finally to Stockholm. But any enthusiasm was quickly dispelled. It soon became apparent that, while the intro- ductive chapter proffered a number of methodological approaches and overarching themes, the only true unifying factor in the work was the author’s own over- extended interpretations of each site. The chapter on Fontainebleau is substantially a rehash of the Panofsky’s classic article from 1928 plus extended sections on Rosso’s wit and parody and on sex and gender ambiguities, drawing from more recent liter- ature. There is considerable and needless repetition as the author goes through each scene in the gallery. Although flawed, this is nonetheless the most successful chapter, and the idea that the esoteric iconography of the gallery resulted from Rosso’s collaboration with the convoluted and riddle-like humanism associated with the court of Francis I’s mother, Louise of Savoy, would have been worth pursuing if the author could have focused on one or two fundamental points rather than have skated around the surface of too many.

Throughout there is a noticeable lack of engagement with primary sources, with the author in most cases happy to base her arguments on the back of well- researched secondary material, whether Kathleen Wilson-Chetvalier’s and Barbara Hochstetler Meyer’s for Francis I’s gallery at Fontainebleau, or Jill Burke’s discussion of 1505 Rome for the Farnese Gallery. One of the author’s arguments about the iconography of the Farnese Gallery is that its nudity and eroticism ‘would have appeared as almost spitting in the pope’s face’ (p.126), but no effort is made to back up this statement (p.48) or many others like it by citing a contemporaneous text. The discussion of the Hall of Mirrors is highly depend- ent on Burke’s work and any hopes that some- thing new would emerge from the analysis of the existing meaning of the mirrors simply peters out. The author on Karl XI’s gallery in Stockholm, while offering extensive commentary on the influence of the Swedish north sun on the Gallery, almost completely ignores the vault paintings by Jacques Fouquet of the Gallery itself, which goes against the stated principle in the preface to examine the gallery as product of a heterogeneity of meanings. This shows the author’s real lack of methodological underpinning.

It takes a great effort to distil such complex interiors made up of so many parts, scenes and media. But this is not enough. Other than choosing four nice spots on the European tour, what theoretical basis linked these chapters, or other of the monarch’s commissions. (In 2015 the exhibition – the institutional history of the Department of Prints. It is a tribute to the Department’s first curator, Robin Muir, to weave together the elements behind the involvement of its foremost contribu- tors. Perhaps the only criticism to be levelled against this catalogue is that it has regularly exceeded the 2015), £65. ISBN 978–1–4724–6033–2.

The exhibition that occasioned this catalogue, shown at the National Portrait Gallery, London (closed 22nd May), and then Manchester Art Gallery (to 30th Octo- ber), is skittish about its intentions. The jacket of this publication declares that since its establishment in Sep- tember 1916, British Vogue has regularly exceeded the boundaried suggested by its nominal role as a fashion publication to serve as a ‘cultural commentator’. However, the exhibition – presented in reverse-chronological order in rooms divided by decade – chiefly indulged the works of recent photographers, designers and models at the expense of those who endowed the magazine with a significant voice in the realms of art and society during the first half of the last century. The first, high-critiqued rooms of the National Portrait Gallery’s main galleries were plastered with a cacophony of images from the 1920s onwards, while lengthy display cases focused more tightly on particular shoots or photographic series (such as Corinne Day’s 1999 photographs of Kate Moss). This part of the selection made a convincing argument for the obtrusive invention of fashion photographers to this day. However, the space and attention afforded to the remainder of the exhibition contracted, with the period between the 1910s and 1970s crammed into the smaller galleries, and represent- ed by few photographs and little contextual informa- tion. The many writings of Bloomsbury group members that appeared in the magazines during the 1920s and the avant-garde connections of numerous long-term contributors (such as photographers Edward Steichen and Lee Miller), for instance, were presented as afterthoughts. As such, this was a missed opportunity to examine the magazine’s history as a testament to the spaces shared (however comfortably) by ‘lifestyle’, high art, high fashion and cultural criticism in the twentieth century.

The catalogue is a refreshing corrective to these problems. Similarly divided by decade, it ditches the reverse chronology of the exhibition. This allows the curator, Robin Muir, to weave together the elements that remained separate or were entirely neglected by the exhibition – the institutional history of Vogue, the his- tory behind the involvement of its foremost contribu- tors, and relevant socio-political contexts – with clarity and precision. Muir does this in introductions to each decade, which are supplemented by quotations and ful- length articles that were originally published in the magazine, mostly on social themes, by such luminaries as Aldous Huxley, Nancy Mitford and J. G. Ballard. The photographs themselves are given the space and quality of reproduction they demand, resulting in a substantial publication that rises to the challenge of its subject.

J.V.

LOUIS MARCHESANO


This catalogue accompanies the recent exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum (closed 22nd May 2016) cel- ebrating the centenary of the founding of the Depart- ment of Prints. It is a tribute to the Department’s first two print curators, William Mills Ivins and his succes- sor, Alphea Hyatt Mayor, who collected hundreds of thousands of prints during their combined fifty-year tenure between 1916 and 1966.

Their collecting policy was unique in America as they acquired not only Renaissance masterpieces but also popular prints and ephemera in order to show that prints were not just aesthetically pleasing but also func- tional objects created within a socio-economic context. The catalogue selection of more than 250 European and American prints includes works by Dürer, Goya, Whistler and Toulouse-Lautrec, complemented by contemporary American printmakers as well as anonym-