

A LIFE OF LEARNING

Henry Millon

Charles Homer Haskins
Lecture for 2002



Professor Henry Millon delivered the annual Charles Homer Haskins Lecture on May 3, 2002, at the ACLS Annual Meeting in Philadelphia, PA. It was published as ACLS Occasional Paper No. 54 in 2003, in print and an HTML version available on the ACLS website. This pdf document reproduces the online version and may differ slightly from the print publication.

ACLS OCCASIONAL PAPER, No. 54
ISSN 1041-536X



American Council of Learned Societies
Occasional Paper No. 54

Charles Homer Haskins Lecture for 2002

A Life of Learning

by

Henry A. Millon

Introduction

by Francis Oakley
Interim President, ACLS

Henry A. Millon has made outstanding contributions to our knowledge of Renaissance and Baroque art and architecture. He has revolutionized our understanding of Michelangelo's role in the architecture of St. Peter's in Rome, shed much-needed light on the work of Filippo Juvarra, one of the most illustrious architects of the eighteenth century, and extended his researches even to the twentieth-century architecture of fascist Italy. His work has established the importance of architectural history and transformed the art historical field. He is the author of 10 books and exhibition catalogues—fundamental works in the discipline—and of nearly 50 scholarly articles. And he holds three bachelor's degrees (in English, Architecture, and Physics), two master's degrees (in Architecture and History of Art), and a Harvard Ph.D. in the History of Art. He is himself, indeed, a Renaissance man.

But it will come as no surprise to those who know him that Millon eschews the academic spotlight. For all the prominence of his scholarship, he values more highly the recognition and realization of the work of others. He has chosen to be an agent of his scholarly discipline, concerned with infrastructure, underpinnings, and, crucially, scholars themselves. Both as director of the American Academy in Rome and as founding dean of the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts at the National Gallery of Art in

Washington, he has convened and lent warm pastoral encouragement to scholars from around the world. He helped advance pioneering efforts to harness the potential of computer technology to develop systematic approaches and increased access for researchers in art and architecture historical disciplines. He has generously served as an officer or on boards or committees of over 40 organizations. Even in his own academic research, he has made clear the importance of ongoing collaboration. His stewardship and also his ambassadorship are again revealed in the monumental exhibitions he has organized, along with their massive, beautiful, and essential catalogues—work that has brought together the perspectives of scholars internationally dispersed, and, significantly, reached beyond the academy to the broader public.

Professor Millon has been called an academic "super citizen," one who has worked steadfastly to overcome the all-too-common isolation of academic life, cultivating circumstances and relationships that propel the best work forth. His love of scholarship is bound up with a profound consciousness of the people who make it possible—teachers, mentors, collaborators, directors, administrators, support staff: he gives well-deserved credit to them all. In keeping with this stance, he defines his "utopian ideal of the academy" as "a community of scholars and artists." In agreeing to give this Haskins Lecture, he characteristically refrained from claiming its honor. This is, in effect, a lecture of appreciation.

© 2002 Henry A. Millon

A Life of Learning

by

Henry A. Millon

The letter inviting me to deliver the Haskins Lecture was read with some consternation. I knew John D'Arms fairly well, enjoyed his friendship, admired his scholarship—and, therefore, was not prepared for this apparent lapse in his judgment. John was aware of my chronic reluctance to talk about my work, my experiences, and my family, as well as my penchant, on the other hand, for detailing what was to be expected of students, colleagues, and friends. It was only after several discussions, reflections, and the relentless encouragement of my wife that I succumbed to John's persuasion and accepted the honor to give a Haskins Lecture.

Judy and I came to know John after visiting him one summer at Cumae, where he directed the Virgilian Center. We began to appreciate his multiple gifts as our engagement with the American Academy in Rome developed more penetrating roots. It was a great pleasure to see him become director of the Academy, and later to see his responsibilities and leadership grow at the University of Michigan. As you know, this would

be followed by his presidency of the American Council of Learned Societies. Under John's leadership, the ACLS has been able to acquire unexpected and significant resources for research in the humanities, resources well needed and, I believe, well deserved. It was particularly gratifying to see that such results might be obtained through the naturally inspired efforts of a buoyant, delightful, and experienced classicist, university dean, and vice-provost.

With respect and admiration for all he accomplished as an administrator, scholar, advocate for academic endeavors, husband, father, and friend, I offer this lecture as a tribute to his memory, as well as to that of Charles Homer Haskins.

John's letter stated that the Haskins Lecture was not intended to present a product of scholarly work, nor a narrative account of the paths explored in developing research papers. I further took the phrasing to imply there would be little interest in the exact subject matter of whatever learning in the history of art and architecture I might have acquired—but that there might be interest in the process of learning as it relates to the "larger institutional life of art and architectural history." Moving ahead on these hints, I have chosen to divide the paper into three unequal sections. The first offers a brief account of my undergraduate and graduate education, my doing time at MIT in Cambridge, the American Academy in Rome, and the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts at Washington. Also appended thereto are reviews of a more than 40-year intermittent collaboration with Craig Smyth, and of a developing interest in original architectural models.¹ A second section will look at four applications of computer technology to the foundations for database construction—applications in which I was engaged—that is, authorities and thesauri as well as cataloguing standards for works of art and architecture. The final section will outline four relatively new professional institutions to which I belonged, which are premised on international membership and collaboration, an area of long-standing interest to many of us in this room, I am sure.

I

My father, born in France, was an aerial photographer. Early on we moved fairly often (I attended a dozen elementary schools). My father worked in South Texas, Indiana, and Iowa, mapping for Woltz Aerial

Surveys from 1937 until flying and mapping were interrupted by the war. He then began to survey airports in Latin America for the meteorology division of Pan American Airways, based in Brownsville, Texas. After many grades on the road, I had the unparalleled permanency of several years in Brownsville High School, where I graduated in June 1942. The effect of war was everywhere around us, but at 15, I was too young to enter the military. I spent a further half-year of study and was admitted to a US Navy V-12 (and later ROTC) program at Tulane University in March 1943, shortly after my sixteenth birthday.

The US Navy was responsible for the beginning of my higher education. During the war, Tulane, as other universities, ran a three-semester year. With a slightly heavier course load than civilian students, it was possible to amass 120 units in seven semesters. A curriculum in Naval Science was not, however, recognized as a major field by the administration at Tulane. Commissioning and assignment to active duty followed in June 1946. The war had ended a year earlier. After a short stay on the inboard ship of four moored at the Point Loma Sonar School in San Diego, voyaging only up and down with the tide, I was released to inactive duty and, thanks to the GI Bill, was able to return to Tulane in the fall.

The naval curriculum included physics, chemistry, mathematics, English, and subjects of naval interest, such as communications, navigation, ship handling, damage control, and naval history and customs. Electives were few, but it was possible to cultivate those interests in language, literature, and history that had sprouted at home and in high school. My interest in archaeology and ancient history took hold in a captivating two-semester subject on Ancient Greece and Rome. That subject, and another on poetry,² persuaded me to return to Tulane to complete not only a major in English, but to participate in plays produced in Tulane's Little Theater, then under the direction of Monroe Lippman. There I delved into voice training, acting, staging, and initiated a love for theatrical production, which it has been noted, pulls me to the podium to this day.

Next came a one-semester foray in law school. Subjects in torts, contracts, and the history of Louisiana's legal code, however absorbing, were not enough to convince me to continue. By the second semester, I was taking subjects in electricity and magnetism, atomic and nuclear physics, and later, optics, analytical geometry, and differential equations, with electives in meteorology and geology, which led to a BS in physics. Why physics? Encouraged by my father, who had had an exemplary grounding and a lifelong interest in the sciences, I had developed an

interest in books and journals that were on physics, geology, natural history, and astronomy that were available either at home, school or in public libraries. The math and science of the naval curriculum made it seem natural to gravitate to physics.

Some months before graduation, I had met Lem McCoy, an architecture student, who was also completing his studies. Talking about the summer over coffee, he spoke of his plans to travel in Europe the coming year to see as much as possible of the art and architecture that had attracted him in class. He asked why I wasn't going to do the same. I was unable to find a reason not to seize an unanticipated opportunity. My grandmother—I would visit my grandmother in Paris. Recently widowed for the second time, she would be able to welcome me and derive, perhaps, some pleasure in hosting a family member. Her first husband, my grandfather, had been a skilled cabinetmaker and decorative sculptor who died when only 27. I had not seen Grandmere since I was two. She had lived in Paris through the occupation and liberation. She remembered the deprivations of two world wars and was the daughter of a veteran of the war of 1870. She had a multitude of recollections to pass on, an unusually generous spirit, and I was an eager listener. Her joy seemed to reside in spending time with her colleagues and friends discussing the news of the day at tea, coffee, lunch, picnic, dinner, theater, and later recording her day in her diary. Her life appeared to be devoted to sociability with her friends and to work in her shop that sold tools and equipment for sculptors, my grandfather's trade. Grandmere was an exquisite and unforgettable exemplar.

I lived with her for almost half a year, using Paris as a base for one-day visits to the many towns, sites, and cities accessible by train. It was an immensely absorbing and engaging period during which the range of personalities among buildings—some disagreeable, others warmly appealing—attracted me more than paintings, sculpture, or even science museums. By the spring term of 1950 I was ready to return to Tulane to study architecture. Why Tulane? Cosmopolitan New Orleans and Tulane had been "home" for five years. I knew people there, had friends there, and had heard talk of the School of Architecture. It was an unproblematic, un-pondered, uncontested, and comfortable choice.

The School of Architecture at Tulane had been since 1949 under the directorship of a converted modernist, Buford Pickens, who implemented the curricular reforms instituted at Harvard by Walter Gropius in the late 1930s, and had brought in young designers who taught modern architecture with a missionary zeal. For the most part they

were educated at Columbia and Harvard.³ Pickens had instituted an energizing, active program of lectures and visiting professorships, some of brief but stimulating and exhausting duration. In the second or third year, a visiting British design professor, Mervyn Frederick Henry Roe,⁴ taught the history of Renaissance and Baroque architecture. My notes indicate he spent a great deal of time on Italian architecture, exhibiting a developed appreciation of both Geoffrey Scott's *Architecture of Humanism* and Rudolf Wittkower's *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism*, which sought to refute Scott's hedonistic thesis. These days of particularly charismatic presentations, apparent erudition, and seeming intimate knowledge of the structures, architects, and patrons were sufficient to expose an entire field of study. At Newcomb College subjects offered by John Canaday and Alfred Moir confirmed expectations and launched me into the vortex of a life of learning in the history of art and architecture. Before moving on to graduate school, it is to be noted here that my academic record at Tulane was unremarkable.

Nonetheless, the faculty at Harvard seemed amenable to my continuing study in both architecture and history of art and architecture, although offered in different departments. Recollection of the Harvard years: contact with John Coolidge, Sydney Freedberg, Sigfried Giedion, and others are too rich to go into at this time,⁵ but I must mention the two summers that Wittkower spent away from London teaching captivating seminars in architectural history at the Fogg.⁶ Time spent in his seminars determined much of the path I followed over the next decade. He transmitted an appreciation for an authoritative mastery of the literature, the archives, and the monuments, as well as a love of the history of art and architecture of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Italy (and England). His probing lectures on Guarino Guarini in the second summer led to my dissertation on the Palazzo Carignano in Turin, to a valued friendship, and a lifelong engagement with Guarini.

A predoctoral Fulbright in 1957, followed by a two-year fellowship at the American Academy in Rome for the dissertation, brought me three rich years of growth in Italy. The first year was spent in the archives, national and civic libraries in Turin and Piedmont, where British historian Stuart Woolf was in Turin gathering material on Piedmontese economic and political history, as well as on family archives. He guided me through the intricacies of archival holdings, provided counsel in my searches, and supplied building costs as he noted them in family archives.⁷

The following summer of 1958, Wittkower led a three-week seminar on Piedmontese art and architecture from 1600 to 1800 for seven

participants, to 48 towns and sites including Turin.⁸ Long-term interest was ensured. In fact, Guarini and Piedmont have me still in their thrall. I am today part of a team preparing an exhibition for 2005 in Turin of Guarini's architectural drawings.

Two years followed at the Academy, with occasional sojourns in Piedmont. The shared knowledge of the fellows, visitors, and faculty; the research resources in Rome and the Vatican; the objects in museums and collections; the sites and buildings to be studied; the trips led by staff and fellows; the heady gatherings with fellows from the other national academies and Italian colleagues breathed life into a utopian ideal of the academy—a community of scholars and artists.⁹ From the policies and activities of the director, Laurance Roberts,¹⁰ I learned the signal importance for most scholars of a support system with adequate resources, a staff dedicated to facilitating each fellow's endeavor, and a director interested in scholarship.

In 1960 I joined the faculty at MIT, where I had earlier, while at Harvard, been a teaching assistant to architectural historian Albert Bush Brown. At MIT, history of architecture and associated subjects are taught in the Department of Architecture, a part of the School of Architecture and Urban Planning, as are graphic arts, painting, and sculpture. In the mid-1940s, Bauhaus designer and writer Gyorgy Kepes introduced subjects in visual design into the graduate program. The 1950s saw the introduction of occasional subjects in the history of art, and by the late '60s a departmental program in history, theory, and criticism of art and architecture had developed the groundwork for one of the earliest doctoral programs in a school of architecture and planning. Further developments led to a program in photography under Minor White and a program in film under Ricky Leacock.¹¹ The history-theory section promoted subjects in the history and theory of the newly added media, believing that students learning the techniques of an art, and those who study the history and theory of that art, have much to learn from each other. With satisfaction we observed that for some students the gains were substantial.¹² Kepes, who founded the Center for Advanced Visual Studies at MIT in 1967, published on the relationship between art, science, and technology, attracting a variety of visual artists and theoreticians to his Center.¹³ A recent conceptually related extension of this are the joint fellowships devised by Joanne Pillsbury, assistant dean at the center in Washington, which pairs an art historian and a conservator to work together on a project of common interest.¹⁴

A most rewarding relationship that began at the Academy has been my

over 40-year collaboration with Craig Hugh Smyth on a study of Michelangelo's St. Peter's. It all began during a Vatican stroll, with an offhand observation in 1959 about the apparent incompleteness of the attic of St. Peter's above us. We were on our way to keep an appointment to visit the Casina of Pius IV. After a closer scrutiny of the attic, Smyth suggested a literature search that, in fact, substantially enlarged the significance of the initial observation. The findings led to years of summer and sabbatical archival research in the fabbrica of St. Peter's (once with a fellowship from ACLS), and the widening of the scope to include all building activity during the 17-year tenure of Michelangelo as architect of St. Peter's.

Our first publication on Michelangelo and St. Peter's, in 1969, stated, rashly as events have shown, that we had a book in preparation.¹⁵ We have published over a half-dozen articles on the subject, but the book has yet to appear. Smyth, who is 86, says we had better finish it soon.

The accidental, unmeditated observation was as happenstance as our both being at the Academy that year and, by chance, both interested in seeing the Barocci frescoes in Pirro Ligorio's Casina di Pio IV.¹⁶ Smyth and I were formed quite differently: he as a musician (his career began as a transatlantic trombonist) and art historian at Princeton, I as an architect and art historian at Tulane and Harvard. We spent considerable time together discussing our readings and archival transcriptions, constructing outlines, and, when possible, writing together as work progressed. We write, of course, quite differently. Smyth, a master grammarian, writes cordial, transparent narratives in an elegant flowing prose. On the other hand, I come from a family that endorsed the value of polemics in debate and politics. Early on, emulating my elder brother (who recently was inducted into the National Academy of Sciences),¹⁷ I was attracted to inordinate and extravagant statements. In addition, in my years in architecture, I had often mistaken for profundity the obscure, ambiguous, and impenetrable, which is virtually ubiquitous among those in the field, whether in practice or in academia. Working with Smyth involved multiple maturation on my part.

In 1967 Craig Smyth and I were discussing our work on St. Peter's with Franz Graf Wolff Metternich at the Bibliotheca Hertziana in Rome.¹⁸ Metternich had considerable knowledge of the history of St. Peter's before Michelangelo, and kindly told us of a curious insertion in one of the apse vaults of Antonio da Sangallo's famous large wood model for St. Peter's. The apse vault, he said, resembled more the vaults of St. Peter's as constructed than the others Sangallo had designed both in

drawings and the model. It proved, in the end, to be a model made under Michelangelo's direction for a newly designed apse vault, and placed probably for a trial in the Sangallo model. Thus began the study of an original architectural model to see what it might reveal about its purpose, its construction, and the architect's intentions.

I always had an interest in models in architectural practice and their value in presentations and exhibitions. In 1966, I was a member of one of four teams from Cornell, Columbia, Princeton, and MIT engaged in preparing urban design proposals for New York City that included large-scale models.¹⁹ The designs and models were shown in 1967 at the Museum of Modern Art in the exhibition *The New City: Architecture and Urban Renewal* commissioned by Arthur Drexler, director, Department of Architecture and Design.

In 1974, while at the American Academy in Rome, the time seemed right to gather scholars to discuss architectural models for structures from the fourteenth through the eighteenth centuries in Italy, surveying their incidence, scale, cost, and purposes. Seventeen scholars attended the day-long seminar.²⁰ Each presented documentation on at least one model for a structure known from archival and/or literary references, as well as known extant models. Smyth and I presented our work on the St. Peter's apse model, which we published later in 1976.

Further work on architectural models was then stimulated in 1986 by a fortuitous and generous scholarly suggestion of David Alan Brown at the National Gallery. He had been discussing a potential Michelangelo drawing exhibition with Paolo Viti, then in charge of cultural affairs for the Olivetti Corporation. The exhibition was to be at the National Gallery in Washington and the Louvre in Paris, with a catalogue written by Michael Hirst of the Courtauld Institute, a specialist in Michelangelo drawings. David Brown, perhaps in response to an inquiry by Viti, noted that it might be desirable to treat Michelangelo's architectural drawings and that Smyth (in 1987-88 the Samuel H. Kress Professor at the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts) and I might be appropriate authors of a complementary companion volume devoted to Michelangelo as architect.

Michelangelo Architect opened in the summer of 1988 at the Casa Buonarrotti in Florence, traveled to the National Gallery in the fall where it joined *Michelangelo Draftsman*, which later went to the Louvre. As it developed, it was not possible to include the newly identified apse vault model of Michelangelo in the exhibition, which did, however,

include the other two of Michelangelo's extant models: the model for the facade of San Lorenzo in Florence (now in the Casa Buonarroti but not executed) and the large half-model for the drum and dome of St. Peter's (partially executed, but with the outer dome of the model modified after Michelangelo's death). The installation of the models, drawings, medals, and prints by Gaillard Ravenel at the National Gallery was sufficiently engaging that Paolo Viti, upon accepting the directorship of the Palazzo Grassi in Venice for the Fiat Corporation, began thinking of a larger and more comprehensive exhibition of architectural models that might encompass the Renaissance in Italy, and eventually a successor show to treat the Baroque.²¹

As a family we left Boston for Washington in the summer of 1980, I returning to MIT thereafter as a visiting professor. The [Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts](#) had been founded at the National Gallery of Art in 1979 to foster an interchange between the curatorial and conservation staff of the Gallery and academic staff in universities through the formation of a community of scholars. The Center, as a research institute, encourages study of the production, use, and cultural meaning of art, artifacts, architecture, and urbanism from prehistory to the near present. It welcomes historians, critics, and theorists of art as well as scholars in the humanities and social sciences with related interests. The Center provides resources for 17 residential fellowships, non-residential dissertation fellowships, symposia, conferences and seminars, institutional research programs, and publications. The federal government funds the administrative and support staff, but the programs of the Center depend on private resources, largely provided by income from endowments.

The notion of a study center at the Gallery was initially posed by David Finley, the first director; John Walker, his assistant director; and Paul Mellon, Gallery benefactor. They envisaged a felicitous conjunction of works of art, research library, and resident scholars. When Carter Brown became assistant director in 1963, he undertook a broad study of active American graduate programs in art history. He concluded that a center for postdoctoral study with ready access to works of art was most needed. In the fall of 1978 with the East Building completed, Brown, as director, asked George Hamilton, Samuel H. Kress Professor (an annual post at the Gallery for a distinguished art historian) to assemble a group of art historians of diverse backgrounds. Seven were selected and asked to review Brown's study of 1963 as a stimulus to their thoughts. They were then asked to outline a possible purpose and scope for the Center.²² By the end of a day of deliberation, the group

recommended a postdoctoral center that would promote studies of art and artifacts, architecture and urbanism, from prehistory to the present.

By the time I was asked to head this formulated Center, the purpose and scope were clear. The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation provided a three-year start-up grant in 1979, followed by an endowment grant in 1982. A skeleton Center staff prepared applications for the advisory board to review in the fall of 1979. Visiting senior fellows arrived the following summer. From the 1960s, the National Gallery had had a program for a half-dozen predoctoral fellows as well as a Kress Professor, supported by annual grants from the Kress and Mellon foundations, and an endowment from Chester Dale, former president of the gallery. All were folded into the Center.

During the ten-year period of planning and construction of the East Building, gallery librarian Mel Edelstein strengthened the collections. Libraries of art historians were solicited and purchased, retrospective buying surged, and funds for current publications and serials increased. Back runs of journals received special attention. Edelstein continued as librarian until he left to develop the collections of the Getty. His successor, Neal Turtell, continued retrospective acquisitions and enlarged the collections with back-runs and rare discontinued periodicals.

The shaping, fine-tuning, and determination of the optimal size of the Center came, over time, after hearing from predoctoral and senior fellows, professional (and observant) staff of the Gallery, visitors and guests of the Center, but most of all in consultation with Shreve Simpson, an extraordinary assistant dean. Shreve's endorsement and upholding of the highest scholarly standards, balanced weighing of issues, incisive judgments, opinions, and probity contributed substantially to the formation of the Center and its programs, and I say this here to ensure she receives the credit she merits for the shaping of the Center.²³ In general terms, the plans for the Center adhered to principles learned at the American Academy in Rome: the necessity of securing adequate, well-equipped personal space for fellows, with reliable office equipment, a fund for research expenses, a staff that would appreciate and respect fellows and facilitate their work—and most importantly, a lounge with an espresso machine.

The continuities enjoyed by a research institution make it possible to sustain research teams and topics over an extended period, as has long been the norm in the sciences. Research programs of the Center are directed individually by a trio of deans to develop research tools of value

to the scholarly community. A Guide to the Description of Architectural Drawings, completed in 1994, is intended to assist repositories of architectural drawings and documents (museums, libraries, and archives) in cataloguing their holdings. The guide resulted from extended collaboration with the Getty Art History Information Program, the Architectural Drawings Advisory Group, and the Foundation for Documents of Architecture, about which more later. Under Associate Dean Therese O'Malley, and with the support of the Getty Grant Program and the Graham Foundation, a second handbook, an illustrated historical dictionary of landscape and garden design terminology that will chronicle the evolution of vocabulary in use in the late-eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in America, is in press. A third project, directed by Assistant Dean Joanne Pillsbury and also in press, will provide a multi-volume guide to documentary sources for the art history and archaeology of the Andean region of South America.²⁴

II

This second section of the paper will address initial attempts to utilize the potential of computer technology in the history of art and architecture. In the late '50s and '60s, most repositories with large collections of architectural drawings had only rudimentary card files, lists, or indices. The Architectural Drawings Advisory Group (ADAG) was convened in 1983, as several repositories of architectural drawings seemed ready to develop systematic approaches to cataloguing standards to ensure consistent sets of research information among repositories. Anticipation of an electronic network was in the air. By engaging user-scholars in the process, we hoped to develop innovative methods for retrieval of information desired by users. A cross-section of repositories was needed—libraries, research centers, museums, professional architectural associations, and archives—as well as an international representation of institutions from Austria, Canada, France, Germany, England, and the United States.²⁵ A number of scholars worked with the core group, composed of curatorial and archival staff as well as documentation specialists.

ADAG had three sections. First were member institutions with one or more representatives who attended three meetings each year. Second, the Getty Art History Information Program (AHIP) and the staff of the Art and Architecture Thesaurus (AAT) provided technical expertise.

And third, the Getty Trust partially funded a staff for ADAG at the Center in Washington, responsible for identification of issues, recommendations to the broader membership, documentation of the project, and liaison with computer specialists.

ADAG meetings made it clear that cataloguing practices, terminology, and scholars' desires varied widely. What at first seemed to the founders to be a straightforward process of rule writing, became instead an arena of struggle towards consensus to identify common documentation needs. It became increasingly apparent that closely related architectural drawings were frequently dispersed among repositories with widely different cataloguing and access practices. ADAG then explored the establishing of a network to apply the guidelines as they emerged from the discussions.

In 1986 a separate organization composed of five ADAG member repositories and the Getty Trust formed a non-profit corporation, the Foundation for Documents of Architecture (FDA).²⁶ The FDA had a central staff of eight, housed at the National Gallery in Washington.²⁷ The purpose of ADAG and FDA was not only to provide guidelines for finding aids to collections but, on a higher level, to define what an electronic research environment might be. In 1988-89 the FDA staff, augmented by cataloguers from the four repositories, spent a year of experimental cataloguing on a computer system newly developed by AHIP.²⁸

The basic challenge, to define a set of retrieval requirements for scholars, sounded straightforward but was extremely difficult. There were few precedents in the field of art history for reconciling differences in cataloguing practices among repositories. As new technology opened possibilities, it also presented formidable conceptual and technical issues. After review and analysis of the experimental period, FDA concluded that the development of a computer network in 1989 was beyond its reach.

Testing, refining, and expanding ADAG'S guidelines during the FDA experiment had considerably advanced the original goal of ADAG. The experience of working toward a common approach to cataloguing warranted a publication that would summarize and codify the results of eight years of discussion. In 1990 the FDA board of directors appointed a steering committee to oversee the preparation of this document.²⁹ Robin Thorne, Royal Commission on the Historic Monuments of England, and Vicki Porter, who directed FDA and managed the ADAG staff from 1986, were the authors. Their work helped to clarify the

findings of ADAG and to uncover issues that ADAG had not addressed. The resulting *Guide to the Description of Architectural Drawings* of 1994 is intended to be a basis for further progress toward a cataloguing standard, and is meant to serve not only historians, curators, archivists, and specialists in the field, but also those who may be confronting the cataloguing of architectural drawings for the first time, or even writing wall labels for an exhibition.³⁰ This is a diverse audience with different professional procedures and protocols. ADAG viewed the diversity of its outreach as one of its strengths. As you know well, in the eight years since publication, database technology, storage, and retrieval systems have evolved continually, as have inventories and catalogues of collections of drawings, some making use of the ADAG guide.

III

The final section will address further collaboration with international institutions.

Applications of computer technology were also being considered by the International Committee of the History of Art (CIHA). The *Thesaurus Artis Universalis* (TAU), a working group appointed by the executive committee of CIHA in Vienna in September 1983, had its origins in a perceived need for an automated biographical databank and the need to anticipate the effect of automated data processing on the history of art. TAU included representatives from the nations of Western Europe and the United States.³¹ At the initial meeting, the Getty Trust was represented by Nancy Englander and the following year by Michael Ester, new director of the Getty Art History Information Program. The Getty Trust/AHIP agreed to fund the meetings of the *Thesaurus Artis Universalis*, as well as portions of the work of subcommittees.

Shortly after the TAU group began meeting, it was recognized that with many automated projects underway—a number of them regional and national catalogues—it was likely that the field might best be served through a study and proposal of standards for art-historical information and the authority files (personal name and geographic) necessary to most, if not all, automated projects. (A Union List of Artists, Names and the Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names were subsequently developed under Getty sponsorship and are available online at www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabulary.) Within the TAU group three

projects were defined: the design of a biographical databank of artists, the structure for an historical/geographical databank, and a survey of authority files already used in automated projects in the field. At a later date a feasibility study of an illustrated multilingual art and architecture thesaurus, based on the thesaurus in English, developed in Williamstown, Massachusetts under the aegis of the Getty Trust, was added to the roster of projects.

The team charged with the development of an historical/geographical authority file structure began with the Lazio region of Italy, a region with a large number of provinces, communities, and localities, and a rich ancient, modern, and recent history.³² The data gathered for Lazio were entered in a prototype system that answered queries in a satisfactory manner. To verify the data structures of the system a second province was selected, this time Tuscan, with different historical experiences. In this case the system also responded well. Thereafter, tests were made of the possibility of producing graphic representations using a standard program for coordinate cartography.

To evaluate further the potential of the Italian historical/geographical database structure, an additional experiment was undertaken. Collected data for the state of Texas were entered in a commercial database program (Oracle).³³ Even though the administrative structure of New Spain, of the republic of Texas, and of the state of Texas differed from that of Lazio and Tuscany, and though the ecclesiastical structure was less complex than in Italy, the software proved able to receive the structured data and relations defined in the Italian example and appeared to be applicable to any historical/geographical situation. *A Methodological Approach to Producing a Historical/Geographical Database* was published in Italian and English in 1989.³⁴

Aware of the many difficulties encountered in establishing even personal name authorities, as well as of the importance of maintaining the integrity of the source document, Jacques Thuillier, College de France, began development of a databank design that would include restricted fields and controlled vocabulary as well as free text fields that respected the language and orthography of sources. The team entered enough data to demonstrate the applicability of the design. Lutz Heusinger, from Marburg, West Germany, developed a biographical section of an automated museum cataloguing system, which was appended to the report published in French and English in 1992.³⁵

Work on a multilingual illustrated thesaurus of architecture (a part of the AAT) produced in Williamstown, Massachusetts lasted for several

years. Teams were formed in France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and the United States. A thesaurus of terms for "built works" had been in development at AAT for several years and was being used by the ADAG in Washington in its cataloguing study of architectural drawings for research. This thesaurus in progress was made available for use by the international teams.

At this time, projects for both multi- and mono-lingual illustrated architectural dictionaries underway or already published included the Swiss-based *Glossarium Artis*, Perouse de Montclos' *Vocabulaire de l'architecture* (1972), and Rene Ginouves and Roland Martin's two volume *Dictionnaire methodique de l'architecture grecque et romaine* (1985 and 1992).³⁶ In Rome, the Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo had published the general cataloguing system developed for works of art. Its members were interested in work on thesauri for cataloguing terminology. Teams at the Istituto were at work on an illustrated thesaurus of ecclesiastical furnishings (1989),³⁷ had already published two volumes of arms and armor,³⁸ and were also working on a vocabulary for the cataloguing of prints.³⁹ A subgroup was busy compiling a vocabulary for an illustrated thesaurus of architecture. In West Germany, Lutz Heusinger was preparing to publish MIDAS, the Marburg Museum Information, Documentation, Administration System (1989).

Our ambition was to utilize these existing thesauri and dictionaries to translate the AAT built works components into the other four CIHA languages and retain the hierarchical structure of AAT. Initial team study of AAT revealed that mere translation would be unwise, if not impossible. Equivalencies were then to be tried. Only the team from Marburg made progress by supplying relevant images for a trial section. First the French, then the Italian and Spanish teams concluded that the AAT built works hierarchies did not correspond well with the modes of thought current in their countries. We had reached a cultural impasse. It seems the conceptual structures of each of the four languages, as well as English, were sufficiently distinct from each other to warrant individual thesaurical treatment. Perhaps after illustrated thesauri of architectural terminology have been constructed for each country, an interest may arise to revisit the project and seek corresponding images within the different conceptual systems.

Forming new associations of comparable institutions with international aspirations is the last section to be discussed. Research institutes in art history in North America that offer resident fellowships exist either as

independent entities or in association with museums and university centers. With the advent of the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts at the National Gallery it seemed useful in 1984 to invite the heads of similar institutions to compare experiences and opinions on visas, fellows' taxes, housing, ownership of fellows' reports, duties and responsibilities, selection procedures, and the list goes on. For example, 20 years ago, each institution mailed letters of award at a date thought convenient. Deadlines for receipt of acceptance of an award varied widely. Giles Constable, at Dumbarton Oaks, raised the point that the applicant who received several offers should be able to make his selection without pressure, and suggested an institutionally agreed upon date for acceptance of an award. With time, as the heads of the institutions came to trust each other, it became clear that there were enough issues of common interest, such as the search for funds, to develop cooperative programs. Articles of incorporation were prepared and in 1987 the Internal Revenue Service recognized the [Association of Research Institutes in Art History \(ARIAH\)](#).

ARIAH, which started with 10 founding members,⁴⁰ has grown to a membership of 21 research institutions.⁴¹ The association maintains an administrative structure through dues of member institutions and raises funds for its special initiatives. In 1999 ARIAH sponsored the first international congress that brought representatives from the European Association of Research Institutes in Art History (RIAH) to meet with their counterparts in ARIAH.⁴²

National institutes of art history that met informally during the meetings of the International Congress of the History of Art in 1983 extended an invitation to the new center at the National Gallery to join them to hear reports of current activities, future plans, and mutual concerns.⁴³ By the twenty-sixth congress in Washington in 1986, the informal group had expanded to include the new Getty Center for Art History and the Humanities, and the Amatller Institute in Barcelona. The informally associated research institutes eventually realized that collaborative work could best be pursued if their association became an incorporated non-profit entity with dues-paying members. Using the incorporation documents of ARIAH as a guide, the new international corporation, [RIAH](#), which included research institutes from West and Central Europe and North America, was founded.

A number of RIAH institutes have exchanged staff members, hosted fellows from member institutes, raised funds, and utilized some of the standards developed by TAU and AHIP, and are able to supply an

automated response to an inquiry in any of the five CIHA languages.⁴⁴ At the thirtieth international congress in London in 2000, RIAH members, now numbering 18, presented a public program to disseminate information about automated resources at member institutions and the nature of future RIAH programs.

The success of the ARIAH-sponsored International Congress of Institutes of Art History in 1999 has led to annual meetings of RIAH and ARIAH. Plans for a short-term (two to three months) continuation of exchange of staff and hosting of fellows are underway. Prospects for international cooperation are considerably more promising than a decade ago.

Time does not allow more than a mention of ILAUD, the unusually successful International Laboratory of Architecture and Urban Design, organized more than 20 years ago by the Italian architect Giancarlo De Carlo. Each year the Laboratory gathers students and faculty from architecture schools in seven different countries and forms international teams to study local urban design issues.⁴⁵ Working together ensures that the different nationals come to know each other well.

The notion of an organization to promote the interest of American overseas research centers seems to have long been in the thoughts of anthropologist Robert McCormick Adams. Adams had worked in the Near East and knew the American Schools of Oriental Research. Overseas research centers, wherever they may be, provide support for scholars and assist in negotiations with the host country. In 1976, Adams began planning a conference to be sponsored by the American Academy of Art and Sciences that would gather representatives from the overseas centers, from the government, and from existing and potential sources of funding. The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities funded a pair of meetings in 1978.⁴⁶ The resulting document, *Corners of a Foreign Field*, edited by Bob Adams and Corinne Schelling, was published as a working paper by the Rockefeller Foundation in 1979. It included an introduction by Adams, chapters on origins, host country relations, the changing world of scholarship, foreign language training (then an issue due to President Carter's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies), and a concluding section by Mason Hammond endorsing an association of the centers.

In 1981, Dillon Ripley, secretary of the Smithsonian, took an interest in the project. He retained Alice Ilchman to convene a workshop and advise the Smithsonian on how best to support the centers. By the end

of 1981, with an endorsement by Ripley of the Ilchman final report, the [Council of American Overseas Research Centers \(CAORC\)](#) formed a steering committee consisting of US-based representatives from the American Institutes for Yemeni Studies and for Iranian Studies, the American Research Centers in Egypt and Turkey, the American Academy in Rome, and the Smithsonian. Gretchen Ellsworth of the Smithsonian was the committee's supportive internal advocate. By the time Bob Adams became secretary of the Smithsonian in 1984, the purposes of CAORC had been defined. It would "advance higher learning and scholarly research through a forum for communication and cooperation among overseas advanced research centers . . . [,] promote the exchange of operational and administrative information, and of scholarly and research information among the centers, encourage joint research projects, as well as assist with the establishment of centers abroad." The 10 member centers were prepared for an inaugural annual meeting.⁴⁷

With funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities, CAORC sponsored an initial meeting of resident center directors in New Delhi in 1989 to discuss common concerns. Successive such meetings of directors were held in Athens in 1991, Istanbul in 1997, and Egypt in 2000. In 1999, with funding from the Smithsonian, CAORC sponsored the first meeting of an expanded and inclusive International Council of Research Centers Abroad, gathering the directors of similar overseas research centers coming from home bases in Austria, Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Sweden, and Switzerland to meet with the officers and executive director of CAORC. The gathering surveyed practices among the centers and explored avenues of cooperation and collaboration among CAORC centers and centers of other nations abroad.

Applications for funding of the CAORC office met with some success and the budget rose from \$23,000 in 1985 to over \$100,000 in 1987.⁴⁸ Thereafter, the Smithsonian and the United States Information Agency in their budget requests included line items for CAORC. The Mellon Foundation funded a program of CAORC fellowships for scholars from Central and Eastern Europe in 1992 and, in the following year, CAORC received support from the Department of Education. A search for funding for programs of the Council, ably promoted and shepherded by Mary Ellen Lane, executive director since 1985, has significantly increased resources for the programs of the individual centers. The CAORC budget is today over \$2,500,000 annually for 16 centers, now including the new centers in West Africa, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, and

Palestine.

These musings report on some of the activities that occupied time when not engaged either with diverting or daunting duties and responsibilities, or on those delicious oblivious moments of research.

I cannot close without citing the imaginative, supportive, loyal, and forthright staffs that have facilitated working at MIT, the American Academy in Rome, and the Center in Washington.⁴⁹ I learned much from them, from faculty colleagues, students, research associates and assistants, and fellows in Rome and Washington. For me, a life of learning would be less satisfying without the pleasures of observing the maturation of younger scholars, the warmth and friendship of colleagues and friends, the blessing of a wife who, while not hesitating to speak her mind, has a generous spirit and warm heart, as well as the delight of four children who love each other.

Notes

1. Among the several categories of architectural models, those that are made for, not of, a structure, i.e., made during the process of realizing architecture, for example, study models, models to be followed in construction, and models for presentation to a client seem to be of greatest interest to historians.
2. Leonard Dean, a colleague of Robert Penn Warren who taught up river at Louisiana State University, led us through critical readings of tragedy from Sophocles to O'Neill, exposing freshmen to the captivating logic of dramatic structure, and to the potency of poetry.
3. Among the gifted design instructors at Tulane's School of Architecture were John Lawrence (Columbia), Samuel Hurst (Harvard), James Lamantia (Harvard), Arthur Q. Davis (Harvard), and Charles Colbert (Columbia). Bernard Lemann, who taught history of art and architecture, received his PhD from Harvard. For further information about the teaching of architecture at Tulane University, see Bernard Lemann, Malcolm Heard, Jr., and John P. Klingman, eds., *Talk About Architecture: A Century of Architectural Education at Tulane* (New Orleans: Tulane University School of Architecture, 1993).
4. After a year or so of presenting mesmerizing lectures in the history of architecture and serving as a critic in design studios, Roe seems to have left for parts unknown. His name does not appear in the centennial

history of the Tulane School of Architecture (see n3 above).

5. Seminars with Jacob Rosenberg, John Coolidge, Sydney Freedberg, and George Hanfmann in the Department of Fine Arts were among the most memorable experiences of those years, but I also profited from subjects taught by Fred Deknatel, Leonard Opdycke, as well as from Kenneth Conant and Sigfried Giedion, members of the faculty of the Graduate School of Design. A year spent in the Graduate School of Design (1954-55) in studios of the urban design program learning from Jose Luis Sert, Jean Paul Carlhian, Wells Coates, and Jacqueline Tyrwhitt, with occasional crits from Joseph Zalevsky and conversations with Eduard Sekler, reinforced a continuing interest in contemporary architecture. Among the class admitted for graduate study in the Department of Fine Arts at the Fogg in the fall of 1953 were Colin Eisler, Donald Hansen, Howard Hibbard, Elisabeth McDougall, Theodore Reff, Carl Weinhardt, and David Wright.

6. Rudolf Wittkower taught seminars at Harvard in the summer sessions of 1954 and 1955. Italian architectural treatises of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were the subject of the seminar in 1954, followed by treatises of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in 1955. A seminar report in the '54 seminar on Francesco di Giorgio led, after further advice from John Coolidge, to the publication of a note in the *Art Bulletin*. A seminar report on Guarino Guarini the next summer, again with further counsel of John Coolidge as an advisor, led to a dissertation on Guarini's Palazzo Carignano in Turin.

7. During the Fulbright year in Turin, Woolf introduced me to many Turinese historians of art and architecture, notably Andreina Griseri, Luigi Malle, Vittorio Viale, and the architect Roberto Gabetti. They and others at the Turin Politecnico ensured that I would meet scholars and architects who had worked on Guarino Guarini. Mario Passanti, on the faculty at the Politecnico, had spent a good part of his life studying Guarini. He was more than generous in many ways, and introduced me to architects and others who offered plentiful suggestions. When Francis Haskell came to Turin gathering material for his *Patrons and Painters*, Woolf arranged a meeting, initiating a friendship that developed over years in Rome, Oxford, and Washington. While Paolo Portoghesi was in Turin on a visit, Andreina Griseri introduced us so that we might discuss his recent monograph on Guarini. With few exceptions, architects, historians, art and architectural historians in Turin were exceptionally kind and generous with their time, establishing a foundation for years of collegial interaction in the archives, libraries, at the university and politecnico, refuting, incidentally, the proverb *Piemontese, false cortese*.

8. The seminar (sponsored by the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University) spent seven of the 21 days visiting structures and drawing collections in Turin. The remaining two weeks were devoted to structures in Canavese (north), Monferrato (east), Langhe (south), and major sites near Turin, including Stupinigi, Rivoli, and Venaria Reale. In all we visited 126 buildings. Participants in the seminar included Judith Perry and Elisabeth Young (British), Norman Canedy, Richard Pommer, Eric van Schaack, Leo Steinberg, and myself. In addition to Margo Wittkower, others who joined the seminar at various sites and moments included Marziano Bernardi, Andreina Griseri, Victoria Moccagatta, Mario Passanti, Vittorio Viale, and Stuart Woolf. A number of the participants stayed at the Dogana Vecchia, a hostelry dating from the eighteenth century.

9. In addition to the enduring presence of the professor in charge of the School of Classical Studies, most years at the Academy are enhanced with distinguished artists and scholars in residence. During my three-year fellowship these individuals included Herbert Bloch and Robert S. Broughton (as professors in charge of the School of Classical Studies), Arthur Osver, Eugene Berman, and Rico Lebrun (painters), Ralph E. Griswold and Thomas Church (landscape architects), Francis Comstock, Nathaniel Owings, Jean Labatut, and Edward Durell Stone (architects), Malcolm Cowley, Matthew Josephson, and Wallace Stegner (writers), Otto Luening, Alexei Haieff, and Ross Lee Finney (composers), Craig Hugh Smyth, colleague and mentor, and H. W. Janson (art historians). Among the fellows, a number who became valued colleagues included James Jarrett and Theodore Musho (architects), Ervin Zube (landscape architect), Jack Massey, Jack Zajac, Zubel Kachadoorian, Donald Aquilino, and Lennart Anderson (painters), Aldo Casanova (sculptor), John C. Eaton and George B. Wilson (composers), George Garrett, Harold Brodkey, and Edmund Keeley (writers), Derickson M. Brinkerhoff and Alfred K. Frazer (classicists), and among the art historians, Howard Hibbard, Milton Lewine, and Donald Posner. Short- and longer-term visitors whose presence added substantially to the collegial atmosphere at the academy in those years included, among many others, Frank E. Brown, director of excavations at Cosa; P.H. von Blanckenhagen; Axel Boethius, from the Swedish Institute; Kathleen Weil-Garris Brandt; Ferdinando Castagnoli, former Fulbright associate at the Academy; Gisela M.A. Richter; Richard Krautheimer; Irving and Marilyn Lavin; Rensselaer W. Lee; William L. MacDonald; Elisabeth MacDougall; Millard Meiss; Helen North; Leo Steinberg; Oliver Strunk; Louise Talma; G.E. Kidder-

Smith; George Kubler; Charles Parkhurst; William Styron; Christopher Tunnard; and Lewis Mumford.

10. Laurance Roberts became the first post-war director on 1 November 1946, a post he graced for over 13 years. He was responsible for numerous changes in the composition of the fellows of the academy, instituting fellowships in art history, post-classical humanistic studies, and initiating the inclusion of Italian Fulbright scholars at a US institution in Italy. He and his wife, Isabel, also began a series of fall trips for new fellows to introduce them first to Florence and North Italy, and successively to Naples and the south to visit museums and encounter local scholars and artists. These trips were followed by extended excursions with the professor in charge of the school of classical studies, as well as with day-visits to monuments and museums in and around Rome itself. It was during these trips that a continuing interest in the Roberts, the fellows, and their projects developed, which led to lunches and dinners at the Villa Aurelia where fellows were invited to meet colleagues with related interests from the US, Italy, or abroad.

11. Donlyn Lyndon, department head, with encouragement from Jerome Wiesner, president, MIT, sought to expand subject offerings in the arts for undergraduates and graduates. A program in photography was initiated under the genial leadership of Minor White. His offerings were so popular that registrations were limited, new faculty members were added (Jonathan Greene), and the program increased. A similar experience followed the appointment of documentary filmmaker Richard Leacock, who was at that time engaged in the design of a silent 8mm camera for documentary work. The film section grew to include, among others, Edward Pincus and a number of visiting filmmakers.

12. Students in History, Theory and Criticism may have benefited most from learning the rudiments of architectural design, photography, and filmmaking.

13. Kepes, designer, photographer, and painter, who died in January 2002 at 95, was an admired, respected, and beloved faculty member at MIT in the Department of Architecture from 1945 until his retirement in 1972. Generations of architecture students became aware of a gamut of potential visual experiences and visual experiments in Kepes' inspiring studio subjects.

14. The paired fellowships in art history and conservation were generously supported by grants from the Samuel H. Kress Foundation upon the recommendation of Marilyn Perry, president, and Lisa

Ackerman, vice president.

15. "Michelangelo and St. Peter's: Notes on a Plan of the Attic as Originally Built on the South Hemicycle," *The Burlington Magazine*, Aug 1969:484. As late as 1988, after the publication of several further pieces on Michelangelo and St. Peter's, we once again mentioned a future publication in "Pirro Ligorio, Michelangelo, and St. Peter's," in *Pirro Ligorio, Artist and Antiquarian*, Robert W. Gaston, ed. (Florence: Silvana, 1988), 216.

16. Craig Hugh Smyth was art historian in residence at the Academy the year of our trip to the Casina of Pius IV. The Casina is located about 150 meters north by northeast from the north transept apse of St. Peter's. The Casina, built 1558-61, was begun under Paul IV and designed by Pirro Ligorio and Giovanni Sallustio Peruzzi. The interior decoration includes frescoes by Federico Barocci, Santi di Tito, and Federico Zuccari.

17. Rene Francis Millon, anthropologist, was inducted into the National Academy of Sciences on 27 April 2002, the Saturday preceding the date of this lecture. Rene is perhaps best known for his excavations and mapping of the ancient city of Teotihuacan in Mexico.

18. Graf Metternich directed the Bibliotheca Hertziana in Rome, the immensely valuable German art historical library and research center, when it reopened after World War II. He continued his work in Rome at the Hertziana well after his retirement.

19. The exhibition was the first to be co-sponsored by the Museum of Modern Art and the City of New York. Coincident with the planning of the exhibition was the establishment of the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, through the joint efforts of the Museum of Modern Art and Cornell University. The institute was itself an outgrowth of CASE (Committee of Architects for Study of the Environment) formed several years earlier at Princeton University. The exhibition, *The New City: Architecture and Urban Renewal*, was held at the Museum of Modern Art, January 23-March 13, 1967. The catalogue contained essays by Sidney J. Frigand, Elizabeth Kassler, and Arthur Drexler. The team members and projects from the four institutions included *from Cornell University*: Colin Rowe, Thomas Schumacher, Jerry A. Wells, Alfred H. Koetter, Steven Potters, Michael Schwarting, Carl Stearns, and Frank Oswald (Manhattan north of Central Park); *from Columbia University*: Jaquelin Robertson, Richard Weinstein, Giovanni Pasanella, Jonathan Barnett, Myles Weintraub, Benjamin Mendelsund, George

Terrien, Paul Wang, David Geiger, Michael Kodaras, and Edward Friedman (the area flanking the railroad tracks, from 97th to 134th streets in Harlem); *from Princeton University*: Peter D. Eisenman, Michael Graves, G. Daniel Perry, Stephen Levine, Jay Turnbull, Thomas C. Pritchard, and Russell Swanson (the waterfront in Manhattan along the Hudson River from 125th to 155th streets); and *from MIT*: Stanford Anderson, Robert Goodman, and Henry Millon (East Harlem/South Bronx, Randall's Island and Ward's Island).

20. Records that may not be complete indicate that on 11 June 1974 at the American Academy in Rome, the attendees at the gathering included Joseph Connors, Alfred Frazer, Richard Goldthwaite, Hellmut Hager, William Hood, Elisabeth Kieven, Richard Krautheimer, Henrik Lilius, Wolfgang Lotz, Elisabeth MacDougall, Hayden Maginnis, Tod Marder, Laurie Olin, Howard Saalman, Eberhard Schroeter, Christoph Thoenes, and Richard Tuttle.

21. The exhibitions sponsored by the Palazzo Grassi were *The Renaissance from Brunelleschi to Michelangelo: The Representation of Architecture*, H. A. Millon and V. M. Lampugnani, eds. (Milan: Bompiani, 1994), shown in Venice (Palazzo Grassi), Paris (Musée des monuments français), Washington (National Gallery of Art), and Berlin (Altes Museum); and *The Triumph of the Baroque: Architecture in Europe 1600-1750*, H. A. Millon, ed. (Milan: Bompiani, 1999), shown near Turin (Palazzina di Stupinigi), Montreal (Musée des Beaux Arts), Washington (National Gallery of Art), and Marseilles (La Vieille Charité).

22. Those attending the meeting, together with the institutions they represented, were Jean S. Boggs (Philadelphia Museum of Art), Marvin Eisenberg (University of Michigan), Oleg Grabar (Harvard University), Irving Lavin (Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton), William Loerke, (Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, DC), and Henry Millon (MIT). George Heard Hamilton, Kress Professor and former director of the Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, Williamstown, Massachusetts, presided.

23. At subsequent moments as the Center grew and defined itself, Shreve Simpson, in 1984, became an associate dean for special programs, symposia and their published proceedings, as Susan Barnes joined the staff as an assistant dean for the fellowship program. Therese O'Malley, who replaced the departing Susan Barnes in 1987, has made substantive contributions, first, as assistant dean to the program for fellowships, then, in 1992, as associate dean succeeding Shreve Simpson upon her departure for a curatorial post at the Freer-Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution. Steven Mansbach, "borrowed" from the

National Endowment for the Humanities when Shreve Simpson and Therese O'Malley took sabbatical leaves, and at three other times, offered many shrewd observations and comments about the structure and functioning of the Center. Joanne Pillsbury, assistant dean from 1995-1999, forthrightly examined a range of activities at the Center, and proposed changes. Her "invention" of a fellowship that paired an art historian and conservator drew directly on her own work in Peru. Several times when searches did not result in appointments, the Center was fortunate to be able to borrow individuals from the education division at the Gallery. At different times, both Gail Feigenbaum and Faya Causey assumed responsibilities for the fellowship program. Faya Causey perused the Center's annual report, brochure, and Web site; noted a number of instances of wording and phrasing capable of diverse interpretations; and suggested ameliorative modifications. Irene Zweig Gallas, assistant to the dean during the initial six years, and Helen Tangires for the last 15 years as Center administrator, supervised the operations of the Center with exemplary leadership and care for staff and members of the Center. Helen Tangires' mastery of all aspects of the Center programs and operations is legendary within the gallery.

24. Center projects included development of a cataloguing template for posters from Central and Eastern Europe, supervised by Acting Associate Dean Steven Mansbach with Research Associate Samuel Albert, and a study of the micro tools employed in antiquity for carving amber, shells, and semiprecious stones, supervised by Associate Dean Faya Causey and Research Associates Bjoern Ewald and Alexis Castor.

25. A listing of the 17 participating institutions may be found on pages xiii-xv in Vicki Porter and Robin Thornes, *A Guide to the Description of Architectural Drawings*, (New York: G. K. Hall and Co., 1994; published on behalf of the Getty Art History Information Program).

26. A listing of the five repositories are found in Porter and Thornes (n25 above), xi.

27. See Porter and Thornes (n25 above), xii.

28. See Porter and Thornes (n25 above), xii, for a listing of the repositories and cataloguers in the experimental cataloguing project.

29. Members of the steering committee are found in Porter and Thornes (n25 above), xii.

30. Porter and Thornes (n25 above).

31. As originally constituted, the members of the working group included

Paola Barocchi and Oreste Ferrari (Italy), John Boardman (Great Britain), Nancy Englander and Henry Millon (USA), Willibald Sauerlander (West Germany), Ernst Ullman (East Germany), and Jacques Thuillier (France). *Ex-officio* members from the Bureau (executive committee) of CIHA included Hermann Fillitz (president), Alfred Schmid (treasurer), and Albert Chatelet (scientific secretary). Thuillier served as chair of TAU and Millon as scientific secretary. In 1986, subsequent to the CIHA Congress in Washington, TAU members Barocchi and Sauerlander were replaced by Fillitz (Austria) and Lutz Heusinger (West Germany). Irving Lavin, the new president of CIHA, became an *ex-officio* member of the group.

32. The Italian team included seven members: three from Centro Nazionale delle Ricerche (Rigoletto Bartoli, Irene Campari, and Oreste Signore); two from Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo e la Documentazione (Oreste Ferrari and Serenita Papaldo), and two contract assistants (Giovanna G. Grita and Carlo Magnarapa).

33. Jane ten Brink Goldsmith gathered information about the political, geographic, and ecclesiastical history of Texas. Following the procedures outlined by the team in Rome, she was able to enter the data compiled using an IBM PC System 2 with a commercially available Oracle database program, and to verify the query response capabilities of the program.

34. Serenita Papaldo and Oreste Signore, eds., *Un approccio metodologico per la realizzazione di una banca dati storico-geografica (A Methodological Approach to Producing a Historical/Geographical Database)*, CIHA-Comite International d'Histoire de L'Art (Rome: Multigrafica Editrice, 1989).

35. Jacques Thuillier with the collaboration of Marie Françoise Clergeau, *International Database of Artists' Biographical Data Manual (with an appendix by Lutz Heusinger)*, June 1989. Produced with the support of the Getty Art History Information Program. Translated by John Goodman with the assistance of Murtha Baca, 1992.

36. *Glossarium artis*, bilingual in French and German, published in Munich and Tubingen, now consists of 18 illustrated volumes devoted to terminology of building elements. Jean-Marie Perouse de Montclos, *Architecture: methode et vocabulaire* (Paris: impr. Nationale, 1972). Rene Ginouves and Roland Martin avec la collaboration de Filippo Coarelli et al., *Dictionnaire methodique de l'architecture grecque et romaine* (Athens and Rome: Ecole fran?aise d'Athens/Ecole fran?aise

de Rome, 1985-1992).

37. Benedetta Montevocchi and Sandra Vasco Rocca, eds., *Metodologie di catalogazione Suppellettile ecclesiastica* (Florence: Centro Di, 1989).

38. Lionello G. Boccia, ed., with Natalia Masserano, *Armi difensivi dal Medioevo all'eta moderna* (Florence: Centro Di, 1982). Carlo De Vita, ed., *Armi bianche dal Medioevo all'eta moderna* (Florence: Centro Di, 1983).

39. Mario Gori Sassoli, ed., *La catalogazione informatica delle stampe dell'istituto nazionale per la grafica* (Rome: Palombi, 1995).

40. The founding members included the American Academy in Rome; Canadian Centre for Architecture; Dumbarton Oaks; Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities; J. Paul Getty Museum; Huntington Library, Art Collections and Botanical Gardens; The Metropolitan Museum of Art; National Gallery of Art Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts; Smithsonian Institution; and the Yale Center for British Art.

41. The new members include the American Antiquarian Society; Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution; Clark Art Institute; Freer Gallery of Art and Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution; Frick Collection and Art Reference Library; Georgia O'Keeffe Museum Research Center; Instituto de Investigaciones Esteticas, Mexico City; Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, London; National Gallery of Canada; National Museum of African Art, Smithsonian Institution; Smithsonian American Art Museum; Winterthur Museum, Garden, and Library; and The Wolfsonian, Florida International University. A number of the institutions maintain Web sites.

42. The two-day congress (5-6 November 1999) was preceded by a pre-congress day in which the directors of 13 European institutes described their programs, functions, and administrative liaisons. A second session heard reports from five research institutes in the process of formation. Two have since become functioning institutes: the Centre Allemand d'Histoire de l'Art, Paris, and the Georgia O'Keeffe Museum Research Center, Santa Fe, New Mexico. The four sessions of the Congress addressed "The Role of National Cultural Patrimonies," "The Implications of Nationalism on the Structures of Scholarship," "The Changing Character of Funding," and "The Nature and Consequences of the Globalization of Technology in the Conduct of Advanced Research."

43. An informal association of international research institutes that met during the international congresses of the history of art included the German institutes in Munich, Florence, and Rome; the Courtauld Institute, London; Netherlands Institute, The Hague; Institut Neerlandais, Paris; Swiss Institute, Zurich; Cini Foundation, Venice; National Institute of Archaeology and Art History, Rome; and the Instituto de Investigaciones Esteticas, Mexico City. When funding for travel was forthcoming, the group included institutes or academies from Warsaw, Prague, and Budapest. RIAH now includes 18 members.

44. See the Van Eyck project of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague.

45. The list of participating schools of architecture varies slightly from year to year. Most years there are students and faculty from Italy, France, England, Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, and the US. Special efforts, sometimes successful, were made to invite students and faculty members from Central and Eastern Europe.

46. The meetings were held at Dumbarton Oaks on 9-10 February (funded by The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation), and at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences on 22-23 June 1978 (funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities). A blizzard in New England kept many from attending the session in Washington. The second session enabled a follow-up to the joint meeting, as well as participation of those who had been snowed in. *Corners of a Foreign Field* includes material from both sessions.

47. In addition to the centers with representatives serving on the steering committee, the founding centers included the American Institutes for Indian Studies, and for Pakistan Studies; the American School of Classical Studies, Athens; the American Schools of Oriental Research; and the Universities Service Center, Hong Kong. Application for membership by the American Institute for Maghrib Studies was approved at the second annual meeting.

48. Elizabeth Moynihan's counsel and support were pivotal in seeking congressional support for CAORC.

49. Nancy Jones (Cambridge), Christine Pontano Young (Rome), Irene Zweig Gallas and Helen Tangires (Washington) eased with firmness and tact a multitude of administrative details. John Sawyer, president of The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation at the time the Center was being formed, pointed out that the professional staff would probably need

research assistance to maintain any scholarly credibility. Research assistants and associates who searched for literature, photographs, models, paintings, drawings, and prints in libraries, archives, and collections in the US and abroad contributed materially to scholarly products from the Center. These cherished colleagues included Alison Luchs (1980-82), Deborah Wilde (1982-86), Anne Gilkerson (1986-87), Tracy Cooper (1987-90), Sabine Eiche (1989-), Christine Challingsworth (1990-1993; 1997-1999), Isabel Frank (1992-1993), Francesca Consagra (1993-1996), Bart Thurber (1996-1998), and Giuseppe Dardanella (1998-2001).