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Abstract

This paper discusses the issues related to providing subject access to art works, focusing on subject access as described in CCO (Cataloging Cultural Objects) and CDWA (Categories for the Description of Works of Art). To illustrate the discussion, I will use examples from CONA (Cultural Objects Name Authority), which has a subject description model in compliance with the CCO/CDWA rules.

What is Subject?

In CCO and CDWA, subject is “core” information, meaning it is required for all works. It is broadly defined, applicable even for objects having no narrative “subject” in the traditional sense: The subject matter of a work of art (sometimes referred to as its content) is the narrative, iconic, or non-objective meaning conveyed by a figurative or an abstract composition. It is what is depicted in and by a work of art. It also covers the function of an object or architecture that otherwise has no narrative content.

Using fields specifically dedicated to subject assures that subject matter is consistently recorded and indexed in the same place using the same conventions for every object represented in the database.

You are probably accustomed to thinking of subject in these ways:

- Representational, narrative: Tells a story
- Representational, not a story: Portraits, landscapes, still lifes, genre scenes, architectural drawings, allegories

But these may also be “subject”:

- Nonrepresentational
- Abstract
Do repositories record subject?

One of the primary ways by which users want to retrieve information and images of art is by subject content. But where can we acquire subject indexing for works of art? *Issue:* Repositories of the art works would be the best sources of current data for objects; however, few repositories of art or of images index subject.

The results of a study conducted by OCLC in 2009 illustrate this point. Cataloging data from nine art museums was analyzed for compliance with CCO and CDWA. Results of the analysis show that a high percentage of object records have correctly included data for core CCO/CDWA fields. In some cases, data seemed to be missing in the survey, but generally this was a problem that could be corrected by parsing the data differently (e.g., *work type* or *role creator* were missing, but values for these fields could have been extrapolated and inserted globally in the data export). But there was one glaring exception where non-compliance was the norm: Only one of the nine museums had subject indexing.

However, a human looking at the data can often easily observe references to the subject in various other fields, particularly in title, which is free text, or in work type. For example, we can reason that a painting titled *Modern Rome–Campo Vaccino* by Joseph Mallord William Turner ([http://www.getty.edu/art/gettyguide/artObjectDetails?artobj=324992](http://www.getty.edu/art/gettyguide/artObjectDetails?artobj=324992)) has a subject that is the place name *Rome (Italy).* *Issue:* How could this data that is hidden in the title be indexed and retrievable as subject? One solution could be via automated parsing, by matching terms in title or work type against controlled subject lists. Another solution would be catalogers entering subject terms by hand in a series of catalog records. While the first method would result in some or many mistakes, the second method may be too time consuming to prove practical. Thus a combination of automatic parsing which is then checked by human editors may be the best solution for assigning subject terms to a large number of work records.

Another alternative may be to mine subject terms from classification categories sometimes used by repositories to organize online collections’ displays. For example, if the collections section of a museum’s Web site has a page labeled *cityscapes,* that term
could be mapped to a controlled subjects list, and *cityscape* could be extrapolated as the subject of all works included on that page (http://www.getty.edu/art/gettyguide/displayObjectList?sub=2032687).

Records for art works held in art libraries and special collections will typically provide subject access, often using headings from Library of Congress authorities. *Issue:* Although most such repositories provide group-level subject access, they do not provide item-level access. Thus linking subject terms to individual items or their images would be very challenging, if not impossible.

**Subjects in CONA: What is CONA?**

The Cultural Objects Name Authority™ (CONA), like the Art & Architecture Thesaurus ® (AAT), the Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names ® (TGN), and the Union List of Artist Names ® (ULAN), is a structured vocabulary that can be used to improve access to information about art, architecture, and material culture. CONA contains authority records for cultural works, including architecture and movable works such as paintings, sculpture, prints, drawings, manuscripts, photographs, textiles, ceramics, furniture, other visual media such as frescoes and architectural sculpture, performance art, archaeological artifacts, and various functional objects that are from the realm of material culture. CONA will grow through contributions from the user community. As is true of the AAT, TGN, and ULAN, the structure of CONA is a thesaurus compliant with national and international standards for controlled vocabularies. CONA is also compliant with the rules established in the CDWA and CCO.
Figure 1: Conceptual diagram for information in a CONA record.

As prescribed in CCO and CDWA, subject description may include general subject terms that are drawn from a short controlled list and specific subject terms that are controlled by subject authorities for people, places, generic terms, and iconographic subjects. In CONA, specific subject is controlled by the three Getty vocabularies ULAN, AAT, and TGN, and by an Iconography Authority that is new to CONA.

**General subject**

General subject uses a short list of general terms to classify the persons, groups of persons, things, places, activities, abstract shapes, decorations, stories, events from literature, mythology, religion, or history, and philosophical, theoretical, symbolic, or allegorical themes depicted in the work.

Even though the subject matter may be referred to in title or elsewhere, indexing of the subject content is required in the subject fields (called *depicted subject* in CONA). In CONA, the minimum requirement for subject indexing is one general subject term, controlled by the list below, which is based on CCO and CDWA. While we strongly encourage contributors to provide at least one subject term, we realize that it may be impossible for some. Therefore a default value *undetermined* is available to populate
the subject field for contributions if absolutely necessary, with the hope that the contributor will provide meaningful subject indexing in later updates.

The following controlled list comprises general subject terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Subject Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advertising and commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allegory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apparel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>botanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cartographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceremonial object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cityscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>didactic and propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funerary art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history and legend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interior architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literary theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed motif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonrepresentational art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numismatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object (utilitarian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portrait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion and mythology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seascape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>still life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of indexing**

For both general and specific subject terms, the *indexing type* (called *subject type* in CCO) may be indicated in CONA by three concepts: description, identification, interpretation. These concepts represent the following three useful levels of subject analysis, which are loosely based on methods prescribed by art historian Erwin Panofskyvi:

- Objective description
- Identification of named subject
- Interpretation of the meaning or theme

These types correspond to *of-ness* and *about-ness*, which is another common way of analyzing subjects. There are no hard and fast rules in how these levels are applied: the distinction between description and identification may be blurred based on the knowledge of the cataloger. Both description and identification correspond to of-ness. Interpretation, corresponding to about-ness, should never be included unless it is documented by scholarly or other authoritative sources.
For example, the three levels of subject indexing for the painting *Irises* by Vincent van Gogh (http://www.getty.edu/art/gettyguide/artObjectDetails?artobj=947) could be itemized in the following way:

*Description*: botanical

*Identification*: Iris (genus) (Iridaceae);

*Interpretation*: Nature (<philosophical concepts>); regeneration (events)

In addition to flagging indexing type, the *extent* to which a term is relevant may also be indicated (e.g., overall, recto, verso, side A, side B, interior, exterior, foreground, background, etc.)

Indexing type and extent are both available in CONA for every subject term, if applicable and if supported by incoming contributed data. It is understood that these flags will often probably be omitted by contributors whose data does not include it. *Issue*: However, fastidious CCO users have pointed out that, if the distinction between identification and interpretation is not maintained, it will be impossible to fine-tune retrieval. For example, a watercolor by Salvador Dalí depicting butterflies but representing an allegory of silk could be indexed with *silk* as subject; if *silk* as subject is not noted to be interpretation, it will be returned with all art works where a depiction of silk fabric is indexed.

**Specific subject**

Specific subjects in CONA are controlled by four authorities, as prescribed in CCO and CDWA. In CONA, however, the authorities are actually live links to the three Getty vocabularies, ULAN, TGN, and AAT, and to a fourth tool, the Iconography Authority.

In a technical advance for the Vocabulary Program’s data model, this marks the first time that one Getty vocabulary is controlled by live links to other vocabularies. While various controlled lists in one vocabulary have always been based on another vocabulary (e.g., the values for *roles* in ULAN are based on AAT terms), these lists are not literally linked to the second vocabulary. Thus the extensible controlled lists could quickly become out of synch with the second vocabulary. We hope to follow the new model for all four vocabularies at some point in the future.
Subjects from ULAN: In CONA, ULAN is used to index the creator (an individual or firm), patron, and other people associated with the work, and the corporate body repository of the object. ULAN is also linked to the depicted subject fields of the work record, in order to control names of any person or corporate body that is a subject. For example, the subject of a portrait bust could be linked to the ULAN record ID:500329592 for Jacob van Reigersberg (Dutch noble and patron, 1625-1675). Issue: Are sitters and other non-artists within scope for ULAN? Yes. While historically ULAN was restricted to artists and related people, over time the “related” people in ULAN included thousands of patrons, rulers, and others. In order to allow control of subjects
by ULAN, these non-artists have been moved to a special facet of ULAN, where additional sitters and other non-artists may be placed.

![Top of the ULAN list / hierarchy](image)

- **.... Non-Artists (ULAN facet)**
  - 1. Abati Olivieri, Giulia degli (Italian aristocrat, 1630-1718)
  - 2. Abdülmeit, Sultan of the Turks (Ottoman patron, 1823-1861)
  - 3. Acquaviva d’Aragona, Andrea Matteo III, Duca d’Atri (Italian patron, 1458-1529)
  - 4. Adams, Abigail (American first lady, 1744-1818)
  - 5. Adams, John (American statesman, president, 1735-1826)
  - 6. Adams, John Quincy (American statesman, president, 1767-1848)

**Figure 4:** The non-artists facet of ULAN online.

**Subjects from TGN:** TGN is used to record the geographic location of the work in CONA; TGN is also linked to depicted subject in order to control names of any existing or historical place depicted in the work. This includes names of physical features (e.g., mountains) and administrative places (e.g., cities, empires). For example, in a painting entitled *Boy Viewing Mount Fuji* by Katsushika Hokusai, the depicted subject would be linked to the TGN record ID: 1107685, *Fuji-san (volcano) (Chūbu, Japan)*.

**Subjects from AAT:** AAT is used to record the work type, materials, style, and various other fields of a work record in CONA, including depicted subject; there it is used to control generic terms describing the subject. For example, a Maya vessel depicting a skeleton could be indexed for subject using AAT ID:300191778, *skeleton (<skeleton and skeleton components>, <animal material by form or function>, ... Materials (Hierarchy Name))*.

AAT and all of the Getty vocabularies are thesauri. When AAT is linked to CONA, this thesaural structure allows for AAT variant terms and hierarchical links to be used in retrieval of the CONA work records, including alternate spellings, various parts of speech, and terms in other languages. For AAT ID:300191778, the terms include the following:
[terms in AAT record for skeleton]
skeleton (preferred, English)
skeletons (English)
skeletal (English, UF, U, N)
skelet (Dutch)
beendergestel (Dutch)
esqueleto (Spanish)
squelette (French)
scheletro (Italian)
骨架 (Chinese)
gūjià (Chinese (transliterated))

Issue: Given that the focus of the AAT has historically been art and architecture, are the generic terms required to index subject within scope of AAT? Yes. Although undoubtedly many new terms will be added to provide subject access, the existing AAT facets will be sufficient to accommodate all of the new terms: Associated Concepts, Physical Attributes, Styles and Periods, Agents, Activities, Materials, and Objects.

This issue brings up the related practical question: When contributors submit records to CONA, how will new subjects, artists, and other terms be added to the related vocabularies in conjunction with the work record? Must the new ULAN or AAT record be created before the CONA record can be loaded? This is a technical challenge that is being addressed by our Getty programmer as he creates a load mechanism to allow interim records to be loaded while awaiting verification against controlled terminology (controlled lists, and also AAT, TGN, ULAN, and the CONA Iconography Authority).

Subjects from the CONA Iconography Authority

The CONA Iconography Authority (IA) contains names/terms and other information for iconography and other subject terminology that is not contained in the AAT, TGN, or ULAN. The IA includes proper names for events, religion/mythology, fictional characters, named animals, themes from literature, and fictional places. For example, it will include names for mythological places (e.g., Xibalba) and characters (e.g., Zeus), the names of specific events (e.g., American Civil War), or iconographic themes (e.g., Adoration of the Magi). The IA is a thesaurus in structure, including equivalence (variant names), hierarchical, and associative relationships. It has links to AAT, ULAN, TGN, and to CONA work records.
Subjects from other sources

In order to capture all subject terms being used by contributors, CONA allows references to outside sources of subject, such as Iconclass or the Library of Congress subject headings. The reference may include the term, the code (such as the Iconclass code or LC control number), and a link to a citation for the published source.

[subject terms from outside authorities in CONA]

Term: Hercules  Code: 94L  Source: Iconclass 2100 Browser (2009-)

Term: Little Bighorn, Battle of the, Mont., 1876  Code: sh 85077676  Source: LC Subject Authority Headings [online] (2002-)

Subjects in which authority? A number of additional issues surrounding subject access have come up in CCO and CDWA workshops over the past few years, including this among the more interesting ones that apply to CONA too. Issue: Where should you place subjects that conceptually could belong to multiple vocabularies/authorities?
For example, what if a place name is known, but the location is unknown or not applicable? Answer: If it is a place known from literature (e.g., *Gath*) but the coordinates are lost, it is considered a historical place and thus goes in TGN as a *lost settlement*. If it is a mythical place (e.g., *Xibalba*), it goes in the CONA IA.

In another example, what if a person is probably historical, but a large legend and iconography surround the person? Answer: The solution may vary in individual situations. In CONA, we have put *John the Baptist* in CONA IA as Christian iconography, even though he was probably a historical person, because the IA is much better suited to recording the rich legend and links to Biblical stories associated with him. However, Herod Antipas, who according to the story had the Baptist’s head chopped off, is in ULAN as a ruler with non-artists.

CCO and CDWA advise that a subject may go in multiple authorities. However, in practice, it is easier to establish rules and enter a record in only one authority. In CONA this is made possible because the IA is linked to ULAN and the other authorities, better allowing us to enter each subject only once. *Herod Antipas* as a historical ruler in ULAN may be linked to *John the Baptist* as a Biblical character in the IA.

**The subject of one work is another work**

One work may be depicted in another work. *Issue*: How should the records for the two works be linked? The CONA depicted subject fields link to other CONA records (separately from the *associative relationships*, which are also links between CONA records). An example is an art work that is a photograph depicting the Eiffel Tower under construction. The subject of that photograph is the built work, Eiffel Tower, which may also be in CONA. The record for the photograph may be linked to the record for the built work through depicted subject.

Another way in which work records may be linked is as related works in associative relationships; examples of relationship types here are *study for*, *model for*, *counterproof from*, *pendant of*, *copy after*. Architectural design drawings, such as a drawing by Michelangelo for the façade of San Lorenzo, may be linked to a record for the church of San Lorenzo as subject, but also linked to the church through associative relationships. In fact, we realize that contributors to CONA will likely treat such relationships differently depending upon their discipline within art and architectural history. While it is common to think of the subject of an architectural drawing as the built work, the same is not true for preparatory drawings for paintings. For the preparatory drawing by Jean-
Auguste-Dominique Ingres for his painted portrait of Madame Moitessier, it is unlikely that the subject of the drawing would ever be considered the painting. The subject of both the drawing and the painting is the sitter, Madame Moitessier. The drawing and the painting in this case are likely to be linked as related works with relationship type study for. These conceptual differences can be accommodated in CONA.

**Subjects for non-narrative works**

Works without narrative subject content should also have subject terms. A general subject term could be, for example, architecture for a building or object (utilitarian) for a bowl, extrapolated from object type. A painting by Rothko may have subject nonrepresentational art.

One general subject term for non-narrative works will suffice for the CONA record. However, subject indexing interpreted broadly can provide access to other aspects of these works. Subject can be used for the dedication of a church or temple; for example, the subjects of the building Hagia Sophia could be architecture and Sophia (holy wisdom). Subject can be used to record method of representation (e.g., plan) and purpose (e.g., design drawing) for architectural drawings. Objects of cultural heritage, such as musical instruments, textiles, ceramics, furniture, numismatics, stained glass, tools, and artifacts could conceivably have several subject terms. Design elements (e.g., acanthus) and symbols of a patron (e.g., sunflower for Louis XIV (French king, 1638-1715)) could be included as the subject for carpets. A globe could have the following subjects, recording what the work is “of” and “about”:

**[Subject terms for a globe]**

**General subject:**
object (utilitarian)

**Specific subject:**
Earth
geography
cartography

For textual works, while a transcription or a description of the text would be recorded in the inscriptions field, the depicted subject field may include indexing terms for the content of the text in addition to the visual subject content.

**[Subject terms for a manuscript page]**

**General subject:**
Performance art also has subject. It can include objects, props, people, functions, as well as the meaning or symbolism of the performance.

[Subject for a piece of performance art]

**General subject:**
- performance

**Specific subject:**
- men (male humans)
- Vietnam War
- death
- remorse

### Specificity and Exhaustivity

Specificity and exhaustivity of indexing must be addressed when indexing subject, the same as is true when indexing in other fields. These concepts refer to the precision and quantity of terms applied to a particular element. *Specificity* refers to the degree of precision or granularity used when assigning terms (e.g., the specific *campanile* rather than the more general *tower*). *Exhaustivity* refers to the degree of depth and breadth that the cataloger uses, often expressed by using a larger number of index terms or a more detailed description. *Issue:* Is it useful to index subject by naming every object in the depicted scene? If not, where do you draw the limit?

The greater the level of specificity and exhaustivity used in assigning subject terms, the more valuable the records will be. However, this ideal must be balanced against practical considerations. Cataloging institutions should establish local rules and guidelines regarding the levels of specificity and exhaustivity.

Cater your approach to the characteristics of the collection; available human resources, time, available technology; and the needs of end-users in retrieval, accommodating expert and non-expert alike. Try to index consistently and evenly across the collection.
It is typically better to index major subject elements across the entire collection rather than to index down to the level of minutia in some works, while omitting subject access entirely for others.

Establish rules regarding the number of terms to assign and method for analyzing. Any of the following three may be helpful: description – identification – interpretation; major elements to minor ones; or spacially, foreground to background or top to bottom.

**Subject of a group**

For a collection or group, record the subjects of all works or of the most important works in the group. Alternatively, record only a few general subjects for the group; this method is particularly appropriate when item-level subject indexing is also available.

*Subjects for a group of photographs*

**General subject:**
architecture

**Specific subject:**
views
Paris (France)
International Exposition of 1889 (Paris, France)
Versailles Palace (Versailles, France)
Parc de Saint-Cloud (Paris, France)
Parc du Champ de Mars (Paris, France)
tavel

**Multiple subjects**

Record multiple subjects if appropriate. Works of art may contain separate scenes in one image, as with an *Adoration of the Magi* in the foreground main scene with a *Journey of the Magi* in the background. Works may have different subjects on different parts of the object, as is common on Greek vases. The location of the various scenes may be distinguished with the extent field, if this level of accuracy is desired.

*Multiple subjects on a Greek amphora*

**Extent:** overall

**General subject:**
religion and mythology
object (utilitarian)
ceremonial object
human figure(s)

**Extent:** side A
**Specific subject:**
- Athena Promachos (Greek iconography)

**Extent:** side B
**Specific subject:**
- Nike (Greek iconography)
- victor
- competition
- prize

**What if subject is unknown or uncertain?**

In identifying subjects, cater your approach to the knowledge of the cataloger or available authoritative information. Do not include information, such as *interpretation* of the subject if you are uncertain. As with all indexing, it is better to be accurate and broad than incorrect and specific. If scholarly opinion is divided, index multiple subjects. For example, if the repository or another authoritative source for a bodhisattva sculpture states that scholars are divided regarding if it represents Avalokiteshvara or Maitreya, index both and describe the controversy in the descriptive note.

However, do not guess. If the cataloger is uncertain based on lack of information, do not list multiple subjects based on your estimation. In this case, it is better to use a broad but accurate term rather than one or more specific terms that could be incorrect. For example, in an illustration depicting a butterfly on a plant, using the term *butterfly* is better than potentially incorrectly labeling it as the genus *Morpho*.

*[Subject for a book illumination, where scholarly documentation has identified the species]*

**General subject:**
- animal
- botanical

**Specific subject:**
- pomegranate (species) (Punica granatum)
- Menelaus blue morpho (species) (Morpho menelaus)
banded sphinx moth (species) (Eumorpha fasciatus)

**Former subjects**

If a work has former subject designations that were published, but are now held to be incorrect, index both the current and former subject designations. For example, a portrait painting by Pontormo was formerly believed to depict Cosimo I de'Medici, Grand duke of Tuscany, but it is now believed to be Italian nobleman Francesco Guardi or an anonymous halberdier nobleman. All three subjects should be indexed.

*Subjects for a portrait of a man whose identification has changed over time*

**General subject:**
portrait

**Specific subject:**
- Francesco Guardi (Italian nobleman, born 1514)
- Cosimo I de'Medici (Grand duke, patron, 1519-1574)
- halberdier
- noble

**How to index the subject of the work at hand**

Using authorities for subject indexing provides consistency and efficiency in indexing. However, you should keep in mind there is probably a difference between the subject as represented in the work at hand and the subject as recorded in the authority. *Issue:* In the Work record, do you need to include specific topics related to the subject, if those specific topics are already part of the authority record? *Answer:* Index those aspects of the subject that are apparent or important in the work you are indexing, even if they are also in the authority. This is particularly important where those terms represent aspects of the subject that are unusual or particular for the work at hand.

Not all aspects of a subject topic are necessarily portrayed in every work having that subject. For example the subject *Adoration of the Magi* in an authority record would have a cast of characters, certain species of animals, and allegorical themes (such as the *three ages of man* or the *three races of man*) that are common in depictions of the story. In actual depictions of the scene, in some cases themes and characters may be variously emphasized or deleted. Extraneous themes, people, or items may be added. For example, the scene may be depicted as taking place in Siena, Italy (making reference to the affiliations of the donor) rather than in the Holy Land. It may be important to recognize this in subject indexing.
Related issues arise when indexing a visual surrogate rather than the work. *Issue:* The subject of the image may be different than subject of the work. For example, the work may be captured within a larger scene in the image (perhaps showing museum goers and the room in which a painting is displayed). These other elements of the image should be indexed (in *View Subject* per CCO). In another situation, perhaps you are indexing an image depicting a detail of the work. Your indexing of that image should include only the elements visible in that view.

[Subject of an image of the entire illumination]

**General subject:**
- religion and mythology
- human figure(s)

**Specific subject:**
- Krishna Subduing Kaliya (Hindu iconography
- lake
- snake demon
- Krishna
- Kaliya
- Nagapatnis
- Vrndavana
- Bhagavata Purana
- salvation

[subject of a detail of the illumination]

**General subject:**
- religion and mythology
- human figure(s)

**Specific subject:**
- Balarama
- Vrndavana
- despair

**Conclusion**

Although subject indexing is often lacking in catalog records for works of art and architecture, subject access is considered extremely important by end users. It is therefore critical for providers of art information to strive to provide subject access. Solutions for the issues that arise in this process should be shared among the
community. Standards and vocabulary tools will aid in this process. CCO and CDWA provide rules and advice regarding the recording and indexing of the subject matter. CONA is a new authority that provides ample fields to record brief, good quality records for works of art and architecture, including several subject fields and links to the AAT, TGN, ULAN, and an Iconography Authority for subject access.

---


iii Additional information about CONA may be found by following links on these pages: http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabularies/cona/index.html ; http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabularies/training.html


v CONA will be available to the contributor community in late 2011/early 2012. If your institution is interested in contributing to CONA, email vocab@getty.edu.

vi Panofsky, Erwin, Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. The discussion of iconology and iconography is included in the introduction to this work.