

CHRONOS

The History Journal of
Yeshiva University

2018-2019

Editor-in-Chief

Shana Adler

Editors

Hadassah Penn

Dani Ritholtz

Zack Rynhold

Scott Weissman



Yeshiva University, New York, NY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcome Letter

Tziona Kamara, *Patriotism:*

Barbeques or Bravery?.....7

Dena Katz, *Before and After Jone v. Hallahan:*

Gender Roles in Marriage Defined and Redefined.....18

Dani Ritholtz, *The Effects of Museums In*

Depicting Atrocities Around the World.....28

Zack Rynhold, *Identifying Subjectivity:*

The Power of Bias and Narrative in Historical Writing.....41

Elianna Sharvit, *The Evolution*

of Tchaikovsky's Nutcracker.....55

Liora Steinberg, *Liberty Weekend:*

July 4, 1986.....70

Faculty Contribution

Professor William Stenhouse, *Scribbles, Supplements and Strike-throughs:*

Early Modern Readers and The Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis.....81

Dear Reader,

Welcome to the 2018-19 edition of *Chronos: The History Journal of Yeshiva University*. For over a decade, *Chronos* has served as a forum dedicated to the dissemination of student research on a broad range of subjects within the realm of history.

We would like to acknowledge the authors of these papers for working with us to prepare their submissions for publication. The articles in this issue are diverse, innovative, and interesting, and they stand as a testament to the high caliber of students' work at Yeshiva University. We would also like to thank Professor William Stenhouse for contributing his article as the faculty submission for this issue.

Additionally, we are grateful to the Dean's Office of Yeshiva University for their enthusiastic support of the *Chronos*, both academically and financially. Finally, we extend our sincere gratitude to our faculty adviser, Dr. Hadassah Kosak, and to the entire history department faculty of Yeshiva University, for their guidance throughout the publication process.

We hope you will enjoy these works as much as we have enjoyed bringing them to you!

Sincerely,

Shana Adler
Editor-in-Chief

Hadassah Penn
Dani Ritholtz
Zack Rynhold
Scott Weissman
Editors



CHRONOS

Patriotism: Barbeques or Bravery?

Tziona Kamara

As funny as it may sound, the United States Army is a brand, complete with teams of marketers whose sole task is to determine how to best sell the product they offer: military service. The famous Uncle Sam propaganda poster, from both World War I and World War II, features Uncle Sam sternly pointing at the viewer with bold, capitalized letters stating “I Want YOU For US Army” (Fig. 1). A second poster, from the early 1970s as the Vietnam War came to a close, features a collage of a diverse group of nine men in one half. The other half is topped with the line, “Today’s Army Wants To Join You”, beneath which is a large block of text that closes with the line, “If you’d like to serve yourself as you serve your country, today’s Army wants to join you” (Fig. 2). While the target audience has consistently remained young men on the brink of adulthood, it is clear that the cultural influences and events of the times play key roles in the manner which the Army is marketed to this audience. It is also apparent that levels of patriotism in America have fluctuated, which is perhaps reflected in recruitment numbers over the past century. A close reading of the posters, taking into consideration the text, figures depicted, and the slogan, as well as a study of world events and societal views regarding the US Army, reveals the way in which these factors interact to effectively market the Army. While the first poster uses



Fig. 1- US army recruiting poster from WWI



Fig. 2- US army recruiting poster from the 1970's

patriotic symbols, color scheme, and text to appeal to American's sense of duty, the second poster had to use more traditional marketing techniques in its slogan, text, and imagery due to the decreased popularity of the Army after the Vietnam War.

The first poster, with Uncle Sam demanding the viewer's enlistment, focuses on the intensely patriotic theme of the American people during World War I and II through its use of the symbolic Uncle Sam, color scheme, and text. In the introduction to *Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen*, Christopher Capozzola describes the sense of duty that was ingrained in Americans during the first World War. He writes that "when Americans discussed their relationship to the state, they used terms such as *duty*, *sacrifice*, and *obligation*".¹ Uncle Sam symbolized just that as he "gave political power a personal face and made sense of the government's presence in everyday life".² Coupling Uncle Sam with the "I Want YOU" caption pushed home the message that "being a good citizen meant fulfilling your political obligations and doing so through voluntary associations".³ Additionally, the poster has a strictly red, white, and blue color scheme, which is generally associated with patriotism because it reflects the colors of the stars and stripes of the American flag. This patriotic attitude of World War I carried through to World War II, when the streets were again plastered nationwide, with

1 Capozzola, Christopher Joseph Nicodemus. *Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen*. (Oxford University Press, 2008), 4.

2 Capozzola, *Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen*, 4.

3 Ibid., 8.

millions of “I Want YOU” posters, driving thousands of men to enlist. Uncle Sam’s statement uses a commanding tone, implying that Americans must enlist in the army, as the draft laws stated. Indeed, as Capozzola writes in his introduction, “when Uncle Sam said ‘I Want YOU’, he invoked a culture of obligation.”⁴ During both World War I and World War II, Americans viewed their Army service as a duty to their country, purely service, and were not interested in how years of army service could benefit their own personal growth, development, finances, or careers. The posters, including this Uncle Sam poster, of the early 20th century reflected that often bearing classic symbols of American patriotism, such as Lady Liberty or Uncle Sam, having patriotic color schemes, and using commanding tones were effective in promoting army service.

Later, as the Vietnam War came to a close in the 1970’s, the American opinion of the army drastically shifted. In response, the Army invested in teams of marketers to brand the army, complete with a slogan and appeal previously unheard of. For years, the Army had been a way for people to give back to their country; it was a responsibility and obligation not to be taken lightly. As JFK famously said in his inauguration speech in 1961, “Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country.” These words were a call to Americans to evaluate what their obligation to their country was. However, that was in the early years of the Vietnam War, when morale was still high and the growing anti-military tides had not hit in earnest.

⁴ Ibid., 8.

Just under ten years later, the war was still raging and so were the American people; movements for peace were in full swing and enlistment rates were down as increasing numbers of men said “no” to the Army. When the war had begun in 1955, 152,777 men had been inducted into the American Army and the induction number peaked at 382,010 in 1966, the mid-point of the war. But by 1973, the draft was ended and the trickle of volunteers resulted in the induction of just 646 men.⁵ Additionally, a 2004 Gallup Poll found that by 1971, 60% of Americans thought that it was a mistake to send troops to Vietnam.⁶ It was at this point that the Army developed into a brand, complete with marketers who were tasked with showing young American men how they could benefit from enlisting.

This is clear in the second poster, an early 1970s poster whose slogan, text, and imagery are in line with the goal of the marketing team of the army to convince young men of what the Army can do for them and of how the Army is evolving to reflect the American people. The poster, in stark contrast with Uncle Sam’s “I Want You”, reads “Today’s Army Wants to Join You”. The message it conveyed was that the Army of “Today” was different; it was not demanding the enlistment of the viewers as a means to fulfill a patriotic obligation. Rather, it informed the viewer that enlistment would not benefit the country alone but the very enlistee

5 United States Government Selective Service Systems. <https://www.sss.gov/About/History-And-Records/Induction-Statistics>

6 Newport, Frank, and Joseph Carroll. “Iraq Versus Vietnam: A Comparison of Public Opinion.” <https://news.gallup.com/poll/18097/iraq-versus-vietnam-comparison-public-opinion.aspx>

himself, as well. Both posters include the word “You”, which, as written in the Asian Social Science Journal, makes it feel “like (a) face-to-face talk, making the conversation warmer, more friendly and trustable in tone, and finally strengthens the appeal to the readers”⁷ However, the Uncle Sam poster reads as a demand while the “Today’s Army Wants To Join You” poster is more of a request. The earlier poster reflects the demands that the country could make of its nation in a fiercely patriotic time, when citizens were doing their all to help the war efforts. Later, as the Vietnam War came to a close, Americans were not as quick to help their country; they were frustrated and angry and wanted an end to a war that had dragged on for 20 years. The Army picked up on that sentiment and aimed to show Americans that the Army was the right choice for them if they wanted to “serve (themselves) as they serve (their) country” (Fig. 2). The poster also informs the viewer of the changes that the Army had underwent in order to be more appealing, such as the elimination of “unnecessary formations, skin-head haircuts, signing out, signing in, (and) bed checks...” (Fig. 2). In a 1971 newspaper article in the *Observer-Reporter*, the new marketing efforts of the Army are noted. In the article, Theodore M. Regan Jr., Vice President of Ayer, the advertising agency behind the new campaign, is quoted saying that the new recruiting advertisements reflect “a new concern (with) individual expression and changing lifestyles”.⁸

7 Li, Min, “The Stylistic Analysis of the Magazine Advertisement—Atkins Chocolate Chip Granola Bar,” *Asian Social Science* 5, no. 9 (2009): 64

8 Associated Press. “Army Bringing Recruitment Advertisements Up to Date.” *Observer- Reporter* (Washington, PA), 9 Mar. 1971, pp. A-5

Additionally, the poster's diverse images of men of all races were meant to indicate the progressiveness of the Army, which was popular due to the Civil Rights Movement. The Army's marketing techniques aimed to reflect current events and trends and the "Today's Army" poster did just that by making a request rather than a demand, detailing the changes that the Army had undergone to become more appealing, and by depicting men of a variety of skin tones.

Throughout the past fifty years, the Army has rebranded many times, each time in line with the goal of marketing the Army to young men by informing them of all that they can gain from enlisting. Past slogans have included "Join the People Who've Joined the Army", "This is the Army", "Be All You Can Be", and "Army of One". Leading intrapreneur Stephan Klaschka explains that these various campaigns have all been in line with the culture and attitudes of the targeted generation. For example, "Today's Army Wants to Join You" was targeted to a generation of baby boomers who are "generally characterized as full of optimism and thirst for social engagement" and this slogan promotes the Army as a team of like-minded individuals working together for a common cause in a modern era.⁹ The "Be all you can be" and "Army of One" slogans appealed to the "independence and self-reliance" of Generation X, who fought in the Gulf War, the Iraq War, and the Afghanistan War.¹⁰ The most recent slogan, "Army Strong",

9 Klaschka, Stephan. "Next-Generation ERG Learn from U.S. Army Recruitment!". *OrgChanger.com*, 2 May 2018, orgchanger.com/2011/04/12/next-generation-erg-learn-from-u-s-army-recruitment/.

10 Ibid.

developed in 2001 and still in use to this day, reveals a shift from the message of independence directed towards Generation X, to one of teamwork and cooperation directed towards millennials, as well as suggesting “contemporary leadership, personal empowerment and strength building that’s found on shared values... (which) caters to (their) interest in making a difference not only in their lives but also for their extended communities. Work is less central in this generation while individuality and leisure value high”.¹¹ Major Jordan G. Bradford writes similarly in his 2017 monograph in which he details the way the marketing efforts of the US Army mirror those of any other company, making it a brand of its own that requires top teams of marketers to sell Army service to the target audience.¹² Bradford explains that this began in the early 1970’s, when the Army became reliant on volunteer enlistees, rather than on the draft. Ever since, the Army has consistently evaluated the attitudes of the generation who they are hoping to recruit and have designed recruiting posters around a slogan that reflects those attitudes, as well as the events of the time, rebranding whenever a campaign is no longer effective as the target audience has shifted.

While an intensely patriotic message may have worked prior to the Vietnam War, for a generation who took their duty and obligation to their country very seriously, more effort was required post-Vietnam War, to combat the negative public opinion regarding the Army. While

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Bradford, Jordan G. *Rebranding the Army*. US Army, 2017

the first poster is based on patriotic ideas, complete with a red, blue, and white color scheme and Uncle Sam, the post-Vietnam War poster makes no reference to patriotism. The second poster uses a different method of recruiting soldiers: instead of focusing on the duty and obligation that young men have as Americans to serve in the Army, it focuses on all that the Army has to offer them. This is due to the fact that the Army, after the Vietnam War, was forced to rethink its strategies as recruiting numbers decreased and evolve into a brand of its own. Again, the Army is re-evaluating the current slogan of “Army Strong” as a new generation of recruits enters the field. Meghann Meyers, in an *Army Times* article, quotes Sergeant Major of the Army, Dan Dailey, who explains that “a new marketing strategy will have to explain the breadth and depth of what the Army offers...while still appealing to a young person’s sense of adventure, and even danger.”¹³ Perhaps most important, according to Dailey, is that the Army appeals not just to the recruits, but to the parents of potential recruits, as well. This indicates that the Army is keeping with their goal of having their finger on the pulse of what will appeal to each unique generation, especially as recruiting numbers hit an all-time low.

Not only are recruiting numbers in decline, but feelings of patriotism are, as well. In a CNN article by Grace Sparks, she references a 2018 Gallup Poll which reveals that “less than

13 Myers, Meghann. “SMA: The ‘Army Strong’ Slogan May Not Be Long for This World.” *Thearmytimes.com*, 25 June 2017, www.armytimes.com/news/your-army/2018/06/25/sma-the-army-strong-slogan-may-not-be-long-for-this-world/.

three-quarters” of Americans say that they are proud to be American.¹⁴ This is a stark contrast to Gallup’s 2001 poll, in which 87% of those polled considered themselves proud Americans.¹⁵ In a time when Independence Day has been reduced to fireworks and barbecues and Memorial Day has been reduced to sales and half-hearted social media posts, perhaps we need to evaluate the current state of American patriotism. While there may be conflicting opinions on both sides of the aisle regarding the Army and its function in today’s age, caution must be exercised in not allowing it to become a divisive issue that reduces general feeling of patriotism. The American Army should bring us together as a symbol of the sacrifices that individuals make for our country and of the dedication, bravery, and heroism displayed by our soldiers on behalf of the nation. While differences of opinion regarding policy and function of the Army are natural, and even expected, the sacrifices made by our soldiers should never be forgotten. As Elmer Davis, reporter, author, and Director of the United States Office of War Information during World War II, stated, “This land will remain the land of the free, so long as it is the home of the brave.”

14 Sparks, Grace. “American Patriotism Is Down.” *CNN*, Cable News Network, 2 July 2018.

<https://www.cnn.com/2018/07/02/politics/american-proud-poll/index.html>

15 Ibid.

Before and After *Jones v. Hallahan*: Gender Roles in Marriage Defined and Redefined

Dena Katz

The history of marriage is both beautiful and disturbing. In her poem *Habitation*, Margaret Atwood calls marriage “not a house or even a tent / it is before that, and colder: / the edge of the forest, the edge / of the desert.” Touching on the primitive origins of marriage, Atwood calls attention to the transcendent and harsh psychological and social features of one of the most ancient institutions of human civilization. Functioning independently of Western legal systems until the sixteenth century, the formalized regulation of marriage in the nineteenth century through the American legal system facilitated technical benefits and responsibilities for married couples. In a broader context, however, marriage has contributed to evolving conceptions of gender roles within and external to marital unions in American society. In the legal history of marriage in the United States, *Jones v. Hallahan* (1973) is a rotting jewel in the crumbling crown of court precedents that limit marriage to heterosexual couples. Serving as an anachronism that attests to the progressing perception of marriage in the years leading up to the landmark 2015 U.S. Supreme Court case of *Obergefell v. Hodges*, the decision in *Jones v. Hallahan* turns on the assumption that procreative capacity is central to the common usage definitions and derived legal definition of marriage. By prodding at and eventually toppling this assumption, subsequent court decisions have remolded the definition of marriage and refocused it on elements distinct from procreativity. Through this redefinition, the courts have influenced the deconstruction of gender roles as they function within and outside of the institution of marriage.

Marriage Defined

In the remarkably short and unanimous opinion of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky for *Jones v. Hallahan*, the court ultimately affirms the judgment of the Jefferson Circuit Court, which held that the two female appellants were “not entitled to have issued to them a license to marry each other” because they were not of the opposite sex. The Court of Appeals’ opinion briefly addresses the appellants’ four contentions but renders them irrelevant overall because of the appellants’ “incapability of entering into a marriage as that term is defined.” In the thundering final line of the opinion, the court firmly concludes that a marriage license issuance is not authorized by the court “because what [appellants] propose is not a marriage.” Deprivation of the constitutional rights to marry, of association, and to free exercise of religion as contended by the appellants, along with their contention that the clerk’s refused marriage license issuance subjected them to “cruel and unusual punishment,” are considerations that the court declares “uninvolved” in its determination.

The court references three common usage definitions of marriage that form the basis of its argument that a marriage is “a status or relationship which the parties are incapable of achieving,” and in doing so limits marriage to opposite-sex union with a procreative component. Resorting to common usage definitions for lack of a Kentucky statute that defines “marriage,” the court turns to prominent dictionaries published seventy-nine, thirty-nine and five years prior to the writing of its decision. All three sources reference the opposite-sex nature of the union. The Century Dictionary and Encyclopedia, published in 1894, called it “the institution whereby men and women are joined in a special kind of social and legal dependence, for the purpose of founding and maintaining a family.” The Second Edition of Webster’s New International

Dictionary, published in 1934, defines it as “the legal union of a man with a woman for life.” The Fourth Edition of Black’s Law Dictionary, published in 1968, contextualizes it as the “relation of one man and one woman united in law for life, for the discharge to each other and the community of the duties legally incumbent upon those whose association is founded on the distinction of sex.” Opposite-sex union being the only element consistent across all three definitions cited, the court effectively establishes the legal definition in *Jones v. Hallahan* as being specific to one man and one woman, and through both the Webster’s and Black’s definitions strongly intertwines marriage with procreation.

The precedents cited in *Jones v. Hallahan* similarly paint marriage as an opposite-sex union with procreative capacity. The court cites the only two other cases in American law that deal with same-sex marriage prior to 1973: *Baker v. Nelson* (1972) of the Minnesota and the U.S. Supreme Courts, and *Anonymous v. Anonymous* (1971) of Queens County Supreme Court in New York. In refuting appellants’ contended right to marriage, the Court of Appeals of Kentucky most prominently takes its cue from the U.S. Supreme Court’s dismissal of the appeal in *Baker v. Nelson* “for want of a substantial federal question.” The right to marriage itself was tenuously derived from the Fourteenth Amendment’s Due Process Clause in *Maynard v. Hill* (1888), which calls marriage “the foundation of the family and society, without which there would be neither civilization nor progress.” The U.S. Supreme Court in *Baker v. Nelson* upholds the Minnesota Supreme Court’s decision that the denial of a marriage license to a same-sex couple remains constitutional since “the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment is not a charter for restructuring [marriage] by judicial legislation.” The Minnesota Supreme Court had indeed extensively considered the same four contentions raised by the appellants in *Jones v. Hallahan*, along with contended constitutional violations of the Ninth Amendment’s right to privacy and the

Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause as it relates to sex discrimination. In its opinion, the Minnesota Supreme Court iterates that "the institution of marriage as a union of man and woman, uniquely involving the procreation and rearing of children within a family, is as old as the Book of Genesis," touching on age-old conceptions of marriage as possessing Biblical reverence in America. *Baker v. Nelson* further emphasizes the procreative aspect of marriage in stating that "marriage and procreation are fundamental to the very existence and survival of the race," and conclusively dismisses "the asserted contemporary concept of marriage and societal interests for which petitioners contend." It is with this American legal understanding of the nature of marriage that the court rules against same-sex marriage in *Jones v. Hallahan*.

Gender Roles Confined

Prior to elucidation of the purported opposite-sex nature of marriage and allusion to marriage's procreative purpose in *Jones v. Hallahan*, Western civilization had viewed marriage as such for centuries. The absence of romantic love in the court's common usage definitions, and their failure to mention the psychological and social features of marriage that Atwood conveys in her twenty-first century poem, underscore the ancient contractual nature of marriage. Though contemporary assumptions about marriage in present-day America logically link licensed same-sex and opposite-sex marriage alike to the slogan "love is love," marriage in earlier Western history hinged not on love, but primarily on procreative function and the ability to produce offspring capable of inheriting a marriage's financial product. In a historical view of the restrictive consequences of marriage for women, scholars point to the sexual and economic benefits separate from procreation. These benefits mostly serve men and include secured fulfillment of sexual desire, psychologically fulfilling subordination of women, and acquisition

of the woman's property. Andrea Dworkin, a feminist legal scholar active in the late nineteenth century, said that marriage is: "an institution, developed from rape, as a practice. Rape, originally defined as abduction, became marriage by capture. Marriage meant the taking was to extend in time, to be not only use of but possession of, or ownership."

Though contested by other scholars, nineteenth century British law continued to evince the view of marriage as having evolved from rape, employing a marital rape exemption that the United States adopted until all states finally abolished it in 1993. Under coverture in twelfth century British law, women's property rights were transferred to their husbands upon marriage.¹ Like the marital rape exemption, this held in the United States until 1900, when all states finally abolished American coverture.² Yet even in the American legal system that had evolved past the points of sexual and property acquisition by the male upon marriage, the marriage contract was originally one of ownership by men of women. The impact of Western marriage's roots in male ownership of women persists in modern times. Marlene Dixon, another feminist legal scholar prolific in the late nineteenth century, wrote that marriage in effect remains "the chief vehicle for the perpetuation of the oppression of women; it is through the role of wife that the subjugation of women is maintained." Because women have historically been expected to bear children in marriage, been socially encouraged and legally pressured to forfeit career opportunities in favor of motherhood and housekeeping, and been widely discriminated against in the workplace, marriage has enclosed the female gender role in a cage of financial dependence on men and perceived proclivity for procreation. There is deep historical truth to the Supreme Court's

¹ Weintraub Siegel, Lalenya. "The Marital Rape Exemption: Evolution to Extinction." *Cleveland State Law Review*, 1995.

² Bromfield, David H., and Marylynn Salmon. "Women and the Law of Property in Early America." *Michigan Law Review* 85, no. 5/6 (1987): 44-49. doi:10.2307/1289037.

statement in *Jones v. Hallahan* that at least in the courts and by much of Western society, “marriage has always been considered as the union of a man and a woman and we have been presented with no authority to the contrary.” It is the court’s rejection of a proposed redefinition of the marital union that is challenged in subsequent cases.

Though women have historically been limited by the gender roles that marriage prescribes, the legal recognition of marriage favorably bestows vast financial and social benefits upon men and women alike, and also facilitates greater access to parenthood for couples who attain marital status. Marriage offers federal benefits that include income tax deductions, hospital visitation rights, property inheritance rights, shared health insurance, and federally provisioned family leave since the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993. Unsurprising given the procreative roots of the institution, the legal responsibilities of parties involved in a marriage are predominantly related to childrearing, and theoretically include the couple as a unit through the factoring in of spousal income and assets towards government determinations of education loans. The couple also shares a mutual responsibility to provide financial support towards the children born of the marriage. In addition to these benefits and burdens, the legal legitimacy that marriage offers within society has been integral to facilitating a couple’s access to parenthood, which until 2016 required that the couple be heterosexually married.³ Particularly in an age where reproductive technologies and adoption have rendered parenting non-biological children possible, the procreative capacity of the marital union has become increasingly irrelevant. As the definition of marriage has stepped beyond procreativity, the legal capability to pursue parenthood beyond the limits of a heterosexual marriage appears both desirable and normative.

³ “Same-Sex Couples.” *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Marriage, Family, and Couples Counseling*. doi:10.4135/9781483369532.n431.

Marriage Redefined

Cases subsequent to *Jones v. Hallahan* first bolstered the link between marriage and procreation, but in the early twenty-first century began to attenuate the connection and redefine marriage itself. In *Bowers v. Hardwick* (1986), the U.S. Supreme Court still negated any “connection between family, marriage, or procreation on the one hand and homosexual activity on the other.” But unlike prior court opinions discussing same-sex marriage, which did not discuss the act of sex outside of procreation, the case mentioned the prohibition of sodomy, marking the subtle refocusing of the marital union on romantic sex rather than procreative sex even if for no other purpose than to refute its value. The court reminded that “sodomy was a criminal offense at common law and was forbidden by the laws of the original thirteen States when they ratified the Bill of Rights” and stated that “until 1961, all 50 States outlawed sodomy, and today, 24 States and the District of Columbia continue to provide criminal penalties.” Yet twenty-six states had removed their penalties, and the tide of American support was beginning to slowly turn towards same-sex marriage. In 1996, twenty-three years after *Jones v. Hallahan*, only twenty-seven percent of Americans supported same-sex marriage according to a Gallup poll. Yet eight years later, *Goodridge v. Department of Public Health* (2004) strikingly fractured the link between procreation and marriage, condemning the “‘marriage is procreation’ argument” because it incorrectly “singles out the one unbridgeable difference between same-sex and opposite-sex couples, and transforms that difference into the essence of legal marriage.” 2011 then marked a

majority vote in favor of same-sex marriage by polled Americans.⁴ By a triumphant 2015, the U.S. Supreme Court declared in *Obergefell v. Hodges* that it was unconstitutional to deprive same-sex couples of the right to marriage, explicitly overruling *Baker v. Nelson* and *Jones v. Hallahan* while regarding marriage not as a procreative union but as a “lifelong union” that “embodies a love that may endure even past death” and merits equal access by all persons with whomever they desire.

Gender Roles Deconstructed

Same-sex marriage challenges the previously confining roles of women and men in American society. No longer restricted to functions of procreation, rights to subordination, and benefits of property acquisition, marriage after *Obergefell v. Hodges* has been legally redefined as a union founded on love rather than biological and economic function. Contemporary feminist scholar Hannah Alsgaard articulates that the opposite-sex model of marriage is the very “basis for discrimination against women,” and argues that it is not “until same-sex marriage is fully legalized” that opposite-sex marriage can change to not assume procreation, and consequently remold the reality whereby in their “role as reproducers, women’s public roles were minimized; men controlled the public sphere and established it as the sphere of primary importance.” Marriage has played a pivotal role in allowing men to attain “financial control and superior economic status” in the home and society at large, control that persists in the absence of full

⁴ Gallup, Inc. “U.S. Support for Gay Marriage Edges to New High.” Gallup.com. May 15, 2017. Accessed March 04, 2019. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/210566/support-gay-marriage-edges-new-high.aspx>.

gender and marriage equality.⁵ In this vein, scholar Nan D. Hunter suggests that same-sex marriage “interrogates deeply embedded notions of gender” by fracturing courts’ traditional justification of disparate treatment of women and men in women’s rights cases based on biological differences between men and women, and treatment of same-sex couples in same-sex marriage cases based on absence of biological difference between men and men, and women and women.⁶ The equality promoted in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, in contrast to the reasoning preceding it in *Jones v. Hallahan*, employs “simple formal equality claims” to negate the value of confining biology-based arguments related to gender roles.

Through the redefinition of marriage since *Jones v. Hallahan*, the courts have redefined marriage itself, and are accordingly contributing to a deconstruction of gender roles that reverberate in the centuries following the initial regulation of marriage. As an institution profoundly intertwined with American life, marriage is but one of many rights inherent to the U.S. Constitution. Like in the poetry of Atwood, the history of marriage itself begins “before that, and colder,” but as her poem concludes, in redefining marriage and gender roles, in negotiating biological difference and social equality, “where painfully and with wonder / at having survived even / this far // we” in American law and society “are learning to make fire.”

⁵ Alsgaard, Hannah. “Recent Developments: Decoupling Marriage & Procreation: A Feminist Argument for Same-Sex Marriage.” *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice*, 2012.

⁶ Hunter, Nan D. “The Sex Discrimination Argument in Gay Rights Cases.” *Sexuality and Equality Law*, 2017, 175-94. doi:10.4324/9781315088051-6.

The Effect of Museums Depicting Atrocities Around the World

Dani Ritholtz

Introduction

In the wake of an atrocity, whether it is genocide, ethnic cleansing, slavery, or any other act of cruelty, there is a need to respond in some way. The question arises as to what response is the most appropriate or impactful for each atrocity. Many turn to the legal system, as in the Eichmann Trial in Jerusalem, or the Nuremberg Tribunals. Though there are some merits in using the justice system, there are limitations as well. One limitation, as Martha Minow, professor of law at Harvard University, explains, is that “...no response can ever be adequate when your son has been killed by police ordered to shoot at a crowd of children; when you have been dragged out of your home, interrogated, and raped in a wave of ‘ethnic cleansing.’...”¹ An additional shortfall is the lack of acknowledgment in the public sphere. Even though precedent is formed through the judicial process, the trial only impacts the public in the short term, leaving limited impact on later generations. There is another more enduring way to document the crimes that were committed and to continue to educate the public—namely, museums. Three examples of museums that have done this are the Tuol Sleng Museum in Cambodia, Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, and the Great Blacks in Wax Museum in Baltimore. Each of these institutions depicts the atrocity at its heart in a particularly vivid and evocative way, effectively forcing the visitor to confront and learn from the horror at hand.

¹Minow, Martha. *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing history after genocide and mass violence*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1998), 5



Fig. 1- Map made of skulls from victims of Khmer Rouge

The Museum

Museums are an appropriate and effective way to present the confusing and unimaginable events that must be shown in an exhibit. Tony Bennet, Professor of Cultural studies at Griffith University, writes:

The museum, as “backteller,” was characterized by its capacity to bring together, within the same space, a number of different times and to arrange them in the form of a path whose direction might be traversed in the course of an afternoon. The museum visit thus functioned and was experienced as a form of organized walking through evolutionary time.²

The organization of an exhibit allows the visitor to digest what the curators of a museum want to transmit. It is also a space that, if done correctly, instructs the visitor how exactly the atrocity depicted relates to the present day. James Young, founder of the Institute for Holocaust, Genocide, and Memory Studies, suggests that Holocaust memorials must serve a dual purpose: to memorialize, yes, but also to reflect the ideas of the present times. He states eloquently, “...how do we respond to the current moment in light of our remembered past?”³ He later concludes, “...were we to leave unexplored [the atrocities’] genesis and remain unchanged by the recollective act, it could be said that we have not remembered at all.”⁴ Young’s point about Holocaust memorials can be applied to museums dealing with all atrocities: Not only do they have to make the viewer consider what caused these events, but they should also shape the mindset of the visitor who has just relived them within the confines of a museum. All three of the museums to be discussed present these elements

² Bennet, Tony. *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. Routledge, (New York: Routledge, 1995) pg. 179

³ Young, James Edward. *The texture of memory: Holocaust memorials and meaning*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993) pg. 15

⁴ Ibid.

powerfully (perhaps, sometimes, too powerfully) to make their visitors contemplate the brutality of their respective exhibits.

Tuol Sleng Museum of Genocidal Crimes

The Tuol Sleng Museum of Genocidal Crime in Cambodia uses images to discuss the Cambodian genocide⁵ and affects visitors to a great extent. In the 1970s the Khmer Rouge, a communist faction, took over the government of Cambodia, killing an estimated 1.7 million people for religious, political, and national reasons.⁶ The murders happened in many different ways, but one method was the use of prisons. One of the most famous prisons was Tuol Sleng, which was used to kill people after extracting information from them.⁷ The Khmer Rouge abandoned the prison in 1979, when Vietnam defeated the KR and installed a new government. The Vietnamese almost immediately documented the disturbing things they found and converted the prison to a museum, a standing proof that they were in the right for invading Cambodia.⁸

The museum has gone through some changes, especially with the extensive changes in the Cambodian government, but the main exhibitions remain the same. One of the primary displays in the museum is a selection of pictures of prison inmates, taken by the Khmer Rouge right before execution. These powerful images prompt the visitor, no

⁵ It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss whether the crimes in Cambodia should be considered a genocide or not, which is up to much legal debate. I am using it in the colloquial way of describing what happened in Cambodia.

⁶ Power, Samantha. "*A Problem from Hell*": *America and the Age of Genocide*, (New York: Basic Books, 2013) 87-104

⁷ Ledgerwood, Judy. "The Cambodian Tuol Sleng museum of genocidal crimes: National narrative." *Museum Anthropology* v21.1 (1997), 82-98.

⁸ Ibid.

matter his background, to empathize with the victims.⁹ As Samantha Powers, former ambassadors to the UN, put it in her book, “The photos have been taken of boys and girls and men and women of all shapes, shades and sizes. Some have been beaten; others seem clean-shaven. Some look crazed, others resigned.”¹⁰ The spectrum of people represented mean that a viewer will identify with at least one of the victims in the photos.

Another impactful element of the museum is towards the end, where a map of Cambodia—made out of the skulls of victims—is displayed.¹¹ This shocking and climactic end to the tour elicits a visceral response from the viewer. In 2002, the actual skull-map was removed, not because people protested, but because the skulls were decaying. Now a photo of the heads, taken before the museum dismantled the map, are there in its place.¹² At the end of the tour, the visitors are asked to visualize what the museum looked like when it was a prison.¹³ The primary purpose of Tuol Sleng is to strike empathy into the viewer of the victims’ and survivors’ plights. Even though the displays may be extreme, one simply cannot leave the museum without thinking of what the prisoners went through and the horror of it all.

Disturbing images and feelings of empathy almost automatically cause the visitor to ask, how could this have happened? Knowing and understanding how it all came about is an essential step in facing genocide and atrocities, as Young pointed out. Additionally, empathy allows people to identify with the victims and therefore understand in a minuscule

⁹ Cychoz, Elizabeth K. " Everything is Just Starting":(Re) presenting the Tuol Sleng Museum of Genocidal Crimes as a Post-Justice Site of Memory. Diss. Ohio University, 2015, 76

¹⁰ Powers, *A Problem*, 145

¹¹ Ledgerwood, “The Cambodian,” 85

¹² AP, *Victims' Shrine Made of Skulls Is Dismantled By Cambodia*, March 11, 2002, New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/03/11/world/victims-shrine-made-of-skulls-is-dismantled-by-cambodia.html>

¹³ Ledgerwood, “The Cambodian,” 85

way what it means to be targeted in a genocide. The strong understanding felt may help people identify with future victims of genocide and cause them to protest or at least raise awareness to the atrocity. The messages one leaves with from Tuol Sleng are not explicitly stated. Instead, they are heavily implied, meant to stay with the viewer and change his perspective on what happens in a genocide.

The Great Blacks in Wax Museum

In contrast, the Great Blacks in Wax Museum not only uses graphic imagery to impact the viewer but spells out what visitors, specifically African American visitors, should take away from the museum. Elmer and Joanne Martin, two African American academics, created the Great Blacks in Wax Museum. In the early 1980s, the Martins traveled around with a few wax figures of prominent black historical figures, lecturing across the country. In 1984 they were able to buy space in Baltimore to make a permanent museum.¹⁴ The museum then expanded to not just depicting great black people from across the world but also the horrors of slavery and lynching in America.¹⁵ B.A Parker of the podcast *This American Life* gives a vivid description of the unique exhibition.¹⁶ She describes entering the exhibit with a model of a small slave ship; she walks in and hears a recording: “new slaves aboard.” That’s when Parker realized that *she* was supposed to be the new slave. The wax figures are shackled and packed tightly together. There are other disturbing figures; Parker says that right outside the ship there are two sailors force feeding a slave (who presumably was not eating to protest his slavery, a not-uncommon occurrence) with a long tube.¹⁷ Other graphic depictions are of the horrors African Americans

¹⁴ Wood, Marcus. "Atlantic slavery and traumatic representation in museums: The National Great Blacks in Wax Museum as a test case." *Slavery and Abolition* 29.2 (2008): 151-171.

¹⁵ Ibid., 152.

¹⁶ B.A Parker, “History is Not a Toy,” *This American Life*, October 6, 2017, Act 2 (min. 16:21) <https://www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/627/suitable-for-children?act=2>

¹⁷ Ibid.

had to go through, like lynching. One display, in particular, is very graphic: Parker describes going to the lynching exhibition and seeing the scene of Hayes and Mary Turner. In 1918, innocent Hayes Turner was lynched by a Georgia mob and later castrated. Mary Turner, eight months pregnant with Hayes' child, tried to seek out justice, but she was lynched too. She was hung upside down and burnt, and then her stomach was cut open, The unborn child was removed and killed.¹⁸ The Great Blacks in Wax museum depicts the scene with Hayes Turner hanging from a rope with his overalls cut in the groin region with blood dripping down, and Marry Turner being burnt.¹⁹

These shocking and unapologetic depictions recall the Tuol Sleng Museum's map of skeletons for their unflinching portrayals, and for the empathy-inducing attributes of the different types of people depicted. Mark Wood, English professor at the University of Sussex, describes how the wax figure of the woman burning, specifically, is supposed to speak to all viewers, no matter their race:

In making the abused body of the woman out of a shop manikin, originally a white manikin, they make a powerful gesture that suggests both black and white attitudes to the victim. A burned black body and a burned white body, if they are burned and mutilated enough, end up looking the same; if black or white human flesh is cooked it goes white, if it is charred it goes black.²⁰

The sympathy one feels for these victims should elicit the feelings and ideas similar to those at Tuol Sleng, but the curators of the Great Blacks in Wax museum wanted people to leave with another message. As a visitor leaves the exhibit they are handed a sheet of paper that says:

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid., In the display she is right side up, unlike in reality.

²⁰ Wood, "Atlantic Slavery," 167

A message from the ancestors. As you leave this monument to human tragedy and triumph remember us, but not in anger or sorrow. Remember. We did not struggle to keep our minds from being shackled, only to have you turn away from learning and the wise ways of the elders. We did not endure bondage for you to become a slave to drugs and alcohol. We did not die by the millions for you to kill each other by the thousands. We did not ward off their insults and claims of our inferiority for you to hate yourselves. We did not become their human commodity, their black ivory, their black gold, for you to put material things above your own people, even your own families and children.²¹

The powerful message, given to people as they depart, provides the visitor with a different perspective on the atrocity. Instead of just focusing in on the question of, “how did this happen,” the visitor must reevaluate his life—is he living up to the sacrifices of his ancestors? (This obviously speaks more to African Americans, being the descendants of these people, but should speak to everyone). The new way to understand the atrocity is a perspective of, “don’t let our sacrifice be in vain.” Unlike Tuol Sleng, this museum wants visitors to focus on improving their lives and the broader community.

The Great Blacks in Wax Museum is powerful, but can sometimes be too violent or graphic for people.²² Still, the Martins believe that the experience gained by seeing these wax figures can not only have someone empathize with the plight and the awfulness of slavery so that atrocities like that never happen again, but also to figure out how they can change themselves and their communities by learning from the pain that came before. However, not every museum needs to have such shocking images and figures like the Great Blacks in Wax Museum and Tuol Sang Museum to achieve a lasting effect.

²¹ Ibid., 158.

²² Ibid., 164.

Yad Vashem

Jerusalem's Yad Vashem, through the images it presents and its architecture, prompts visitors to ask and come to conclusions about the Holocaust and what their attitudes should be after leaving the museum. Yad Vashem is one of the premier museums and institutions commemorating the Holocaust, and it has a fascinating history. For around the first fifty years of the museum's existence, the emphasis was not on the suffering and atrocity that the victims and survivors endured, but more on the heroes and martyrs. The museum initially had more exhibits focused on the heroes and less on the destruction of European Jewry. There were whole exhibits dedicated to the subject of the Warsaw uprising, and another about the Partisans fighters. This emphasis on heroism was typical for Israeli society until relatively recently. Many Israelis looked down at the majority of Jews from Europe who did not fight back, which runs contrary to the Israeli mentality of battling enemies that surround Israel for survival. The focus on heroism in Israel also permeates the national day of Holocaust commemoration, *Yom Hashoa uGvurah*, which means "the day of the Holocaust [literal translation, destruction] and the strength [referring to the heroism]." However, this all changed in 2005, when the museum constructed a new space based on the architectural plans of Moshe Safdie.²³ The new centerpiece of Yad Vashem is a long triangular structure 300 meters long and 30 meters high.²⁴ When one first walks in, one sees a projection of what life was like in Europe for the Jews before the Holocaust, which includes videos from many different Jewish towns and Jews in the bigger cities. The visitor is then led farther down the corridor to where there are pictures of bodies that were burnt outside

²³ Lu, Fangqing. "Museum architecture as spatial storytelling of historical time: Manifesting a primary example of Jewish space in Yad Vashem Holocaust History Museum." *Frontiers of Architectural Research* (2017). 442-454

²⁴ Ibid., 448.

the town of Vilna. This part of the tour is the only thing that is not chronological (this massacre was perpetrated towards the end of World War II). The curators display these photos along with letters that were found by the bodies, so people would connect to the individual, realizing that these were people with real experiences. Just like the Tuol Sleng Museum and the Great Blacks in Wax Museum, Yad Vashem successfully gets their visitors to sympathize with the victims, through the use of pictures of burnt bodies. Yad Vashem uses the letters to personalize the people killed, similar to the Lynching Exhibit with the Turners.

After the photos of the burnings in Vilna, the tour continues in chronological order with the rise of anti-Semitism and Nazism, the Nuremberg Laws, and then to the ghettoization of the Jewish people, and so on. The architecture and layout of the museum are unique: It is impossible to walk straight through the museum, due to the barriers in the principle structure every few meters. Instead, the visitor must zig-zag into chambers connected to the main structure that wrap back into the central structure. The exhibits are all in these branched-off rooms, darker than the main corridor (which has natural light coming from the ceiling) and more crowded.²⁵ The pictures that are displayed are also graphic, but they feel less shocking than the other displays discussed in the other museums because the photos are black and white and focused on large groups of people. A lot of the feeling comes from the structure itself: the massiveness of the structure, its forced zig-zag path and claustrophobic feeling change the visitor's perception. The width of the building intentionally narrows, mirroring the worsening Jewish predicament.²⁶ The claustrophobic atmosphere is another way the visitor can empathize with the victims.

²⁵ Ibid., 448.

²⁶ This is from my own experience

The question of “how could this happen” is strong in Yad Vashem. Just like Tuol Sleng, the “lesson” is not explicit; however, other ideas are imposed on the visitor as he exits the massive structure. First, before the exit, the structure gets wider and elevates. At this point, there is one more room connected to the principal building. The exhibit differs from those that precede it. It is a bright room, with two large cones: one facing up with pictures and documents of victims, and one below made of the bedrock of the mountain, with water in it to reflect the top cone.²⁷ All around the enormous room are massive bookcases filled with records of those who were killed, and beyond the massive cones lies a real research center where people can research specific victims. Even though most visitors will not have time to go in and research, the concept is powerful—the implication that there is still work to be done. People leaving feel a responsibility to fill in the blank cabinet spaces where millions of names are not yet recorded.

Additionally, once the visitor departs the structure, he is greeted by a gorgeous view of the new Jerusalem forest, from a high altitude, with new communities spread across the landscape. The power of this scene cannot be understated, especially after seeing the Jewish people in such dire straits. Yad Vashem tries to frame this as an answer for what to do after an atrocity strikes, which is to rebuild and prosper. The founding of Israel as a Jewish state can be arguably connected to the horrors of the Holocaust, with respect as to why the international community voted in favor to establish the Jewish state. This compelling idea of rebuilding and prospering is not only inspirational for the Jewish people but also other victims of atrocities and their descendants. Similar to the note given after the Great Blacks in Wax Museum, the view tells visitors how they (or a community) should respond after a tragedy. In contrast, however,

²⁷ Lu, “Museum Architecture,” 452-453

the paper received in Baltimore is an aspiration, while outside of Yad Vashem there is a physical manifestation for what a response to genocide or crimes of that nature should be.

Conclusion

All three museums— Tuol Sleng, the Great Blacks in Wax Museum, and Yad Vashem— in their unique way elicit empathy for the victims and survivors of their respective atrocities and leave visitors with messages of what should be taken with them as they depart. Not one is better than the other because there are many different ways of imparting sympathy for the people who were affected by the atrocity.

The three museums discussed above are perfect examples of responses to atrocities that are not in the legal realm but have a significant impact on society. As Minnow writes, it is impossible for *anything* to make up for the pain a person or a nation has gone through in the course of an ethnic cleansing or genocide,²⁸ let alone a museum. However, the museum allows there to be a testament to the atrocities that took place, a testament that could last, hopefully, for hundreds of years after the tragedy. Also, the powerful feelings that museums generate can teach a new generation, which did not grow up with the memories, images, or the guilt that occur with living through an era of genocide, whether they are descendants of the victims or even of the perpetrators. It may sound idealistic, but the knowledge, and, more importantly, the empathy generated by a museum may teach the horrors of genocide and dissuade people in the future from engaging in it, or, at minimum, stand up and act in any way they can to help any people in the world facing atrocities.

²⁸ Minnow, *Between vengeance*, 5

Identifying Subjectivity: The Power of Bias and Narrative in Historical Writing

Zack Rynhold

Introduction

“History” – a word that perfectly constructs and dismantles its own discipline. The word’s first component stems from the word –‘his’, implying individualistic and perhaps sexually discriminatory undertones. The latter part of the word – ‘story’, meanwhile reflects the literary aspects in a genre of writing that supposes to dictate facts of the pasts. To an extent, therefore, history exists as a creation of those who espouse it rather than as a series of events or a manifestation of causality. This complicates the role of historians, who stand in the liminal space between objective historical events and subjective historical writing. Prominent historian and historiographer, Hayden White, theorizes similarly, placing historians on a “neutral middle ground” between science and art.¹ Historians must serve as mediators between these two extremes, borrowing from science’s objective analysis of data and from art’s intuition and ambiguity.² In this sense, historians assume the responsibility of balancing unbiased, rational inquiry with the personal voice of narrative structure. One could thus classify historical writing as an authoritative “textual mimesis of the past.”³ Analyzing such texts while maintaining their historical integrity necessitates an examination of the purpose of history and demands distinguishing between types

¹ Hayden White, *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), 27.

² Ibid.

³ Frank Ankersmit as quoted in C. Behan McCullagh, “Bias in Historical Description, Interpretation, and Explanation,” *History and Theory*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (Feb. 2000), 64.

of bias and subjectivity. These discussions will be applied to the works of the Roman historian, Tacitus, revealing his narrative prowess and justifying his place in the Western historical canon despite his apparent biases.

Understanding History

Before approaching the topic of bias in history and its different forms, one must determine what in history's nature elicits such vehement condemnation of partiality. C. Behan McCullagh outlines some of the dilemmas that bias presents: "Biased histories generally purport to provide a fair account of their subject but in fact do not, and so are misleading. This is intrinsically bad."⁴ This violates McCullagh's requirement that history remain "fair and not misleading."⁵ McCullagh criticizes bias for its consequences, too, claiming that biased accounts "usually result in injustice" and "cause misunderstanding of the structures and processes involving the things they describe."⁶ Although McCullagh admits that historians cannot avoid some elements of bias, he suggests that they can produce a reliable historical account by providing a complete report of different perspectives and by committing to "standards of rational inquiry," detached from the writer's "preferred outcomes."⁷

McCullagh represents the position of modernist historiographers, who require that historical accounts adhere to the objective reality of the past, or at least that it portrays events as close to the factual past as possible. Postmodernist thought, however, disputes this premise. Even

⁴ McCullagh, "Bias in Historical Description," 50.

⁵ Ibid., 39.

⁶ Ibid., 50.

⁷ Ibid., 55.

McCullagh questions historians' abilities to avoid bias at all, since their "interests will inevitably influence their judgement," evidence upon which they rely is itself subject to bias, and they "are still products of their culture."⁸ On this basis, historical writing "is simply the product of the individual historian's creative activity."⁹ Critics of historiography, such as Claude Levi-Strauss, therefore argue that "historical accounts are nothing but interpretations," carrying no effective historical-scientific weight.¹⁰

Hayden White explains that modernist philosophers have tried to salvage the authority of history by reclaiming its scientific status, downplaying the literary aspects of historical writing. These scholars assume "that what is interpretation is not knowledge but only opinion," therefore demoting subjective accounts of history.¹¹ The likes of White and other postmodernist critics would reject this notion and that of Levi-Strauss. In a more optimistic approach, these scholars view history as inherently subjective and as a product of literature, which ought not to detract from its legitimacy. White attributes this line of thinking, in part, to Nietzsche, who "insisted that interpretation was necessary in historiography because of the nature of that 'objectivity' for which the historian strived. This objectivity was not that of the scientist or the judge in a court of law, but rather that of the artist, more specifically that of the dramatist."¹² White therefore embraces the subjective nature of history, acknowledging the inextricable link between history and its literary properties. In a process that White dubs "emplotment,"¹³ historians must make sense of

⁸ Ibid., 52.

⁹ Ibid., 53.

¹⁰ White, *Tropics of Discourse*, 55.

¹¹ Ibid., 54.

¹² Ibid., 53.

¹³ Ibid.

the available evidence, framing the facts into an appropriate narrative. This enables the historian to comment on the state of humanity just as literature illuminates human experience. He writes, “the image of reality which the novelist thus constructs is meant to correspond in its general outline to some domain of human experience which is no less ‘real’ than that referred to by the historian.”¹⁴ This does not necessarily permit the historian to distort the facts according to his or her personal convictions, but it does give the historian artistic license to relate events of the past.

Forms of Bias and Subjectivity

The status of subjectivity sits at the cornerstone of each of these historical theories. I have divided subjectivity into the following four categories to simplify the evaluation of their respective roles: subconscious or cultural bias, conscious or personal bias, informative bias, and narrative or personal inflection.

Subconscious bias refers to the inevitable underlying factors that influence any writer, a bias that proves difficult to remedy considering the near impossibility of transcending ideological barriers. McCullagh describes this form of bias as “cultural,” but differentiates between cultural relativism and cultural bias. Historians may not detect the former because culture defines the parameters for historical interpretation, which change over time. Cultural bias, on the other hand, represents a failure of the historian to recognize a culturewide bias. This appears in “histories that are inadequate even on the basis of what was known in the historian’s own day, thanks to a pervasive failure to note all the relevant facts, a failure motivated by some interest that is not

¹⁴ Ibid., 122.

personal but widespread in the culture.”¹⁵ Though readers may misconstrue this bias as relativism, thereby absolving the historian of blame, McCullagh still deems this a bias which historians can knowingly circumvent.

Conscious bias denotes intention; the historian makes a conscious effort to manipulate evidence in his or her favor to reach a conclusion that accords with his or her interests. McCullagh terms this “personal bias,” which manifests itself in several ways. Such bias can result from a historian’s choice to include certain interpretations, information, or perspectives over others in his or her writing by exaggerating the significance of one novel idea over others, or by allowing personal emotion to direct the characterization of a figure or event. McCullagh hopes to retain historical integrity by defeating this form of bias via commitment to rational inquiry and completeness of accounts.

Informative bias can stem from either of the previous categories. On a broad level, bias possesses historical value since readers can learn from its content and reasons behind it. Even if the historian does not provide an accurate image of the events in question, the way in which he or she describes those topics indicates the sentiment of the author, and perhaps his or her peers, in response to their surroundings. McCullagh elaborates accordingly: “this does not mean that the descriptions can tell us nothing about the external world...what we imply by this is that there is something in the world producing those perceptions in us.”¹⁶

¹⁵ McCullagh, “Bias in Historical Description,” 65.

¹⁶ Ibid., 62.

Narrative or personal inflection comprises the instrumental feature of historical writing according to White. This involves the historian using his or her own voice and tone to direct a historical narrative, “emplotting” his or her resources to conjure up a meaningful representation of the past. White envisions this as an aesthetic process in which the historian refamiliarizes the reader with unfamiliar events of the distant past.¹⁷ McCullagh may criticize this approach as biased, since it lends itself to prioritizing certain parts of the narrative and selecting more intriguing evidence at the expense of available documentation. White responds to this line of thinking as follows: “Historians may not like to think of their works as translations of fact into fictions; but this is one of the effects of their works. By suggesting alternative emplotments of a given sequence of historical events, historians provide historical events with all of the possible meanings with which the literary art of their culture is capable of endowing them.”¹⁸ Therefore, such narrative elements do not contradict the aims of the historian, but rather give credence to his or her personal inflection.

Tacitus: “Mimetic Writing of the Highest Order”¹⁹

Roman historical writing emphasized a “return to the origins,” embodying Roman culture’s foundational reverence for father figures.²⁰ In the face of Roman imperialism, post-Republican writers wrote despairingly about their time, longing for the civility of their predecessors. Thus, “none of these historians were ‘objective’ in a modern sense; all were eager

¹⁷ White, *Tropics of Discourse*, 87.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 92.

¹⁹ Christopher Pelling, “Tacitus’ Personal Voice,” *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*, ed. A.J. Woodman (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 164.

²⁰ Donald R. Kelley, *Faces of History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 49.

to celebrate the moral virtues which had made Rome great and to decry the decline which was threatening its eternal claims; and so all were judgmental in their own ways.”²¹

Tacitus found himself at the heart of this literary tradition, not only as a historian, but as an active participant in Roman affairs. Born in Gaul during Nero’s reign (54-68 CE), Tacitus encountered an optimistic Roman atmosphere after the volatile reign of Claudius. Nero quickly followed suit, however, committing suicide and leaving a power vacuum in Rome. The young Tacitus’ exposure to the ensuing civil war gave him “an acute sense of how fragile and ephemeral apparently robust political systems could be and how costly their disintegration was.”²² Under the short-lived Flavian dynasty, Tacitus served as praetor and eventually senator, before his promotion to consul under Emperor Nerva in 97 CE. His political career thereby survived the tyrannical reign of Domitian and the brink of another civil war after his assassination in 96 CE. These experiences entitled Tacitus to exclusive information of government affairs, but also influenced his opinions of certain emperors and systems of power.

Such external forces pervade Tacitus’ writing. On a subconscious level, Erich Auerbach points out that “the historians of antiquity did not attain, and indeed did not seek to attain, a presentation of general, world-moving ideas...[their] formulation of problems is not concerned with historical developments either intellectual or material, but with ethical judgements.”²³ Therefore, Tacitus writes in a certain manner because he cannot escape the limits of the Classical style. In Auerbach’s mind, this manifests itself in Tacitus’ focus on individuals and their errors,

²¹ Ibid., 65.

²² Rhiannon Ash, *Tacitus* (London, Bristol Classical Press, 2006), 13.

²³ Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard R. Task (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), 38.

as opposed to assorted groups of people at the vanguard of historical progress.²⁴ Namely, Tacitus speaks from his perspective as a male, upper-class member of the Roman political elite.

One could render Tacitus guilty of McCullagh's cultural bias as Auerbach blames Tacitus' "reluctance to become involved with growth processes in the depths"²⁵ on his "aristocratic conservatism."²⁶ Tacitus expresses such bias in his final work, *Annals*, Book 1, when he recounts a speech from Percennius in the aftermath of Augustus' death. Rather than addressing the grievances of the soldiers in attendance, Tacitus states that "the accession of a new prince promised impunity to tumult."²⁷ Tacitus immediately delegitimizes their claims, simply viewing them as "nothing but a lawless mob."²⁸ Such an attitude towards the soldiers' demands could stem from Tacitus' embedded fear of military uprisings destroying the political system during a transfer of power. Though most of the Roman elite may have shared his trepidation, Tacitus' failure to acknowledge the complaints of the soldiers constitutes part subconscious-cultural and part conscious-political bias.

These shades of culturewide and conscious bias seep into Tacitus' writing elsewhere, particularly when he contrasts Jewish practices with Roman traditions. Classical scholar and Tacitus specialist, Rhiannon Ash, writes that "Tacitus presents Jewish culture as an inversion of everything that a Roman reader would regard as normal and the tone is, at best, perplexed and, at

²⁴ Ibid., 43.

²⁵ Ibid., 38.

²⁶ Ibid., 37.

²⁷ *The Works of Tacitus*, Oxford Translation, as quoted in Auerbach, *Mimesis*, 35.

²⁸ Ibid., 37.

worst, hostile.”²⁹ He uses “polarizing” and “pejorative” language to depict Jewish beliefs and rituals, thereby reinforcing “what was distinctive about the writer’s own culture.”³⁰ By commenting on notions of Jewish identity, Tacitus aims to unify his readers against a common enemy, as Rome seeks a lift from the civil war that dominates the first three books of *Histories*, Tacitus’ major work spanning from Nero’s death in 69 CE through the rule of Domitian. This fulfills McCullagh’s definition of personal bias, as Tacitus leans on his own inclinations against foreigners to disparage Jews for his own purposes.

Tacitus invokes further conscious bias due to political ties, simultaneously authorizing himself as an arbiter of reliable information and destabilizing his writing with personal bias. Christopher Pelling, a Classicist lecturer at Oxford, highlights this phenomenon in Tacitus’ introduction to *Histories*. Tacitus admits that his career “owed its beginnings to Vespasian, its advance to Titus, and its further progress to Domitian,” but promises that as an unbiased writer, “he must describe everyone without either affection or hatred.”³¹ Yet Tacitus shortly afterwards portrays life under Trajan as a “rare delight of times when you can think what you like and say what you think.”³² This statement may inform the reader that Tacitus can write freely without fear of censorship, but heavily implies a personal bias in favor of the current imperial dynasty in contrast to the Flavians.

²⁹ Rhiannon Ash, “Fission and Fusion: Shifting Roman Identities in the *Histories*,” *Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*, 97.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 98.

³¹ Tacitus, *Histories* 1.1.3-4 as quoted in Pelling, “Tacitus’ Personal Voice,” 147.

³² *Ibid.*

Tacitus' political bias, however, falls into the category of informative bias. Rhiannon Ash speculates that while horrifying stories about Domitian may not tell the truth, "the fact that such stories were told and preserved is still revealing about contemporary perceptions of Domitian."³³ Such political-informative bias influences the *Annals*, too, as Tacitus criticizes Tiberius despite events justifying or disproving his apparent wrongdoings. Tacitus enthuses about Germanicus and encourages the reader to suspect Tiberius of foul play in his death, despite the facts pointing to fever or plague.³⁴ But this conscious bias still exposes relevant historical data. Pelling comments, "If Germanicus is wrong but romantic and Tiberius is right but repulsive, all four adjectives capture historical points of the highest importance."³⁵ Even if historically false, the way people felt towards these characters matters in the historical record, informing readers of the consensus and manner of thinking of that time period.

The dissonance between fact and writing evokes the Roman public's mental struggle. Through Tacitus' narrative, he has "nurtured a mentality where a reader understands that anything, particularly with an emperor like Tiberius, may not be what the surface facts might suggest."³⁶ This immersive element of Tacitus' writing prompts Tacitus scholar Norma Miller to designate his works as "literature and not regimental history."³⁷ Auerbach reflects similarly in light of Tacitus' implicit contempt for Percennius, calling Tacitus "a great artist" in contrast to the modern historian.³⁸ Auerbach continues in this vein: "Tacitus is a master of his craft, and his

³³ Ash, *Tacitus*, 16.

³⁴ Pelling, "Tacitus' Personal Voice," 162.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 163.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 164.

³⁷ Norma P. Miller, "Style and Content in Tacitus," *Tacitus*, ed. T.A. Dorey (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1969), 108.

³⁸ Auerbach, *Mimesis*, 36.

speeches...are really imbued with the character and the situation of the persons supposed to have delivered them; but they too are primarily rhetoric. Percennius does not speak his own language; he speaks Tacitean.”³⁹ Since Tacitus cannot have known the exact content of Percennius’ speech, he implements his personal inflection, putting his own words into the mouths of his characters.

Ash specifies instances in the *Histories* in which Tacitus employs this form of subjective historical writing. In his accounts of the treacherous Year of the Four Emperors, a time when four different emperors ruled Rome in the span of one year, Tacitus conveys a decline of Roman society as a result of imperialism and civil war. He accomplishes this through his use of narrative inflection and poignant imagery, which appear in the graphic tale of Galba’s execution: “Their severed heads were being carried along fixed on poles amidst the standards of the cohorts and alongside the legion’s eagle, as men vied with one another and showed off their bloody hands.”⁴⁰ By depicting the heads on the backdrop of the legionary banner, Tacitus magnifies the moral decay of Rome, underlining the honor now attached to killing fellow Romans. This emotive imagery contrasts with Plutarch’s account, which merely states that one soldier carried the heads around mockingly.⁴¹ Such depravity continues in *Histories* Book 3, when a soldier requests a reward for killing his brother. Although this story probably did not occur, finding its source in a poem about the civil war between Antony and Octavian, Tacitus alarms the reader with this Roman folklore reference to Romulus’ fratricide.⁴² Ash therefore concludes that, to Tacitus, “the

³⁹ Ibid., 39.

⁴⁰ Tacitus, *Histories* 1.44.2 as quoted in Ash, “Fission and Fusion,” 91.

⁴¹ Ibid., 92.

⁴² Ibid., 93.

‘truth’ is less important than the emotional impact of particular episodes on his contemporary audience.”⁴³

Tacitus’ masterful use of personal inflection to support his larger narrative goals could explain his aforementioned biases. In the case of his writing on Jews, Tacitus employs the common tactic of scapegoating outsiders to promote Roman ideals. This plays into the narrative of the Histories, as it precedes his account of Rome’s victory in Judea. Tacitus thereby places this moment of bias at a critical juncture in the narrative, as Rome embarks on a rebuilding project in the wake of its moral pitfall during the civil war.⁴⁴ His political bias functions similarly, adding to the immersive experience of his narrative. Tacitus mystifies his readers with his elaborate tone that contradicts his record of events, at once claiming and challenging their trust in him. By toying with the reader’s perception of his writing, characters, and version of events, “the reader is thrust into events, and helped to understand those responses of people at the time through a type of personal reaction that the text has both generated and warned against.”⁴⁵

Conclusion

As an author, Tacitus “writes from a vantage point which surveys the fullness of events and transactions.”⁴⁶ He stands aloof from the reader and from events, putting him in a position to retain some semblance of objectivity. But Tacitus takes advantage of the writer’s omniscience, writing in the manner that best exhibits his intended message. Hence, Tacitus’ personal glosses

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 98.

⁴⁵ Pelling, “Tacitus’ Personal Voice,” 151.

⁴⁶ Auerbach, *Mimesis*, 46.

encapsulate White's paradigm of history as a subjective discipline that captures the reader's imagination, but does not seek to misguide the reader to any objective conclusions. As a historian willing to not only delve into, but to trigger the enigma of historical writing, Tacitus straddles the line between objectivity and subjectivity. Thus, he serves as a role model for future historians as the quintessence of the historian's everlasting predicament.

The Evolution of Tchaikovsky's *Nutcracker*

Elianna Sharvit

The *Nutcracker* ballet is a Christmas tradition, and arguably the most famous ballet in contemporary America. However, the development of the work did not go as smoothly as anticipated; in adapting the story for ballet, the librettist encountered challenges with regards to plot, the senior choreographer fell ill and was unable to complete the choreography himself, and even Tchaikovsky lacked inspiration for the composition. At its premiere, the ballet was considered a failure in light of Tchaikovsky's contemporaneous works. Yet despite these early struggles and the opposition of many critics, the finished score was well-received, and close analysis demonstrated Tchaikovsky's mastery of composition. Although it never gained wide renown in Russia, it later found a home in the United States, under the artistic direction of Russian-born American ballet master George Balanchine. It is this choreography that most Americans consider to be the definitive version, even though Balanchine had revised his own choreography several times over the years. Balanchine carefully maintained some loyalty to the original story and some of the Russian choreography, but as a whole created an entirely new production, especially crafted for the American audience of the times. These changes included changing the sequence of the score and framing the story around a middle-class American home, instead of an imperial Russian one. Ultimately, these changes helped secure the success of *Nutcracker* for generations. Even today, many ballet companies have made it an annual tradition, while modern versions of the classic continue to emerge each year.

The origins of *Nutcracker* were promising. By the 1880s, Russian Ballet was thriving, with lavish support from the Russian nobility. In 1890, two years before the premiere of *Nutcracker*, Tchaikovsky's *Sleeping Beauty* premiered at the Mariinsky theater, under the artistic and choreographic direction of Marius Petipa, a ballet veteran at this point of his career. Petipa's work on *The Pharaoh's Daughter*, which premiered in 1862, had already established him as a ballet master. *Sleeping Beauty* was an immediate success in the eyes of even the most scathing critics⁴⁷.

The story of *Nutcracker* was inspired by the E.T.A Hoffmann fairytale, entitled *Nussknacker und Mausekönig (Nutcracker and the Mouseking)*, published in 1816. In 1844, Alexandre Dumas, a French author, wrote a popular adaptation of the story, which he renamed *The Nutcracker*. This is most likely the version that Ivan Vsevolozhsky, the director of the Imperial Ballet and the commissioner for this project, along with Petipa adapted for the ballet, since both were French speakers⁴⁸. The work was well-regarded in Russia; Tchaikovsky himself was familiar with it and expressed interest in the story years before he was commissioned to write the ballet. By choosing a beloved story, the librettist was essentially ensuring that the ballet would have an existing audience⁴⁹.

However, many critics took issue with the original libretto, because *Nutcracker's* plot was not so easily adapted for ballet. The original story by Hoffman was broken into ten short chapters and relied heavily on the techniques of time-lapse and flashback. While Hoffman easily achieved

⁴⁷Fisher, Jeniffer, *Nutcracker Nation: How an Old World Ballet Became a Christmas Tradition in the New World*, 2003, 7.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 8.

⁴⁹Wiley, Roland J. *On Meaning in "Nutcracker"*, *Dance Research: The Journal of the Society for Dance Research*, Vol. 3, No. , 3-28, Autumn 1984, 4.

a sense of clarity in his organization of the story, for the ballet adaptation, Petipa chose to simplify the story and focus only on selected scenes. Critics complained that the story lacked a clear and logical narrative and looked disjointed as a whole. The scenes did not seem to flow smoothly as they had in the Hoffman version, nor was there any explanation for the fantastical turn of events in the second act. Although Hoffman was able to clearly articulate his ideas, the libretto failed to explain some of the basic premises of the story. Whereas the original fairytale makes it clear that the supernatural events are in fact occurring, the libretto does not discount the possibility that Clara is dreaming. In fact, many modern productions conclude the ballet as Clara wakes in her bed. Fans of the original story were not impressed by the ballet adaptation, which was missing many key elements⁵⁰.

In addition to the issues with the story and libretto, dance critics were quick to point out weaknesses in the original choreography. When Ivan Vsevolozhsky, who commissioned Tchaikovsky to write a new opera and ballet, approached Tchaikovsky with the project, he requested to work with Marius Petipa. Because Tchaikovsky was so well-known at this time, he was given a lot of free range with regards to subject matter and content. He had worked with Petipa before, on the hugely successful *Sleeping Beauty* which premiered in 1890. The choreographer worked closely with Tchaikovsky, shaping his composition by demanding that pieces, and even specific sections, be particular lengths to suit the choreography.

Because of their good working relationship, Petipa seemed like a reliably safe choice, yet the choreography of this production was fraught with controversy. Before the project was close to completion, Petipa fell ill, and his younger and less experienced assistant, Lev Ivanov, took

⁵⁰ Ibid., 8.

over. Although some have suggested that the problematic choreography was a product of Ivanov, who lacked the expertise of his mentor, Petipa still incurred most of the dissatisfaction from critics. It is also unclear how much direction Ivanov was given. Although ballets often integrate mime in order to best express drama and plot in the choreography, *Nutcracker* relied heavily on mime throughout most of Act I and seemed to neglect dance altogether. There were no grand displays of classical ballet choreography. Act II, however, showcased dance almost exclusively. This generated a lopsided effect, where it seemed no appropriate balance of mime and dance was reached. In the original production, the prima ballerina was not showcased until the end of Act II.

Additionally, this ballet differentiated between significant characters and significant dancers. Whereas lead roles in ballets are typically awarded to accomplished ballerinas, the lead characters in *Nutcracker* were either children or mimes who performed little to no dancing. More troubling perhaps was the use of the most talented dancers in secondary and supporting roles. One critic said: “There is nothing of this in *Nutcracker*, there is not even a subject... In the first act there is not one classical pas, and the music is written in such a way that, the ballet master’s wishes notwithstanding, it was impossible to produce one classical variation.” These factors left audiences and critics dissatisfied with the overall performance⁵¹.

In contrast to the issues present in the libretto and choreography, the original score was well received. However, the process of its composition presented significant challenges to Tchaikovsky. Early on, Tchaikovsky expressed discontent with the story and complained that he was not inspired to compose for it. In his correspondence to Vsevolozhsky, he even requested to

⁵¹ Ibid., 9-10.

be released from his contract. However, Vsevolozhsky only extended his deadline by one year, and required that he continue to compose the ballet, since costumes had been manufactured and sets constructed⁵². It is likely that Tchaikovsky was aware of the major flaws in the plot, yet he did not suggest any particular remedies to them⁵³.

Soon after the pinnacle of his distress over the composition of *Nutcracker*, Tchaikovsky found it within him to not only complete the score, but to do so promptly. The day after his correspondence with Vsevolozhsky in April 1881, he learned of the death of his beloved sister Alexandra, known as Sasha. There is much evidence to suggest that he shared a particular bond with Sasha. They not only shared similar temperaments, but supported each other through difficult times. When Pyotr Ilyich Tchaikovsky first expressed interest in music studies, Sasha was the only family member to encourage him, while the rest remained skeptical. When Sasha married young and relocated to Kamenka, Tchaikovsky wrote her words of encouragement and guidance, spending much time at her estate there. After learning of her death, he proceeded to embark on his scheduled journey to the United States. During this voyage, he wrote extensively, reflecting on Sasha's life. Some believe that Sasha provided the much-needed inspiration to complete this composition⁵⁴.

In particular, scholars have noted that Tchaikovsky's fascination with the Sugar Plum Fairy likely stems from his perception of her as a tribute to his late sister. The Sugar Plum Fairy

⁵² Ibid., 12.

⁵³ Wiley, Ronald J. *The Symphonic Element in Nutcracker*, *The Musical Times*, Vol. 125, No. 1702 693-695 December 1984, 693-694.

⁵⁴ Wiley, On Meaning, 12-14.

is portrayed as the image of ideal womanhood, who perhaps serves to mirror Clara's own ambitions⁵⁵.

Dance of the Sugar Plum Fairy, the third movement of the *Pas de Deux* in Act II, is the ballet solo for the prima ballerina. This is where the Sugar Plum Fairy is showcased to the audience for her technique. Its sound is particularly striking because it features the celesta, a keyboard instrument with a unique timbre. In contrast to the piano, which utilizes hammers on string, the celesta hammers strike metal instead, making its sound closer to that of a bell or xylophone. As alluded to by its name, which originates from Latin and means sky or heaven, the sound of the celesta is often perceived as being otherworldly. It is, then, no surprise that the celesta solo was chosen to represent the Sugar Plum Fairy in the score. If, in fact, as Wiley, a leading expert on Tchaikovsky and his ballet music, suggests, she is an homage to Sasha, it is befitting to associate her with angelic sounding notes. The song also features long runs of sequential notes that evoke the sense of a dream sequence. This supports the thesis presented by Wiley that the Sugar Plum Fairy represents some aspirational goal of the perfect adult woman, as perceived by Clara.

Additionally, Wiley makes a strong and detailed analysis of the theme which introduces the Sugar Plum Fairy. At the beginning of the *Pas de Deux*, following the introduction, a simple theme is introduced. The theme is composed only of a descending scale, beginning with G, with increasing tempo.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 15.



(í sŏ svŷa-tý-mí ů-řo-kóı)

Wiley suggests that the hidden meaning behind this theme, which is repeated consistently throughout the movement, is not in the simplicity of the notes itself, but in the rhythm. The rhythm of these notes fit the accents of the words “I so svyatymi upokoi”, a Russian phrase meaning “and the saints will give rest”. This is a line closely associated with the Russian Orthodox funeral service. Wiley indicates that in some way, Tchaikovsky’s introduction of the Sugar Plum Fairy doubles as a farewell to Sasha⁵⁶. It would then seem particularly fitting to portray the Sugar Plum Fairy using the angelic timbre of the celesta in Dance of the Sugar Plum fairy near the end of the *Pas de deux*, as she has already been sent off, and can now be immortalized as the image which Clara idealizes her to be.

It has also been suggested that Tchaikovsky views himself as a parallel to Drosselmeyer, a key character in *Nutcracker*; Drosselmeyer is Clara’s mysterious godfather who arrives during the party scene in Act I and distributes toys, including the Nutcracker, to Clara. Wiley points out that Tchaikovsky and Drosselmeyer share a love of children that is highlighted by a lack of their own. Tchaikovsky expressed in letters to Sasha that he felt a strong affection for her children. Similarly, in *Nutcracker*, Drosselmeyer expresses his fondness for Clara⁵⁷. However, the meaning behind the character of Drosselmeyer is not shown explicitly in thematic material, but rather in

⁵⁶ Ibid., 20-21.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 15-16.

key changes. Tchaikovsky associated the normal world with the key of B flat major, but when Drosselmeyer enters, the key suddenly shifts, first landing on E minor before settling in E major. The E major key is used to represent the fantasy world of the second act. By using a distantly related key upon the entrance of Drosselmeyer, Tchaikovsky is cleverly signaling that it is indeed Drosselmeyer who causes the shift in the second act, achieving in music what the librettist failed to do in words⁵⁸. The 1993 performance of *Nutcracker* by the New York City Ballet, using the George Balanchine choreography, highlights this in the mime sequence of Drosselmeyer's entrance. Right before he enters, the lights dim, and the key of E minor takes over, as the libretto shares that Clara as well as the others are unsure of this "stranger." As Clara realizes that this is her godfather, the key immediately settles into major and the lights return to normal. As this happens, the libretto shares that "magical things always happened when he came to the house." By adding this key line, the libretto clues the audience in to the idea that magic accompanies Drosselmeyer, just as Tchaikovsky does by the change of key into E major.

In addition to the major thematic elements, such as the homage to Sasha in the musical personification of Sugar Plum Fairy and use of key changes to connect Drosselmeyer to the magical events of the second act, Tchaikovsky litters the score with expertly placed musical hints to help structure both the libretto and choreography. For example, in Act I, a short section dominated by soft woodwinds, during which the girls along with Clara sit holding their dolls, is abruptly interrupted by the horns and drums. The choreography mirrors this by having the rowdy boys run amongst the girls, brandishing their horns and drums, which they received as their Christmas gifts. This sequence repeats twice, bringing even more attention to the detail in the

⁵⁸ Wiley, Symphonic, 694.

score and demonstrating how much score guides the timing of the story as well as the choreography. These techniques, although they did not fully remedy the major issues with the first performance caused by the libretto and choreography, demonstrate Tchaikovsky's brilliance as a composer.

In the year immediately following the premiere of the coldly-received ballet, *Nutcracker* continued to be performed frequently. During the summer of 1893, parts of the ballet were included in programs for the Imperial Ballet's Krasnoe Selo season. Shortly after, *Nutcracker* fell into obscurity in Russia, except for a few special performances and the 1909 production that aimed to recreate the original. During these years, *Nutcracker* often accompanied another piece, sometimes only including the second act of the ballet. Because it did not particularly feature the prima ballerina, it was not popular among mature dancers, but *Nutcracker* did become popular in dance academies for recitals. In 1919, Alexander Gorsky choreographed a new production of *Nutcracker*, followed by Fedor Lopukhov in 1929. In 1934, Vasily Vainonen choreographed a production for the Kirov Ballet, and in 1966 Yuri Grigorovich choreographed *Nutcracker* for the Bolshoi Ballet; both of these versions became prominent on the Russian scene⁵⁹. (Fisher, 18, 2003)

The *Nutcracker* was brought to the United States via Russian tours but did not immediately gain widespread popularity. It was not until by William Christensen staged a full-length production for the San Francisco Ballet in 1944 that the ballet began to become somewhat of an American classic. Christensen gleaned advice from ballet master George Balanchine as well as ballerina Alexandra Danilova, who even demonstrated some choreography from the original

⁵⁹ Fischer, *Nutcracker Nation*, 22.

Mariinsky production. But overall, Christensen was urged to approach *Nutcracker* with an open mind and produce original choreography.

A watershed moment for *Nutcracker* was in 1954, when George Balanchine produced it for the New York City Ballet. Balanchine, born Georgi Balanchivadze in St. Petersburg in 1904, was trained as a young boy in the Imperial School for Ballet. After a rough period following the first World War, during which the school closed, the Imperial School reopened under Communist control and was renamed The State Academic Theatre for Opera and Ballet. As a student, Balanchine was noticed for his piano skills and his bold choreography. He once choreographed a sensual *pas de deux*, which shocked his professors and mentors. After years of strife in Russia, followed by many years touring Europe looking for work and achieving success in various cities, Balanchine was invited to the United States by Lincoln Kirsten, a well known writer and cultural figure, in 1933, with the promise of opening an elite dance academy in the United States. In 1934, he opened The School of American Ballet in New York City. His career in New York was diverse and successful; he choreographed not only opera ballets for the Met, but also popular Broadway productions. However, it is *Nutcracker* with which Balachine achieved lasting fame⁶⁰.

In many ways, the Balanchine production was similar to the original. For example, it maintained the unbalanced use of mime in Act I and dance in Act II. However, Balanchine made certain artistic decisions that drastically changed the format of the show. In 1958, four years after the premiere, he opted to introduce Sugar Plum Fairy, in her solo Dance of the Sugar Plum Fairy, closer to the beginning of Act II, giving new prominence to that role.

⁶⁰Reine, Bethany. *Balanchine : Russian-American Ballet Master Emeritus*. Vol. First edition, Branden Books, 2012, 7-94.

Despite a few poor reviews that highlighted many of the same weaknesses as the original production, the show was a hit in New York. The company scheduled additional performances after the show sold out; eventually even the additional shows were sold out during that season. Ultimately, Balanchine received most of the credit for the success of the production. People applauded his strong and technically-oriented choreography, as well as his artistic supervision of the scenery and costumes⁶¹. A few years later, Balanchine's *Nutcracker* became a nationally televised event, prompting its popularity as a Christmas tradition⁶².

In order to understand the success of Balanchine's interpretation of *Nutcracker*, is important to consider the Cold-War ideologies that were especially prevalent at the time when Balanchine presented his production on the New York stage. First, in contrast to the grand, upper-class setting, (a staple of the Mariinsky original), Balanchine deliberately chose to focus on the middle class. This note likely made an impact on increasing audience sizes and drawing in a varied crowd. Balanchine also decided to make the show more family-friendly as a whole, a wise move considering how heavily the show relied on child dancers. Whereas in previous productions some had speculated Freudian-like sexual tension between Clara, a young girl, and her godfather, Drosselmeyer, Balanchine introduces Drosselmeyer's nephew. This move left no room for speculation and clearly transplants any affection Clara has for her godfather to an age-appropriate crush.

Balanchine also boldly chose to address gender roles of domesticity with his choreography for Sugar Plum Fairy. In 1959, Balanchine re-choreographed the pas de deux, highlighting the

⁶¹ Ibid., 94.

⁶²Kodat, Catherine G. *Dancing Through the Cold War: The Case of "The Nutcracker"*, Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal, Vol. 33, No. 3 , pp.1-17, September 2000, 7.

Sugar Plum Fairy as supreme ruler of the domain. He significantly cut the part of the Cavalier, highlighting Sugar Plum Fairy's importance over his, and showcased her doing normally-partnered moves alone. He even featured several unsupported pirouettes, and only allowed the Cavalier to support her movements when it was impossible to do otherwise. These changes and sensitivities no doubt played a large role in the productions overall lasting success; especially significant is Balanchine's ability to reimagine his work and edit it for later productions⁶³.

Yet, despite the view of Balanchine's adaptation of *Nutcracker* as the definitive one, modern adaptations continue to be produced, some of which have stayed true to the original ballet, and some which have held on to only remnants of that original 1892 production. In 1991, *The Hard Nut*, choreographed by Mark Morris, premiered in Brussels. This adaptation completely modernized the costumes and setting, and even strayed from classical ballet choreography. Although it uses the original Tchaikovsky score, Morris made many major changes. First, he eliminated the role of Sugar Plum Fairy, and Clara herself dances both roles. Additionally, he romanticizes the relationship between Clara and Drosselmeyer's nephew, a character introduced in the Balanchine production, even having Clara kiss him during Dance of the Sugar Plum Fairy. During the waltz shortly after, Clara and her partner French kiss throughout the number. Morris utilized modern choreography in place of classical ballet technique. In the Morris production, although Clara assumes the role of the prima ballerina, she does not dance *en pointe*; Instead of wearing pointe shoes, she dances barefoot. Additionally, during the pas de deux, there are many lifts for male roles— a move typically only done for females. In fact, many have suggested that

⁶³ Ibid., 14-18.

Morris laced his choreography with overt sexuality, references to homosexuality, and uncharacteristic gender roles, showing how modern this story could become.

In 1960, American composer Duke Ellington presented a jazz adaptation of *The Nutcracker Suite*, where many of the classic tunes and melodies were reimagined for a jazz orchestra. While some of the pieces are barely recognizable on a first listen, there is clear loyalty to Tchaikovsky's original score. Dance of the Sugar Plum Fairy still presents the same bold and haunting melody, albeit in a completely different setting. Ellington's version begins as a drum solo which supports the entire piece, comparably to how the celesta supported the Tchaikovsky original, and uses brass to present the classic melody. Although it is strikingly different, the tune, and especially the rhythm make it impossible to miss.

In 2018, a movie adaptation entitled *The Nutcracker and the Four Realms* generated a global profit margin of over 150 million dollars. The movie uses the many themes from the original score and features ballet in addition to the action/adventure plot.

In conclusion, somehow, despite the lack of success of the original *Nutcracker* production supervised by Tchaikovsky and ballet master Petipa, *Nutcracker* eventually rose to become one of the most famous ballets in history, one that still generates millions in revenue each year. In fact, many ballet companies can depend on *Nutcracker* to fund the entire season. Although it is clear from close analysis of the original score that *Nutcracker* is testament to Tchaikovsky's mastery of music, flaws in the libretto and choreography prevented its immediate success. Many of the key issues which contributed to the failure of the original production are still prevalent today. After years of small productions in Russia as well as a successful production in 1944, It was Balanchine's 1954 production which gained *Nutcracker* a place in everlasting fame. His

nuanced deviations from the original, which made it more sensitive to American culture, as well as his expert choreography created the classic which is still widely performed today. Finally, its lasting impact on American culture has led to its continuous adaptation and popularity in new and varied forms.

Liberty Weekend: July 4, 1986

Liora Steinberg

Statistics show that one in every four Americans are immigrants or children of immigrants.¹ Some came to escape war, persecution or illness, and some came to find new opportunities for success. In 1938, Nazi Germany invaded Nelly Ratner's hometown of Vienna. The Ratner family feared for their lives, as they knew Jewish families would not be welcome in a Nazi invaded country. This began a long journey for the Ratner's. They traveled to Italy where Nelly and her family were able to board the very last ship heading towards the United States. They spent weeks on board, after which they finally found safety on the shores of Ellis Island. As their ship docked at the port; Lady Liberty was there to welcome them and shelter them from the horrors of World War II.² This narrative of Lady Liberty being the beacon of freedom for newcomers, however, is not so clear cut and has been developed throughout its 150 years of history. This process hit a major turning point over Liberty Weekend in 1986, which was an event which contributed to the evolution of the Statues significance and symbolism.

Twelve million immigrants passed through the shores of Ellis Island, which stands in the shadow of Lady Liberty, between the years of 1892 to 1954. Every one of those immigrants was able to look upon her shine and gain confidence that they had made the right decision in coming to the US, and thus she became a symbol of liberty and freedom for all. The truth is, though, it didn't start that way; the real origins of the statue weren't tied in any way to immigration, In the

¹ Zong, Jie, et al. "Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States." *Migrationpolicy.org*, 14 Mar. 2019, www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states.

² National Park Service, January 29, 2018



Fig. 1- The Statue of Liberty seen on Liberty Island in New York Harbor, about a decade after her arrival, in 1898.

year 1865, Edward De Laboulaye wanted to give a gift to the United States in celebration of 100 years since they gained independence from Britain and became their nation. This also coincided with the end of the Civil War, and a group of French men wanted to show their support of emancipation. The group wanted to assist African Americans and encourage the anti-slavery movement in any way they could. They enlisted a sculptor named Auguste Bartholdi to build the monument as a gift to the US from France. Bartholdi's intentions were to highlight the freedom flowing from America, in reference to the newly established emancipation proclamation; he never intended for it to become a symbol of freedom for those coming to America.³ When the time came to celebrate the centennial of the country in 1876, the builders only completed the torch because there wasn't enough money to complete the project. There were competitions and fundraisers to help promote the building of the statue, but nothing caught on. During one of these small events, Emma Lazarus wrote the famous poem that is now inscribed on Lady Liberty's base, titled "The New Colossus" and included iconic lines such as "Give me your tired, your poor/your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."⁴ The statue remained incomplete until there was a sudden breakthrough in 1885. Joseph Pulitzer, the publisher of the New York World, started up a drive for donations to finish the project, and contributors came pouring in, most only giving a few dollars. The statue was finally completed and unveiled in 1886 by President Grover Cleveland.⁵

Lazarus gave new meaning to the statue, and people were starting to see Lady Liberty as a symbol of freedom. Simultaneously, many began to look at it as quite the opposite. It became a

³ Robert McNamara, How the Statue of Liberty became a Symbol of Immigration, (Thought Co., 2018).

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Christopher Reynolds, Think You Know the Statue of Liberty? Think Again, (Los Angeles Times, 2016).

controversial symbol for nativists and xenophobic groups who were opposed to immigration. They looked at the statue as a warning sign against letting people through the borders. Lady Liberty was seen as a watch guard against unwanted newcomers. Most Americans discarded this unique perspective as the refugee crisis became more and more of a prevalent issue after World War II, and the Statue of Liberty slowly became an optimistic symbol of freedom for immigrants.⁶

The first half of the twentieth century looked drastically different in comparison to the end of the twentieth century in America in terms of their treatment towards immigrants. Between the years 1981 and 1990, the Washington Post predicted immigration would hit "Historic highs."⁷ The numbers were supposed to be even higher than the years between 1901 and 1910, when there were 8.7 million immigrants. The article reads, "The influx of immigrants, who, like their predecessors, have come to the United States to escape economic and political instability, is expected to have long-lasting repercussions on all aspects of American life, from business to politics to social institutions."⁸ The surprising part about this is that these 'long lasting repercussions' were mostly seen as positive ones. For example, Americans saw immigration as a positive for "creating new opportunities and expanding horizons," as well as producing more seats in Congress as the population increased.

With the shift in attitude towards warmly welcoming immigrants in mind, President Ronald Reagan decided to open the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Centennial Commission in 1982, in order to restore the statue in celebration of 100 years since she was completed.⁹ For the

⁶ Lady Liberty and Immigration, (City Reliquary, 2009).

⁷ Zita Arocha, 1980's Expected to Set Mark as Top Immigration Decade, (The New York Times, 1988).

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Liberty's 100 Years, (Chicago Tribune, 1986).

following four years, a countdown began to the biggest celebration in American history. It was to be a giant, extravagant weekend bash with the unveiling of the statue by the president kicking it all off. The whole event would surround July 4th weekend, a dual celebration of the unveiling as well as commemorating the beginnings of the country.

The day before the event, the New York Times reported the event was to be a "30 million-dollar extravaganza...a bonanza of harbor activities, street festivals, fireworks, concerts, races, and other events."¹⁰ Visitors were coming from all over the country and all over the world. They were coming into New York City through all modes of transportation: trains and cars. On the first day of the event, President Reagan unveiled the 66 million dollar newly refurbished Statue of Liberty, relit her torch, and declared, "We are the keepers of the flame of liberty!"¹¹ The statue officially reopened for visitors on the second day of the event, along with a huge street fair spanning fifty blocks. This street fair was meant to celebrate variety in immigrants and included ethnic foods, cultural dancers, banners to represent different nationalities, folk singers, and various other fair acts such as jugglers and musicians.¹²

On the last day of the weekend celebration, there was an elite cruise ship party with an exclusive guest list. Those invited included President Reagan, Frank Sinatra, Elie Wiesel, Elizabeth Taylor, Neil Diamond, and many more dignitaries and celebrities. Another notable figure at this elegant event was President Mitterrand, the President of France at the time.¹³ As the cruise ship reached Governors Island; President Reagan took the stage to speak. He began by highlighting the friendship between France and America, and then he continued, "My fellow

¹⁰ Tom Shales, Ready Or Not, it's Liberty Weekend, (The New York Times, 1986).

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid., July 3, 1986.

¹³ Ibid., July 4, 1986.

Americans, it is not only the friendship of two peoples but the friendship of all peoples that brings us here tonight."¹⁴ With this message of unity, Reagan finished with, "whatever corner of the world they [immigrants] came from, there would be in their hearts a fervent love of freedom...We dare to hope for our children; that they will always find here the lady of liberty in a land that is free."¹⁵

In the aftermath of Liberty Weekend, as the city emptied of the approximate seven million visitors, the country was able to take a moment and reflect on the momentous occasion that had just occurred. People began to realize the significance of the event, and many wanted to share their opinions on how the weekend went. Almost every reaction was positive, with very few criticisms of the occasion. Samuel G. Freedman wrote a beautiful piece for the New York Times describing the timeless symbolism of Lady Liberty, "Architects and engineers created her form, but millions of immigrants and the children and grandchildren who heard their stories created her spirit."¹⁶ He also described the current circumstances in the country with Congress wanting to pass new immigration laws: "The immigrants continue to come - 570,009 in the last full year, led by Mexicans, Filipinos, and Koreans. Moreover, as Congress deliberates anew on immigration laws, Miss Liberty continues to play the maverick, her lamplight falling equally on the newcomer with papers [and] sponsors."¹⁷ Freedman points out the positive effects of the weekend, as it promoted pride for native-born Americans and immigrants alike.

John Corry, another journalist for the New York Times, posed a question in his article after the fanfare of the weekend had died down that pointed out some of the uglier parts of the

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

event. He asked, "Who or what are the immigrants and when do they become Americans?"¹⁸ Corry was able to agree that the United States is a nation of immigrants, and he said that the swearing-in ceremony of 200 immigrants on Ellis Island was "wonderfully appropriate," but at the same time he also wondered whether or not these new immigrants would make good Americans, which was a constant fear of Americans throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. He outlines the events of the weekend according to his perspective: at all of these parties and street fairs, the native-born Americans were subconsciously picking out the non-Americans and noticing their differences. Instead of it being a celebration of unity, and instead of feeling like an all-inclusive group of Americans, it seemed almost like a show that the non-native born Americans were putting on for the Americans. He makes a few powerful statements about the history of America's treatments of immigrants, "In retrospect, we sometimes have been unfair and at times we have been brutal. The know nothings persecuted the foreign-born, and Klansmen and others lynched blacks. Japanese-Americans were interned in World War II. Nonetheless, we have had no pogroms, gulags or death camps, and this has been our glory. At the same time, those of us who are already here have always wondered, and worried, about those of us who came after. Will they make good Americans, too?"¹⁹ Corry agreed that Liberty Weekend was a powerful event that celebrated different nationalities in America, but he was not sure whether or not America should be celebrating these nationalities or if America should be wary of them. Despite his apprehensions, Corry supported Liberty Weekend and celebrated its success.

Two weeks after the grand occasion took place, an article appeared in the New York Times written by Paul Goldberger. He reflected on the events of Liberty Weekend and explained

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

how astounded he was that despite the entire weekend being focused on a single statue, Lady Liberty did not lose any of her dignity. He says, "The miracle of it all is how well the Statue of Liberty survived all of this. Through it all - through the overblown, overproduced extravaganzas, the souvenirs, everything."²⁰ He speculates at the reasons for this and finally concludes that it boils down to the fact that the statue has a unique relationship with New York City. He explains that the Statue of Liberty was deliberately placed where it is, out in the middle of the harbor. She specifically faces the sea, not inwards towards the country, and thus welcomes others into the country. Goldberger emphasizes the relationship that Lady Liberty shares with her country, "The Statue of Liberty actually turns the harbor into a door; it makes the place where the sea becomes New York Bay an entry, not just a body of water, and it makes the city itself, not to mention the nation that lies to its west, seem more tangible, more understandable, more coherent as a place."²¹ Goldberger recognized the enormous impact the statue has on the United States, and he proved that in his piece reviewing the weekend. Freedman, Corry, and Goldberger accurately summarized the positive feelings of the country in the aftermath of the weekend.

Not only were there articles published discussing the impact and implications of Liberty Weekend, but some also used the weekend as a platform to push particular political agendas. On July 15, a few weeks after the event, a Letter to the Editor in the New York Times was titled "Strange Contradictions." The author expressed frustration because, at the time, Congress had decided to withdraw from the World Court after they declared the US violated international law. Congress agreed to accept the court's jurisdiction from then on only on a case-by-case basis. In the letter to the editor, the author points out the contradiction among all of the celebrations:

²⁰ Ibid., July 17, 1986

²¹ Ibid.

"While millions of dollars and hours were devoted to celebrating a symbol of freedom offering the possibility for all people to live peacefully, our nation stands firm on its decision to boycott the only permanent international forum for conflict resolution."²² He kindly asks that Americans consider speaking out against Congress' decision.

One other important aspect of the extended weekend festivities was the strengthened ties between France and America. President Mitterrand was involved in all of the exclusive parties and was standing at the forefront of all the presentations. Around the same time as the centennial celebration, France had recently denied the United States request to fly combat planes over France in order to send a bombing raid to Libya. Tensions had risen between the two nations, and this weekend cooled down the situation. In a news report published by the New York Times, it quotes Claude de Kemoularia, France's representative to the United Nations, "It's a great day for France. And it's a great day for French-American relations."²³ The event had many positive outcomes, and an important one was this strong effect on the French-American friendship.

After Liberty Weekend was over, except for a small few that disagreed, the symbolism of the crucial occasion that had occurred was felt around the country. Many appreciated all of the celebrations and thought very highly of the way it had panned out, with minimal complaints or criticisms. It was one of the most significant and extravagant commemorations our great nation has ever experienced, and we are still feeling its impacts today. In the year 2015, 4.3 million people visited Liberty Island and the Statue of Liberty makes it to the top of every list of must-visit sites in New York City. In almost every discussion of immigration policy today, Lady

²² Strange Contradiction, (New York Times, 1986).

²³ Liberty Weekend/The People; French See Better Ties From Visit, (New York, 1986).

Liberty is brought to the forefront of people's mind, to remind them of what this country stands for: freedom for all. In an article written in 2016, Dave Eggers describes how Lady Liberty is wearing sandals, which signifies that she is not stagnant, instead she is wearing traveling shoes. Therefore, he says, "remember that the symbol of this country has not put down her torch, has not closed the book on the Declaration of Independence, and has not stopped moving. If we ever forget who we are or why we're here, if we ever forget the meaning of America, we need only look at the woman's feet."²⁴

²⁴ Dave Eggers, The Statue of Liberty was Built to Welcome Immigrants - That Welcome Must not End, (The Guardian, 2016).

Scribbles, Supplements and Strike-throughs: Early Modern Readers and The *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis*

William Stenhouse

Introduction

In 1521, the Roman printer Giacomo Mazzocchi published a book called the *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis* (*Epigrams of the Ancient City*). It contained the texts from hundreds of the Latin inscriptions that were preserved in Rome, as well as woodcuts of some of the most famous ancient monuments. The publication of a book of this type in the early sixteenth century needs little explanation today. We know that the humanists of the Renaissance had become increasingly interested in material remains from antiquity, especially inscriptions. By 1521, scholars in some northern Italian and southern German cities had collected and published what survived in their hometowns. In Rome, Pope Leo X (1513-21) was especially interested in promoting scholarship on the past, and had made the artist Raphael his commissioner of antiquities, with the responsibility of preserving and promoting the city's ruins. More ancient inscriptions survived in Rome than anywhere else, and in the scholarly climate of the early sixteenth century it is no surprise that an enterprising printer decided to publish them. His book is a long way from modern standards of archaeological verisimilitude (fig. 1) but does at least give an idea of the words that appeared on inscribed monuments in the city.¹

¹ Discussions of the *Epigrammata* include Marco Buoncore, "Sulle copie postillate vaticane degli *Epigrammata antiquae Urbis*," in *Miscellanea bibliothecae apostolicae vaticanae XIII* (Studi e testi 433) (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 2006), 91-102; Concetta Bianca, "Giacomo Mazzocchi e gli *Epigrammata antiquae Urbis*," in *Studi di antiquaria ed epigrafia per Ada Rita Gunnella*, ed. Concetta Bianca, Gabriella Capecchi, and Paolo Desideri (Rome: Edizioni di Storie Letteratura, 2009), 107-116; Joan Carbonell Manils, "El corpus epigráfico de los *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis* (ed. Mazochius 1521) a raíz del estudio del ejemplar anotado por Jean Matal (ms. Vat. Lat. 8495)," in

Peregrinationes ad inscriptiones colligendas. Estudios sobre epigrafía de tradición manuscrita, ed. Gerard González Germain (Bellaterra: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2016), 13-72.

82 [Please note: Images have been deleted per copyright considerations.]

Fig. 2- The Arch of Septimius Severus

Fig. 3- An inscription with woodcut setting (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 80.D.30 [*Epigrammata antiquae urbis*], fol. 130r) corrected by a later reader. This inscription, now lost, was a favorite of sixteenth-century scholars: it reads “He lived 52 years. To the spirits of the Tiberius Claudius Secundus. Here he has everything with him. Baths, wines, and Venus break our bodies, but baths, wines, and Venus make our life. Merope, freedwoman of Caesar made this for her dear companion, for herself, and for their family and their descendants.

Although we can understand why it was published, the book has some puzzling features. Its privilege (a sort of license and copyright awarded by Pope Leo) is dated 1517, four years before its publication. It includes a significant fourteen-page errata list at the end, in which its compiler points out that he cannot find many of the examples included, and sometimes lays into the printer: “the inscriptions on the first side,” runs one correction, “are monstrously and wholly confused, with a fatal flaw, as they are combined into one when there are actually three of them.”¹³⁸ And there is no named author: Mazzocchi begins the book with a dedication to Mario Maffei, a prominent churchman, but does not mention who gathered the inscriptions. None of these features is especially unusual – authors tend to blame editors for their mistakes – but together they point to a book with a complicated gestation. They also demonstrate that the work is not perfect, and invite the book’s users, like the compiler of the errata, to question and intervene in its pages. And intervene they did. Many copies of the book that survive today include annotations, where earlier readers have integrated the corrections in the text, pointed out other errors, and added their own notes.¹³⁹

By studying these notes, historians today can try to establish how people who consulted the book came to grips with Latin inscriptions and, more widely, to document how the book was used. In theory, copies of Mazzocchi’s work can provide us with a window into scholarly

¹³⁸ *Epigrammata antiquae urbis* (Rome: Mazzocchi, 1521), sig. aaiiir “Epig. In prima facie monstrose atque omnino capitali noxa indigesta permixtaque in unum cum sint tria.” In her study of sixteenth-century errata lists, the longest that Ann Blair records is ten pages: see Ann Blair, “Errata Lists and the Reader as Corrector,” in *Agent of Change: Print Culture Studies after Elizabeth Eisenstein*, ed. Sabrina Alcorn Baron, Eric N. Lindquist, and Eleanor F. Shelvin (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007), 21-41.

¹³⁹ See, for example, Buoncore, “Sulle copie postillate vaticane”, and Sylvie Deswarte-Rosa, “Sous la dictée de la Sibylle. Épigraphie et Poésie,” in *Peregrinationes ad inscriptiones colligendas. Estudios sobre epigrafía de tradición manuscrita*, ed. Gerard González Germain (Bellaterra: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2016), 73-134.

practices in the sixteenth century and beyond. In order to get as full a picture as possible about this phenomenon, two colleagues in Spain are trying to put together a census of surviving copies, with information about any annotations that these copies include.¹⁴⁰ They discovered that the *Epigrammata* must have been quite a success: so far, they have found 320 copies in public libraries, and several more in private hands. (It is very difficult to extrapolate from that figure to make an estimate of an original print run, but it does seem to have been popular for an erudite collection).

As part of this project, I have been looking at copies in north America, which I reported on at a conference in Barcelona in January. There are forty copies of the *Epigrammata* in public libraries in the US and Canada, and I have seen around half of them (this is less impressive than it sounds: there are five in New York, five in Boston, and five in the D.C. area). They come from a variety of sources, though many have been acquired in the last twenty years or so, often from book dealers or collectors in Britain. None of them is especially remarkable in terms of its previous owners or in the quantity of annotations that it contains (among the Vatican Library's eleven copies, in contrast, there are some that belonged to well-known scholars and patrons, and some that have effectively been used as archaeological notebooks). When I began surveying these copies, I was hoping to find one that belonged to a famous sixteenth-century humanist, or one that included transcriptions of several monuments that have since been destroyed. In those hopes I was disappointed. But I realized that, together, the American copies do provide insight into the possible lives of this early modern book. In this essay, I shall give a brief account of some of the

¹⁴⁰ For a similar project, see Margócsy, Dániel, Mark Somos, and Stephen N. Joffe. *The Fabrica of Andreas Vesalius*, (Leiden: Brill, 2018).

copies to see what they tell us about how the book was used, as a case-study of early modern reading and scholarly habits.

The tourist as reader

The *Epigrammata* owned by Tulane University used to belong to a young man from northern Italy, named Giambattista Forzano.¹⁴¹ We know this not only because he wrote his name on the title page in orthodox fashion, but also because he added his name, sometimes with the year 1600 and the month August, to various monuments in the book. These insertions are virtual graffiti, personalizing some of Rome's most famous sights, including the Arch of Septimius Severus (fig. 2) and Trajan's Column. It seems reasonable to conclude that Forzano was indeed in Rome in August 1600, where he added his signature to the woodcuts of the tourist sights he had found. Why might he have been in Rome then, in the heat of the summer? It is possible that he was one of the thousands of pilgrims who came to Rome for the Jubilee a special tradition proclaimed by Pope Clement VIII in that year, in which penitent visitors were promised remission from their sins. Certainly, other annotations in his book point to a Catholic sensibility. A common way in which people marked their books in this period was to underline interesting terms or phrases in texts and copy them in the margins, a sort of predecessor to modern fluorescent highlighting. Forzano seems to have been particularly drawn to Christian terms in the inscriptions. He copied out references to the name Maria, for example, when he saw them, and in one case found a "Chrestus". To modern eyes this seems to be somewhat perverse: while thousands of

¹⁴¹ New Orleans, Tulane University, Howard-Tilton Rare Books [J. Arthur Warner] CN521 .M39.

early Christian inscriptions have been found in Rome, Mazzocchi printed very few of them, attempting to maintain a division between pagan and Christian material in a way characteristic of scholars in the period. Forzano therefore seems to be trying to find evidence in pagan material of terminology that was later to become characteristically Christian. There was not a huge amount of it. Even if he was inspired by a visit to Rome, Forzano himself does not seem to have been unusually pious. He turns up in secular literary and poetic circles in Savona, near Genoa, slightly later in the seventeenth century.¹⁴²

The *Epigrammata* as Renaissance monument

Forzano's interest in the *Epigrammata* seems to have been spurred by his actual experience of Rome, but for many of the book's readers, the illustrations in its pages were as close as they were going to get to the Eternal City. Through annotated copies, we can chart the attempts of several northern European scholars to compare Roman remains from the center with locally-found examples. But we can also see that the book came to be valued for more than just its inscriptions. It could be celebrated as a good example of Italian print technology: an eighteenth-century note in the copy belonging to the Getty Center, Los Angeles, points to its value as a document of the "adolescence of printing."¹⁴³ The copy now in the National Gallery of Art,

¹⁴² See, for example, Jean Balsamo, *De Dante à Chiabrera: poètes italiens de la Renaissance dans la bibliothèque de la Fondation Barbier-Mueller* (Geneva: Droz, 2007), 243 and 256.

¹⁴³ Los Angeles, Getty Research Institute, Special Collections, CN520 .E65 1521 c.1, online at <https://archive.org/details/epigrammataantiq00mazo> (consulted March 5, 2019), t.p., "Typographicae artis adolescentiam".

in Washington D.C., has the names of various French owners on the title page.¹⁴⁴ The first seems to be Michel de la Haye, a canon in Normandy in the 1520s, and so we can assume that this copy arrived in the north quite soon after it was printed. It is hard to match the style of de la Haye's signature with any of the annotations in the book. Rather, a subsequent owner appears to have begun using the book by following its instructions in an orthodox manner: in the top corners of the opening pages, he noted the page number in the errata list at the end that included the corrections to what he was reading, and in some added the emendations. His attention soon seems to have wandered, however, and later in the book his eye was caught not by the texts, but by the settings that Mazzocchi had placed around them. These settings were usually fairly fanciful woodcut adaptations of the original Roman monuments (fig.3). The French annotator copied and adapted these settings, apparently pondering their construction and ornament (fig.4). It is difficult to distinguish doodles from drawings made with a specific project in view. But in this case, I would suggest, the annotator is consulting the book not for the details it provides of Roman inscriptions, but as a resource for classicizing Italianate design. In the dedication, Mazzocchi presented his book squarely as a resource for historians of the ancient Romans; both Forzano and the French annotator seem to have approached it in ways that the printer did not foresee.

Students of ancient Rome and the *Epigrammata*

Most readers, in contrast, took more conventional approaches. Some added details to make it more user-friendly. In one of the copies in the Newberry Library, Chicago, for example,

¹⁴⁴ Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art, Rare CN520.E65 1521; the title page is illustrated at https://library.nga.gov/discovery/fulldisplay?docid=alma992822943504896&context=L&vid=01NGA_INST:NGA&search_scope=MainLibrary&tab=MainLibrary&lang=en (consulted March 5, 2019).

Fig. 4- An inscribed monument

Fig.5- Page from the *Epigrammata*

a German-speaking reader has added a simple index at the end.¹⁴⁵ The index is not comprehensive, nor does it focus on special features (it includes references to deities, emperors, religious ceremonies, etc., rather than just all the examples of one phenomenon). It seems, therefore, simply to reflect the reader's own interests. Mazzocchi included a guide to the interpretation of abbreviations in inscriptions at the beginning of the work, and we find that some readers added other abbreviations to the list or corrected Mazzocchi's interpretations. Other readers included cross-references, partly because Mazzocchi repeated some texts in the work, and partly to show where different inscriptions included the same phrase. And many underlined and excerpted terms in the way Forzano did, but chose more conventional words than the ones that caught Forzano's eye.

Fig. 6- Annotation recording another inscription and the date on which it was seen.

¹⁴⁵ Newberry Library, Chicago, Case folio X 067 .56.

The most heavily annotated copies, however, usually belonged to scholars who were both interested in inscriptions and had access to the collections of Rome so that they could correct and supplement Mazzocchi's work. Copies of this sort are most popular with classicists and historians today, as they promise to provide better texts or previously unknown examples and allow us to document scholars' increasing familiarity with, and understanding of, ancient Roman objects. Three copies that I have seen fall into this category; one in the Boston Athenaeum, Johns Hopkins University, and the other in the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington.¹⁴⁶ They include corrections to the texts that seem to be made from the stones themselves, descriptions of the monuments on which the texts appear, and updates to the locations that Mazzocchi had included (there was a market in classical antiquities in Rome, and some monuments passed through the hands of four or five collectors in the course of the sixteenth century). They also include contextual information and commentary, including observations on the language and dating of the inscriptions. The insertions can be tricky to interpret. The Johns Hopkins copy, for example, seems to include notes in four separate hands, although I suspect that two could have been written by the same person at different points in his life. Some notes respond not to Mazzocchi's text, but to other notes. In addition, we know that in some cases, scholars copied the annotation from other copies, recognizing the added value such emendations gave to the work. Thus it can be difficult to be sure that the annotator has actually seen what he appears to have seen. Careless copying of this sort can explain some puzzles in the Boston Athenaeum copy, in cases where the annotator adds careful emendations to texts from monuments that survive today, allowing us to assess the corrections. Most of the emendations seem to be the result of close examination of the stones,

¹⁴⁶ Boston, Boston Athenaeum Rare (Cutter) \$XB //M458 //1521; Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Eisenhower CN.527.M29 1521 QUARTO c.1; Washington, D.C., Folger Shakespeare Library 264694.

but one or two are implausible and bear little relation to the surviving stone. A copy of the work now in Vienna includes a transcription of comments and corrections that appear in a copy now in the Vatican, and at the top of each page, the annotator seems to have recorded which of the examples he has seen: can we believe that he saw them himself, or are these records taken from another copy? (fig.5)¹⁴⁷

Given difficulties of this sort, it is hard to draw precise conclusions about when and how the notes were made. However, I tried to make some general comments and observations based on what I had found. One of the annotators of the Folger copy, for example, adds copies of three inscriptions from north of Rome to his book. He wrote that two were in Pisa, which is confirmed by other witnesses, but he claimed to have seen the third in a fort built in 1548 on the island of Elba, and that is not otherwise known.¹⁴⁸ He also seems to have been well versed in comparative material from outside the city, comparing one Roman inscription to an example from the northern Italian town of Mantua, and he knew that another inscription in Mazzocchi's collection had been brought to Florence. Most importantly, he noted that in May 1547 he saw a fragment similar to one of the inscriptions Mazzocchi printed in the basement of a house in Rome (fig.6). Putting these details together, we can guess that this owner was probably from Tuscany (where he copied the inscriptions from Pisa and Elba) and had been in Rome during the second half of the 1540s. More generally, we can date some of the annotations in the Boston and Hopkins copies to the late 1540s as well, by comparing the sites and collections given for monuments with other dates and

¹⁴⁷ Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 80.D.30, digitized by google books at

https://books.google.com/books?id=rdhYAAAACAAJ&source=gbv_navlinks_s (consulted March 5, 2019).

¹⁴⁸ The two known inscriptions are edited as *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* XI.1434 and XI.1437.

witnesses. This accords with a general pattern among the datable annotated copies of the work suggesting that the book's scholarly impact was not immediate, but it attracted lots of engaged readers about twenty-five years after its publication. This is partly for political reasons, as the Sack of Rome in 1527 disrupted intellectual activity in the city. But it also suggests that it was only a while after the book appeared that scholars in Rome and elsewhere really started to think about the historical and linguistic data that could be derived from a careful analysis of these Roman primary sources and realized that they would have to correct and build on the *Epigrammata* to perform that analysis.

Conclusion

This might all sound rather vague and obscure, and the benefits of a project of this sort might seem rather limited. Demonstrating that this recondite book was widely used and that scholars added comments and corrections of a variety of sorts does not necessarily get us very far. But I hope that it might give an idea of how the history of reading and book history can illuminate the history of scholarship. The *Epigrammata* is certainly interesting as an artifact created in 1521, and its appearance has often been celebrated as a turning-point in the history of classical epigraphy (the study of inscriptions) in much the same way that people claim that Darwin's publication of the *On the Origin of Species* on November 24, 1859 is a turning point in the history of biology. Historians of reading, however, suggest that it is productive to think in terms of the life cycle of books (borrowing a Darwinian metaphor), especially in the early modern

period.¹⁴⁹ Published books were (and are) the products of a collaboration between authors, editors, and printers that begins before their publication, and then owners and users of books subsequently determine their reception, adding to them, sharing them, and shaping how new readers approach them. The *Epigrammata* was a reference work with plenty of flaws and not a book that people sat down to read, so it is certainly an unusual case. But I would argue that it still offers a useful vantage point for thinking about other books in the period. Because we have an unusual number of annotated copies, and because we are studying them, we have a chance to chart its post-publication development, to observe how owners interpreted it in ways that the publisher would not have anticipated, and to see how it spurred scholarly collaboration and reaction long after 1521.

¹⁴⁹ See, e.g., Ann Blair, *The Theater of Nature: Jean Bodin and Renaissance Science* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997); Frederic Clark, "Reading the Life Cycle: History, Antiquity and *Fides* in Lambarde's Perambulation and Beyond," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 81 (2018): 191-208.

Picture captions:

(8) Fig.1. Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Washington, D.C. 20540 USA
<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/pp.print>

(8) Fig.2. N. W. Ayer Advertising Agency Records, Archives Center, National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution

(29) Fig.1. Photograph of a map of Cambodia made of 300 human skulls, Toul Sleng Genocide Museum in Phnom Penh, Cambodia.

(71) Fig. 1. The Statue of Liberty seen on Liberty Island in New York Harbor, about a decade after her arrival, in 1898. The New York Historical Society—Getty Images.

(82) Fig.1. An obelisk in Rome as illustrated in the *Epigrammata*. (*Epigrammata antiquae urbis*, fol. 10v; <https://archive.org/details/epigrammataantiq00mazo/page/n45>).

(83) Fig.2. The Arch of Septimius Severus (New Orleans, Tulane University, Howard-Tilton Rare Books [J. Arthur Warner] CN521 .M39 [*Epigrammata antiquae urbis*], fol. 4v) with virtual graffiti by Giambattista Forzano (©Howard-Tilton Library, Tulane University).

(83) Fig.3. An inscription with woodcut setting (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 80.D.30 [*Epigrammata antiquae urbis*], fol. 130r)

(<https://books.google.com/books?id=rdhYAAAACAAJ&pg=RA1-PT251#v=onepage&q&f=false>).

(89) Fig.4. An inscribed monument (Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art Rare CN520.E65 1521 [*Epigrammata antiquae urbis*], fol. 80r) with annotation (© National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.).

(89) Fig.5. Page from the *Epigrammata* (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 80.D.30 [*Epigrammata antiquae urbis*], fol. 177r) on which the annotator has recorded which inscriptions

(<https://books.google.com/books?id=rdhYAAAACAAJ&pg=RA1-PT341#v=onepage&q&f=false>).

(90) Fig.6. Annotation recording another inscription and the date on which it was seen
(Washington, D.C., Folger Shakespeare Library 264694 [*Epigrammata antiquae urbis*], fol. 103v;
©Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.).