink and paint on wove paper mounted on rag board, 7 1/2 x 7 1/2 (19 x 19) (sheet)
Gift of Katharine Kuh, 1969.2

4 May-3 September 1995
Design Museum, London, England
Frank Lloyd Wright: The Early Years
4 May-3 September 1995
FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT, designer
American, 1867-1959
Arm Chair, 1900
Oak, 34 1/2 x 26 1/2 x 28 (87.6 x 92.7 x 71.1) (overall)
Designed for the B. Harley Bradley House, Kankakee, Illinois University Transfer, Gift of Mr. Marvin Hammack, Kankakee, 1967.66

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT, designer
American, 1867-1959
Window, circa 1909
Wood and metal with clear colored leaded glass, 33 3/4 x 35 5/8 (85.7 x 90.5)
Designed for the Frederick C. Robie Residence, Chicago University Transfer, 1967.87

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT, designer
American, 1867-1959
Side Chair, circa 1909
Oak with (replacement) leather slip seat, 52 1/2 x 21 1/2 x 29 3/4 (133.5 x 54.6 x 75.5) (overall)
Designed for the Frederick C. Robie Residence, Chicago University Transfer, 1967.89
Gift of Katharine Kuh, 1969.2

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT, designer
American, 1867-1959
Arm Chair, 1900
Oak, 34 1/2 x 26 1/2 x 28 (87.6 x 92.7 x 71.1) (overall)
Designed for the B. Harley Bradley House, Kankakee, Illinois University Transfer, Gift of Mr. Marvin Hammack, Kankakee, 1967.66

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT, designer
American, 1867-1959
Window, circa 1909
Wood and metal with clear colored leaded glass, 33 3/4 x 35 5/8 (85.7 x 90.5)
Designed for the Frederick C. Robie Residence, Chicago University Transfer, 1967.87

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT, designer
American, 1867-1959
Arm Chair, 1900
Oak, 34 1/2 x 26 1/2 x 28 (87.6 x 92.7 x 71.1) (overall)
Designed for the B. Harley Bradley House, Kankakee, Illinois University Transfer, Gift of Mr. Marvin Hammack, Kankakee, 1967.66

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT, designer
American, 1867-1959
Window, circa 1909
Wood and metal with clear colored leaded glass, 33 3/4 x 35 5/8 (85.7 x 90.5)
Designed for the Frederick C. Robie Residence, Chicago University Transfer, 1967.87

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT, designer
American, 1867-1959
Side Chair, circa 1909
Oak with (replacement) leather slip seat, 52 1/2 x 21 1/2 x 29 3/4 (133.5 x 54.6 x 75.5) (overall)
Designed for the Frederick C. Robie Residence, Chicago University Transfer, 1967.89
Gift of Katharine Kuh, 1969.2

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT, designer
American, 1867-1959
Arm Chair, 1900
Oak, 34 1/2 x 26 1/2 x 28 (87.6 x 92.7 x 71.1) (overall)
Designed for the B. Harley Bradley House, Kankakee, Illinois University Transfer, Gift of Mr. Marvin Hammack, Kankakee, 1967.66

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT, designer
American, 1867-1959
Window, circa 1909
Wood and metal with clear colored leaded glass, 33 3/4 x 35 5/8 (85.7 x 90.5)
Designed for the Frederick C. Robie Residence, Chicago University Transfer, 1967.87

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT, designer
American, 1867-1959
Arm Chair, 1900
Oak, 34 1/2 x 26 1/2 x 28 (87.6 x 92.7 x 71.1) (overall)
Designed for the B. Harley Bradley House, Kankakee, Illinois University Transfer, Gift of Mr. Marvin Hammack, Kankakee, 1967.66
Permanent collection, loan, and traveling exhibitions from 1 July 1994 through 30 June 1995.

**Exhibitions**

*John Phillips: Selections from the Series A Contemporary Odyssey*
5 July–21 August 1994

A modern reexamination of classical themes and the heroic search for the self, *John Phillips: Selections from the Series A Contemporary Odyssey*, presented six of the artist's oil and collage paintings from his 78-piece series depicting scenes from Homer's *Odyssey*. The exhibition was the second in an ongoing series of intimate shows featuring the work of University of Chicago alumni artists.

*M.F.A. 1994*
14 July–28 August 1994

The eleventh annual group exhibition of work by recent graduates of the University of Chicago's Midway Studios featured a diverse selection of paintings, drawings, photographs, and sculpture. Taken together, the work by artists Gary N. Gordon, Farida Hughes, Erica Molah James, Darlene Kryza, Blanca E. Lopez, Craig Newsom, Tim Portlock, Christopher Ritter, José Alemdán Saseta, Vera Anna Slawinski, Yvette Kaiser Smith, and Jacqueline Terrassa attested to the strong technical and theoretical focus of the Midway Studios Master of Fine Arts program.

*An Old Master Painting Restored: King David by Girolamo da Santa Croce*
30 August–4 December 1994

An Old Master Painting Restored focused on the conservation of Girolamo da Santa Croce's *King David*, a sixteenth-century Venetian School portrait of the biblical king playing his lyre (the conservation was made possible through a grant from the Women's Board of the University of Chicago). The newly restored painting, which had not been conserved since the 1930s, revealed the work's rich, original coloration and the artist's detailed brushwork. Employing documentary photographs and labels alongside the restored painting, the exhibition afforded audiences a close look at the conservation process and exemplified the Museum's commitment to teaching exhibitions.

*Rochester Laurent and American Figurative Sculpture 1910–1960: Selections from the John N. Stern Collection and the David and Alfred Smart Museum of Art*
4 October–11 December 1994


*Visions of a Nation: Images of Mexico by Mexican and American Photographers*
13 December 1994–5 March 1995

This exhibition explored the role of photography in defining a national identity for Mexican artists, the images American photographers created as foreigners, and the differing artistic and cultural visions the two groups expressed through their work. Organized from the Smart Museum's photography collection as well as selected loans from the Museum of Contemporary Photography, *Visions of a Nation* included work by Manuel Alvarez Bravo, Manuel Carrillo, Alan Cohen, Danny Lyon, Aaron Siskind, Paul Strand, and Mariana Yampolsky.

*Jacques Lipchitz: Sketches in Bronze, Ideas on Paper*
20 December 1994–5 February 1995

Seven bronze sculptures and four works on paper comprised this mini-retrospective of the study work of Jacques Lipchitz, allowing a glimpse of the cubist sculptor's initial explorations of themes and compositions. The first of three twentieth-anniversary exhibitions devoted to selected works from the permanent collection, *Jacques Lipchitz* reunited sketches and models that had not been shown together since the Museum's inaugural exhibition in 1974.

*From the Ocean of Painting: India's Popular Painting Traditions, 1589 to the Present*
19 January–12 March 1995

Organized by the University of Iowa Museum of Art, this exhibition was the first in the United States to examine comprehensively India's folk, tribal, and popular urban painting traditions. With over 100 works spanning more than twenty painting
Post-War Chicago Works on Paper and Sculpture
14 March-1 June 1995

Three generations of Chicago artists, including the “Monster Roster” of the 1950s and the Chicago Imagists of the 1960s, were featured in this exhibition of drawings, collages, and sculpture drawn from the Museum’s extensive collection of Chicago art. Influenced by traditions outside the mainstream, such as outsider art and the work of mental patients, these post-war Chicago artists employed bizarre imagery, unconventional spatial construction, and bold, arbitrary color. The exhibition included works by Leon Golub, Richard Hunt, June Leaf, Gladys Nilsson, Jim Nutt, and many others.

Literary Objects: Flaubert
2 May-1 June 1995

Organized by University of Chicago Professor Philippe Desan and his students, Literary Objects explored the concept of the commodity as seen through the writings of the nineteenth-century writer Gustave Flaubert. The exhibition re-created the nineteenth-century salon, complete with furniture, prints, and objets. Together with selected passages from Flaubert, these objects referred to the overlapping worlds of the French middle class: the domestic interior, the political arena, the imagined Orient, and the historical past. This was one of several projects funded by a multiple-year grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation in which the Museum’s collections are being used by University professors for classes and exhibitions.

Madness in America: Cultural and Medical Perceptions of Mental Illness before 1914
13 April-11 June 1995

Examining visual images of madness in America’s history, this exhibition illuminated the relationship between cultural and medical perceptions of mental illness. With 150 objects ranging from paintings, drawings, advertisements, cartoons, and photographs to medical texts and corresponding instruments and models, Madness in America explored how concepts of insanity intersected with ideas about gender, race, politics, sexuality, criminality, and artistic creativity. The exhibition was curated by Lynn Gamwell and Nancy Tomes, and organized by the Binghamton University Art Museum, State University of New York at Binghamton, in cooperation with Pennsylvania Hospital and the Arthur Ross Gallery, University of Pennsylvania.

Paul Caffrey: My Days with Peter in the Weed Garden
20 June-20 August 1995

The third in a continuing series of alumni artist exhibitions, this installation featured an interior walled, non-organic garden. Drawing on his study of Rome’s Aurelian Wall, artist Paul Caffrey incorporated the experiences of Saint Peter with representations of the Boston ivy that grows on the University of Chicago campus to produce a setting of visually tempting, yet obstructive walls.

ACTIVITIES AND SUPPORT
Events

Lectures, gallery talks, opening receptions, concerts, special events, colloquia, and symposia from 1 July 1994 through 30 June 1995.

Special events accompanying the exhibition M.F.A. 1994:

Special events accompanying the exhibition Robert Laurent and American Figurative Sculpture 1910—1960: Selections from the John N. Stern Collection and the David and Alfred Smart Museum of Art:
- Lecture: "Robert Laurent and Vanguard American Sculpture," Roberta Tarbell, exhibition catalogue author and Associate Professor of Art History, Rutgers University, 2 October 1994.
- Lecture Series: gallery talks focusing on nineteenth- and twentieth-century American figurative painting and sculpture at the Terra Museum of American Art with Paula Wiśniewski, Assistant Professor of Fine Arts, Loyola University; and at the Smart Museum with Kathleen Gibbons, Smart Museum Education Director, 30 October and 6 November 1994.

Lecture: Herbert George, Associate Professor, Committee on Art and Design, University of Chicago, discussed the exhibition, 30 November 1994.

Mostly Music Concert: The Barbell Woodwind Quintet performed Samuel Barber’s Summer Music, Antonín Rejcha’s Quintet in D Major, and John Harbison’s Quintet for Winds, 9 October 1994.


Special events accompanying the exhibition From the Ocean of Painting: India's Popular Painting Traditions, 1589 to the Present:
- Symposium: Popular Painting Traditions in India and Their Impact on Contemporary Art and Culture, 21 January 1995:
  - "Discovering, Distilling, Dispensing Round: An Artist and India's Popular Painting Traditions," Barbara Rossi, exhibition curator and Professor of Painting and Drawing, The School of the Art Institute of Chicago.
  - "Two Pictorial Traditions of the Picture-Showmen of the Deccan," Jagdish Mittal, scholar and collector of Indian popular and folk painting, Hyderabad, India.
  - "Popular Art or the Continuity of Tradition: Art from Patharkatti and Jaipur," Frederick Asher, Professor of Art History, University of Minnesota.
  - "Bengali Pat Paintings and Performance," Clinton B. Seely, Associate Professor of South Asian Languages and Civilizations, University of Chicago.

Mostly Music Concert: Chicago Baroque Ensemble presented concertos, a sonata, and a chamber cantata by Vivaldi on period instruments, 12 February 1995.

Dr. Manoj Sanghvi, President of the ILA Foundation, addresses the guests at the members’ opening reception for From the Ocean of Painting: India’s Popular Painting Traditions, 1589 to the Present, 21 January 1995; in background (1-r): Kimerly Rorschach, Director of the Smart Museum; Susanne Rudolph, Professor of Political Science and Director of the South Asia Language and Area Center, University of Chicago; Mr. K. R. Sinha, Consul General of India; Don Baum, artist; and Barbara Rossi, exhibition curator and artist.

"Appropriating from Indian Art: A Catalog of Strategies," Michael Rabe, Associate Professor of Art History, St. Xavier College, and Adjunct Assistant Professor for Asian Art, The School of the Art Institute of Chicago.


Mostly Music Concert: special program with a discussion of Indian art by Kathleen Gibbons, Education Director, and Joan Erdman, Professor of Social Sciences, Columbia College; Lyon Leifer, flutist, and young Indian artists played music of India on drums, flute, and sitar; performance by costumed dancers, 22 January 1995.

"Two Pictorial Traditions of the Picture-Showmen of the Deccan," Jagdish Mittal, scholar and collector of Indian popular and folk painting, Hyderabad, India.

"Popular Art or the Continuity of Tradition: Art from Patharkatti and Jaipur," Frederick Asher, Professor of Art History, University of Minnesota.

"Bengali Pat Paintings and Performance," Clinton B. Seely, Associate Professor of South Asian Languages and Civilizations, University of Chicago.


"Appropriating from Indian Art: A Catalog of Strategies," Michael Rabe, Associate Professor of Art History, St. Xavier College, and Adjunct Assistant Professor for Asian Art, The School of the Art Institute of Chicago.
University of Chicago President Hugo Sonnenschein helps young museum visitors enter the President's Day raffle, 21 May 1995.


Special events accompanying the exhibition Post-War Chicago Works on Paper and Sculpture:
- Fellows' Program: visit to the home and studios of Chicago Imagist artists Gladys Nilsson and Jim Nutt, 2 April 1995.

Dennis Adrian, Instructor, The School of the Art Institute of Chicago, examined selected works from the exhibition.

Mark Pascale, Assistant Curator of Prints and Drawings, Art Institute of Chicago, discussed contemporary Imagist prints from the permanent collection.

Mostly Music Concert: The Orion Ensemble, 2 April 1995.

Special events accompanying the exhibition Madness in America: Cultural and Medical Perceptions of Mental Illness before 1914:
- Film and Lecture Series: Visual Madness: Perceptions of Mental Illness in Popular and High Culture, co-sponsored by the Film Studies Center, University of Chicago, 23 April–25 May 1995:
  - Film, Ingemar Holm (Victor Sjostrom, Sweden, 1913), introduced by Miriam Hansen, Professor of English Language and Literature and Director of the Film Studies Center, University of Chicago, 3 May 1995.
  - Lecture, "Nature Unveiling Herself to Science: Images of Science and Sexual Politics in Fin-de-Siecle France," Stephanie D'Alessandro, Associate Curator, Smart Museum of Art, University of Chicago, 7 May 1995.
  - Film, Titicut Follies (Frederick Wiseman, U.S.A., 1964), introduced by Sander Gilman, Professor of Germanic Studies and Psychiatry, University of Chicago, 10 May 1995.
  - Film, The Snake Pit (Anatole Litvak, U.S.A., 1948), introduced by Lauren Berlant, Professor of English Language and Literature, University of Chicago, 18 May 1995.
  - Film, Invisible Adversaries (Valie Export, Austria, 1977), introduced by Katie Trumpener, Associate Professor of Germanic Studies, University of Chicago, 25 May 1995.

Lecture, "Nature Unveiling Herself to Science: Images of Science and Sexual Politics in Fin-de-Siecle France," Stephanie D'Alessandro, Associate Curator, Smart Museum of Art, University of Chicago, 7 May 1995.

Performance Art Day: an event featuring performance pieces presented by students from University of Chicago Lecturer Steven Totland's Performance Art Course, which was co-sponsored by the Committee on General Studies in the Humanities and University Theater, and supported by a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to the Smart Museum, 4 June 1995.

Concert: "Variations on America" by CUBE Contemporary Chamber Ensemble, including works by John Cage, Douglas Ewart, Charles Ives, Ruth Crawford Seeger, and audience-participation pieces by Pauline Oliveros, 11 June 1995.

Family Day: an open house for families co-sponsored by the Hyde Park Art Center with professional artists Tom Nault, Carole Silverstein, Brian Wildeman, as well as crafts, music, and refreshments, 25 June 1995.


Exhibitions and Programs

Education

Educational programming and outreach, both continuing and new, from 1 July 1994 through 30 June 1995.

Museum as Educator

The Smart Museum's Education Department continued to provide schools in Hyde Park and the greater Chicago area with intensive, high-quality educational programs that help foster appreciation and understanding of the visual arts while at the same time enriching curricula. This year over 1,200 students visited the Museum (55 single-visit, docent-guided tours). In addition approximately 530 fifth-grade students (seventeen classes) were involved in the five-week Docent for a Day program made possible by The Sara Lee Foundation. Thirteen schools participated in this program that includes in-class slide presentations, five museum visits, and final student presentations. Registration was at capacity for the second consecutive year.

The Docent for a Day program received national attention this year when Education Director Kathleen Gibbons was invited to conduct a docent training session at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. and the Smart's docent program was incorporated into an already-existing educational project. Ms. Gibbons also served on an education panel and presented the Docent for a Day video at the annual American Association of Museums conference in Philadelphia.

A new outreach effort, also under the aegis of The Sara Lee Foundation, is the Museum in a School program. Initiated this year at both the Kenwood Academy and the Hyde Park Career Academy, this program brings high-school students to the Museum for a series of interview-visits with staff members to learn how to plan and mount an art exhibition. Classroom sessions are also conducted by members of the Museum's education and preparatorial departments at the schools. The final project is a student-curated exhibition of their colleagues' artwork, complete with labels, catalogue, press release, invitations, and an opening reception. Highly successful this year, the semester-long project was incorporated into the curriculum of the Hyde Park Career Academy by Principal Dr. Welden Beverly.

Mythology in Art is another new program at the Museum and was developed for sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade students. Complementing the Chicago middle-school curriculum, the program provides instructors with slide packets and teaching materials for class presentations and assignments. Mythology in Art requires students to visit the Museum twice: once for a tour of the permanent collection and a discussion of mythology in art, and again, to perform short, dramatic reenactments of students' favorite myths. Both the Kozminski Academy and the Murray Language Academy participated in the program this year.

Art Talks with Mostly Music: initiated in April 1993, this program features gallery talks before regularly scheduled Mostly Music concerts. The focus of these discussions complements the musical themes of the scheduled performance (for example, a talk focusing on seventeenth-century art from the Museum's permanent collections preceded a concert of Baroque music). The program also includes gallery talks on special exhibitions.

Annual Teacher Training Workshop: designed to introduce new teachers to the Docent for a Day program, this all-day workshop trains participants to talk and write about artworks.

Teacher/Principal Evaluation Meeting: held every June, this meeting encourages feedback from teachers who have participated in the Museum's educa-
As part of the new *Mythology in Art* program, Kozminski Academy students reenact their version of a modern-day dance of the three graces, while the painting by Arthur B. Davies (left) inspires them.

Art and Music Program: inaugurated in December 1992, this program is offered to sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade students who listen to classical compositions while creating original works of art. Students’ works are displayed in the Museum’s lobby and judged by local artists and musicians. A first-place winner from each participating school is presented with an award during a free concert that takes place in the Museum. This year nine schools participated in the program, producing 90 finalist entries. As a vote of support for the program, Joe Clark of the Art Werk Gallery matted and framed all first-place works free of charge.

The South Side Arts Partnership: founded in April 1992, this group is a consortium of South Side arts organizations and neighborhood schools working together to bring the arts into the daily lives of local students, and is part of Marshall Field’s Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education. The Smart Museum is a member of this collaborative effort and will receive monies from a $60,000 grant awarded to the Partnership to implement teacher materials and programs for the upcoming year. Last August the Museum participated in a two-day Summer Institute for members of the Partnership and hosted the closing reception.

Murray Language Academy Teacher Institute Training: begun in March 1995, the Smart Museum hosted an afternoon workshop and reception for teachers from the Murray Language Academy. A required day of continuing education for teachers, this session also served as a stimulus for more active use of the Museum.

M. F. A. 1994

Brochure published in connection with the annual Master of Fine Arts exhibition, held at the Smart Museum from 14 July to 28 August 1994. With an introduction by Tom Mapp, Director of Midway Studios, the brochure highlights the work of emerging artists Gary N. Gordon, Farida Hughes, Erica Moiah James, Darlene Kryza, Blanca E. Lopez, Craig Newsum, Tim Perdlock, Christopher Rittner, José Aleman Sasieta, Vera Anno Slawinski, Yvette Kaiser Smith, and Jacqueline Terrassa, with twelve black-and-white photographs and artist statements.


An illustrated catalogue published in conjunction with the exhibition of the same name, held at the Smart Museum from 4 October to 11 December 1994. Robert Laurent and American Figurative Sculpture features the essay "Robert Laurent and Modern Figurative Sculpture" by Roberta K. Tarbell, and contains a checklist of the forty-nine objects in the exhibition, bibliography, 53 black-and-white illustrations, and two color plates.

Robert Laurent, *Mother and Daughter*, 1946, carved mahogany, h. 34 (86.4 cm.), Collection of John N. Stern.
Sources of Support

Cash and in-kind contributions received from 1 July 1994 through 30 June 1995.
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Illinois Humanities Council
Illinois General Assembly
Indian Council for Cultural Relations
Institute of Museum Services
Marshall Field's Neighborhood Arts Partnership/Kraft/General Foods
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Visiting Committee on the Visual Arts, University of Chicago

Women's Board of the University of Chicago
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Michael Hyman
Honorable and Mrs. Edward Hinch
Levi
Mr. and Mrs. Hugo F. Sonnenschein

Fellowship Gifts of $1,000 or more
Stanley M. Frehling
Richard and Mary Gray
Mr. and Mrs. Jacob Greenberg
Helen and Jack Halpern
The Harris Foundation
Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago
Elisabeth and William Landes
Mrs. Frederick T. Lauerman
John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
Inge Mauer
Harold T. Martin Charitable Trust
Mr. and Mrs. Marshall J. Budor
Elisabeth Plof尼克
Virginia P. Rorschach
The Smart Family Foundation, Inc.
John N. Stern
Dr. and Mrs. John Ulmann

Sustaining Fellow and Gifts of $1,000 or more
Mrs. Gaity Nashat Becker
Marie Krane Bergman and Robert H. Bergman
Mr. and Mrs. David L. Blumberg
Laura and Robert Boyd
Mr. and Mrs. Henry Buchbinder
Mr. and Mrs. David L. Crabh
Robert G. Donnelly
Phil and Suzanne Gossow
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Neil Harris, in honor of Richard Gray
Marshall and Doris Holleb
Ruth Hornick
Michael Igoe, Jr.
Burton and Naomi Kanter
Robert H. and Barbara S. Kirschnick
Erber G. Klitz
Richard G. Kroh
Mary S. Lawton
Adler and Vera Margulis
Ira and Janina Marks
McKin Merchant
Inge Mauer
Robert McDermott
J. Clifford Moon
Diane S. and Robert M. Newbury
Joe Nieda
Mr. and Mrs. Richard Philbeck
John and Marilyn Richards
Howard J. Romanick
Kimerly Rorschach
Susan and Charles P. Schwartz, Jr.
Sorena and Henry Shapiro
Philip Shore
Joseph P. Shure
Mr. and Mrs. Gravina Specks
Jean Paul Spire, M.D.
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Marie M. Defonso
Mrs. Joseph R. DePencier
Mrs. and Mrs. Leon L. Depoer
Victor and Alia Dursch
Virginia and George Dick
Ruth Card Dickinson
Alice Dullone
Mrs. Louis C. Duncan
Mr. and Mrs. E. Bruce Dunn
Mr. and Mrs. Joel E. Dyndal
Terri J. Edelstein
Mrs. Robert Donald Erickson
William and Norah Erickson
Sally H. Fairweather
Dr. and Mrs. Philip Fark
Mrs. Frances Stone Fash
Professors Jay M. Feinman
Mr. and Mrs. Alan M. Ferr
Joe and Barbara Ferrari
Mr. and Mrs. Robert D. Fitzgerald
Zelife Frank
Mr. and Mrs. Paul Frehling
Deborah Friedelich
Arnold M. Gilbert
Sylvia Glagov
Curtis Tran
Natalie and Howard Goldberg
Helyn D. Goldenberg
Mr. and Mrs. Julian R. Goldsmith
Eugene Goldwasser and Deonne Jackman
Helen and Michael Goodkind
Marvin A. Gordon
Lois Lewellyn
Eva Fellows Lichtenberg
Robert B. Lifton
Gerald Lowinsky
Edna Mauer
Sylvia B. Mann

James C. Martin
Martin and Harriet Marx
Jane and Arthur Mazor
Naomi and Evan Mazur
Georgianna M. Maynard
Mary M. McDonald
George and Jane McElroy
Henry W. Meers
Mr. and Mrs. David B. Midgley
Shelby A. Miller
Charles Moritz
Ruth S. Nash
National Fine Arts Association
Charles D. and Margareta N. O'Connell
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Rolfe Achilles
The Arts Club of Chicago
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Barnes
Henry Cohen
G.U.C. Collection
Mr. and Mrs. Lester Gutman
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Michael S. Hyman
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Patricia John
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The Mary and Earle Lodging Collection
The Robert B. Mayer Memorial Loan Collection

Willa H. Mensch
Nasimi Vance Milanes
Mr. and Mrs. French Peterson
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John N. and Fay S. Stem
John L. Strauss, Jr.

The University of Chicago
Visiting Committee on the Visual Arts
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Dr. Abraham Bjerke
George Bowerman
Hans Broyard
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Bernard Chodsky
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Howard Cohen
Charles Coletti
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ACTIVITIES AND SUPPORT
Operating Statement

Statement of operations (unaudited) from 1 July 1994 through 30 June 1995.

Revenues
- Government grants and contracts $ 57,000
- Private and state gifts, grants, and contracts 236,000
- Investment income
  - Endowment payout used for operations 114,000
  - Earnings on other investments 4,000
- University allocation for direct expenses 255,000
- University allocation for physical plant expenses 125,000
- University allocation for capital improvements 40,000
- Bookstore sales, gallery rental, and other income 57,000

Total revenues 886,000

Expenses
- Staff salaries 352,000
- Benefits 64,000

Total compensation 416,000

- Operation and maintenance of physical plant 125,000
- Amortized capital improvement expense 40,000
- Supplies and services 255,000
- Insurance 8,000

Total expenses 844,000

Operating surplus (deficit) 42,000

Transferred to reserves (42,000)

Net operating results 0

Prepared by the University Office of Financial Planning and Budget, edited by the Smart Museum of Art.
Smart Museum Staff 1994–95

Kimerly Rorschach, Director
Rudy I. Bernal, Chief Preparator
Richard A. Born, Curator
Stephanie D’Alessandro, Associate Curator
Kathleen A. Gibbons, Education Director
Matthew Leary, Membership Coordinator
Bruce Linn, Registrar
Jessica L. Rose, Marketing Manager (through May 1995)
Priscilla Stratten, Operations Manager
Stefanie Rothman White, Public Relations and Marketing Manager (as of June 1995)

Interns
Julie Cullen-Cheung, Registrarial
Lisa Hernandez, Education
Kenneth J. Kocanda, Registrarial
Craig Newsom, Preparatorial
Michael Robertson, Preparatorial
Liz Siegel, Curatorial

Office Assistants
Juliette M. Bianco, Registrarial
Josh Brunaugh, Registrarial
Clive de Freitas, Education
Eugenia Lobo-Lowe, Education
Gabrielle Pak, Administration
Stephanie Serpick, Public Relations
Dana White, Administration

Student Guards
Vassilis Athitos, Guard Captain
Joel Better
Darren Brewington
Christopher Calise
Jennifer Cash, Guard Captain
Alma Cisneros, Guard Captain
Laurie Clewett
Morgan DeLaGrange
Luke Dittrich
Kathy Dowell
Bich Duong
Stephen Farrell
Amanda Fehd
Michelle Gauthier
Jeff Gramm
Anna Greenlee
Damian Grivetti
J. Michael Hamilton, Guard Captain
Grace Han
Sasha Kramer
Brett Lambo
Daniel Lav
Jamie Levine
Gladys Loneli
Belinda Marcordes
Jeremy Mayes, Guard Captain
William Morrison
George O’Brien III
Erika Orr, Guard Captain
Jodee Page
Nick Patterson
Nathaniel G. Radley
Shami Shenoy, Guard Captain

Mikelle Standbridge
Richard Talbot
Gina Thompson
Mpho Tlali
James Tracy
Tsa Weatherl
Lisa Wegner
Stephen Wellman
Jamie Wong
Italo Zanzi

Volunteers
Martha Abeleson, Education
Helen Halpern, Curatorial
Missy Parker, Curatorial
Dorothic Shah, Education
Joseph P. Shure, Curatorial
Agnes Zellner, Curatorial

Docents
Jessica Basta
Juliette Bianco
Chris Bishop
Candice Breitz
Eloise Erasmus
Joanne Ruvolo Gannett
Andrew Hershberger
Jean MacDougall
Stephanie Macholtz
Stephanie Mayer
Daniella Meeker
Andy Moore
Amanda Phillips
Mikelle Standbridge