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Editor’s Foreword

CATHY CALLAWAY

Let me begin by expressing sincere thanks to Nancy and David Bedan for their financial support of the printing and mailing costs associated with *Muse, the Annual of the Museum of Art and Archaeology*. Their contribution is deeply appreciated by many. *Muse* is available online (https://maa.missouri.edu/muse and perhaps that is how you are reading this), but mailing it to the many international places with which we have a publications exchange program is key to sharing knowledge about the Museum and its collections.

The previous *Muse* (2017) was the last issue under the expert editorship of Dr. Jane Biers. Following in her footsteps is a daunting task, but she has already given me good advice and I hope for more. We also have an excellent editorial board, listed in the front of this issue. Dr. Biers has served as editor of *Muse* beginning with volumes 33, 34, & 35, 1999–2001, up to volume 51, 2017. While interim director (September 2004–April 2006; more on her connection to the Museum in About the Authors, p. 75), she edited three triple issues of *Muse*, bringing the series up to date. With the hiring of a permanent director for the Museum she offered to continue editing this journal as a volunteer and published nine additional issues of *Muse*, ending her editorship with last year’s. We are all grateful to her selfless donation of time, effort, funds, and expertise.

Jane followed a line of distinguished editors. Gladys D. Weinberg is listed as the editor of the first issue of *Muse*, in 1967. The director of the Museum (which then was located on the fourth floor of Ellis Library) was Saul Weinberg. The goal of the publication was to present the acquisitions of 1966 and “to illustrate a representative selection.” In addition, it was hoped the journal would contain “a continuing series of studies of individual objects or groups of objects” that would “present the scholarly work of the University in a form suitable for the much larger public.” Saul and Gladys Weinberg recognized the importance of the Museum to the community as well as to the University.

The first article in this issue of *Muse* was originally published in 2002 in *Ancient Journeys: A Festschrift in Honor of Eugene Numa Lane*. The entire collection of essays is now available on the University of Missouri Libraries MOspace: https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/handle/10355/70075

“Tapping Hooves: Small Bronze Figures of Dance-Loving Pan” is reprinted here to honor its author, Jane Biers.
Museums can offer an illusion of constancy, a sense of imperturbable order conferred, in part, by the ongoing demands of collections stewardship and consistency of mission over time. Such constancy of outcome often requires endless readjustment and adaptation, and over the course of 2018 the Museum of Art and Archaeology remained true to its mission and mandate through continuing adaptations. We faced many of the same challenges confronting other museums, and it’s a measure of the professionalism and commitment of the Museum’s staff that we not only maintained the same quality of programs and services but for the second year in a row were named by American Art Awards as one of the twenty-five best museums and galleries in the nation. We offer the people of the region access to a world of art and remain the only accredited museum in the University system and in mid-Missouri; individual staff members were recognized both for their outstanding contributions to the University as a whole and for their excellence within their respective disciplines. In many ways those accomplishments are more hard-won and meaningful, but the external accolades are welcome too.

Constancy of mission does not mean static and unchanging; engaging audiences and addressing their changing needs requires innovation and creativity, and over the course of the year we offered a range of exhibitions geared to different audiences at different levels. The year opened with Electrify!, a traveling juried exhibition of works by emerging artists with disabilities (Fig. 1). Organized by VSA, the Kennedy Center, and the Volkswagen Group of America, the show featured fifteen works by artists between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five. The exhibition was supported by a range of programming.

Fig. 1. Museum docent Lisa Jerry and children experiencing Brianna Beck’s artwork Negotiating Space: Othered by Design during the Electrify! exhibition. Photo: Cathy Callaway
and outreach activities, and coincidently in 2018 the Museum of Art and Archaeology and its sister museum, the Museum of Anthropology, proudly became the first entities in the larger University of Missouri System to be certified as “Autism-Friendly Businesses” by the Thompson Center for Autism and Neurodevelopmental Disorders. Museum staff and docents also received additional training in welcoming visitors with disabilities to the galleries and in interpretive techniques for meeting the needs of differently abled individuals.

Japonisme in Print: Japanese Style in Western Culture—part of a continuing series of exhibitions examining both the development and influence of ukiyo-e Japanese woodblock prints—continued from November 2017 until the beginning of April 2018. Juxtaposing works by Japanese masters like Utagawa Kunisada and Andō Hiroshige with European and American artists like Mary Cassatt and Henri Rivière, the exhibition asked viewers both to appreciate works on their own merits and to explore issues of influence and artistic appropriation. Page-Turners: Medieval and Early Modern Illustration also continued from late 2017, closing in mid-May. Including illuminated manuscripts, incunabula, and broadsheets, the exhibition was jointly organized by Alisa McCusker, curator of European and American art, and graduate assistant Christina Wytko. It reexamined the mutualism of word and image—a theme of long-standing interest to the Museum.

In mid-April we added a small exhibition of rarely seen Pre-Columbian pottery drawn from the permanent collections of both the Museum of Art and Archaeology and the Museum of Anthropology. The first installation of Pre-Columbian Pottery from the Museums’ Collections focused on Chancay and Chimú ceramics from the north and central coast of ancient Peru; later installations, focusing on Nazca and Moche Peruvian pottery, as well as Mayan and West Mexico ceramics, are planned.

Later in April the Museum reinstalled its modern galleries. Seeing Anew: A Reinterpretation of Modern and Contemporary Artworks from the Permanent Collection opened on April 21 to very positive reviews. Focusing mainly on works after 1950, the reinstallation brought back some old favorites alongside hidden gems from storage and added an area of the gallery dedicated to regularly changing displays of recent works on paper. The initial offerings on paper included Keith Crown’s 1993 homage to the Museum, photographs by Diane Arbus and Cindy Sherman, and a full-body print by Koo Kyung Sook. The next rotation, Mid-Twentieth-Century Photography, opened in September and featured works by Brassai, Werner Bischof, Dorothea Lange, Larry Clark, and Henry Edward Weston, among others. We followed that rotation with Vasarely’s Cosmic Visions (December 2018–May 2019), which presented all of the works from Vasarely’s 1959 serigraph portfolio honoring astrophysicist Alexandre Dauvillier—and let us encourage visitors to enjoy the Quadrantid, Lyrids, and Eta Aquariids meteor showers, as well as the lunar eclipse of January, 2019, all of which occurred during the run of the show.

Studies in Classical Beauty, organized by curator of ancient art Benton Kidd, opened in May. Examining the classical tradition through the lens of later art, the exhibition featured works from the sixteenth to early twentieth centuries and included works by Giovanni
Battista Cipriani, Tommaso Minardi, Otto van Veen, and Arthur Bowen Davies, among others. It neatly encapsulated the Museum’s dual nature, simultaneously embracing archaeology of the classical world and art.

Later in the year we opened *British Humour: Satirical Prints of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* (Fig. 2). Featuring works by leading caricaturists and visual satirists, the show included a selection of works by William Hogarth, James Gillray, and George Cruikshank. The exhibition and accompanying didactic materials explored the role of satire in democracies—especially as parrhesia in response to false rhetoric. The irony of such an exhibition now, in an age when satire cannot keep pace with reality, was lost on no one.

That calendar was supplemented by a range of public programming: nine formal lectures including programs by Barry Bergey, retired director of the Folk and Traditional Arts Program of the National Endowment for the Arts, and Briana Beck, one of the artists included in the *Electrify!* exhibition, and supplemented by talks from MU faculty members Anne Stanton and Michael Yonan, graduate assistant Christina Wytko, and curators Benton Kidd and Alisa McCusker. More than twenty other public programs were offered, ranging from exhibition openings to in-gallery concerts organized in collaboration with the MU School of Music, and from the student-organized, juried Art After Dark art show to the Museum Associates’ Annual Crawfish Boil. While a full listing appears in the back-matter of this issue, several merit special mention. Staff of Services for Independent Living offered a February program on “Creating and Creative Access for Artists with Disabilities” in the Museum galleries, engaging staff, docents, and the public with how different abilities do not prevent or constrain creative efforts—especially if we’re creative.

![Fig. 2. British Humour 2018 flyer by Bruce Cox](image)
in our approaches and accommodations. Later in February we collaborated with the Ars Nova Singers of the MU School of Music for our annual Music and Art Concert, bringing together works of art and works of music that examine, express, or reflect similar themes, periods, or styles. Continuing that musical theme, in May we offered a traditional Irish music concert in the galleries through the Missouri Folk Arts Program, and musicians Eimear Arkins, Rowan Elliot, and KT Elliott did a superb job (Fig 3). November’s gallery concert featuring MU’s Gypsy Jazz Trio would have done Django Reinhardt proud. I’d like to specifically acknowledge the Museum Advisory Council of Students, led by Brianna Veal (president) and Chelsey Brown (vice president) for organizing the Art After Dark juried art show (Fig. 4).

Fig. 3. Rowan Elliott (flute), Eimear Arkins (fiddle), and KT Elliott (harp) performed a series of reels and songs at the Museum. Rowan Elliott (apprentice) and Eimear Arkins (master artist) participated in the Traditional Arts Apprenticeship Program in FY2018, where they focused for months on the Irish Sean nós singing tradition. Photo: Deborah A. Bailey

Fig. 4. First Place Award at Art After Dark went to Yuhuai Hu for his artwork, *Father*. Photo: Cathy Callaway
The Art of the Book Club, sponsored by Museum Associates, continued its ongoing programs, with titles including *Anthropologist on Mars*, *People of the Book*, *Portland Vase*, *The Muralist*, and a special film screening of 2017’s *Faces Places*. Given the Museum’s long-standing interest in ekphrastic writing, the reciprocity of word and image, and its multiple exhibition and publications examining the art of the book, the Club’s continuing programs are both an ideal complement to the Museum’s mission and an excellent means of broadening our reach to new audiences and placing art into different and more accessible contexts.

Family programs included docent-led tours on topics ranging from “How Things Are Made” to “Glass through the Ages,” and from “The Kress Collection” to “Art in Jane Austen’s World.” The Museum’s docents are a remarkable group and serve as the public face of the Museum for many of our visitors. They lead a range of programs and tours throughout the year for groups of all kinds, but these thematic tours are special, not least because the subjects, artworks, and approach are decided by individual docents based on their own interests, enthusiasms, and background. As a result, they offer monthly opportunities for visitors to see old collections and existing exhibitions in new ways, with different approaches and topics regularly showcased, while also allowing the docents to indulge their passions and share their knowledge.

Events for children—beyond the school-based programming that remains the mainstay of Museum educational offerings—included special programs on the elements of art, sketching, individual artists like Picasso (Fig. 5), and “Art in Bloom for Kids,” at the Museum’s annual Art in Bloom event in March. We also participated in Slow Art Day, National Day without Art, Museum Day (in partnership with the Smithsonian Institution), Archaeology Day (in partnership with the Archaeological Institution), and...
Institute of America), and World Anthropology Day (in partnership with the American Anthropological Association) (Fig. 6).

The Ad Hoc Film Series provided a sidelight on Museum exhibitions and programs by offering a diverse array of free films, ranging from Ingmar Bergman’s 1966 classic \textit{Persona} to Greer Garson and Laurence Olivier in \textit{Pride and Prejudice}. Some were just fun, like Gabriel Pascal’s 1945 \textit{Caesar and Cleopatra}, which hews closely to the original George Bernard Shaw play, or the 1978 version of Agatha Christie’s \textit{Death on the Nile}, with Peter Ustinov, Bette Davis, Mia Farrow, Angela Lansbury, David Niven, and Maggie Smith. In between were some more challenging works, such as Derek Jarman’s \textit{Caravaggio}, Anthony Minghella’s \textit{The English Patient}, and Mick Jackson’s \textit{Temple Grandin}.

But beyond celebrating creativity, the Museum also cultivates it. One of my deepest pleasures is walking through the Gallery of Greek and Roman casts while art students are drawing works. I peer over their shoulders (hopefully not too obviously) and appreciate their growing skill and mastery, moving from one to another, intrigued by the works they selected, the perspective they chose to represent, and the elements they chose to highlight or explore. This year, through the efforts of longtime Museum friend Stacey Thompson and with the support of Museum Associates, we launched a monthly sketching group for the public. No particular talent or experience is required. While we’ve always welcomed members of the public who wished to sketch in the galleries, this program actively encourages sketching by providing both materials and the camaraderie of like-minded persons, and its popularity is growing. And it gives me more opportunities for vicarious appreciation.

We’ve also begun a collaborative program with the University of Missouri’s School of Medicine to use visual thinking strategies and related techniques to help train the observational skills and acuity of medical students. The Art and Medicine Experience

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Electrify!
visiting artist, Brianna Beck talking with visitors during World Anthropology Day. Photo: Cathy Callaway}
\caption{Fig. 6. Electrify!
visiting artist, Brianna Beck talking with visitors during World Anthropology Day. Photo: Cathy Callaway}
\end{figure}
(AME) was organized with the support of Dr. Kevin Craig, associate professor of Clinical Family and Community Medicine and medical director of Supportive and Palliative Care for the University of Missouri Health Care, and we gratefully acknowledge his continuing friendship and support.

In addition to on-site exhibitions, the Museum made its collections accessible to other audiences through loans. Some were proximate—we have an ongoing loan program to the University’s Ellis Library, where rotating displays of antiquities from the Museum’s collections are shown in a case on the first floor—but most engage audiences further afield. The St. Louis Art Museum, for example, borrowed four ancient Peruvian textiles from the Museum’s Pre-Columbian collections for its Balance and Opposition in Ancient Peruvian Textiles exhibition. During roughly the same period, we loaned Joseph Delaney’s Low Key (ca.1945) to the Knoxville Museum of Art for Joseph Delaney: On the Move. And in the fall we loaned Winold Reiss’ iconic Harlem Girl (ca.1925) to the Columbus Museum of Art for its I Too Sing America: The Harlem Renaissance at 100. Through these and other programs (including Muse) the Museum’s programs and offerings reach far beyond mid-Missouri.

The Museum’s collections continued to grow, including several notable additions to the Museum’s Missouri holdings. We acquired two marvelous Thomas Hart Benton sketches from 1959, part of an attempt by Benton to explain to Sidney Larson the ways in which El Greco used balance and mass in composing his paintings. As far as I can tell, they’re sketches based on El Greco’s St Peter from the Monastero dell’Escorial, San Lorenzo de El Escorial in Madrid and Christ Carrying the Cross, either from the Lehman collection at the Metropolitan Museum, the Prado, or the Museu Nacional D’Art de Catalunya (all of which hold similar versions). They offer a lovely insight into one artist trying to explain to another the creative logic of a third. The gift of Dr. and Mrs. James Rogers, the drawings belie Benton’s carefully cultivated image as native curmudgeon and underscore his deep study and knowledge of European tradition.

Another intriguing Missouri work acquired in 2018 is a George Caleb Bingham portrait of Samuel Tribble Crews, painted in the 1830s. The gift of Will and Carlynn Ferguson, and acquired with the assistance of Pam Hufstutter, the work was thought to have been lost in a fire at the family home in 1930. Damaged rather than destroyed, it was later restored by Sid Larson of Columbia College, and we look forward to additional study to further document restored versus original areas and the full biography of this remarkable work. The Museum also received two gelatin silver prints by WPA-era American photographer Russell Lee. Daughter of Sharecropper in Corner to Shack Home, La Forge, Missouri (ca. 1935) and Man in Chair (1936) are welcome additions, received through the generosity of Linda Wheeler.

Beyond these Missouri-related works, the Museum also received an intaglio and photointaglio print on paper from Missouri artist and retired professor of art at the University, Brooke Cameron (who, I am proud to say, has joined the Museum docent corps). Trail of Tears: Chief John Ross and Mary Brian Stapler Ross and Sequoyah (2014) becomes the fourth of Cameron’s prints in the Museum’s permanent collections.
Norman Land, professor emeritus of Renaissance art at the University of Missouri, generously donated two Richard Smith color lithographs with collage, *Orange* (1971) and *Composition with Triangles* (1976). Two Richard Helmick (longtime University of Missouri faculty member in the Art Department) computer-generated serigraphs on paper (*Bluffs and Pinnacles II* and *Hills*) were transferred from the University’s Ellis Library to the Museum’s collection. Christine Montgomery, a University staff member, and her spouse, Greg Olson, donated the Ellen Lanyon ink print on paper *Mount St Helens May 18 1980*. One Mel Kishner watercolor and a Robert von Neumann oil on canvas were added to the Museum’s collections through the generosity of museum educator Cathy Callaway, in memory of her parents, Joan and Rolland Callaway; I was personally delighted to see the von Neumann work (*In the Stables*, undated) as von Neumann had been one of my mother’s teachers. One watercolor by Don Nice, *Oceanside North, Palm Beach (Looking South)* (1998) and an oil on canvas painting by Hunt Slonem, *Abraham’s Peace Offering* (1998) were transferred from the University of Missouri School of Journalism. David Schenker, associate professor of classics at the University, donated a nineteenth-century American work, *Portrait of Sadie Moutran*. All of these additions to our holdings were through the generosity of the Museum’s many friends and supporters, and we are deeply grateful. [Ed. Note: many of these works can be seen in the backmatter in this issue.]

In addition to these donations, the Museum acquired one work by purchase: Katherine Sherwood’s *Blind Venus (for G)* (2018). In her complex and multivalent work that touches on issues of disability, beauty, and objectification, Sherwood uses acrylic and mixed media

---

Fig 7. Katherine Sherwood (American, b.1952) *Blind Venus (for G)*, 2018, 228.6 x 289.56 cm, acrylic and mixed media on recycled linen (2018.7.1) Gilbreath-McLorn Museum Fund. Photo: Erin Pruhs
on repurposed teaching reproductions of great works from the Western canon to create a stylized version of Titian’s *Venus of Urbino*, with a face made up of medical scans of Sherwood’s own crania (Fig. 7). The work was a focal point in the Museum’s exhibition *Objectified: The Female Form and the Male Gaze* organized by curator of European and American art Alisa McCusker, which opened in early 2019, and served as a fitting way to end a year beginning with *Electrify!*, showcasing the work of younger artists with different abilities.


Museum staff also remain engaged and productive professionals within our respective disciplines. Registrar Linda Endersby served as treasurer of the Missouri Association of Museums and Archives, and as secretary of the Midwest Registrars Association and coeditor of *Courier*, its newsletter. She also serves as a board member of the Coalition of State Museum Associations as well as a member of the national program committees.
for both the American Alliance of Museums and the American Association for State and Local History. In addition to editing Muse, Cathy Callaway leads the Museum’s educational efforts, serves as assistant editor of the Museum’s membership magazine, and helped coordinate the participation of seven docent presentations as part of the annual Music and Art concert. This year she also combined two related events—National Museum Day (sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution) and International Archaeology Day (sponsored by the Archaeological Institute of America)—that fall in later September and mid-October, respectively. The combination proved a success and was less confusing for visitors and less taxing for the many local partners we engage to help with the celebration (Fig. 8).

For my part, I am currently president of the ten-thousand-member American Anthropological Association, as well as serving on the Cultural Heritage Committee of the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), as part of discussions between AIA and other archaeological organizations with the Association of Art Museum Directors regarding orphaned objects and undocumented antiquities. I was an instructor (along with Max Anderson, Josh Knerly, and Victoria Reed) for a joint AAMD/AIA/National Geographic Society workshop on determining provenance for antiquities. I served as a delegate to the World Council of Anthropological Associations, as a peer-elected expert member of the International Council on Monuments and Sites’ (ICOMOS) International Scientific Committees on Archaeology and Heritage Management and Conservation of Earthen Architectural Heritage, respectively, and became an associate member of the ICOMOS

![Fig. 8. Museum and Archaeology Day (MAD) 2018 flyer by Bruce Cox](image-url)
International Scientific Committee on Legal, Administrative, and Financial Issues. I served as a member of the national social sciences advisory board for Southern New Hampshire University’s online education programs, and was on the advisory board for the Lewis Binford archive at Truman State University. I was president of the Missouri Phi Beta Kappa chapter and convener of the Heritage in Motion panel (on behalf of the Interamerican Cultural Heritage Working Group) for the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences’ (IUAES) Committee on Intangible Cultural Heritage. Finally, I served as a visiting reviewer for the Harvard University board of overseers and as a Museum Assessment Program visiting peer reviewer for the American Alliance of Museums—it was a busy year.

The Museum’s preparation staff remains equally engaged, albeit at a more local level. Chief preparator Barb Smith and preparator Matt Smith contribute countless hours to projects throughout the campus and the community, ranging from creating frames for and hanging replica works at the Chancellor’s Residence to assisting with Columbia’s renowned True/False Documentary Film Festival. Because of their quiet professionalism—and their exquisite care and preparation—their work too often passes unnoticed because it seems so integral and natural. But it is noticed, and gratefully appreciated. Barb Smith was honored in the spring as the recipient of the University-wide Chancellor’s Outstanding Staff award for 2017–2018 (Fig. 9). It was a richly deserved recognition of her work and her professionalism, and “Team Smith” deserves many more such accolades.

Fig. 9. Award Ceremony with University of Missouri Chancellor Alexander Cartwright (left), honoree Barb Smith (center), and Nathan Willett, 2017–18 President of Missouri Students Association (right). Photo: Alisa McCusker
Since the Museum is located off-campus, and the depth of its collections are of interest to and serve an audience far beyond our region, the Museum has been actively working to digitize its collections and make all works available online. This year we launched the public collections portal (http://maacollections.missouri.edu), and registrar Linda Endersby and collections specialist Erin Pruhs continue to add content, correct records, and fine-tune the user interface. We’re grateful to the federal Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS) for their multi-year support of the project. We also received a new IMLS award in 2018 to support rehousing portions of the Museum’s growing print collection.

We’re proud to be the home to the Missouri Folk Arts Program (MFAP), one of the most celebrated programs of its kind anywhere in the nation. Program director Lisa Higgins and Folk Arts specialist Deborah Bailey served artists, community scholars, and organizations in all ten regions of the state. With the Doniphan Neighborhood Assistance Program, MFAP organized two days of events that explored and showcased local traditions in Ripley County and south-central Missouri. MFAP launched its Show Me Folk project, a series of regional field surveys conducted by visiting folklorists and project staff. Visiting folklorist Thomas Grant Richardson organized artist interviews in a dozen northern Missouri counties, making plans to document old-time music, quilting, blacksmithing, and new immigrant foodways. The Traditional Arts Apprenticeship Program continued in its thirty-third year, hosting eight apprenticeships that featured an array of art forms: luthiery, Irish Sean-nós, three old-time music traditions, white oak basket making (Fig. 10), Bharatanatyam (the oldest classical dance tradition of India), and Ozark storytelling.

![Fig. 10. Aaron Holsapple (left) helps a young visitor try a hand at weaving a white oak basket at the annual Museum/Archaeology Day. Holsapple apprenticed to Joe and Alice Dudenhoeffer in the Traditional Arts Apprenticeship Program, where they taught him basket making from tree to basket. Photo: Deborah A. Bailey](image-url)
Much of the work of the Museum is supported by external, peer-reviewed grants, and as University support has declined, those grants become still more important. External grants increased by 11 percent from 2017 and supported programs of the Missouri Folk Arts Program, digitization of museum collections, rehousing of works on paper, and programmatic support for Museum exhibitions. In an age of increasingly competitive grant programs and dwindling sources for external support, the Museum’s continued success in garnering external support is a source of pride. That level of grant solicitation and administration would not be practical without the yeoman work of Carol Geisler, the Museum’s fiscal officer, who constantly juggles the deadlines and reporting requirements of multiple bureaucracies, each with its own, often-contradictory, demands.

The Museum’s docent corps continued its exemplary service, and we welcomed four new docents to its ranks—J. Wayne Merrill, Alice Landrum, Barb Montgomery, and Janet Elmore. In addition to the themed monthly docent-organized and docent-led tours, docents lead myriad tours of museum exhibitions for school groups and classes of all kinds (Figs. 11 and 12). Cathy Callaway coordinates the docent program with training support from the Museum’s curators, and our more than forty docents receive ongoing enrichment programs to maintain their currency and fuel their passion for interpreting art to the public. The docents are also represented on the Museum Associates board; active docent Valerie Hammons served as docent liaison until November, when she became a regular member and secretary of the board. She was succeeded as docent liaison by new docent Barb Montgomery.

Figs. 11 and 12. Docents Robin Blake (left) and Andrea Allen (right) discuss art with groups of appreciative elementary students. Photos: Cathy Callaway
Yet public engagement means more than public offerings. The Museum Associates continued their long-standing role as advocates for and ambassadors of the Museum to the larger community and as advocates for and ambassadors of the community to the Museum staff. Gary Anger served as president until the 2018 annual meeting in November and was succeeded by Sandy Neal. Other officers were Tootie Burns (vice president), Dennis Sentilles (treasurer), and Valerie Hammons (secretary). Signature events, including the Museum Associates’ Annual Crawfish Boil, and the Holiday Fête, remain popular fixtures in the yearly round of Columbia events. This year the Canvas Carnaval replaced the Paintbrush Ball as the Museum Associates’ major fundraising event. But perhaps the most storied Associates-sponsored event is Art in Bloom, a weekend event (this year, March 16-18) showcasing local florists who have created works of floral art in response to individual works in the Museum’s galleries. These are shown side-by-side, and visitors are asked to choose their overall favorites, as well as favorites in specific categories that help hone their aesthetic judgment and observational skills (Fig. 13). The event is organized by assistant director Bruce Cox and is one of the Museum’s most-loved programs. Bruce also manages the

Fig. 13. Art in Bloom floral design created by Kent Anderson, Kent’s on Broadway, inspired by the artwork Angel by Rein Brooks from the Electrify! exhibition. Photo: Thomas Scharenborg

Fig. 14. Ad for Museum Store by Bruce Cox
Museum Store, staffed by a dozen local volunteers, allowing visitors to take home books relating to the Museum’s collection, gifts to offer friends and family, and souvenirs to remind them of their visit (Fig. 14).

Similar assistance and counsel regarding engagement with the students, faculty, and staff of the University is provided by the Museum Advisory Committee, chaired by Dr. Kristin Schwain of the Art History Program, School of Visual Studies. In addition to providing advice regarding larger museum purchases, the committee helps ensure that museum programs are responsive to the needs of the campus and that campus administrators understand the Museum’s programs, purpose, and promise. One reason such counsel is critical is the breadth of the Museum’s audience. Combined attendance at the Gallery of Greek and Roman Casts and Exhibition Gallery was 19,135 this year and included visitors from nearly seven hundred different zip codes and twenty-two different countries (Fig. 15). Such breadth offers simultaneous challenges and opportunities, and given the small staff and limited resources of the Museum we must constantly reassess how we can best serve our audiences and pursue our mission.

At day’s end our values and vision remain constant, but their pursuit requires continuing adaptation and creativity. In part that creativity reflects the demands of meeting unchanging or even growing needs with smaller budgets and of ensuring that we serve as ever-better stewards of the collections we hold in trust. In part it reflects new ideas for meeting the evolving needs of our audiences and staying fresh and vibrant for visitors old and new. And in part it’s inherent in a mission-based institution, whose staff members hold ideals rather than just jobs.

I am privileged to work beside them.
Tapping Hooves
Small Bronze Figures of Dance-Loving Pan*

JANE BIERS

The goat-god Pan is one of the lesser gods of the Greek pantheon, but representations of him in ancient art are numerous and varied.1 In this article I discuss only one type, a group of small bronze figures of the god dancing. I offer it to Eugene Lane in memory of many years of pleasant collaboration in acquiring works from antiquity representing other lesser, but nonetheless interesting, gods for the Museum of Art and Archaeology at the University of Missouri.

Arcadia, the mountainous central area of the Peloponnesus of Greece, is the original home of Pan.2 There he was considered a major god. Small bronze figures of votaries, most carrying animals, and some with dedications to Pan incised on them,3 attest his worship in the region from as early as the sixth century BCE, but the cult came later to other parts of the Greek world. Soon after 490 BCE it spread to Attica, slightly later to Boeotia in central Greece, and then to the rest of Greece and the eastern Mediterranean.4 In Arcadia, Pan was worshipped both at rustic shrines and in cities. In Attica and elsewhere he was worshiped in caves and in association with Hermes and the Nymphs, and other gods.5

In appearance, Pan combined animal and human features. He usually appears with shaggy legs and goat hooves, bearded, with a goat-like face and horns but a human torso, arms, and upright stance.6 His nature as described in the literature reveals him to be lusty and aggressive.7 He brought fertility to livestock and protected herdsmen. In later times, in the Hellenistic period, he was also linked to war. From the Hellenistic period on, he was considered capable of creating panic in the enemy, and thus soldiers worshiped him. The word "panic" is erroneously thought to derive from the name Pan.8

Although many ancient authors describe Pan’s worship, appearance, and nature, one set of references is of particular relevance here. They indicate the importance of dance for his cult. They describe Pan as dance-loving, as dancing with the nymphs, or as leader of the dance in heaven.9 Several small bronze figures of the god emphasize this aspect. One of these figures was purchased by the Museum of Art and Archaeology at the University of Missouri in 1985 from a private collection (Figs. 1–3).10

Pan dances with his right leg raised, his weight resting on his left leg. The god has both arms outstretched, his right one held straight out at shoulder height, his left one lower.
Fig. 1. Pan. Greek, fifth to third century BCE, bronze, H. 12 cm. Museum of Art and Archaeology, Weinberg Fund (85.59), front view. Photos: Jeffrey Wilcox.

Fig. 2. Side view of Figure 1, the Missouri Pan.

Fig. 3. Rear view of Figure 1, the Missouri Pan.
and slightly bent. He once held two objects, one in each hand. Both objects appear to have been round in section judging by a short, bronze plug that remains in the left hand; the curve of the god’s right hand suggests that this hand originally held a similar object. Although his torso and arms are human, his goat-like nature is immediately revealed by the lower part of his body, which resembles a goat’s hooves and hind legs; the shaggy hair on the thighs is indicated by short, semicircular incisions on the front and sides. The hair on his head forms a kind of cap from which two goat horns project to left and right. The features of the face are crudely modeled with large, irregularly placed, almond-shaped eyes, small pug nose, thick lips, and pronounced groove from nose to corners of mouth. On his receding chin is a small beard, which reaches to the base of his neck. He has small, low-set, protruding ears that continue at the back of his head into a ridge below his cap-like hair. When he is viewed from the back or side, the most noticeable feature is the pronounced curve of the back of his thighs where a lightly incised, leaf-shaped design is evident on the smooth surface. The inner area of his legs is flat. His tail is a small stub, and the modeling of his torso is superficial with shallow grooves marking his shoulder blades, a shallow vertical groove and a horizontal ridge on his torso at the front indicating his rib cage, and an incised circle denoting his right nipple. A very shallow scratched circle forms his belly button.

A number of similar, small bronze figures exist, some of which have appeared on the art market in the last decade, while others have been known for a long time. One of the latter is a Pan in the Oriental Institute Museum in Chicago (Figs. 4–7). This figure is less worn than the one in the Museum of Art and Archaeology with incisions indicating shaggy hair preserved on the chest as well as on the front and sides of the thighs. The inner surface and back of his legs are smooth like the Missouri Pan, but this figure does not have the lightly incised leaf-pattern of the Missouri figure on the back of the thighs. His lower left hoof is broken off, but his right leg preserves part of a strut. His left arm curves further forward than the left arm of the Missouri figure, but like the Missouri figure the objects he once held are missing. The hands do, however, preserve the cylindrical shape of whatever was once in them. The Missouri and Chicago figures appear to be of identical size and were presumably cast from beeswax working models formed in the same master mold. They seem to be part of the same series.

A third figure of this type was once in the Schimmel Collection and is now in the Israel Museum, Jerusalem. It is better preserved than the two figures so far discussed and is of better quality with much more incised surface decoration, such as chest hair, pubic hair, notching on top of horns, edge of cap, contour of hair in back, eyebrows, and mustache. The beard is forked, and incised wavy lines indicate the strands of hair; its pupils are drilled. All these details are lacking in the Missouri and Oriental Institute Pans. Like the Missouri Pan, however, there is a leaf-shaped design incised on the back of the thighs. The Israel Museum Pan preserves a small round plinth and a strut that connects the raised right hoof to it. The front and sides of the strut are notched. The position of the arms is closer to the Missouri Pan than to the Oriental Institute one; the figure is the same size as the other two. This Pan was made with much greater care than the two figures discussed.
Fig. 4. Pan. Greek, fifth to fourth century BCE, bronze, H. 11.7 cm. Oriental Institute Museum. A 7448, front view. Photos courtesy of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Fig. 6. Side view of Figure 4, the Chicago Pan.

Fig. 5. Back view of Figure 4, the Chicago Pan.

Fig. 7. Side view of Figure 4, the Chicago Pan.
above. Although the same master molds may have been used, the beeswax working model was more carefully worked.

Three other figures closely resemble the first three discussed. Two were on the New York art market in 1990 and 1992 (ex Hunt and Schmidt Collections); the third is now in the Bastis Collection. The current location of the two that were sold in New York is unknown, but the photographs published in the sale catalogues show that they are very similar to the Israel Museum Pan in both size and amount of detail. The figure from the Hunt collection is the closest and has the same height. The Pan from the Schmidt Collection is slightly smaller than the Israel Museum example and appears to lean to the right, whereas the other figures are vertical. The Pan in the Bastis Collection, although obviously the same type, is a much cruder version with gouged incisions for the shaggy goat hair on the thighs, disproportionately large hooves, and large protruding ears. It is about the same size as the Pan from the Schmidt Collection. All these three figures preserve a plinth and a strut that connects the right hoof to the plinth.

There are thus six figures of dancing Pan, all approximately the same scale and closely resembling each other. The Israel Museum Pan and the figures from the Hunt and Schmidt Collections apparently represent one series, while the Missouri and Oriental Institute Pans, lacking the details of these three, are perhaps a separate series. The Pan in the Bastis Collection stands alone. One or two further examples may also belong with these figures, but their whereabouts is unknown. Dietrich von Bothmer mentioned two that Frank Brommer had seen, one in Ankara, the other in Istanbul. One of these may be the figure that is now in Missouri.

Four other small bronzes also show Pan dancing. One is in Lyon, the second in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (Fig. 8), and two were on the New York art market. The stance of all four figures is the same, right leg raised and arms stretched wide, but in other respects they differ from the first six figures discussed. These four figures have a more sculptural treatment of the modeling of the body, and the representation of the hair on the thighs is very different. Instead of being treated as surface decoration, it forms thick rolls or folds over the front and sides of the thighs; the Metropolitan Museum Pan almost appears to be wearing a pair of breeches. On three of the figures — the Lyon Pan, the Metropolitan Museum one, and no. 4 (see note 17) — the surface on the backs of the thighs is smooth, because the shaggy hair on front and sides does not continue here. (The published photograph of no. 3 in note 17 shows only a front view.) This smooth area, in a sunken leaf shape, is reflected in the surface decoration on the backs of the thighs of the Missouri and Israel Museum figures. There are also differences among the four figures discussed in this paragraph. The Pan in the Metropolitan Museum is the most detailed and, unlike any of the other bronzes, wears the φορβεία, or head strap, that held the double pipes in place. The Lyon Pan has realistic locks of hair that are arranged in three tiers on the back of the head, whereas the hair of the Metropolitan Museum Pan is arranged in plain, horizontal rolls. The two on the art market preserve objects in their hands, the only two figures to do so. One figure holds the Pan pipes, or syrinx, in his left hand, the normal attribute of the god. The other holds the pipes in his left hand and a torch in his right.
A further example of a dancing Pan was once on the Swiss art market. This figure is somewhat smaller than the others and appears to have a longer torso and shorter legs, although his proportions approach those of the Lyon Pan. He is a much less detailed version than any of the others discussed above with no horns but a cylindrical object on his head.

Dates for these small bronzes are not easily established. The Lyon Pan, the figure with the earliest publication date, is assigned to the fifth to fourth centuries BCE in the 1970 publication. Stephanie Boucher compared it to the one on the Swiss art market. This latter figure was, however, assigned a date in the fifth to fourth centuries BCE without any parallels to securely dated works. Boucher also tentatively proposed a comparison with a terracotta figurine from Olympia, but this figurine bears no stylistic relationship to the Lyon Pan and does not appear to be a valid comparison. The Metropolitan Museum Pan is compared to the Lyon bronze and dated to the late fifth or fourth century BCE. The Bastis Pan and the example on the New York art market in 1996 are dated by comparison with the Lyon bronze and the Metropolitan Museum one; the bronzes from the Hunt and Schmidt Collections are compared to the Bastis, Lyon, and Metropolitan Museum.
The Israel Museum Pan is dated to the late fourth or third century without any reasons being given. Thus, the dating of most of the figures of dancing Pan is based on the evidence of the Lyon Pan, which itself is not securely dated. Without parallels from excavated objects, the dates must remain problematical.

These small figures of dancing Pan must have had some function in antiquity. Dietrich von Bothmer suggested that the Israel Museum Pan might have formed a group together with the similar ones known to Brommer and perhaps were attached to the rim of a cauldron, or to another vessel, or utensil. Marquardt briefly discussed the function of those figures known to her. She also felt that they were originally attached to a vessel, pointing out that the hands of two of them, the Bastis Pan and the one at Sotheby’s in 1990, seemed to have been firmly soldered around something that made her think that the figures were on the upper part of a vessel with the hands touching the rim. Like Eileithyia, Pan belongs to a class of divinities who appear as multiples. Groups of Pans are quite common in Greek vase painting. Thus, a group of small bronze Pans on a bronze vessel would not seem out of place, and in the Classical and Hellenistic periods small bronze figures continued to be produced for attachment to vessel lids and shoulders. The smooth surface on the backs of the thighs might then be a feature of the placement of the figures on a vessel. The Israel Museum Pan, the only example that preserves its base and that is also available for examination, has, however, no marks of attachment. Furthermore, single figures of dancing Pan would not be unsuitable dedications to the god since dancing was integral to his worship.

As well as questions about their date and function, the figures raise other questions. Where were they made, what did they hold in their hands, and why was a strut thought necessary to support the right foot? Only two of the figures have any possible provenience. The Missouri Pan was acquired in Turkey; Professor Gottheil published the Oriental Institute figure as coming from Tyre, although in his correspondence with the Oriental Institute this was not mentioned. Other figures are described as Greek, and some are tentatively said to be Peloponnesian, although no reasons are given. As for the objects held by the figures, they may not all have held the same ones. The Metropolitan Museum Pan presumably held the double pipes, since he wears the φορβεία. Two of the figures hold the syrinx in their left hands. Perhaps they held the λαγώβολον (shepherd’s staff) in their right hands. Both objects are appropriate for Pan. The Missouri, Oriental Institute, and Israel Museum Pans may have held torches, one in each hand. Pan running with one torch occurs in the tondo of a black-figure kylix by the Haimon Painter Group. He holds two torches on a gem in Munich. The cylindrical impression in some of the hands, or the remains of a cylindrical object, supports this suggestion, whereas the arms are perhaps too widely spread to be playing the double pipes. The presence of a strut on these small figures is puzzling. Other small bronzes of dancing figures with one leg raised have no strut, and so a strut was not necessary to support the leg. Perhaps the strut is a design feature that relates to the placement of the figures on a vessel.

These ten bronzes form an interesting group, linked by the dancing pose with right leg raised and arms outstretched. The treatment of the back of the thighs—smooth
skin represented without hair—also links many of them. While their dates and function remain problematical, and the quality within the group varies widely, they represent a substantial body of evidence for a small-scale sculptural type of dancing Pan.

NOTES
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The article is published here without revision.


4. Borgeaud, Cult of Pan, p. 48. The introduction of the cult into Attica is recorded in the well-known story in Herodotus (6.105). Before the battle of Marathon in 490 BCE, Pheidippides, sent by the Athenians to ask Sparta for help against the Persians, encountered Pan in the hills above Tegea, a city in the Peloponnesus. Pan told him to ask the Athenians why they paid him no attention. Pan goes on to say that he felt kindly toward the Athenians, had been useful to them in the past, and would be again in the future. According to Herodotus, the Athenians believed Pheidippides’ story, and once they had prospered, they established a shrine to Pan under the Acropolis. At an annual festival they made sacrifices to him and ran torch races. This is the earliest mention of the god in ancient literature. See R. Garland, Introducing New Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion (Ithaca NY, 1992) pp. 47–54 for discussion of the incident.


6. The earliest extant representation of Pan occurs on an Attic black-figure neck-amphora dated to about 490 BCE. He is shown as a goat standing beside a woman, perhaps a maenad. Only his upright stance distinguishes him as Pan (South Africa Cultural History Museum L64/4; J.
Boardman and M. Pope, *Greek Vases in Cape Town* (Cape Town, 1961) pp. 7–8, no. 2, pl. 2; *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* 8, 924, no. 3). On a fragment of another black-figure vase of about the same period he is playing the double pipes (Allard Pierson 2117/8; Brommer, *Satyroii*, figs. 3, 4; Brommer, “Pan in 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.,” p. 15, fig. 14; *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* 8, 924, no. 4).


8. The etymology of the word “Pan” is uncertain. Borgeaud, *Cult of Pan*, Appendix, pp. 185–187, favors an etymology derived from pa(s), designating guardian of flocks.


10. Acc. no. 85.59; restored height 12.1 cm. Weinberg Fund. Bronze. Solid cast. Left leg broken off from just below the knee and restored in wood. Unpublished. Provenience: originally acquired in Turkey. Professor Saul S. Weinberg and I planned to publish a joint article on the Missouri Pan, but his death in 1992 prevented this. Professor Weinberg discovered the Oriental Institute Pan discussed here and had collected many of the other examples of figures similar to the Missouri Pan that are discussed here.

11. OIM A 7448; preserved height 11.8 cm. Purchased. Bronze. Solid cast. Left foot broken and missing. Published: Richard Gottheil, “Figurines of Syro-Hittite Art,” *Studies in the History of Religions, Presented to Crawford Howell Toy by Pupils, Colleagues, and Friends* (New York, 1912) pp. 361–365. Provenience: the Oriental Institute acquired the figure in 1931 from Professor Gottheil who had bought it in Jerusalem in about 1912. In the publication he stated that the figure was “said to have been dug up at Tyre,” (p. 361), but in the correspondence about the purchase, preserved in the archives of the Oriental Institute, he wrote that when he bought the figure he was not then told where it had been found (letter February 4, 1931, Director’s Office Correspondence Files, 1930/1931, Oriental Institute Archives. Courtesy of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago). I am grateful to John A. Larson of the Oriental Institute for tracking down the publication and for providing me with access to the correspondence in the archives.


16. The late Professor George Hanfmann knew the Missouri Pan, and it is possible that Professor Brommer heard about it from him. Unfortunately, Professor Brommer’s death in 1993 made it impossible to verify this.


19. The torch held by Pan no. 4 (described in note 17) may be a restoration.


23. See above, note 17 (2).

24. See above, note 14 (3) and note 17 (3). Marquardt, Pan in der Hellenistischen und Kaiserzeitlichen Plastik, p. 294 agreed with a fourth century date for the four figures she discussed: the Lyon Pan, the Metropolitan Museum Pan, the Bastis Pan, and the Pan from the Hunt collection at Sotheby’s in 1990.

25. See above, note 14 (1) and (2).


27. Von Bothmer, Ancient Art, no. 25.

28. See above, note 14 (1) and (3).

29. Marquardt, Pan in der Hellenistischen und Kaiserzeitlichen Plastik, p. 294.


31. For example, three Pans dance on a red-figure vase that depicts the return of Persephone from the underworld (Dresden 350 [destroyed]; Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters [1963] pp. 1056, 95; Brommer, “Pan in 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.,” p. 20 and fig. 25, p. 22; pl. 16, fig. 53); two Pans dance around a goddess who rises from the earth on a skyphos in Boston (01.8032; Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters [1963] pp. 888, 155; Brommer, “Pan in 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.,” fig. 27; Cl. Bérard, Anodoi, essai sur l’imagerie des passages chthoniens [Rome, 1974] pl. 12, fig. 42); several dance on the neck of a red-figure krater as a goddess rises from the earth (Berlin 3275 [destroyed]; Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters [1963] p. 1276; Brommer, “Pan in 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.,” figs. 28 and 30; Bérard, Anodoi, pl. 16, fig. 58); and many Pans dance on a red-figure krater in London (E 467; Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters [1963] pp. 601, 23; Brommer, “Pan in 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.,” fig. 32). See also the much larger pair of bronze Pans, possibly attachments for a piece of furniture, The Gods Delight: The Human Figure in Classical Bronze (Cleveland, 1988) pp. 142–147, no. 23; Glories of the Past: Ancient Art from the Shelby White and Leon Levy Collection (New York, 1990) pp. 188–190, no. 136.


35. See above, note 17 (2).

36. See above, note 18 for Pan and the syrinx.


38. *Antike Gemmen in deutschen Sammlungen, Munich* I, 1, no. 335.

And they brought the ass and the colt and laid their garments upon them and made him sit thereon. And a very great multitude spread their garments in the way, and others cut down boughs from the trees and strewed them in the way. And the multitudes that went before and that followed cried, saying, “Hosanna to the son of David! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest.” (Matthew 21:7-9)

Introduction

A few days before the Last Supper, Jesus sent two of his disciples on a mission. He instructed them to retrieve a donkey that would be tethered at a village near the site of Bethany, where Jesus had been staying. If the owner protested, he advised, they should simply state that it was “needed by the Lord.” Once the animal had been successfully obtained, the disciples laid their cloaks ceremoniously across her back, and Jesus sat astride, riding this humble creature toward the gates of Jerusalem. Eager to celebrate his arrival in the city, a crowd gathered along the road, its members spreading articles of clothing and palm branches reverently across Jesus’s path while chanting “blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.” This pivotal moment, known as the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem, would mark the beginning of the Passion—or the final week of Jesus’s mortal life—inciting a series of events that would ultimately lead to his execution and divine resurrection three days later.

Two carved bone plaques in the permanent collection of the University of Missouri’s Museum of Art and Archaeology capture the intensity of this decisive event (Fig. 1). Jesus rides toward a throng of people who surge forward to greet him. He gazes peacefully toward the people and raises his hand in a gesture of blessing. A young man at the forefront prepares to lay his mantle at the donkey’s feet while others reach their hands toward Jesus or wave celebratory palm fronds. At the far right, one witness raises his hand in a gesture that mirrors the posture of Jesus’ disciple on the far left, their poses providing a frame for the action in the two panels. A forest and the tightly packed buildings of the fortified
city perch on rocky outcroppings above, hinting more toward the artist’s medieval Italian surroundings than the landscape and architecture of biblical-era Jerusalem. The exacting detail of this finely carved scene is especially impressive given the modest size of the work surface—hardly larger than four by three inches.

While the plaques have long been on display in the Museum, they have attracted little scholarly attention. This may be due to their small size and unassuming material, or perhaps because in the six centuries since their creation they have become divorced from whatever framework originally held them. Nonetheless, clues garnered from the objects’ formal structure, their material and subject matter, and the artistic methods of the workshop where they were created provide valuable insight into the Entry of Christ into Jerusalem plaques, allowing me to argue that they most likely comprised one part of a larger cycle of Passion imagery that would have originally adorned a triptych.

**The Embriachi Workshop**

Shortly after the plaques were donated to the Museum by J. Lionberger Davis in 1967, Alan McNairn attributed The Entry of Christ in Jerusalem to the Embriachi workshop. This bone carving enterprise was active in late-fourteenth- and early-fifteenth-century Florence and Venice, producing an array of high-quality altarpieces, devotional triptychs, and containers (Figs. 2 and 3). The Embriachi’s significant output is evidenced by scores...
Fig. 2. Workshop of Baldassare Embriachi, Venetian, 1390–1409. Altarpiece, ca. 1390–1400, bone framed with intarsia and horn, traces of paint and gilding. 128.3 × 153.7 cm, not including wooden base. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917. 17.190.489. www.metmuseum.org.

Fig. 3. Workshop of Baldassare Embriachi. Casket, ca. 1400, carved bone, stained horn, wood, pigment, gilt metal. 28.3 × 33 × 19.1 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Purchased with funds provided by the William Randolph Hearst Foundation (47.8.25). Photo © Museum Associates/Los Angeles County Museum of Art.
Fig. 4. Workshop of Baldassare Embriachi, Venetian, ca. 1390–1409. Altarpiece of the Certosa di Pavia with legends of the prophet Balaam and the Magi, the life of the Virgin, and the life of Christ, ca. 1396–1400, bone, ivory, remnants of polychrome; wood and poplar frame; decorative border of inlaid wood, horn, mother of pearl, and ivory. Approx. 260 × 243 cm (overall). Sacristy of the Certosa di Pavia. Scala / Mauro Ranzani / Art Resource, NY.
of works that survive today in institutions across Europe and North America. The surfaces of their products were decorated with configurations of distinctively carved bone or—less commonly—ivory plaques, with three or four plaques typically employed to represent a scene from a larger narrative, either a biblical account or an episode from a romance or classical tale. Details of the figures, such as eyes, mouths, and clothing, as well as landscape elements were sometimes accentuated with touches of polychrome or, more rarely, gold (Fig. 3). Each scene was generally bordered by delicate certosina work, which comprises colorful fragments of inlaid bone, wood, and horn fashioned into intricate geometric patterns.

McNairn’s argument mainly concerned the attribution of the plaques to the Embriachi workshop based on stylistic similarities between them and the only three artworks that can be definitively attributed to the Embriachi through documentary records: two large chests and a monumental altarpiece produced for the Certosa di Pavia, an extravagant Carthusian monastery built and financed by the duke of Milan, Gian Galeazzo Visconti (1351–1402) (Fig. 4). The Missouri plaques, McNairn determined, exhibit hallmark characteristics of Embriachi carvings, including the three-layered “formalized mushroom-shaped Tuscan pines” at the upper left, elongated figures with slim waists and swelling chests, and a distinctive hairstyle marked by a tight curl around the ear. In comparing the Missouri plaques to some of the highest-quality objects ever created by the workshop, McNairn curtly concluded that they were likely once affixed to an altarpiece, comprised the entirety of the original scene, but were “clearly the work of a lesser craftsman, probably an apprentice.” Can advancements in the literature about the Embriachi and their late-medieval bone-carving endeavors help us revisit, confirm, and expand upon the conclusions McNairn drew when the scholarship on the Embriachi was still in its infancy nearly fifty years ago?

Although several late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholars laid the groundwork for a preliminary understanding of late-medieval bone carving workshops and their products, in the intervening decades since McNairn published his research on the Missouri plaques, a small but dedicated group of scholars has contributed immensely to our knowledge of how the Embriachi workshop was organized, its chronology and methods of production, its clientele, and its iconographic tendencies. What scholars describe as the “Embriachi workshop” was one of what appear to be several distinct ateliers that emerged in the latter decades of the fourteenth century in central and northern Italy, producing ecclesiastical, devotional, and secular objects decorated with configurations of carved bone plaques. The Embriachi atelier, however, is the only bone-carving enterprise that has been substantiated through documentary records. Surviving evidence includes the note of a considerable payment of one thousand gold florins made by the prior of the Certosa di Pavia to a “Baldesario de Ubriachis” for the aforementioned altarpiece and chests. Additionally, wills were produced in Venice in both 1395 and 1406 by an individual with a strikingly similar name: Baldassare di Simone d’Aliotto degli Ubriachi. The most crucial piece of evidence is contained within the earlier will, wherein Baldassare cited an individual named Giovanni di Jacopo as “master of my
works in bone.” Through this epithet, the two Baldassares were determined to be one and the same. In recent decades, scholars have been able to gain greater insight into this individual’s life and attribute a multitude of objects to the workshop that is associated with him, albeit through an erroneous transcription of his surname. In the late 1970s archival research by historian Richard Trexler uncovered many of the historical details of Baldassare’s life. An enterprising nobleman of Florentine origin, Baldassare spent a significant portion of his adolescence being educated in Avignon, France. During his mature years he traveled throughout much of western Europe, working at times as a dealer of precious jewels and illuminated maps, and as a diplomat to the courts of rulers such as Martin I of Aragon (r. 1396–1410) and Richard II of England (r. 1377–1399). It is not entirely clear when Baldassare founded his bone-carving workshop and when it ultimately ceased production. Elena Merlini has argued that the tightest time-frame possible for the workshop’s operation is approximately 1390–1405, while others such as Michele Tomasi have posited a more expansive range, from the 1370s until the mid-1410s. Since the workshop’s productions bear an “incontestably Florentine character,” most scholars agree on one detail: that the workshop was founded in Florence and that Baldassare moved it to Venice in the mid-1390s after he encountered political difficulties in his hometown.

Although Trexler suggested that Baldassare was the head artist of the workshop, later researchers have argued that he was instead the financial backer of the atelier, with Giovanni di Jacopo serving as its leader for at least part of enterprise’s mature years. As Tomasi has noted, given his childhood spent abroad, his status as a member of the nobility, and his travels throughout Europe as an adult, Baldassare would have had little time to undertake the requisite training in a sculptor’s guild and practice this art on a commercial level. Likewise, his acknowledgment of Giovanni as “master of my works in bone” supports the consensus that he performed the role of proprietor rather than artisan. After all, workshops traditionally consisted of multiple individuals who purchased or prepared materials, designed or executed components of works, fitted them together into finished objects, and interacted with patrons and buyers. While Luciana Martini has identified the hands of various sculptors within the workshop, the division of labor is still poorly understood. It is especially unclear if the woodworkers who prepared the boxes and altarpiece forms, plus the certosina borders, were employed by the workshop or were simply contracted to deliver the armatures in bulk or by commission.

Although the impetus for Baldassare’s establishment of the workshop is unknown, his social standing may have secured its success. Through his peers at home in Italy and his travels through the courts of Europe, he likely developed a keen understanding of the types of luxury items that were desired by the mercantile and noble classes and ordered his workshop to craft products with these audiences in mind. Indeed, the Embriachi produced a number of boxes and chests depicting tales derived from popular vernacular literature that was enjoyed by the upper echelons of society, such as the legends of classical heroes Paris and Jason and the Old French romance Mattabruna. In addition, Embriachi products were so refined as to attract some of the most illustrious figures of the day,
including the duke of Milan, whose patronage was described above, and Jean, duke of Berry, who commissioned a lavish large-scale altarpiece for the abbey of Poissy, northwest of Paris. Baldassare’s procurement of these expensive commissions suggests that he possessed an astute sense of business acumen and an intimate familiarity with the tastes of contemporary noble audiences.

Although most of the workshop’s surviving products cannot be definitively linked with specific patrons, the periodic inclusion of episodes outside of a usual narrative formula or the depiction of uncommon saints suggest some level of personalization as might be requested by a buyer. In addition to commissions, the workshop also created a number of boxes, chests, triptychs, and diptychs that were likely preconfigured and sold “as is,” as well as objects that appear to have been produced “on demand” from an assemblage of pre-carved plaques, depending on the taste or needs of a prospective patron. In fact, Merlini has identified a number of small devotional triptychs with little or no variation in iconography, suggesting that they were sold preconfigured or nearly complete, with key figures or saints inserted around the time of purchase. By shrewdly producing a combination of premade objects, compositions requiring minor input from the buyer, and more costly and effortful commissions, the Embriachi appear to have been able to guarantee different streams of income, lower their costs, and consolidate their workflow.

A Question of Material

Another facet of the Embriachi workshop that afforded them economy and expediency was their use of bone as a primary material. Easily obtained as butchers’ castoffs, bone was ideal for its plentitude and low cost. Perhaps more valuable to the Embriachi, however, were its physical properties: the bones, which likely came from the legs of large animals such as cattle or horses, could be sized into plaques of relatively uniform dimensions displaying little natural variance in color. This inherent standardization would have allowed the workshop to prepare in advance multiple versions of the same scene in predictable sizes and configurations, inserting them into a wooden armature whose shape could also be predetermined by the semi-regular dimensions of the plaques. Working in a serial manner, made possible by the physical properties of bone, was a likely contributor to the success of the atelier.

The Embriachi’s material proclivities have been at the forefront of scholarly discussion since art historians first started writing about the workshop. While it was generally acknowledged in the nineteenth century that the Embriachi employed bone as a work surface, confusion regarding their rate of ivory use abounded well into the twentieth century, as certain items were incorrectly assumed to have been made from the more valuable material. Prized for its lustrous surface and desired for its scarcity, ivory, or the bony tissue of tusks from animals such as elephants, walruses, or narwhals, has been valued as sculptural material across cultures for millennia. In the Middle Ages elephant ivory had to be transported to Europe at enormous expense, passing over thousands of miles of trade routes that began in African deserts and savannahs or in the tropics of India. Although
the evidence indicates that it was probably carved in the same workshops as bone, ivory was often reserved for crafting precious objects for wealthy patrons, including manuscript covers, reliquary chests, or portable diptychs presenting images of holy figures or scenes of the Passion (Fig. 5). Even today, art museum collections across the world are filled with thousands of examples attesting to ivory’s significance in medieval Europe and beyond.

Bone, on the other hand, has a less venerable history. Although employed as a primary sculpting material since the dawn of humanity, bone has received notably less serious scholarly consideration by art historians, likely because, as Leslie Blake and Francine Corcione have noted, this ignoble substance has often been dismissed as a cheap substitute for its more prized counterpart. Indeed, at first glance it can be difficult to distinguish between the two materials, which can exhibit similar off-white hues and shiny surfaces, depending on the level of polish. These characteristics have the potential to mislead collectors, cataloguers, and curators tasked with classifying and interpreting Italian bone carvings. McNairn described the Missouri plaques as ivory in his 1968 article. Likewise, an art historian described the left plaque as ivory when visiting the Museum in the 1980s. These ascriptions are upended, however, by a careful examination of the front and reverse surfaces.
On a superficial level it appears possible that the left plaque is carved from the more precious material due to its slightly yellow hue, a characteristic assumed by ivory, especially as it ages. However, as Blake and Corcione point out, bone may present a yellower color if the animal from which it is harvested has a higher body fat percentage. Another misleading characteristic is the left plaque's smooth and glossy surface, which contrasts with the pitted surface of the right plaque. The quality of a bone, however, may vary because of an animal's diet or age, so it is possible that the bone used for the left plaque was simply extracted from a younger or sturdier animal while the right was obtained from an animal of less robust health. The best evidence for classifying these works as bone, however, comes from the reverse (Fig. 6). The plaques both exhibit a central vertical canal that once housed the animal’s marrow. The distinctive outward flare at the tops, and most noticeably at the bottoms, suggests that the Museum’s plaques were most likely carved from the cannon or metapodial bone of what a zooarchaeologist has described as a “cow-sized animal,” rather than the tusk of a more exotic creature.

Why did bone emerge as a material for small-scale relief sculpture in Italy in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries? This phenomenon has, predictably, been linked to trends in the ivory trade. Art historians have noted a dramatic increase in the amount of African ivory reaching western Europe in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The establishment of bone-carving workshops such as the Embriachi atelier coincides with the peak in the availability and popularity of ivory in the mid-fourteenth century. The prominence of these types of carved-bone products extends into the fifteenth
century, when ivory was not as widely available because of shifting economic circumstances. Are we to understand the use of bone plaques on these chests, boxes, triptychs, and altarpieces simply as an inexpensive substitute for a more fashionable material whose decline in availability rendered it increasingly out of reach for even wealthy consumers? This explanation, posited by a number of art historians and ivory specialists such as Richard Randall, in his influential *The Golden Age of Ivory: Gothic Carvings in North American Collections*, likely accounts for at least some of the business garnered by Italian bone-carving workshops in the late medieval and early Renaissance eras. While the Embriachi did occasionally employ ivory, most notably in the monumental altarpiece at the Certosa di Pavia, it was typically reserved for the most important or highly symbolic episodes in a narrative, including Jesus’s birth, his Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem, his crucifixion, and his ascension into heaven. Dozens of their products employ solely bone, including other prestigious commissions, however, and Embriachi scholars have not often paused to consider the multiplicity of meanings this humble material might have carried for a late medieval viewer.

As Ittai Weinryb has recently argued, “We would like to think that material signification existed throughout the Middle Ages and was applied to all types of material, and that the selection of materials would be essential for the transmission of the significance that foregrounds the object.” Following this line of reasoning, it is worth considering how bone may have functioned not only in an economic context but also on a metaphorical level: while medieval audiences may have appreciated bone for its lower cost and its close physical resemblance to ivory, it may have also served as a signifier for religious meaning when employed in the production of devotional or ecclesiastical materials. In the Bible, bone is variably identified as a life-giving or life-affirming material. For example, God fashions Eve from Adam’s rib bone in a gesture that the Book of Genesis describes as a testament to the unity of husband and wife (2:22–24). Additionally, when Jesus appeared to his disciples three days after his death, he cited bone as evidence of his divine resurrection: “See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself. Handle, and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have” (Luke 24:39). Per John the Evangelist, this reflects the fulfillment of Old Testament verses, which predicted “You shall not break a bone of him” (Exodus 12:46, Numbers 9:12, and John 19:36).

Bone is the support that provides structure to living bodies, but it also remains as a signifier of the body long after the flesh decays. Human bones are linked to the medieval phenomenon of the relic trade, whereby the corporeal remains of saints were acquired by monastic orders, ecclesiastical institutions, and individuals. Ranging from a single tooth to a complete skeleton, these types of relics were venerated for their physical links to holy figures and their concomitant miraculous healing abilities. Relics were also highly symbolic. In the case of Jesus, they underscore the miracle of his divine ascension; since he was taken up into heaven whole, the only material remnants of his body were things shed during his life, such as his blood and deciduous teeth. While medieval audiences probably would have realized that the bone employed by the Embriachi was of animal...
rather than human origin, it is entirely possible that worshipers would have understood the multivalent meanings inherent in the material and interpreted it through their personal beliefs and cultural experiences. The elevation of such a base material through the transformative potential of sculpture may have even amplified themes of rebirth, renewal, and resurrection for a viewer interacting with a devotional or ecclesiastical object fashioned from carved bone.

In sum, it may be helpful to consider not only the economic circumstances that led the Embriachi to employ bone but also the connotations of the material, especially as it could potentially relate to biblical themes. As scholars turn toward more expansive interpretations of the Embriachi workshop and its output, the preliminary comments postulated here may be further advanced and nuanced.

**Iconography and Original Context for the Missouri Plaques**

Although the Embriachi workshop produced dozens of objects bearing Passion imagery, scenes of the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem are relatively rare among them. In fact, despite an extensive search, I have identified only six other published instances of this episode in their oeuvre:

1. The monumental altarpiece at the Certosa di Pavia, two plaques, the left being ivory and the right being either ivory or bone, both with polychrome and gilding (Fig. 7)\(^53\)
2. The monumental altarpiece produced for the abbey of Poissy, now in the collection of the Louvre, four plaques, bone\(^54\)
3. A large triptych sold to a private collection in Europe by Sotheby’s in 2015, three plaques, bone (Fig. 8 and detail)\(^55\)
4. A smaller triptych in the collection of the Staatliche Museen, Berlin, two plaques, bone (Fig. 9 and detail)\(^56\)
5. A chest in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA), four plaques, polychrome bone and gilding (Fig. 10)\(^57\)
6. A single plaque which appears to depict the crowd gathering before Jesus, sold to a private collection in Europe by Sotheby’s in 2003, bone\(^58\)

Unlike the works mentioned above (with the exception of the single Sotheby’s plaque), the Missouri plaques are now divorced from whatever armature once held them, obscuring their original use. However, a comparison of the two plaques with the six other representations of the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem yields important insight into two basic questions: First, do the works in the Museum’s collection comprise the entirety of the original scene, or were there once additional plaques that have been lost in the intervening centuries? Second, what was their original context: did they decorate the surface of an altarpiece, triptych, or container? The narrative structure and physical form of the plaques allow us to piece together answers.
The Triumphal Entry episode is instantly recognizable to viewers through specific iconographic elements that the Embriachi incorporated into their designs. Chart 1 (pp. 50-51) tabulates these elements as they appear in the surviving representations. The first and most important is the figure of Jesus astride a donkey, which appears in every representation except the Sotheby’s plaque, since the remainder of that scene is missing.59 Jesus’ pose is conventionalized, with his right arm extended in a gesture of blessing regardless of whether he enters the tableau from the left or the right side. Likewise, the form of his elegantly draped, classical-style robes deviates little between the six representations. The second key element—as stipulated by Scripture—is a throng of greeters, which ranges from three people in the Sotheby’s triptych to as many as eight in the Louvre altarpiece. Predictably, nearly all of the examples include figures brandishing celebratory palm fronds and a young man laying his mantle in deference at the donkey’s feet.60 Finally, the city appears in every complete episode, either as a cluster of Italianate buildings perched on a cliff above the Jerusalemites or occupying the entirety of the left- or right-most plaque, depending on the orientation of the figures. While the seven compositions are similar to one another in a broad sense, their structure does not necessarily follow a distinct template as seen elsewhere in the Embriachi’s output.61 Since the Triumphal Entry appears to have been uncommonly depicted in the workshop’s products, it appears that the carvers shifted the composition to best fit the object that the plaques were destined to decorate.
Fig. 8 and detail. Workshop of Baldassare Embriachi, Venetian, ca. 1390–1409. Triptych with Scenes from the Life of Christ, certosina wood, bone and horn, with remnants of polychromy on the shutters. 113 × 64.5 cm (open). Private collection in Europe. Image courtesy of Sotheby's.
Fig. 9 and detail. Workshop of Baldassare Embriachi, Venetian, ca. 1390–1409. Triptych, bone and wood. 51.5 × 32 cm (open). Berlin, Staatliche Museen. Photo by Daderot; creative commons/public domain license.

Fig. 10. Detail of Figure 3 with depiction of the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem. Photo © Museum Associates/Los Angeles County Museum of Art.
The Missouri plaques contain each of the essential iconographic conventions employed by the Embriachi to represent the Triumphal Entry, suggesting that the current configuration is original and complete. This aligns with McNairn's findings, although he based his conclusions on the symmetry of the scene and the identical poses of the outermost figures rather than through a comparative iconographic reading. Several additional details support my and McNairn's conclusions. The first is the figure of the disciple, who lingers close behind Jesus at far left and gazes straight at the viewer. Had the composition contained an additional plaque to the left, the disciple would most likely have been depicted on it, rather than being squeezed into the cramped space above the donkey’s haunches. On the LACMA chest, for example, the artist placed the two disciples on the leftmost plaque, allowing the figure of Jesus to occupy his own individual space (Fig. 10). Second, the appearance of disciples in fewer than half of the complete Triumphal Entry scenes suggests that their presence is not necessarily requisite, but that it serves instead to further enrich and enliven the composition. Since the artist of the Missouri plaques included this nonessential element in a manner that suggests space was limited, it is likely that no other plaques were employed to represent this episode.

A final detail to support the conclusion that the Missouri plaques are a complete representation of the scene is the number of figures in the crowd, which totals six. Only the large-scale altarpieces at the Certosa di Pavia and in the Louvre depict a greater number of greeters present at the Triumphal Entry, totaling seven and eight, respectively. It is unlikely that the artist of the Missouri composition would have included more figures than appear in these two monumental works. If the carver did include an additional plaque to the right with several more greeters, the drive for visual balance would require another plaque to be placed to the left of Jesus, and as described above, this is highly unlikely given the position of the disciple. Every key element of the Triumphal Entry—and more—has been accounted for by the artist. Thus, the Missouri plaques likely present a complete rendering of this inaugural scene of the Passion.

It is now worth exploring the type of framework that may have originally held the plaques. While it is impossible to offer a definitive conclusion, some inferences may be drawn by comparing the Missouri plaques to the general output of the Embriachi workshop. As mentioned elsewhere, the atelier produced three main categories of items: monumental altarpieces, triptychs, and chests or boxes. Religious subject matter is largely confined to the former two types of objects; there are only three published examples of containers depicting religious imagery, with decorative schemes on these products typically reserved for classical tales and romances. It is therefore statistically unlikely that the Missouri plaques were once affixed to a box or chest, leaving monumental altarpieces or triptychs as more likely possibilities.

Only the three monumental altarpieces at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Louvre, and the Certosa di Pavia have survived intact to the present day, but it is telling that their narrative episodes generally consist of three or more plaques, making it unlikely that the comparatively smaller Missouri works were destined for such a sizeable frame. In addition, almost all of the plaques covering the altarpieces’ surfaces are level across the
top (see Figs. 2 and 7), in marked contrast to the curved form of the Missouri plaques. Generally speaking, when the Embriachi arched the tops of their compositions, they were set into the workshop’s smaller-scale items, such as triptychs and containers (see Figs. 3 and 8). Since the latter objects have been ruled out, it is therefore most likely that the Missouri plaques were once affixed to a narrative triptych, possibly one similar to or slightly smaller than the Sotheby’s example (Fig. 8).

### Triptychs and Devotional Circumstance

Serving variably as teaching devices, aids for prayer, prompts for contemplation or veneration, decoration, or some combination thereof, triptychs were integral components of elite devotional culture, whether placed in an ecclesiastical or monastic structure, or in a domestic space. As instruments for imparting religious knowledge, these objects communicated meaning on many levels, not least of which was encouraging emotive responses to the tribulations of Jesus through detailed narrative episodes. In the early Middle Ages, church teachings and religious art tended to emphasize Jesus’ divine and redemptive qualities. In contrast, by later in the medieval era, liturgical, textual, and visual materials often centered on his physical qualities and human experiences. Texts such as the widely consumed *Meditationes vitae Christi*, written in Tuscany in the mid-fourteenth century, encouraged devotees to imagine themselves as engaged witnesses to the events of Jesus’ life. This was done by walking them through what Eugène Honée has referred to as a “richly tapestried biography of Christ,” which elaborated on the comparatively drier and more terse account provided by the Gospels. The most dramatic section of the text, which focuses on Jesus’s final days, is told through the perspective of those closest to him: the Virgin Mary, Mary Magdalene, and the disciple John. This literary device magnifies the pain and suffering of all involved and prompts the reader not only to reflect on and internalize the simultaneously heartbreaking and uplifting message but also potentially to identify physically with Jesus. As might be expected, this phenomenon, referred to by modern scholars as affective meditation, appears to have influenced—or have been influenced by—the visual arts, coinciding with changes to the narrative structure of religious imagery that favor emotional immediacy.

Art historians have long sought to illuminate the relationships between social and religious circumstances (such as affective meditation) and trends in the arts. In his influential *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style*, Michael Baxandall argued that the visual and theological culture of an artist’s day, such as the trend for a devotee to imagine their presence in Jesus’ life, would necessarily manifest in pictorial style. In other words, paintings are cultural artifacts. For example, an artist producing a religious scene might paint figures whose features are generalized so that a viewer might be free to “impose his personal detail” onto the image, as was encouraged in the process of affective meditation. An artist might also depict people gesticulating expressively, which Baxandall associated with the system of communicative hand signs and body gestures co-opted by fifteenth-century preachers for dramatic and
emotive effect in public sermons. These details do not only ground a work of art firmly in the time period in which it was created but also draw in the viewer based on a system of visual communication with which they were familiar, triggering memories and inviting close contemplation. Although developed for the genre of early Renaissance painting, Baxandall’s ideas about how the style of works of art belie the social circumstances of their creation and their expressive goals may be applied to sculptural objects.

For example, through their physical form, narrative structure, and minute detail, triptychs like those produced by the Embriachi necessitate physical and emotional intimacy—key tenets an artist might rely on to evoke an affective response in a viewer. One can attempt to gain an understanding of these key traits by imagining how a medieval person might have experienced such objects. To access the carved imagery of an Embriachi triptych, its user would have needed to open the object’s hinged doors to expose the interior, activating the work through a physical touch. Perhaps the user would notice how the narrative episodes were framed by decorative archways with a scalloped lower edge and trefoil and quatrefoil perforations at the corners (see Fig. 8 and detail). Supported, as in the Sotheby’s triptych, by delicately twisted colonnettes, these elegant details reference design elements such as gothic tracery and sculptural niches that were ubiquitous in medieval European ecclesiastical architecture. They enliven the surfaces of the Embriachi’s products, while recalling the ecclesiastical surroundings with which a medieval viewer would have been intimately familiar. What better way to frame biblical accounts than through the visual language of church architecture? These borders also cleanly compartmentalize each narrative episode, in a technique that Patricia Lee Rubin has argued “correspond[s] to the focused process of contemplative viewing.”

After absorbing a triptych’s decorative border, the user might then move on to carefully examine each narrative episode. This would have required viewing from a close proximity, since the size of the bone plaques used by the Embriachi generally average around four and a half inches high by one and a half inches wide apiece; even if a scene comprised four or five plaques, it would hardly be larger than five by seven inches. The minute details employed by the Embriachi carvers in the Museum’s *The Entry of Christ into Jerusalem*, such as the two different types of leaves on the trees or the cinched waistband of Jesus’s robe, reward this intimate encounter (see Figs. 1 and 11). So, too, do the strategies used by the artist to successfully achieve a lively and emotive composition in spite of a modest work surface. The arched tops of the plaques counterbalance the strong reliance on diagonals seen in the rocky outcroppings, in the pose of Jesus’ arm, in the upturned heads of his greeters, and in the position of the mantle that a young man prepares to lay in the path of the donkey.

Complementing the fine details of the figures and landscape is a pleasant reliance on symmetry and echoing, a common tactic employed by sculptors of medieval narrative ivories to impart visual rhythm and energy to the composition. These include Jerusalem’s wall, which slopes upward to meet mountainous terrain that elegantly descends into a bucolic forest. The donkey’s crooked fetlock and the bent knee of the young man with the mantle suggest collective movement, while a hand reaching out of the throng paral-
Finally, the disciple and the man at far right share the same pose, not observing the dramatic event unfolding before them but looking directly at the viewer, as if inviting them into the composition. Imagined eye contact between a viewer and a sculpted or painted figure, Rubin has noted, “produces a sense of immediacy” that otherwise might be discouraged by the formal feeling of an “iconic, frontal” pose. Although somewhat crudely executed, the men’s are raised in a pious gesture associated by Baxandall with a “holy matter or devotion, or alternatively, welcome, with the palm raised and presented to the audience. Given the importance of the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem as the beginning of the Passion, it is an apt moment to welcome the viewer into the composition and encourage them to embark on a contemplative journey, accompanying Jesus through his final mortal days.

Conclusions

At first glance, it may seem unlikely that we can gain a more complete understanding of what purpose the Missouri Embriachi plaques originally served because they have become completely decontextualized in the six centuries since their creation. Nevertheless, a careful examination of their form and an analysis of how the artist represented the scene provide critical insight into The Entry of Christ into Jerusalem’s original function as a narrative episode in a larger Passion cycle, most likely once presented in the format of a triptych. The finely carved surfaces and expressive figuration invite the viewer to linger and internalize the jubilation and tumult of a key episode that would generate a series of events leading to Jesus’s death and redemptive resurrection. While the findings presented in this article are necessarily preliminary, they may be updated as research on the Embriachi workshop grows more comprehensive, and especially as more examples of the Triumphal Entry and Passion cycles are published. What remains conclusive, however, is the plaques’ steadfast ability to pique engagement and interest through delight in the intricate details that, in spite of their minute scale, indelibly express the magnitude of this key religious event.
NOTES

*I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to the individuals who supported my research on The Entry of Christ into Jerusalem: Alex W. Barker, Jane Biers, Cathy Callaway, and Jeffrey B. Wilcox. My thanks also go to R. Lee Lyman, Kathleen Slane, Anne Rudloff Stanton, Elizabeth Graff Wolfson, and my anonymous peer reviewer for their insightful comments at various stages along the way.


3. Workshop of Baldassare Embriachi, Venetian, 1390–1409. The Entry of Christ into Jerusalem, ca. 1400, bone. 11 × 4.2 cm (each); 11 × 8.4 cm (overall). Museum of Art and Archaeology, University of Missouri, Gift of Mr. J. Lionberger Davis, 67.59 A and B.


5. These include the Art Institute of Chicago, Princeton University Art Museum, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Musée du Louvre, Musée de Cluny/Musée national du Moyen Âge, Museo Civico d’Arte Antica in Turin, the Staatsliche Museum in Berlin, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and the Walters Art Gallery, among others.

6. The altarpiece is still housed in the old sacristy at the Certosa di Pavia, but the chests were eventually dismantled and remounted on a wooden armature, currently in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum in New York (accession no. 17.190.490a, b).


8. Ibid., p. 32.
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(Castelló, Spain, 2007). For an in-depth examination of the altarpiece at the Certosa di Pavia see Gian Alberto Dell’Acqua, Embriachi: il Trittico di Pavia (Milan, 1982).

10. Martini has proposed that there were at least four such workshops in operation. See Martini, Bottega degli Embriachi, pp. 10–20. The emergence of workshops producing items faced with carved-bone plaques may be linked to the rising popularity of the decorated chests and boxes, called forzieri and forzierini, that were given to a bride before marriage to hold her trousseau or precious gifts presented to her by her fiancé. The use of bone may have allowed buyers to evade sumptuary laws since it was less expensive than ivory. See Paula Nuttall, “Dancing, Love and the ‘Beautiful Game’: a New Interpretation of a Group of Fifteenth Century ‘Gaming’ Boxes,” Journal of the Society for Renaissance Studies 24, no. 1 (February, 2010) pp. 119–141, and Brucia Witthoft, “Marriage Rituals and Marriage Chests in Quattrocento Florence,” Artibus et Historiae 3, no. 5 (1982) pp. 43–59.


17. See Williamson, “The Embriachi Workshops,” p. 751 for an excellent summary of the various dating schemes posited by scholars.

18. Ibid., p. 751. Tomasi has also argued that the Embriachi works take the form of Tuscan polyptychs popular in the fourteenth century, which, he has argued, further supports the claims that the workshop emerged in Tuscany. See Tomasi, Monumenti d’Avorio, pp. 178–179.


20. See Tomasi, Monumenti d’Avorio, pp. 230–31 for a description of how this process might have been carried out within the Embriachi workshop.


24. Martini, Bottega degli Embriachi, p. 15.

25. The altarpiece is now housed in the Louvre Museum (accession no. INV. MR. 379). For a detailed analysis of this work see Tomasi, Monumenti d’Avorio, pp. 107–128, 239–245.

26. Tomasi, Monumenti d’Avorio, pp. 94–95.


31. For instance, Mary Alice Weyman identified the plaques that originally decorated the two caskets produced for the Certosa di Pavia, but which were inserted onto a wooden backing and eventually donated to the Metropolitan Museum in 1917 by J. Pierpont Morgan, as largely consisting of ivory. This ascription has since been modified to reflect that they are crafted from bone. See Mary


38. This is noted in the object file for the Missouri plaques.

39. The change in color as ivory ages was noted even in antiquity. See Cutler, *The Craft of Ivory*, p. 51. Per Paul the Silentiary, ivory “tinged by the passage of long years, turns its silvery color to quince-yellow.”


41. The tiny pits visible on the right plaque are likely the remnants of the blood vessels that once traversed the bone.


43. I am indebted to R. Lee Lyman for examining the Missouri Embriachi plaques and sharing his observations with me. While Lyman noted there are no anatomical markers that indicate from what species of animal the bones were harvested, given the thickness of the bone and its apparent diameter, a cow, or less likely a horse, is the best contender. The red and brownish substances on the back of the plaques are most likely remnants of adhesives used to affix them to some kind of backing.


45. Products faced with carved bone appear to have been available until around 1430, after which the phenomenon seems to wane (Martini, “Bottega degli Embriachi,” p. 9). Richard Randall has argued that the perceived decline in the production of ivory products is not necessarily related to the


47. For images of the episodes in the Certosa di Pavia altarpiece carved in ivory, see Dell’Acqua, Embriachi, p. 80 (nativity), p. 86 (triumphal entry), p. 91 (crucifixion), and pp. 92–93 (resurrection, noli me tangere, and ascension).


50. The Holy Bible: Douay Rheims Version (Rockford IL, 1899), I.75 (Exodus), I.151 (Numbers), and II.130 (John).


52. I would like to express my gratitude to Anne Rudloff Stanton, who provided invaluable insight for this section.


54. Workshop of Baldassare Embriachi, Venetian, ca. 1390–1409. Altarpiece of the abbey of Poissy, ca. 1397, bone, traces of polychrome, and gold; certosina borders. Approx. 276 × 236 cm (overall). Paris: Louvre Museum INV. MR. 379. For an image, see Tomasi, Monumenti d’Avorio, p. 458, fig. 73 (bottom left scene).

55. Workshop of Baldassare Embriachi, Venetian, ca. 1390–1410. Triptych with Scenes from the Life of Christ, certosina wood, bone and horn, with remnants of polychromy on the shutters. 113 × 64.5 cm (open). Sold to a private collection in Europe as lot 34 of Old Master Sculpture and Works of Art, July 9, 2015, Sotheby’s London.


57. Workshop of Baldassare Embriachi, Venetian, active circa 1393–1409. Casket, ca. 1400, carved bone, stained horn, wood, pigment, gilt metal. 28.3 × 33 × 19.1 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 47.8.25.


59. As an indispensable part of the iconography of the triumphal entry, the Sotheby’s plaque undoubtedly included a depiction of Jesus riding the donkey.

60. The Sotheby’s triptych is the only example that does not depict a young man laying down a mantle or figures waving palm fronds. Furthermore, the depiction of Jesus being greeted by three women is odd. Though women are present in paintings of the subject in medieval and early Renaissance art (see the depiction of this scene by Giotto at the Arena Chapel of Padua, ca. 1304–06,
for a well-known example), the Embriachi tend to depict only men present during the Triumphal Entry. In fact, the composition of this plaque is strikingly similar to the plaque depicting the three Marys at the Crucifixion, in the top-center scene of the triptych. There are congruences between the poses of the women in these two scenes. Additionally, the conical hat just visible in the background of the three female greeters is identical to those worn by the Roman soldiers in the Crucifixion scene. It appears that the plaque employed in the Triumphal Entry scene was originally intended to be included in a Crucifixion scene and was refashioned into a depiction of greeters at the gates of Jerusalem.

61. See Merlini, “I trittici portali,” pp. 47–62 for an informative study of templated scenes, especially as they relate to small, portable triptychs.


63. Tomasi, Monumenti d’Avorio, p. 167. The two other examples of containers featuring religious imagery include the LACMA chest (accession no. 47.8.25), one in the Museo nazionale del Palazzo di Venezia that appears to depict Old Testament scenes, and one depicting the legend of Saints Cosmas and Damian used as a reliquary container in the treasury of Amalfi Cathedral (http://museodioecesanoamalfi.it/app/it/la-basilica-del-crocifisso/cassetta-rel/). There are also a number of boxes that depict the story of Susannah and the Elders. While this is technically religious subject matter, I exclude it from the present study because it was commonly depicted on forzieri and forzierini in a romantic context.

64. The Louvre altarpiece does include two three-panel scenes with arched tops at bottom left and right, which depict the donor, Jean de Berry, and his wife, Jeanne de Boulogne, accompanied by saints and praying. This is the only instance among the three monumental altarpieces where plaques bear arched tops but level bottoms. See Tomasi, Monumenti d’Avorio, p. 412, figs. 35 and 36. It is possible that the Embriachi produced additional altarpieces with differing shapes of plaques, but these works have not survived to the present. Unless further monumental altarpieces with arched plaques are located, a triptych remains the most likely original framework for the Missouri plaques.


67. Anne Derbes has argued that in Italy this phenomenon begins to occur in the mid-thirteenth century, with images of Jesus and events from the Passion appearing to be “reinvented” specifically to elicit sympathy from the viewer. See Anne Derbes, Picturing the Passion in Late Medieval Italy: Narrative Painting, Franciscan Ideologies, and the Levant (Cambridge, 1996).


70. Derbes, Picturing the Passion, pp. 2, 10–11.
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74. Wilkins, “Opening the Doors to Devotion,” p. 376. For an analysis of the spiritual connotations of doors as they relate to triptychs, plus a discussion of how often triptychs were opened, to what degree the wings were angled, and the various functions triptychs fulfilled in late medieval and early modern religious life, see Jacobs, Opening Doors, pp. 8–20.


77. Dimensions of Embriachi products are generally given for the overall object, rather than

---

Chart 1: Comparison of Embriachi Triumphal Entries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Number of Plaques</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Direction Jesus faces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missouri plaques (Fig. 1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Above Jesus</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certosa di Pavia altarpiece (Fig. 7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ivory (left) and bone (right)</td>
<td>Above Jesus, with shepherd and animals</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvre altarpiece</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Above Jesus and crowd</td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotheby’s triptych (Fig. 8, detail)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Above Jesus and crowd</td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staatliche Museen, Berlin triptych (Fig. 9, detail)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Above Jesus</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACMA chest (Fig. 10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Above Jesus and crowd</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotheby’s plaque</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Above crowd (unclear if the trees would have extended onto other plaques)</td>
<td>(Right)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

i Because one of the figures’ hands have been broken off, it is impossible to tell if additional palm fronds were once represented in this plaque.

ii See endnote 60.
individual episodes comprising two or more plaques. I have calculated the dimensions mentioned in the text above by looking at other examples of single plaques preserved in collections such as the Princeton University Art Museum (see accession nos. y1929-16, y1959-41, and y1959-42, for example).

79. At some point in its lifetime, the right plaque was broken in half. As a result, the left hand of the figure raising a palm frond is missing. The damage is especially evident on the reverse (see Fig. 6), although the plaque has since been repaired.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donkey</th>
<th>Disciples</th>
<th>City of Jerusalem</th>
<th>Boy with Mantle</th>
<th>Palm Fronds</th>
<th>Greeters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Above crowd</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 i</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Above crowd</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Leftmost plaque, with person breaking off branch or climbing tree</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 (or 8, including figure at far left)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Leftmost plaque</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>__ ii</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Above crowd</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rightmost plaque</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>( Might have once been represented on a now-lost plaque to the right of the crowd)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>At least 2</td>
<td>At least 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three royally sponsored theater troupes entertained the eighteenth-century Parisian viewing public. Established in 1653 and settling permanently in their theater at the Hôtel Bourgogne in 1680, the troupe of the Italian Comedians, to the relish of its audiences, performed pieces characterized by slapstick, gross parody, and ribald humor. The other two troupes supported by royal subsidy were the Comédie Française, founded in 1680, which held a monopoly on theatrical performances spoken in French, and the Opéra, founded in 1672, which held a monopoly on musical operatic performances. The Italian Comedians were known for cultivating lapses from conventional standards of decorum that would never have been tolerated by the other two officially sponsored troupes. Scatological and sexual references peppered the plays of the Comedians, and they were also very outspoken in their ridicule of the values, virtues, and institutions that Crown and clergy held dear. Yet the Italians generally seemed to get away with their boisterous behavior; indeed, this less refined, less innocent humor was a major attraction. Nevertheless, the Italians did not escape the scrutiny of the police. In 1688 they received a warning to cut “all the double-entendres that are too risqué,” and in 1695 they received a severe reprimand from the authorities for a too thinly disguised portrayal of an important commissaire as a forger and a thief. The Italian Comedians, however, went a step too far in 1697 when Louis XIV heard a rumor that the Italian Comedians were going to perform a play, La Fausse Prude (The False Prude), that besmirched the reputation of the king’s publicly pious wife, Madame de Maintenon. To avoid an act of the greatest disrespect, and to exert his authority over the unruly, immoral Comedians, Louis XIV ordered the expulsion of the Italian Comedians on May 14, 1697.

The expulsion has been little commemorated in the visual arts, and for good reason: It was not a moment of glory either for the Comedians or for the Crown that banished them. The Museum of Art and Archaeology is fortunate, therefore, to have in its collection a painting of this rarely depicted event—The Departure of the Commedia dell’Arte from Paris in 1697, attributed to Joseph-François de la Pierre (Fig. 1). The Missouri painting is even more remarkable because it is a copy of a lost painting by Antoine Watteau (1684–1721). Although the Watteau painting no longer exists, its composition has been preserved through an engraving, titled The Departure of the Italian Comedians in 1697,
Fig. 1. Joseph-François de La Pierre (French, early eighteenth century). Departure of the Commedia dell’Arte from Paris in 1697, 1740–1750, oil on canvas. University of Missouri, Museum of Art and Archaeology, gift of Mrs. Irene S. Taylor (75.196). Photo: Erin Pruhs.

by the printmaker Louis Jacob (1696–) produced in 1729 (Fig. 2). Jean de Jullienne, Watteau’s friend and patron, commissioned Jacob to copy the Watteau painting for a compendium of prints after Watteau’s drawings and paintings called La Receuil Jullienne (The Jullienne collection). The engravings in the Receuil have preserved the compositions of many Watteau paintings that have since disappeared, such as the Departure of the Italian Comedians in 1697.
The Missouri Departure is a significant work for a couple of reasons. As a copy of an original painting, and recognizable through Louis Jacob’s engraving after the original painting, the Missouri Departure enriches our understanding of the culture of collecting and the commerce of “copies” in an age before mechanical reproduction. The Missouri painting is even more significant in relation to Watteau’s career. The original Departure, executed by Watteau sometime between 1703 and 1709, was one of the earliest manifestations of his investigation into theatrical subjects, before he established the conventional hallmarks of his mature fêtes galantes. Thus, the Missouri Departure provides a window into his early artistic development in terms of formal style, narrative strategies, and the significance of the subject for the Parisian viewing audience.
The Missouri Departure was bequeathed to the Museum of Art and Archaeology in 1975 by the late journalist and Mizzou alumna Irene Taylor. We do not know when the painting was done, although it certainly postdates the original Watteau painting, and we do not know the circumstances surrounding its production; for example, whether it was painted for a particular client or for sale in a dealer’s shop. The provenance of the Missouri Departure can, however, be traced back to the 1940s when Irene Taylor reported that her son purchased it at auction in Aschaffenburg, Germany. A signature, “de la Pierre,” originally appeared on the painting but was removed during cleaning. Little is known about the early eighteenth-century artist Joseph-François de la Pierre, and the Missouri Departure is the only painting this author is aware of as attributed to him. Joseph-François de la Pierre appears in the records of the Academy of St. Luke, which was the guild of painters, and he was likely the father of Nicolas-Benjamin Delapierre (ca. 1739–1802), a painter who specialized in portrait miniatures and enjoyed professional success in Paris, where he was a member of the Royal Academies of Painting and Sculpture in Russia and Lyon.

Our knowledge of Watteau’s original Departure is as sketchy as that of the Missouri Departure. While scholars disagree about the exact date of Watteau’s Departure, there is a consensus that it was painted sometime during his apprenticeship with Claude Gillot (1673–1722) from 1704/1705 to 1708/1709. The provenance of the original version of Watteau’s Departure is known only up to 1729, when the Mercure de France published the announcement of Louis Jacob’s engraving after the painting. The legend on the print indicates that Louis Jacob engraved it after the original painting by Watteau, that the dimensions of the painting were “1 pied, 7 pouces” by “1 pied, 11 pouces” (approximately 51.3 x 62.1 cm), and that it belonged to Abbé Penetti. Abbé Penetti was the secretary to Abbé Franchini, who was the Florentine envoy at the French court; Penetti and Watteau had an important mutual friend in the art collector Pierre-Jean Mariette. Nothing further is known concerning the whereabouts of the original Watteau painting.

The Missouri Departure represents a group of six members of the Italian Comedy posed in a theatrical urban street scene. Dominating the scene in the center is one of the female leads, or amoureuses, who gazes upward with outspread arms; behind her and just to the right is the spirited servant, Columbine, who poses in the stock “weep of despair” pose. Viewers can recognize the stock male figures by their characteristic costumes, gestures, and poses. In the right foreground is the impish Harlequin in his lozenge-patched suit and black mask; behind him and to his right is the pot-bellied and hunchbacked Polichinelle, a self-inflated big mouth. To the left of the central amoureuse is the scheming, flirtatious valet Mezzetin wearing his characteristic striped costume with floppy hat and ruff around his neck. At the time of the expulsion the Italian actor Angelo Constantini had popularized the role of Mezzetin and endowed the character with an overblown sensibility. In Departure he pulls his hat and raises his arm in a comic gesture of anguish. The supplicating figure to his right is Pierrot, the naïve ninny, wearing his oversized white costume. Three more figures appear who do not sport the traditional costumes of the Italian Comedians: on the right-hand side, a man in a red cloak with his back to the viewer walks into the background; on the left, a figure in a brown coat, seen in profile, similarly
moves toward the back; and a barely perceptible third gentleman is situated in the center back of the painting. Earth tones dominate the overall palette of the painting, with pops of red, yellow, and blue, and white highlights in the comedians’ costumes.

There are two significant differences between the Missouri Departure and the Louis Jacob print. First is the orientation; the Missouri Departure is the mirror image of the engraving. This discrepancy is due to the engraving process; when the printmaker incises the plate to be printed the image is in the same orientation as the image being copied; however, when the plate is inked and put through a press the resulting image is the reverse of the image incised on the plate. Second, the Missouri Departure is a reduced version of the scene represented in the engraving. The painting includes only the central section, leaving out several figures that appear in the engraving—on the right side, the magistrate, a pie seller, and a man posting a sign on the wall; on the left side several other figures: Scaramouche, a clowning figure filled with false bravado, who, dressed in his traditional black costume with white ruff and floppy black hat, raises his hands in a gesture of surprise; Doctor Baloardo, a pompous pedant and frequently rejected suitor, who appears behind and to the left of Scaramouche wearing his doctoral robes and holding a weighty tome; and directly behind the doctor a finely dressed figure with his back turned, perhaps one of the troupe’s amoureux, either Octave or Leandre. The Missouri painting further excludes the upper portion we see in the engraving, which includes a group of onlookers, on the left side of the engraving, peering down from the upper story of the building.

An examination of the Missouri Departure reveals that it has been cut down on all sides, glued to another canvas and attached to its current support (Fig. 3). The painting, moreover, is not in excellent condition. There are areas of paint loss, particularly in the upper and lower right corners, and there appears to be infill in the upper portion of the painting and the lower right corner. Just above the heads of the figures is a faint horizontal line suggesting that there may have been some kind of alteration to the underlying canvas. Some of the white highlights throughout the painting may be the result of a later restoration. There is also evidence of restoration on Harlequin’s costume and face, especially the eye, and also on the eye and moustache of Polichinelle (Figs. 4a and b). We do not know when the restoration occurred and whether it was performed at the same time the painting was cleaned and the signature removed.

Fig. 3. Unframed view of one side of Figure 1.
Figs. 4a and b. Detail of Figure 1, lower right side, showing restorations on Harlequin and Polichinelle.
Owing to the linear nature of printmaking technique, the details in the Jacob print are more clearly defined than they are in the Missouri painting. Most notable is the figure leaning against the far corner of the building on the right-hand side of the Jacob print, who in the Missouri Departure appears only as an indistinct, shadowy shape on the left-hand side of the image (Fig. 5). This figure is interesting, for he wears a pointed hat and a robe with very deep sleeves—elements that are characteristic of the fanciful Asian figures found in contemporary costume design and in the arabesques that Watteau designed and executed at the Château of La Muette sometime between 1708 and 1712.¹⁰ The room’s decoration did not exist for very long, but there is a suite of engravings—Figures chinoises et tartares peintes par Watteau Peintre du Roi (1731)—done after the La Muette decorations (Fig. 6). Thus, this figure in Departure is an even earlier example of Watteau’s engagement with chinoiserie.

Fig. 5. Detail of Figure 2: man wearing pointed hat and robe with deep sleeves leaning against the building.

Fig. 6. François Boucher (French, 1703–1770) after a painting by Jean-Antoine Watteau (1684–1721). Lao Gine ou Vieillard Chinois, 1731, engraving on paper. RMN-Grand Palais/Art Resource, NY (Musée du Louvre), (N248folio127). Photo: Angèle Dequier.
Both the engravings of *Figures chinoises et tartares* and Louis Jacob’s engraving after *Departure* were included in the four-volume set of engravings after Watteau’s works, the *Receuil Jullienne*. The *Receuil* consisted of two volumes titled *Figures de différents caractères* published in 1727 and 1728 that contained 343 engravings after selected Watteau drawings, and two volumes titled *L’oeuvre gravé* published in 1735 that contained 271 engravings after Watteau’s paintings. Jean de Jullienne was Watteau’s friend and patron, and following the artist’s death he masterminded the project of creating a collection of engravings after Watteau’s works as a tribute to Watteau and as a monument to their friendship. Indeed, the work was conceived and marketed in terms of friendship, and we might view Jullienne as the self-appointed guardian of Watteau’s memory.

Jullienne was the director of the Gobelins tapestry manufactury as well as an art collector and dealer—especially of “modern” painters, such as Watteau. We know that Jullienne at one time owned at least thirty-nine of the paintings reproduced in *L’oeuvre gravé*; one of their mutual friends wrote “for a time Jullienne owned almost all of the pictures Watteau had ever painted.” Certainly the *Receuil Jullienne* glorified the memory and reputation of Watteau, but it also functioned as an advertisement for Jullienne, who was the chief dealer of Watteau’s painting. We know that Jullienne lost money on the production of the prints but profited in other ways; he was able to place Watteau paintings with collectors of the highest standing, such as Frederick the Great of Prussia, thereby increasing the desirability of Watteau’s paintings and prints produced after them. As an intermediary in the procurement and sale of Watteau paintings, Jullienne more than made up for the loss from the *Receuil*. The publication of the *Receuil Jullienne* certainly contributed to and capitalized on the growing trend for collecting art during the course of the eighteenth century, for the collecting and display of prints, paintings, and other objets d’art had become a means to elevate one’s social status. Another friend of Watteau’s, the art dealer Édme Gersaint, articulated art collecting’s power to define social status in a statement he published in a sales catalog:

> What advantages can a *Curieux* [an art lover] customarily derive from his curiosity? . . . his title of *Curieux* gives him access to the most famous collections and he can go to enjoy himself there; in the capacity of *Curieux* he becomes equal to those same people given over to this noble passion whose rank or condition is beyond his; as such he is invited to and received with pleasure at their gatherings established for the purpose of communicating to one another their discoveries or their acquisitions; he benefits from and rejoices with them over these *nouveautés* and he acquires daily some information and knowledge thus enlightening himself in the course of entertaining himself.15

Personal aesthetic pleasure and the display of social status have become mutually inclusive. Whether Jullienne’s intention in producing the *Receuil Jullienne* was a sincere token of friendship or a marketing ploy (or more likely a combination of the two), the
resulting collection of prints fed the growing demand for print collecting in the eighteenth century and contributed to the growth of a sophisticated network of print production linking printmakers, painters, dealers, makers of materials and tools, collectors, and connoisseurs.\footnote{16}

As well as satisfying collectors’ demands for prints in the eighteenth century, the prints in the \textit{Receuil Jullienne} have also provided today’s scholars with a wealth of documentation on Watteau’s paintings. The prints often included the name of the owner of the painting, the print shop where it could be purchased, dimensions, and sometimes a dedicatory verse. Most important, however, the prints in the \textit{Receuil Jullienne} have preserved the composition of paintings that have been lost, such as \textit{Departure}.

Prints were not the only means of reproducing a painted image. Artists and patrons would frequently have painted copies made of original paintings. This was particularly the case with portraits, when duplicates would be presented as gifts to family and friends. Paintings that were in vogue would be copied multiple times in what might be termed painting sweatshops where artists cranked out paintings by the yard. Many artists supplemented their incomes by freelancing as copyists, and copying the works of a master was an integral part of an apprentice’s training. Watteau himself was employed in such a painting factory when he first arrived in Paris.\footnote{17} The production of the Missouri \textit{Departure} was thus in keeping with the practices of the period and is a testament to the popularity of Watteau’s work. Watteau’s paintings, in particular, were frequently copied and pastiched, so much so that Oliver Wunsch writes: “A small industry of Watteau copyists emerged across Europe, some adhering as closely as possible to the original composition, others following Watteau’s own practice of recombining figures in order to create novel pastiches.”\footnote{18}

We can only speculate on who originally owned or commissioned the Missouri \textit{Departure}. In all likelihood it was a member of the growing ranks of art collectors—perhaps someone who had an interest in the Italian theater. It is interesting to recall that the owner of Watteau’s original painting of \textit{Departure} was an Italian, Abbé Penetti, the secretary to Abbé Franchini who was the Florentine envoy at the French court. Thus, \textit{Departure} would have been an appropriate subject for an Italian who was presumably himself departing from time to time. The relatively small size of the painting would have made it ideal for display in a private picture gallery.

The Missouri \textit{Departure} was not the only copy of the original Watteau. One copy was listed and illustrated in a 1970 sales catalog, so it could not possibly be the Missouri version, and there is a copy, attributed to Nicolas Lancret, listed in a sales catalog from 1842. The whereabouts of these other works are, however, no longer known, and the Missouri \textit{Departure} remains the only existing copy.\footnote{19}

Even though it is a copy, and a reduced one at that, the Missouri \textit{Departure} provides a window onto Watteau’s early, formative career when he was working with Claude Gillot, an inventive, if somewhat idiosyncratic, printmaker, illustrator, painter, stage-set and costume designer who was influential in the development of Watteau’s style and
engagement with theatrical subject matter. Comparing Gillot’s painting *The Tomb of Master André: Harlequin a Glutton* (Fig. 7) and Gillot’s engraving *The Death of Maître André* (Fig. 8) with the Missouri *Departure* and the Jacob print, we can immediately observe similarities.

Gillot had a recognizable figure type, characterized by a stiffness in pose and bearing, elongated proportions, and tiny pointed hands and feet. Scholars frequently use the terms “rigid,” or “nervous,” to describe his style, and this quality is underscored by the tight yet energetic use of line in his drawings and engravings. Early in his career, Watteau absorbed many of Gillot’s stylistic elements, including this figural type. Watteau copied Gillot’s costumed figures; a case in point is a figure of a weeping female that Watteau copied and which is plausibly the prototype for the weeping female in *Departure*. The setting in Watteau’s *Departure* is also very similar to the setting in Gillot’s theatrical scenes, such as that in *The Tomb of Master André: Harlequin a Glutton*. Gillot did a series of paintings and drawings that illustrated specific scenes from plays. These images of performances were subsequently engraved. Often in Gillot’s works the juncture between a painted backdrop and stage floor is apparent, such as in *The Tomb of*
Master André: Harlequin a Glutton and The Death of Maître André; he makes no attempt to disguise the fact that the image represents a theatrical performance. The buildings in Gillot’s Tomb of Master André: Harlequin a Glutton and Watteau’s Departure are nearly identical in their stiffness and the somewhat distorted, inflexible perspective characteristic of stage-set design. These similarities have led some scholars to speculate that Departure was a collaboration between Watteau and Gillot. Whether Gillot actually laid a brush to the canvas of Departure or not, we can consider the work as a collaboration in the sense of a relationship between a student and a master whose work the student thoroughly absorbed and emulated. This kind of frank stage-setting and theatrical illustration is common in Gillot’s works. Watteau’s treatment of theatrical subject matter, especially in works produced after his apprenticeship with Gillot, is, however, typically more allusive than literal; the boundaries between the real and the theatrical are blurred. A good example of this can be seen in two other prints after Watteau paintings that are in the Museum of Art and Archaeology’s collection—Love in the French Theater (Fig. 9) and Love in the Italian Theater (Fig. 10). In Love in the French Theater a group of actors and musicians surround a dancing couple in the center; behind them an actor portraying Bacchus with his grape-leaf crown and another one portraying Cupid with his quiver make a toast beneath the watchful eye of a bust. These actors, however, are in an outdoor setting and not on a stage, and one cannot even be sure that they are actors.23 They could be in costume at a masquerade party in a garden setting, a type of activity enjoyed by elite society of the period and immortalized by Watteau in his fêtes galantes. In Love in the Italian Theater we see an outdoor nocturnal scene where actors dressed in the costumes of...
Fig. 9. Charles-Nicolas Cochin, the elder (French, 1688–1754) after a painting by Jean-Antoine Watteau (French, 1684–1721). Love in the French Theater, 1734, etching and engraving on paper. University of Missouri, Museum of Art and Archaeology, Gilbreath-McLorn Museum Fund (2010.14).

Fig. 10. Charles-Nicolas Cochin, the elder (French, 1688–1754) after a painting by Antoine Watteau (1684–1721). Love in the Italian Theater, 1734, etching and engraving on paper. University of Missouri, Museum of Art and Archaeology, Gilbreath-McLorn Museum Fund (2010.13).
the stock figures of the Italian Comedy turn to the Pierrot figure in the center who plays a guitar. We see none of the frank depiction of stage and stagecraft so typical of Gillot’s theatrical scenes, and we are not sure if they are acting or even in character. Watteau depicts, perhaps, the liminal moment after a performance. The ambiguity of the theatrical elements in these two works raises questions about illusion and reality, and about costume and identity. Are the costumed figures acting, or not? In contrast, the histrionic gestures and theatrical setting in Departure would suggest a performance on stage. If Departure’s actors seem more overtly theatrical than those in Love in the French Theater and Love in the Italian Theater, they still, however, exhibit a level of ambiguity since Departure represents an actual historical event and not a scene performed onstage.

In Departure, the figures are still in character; they have not lost their theatrical identities. Watteau does not depict a real event as it probably occurred. The tension between the actual event and a theatrical performance becomes apparent if we compare Departure to two of the known images representing this event. The first is a painting, The Expulsion of the Actors after the Suppression of the Commedia dell’Arte, by an anonymous artist, at the André Malraux Museum of Fine Arts in Le Havre, France (Fig. 11). In both Departure...
and the Le Havre painting we see the same moment, and both illustrate the posting of the notice of the Comedians’ expulsion outside the theater. The biggest difference between the two images is the behavior of the actors. The comedians depicted in the Le Havre painting are subdued, chastened, and resigned to their fate. They obediently file out of the theater in single file. On the left-hand side of the painting, there is a group of officers who oversee and document the expulsion, thereby emphasizing the Comedians’ submission to royal authority. The king’s decree of banishment has effectively snuffed out their theatrical identities; the Comedians are now merely petty offenders. Even Columbine’s tearful plea lacks the rhetorical flourish that would mark it as theatrical convention. This is a plausible “reconstruction” of an actual event, and by contrast Watteau’s histrionic comedians are behaving oddly, given the context. Watteau’s Comedians refuse to give up their theatrical identities; they are literally acting up!

The other representation of this event is known only through a photograph in the archives of the Bibliothèque de l’Opéra in Paris of an anonymous, undated drawing. The title of the work appears within a scrollwork frame at the bottom of the image: *Burlesque of the Flight of the Italian Comedians Driven from Paris in 1697* (Fig. 12). The scene is crudely rendered and was probably done by an artist with minimal training or skill. The figures are clumsy and puppet-like, and there is no unity of scale within the image. Beyond issues of artistic skill, the Opéra drawing differs in several respects from the Le Havre painting and Watteau’s *Departure*. First, the point of view is panoramic, including many more figures and a vaster space. The scene presents a variety of episodes, and one can read it almost as a continuous narrative: from left to right, the arrival of the official entourage, the posting of the decree, the removal of stage properties and belongings, and

the final accounting and administrative documentation. The figures are still in costume, but they are engaged in a variety of activities associated with the nuts-and-bolts of emptying the theater and leaving town. Second, the drawing is titled as a “Burlesque,” indicating that it is meant to be a satirical, derisive representation of the event. The emphasis on the mundane details presents a “behind the scenes” version of the event, thereby mocking and diminishing its meaning as a celebration of royal power and moral authority.

In spite of the differences in their visual formats and mediums, the Opéra drawing and the Le Havre painting resemble each other more than either resembles Watteau’s version of events. Watteau introduces an incongruous theatricality that makes it difficult to understand the image as a straightforward documentation of the event and, subsequently, raises questions about why Watteau chose to depict the expulsion of the Italian Comedians in the manner that he did.

It should first be mentioned that Watteau could not have witnessed the event firsthand; he arrived in Paris in 1702 or 1703, well after the event, and in all likelihood his rendering of the subject was based on Gillot’s figure sketches and verbal accounts. The Italian Comedians did return to Paris in 1716. In fact, it was one of the first acts of the Regent, Philippe d’Orléans, who took over the rule of France after the death of the long-reigning Louis XIV (he ruled from 1663 to 1715). Watteau must then have painted Departure sometime after the expulsion of the Comedians in 1697 but before their return in 1716.26 This interim time frame is significant, because between their expulsion and return, Italian Comedians had come to symbolize the subversion of royal authority. Certainly, the impetus for Louis XIV’s banishment of the Italian Comedians—the rumor they were to present a play besmirching the reputation of his beloved Madame de Maintenon—was more than just a breach of good taste; it was above all a challenge to the king’s ability to control cultural discourses. It can be argued that Watteau’s Departure is principally an image about a crisis of authority.27

While the Italian Comedians were officially out of sight after Louis XIV’s banishment, they were definitively not out of the public’s mind. The bawdy, subversive tradition of the Italian Comedians persisted and flourished in the theaters at the foires (fairs). The fairs were seasonal events held in Paris—in the spring in an area near the parish of St. Germain des Près, and in the summer in an area near the parish of St. Laurent.28 The Fair St. Germain was almost a city within a city and consisted of nine major streets; the Fair St. Laurent, the smaller and less fashionable of the two, was composed of eight tent-covered markets organized in a series of intersecting streets. The areas of the fairs were legally the domain of the parish church, and not the city of Paris, and usual guild and city restrictions did not apply. The fairs could not be regulated and controlled according to the same rules as the rest of the city, and as a result, the fairs were spaces where a sense of freedom and freewheeling reigned. Joachim Nemeitz, a German who wrote a guidebook of sorts for foreign visitors to Paris, observed this about the fairs: “Everything there is pell-mell, masters with valets and lackeys, swindlers with honest men. The most refined courtiers, the prettiest young women, the most subtle pickpockets are all mixed up together.”29 This mixing of groups of people who normally would never have rubbed shoulders provided
the allure of a walk on the wild side and was an attraction in and of itself. A variety of other attractions and entertainments drew Parisians of all levels of society to the fairs. A multitude of boutiques sold goods of all sorts, including luxury items and paintings; street stalls and peddlers sold a variety of special treats; and cafés provided the visitors a place to eat, drink, and enjoy the spectator sport of people watching. There were also theatrical spectacles that ranged from organized professional troupes who performed on a regular schedule in semi-permanent theaters to crude, unsophisticated street diversions such as sword swallowers, acrobats, jugglers, performing animals, waxworks, puppet shows, fortune-tellers, and automaton displays. Yet, even the most sophisticated entertainments at the fair were popular in nature, and it was in this marginal, unofficial milieu that the tradition of the Italian Comedians continued and thrived.

After Louis XIV banished the Italian Comedians, the fair entrepreneurs immediately appropriated their repertoire and audience. According to an eighteenth-century source:

The suppression of the Italian Comedians’ troupe provided fresh territory for those in the entertainment business at the fair. These entrepreneurs regarded themselves as the heirs of the Italian comedians; they performed several fragments from the Italians’ repertoire at this fair and added new actors to the troupe in order to bring off the performance. The public, who regretted the loss of the Italian Comedians, rushed in crowds to see these imitations. What they saw at the fair delighted and pleased them.

In addition, members of the banished troupes wrote new works for the fair theaters. The children and grandchildren of the banished comedians performed at the fair theaters. The Italian Comedians, while banished, were still very much alive.

The Italians’ gross physical humor, improvisational style, and political satire prevailed at the fair theaters, and the fair troupes became even more outspoken and indecorous than their predecessors. The lapses from accepted notions of propriety and the ridicule of social norms were attractions that united spectators, whether elite or from the street, in a shared, derisive laughter. Nemeitz commented of the fair performances, “I have observed with astonishment that even women of quality could hear and see obscenities without blushing from shame; I can only say that these women could not contain their pleasure and laughed, wholeheartedly.” The unofficial holiday atmosphere of the fairs fostered an ever greater profanity and more pointed satire of social conventions and official authority. The Italian Comedians had pushed the boundaries of what was deemed acceptable, resulting in the king’s banishing their troupe; the even more subversive performances of the fair troupes proved far more intractable and impervious to official control. The thorny question of legal jurisdiction over fair property owned by a parish led to disputes, and the temporary, tumultuous nature of the fairs made it difficult for the authorities to implement the cumbersome machinery of regulatory protocol and procedure. All this created an atmosphere that invited the Comedians to make a game of pushing the limits and outwitting official regulation. When necessary to avoid official ordinances, the fair
troupes changed the locations of their theaters; they could disband a troupe, only to reform a “new” troupe a short time later.

The overwhelming popularity of the fair theaters also posed a real financial threat to the two royally sanctioned theaters, the Comédie Française and the Opéra. During the fairs, the attendance at these two institutions decreased dramatically. The fair troupes mercilessly parodied the more highbrow performances of the Comédie Française and the Opéra, sullying their reputations as the officially sanctioned conveyors of high culture. Moreover, the fair troupe’s mockery of officially sponsored performances presented a larger symbolic threat to royal authority. The Comédie Française and the Opéra, supported by royal sponsors and the police, fought back. From around 1700 until the return of the Italian Comedians in 1716 there was an ongoing “battle of the theaters.” The Comédie Française and the Opéra asserted their royally sanctioned privileges—monopolies on dialogue, music, and dance—in an attempt to restrict fair performers and protect their revenues and reputations.

The heirs to the Italian Comedians gleefully engaged in the skirmishes of this battle; their performances at the fair theaters taunted and provoked official intervention and then made a show of eluding those proscriptions. The fair troupes’ boastful evasions of official intervention became as much a part of the spectacle as the actual performance, much to the delight of the viewing audience. In 1699 d’Argenson, the lieutenant-general of police, prohibited the fair troupes from performing anything that resembled the productions of the Comédie Française. In 1699 d’Argenson, the lieutenant-general of police, prohibited the fair troupes from performing anything that resembled the productions of the Comédie Française. This decree did not stop the fair comedians from parodies that were claimed “not to resemble” the Comédie Française’s performances. In 1706 the police went further and placed greater restrictions on the fair troupes: dialogue—the rightful privilege of the Comédie Française—was prohibited. This left monologue as the only permissible verbal mode for the fair troupes. The fair performers became experts, however, at overcoming this obstacle while pointedly complying with the letter of the law. They exploited the use of monologue in new and creative ways. Monologue was defined by law as one actor speaking alone on the stage, thus, the fair comedians would have one actor speak on the stage, and another would reply offstage. Or, an actor would speak onstage, run off while another actor ran onstage for the response. Other tactics to circumvent the prohibition on dialogue relied on texts to be read by the audience. Actors would carry scrolls in their pockets with written speeches, these would be unfurled and held up for the audience to read, or printed dialogue would be suspended from above, creating a “cartoon bubble” effect.

The subversive spirit and tradition of the Italian Comedians succeeded not only despite the restrictions placed upon them but also because of the restrictions. The heirs of the Italians at the fair theaters succeeded by creating new forms that cleverly circumvented attempts to control them, and they turned the whole process of circumventing official decrees into a spectacle in its own right. The triumph of the Italian tradition was so great that the regent, Philippe d’Orléans, waited only one day after the death of Louis XIV to officially restore the status of the Italian Comedians.
When Watteau painted *Departure*, the battle between the renegade fair theaters and the Comédie Française, backed by royal authority, was in full force. The Italian Comedians in general, and their banishment in 1697 more specifically, had become freighted with anti-authoritarian meanings and associations. The Italian Comedians had come to represent subversion, resistance, and revitalization. Watteau’s *Departure* pays tribute not only to the Italian Comedians but also to the persistence of their tradition in the face of royal suppression. Like the Comedians at the fair, the Comedians in *Departure* have not succumbed to official repression; they have retained their theatrical identity. They are literally “acting up” and have made official repression part of their repertoire, thereby undermining the king’s authority as they ostensibly comply with it.

There is one apparently innocuous detail in *Departure* that further adds to the image’s anti-authoritarian message—the signboard that extends out from the building on the right-hand side of the Missouri painting. Before street numbering was introduced in the 1780s, locations were marked by signboards that often illustrated the name of an establishment or its nature.35 Jutting out from the building just above the signboard in *Departure* is a fir tree, which in the Missouri painting is very faint—it is far more legible in the Jacob engraving (Figs. 1 and 2). The fir tree is a traditional indicator of an inn or a hostel.36 The signboard itself displays an upward-pointing crescent; it probably represents the name of the establishment, for *Le Croissant* or *Au Croissant* was a common name for a cabaret in the period. It may also specifically refer to a rather well-known cabaret, the *Au Croissant* that was located near the Italian Comedians’ theater, the Hôtel Bourgogne. By including this landmark, Watteau could better persuade the viewer that the scene represents an actual event. As well as underscoring the authenticity of the event depicted, the crescent signboard could also be understood in theatrical terms, underscoring the sense of a stage performance. Signboards were used as stage properties by the Italian Comedians, and Claude Gillot represented them in some of the theatrical scenes such as the *Death of Maitre André* (Fig. 8). Signboards are also mentioned in the Italian Comedians’ plays. For example, a scene in *Arlequin Protée*, first performed in 1683, might have required a signboard like the one in *Departure*. In the scene two innkeepers try to persuade Harlequin to lodge in their establishments.

Inkeeper I: Come, lodge here Monsieur.
   Good lodging whether afoot or mounted
   At the sign *Au Croissant*
Harlequin: *Au Croissant?* Now there’s a sign
   That’s a bad omen.37

Why would lodging at the inn at the sign of *Au Croissant* be a bad omen? To answer this question, we must turn to popular jargon of the period where, according to the 1735 *Dictionnaire comique, satirique, critique, burlesque, libre et proverbial,*38 *croissant* refers to “the horns that a man who is a cuckold wears.” The horns of a cuckold originally
derived from the myth of Artemis and Acteon, where Artemis turned the hunter Acteon into a stag after he accidentally stumbled upon her bathing in a secret outdoor grotto. According to ancient tradition cuckolds had horns and hence the name Acteon became an appellation for a man whose wife is unfaithful. The *Dictionnaire* further states that “to be lodged *au croissant* signifies membership in the brotherhood of Acteon, to be numbered among the cuckolds.” The upward points, or horns, of the crescent on the signboard in *Departure*, would have clearly indicated to contemporary viewers that someone is a cuckold. But who is the cuckold? A verse from a play, Jean-François Regnard’s *La baguette de Vulcain*, first performed by the Italian Comedians in 1693 and several times thereafter, provides a clue.40

The vagabond Sun never rests  
Ever scurries from house  
to house, as husbands would do  
if they were allowed to  
be set free from their prisons,  
But of one spouse the abode is certain:  
whatever path that he takes as he comes  
and he goes, he will always arrive  
to lodge at the sign of the crescent.41

Louis XIV was known as the Sun King, and he likely would have been recognized as the “vagabond Sun” referred to in the verse from *La baguette de Vulcain*. Louis XIV was also represented as a cuckold in the scurrilous and malicious literature that circulated during his sunset years when he was married to Madame de Maintenon. She was an intensely devout and religious woman who wanted to make certain that the king would attain salvation. Under her influence, Louis XIV also became more devout and instituted a policy of public piety that the court was expected to follow. This included eliminating the entertainments, including the theater, that the court had previously enjoyed. Courtiers’ journals are filled with complaints that life at Versailles had become oppressive and somber, and Madame de Maintenon was clearly to blame for this! Members of the court were obliged to curry favor with her publicly, but in private Maintenon was the object of contempt and derision. She was also the subject of much satirical and malicious literature that circulated underground—the *False Prude*, the alleged play that precipitated the banishment of the Italian Comedians, is an example of this literature.42 In these satires, Madame de Maintenon was often represented as a lascivious, promiscuous woman who had love affairs with multiple servants and members of the clergy, making a cuckold out of her husband, Louis XIV.

In *Departure*, Louis is the supreme cuckold. Madame de Maintenon, at least in the scurrilous literature, cheats on her husband. In addition, she was viewed by many of the courtiers as the person behind the banishment of the Comedians who used the king to achieve that end. The cuckold’s inn, indicated by the signboard bearing the crescent
becomes an ironic reply to the decree being posted on the wall that clearly bears the words “de par le Roi” (in the name of the king). In the popular imagination, it is really Madame’s wishes that are satisfied at the expense of the king’s reputation.

In the context of Departure, moreover, it is the Italian Comedians who make a cuckold of the king. They deceive him by refusing to succumb to his will; they carry on quite well without his sanction at the fair theaters. They figuratively mock the king as well in Departure, for the potent symbol of Louis—the Sun—is now symbolized on the signboard by the *croissant*, a waning crescent moon.

In Departure, Watteau draws from popular culture, a practice that he continued throughout his career. He mixes his metaphors, using symbols such as the crescent signboard, that function in a number of different contexts. Moreover, Watteau mixes genres, creating an allusiveness the viewer is called upon to interrogate. In Departure we shift back and forth from interpreting the image as a theatrical scene to understanding it as a documentary depiction of an actual event; Watteau sets up levels of meaning that reverberate against one another. All the elements of Departure refer back to and support a meaning that is nowhere openly stated, but that the viewing public would have intuited. Hence, the importance of the Missouri Departure: it is an early example of the mode of narrative structuring Watteau would consistently employ in his mature works. This deployment of a vibrant subterranean conversation of meanings that included a delight in playing with accepted formal means of expression, all for the benefit of a knowledgeable and knowing audience, is a tactic that Watteau used with increasing mastery through the *fêtes galantes* all the way to the final Signboard of Gersaint.

NOTES


2. Museum of Art and Archaeology, acc. no. 75.196, oil on canvas, H. 36 cm, W. 35 cm.


4. *Fêtes galantes* are scenes of elegant men and women engaged in leisurely activities in a park-like setting. The figures often sport masquerade costumes derived from theatrical characters like those of the commedia dell’arte. The most celebrated of Watteau’s *fêtes galantes* is the *Pilgrimage to Cythera*, 1717, Louvre, Paris.

5. Handwritten notes from the donor in the Museum of Art and Archaeology’s object file for acc. no. 75.196. They also indicate that there was a similarity between a family name and that of the artist—de la Pierre.


8. The print was announced in the Mercure de France (July 1729) p. 1603.

9. The following text appears on the lower-left-hand side of the engraving, and on the right, a Latin translation:

**Departure des Comédiens Italiens en 1697**

Gravé d’Après le Tableau original peint par Watteau haut de
1 pied 7 pouces sur 1 pied 11 pouces de large

In smaller print, between the French and Latin texts, is “Tirée du Cabinet de M. L’Abbé Penety.”


13. For an in-depth study of Jean de Jullienne as a collector and dealer, see Isabelle Tillerot, Jean de Jullienne et les collectionneurs de son temps (Paris, 2010).


20. Martin Eidelberg discusses the significant influence Gillot had on Watteau’s artistic formation in “Watteau in the Atelier of Gillot,” in Moureau and Grasselli, eds., Antoine Watteau, pp. 45–57; for works on Gillot see Bernard Populus, Claude Gillot (1673–1722): Catalogue d’œuvre...

21. Gillot’s painting *The Tomb of Master André: Harlequin a Glutton* was part of a series of four works that illustrated scenes from Brugiére de Barante and Louis Biancolelli’s play *Le Tombeau de Maître André*, first performed in 1695, and again in 1718. In 1716 it was performed by marionette puppets of Alexander Bertrand, with whom Gillot was associated. The print, *The Death of Maître André*, was engraved by Jacques Gabriel Huquier (1730–1805) after an original by Claude Gillot. It was part of a set of twelve engravings representing scenes from the Italian Comedy.


23. Scholars have attempted to link *Love in the French Theater* to a specific performance, and there are many opinions concerning what play this painting might represent. For a summary of the various theatrical pieces that have been proposed, see Guillaume Glorieux, *Watteau* (Paris, 2011) pp. 288–295.


25. A copy, in bad condition, of the Le Havre painting is in the Musée Carnavalet in Paris.


32. Nemeitz, *Séjour*, p. 174. “J’ai vu souvent avec étonnement que même des Dames de condition ont pu entendre & voir des saltzez sans rougir de honte; que dis-je, elles n’ont pas pu cacher le contentement qu’elles en ressentoient puisqu’elles rioient de bonne Coeur.”

35. For the culture and lore of signboards in early modern Paris, see Édouard Fournier, Histoire des enseignes de Paris (Paris, 1884); and Charles Fedgal, Les vieilles enseignes de Paris (Paris, 1913).
Aubergiste I: V enez loger chez nous Monsieur.
Bon logis à pied et à cheval
C’est Au Croissant.
Arlequin: Au Croissant? Voila une Enseigne
De mauvaise augure.
39. Ibid., “être logé au croissant signifie être de la confrérie d’Acteon, être au nombre des cocus.”
41. La baguette de Vulcain was an outgrowth of scenes from Regnard’s Les chinois. See Jean-François Regnard, “Les Chinois,” in Calame, ed., Regnard Comédiès, p. 479.
“Le Soleil vagabond jamais ne
se repose il va toujours de maison
en maison, que de maris feroient la
même chose s’il leur étoit permis de
sortir de prison mais d’un époux
la demeure est certain quelque
chemin qu’il prenne qu’il aille qu’il
vienne son ascendant toujours l’entraîne
loger au croissant.”
There is a print for this play that carries this verse and the image of an upward pointing crescent. Bibliothèque Nationale, Collection Hennin, vol. 68, no. 6016.
42. The most important of this anti-Maintenon literature is the compilation R. Bussy Rabutin, Histoire amoureuse des Gaules, suivie de La France galante, romans satiriques du XVIIème siècle, 2 vols. (Paris, 1868).
About the Authors

Jane Biers has a BA from Oxford University and a PhD from the University of California, Berkeley. She retired as curator of ancient art at the Museum of Art and Archaeology in December 2000 after being employed at the Museum since September 1968. She was rehired as interim director of the Museum in September 2004 and served in that position until April 2006. Among her publications are a monograph on the Roman bath in Ancient Corinth, in the series issued by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, and contributions to the publication of the University of Missouri’s excavations at Mirobriga, Portugal. In 2004 she was the editor of a volume entitled A Peacable Kingdom: Animals in Ancient Art from the Leo Mildenberg Collection. She has excavated at St. Albans and Fishbourne, United Kingdom, Ancient Corinth and Phlius, Greece, Tel Anafa, Israel, and Mirobriga, Portugal.

Julie Anne Plax is professor emerita at the University of Arizona. She received her MA and PhD in art history from the University of Missouri. She has written on French eighteenth-century paintings, tapestries, and garden design, including Watteau and the Cultural Politics of Eighteenth-Century France, published by Cambridge University Press. The focus of her current research is on the theme of the hunt in eighteenth-century art.

Heather Alexis Smith received her MA in art history from the University of Missouri in 2015 and is a member of the curatorial team at the Pulitzer Arts Foundation in St. Louis. Her research centers on cross-cultural contact in the late medieval and early modern worlds.
Acquisitions 2018

European and American Art
Drawings

Thomas Hart Benton (American, 1889–1975) untitled, 1959, pencil on paper (2018.8.1 and 2018.8.2) gift of Dr. and Mrs. James Rogers (Figs. 1 & 2).

Figs. 1 and 2. Thomas Hart Benton, untitled, each 28.0 x 21.5 cm (2018.8.1 and 2018.8.2). Photo: Erin Pruhs.

Graphics

Brooke Bulovsky Cameron (American, 1941–) Trail of Tears: Chief John Ross and Mary Brian Stapler Ross and Sequoah, 2014, intaglio and photo-intaglio on paper (2018.1.1) gift of the artist (Fig. 3).

Richard Helmick (American, 1939–) Bluffs and Pinnacles II, twentieth century, computer-generated serigraph on paper (2018.10.1) transferred from the University of Missouri Ellis Library.

Ellen Lanyon (American, 1929–) *Mount St. Helens May 18 1980*, 1981, ink print on paper (2018.4.1) gift of Christine Montgomery and Greg Olson (Fig. 4).


Richard Smith (American, 1931–2016) *Orange*, 1971, color lithograph with collage (2018.2.1) gift of Norman Land (Fig. 5).

**Photography**

Fig. 4. Ellen Lanyon, *Mount St. Helens May 18 1980*, 28.0 x 23.0 cm (2018.4.1). Photo: Erin Pruhs.

Fig. 5 Richard Smith, *Orange*, 61.5 x 92 cm (2018.2.1). Photo: Erin Pruhs.
Russell Lee (American, 1903–1986) *Daughter of Sharecropper in Corner to Shack Home, La Forge, Missouri*, ca. 1935, gelatin silver print (2018.11.2) gift of Linda Wheeler (Fig. 6).

**Watercolor**


Don Nice (American, 1932–) *Oceanside North, Palm Beach (looking South)*, 1998, watercolor on paper (2018.9.1) transfer from University of Missouri Ellis Library.
**Painting**

Anonymous/unknown (American) *Portrait of Sadie Moutran*, nineteenth century, oil on canvas (2018.6.1) gift of David J. Schenker (Fig. 7).

George Caleb Bingham (American, 1811–1879) *Samuel Tribble Crews*, 1830s, oil on canvas (2018.3.1) gift of Will and Carolynn Ferguson (Fig. 8).


Hunt Slonem (American, 1951–) *Abraham’s Peace Offering*, 1998, oil on canvas (2018.9.2) transferred from University of Missouri School of Journalism.

**Mixed media**

Exhibitions 2018

Japonisme in Print: Japanese Style in Western Culture
November 7, 2017–April 1, 2018

This fourth installment of the exhibition series on Japanese prints considered the impact of Japanese color woodblock prints on the prints of European and American artists, including Mary Cassatt, Arthur Bowen Davies, Henri Rivière, and John Taylor Arms. Their works were juxtaposed with prints by Japanese predecessors and contemporaries, including Utagawa Kunisada, Andō Hiroshige, and Kawase Hasui.
Page-Turners: Medieval and Early Modern Illustration
December 19, 2017–May 13, 2018

Presenting illustrated narratives and decorated pages, this exhibition investigated different functions of images as well as the interplay between text and image in Medieval and Renaissance books and prints. The selection of objects included leaves from illuminated manuscripts, early printed books and folios, and broadsheets.

Electrify!
January 26–March 18, 2018

The Kennedy Center and Volkswagen Group of America teamed up for the VSA Emerging Young Artists Program to recognize and showcase the work of emerging young American artists with disabilities, ages sixteen to twenty-five. This traveling exhibition featured fifteen selected artists who created Electrify! The artwork in this exhibition was charged with ideas that acted as a conduit for reflection on the past, explored the “now,” and invoked a future full of possibility and inclusivity.

Pre-Columbian Pottery from the Museums’ Collections: Ancient Peru
April 10, 2018–ongoing

Pottery from ancient Peru is justly celebrated for its beauty and technical craftsmanship, combining elements of naturalism and patterned abstraction with bold imagination. Reflecting a range of cultures and belief systems spanning more than a millennium, this continuing exhibition highlights ceramic arts from the Chavin, Tiwanaku, Moche, Nazca, Wari, Sican, and Chimu cultures. Both the Museum of Art and Archaeology and the Museum of Anthropology hold deep and rarely seen collections of Pre-Columbian art.
Electrify!
January 26–March 18, 2018
Photo: Erin Pruhs

Pre-Columbian Pottery from the Museums’ Collections: Ancient Peru
April 10, 2018–ongoing
Photo: Erin Pruhs
Seeing Anew: A Reinterpretation of Modern and Contemporary Artworks from the Permanent Collection
April 21, 2018–ongoing
Photo: Erin Pruhs

Seeing Anew: A Reinterpretation of Modern and Contemporary Artworks from the Permanent Collection
April 21, 2018–ongoing

After two years of special exhibitions, two galleries were rededicated to highlighting extraordinary works of modern and contemporary art. Selections of artworks from about 1950 to the present were reinterpreted with an emphasis on diversity represented in the permanent collection. Both familiar favorites and recent acquisitions are displayed, along with a new section devoted to works on paper.

Studies in Classical Beauty
May 22–September 30, 2018

By the fifteenth century, a small artistic revolution had begun in Italy, where artists rejected the Gothic style and began recapturing the Graeco-Roman aesthetic in architecture and the human figure. Regardless of subject matter, Gothic artifice ultimately gave way to perfected proportions, classical contrapposto, and stoic bearing. This focus exhibition explored various studies in classical beauty, from the sixteenth to early twentieth centuries.
Studies in Classical Beauty
May 22–September 30, 2018
Photo: Erin Pruhs

British Humour: Satirical Prints of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries
October 9, 2018–January 27, 2019
Photo: Erin Pruhs

**British Humour: Satirical Prints of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries**
October 9, 2018–January 27, 2019

Contextualizing satirical prints by British artists William Hogarth, James Gillray, and George Cruikshank, this exhibition considered the significance of social and political criticism in democratic societies. The role of the artist as critic was also examined, including consideration of recently discovered evidence about the lives of these (in)famous caricaturists.
**Vasarely’s Cosmic Visions**  
December 11, 2018–May 12, 2019  
In 1959, Victor Vasarely issued a portfolio of twelve serigraphs named after prominent stars and constellations in the Northern Hemisphere, and he dedicated these experiments in Op Art to French astrophysicist Alexandre Dauvillier. Our presentation of this complete portfolio both highlighted the symbiosis between creative and scientific thinking and celebrated humanity’s enduring awe and fascination with the celestial.

**Noor’s Mosaics**  
April 17, 2018–May 13, 2018  
Two digital prints by Noor Khreis, winner of the University’s Visual Arts and Design Showcase, were inspired by mosaics used in mosques around the world. *Mosaic Print One* is in black and white to create a sense of uniformity and to contradict typically colorful mosaics, whereas *Mosaic Print Two* is highly distorted and monochromatic, although they both started out from one collage. The artist stated: “The decision to use images of different mosaics is a representation of unifying different Islamic cultures and different locations through art. This is representative of my identity as a Muslim, Arab, and American. My piece contradicts the traditional mosaics because it is not symmetrical, similar to the way Arab culture often contradicts American culture.”
Loans to Other Institutions 2018

To the Columbus Museum of Art, Columbus, Ohio, October 19, 2018–January 20, 2019, the drawing *Harlem Girl*, ca. 1925, pencil, charcoal, and pastels on heavy illustration board (78.183) by Fritz Winold Reiss (American, 1886–1953) for the exhibition *I Too Sing America: The Harlem Renaissance at 100*.

To the St. Louis Art Museum, St. Louis, Missouri, June 15–November 25, 2018, four Peruvian textiles including a sash, 100–600 CE, camelid fiber (82.464); a patchwork textile, 500–800 CE, camelid fiber (86.109); a head band, 1100–1450 CE, camelid fiber and cotton (87.165); and a woman’s mantle, 1450–1550 CE, cotton, with camelid fiber (88.97) for the exhibition *Balance and Opposition in Ancient Peruvian Textiles*.

To Elmer Ellis Library, University of Missouri, March 27–September 12, 2018, twelve objects of ancient art: kothon, late Corinthian, pottery (59.28); teano bowl, late fourth century–early third century BCE, pottery (61.5); aryballos, first–second century CE, glass (62.4); boat-shaped lamp, eighth century CE, terracotta (62.32); red-figure mug, late fourth century BCE, pottery (64.50); one-handled jar, first century CE, glass (65.70); zoomorphic vase, ca. 700 BCE, pottery (68.131.27); baggy jar, 1550–1200 BCE, travertine (68.233); lamp, eighth century CE, terracotta (68.320); Euboean black-figured plate, mid-sixth century BCE, pottery (72.23); carinated bottle, fourth century CE, glass (72.94); and a three-legged zoomorphic jug, 3500–2700 BCE, pottery (74.99), for exhibition.


To Elmer Ellis Library, University of Missouri, October 12, 2018–March 26, 2019, ten objects of ancient art: figure of Aphrodite, second century CE, terracotta (58.23); attic black-glazed bowl and lid, first quarter fifth century BCE, pottery (59.24); globular bottle, second century CE, glass (64.55); double-spouted lamp, first century CE, terracotta (66.304); bird vase, 1200–1000 BCE, pottery (68.251); pitcher, 300–1 BCE, pottery (72.55); green-glazed bowl, mid-first century CE, pottery (75.86); plaque of a solider riding over a fallen opponent, fourth century BCE, terracotta (81.267.2); double-spouted askos, third century BCE, pottery (84.17); and provincial wild goat- style feeding vessel, early sixth century BCE, pottery (90.99), for exhibition.
Museum Activities 2018

Lectures

February 16
Briana Beck, artist, for “Electrify!” exhibition, sponsored by The Kennedy Center, VSA, Volkswagen, and the Missouri Arts Council.

March 14

March 17
Alisa McCusker, curator of European and American art, Museum of Art and Archaeology, “Crowning the Monarch and Cultivating the Soul: Flowers in Medieval and Renaissance Art.”

April 10
Barry Bergey, retired director, Folk and Traditional Arts Program, National Endowment for the Arts, presentation and book signing, “Folk Masters: A Portrait of America.”

May 10
Christina Wytko, graduate research assistant, University of Missouri School of Visual Studies, “A Personalized Processional: Considering St. Ursula in a Sixteenth-Century Dominican Manuscript.”

May 24
Anne Stanton, associate professor, University of Missouri School of Visual Studies, “Moving Stories: Medieval Woman and Illustrated Manuscripts.”

August 16

October 26
Michael Yonan, associate professor and program director, University of Missouri School of Visual Studies, “William Hogarth’s Marriage à-la-Mode and the Contours of Eighteenth-Century British Satire.”

November 14
Alisa McCusker, curator of European and American art, Museum of Art and Archaeology, “From WPA to AbEx: Modern Art in America.”

Art of the Book Club Events

February 2
Art of the Book Club Brown Bag lunch and discussion, Anthropologist on Mars.

May 1
Art of the Book Club Brown Bag lunch and discussion, People of the Book.

August 1
Art of the Book Club Brown Bag lunch and discussion, Portland Vase.

November 8
Art of the Book Club Brown Bag lunch and discussion, The Muralist.

November 28
Special Events

January 26
*Electrify!* exhibition opening with Museum Associates reception.

February 9
Missouri Folk Arts Program, Services for Independent Living staff, “Creating and Creative Access for Artists with Disabilities.”

February 18
Museum gallery concert, vocal/instrumental chamber music, University of Missouri School of Music.

February 27
Annual music and art concert performed by Ars Nova Singers, University of Missouri School of Music.

March 10
Museum Gallery Concert, clarinet ensemble, University of Missouri School of Music.

March 16–18
“Art in Bloom,” mid-Missouri florists celebrated the museum’s artwork with their inspired floral designs.

April 5
Art after Dark, sponsored by the Museum Advisory Council of Students (MACS), with an art contest, music, and food.

April 10
*Pre-Columbian Pottery from the Museums’ Collections: Ancient Peru*, focus exhibition opens.

April 21
*Seeing Anew: A Reinterpretation of Modern and Contemporary Artworks from the Permanent Collection* exhibition opens.

Canvas Carnaval, buffet, silent and live auctions, funding opportunities for education, acquisitions, and conservation.

April 22
Museum Gallery Concert, Honors Guitar Ensemble, University of Missouri School of Music.

May 20
Missouri Folk Arts gallery concert, traditional Irish singing, Eimear Arkins, KT Elliot, and Rowan Elliot, musicians.

May 22
*Studies in Classical Beauty* focus exhibition opens.

September 21
Museum Associates annual Crawfish Boil.

October 9
*British Humour: Satirical Prints of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* focus exhibition opens.

November 9
Museum Associates annual meeting.

November 11
Museum gallery concert, Gypsy Jazz Trio, University of Missouri School of Music.
December 1
National Day Without Art, day of observance recognizing the disproportionate number of arts community members who have died or are living with AIDS.

December 5
Museum Associates annual Holiday Fête.

December 11
*Vasarely’s Cosmic Visions* focus exhibition opens.

**Family and Educational Events**

January 14
Docent-led theme tour, Horses.

January 17
Focus exhibition tour of *Page-Turners: Medieval and Early Modern Illustration* with curator Alisa McCusker.

January 31
Exhibition tour of *Electrify!* with curator Alisa McCusker.

February 17
World Anthropology Day sponsored by the Museum of Anthropology.

February 20
Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.

March 7
Focus exhibition tour of *Page-Turners: Medieval and Early Modern Illustration* (second installment) with curator Alisa McCusker.

March 11
Docent-led theme tour, Art in Jane Austen’s World.

March 17
Art in Bloom for Kids, art activities for children of all ages.

March 20
Museum Associates sponsored Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries.

April 8
Docent-led theme tour, Flowers in the Museum.

April 14
Family event, Slow Art Day.

April 17
Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.

May 1
Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.

May 6
Docent-led theme tour, Writing and Books.

May 15
Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.

May 23
Focus exhibition tour of *Studies in Classical Beauty* with curator Benton Kidd.

June 3
Docent-led theme tour, Landscapes.
June 5
Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.

June 6
Exhibition tour with curator Alisa McCusker, Seeing Anew: A Reinterpretation of Modern and Contemporary Artworks from the Permanent Collection.

June 7
Kids’ Series: World of Art, New and Old: Sketching in the Galleries.

June 19
Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.

June 21

July 1
Docent-led theme tour, How Things Are Made.

July 3
Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.

July 9–13
Kids’ summer camp sponsored by the Museum of Anthropology.

July 17
Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.

July 26
Kids’ Series: World of Art, Picasso.

August 5
Docent-led theme tour, Glass through the Ages.

August 6
Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.

August 9
Kids’ Series: World of Art, Dig It (to be rescheduled).

August 21
Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.

September 4
Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.

September 12
Curator-led tour with curator Alisa McCusker, Mid-Twentieth-Century Photography.

September 16
Docent-led theme tour, Technology in the Ancient World.

September 18
Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.

October 2
Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.

October 6
Museum/Archaeology Day, with activities for all ages provided by programs, departments, museums, and galleries at the University of Missouri and statewide.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 7</td>
<td>Docent-led theme tour, The Kress Collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16</td>
<td>Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 17</td>
<td>Focus exhibition tour with curator Alisa McCusker, <em>British Humour: Satirical Prints of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4</td>
<td>Docent-led theme tour, Modern Art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6</td>
<td>Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20</td>
<td>Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4</td>
<td>Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 10</td>
<td>Drop-In Sketching Group in the galleries, sponsored by Museum Associates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Hoc Film Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 12</td>
<td><em>Persona</em>, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 9</td>
<td><em>Temple Grandin</em>, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9</td>
<td><em>Awakenings</em>, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13</td>
<td><em>Suddenly</em>, 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11</td>
<td><em>Name of the Rose</em>, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8</td>
<td><em>Maudie</em>, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13</td>
<td><em>Death on the Nile</em>, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 10</td>
<td><em>Caesar and Cleopatra</em>, 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9</td>
<td><em>Local Hero</em>, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14</td>
<td><em>Pride and Prejudice</em>, 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11</td>
<td><em>The English Patient</em>, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9</td>
<td><em>Caravaggio</em>, 1986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Museum Staff 2018

Alex Barker
Director

Cathy Callaway
Museum educator

Bruce Cox
Assistant director, museum operations

Linda Endersby
Curator of collections/registrar

Carol Geisler
Business support specialist

Benton Kidd
Curator of ancient art

Alisa McCusker
Curator of European & American art

Erin Pruhs
Collections specialist

Barbara Smith
Chief preparator

Matt Smith
Preparator

Pete Christus (through 11/18), Will Fish, Leland Jones, Ivy Hettinger-Roberts, and Samuel Markey, Aaron Schultz (began 12/18)

Security guards

Lisa Higgins
Director, Missouri Folk Arts Program

Deborah Bailey
Folk Arts specialist
Museum Docents 2018

Andrea Allen                   Valerie Hammons       Alice Landrum
Luann Andrews                  Amorette Haws        Mary Beth Litofsky
David Bedan                   Ingrid Headley       Kathryn Lucas
Robin Blake                    Anne Hessler         J. Wayne Merrill
Brooke Cameron                Sue Hoeveelman       Meg Milanick
Yolanda Ciolli                Lisa Jerry            Barbara Montgomery
Patricia Cowden                Karen John           Carol Stevenson
Ross Duff                      Julie Kalaitzandonakes Chuck Swaney
Janet Elmore                   Linda Keown           William Wise
Barbara Fabacher

Emeritus status

Gary Beahan                     Ann Gowans
Nancy Cassidy                   Dot Harrison
Caroline Davis                  Mary Beth Kletti
Dorinda Derow                   Nancy Mebed
Sue Gish                        Alice Reese

Museum Store Volunteers 2018

Valerie Hammons                 Karen John
Dot Harrison                    Brenda Jones
Mary Beth Litofsky              Sue Pereira
Linda Lyle                      Kimberly Ring

Levi Sherman                   Andy Smith
Pam Springsteel                Deb White
Museum Advisory Council of Students (MACS) 2018

Brianna Veal  
*President*

Chelsey Brown  
*Vice-president*

Active Members
Hailey Robb
Alexandra Rowles
Tony Vazquez

Advisory Committee 2018

Kristin Schwain, Chair  
*School of Visual Studies*

Gary Anger  
*President, Museum Associates*

J.D. Bowers  
*MU Honors College*

Juanamaria Cordones Cook  
*Department of Romance Languages*

Carrie Duncan  
*Department of Religious Studies*

David Schenker  
*Department of Classical Studies*

Josephine Stealey  
*Department of Art*

Michael Urban  
*Department of Geography*

James Van Dyke  
*School of Visual Studies*

Michael Yonan  
*School of Visual Studies*

Ex officio members
Alex W. Barker  
*Director*

Patricia Okker  
*Dean, College of Arts and Science*
Museum Associates Board of Directors 2018

Officers

Gary Anger (through 11/18)
Sandy Neal (beginning 11/18, through 12/18)
President

Tootie Burns (through 12/18)
Vice-President

Alex Barker
Executive Vice-President

Dennis Sentilles
Treasurer

Valerie Hammons
Secretary

Ex Officio Members

Bruce Cox
Assistant director, museum operations

Valerie Hammons (through 11/18)
Docent liaison

Benton Kidd
Curator of ancient art

Honorary Members

Patricia Atwater (through 10/18)
Libby Gill

Board Members

Gary Anger
Tracey Atwood (through 11/18)
Sheila Baker (beginning 11/18)
David Bedan (through 11/18)
Tootie Burns
Carol Deakyne
Sarah Dresser (beginning 11/18)
Brian Foster
Ken Greene
Jen Griffin (beginning 11/18)
Valerie Hammons (beginning 11/18)
Linda Harlan (through 11/18)
Pam Huffstutter (beginning 11/18)
Darlene Johnson (through 11/18)
Jerry Murrell
Sandy Neal (through 12/18)
Lise Nyrop (beginning 11/18)
Carolyn Oates (beginning 11/18)
Christiane Quinn
Terri Rohlfing
Louise Sarver (beginning 11/18)
Stacie Schroeder (beginning 11/18)
Dennis Sentilles
Stacey Thompson (through 11/18)
Jeannette Jackson-Thompson (beginning 11/18)
Kathy Unrath (through 11/18)
Jane Wagner

Ex Officio Members

Bruce Cox
Assistant director, museum operations

Valerie Hammons (through 11/18)
Docent liaison

Benton Kidd
Curator of ancient art

Honorary Members

Patricia Atwater (through 10/18)
Libby Gill