

The composition of the final version of Ricci's Solomon painting is thus more simple and static than that of the *bozzetto*. As if to compensate for the simplification of the composition, Ricci added to the final version numerous new details. He introduced among the audience several highly individualized figures, among which a stout man with a red beretto, who has attracted the attention of writers on this painting as a possible self-portrait (Daniels 1976, p. 149).

The simple stepped platform upon which Solomon is standing in the *bozzetto*, was elaborately redesigned in the final version and decorated with classical reliefs, and an ornate throne was added on its right side. The empty throne emphasizes the particular meaning of the standing-striding posture of the king, illustrating I Reg. VIII,22: "And Solomon stood before the altar of the Lord in the presence of all the congregation of Israel" (see also 55). The altar and the Ark were decorated with classical motifs too, and carved Cherubim appear on the quoins of the latter, probably as an allusion to the decoration of the Tabernacle as it is described in the biblical account of the installation of the Tabernacle in the Holy of the Holies (6-8).

All these elaborate details could not, however save the Solomon painting from some negative remarks by later critics, from Cochin to Palluchini, to whom the dense composition appeared to be also confused and cluttered (Charles-Nicolas Cochin, *Voyage D'Italie*, vol. III, Paris 1758, reprinted Geneve 1972, p. 103; Derschau 1922, p. 121; Rodolfo Palluchini, *La pittura veneziana del Settecento*, Venice-Rome 1960, p. 16, cited by Daniels and Rizzi).

Had Sebastiano followed more closely the composition of the *bozzetto* of the Solomon painting, he might perhaps have avoided the negative judgement of posterity.

Avraham Ronen

I am grateful to Dr. Benjamin Arbel, Prof. Henning Bock, Prof. Cristina de Benedictis, Robin A. Harms, Prof. Rudolf Kuhn, Dr. Erich Schleier, and, particularly, to Doron Lurie, for their kind and prompt help.

Tagungen

ARTE, HISTORIA E IDENTIDAD EN AMÉRICA:
VISIONES COMPARATIVAS
C. I. H. A. COLLOQUIUM XVII

Zacatecas/México, Museo Pedro Coronel, 22. bis 27. September 1993

In the last week of September 1993, approximately two hundred fifty scholars from twenty countries gathered in the colonial city of Zacatecas, Mexico, to

attend the XVII International Colloquium in the History of Art. Held under the auspices of the Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art, and organized by the Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, the conference was dedicated to the theme of "Comparative Visions: Art, History, and Identity in America." In all there were almost eighty papers delivered, gathered under the general headings of "America, a Theme for Art", "The Problem of National Schools", "The Presence of European Artistic Modernity in the Americas", and "Art in the Americas: Methods and Objects of Study". By virtue of the number of participants, scope of papers, and passion of debate, this colloquium constituted a signal intellectual event and marked a major enhancement of earlier art historical conferences organized in Latin America. This international gathering also revealed many of the contemporary challenges and fissures within the discipline: ideological, methodological, and practical.

The most unavoidable reality of the conference, and one which affected every aspect of its organization and implementation, is the enormity of the "Americas": geographically, conceptually, and historically. In attempting to embrace the scale, complexity, and resonance of whatever the "Americas" once meant and may signify today, the organizers were faced with a monumental challenge. First, just bringing together "American" scholars was both a heroic undertaking and one of the conference's greatest achievements. The physical distance between Canada in the north and Chile or Argentina in the south is so great that only rarely do researchers manage to meet. Indeed, the geographical span between north and south is comparable to the distance between Zacatecas and Germany, the most distant represented European country. Yet scholars managed, many with a travel subvention provided by the Getty Grant Program, to come to Zacatecas to participate in this largest ever art historical conference in Latin America.

The monumental geographical expanse from north to south is paralleled in the magnitude of difference in regard to resources, opportunities, and especially traditions among North, Central, and South American art historians; and these were also evident in Zacatecas. In terms of numbers alone, the disparity between North and South is notable. For example, in Ecuador there are but four art historians who hold the doctorate; in Peru only a few more. Even in Argentina, the South American country most richly endowed with departments of art history and archaeology, the numbers of Ph. D. degrees both awarded to and possessed by art historians is quite modest, certainly when compared to the relatively greater quantity not only in the United States but in Canada whose population is in fact considerably smaller than that of Argentina.

But it is not just in numbers that the differences are striking. In resources such as libraries, research grants, university departments, and so forth, the nations located south of Mexico are, as a group, less well-endowed with resources than those in North America. This has considerable consequence for the practice, stature, and significance of art history, as evidenced at the Zacatecas conference; for what became most clear is that art history in Latin America is very much in a crucial transitional phase in which the discipline is appraising its status, role, and

responsibilities as these countries continue their development into free market, liberal democracies. Despite enhanced openness, almost all the Latin American nations must contend with quite circumscribed resources: small numbers of research scholars, limited academic resources, and scarce funds for travel, acquisition of books, and for "non-native" art. Possibly as a result of these conditions, as well as from other factors, there was evident at Zacatecas a high level of nationalism, and not just among Latin American scholars.

Much of the scholarly attention at the XVII International Colloquium was focussed on the art and cultural monuments of the respective Latin American countries, an emphasis that was reflected most emphatically in the conference theme, "The Problem of National Schools." Within this organizing topic, one should remark on the manifestation of a unusual form of national chauvinism. This was reflected not in terms of affirming the superiority of one country's art over that of another nation; rather it was often expressed as a belief in scholarly entitlement or privileged access to a nation's art. Through vociferous questioning, challenging debate, and passionate discussion, it became evident that for many of the conference participants – particularly those working professionally in Latin America – one's nationality either entitled one to or excluded one from a just consideration of a nation's cultural artifacts, traditions, or monuments. Thus were pointed questions addressed to such disparate talks as, for example, those on the modern Mexican artist J. G. Posada or on Spanish colonial retablos or on the meanings of the railroad in the landscape. The charged questions from the audience interrogated the presenter not just on the wholly legitimate internal merits or faults of the respective talk but also on the appropriateness of the speaker, by virtue of his or her nationality, to investigate this subject. All too frequently one detected a conviction in the validity of "nativeness" as the source of a unique form of sensitivity and intellectual subtlety.

It may be appropriate in light of the above to affirm that familiarity with a subject, its history and context, is a prerequisite for scholarship; but this is not conveyed by grace of nationality. Rather, it results from conscientious study and experience. Nationality might be an advantage; it may even provide a special insight. It is, however, not an academic enfranchisement. (This partiality is, of course, in no way limited to any single region, discipline, or tradition. Indeed, it is manifested in most parts of the globe, perhaps at present most disturbingly in the new, post-Soviet "democracies" in east central and eastern Europe.)

In Zacatecas, many participants from the United States, Canada, and of course Europe were actively engaged in assessing the historical and contemporary art and art history of Mexico, Argentina, Chile, and other (modern) nations of the Western Hemisphere. These exercises were not infrequently challenged in the often lengthy discussions following the individual papers. It was not unusual for a passionate debate to take place when, for instance, an Uruguayan would speak about Mexican muralism or an Argentinean would address colonial or pre-conquest art in Chile or Brazil. What one witnessed in sometimes sharp exchanges was a type national possessiveness, if not chauvinism, whereby South

American scholars were less challenged when they tended to limit their focus rather jealously to their own countries, even when the subject transcended the borders of the modern polities. This was in notable opposition to the majority of North American and European speakers who, regardless of conference session, examined issues of consequence that often ignored contemporary political boundaries.

As remarked above, occasionally one detected from the audience resentment for what might be expressed as (misplaced) "cultural imperialism." This was most evident in the discussion period following talks delivered by scholars from North America (including Mexico) and Europe. Ironically, there was little opportunity in Zacatecas, a most elegant and impressive colonial city, to address forthrightly the issue of imperialism and its consequences, both positive and negative. With not a single speaker from the former colonial power of Portugal and only one presenter from Spain, who spoke quite convincingly on the impingement of "America" on early modern *European* culture, there was little dialogue between Iberian scholars and those from Latin America. The numerous lectures on the transposition, adaptation, and reinvention of Iberian artistic forms and cultural practices in Latin America were to a significant degree delivered by U. S. scholars who addressed topics ranging from the "Combination of European and American Cosmological Imagery in Mexican Ritual Ceramics" to "Terra-cotta, a Conduit to the New World for Mudejar Vision."

The truly international breadth of the conference was most clearly evident in the papers gathered in the session devoted to the "Presence of European Artistic Modernity in the Americas." Here, German, Canadian, Belgian, U. S., British, and a host of Latin American speakers explored essential aspects of the transmission of European culture to and the complex effects on the existing patterns of social organization, urban structure, educational organization and visual presentation in the New World.

In some respects, this session was a model for what the organizers must have had in mind for the conference as a whole. For here comparative visions were most explicitly stated, analyzed, and debated. Here, the scope of topics was the most richly varied and issues of national identity, cultural expression, and historical interpretation most passionately contested. Indeed, this session on the "Presence of European Artistic Modernity in the Americas" revealed most clearly both the state of contemporary scholarship and the direction of its potential development. It demonstrated the wealth of methods, the variety of sources, and the scope of concerns that engage the interests and animate the research of scholars in and outside Latin American who are professionally committed to understanding the interplay between visual imagery and the various American contexts in which art was produced, received, and at times rejected. Moreover, this session, more I think than the others, demonstrated the degree to which the contemporary practice of art history has overcome provinciality, if not partisanship. Speakers and audience grappled with issues which resonated beyond the Americas to treat forthrightly many of the intellectual challenges facing the dis-

cipline: how is, can, or should art history function as a humanistic discipline? how or should one recognize art history in its political or ideological dimensions? what role or responsibility has art history in the establishment and transmission of classical canons or normative values? among many other questions.

In light of the breadth and consequence of the topics, the passionate exchange of opinions, and the number of participants, the Zacatecas meeting will doubtless be a stimulus to the practice of art history in Latin America and beyond. Further, the meeting likely will encourage Latin American scholars to push beyond their traditional academic and ideological borders, not by emulating colleagues from Europe or North America but by establishing new frameworks of reference through which to engage the artistic traditions and artifacts of their own countries. On the other hand, scholars from outside the Americas or those from North America will necessarily take into account the intellectual vitality of the discipline as pursued by colleagues throughout the Western Hemisphere. Thus will this seventeenth "Coloquio Internacional de Historia del Arte" not only have provided the intended comparative visions of art in the Americas, but it will have enlarged the horizons of contemporary art history in general.

Steven A. Mansbach

Ausstellungen

LUDOVICO CARRACCI

Bologna, Museo Civico Archeologico (25. September - 12. Dezember 1993), danach Fort Worth/Texas, Kimbell Art Museum (22. Januar - 10. April 1994). Katalog hrsg. von Andrea Emiliani. Bologna, Nuova Alfa Editoriale 1993. 365 S. mit vielen, überwiegend farbigen Abbildungen (in der Ausstellung: 60.000 Lire).

(mit sieben Abbildungen)

"Lodovico Carracci is a main representative of the inaugural phase (des Barock – Anm. d. Autors) – on his art is based to a great extent the development of the Bolognese school, which in the works of Guido Reni and Guercino won worldwide fame. To understand this important branch in the evolution of seventeenth-century painting, therefore we must understand the art of Lodovico", schrieb Walter Friedländer in seiner Rezension der bislang einzigen, 1939 erschienen Ludovico-Carracci-Monographie von Heinrich Bodmer (in: *Art Bulletin* 24, 1942, p. 195).

Sah Friedländer Ludovicos Werk somit eher noch als eine Art ästhetischer Vorhalle zur Malerei eines Reni oder Guercino an, zu deren besserem Verständnis der Älteste der drei Carracci (1555-1619) brückenhaft hinführen