Key-Terms

Affect

In recent years, the "affective turn" in the humanities and social sciences has involved a focus on affects and emotions in scholarly analysis. Theoretical approaches and definitions in the fields of emotion research and affect studies are, of course, many and diverse (see Gregg and Seigworth 2010). In general, a new awareness of affect seems to have gained in relevance in the twentieth century under the influence of global mediatization and exchange, mobility, and migration.[1] While affectivity and emotionality, to date, have not played a major role in art history, a growing body of work combining affect studies with postcolonial studies—for example the writings of Sarah Ahmed—inspires a transcultural perspective in art historical research and renders affect and emotion relevant as categories.

Objects in the contact zone are obviously linked to affective and emotional processes, practices, and politics, as can be paradigmatically shown in the field of photography, a central medium of modern transculturality. Recent research in photography studies points to the importance of both the affective turn and the material turn to exploring the history of the photographic image. Those "turns" have contributed significantly to larger debates about the understanding of photographs as three-dimensional tactile and visual objects in their own right, as bearers of embodied and lived experience and emotions as well as of knowledge, in addition to the representational quality of the photographic image, i.e. its notion of indexical, experiential, and evidential truth (Geismar and Morton 2015). Tactile values of photographs are emphasized with reference to photography's literal origin of "light-writing," which generates the polarity of vision and touch in their ability to activate and perform relations between human beings and communities (Olin 2012).

At the same time, the affective dynamics of digital photography and its global distribution through social media also became a subject for research (Andén-Papadopoulos 2014; Schankweiler 2016). Here, the focus is not on tactile values but on online image practices (liking, sharing, and commenting). Photographs, or images in general, seem to play a crucial role in the "affective economies" (Ahmed 2004) of the present age and for networks of social relations. Relationships, affects, and emotions lend images their importance and meaning. Due to their widespread circulation across cultures and nations, transcultural aspects are obviously inscribed into photographs—be it the digital image of today or the photographic object in, say, colonial times (Poole 1997). The relationship of photography and affect "indicates a matrix of the subjectivities of experience, embodiment and emotion of all parties of the anthropological encounter—both observer and observed, as they intersect" (Edwards 2015)—especially with regard to the social lives of photographs in cross-cultural and non-Western contexts and the asymmetrical power relations in colonial settings where photographic objects serve as a medium of social interactions and cross-cultural or, indeed, colonial encounters (Edwards 2015).

Anna Sophia Messner
Kerstin Schankweiler

ENDNOTE

1 See the work of the CRC 1171 "Affective Societies" at the Freie Universität Berlin.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, Sara. 2004. "Affective Economies." *Social Text* 22 (2): 117–139.

Andén-Papadopoulos, Kari. 2014. "Citizen Camera-Witnessing: Embodied Political Dissent in the Age of Mediated Mass Self-Communication." *New Media Society*, 16 (5): 753–769.

Edwards, Elizabeth. 2015. "Anthropology and Photography: A Long History of Knowledge and Affect." *Photographies*, 8 (3): 235–252.

2021. "Key-Terms." In *Reading Objects in the Contact Zone*, edited by Eva-Maria Troelenberg, Kerstin Schankweiler, and Anna Sophia Messner, 205–251. Heidelberg Studies on Transculturality 9. Heidelberg: Heidelberg University Publishing.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.17885/heiup.766.c10426

Geismar, Haidy, and Christopher Morton. 2015. "Introduction." *Photographies*, 8 (3): 231–233.
Gregg, Melissa, and Gregory J. Seigworth, eds. 2010. *The Affect Theory Reader*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Olin, Margaret. 2012. "Introduction: Tactile Looking." In *Touching Photographs*, edited by Margaret Olin, 1–20. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Poole, Deborah. 1997. *Vision, Race, and Modernity: A Visual Economy of the Andean Image World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Schankweiler, Kerstin. 2016. "Affektive Dynamiken von Bildern in Zeiten von Social Media. Bildzeugenschaften aus Ägypten 2010–2013", *kritische berichte* 44 (1): 72–85.

Agency

The definition of agency has become a key site of methodological contention within the humanities and social sciences. Traditionally reserved for human actors, theorists have sought to broaden the term's parameters, thereby challenging the dominance of the 'Liberal Humanist Subject' in academic scholarship, and circumventing the racial and sexual prejudices that have historically informed the idea of agenthood in 'Western' philosophy.

In art history, the notion of non-human agents has been influential since the publication of Alfred Gell's *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory* (1998). In this work, Gell devalued the importance of aesthetics and semiosis, and privileged instead the manner in which art objects function causally within society. His account is premised on four key terms—or structural positions—that configure what he defined as the "art nexus": The artist; the index (work of art); the prototype (the 'real' object represented); and the recipient (beholder). Each of these positions can function as an "agent," or a causal actor, as well as the object on which an agent acts, which Gell calls the "patient." The various combination of these structural positions affords multiple "art-like situations." Gell's aim was to avoid appealing to systems of cultural convention when interpreting art objects, and to achieve an understanding of art "as a system of action, intended to change the world rather than encode symbolic propositions about it" (Gell 1998, 6).

Gell's approach complemented a range of art-historical studies focused on the ways that people have historically engaged with inanimate objects *as if they were* living beings (Freedberg 1989; Belting 1990; Mitchell 2004; van Eck 2015). Nevertheless, such scholars have frequently stressed how the 'experience' of the aesthetic is crucial to understanding how objects have exercised agency over beholders, whilst equally asserting the importance of historically specific cultural conventions in shaping aesthetic affect—thus contradicting Gell's insistent calls to minimize the importance of these very issues (Layton 2003; Osborne and Tanner 2007). Most significantly, Gell's approach essentially precludes several of the discipline's more traditional concerns, particularly the histories of stylistic and iconographic change. Art historians who have sought to apply Gell's methodology have frequently struggled to avoid exploring the ways "cultural frameworks" inform how art objects were produced or received. Most applications of Gell's theory thus reorient art-historical analysis towards the political nature of art and the power dynamics it mediated within social structures, rather than fundamentally realigning the ontological or epistemological bases on which traditional art history is conducted.

The last two decades of art-historical scholarship have also been influenced by a radical rethinking of agency within posthumanist and new materialist scholarship. The term 'critical posthumanism' denotes a collection of approaches that emphasize the agency and responsiveness of non-human actors, both natural and artificial. The field has been dominated by Bruno Latour, whose

actor-network theory deconstructed the logic of the "Humanist agent" by examining the agency of various non-human "actants" (Latour 2005). Similar concerns are shared by new materialists such as Rosi Braidotti and Jane Bennett, who have drawn upon the philosophies of Spinoza, Nietzsche, and Deleuze and Gauttari in order to attribute "agentic capacities" not only to non-human actors, but to inanimate matter more generally—conceptualizing nature as possessing an "autopoietic," agentive life force, despite its lack of "soul" or "mind" (Braidotti 2013; Bennett 2010). As the title of Latour's actor-network theory implies, critical posthumanist and new materialist approaches largely conceive of agency as "distributed" within a network or "assemblage" (Latour 2005). The 'liberal humanist subject' is deconstructed by asserting the supposed fallacy of 'autonomous' action, and emphasising instead the 'collaborative' constitution of agency.

This redefinition of agency has significant potential for transcultural studies of art. "Distributed" accounts of agency undermine the rationale for examining an artist's primary intentions, and instead lend theoretical weight to studies focused on the various meanings an art object can accrue within multiple social relationships. Consequently, an object's 'meaning,' as well as its capacity to affect society, can be conceptualized as distributed across time and space—produced as it travels within, or between, "contact zones" (Pratt 1991; ▸**Expanded Contact Zone**). In this paradigm, 'reading' an object becomes a matter of recognising the multiple "agentic capacities" that have come to bear on a work of art's inception, production, and reception, thereby uncovering what Arjun Appadurai has termed the object's "social life" (Appadurai 1986).

Tom Young

REFERENCES

Appadurai, Arjun, ed. 1986. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Belting, Hans. 1994. *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art*. London: University of Chicago Press.

Bennett, Jane. 2010. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2013. *The Posthuman.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

van Eck, Caroline. 2015. *Art, Agency, and Living Presence: From the Animated Image to the Excessive Object.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Freedberg, David. 1989. *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gell, Alfred. 1998. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Latour, Bruno. 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Layton, Robert. 2003. "Art and Agency: A Reassessment." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 9 (3), (September, 2003), 447–464.

Mitchell, W.J.T. 2005. *What do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Osborne, Robin, and Jeremy Tanner, eds. 2001. *Art's Agency and Art History*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 1991. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession*: 33–40.

Allelopoiesis

The term "allelopoiesis" was introduced by the Berlin-based research group "Transformationen der Antike" (SFB 644, active between 2005 and 2016). The neologism combines the Greek words *allelon* (mutual, reciprocal) and *poiesis* (produce, create) and denotes the interdependent relationship between ancient and post-ancient cultures (Helmrath, Hausteiner, and Jensen 2017). The term was coined as part of an attempt at widening the

concept and study of "reception." To this end, allelopoiesis is meant to shift the emphasis from the horizon of the reception sphere to the reciprocal relationship between ancient and post-ancient eras. The term is an expression of the ways that the active and selective engagement with ancient ideas and sources has shaped the very definition of "antiquity." Hartmut Böhme (2011) uses the concept in his discussion of the mutual influence between Freud and Aristotle. Aristotle, Böhme admits, was not a psychoanalyst, but after Freud, psychoanalytical models have become so prevalent in literary analysis that any reading of Aristotle will recognize the philosopher's arguments as following a psychoanalytical framework. Aristotle's writing influenced Freud, but the post-Freudian Aristotle has become increasingly psychoanalytical.

The term "allelopoiesis" reflects an effort within cultural studies, increasingly prevalent since the 2010s, to introduce terms that stress non-hierarchical and non-linear relations of influence. A comparable term is the Swedish concept of "*antikbruk*," meaning "use of antiquity" (Siapkas and Iordanoglou 2011, 9–42; Siapkas 2017). Like allelopoiesis, *antikbruk* refers to the modern interests that shape approaches to the—mostly material—past. Allelopoiesis and *antikbruk* are terms by means of which academic discussions can avoid being constrained by questions of correct responses to ancient originals. Instead, they provide a vocabulary with which to discuss post-ancient investments and ideologies that have shaped our notion of antiquity.

In line with this, the term "allelopoiesis" could also offer a way to consider the influence of classical scholarship on post-colonial studies. The very notion that culture is something that can be studied was shaped by early European scholarly approaches to antiquity. The possibility of a receiving culture shaping the perception of the culture it observes or responds to is of particular relevance to cultural studies. The term also provides a way to describe the process through which modern (Western) cultures have used the foil of cultural or historical "others" to define themselves (‣**Othering**).

Frederika Tevebring

REFERENCES

Böhme, Hartmut. 2011. "Die Antike 'nach' Freud. " In *Freud und die Antike*, edited by Claudia Benthien, Hartmut Böhme, and Inge Stephan, 423–459. Göttingen: Wallstein.

Helmrath, Johannes, Eva Marlene Hausteiner, and Ulf Jensen. 2017. *Antike als Transformation, Konzepte zur Beschreibung kulturellen Wandels*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Siapkas, Johannes, and Dimitrios Iordanoglou. 2011. *G(l)ömda historier: Klassiska normer och antik kritik*. Uppsala: Centrum för genusvetenskap.

Siapkas, Johannes. 2017. *Antikvetenskapens teoretiska landskap Volym I: Från Laokoon till Troja*. Lund, Nordic Academic Press [forthcoming in English translation].

Appropriation

The term "appropriation" refers to modes of taking possession, of making something one's own; as such, it is a relational term indicating that something is taken from one group or person and comes to belong to or be the property of another. Appropriation can be physical, intellectual, or symbolic, and can be considered an essential aspect of the dynamics of transcultural interactions and the tension between "own" and "foreign."

Its value as a concept is related to the broad range of phenomena it can refer to, from outright stealing to the most complex issues of artistic and epistemic authorship and transcultural exchange. Generally understood in opposition to assimilation, it can be seen as "a process whereby dominant groups may be criticized and challenged

when they borrow the cultural forms associated with subordinate groups" (Ziff and Rao 1997, 7). It can thus be used to indicate brutal exploitation and hegemonic dominance. This political usage has tended to consider appropriation as a way of reinforcing existing power structures and, thus, to deal with cultures and artistic realizations as closed systems. This has led to a preference for such terms as "hybridization" or "transculturation" in the description of cultural dynamics, but with the loss of emphasis on power asymmetries.

Yet, the term "appropriation" in our understanding, because it focuses on power relations, can also point to their potential reevaluation. In this sense, appropriation describes both a practice and a strategy that contributes to creating new or subverting pre-existing power dynamics. Arnd Schneider observes that one key advantage of the term, especially in transcultural analyses, is its capacity to situate us at the level of collective and individual actions: "The focus on appropriation, as an individual strategy and practice, is required in order to recalibrate theories of globalization and hybridization, which do not sufficiently focus on individual practices" (Schneider 2006, 19). Robert S. Nelson established appropriation as a critical term for art history (Nelson 2003) and stressed its usefulness, especially when compared to traditional art historical ("power-neutral") terms like "influence" or "borrowings": "Taken positively or pejoratively, appropriation is not passive, objective, or disinterested, but active, subjective, and motivated" (Nelson 2003, 162).

For this discussion, we explicitly connect the notion of appropriation to material objects—as a concept for transcultural art history, material appropriation can be seen to represent many levels of social and cultural relations. Hans Peter Hahn identifies different elements in the process of the appropriation of things (acquisition / adoption, material and cultural transformation, (re)qualification, incorporation, tradition making [Hahn 2005, 103]) and describes it as a spectrum of actions that can be taken, ranging from mere usage to complete metamorphosis. As such, appropriation has been part of an avant-garde repertoire of artistic strategies at least since the beginning of the twentieth century. In the 1980s, "appropriation art" became a style in its own right within American conceptual art, one focusing on working with copies and quotations, sampling or paraphrasing existing art works to reflect on concepts such as originality, innovation, and authenticity, and questioning value systems such as the canon of art history. In transcultural contexts, appropriation practices similarly allow for the confrontation of different value systems and the subversive questioning of cultural standards in the global art system.

Physical displacement as part of collecting and display practices represents another set of appropriation processes (or practices) and a research field of transcultural art history. It is essential to understanding the dynamics, desires, and politics of art collecting and ownership, be it private or public, and particularly the formation of "universal" collections that have brought together material objects from different cultures. Since the 1980s, an ever-recurrent debate on "Whose culture?" (Appiah 2009) has questioned the legitimacy of the holdings of major archaeological and anthropological collections, producing both positive and negative narratives of appropriation. The notion of such museums as sites for transcultural exchange and encounter has been proposed in contrast to the metaphor of the "cannibal museum" (Gonseth, Hainard, and Kaehr 2002). These debates imply that ownership is no longer considered a neutral state and issues of physical appropriation have merged with the notion of cultural appropriation.

The notion of appropriation is a key term for transcultural art history and its examination of objects in the contact zone, because it articulates difference. The decontextualization and recontextualization inherent to appropriation practices opens up new meanings whose analysis helps to identify

changes in relational dynamics across social, cultural, and political spheres.

Felicity Bodenstein
Kerstin Schankweiler

REFERENCES

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 2009. "Whose Culture Is It?" In *Whose Culture? The Promise of Museums and the Debate over Antiquities*, edited by James B. Cuno, 71–86. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gonseth, Marc-Olivier, Jacques Hainard, and Ronald Kaehr. 2002. *Le musée cannibal*. Neuchâtel: Musée d'ethnographie.

Hahn, Hans Peter. 2005. *Materielle Kultur: Eine Einführung*. Berlin: Reimer.

Nelson, Robert S. 2003. "Appropriation." In *Critical Terms for Art History*, 2nd ed., edited by Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff, 160–173. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schneider, Arnd. 2003. "On 'Appropriation.' A Critical Reappraisal of the Concept and its Application in Global Art Practices." *Social Anthropology* 11 (2): 215–229.

———. 2006. *Appropriation as Practice: Art and Identity in Argentina*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ziff, Bruce H., and Pratima V. Rao. 1997. *Borrowed Power: Essays on Cultural Appropriation*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Canon

In philology, the history of literature, and theology, the concept of the "canon" goes back to late antiquity. It describes a certain set or body of texts that is regarded as normative or defining. In parallel, art criticism and art history developed a body of artists and works that are considered very influential and the "backbone" or "core" of art. The canon thus creates a self-affirming notion of "greatness" or of certain formal and social norms linked to the question of what is art and who is to be considered an artist. Accordingly, the concept of the canon is intrinsically tied to the empirical database of art history as well as to the value assignments of the discipline. More recently, art history has developed a more critical and dynamic take on the canon, emphasizing that it has never been truly stable and defined, but shaped by transnational, transcultural, or historical dynamics (Locher 2012). This critical approach was already adumbrated in postcolonial positions that drew attention to the exclusive implications of Eurocentric canon formation (Mitter 2013 [1977]). Around the same time, feminist art history began to criticize androcentric categories resulting from the often self-affirmative circular reasoning of canon concepts (see e.g. Nochlin 1988; Troelenberg 2017). This went hand in hand with critical feminist artistic interventions that pointed out racial and gender inequality in the art and museum world (see, for example, https://www.guerrillagirls.com/).

In the visual arts, there is not only this notion of the canon as an empirical body or data set, but also a different, though closely related concept. The term "canonical" can also imply a sense of measure, proportion, and interrelation. In the history of art and architecture, it was used especially during the Renaissance with reference to the work of the ancient Greek sculptor Polykleitos and has ever since been applied with a focus on a mimetic approach to the human body, its relation to both the natural world and the built environment as well as in theories of ideal proportion and imitation. Particularly before the advent of abstraction, this sense of measure has served as one of the benchmarks of "great art" within the empirical canon. Because mimesis and imitation have been a primary concern in Western art traditions, but less so in non-European cultures, this notion of a canon has often been identified as an anti-modern and / or Eurocentric category, not just with regard to the subject but also to the manner of representation. One

reaction to this has been the formation of alternative or complementary canons (e.g. Iskin 2017; see also ‣**Multiple Modernities**). Considered in purely methodological terms, the concept of the canon can thus be a very dynamic one, as it tells us something about the relation of parts to the whole or to one another. Hence it is not surprising that, as an epistemic concept, it entered the fields of musicology, logics, and ethics where it was now no longer understood as a merely technical, but as a conceptual "guideline" that is responsive to historical change. Accordingly, canon critique doesn't necessarily imply the revision or abolishment of historical canons, but rather a potential openness to expansion in empirical, formal, and methodological terms. A critical assessment of canons and canonical thinking can be a very viable function of a discipline now shaped by a post-structuralist, post-modern, and post-colonial history of ideas: Issues such as the relation of parts to the whole, the question of measure, of variety and unity, or variety within unity, are immanent to the concept of the canon. At the same time, they resonate with some of the most vividly debated demarcation lines of cross-cultural art history.

Eva-Maria Troelenberg

REFERENCES

Iskin, Ruth E. 2017. *Re-envisioning the Contemporary Art Canon: Perspectives in a Global World*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Locher, Hubert. 2012. "The Idea of the Canon and Canon Formation in Art History." In *Art History and Visual Studies in Europe*, edited by Matthew Rampley, Thierry Lenain, Hubert Locher, Andrea Pinotti, Charlotte Schoell-Glass, and Kitty Zijlmans, 29–40. Leiden: Brill.

Mitter, Partha. 2013 [1977]. *Much Maligned Monsters: A History of European Reactions to Indian Art*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Nochlin, Linda. 1988. "Why Have There Been No Great Woman Artists?" In Linda Nochlin, *Women, Art, and Power and Other Essays*, 145–178. Boulder: Westview Press.

Troelenberg, Eva-Maria. 2017. "Post-Greatness, oder: Zur Epigenetik der Kunstwissenschaft." In *Faktor X – das Chromosom der Kunst*, edited by Albert Coers and Alex de Vries, 74–80. Berlin: Revolver Publishing.

Circulation

The term "circulation" signifies the movement (cyclical, circular, or otherwise) of objects, images, ideas, materials, and people across cultural, temporal, and spatial borders. Circulatory patterns and the objects that occupy them, therefore, connect seemingly disparate social, political, cultural, and religious spheres as well as vast territories of land. As such, circulation establishes and facilitates cross-cultural contact zones. It is critical to understand the multiple dimensions of materiality involved in such exchange as well as how materials move through time and across space. In this way, the state of transit—how, where, when, and why things circulated and not only that they did—emerges as fundamental when considering objects in the contact zone. Moreover, this element of portability, as Jennifer Roberts suggests, is integral to the historical, social, and spatial context in which these works circulated (2014). Such emphasis on passage and mobility within the framework of the contact zone—particularly for photographic material that is most often printed, pocketed, and reproduced repeatedly—encourages a reading of these objects as legible (or illegible) in various cultural settings and puts them in dialogue with each other allowing for exchange across land, space, and time. Arjun Appadurai's model provides an important and useful "new perspective on the circulation of commodities in social life [...] [that] focuses on the things that are exchanged, rather than simply on the

forms or functions of the exchange" (Appadurai 2016, 3; Gell 1998).

Particularly in the field of Islamic art history, scholars have addressed patterns and pathways of portability as early as the Medieval period. This historic assessment of global networks, particularly through gift and diplomatic exchange across the body of the Mediterranean, sheds light on the transnational movement of objects, ideas, and imagery (Fetvacı 2013; Hoffman 2007; Necipoğlu 2000; Rothman 2014). Later, circulation shifted with the changing nature of mobility in the eighteenth and nineteenth century due to industrialization, the rise in capitalism, and the grand scale of trade and traffic (Bahrani, Çelik and Eldem 2011; Ersoy 2015; Fraser 2017; Hamadeh 2008; Micklewright 2003; Roberts 2015). This is especially true for printed media developed during this modern period. For photography, lithography, the illustrated press, and the postcard, the migratory experience is central to their nature as mechanically produced objects. By looking at the migration of images and ideas both inside and outside of capital centers, we can ask questions about a shared visual language (or languages) and thus form a more broad-based analysis of collective (although not monolithic) experience. This "decentered" approach to circulation presupposes connections and relationships beyond national borders or capital centers, and in turn, builds bridges to other areas of art historical inquiry and theoretical investigation. In the digital era, the notion of circulation (online, in social networks etc.) has become highly topical and moves away from an object and material-centered approach to travel and migration.

Erin Hyde Nolan

REFERENCES

Appadurai, Arjun. 2016. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bahrani, Zainab, Zeynep Çelik, and Edhem Eldem. 2011. *Scramble for the Past: A Story of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire, 1753–1914*. Istanbul: SALT.

Ersoy, Ahmet. 2015. *Architecture and the Late Ottoman Historical Imaginary: Reconfiguring the Architectural Past in a Modernizing* Empire. Burlington: Ashgate.

Fetvacı, Emine. 2013. "From Print to Trace: An Otto- man Imperial Portrait Book and Its Western European Models." *The Art Bulletin* 95 (2): 243–268.

Gell, Alfred. 1998. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fraser, Elisabeth A. 2017. *Mediterranean Encounters: Artists between Europe and the Ottoman Empire, 1774–1839*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Hamadeh, Shirine. 2008. *The City's Pleasures: Istanbul in the Eighteenth Century*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Hoffman, Eva R. 2007. "Pathways of Portability: Islamic and Christian Interchange from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century." In *Late Antique and Medieval Art of the Mediterranean World*, edited by Eva R. Hoffman, 317–349. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Micklewright, Nancy. 2003. *A Victorian Traveler in the Middle East*: *The Photography and Travel Writing of Annie Lady Brassey*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Necipoğlu, Gülru. 2000. "Word and Image: The Serial Portraits of Ottoman Sultans in Comparative Perspective." In *The Sultan's Portrait: Picturing the House of Osman*, edited by Selmin Kangal, 22–61. Istanbul: İşbank.

Roberts, Jennifer L. 2014. *Transporting Visions: The Movement of Images in Early America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Roberts, Mary. 2015. *Istanbul Exchanges: Ottomans, Orientalists, and Nineteenth-Century Visual Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rothman, E. N. 2014. *Brokering Empire: Trans-imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Commodification

Commodification refers to the process by which an (art) object comes to acquire the status of commodity, one that allows it to be exchanged for a price that is negotiated by a variety of actors. It can be considered in opposition to relational processes such as gifting; commodities themselves can be defined by contrast to inalienable objects and gifts, categories in turn defined by the fact that they are outside of circuits of commercial exchange and serve interpersonal relationships or civic purposes. Following the supply and demand of the market, commodification processes typically involve a decontextualization or disembedding of objects as well as their appropriation (‣**Appropriation**) in new contexts, deeply affecting the meanings and the interpretations that determine the values attributed to such (art) objects.

Though rooted in Marxist conceptions of the commodity, the expansion of the noun to define a process is quite recent, and as an operational term in cultural studies and art history, commodification gained considerable attention from the volume of essays, *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (Appadurai 1986), that was largely responsible for establishing the study of commercial object value beyond Marxist issues of production and work value. Art in particular, but also luxury goods have proven extremely important for anthropologists and sociologists in developing a better understanding of the constructed nature of capitalist value-making processes. The economy based on the increase of an art or heritage object's value was recently defined by Boltanski and Esquerre as "enrichment": A collection process that does not produce anything new but rather "enriches" things that already exist, principally by associating them with narratives that tend to affirm their singularity (Boltanski and Esquerre 2017, 11).

Objects that circulate in the international art and antiquities markets lead imminently transcultural lives that can be observed in the practices and strategies that seek to augment their value by responding to the tastes and imaginaries of potential buyers often far-removed from their place of production. These include aesthetic and epistemic revalorizations or, indeed, transformations of their materiality, for example through restorations that change their physical aspect.

The discretion with which commodification processes and related commercial gains are dealt with in art history, archaeology, or anthropology can be seen as generally characteristic of the working of the art market itself (Bourdieu 1977, 4). In the last two decades, however, art market studies have thrived, and a growing body of work has begun to deal with the history of trade in rare and prestigious art objects as an integral part of the global turn (Dacosta Kaufmann, Dossin et al. 2016; De Marchi and Van Miegroet 2006; Phillips and Steiner 1999).

Another aspect of the commodification of art and culture that has received increasing attention is related not so much to the displacement and the trajectories of traded objects as to the movement of persons in the growing tourist industry (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1997; Errington 1998) and how it produces conditions not just for new forms of transcultural exchange but also for cultural essentialism (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009). It has become increasingly clear that issues of cultural representation, exoticization, and authenticity cannot be understood without taking into account the strategic role of such phenomena in commercial strategies (MacCannell 2013).

Felicity Bodenstein

REFERENCES

Appadurai, Arjun. 1986. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boltanski, Luc, and Arnaud Esquerre. 2017. *Enrichissement: Une critique de la marchandise*. Paris: Gallimard.
Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. "La production de la croyance." *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 13 (1): 3–43.
Comaroff, John L., and Jean Comaroff. 2009. *Ethnicity, Inc.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Dacosta Kaufmann, Thomas, Catherine Dossin, and Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel, eds. 2016. *Circulations in the Global History of Art*. London: Routledge.
De Marchi, Neil and Hans J. Van Miegroet. 2006. *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe 1450–1750*. Turnhout: Brepols.
Errington, Shelly. 1998. *The Death of Authentic Primitive Art and Other Tales of Progress*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 1998. *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums and Heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
MacCannell, Dean. 2013. *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Phillips, Ruth B., and Steiner, Christopher B. 1999. *Unpacking Culture: Art and Commodity in Colonial and Postcolonial Worlds*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Constellation

The meaning of the term "constellation" is derived from its use in astronomy: The observation of the stars has resulted in the description of interrelations and patterns that are not necessarily inherent in the cosmos, but rather defined by the viewpoint from earth at a certain position and moment. Since the age of Enlightenment, philosophical debates have underlined the potential irrationality or subjectivity of any interpretation of the stars. This becomes an important aspect for the conceptual use of the term, as it speaks to the "contingency of the empirical" (McFarland 2011, with reference to Adorno, 475–476). In this vein, Kant uses the image of *Sternbilder*, or constellations, when expounding objective vs. subjective epistemics of orientation. Since every act of orientation needs a fixed point (the North Star), the concept of "constellation," on the face of it, implies a strong hierarchical order, a defined and directed viewpoint. Yet, thinking in constellations is also characterized by a dynamic temporal and spatial dimension, as it operates with the notion of change in the sense of a cyclical, repetitive order. Suggested as a term analogous to "collection," "arrangement," or "ensemble" (McFarland 2011, 473), constellation proves to be a fertile metaphor for the study and analysis of material culture and its epistemic rules of perception (see also Krauß, 2011).

Adopted by thinkers such as Benjamin, Adorno, and the ensuing postmodern discourse, the concept of constellation finds its continuation in the twentieth-century history of ideas where it serves to spell out relations between parameters such as social determination, the unconscious, and memory. In this sense, the concept is closely related to Benjamin's notion *Denkbild* ("image of thought") or Warburg's notion of *Bildgedächtnis* ("image memory") (see Schuller, 2011). Applied to the field of visual and art historical studies, it thus can be used to describe artistic manifestations in relation not only to each other, but also to the world and across time, yet without necessarily implying any predestination or teleological determinism.

Accordingly, the temporal and spatial dimension implicit in the historical understanding of the term "constellation" becomes increasingly dynamic and, indeed, "messy" and multidirectional in its modern interpretation. The reference to constellations nowadays tends to suggest an expansion into the field of cultural difference or intercultural dynamics. Okwui Enwezor has described the paradigm of a

"postcolonial constellation" (Enwezor 2003) consisting of dichotomies and relations that transcend the realms of subjectivity and creativity that have shaped definitions of art and its autonomy in Western discourse through to modernity. Based on this paradigm, he examines exhibitions and curators as substrates of an outright "age of constellation" (Enwezor 2003, 58–59). While Enwezor concedes that artists, curators, and institutions and their particular viewpoints always shape the constellation of any exhibition, he also underlines that these viewpoints must be understood and spelled out as intertwined, multiple agencies. The concept of a "postcolonial constellation" therefore provides the potential to restrict the power of overarching hierarchical viewpoints and perspectives. As such, it can supersede the panoptic, directed gaze that has informed visual culture since the nineteenth century (Enwezor 2003, 75; see also Mitchell 1989), while ultimately serving as a central paradigm for an age of cross-cultural communication.

Eva-Maria Troelenberg

REFERENCES

Enwezor, Okwui. 2003. "The Postcolonial Constellation: Contemporary Art in a State of Permanent Transition." *Research in African Literatures* 34 (4): 57–82.

Krauß, Andrea. 2011. "Constellations: A Brief Introduction." *MLN German Issue: Constellations / Konstellationen* 126 (3): 439–445.

McFarland, James. 2011. "Sailing by the Stars: Constellations in the Space of Thought." *MLN German Issue: Constellations / Konstellationen* 126 (3): 471–485.

Mitchell, Timothy. 1989. "The World as Exhibition." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31 (2): 217–236.

Schuller, Marianne. 2011. "Darstellung des Ungedachten. Zum konstellativen Verfahren in Aby Warburgs Mnemosyne-Atlas." *MLN German Issue: Constellations / Konstellationen* 126 (3): 581–589.

Cultural Mobility

This term was initially coined (Sorokin 1959) and continues to be used by scholars in the mainstream social sciences to refer to the role that culture plays in upward or downward social mobility. This model presumes a vertical hierarchy of class positions and that individuals can be located within or move between these social strata according to, among other factors, their capacity to consume cultural goods such as education and outward signs of wealth like expensive clothing or luxury travel. Notably, according to the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1979), the concept of cultural mobility could be considered something of an oxymoron, as he maintained that factors of taste—the aesthetic preferences that produce a cultural sphere—are taught and internalized at a very early age, rendering true social mobility difficult and ensuring the durability of the upper classes through its cultural dominance.

More recently, and perhaps more relevant for the purposes of this volume, the literary historian Stephen Greenblatt (2010) has co-opted the phrase to situate cultural studies squarely within the "mobility turn" that has been gaining purchase across the humanities and social sciences over the last decade. Greenblatt is thus responding directly to the wider emergence of what John Urry (2007), among others, describes as the "mobilities paradigm": An interdisciplinary movement that places emphasis on networks, transportation, flows, and migration. This focus on people, objects, or ideas on the move—a natural development in the postmodern age of globalization—is intended to correct a long-standing tendency within academe to assume insularity or fixity when describing models of social structures.

Despite the title of his edited volume, *Cultural Mobility: A Manifesto*, Greenblatt does not attempt to develop the concept of "cultural mobility" as a robust theoretical term in and of itself,

but rather prefers to prescribe a number of objectives for future scholars of mobility studies with regard to culture. Most significantly, he calls for the identification of new contact zones "where cultural goods are exchanged" and the attendant group of mobilizers—"agents, go-betweens, translators, or intermediaries"—who facilitate these processes of exchange (Greenblatt 2010, 251). Yet Greenblatt advises that scholars must also be prepared to account for the indisputable appeal of the local, sedentary, and autochthonous in these new contact zones. Additionally, within the mobilities paradigm, one should balance the concepts of contingency versus fate, addressing the "intense illusion that mobility in one particular direction or another is predestined" (Greenblatt 2010, 16).

Emily Neumeier

REFERENCES

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1979. *Le distinction: critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.

Greenblatt, Stephen, ed. 2010. *Cultural Mobility: A Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sorokin, Pitirim A. 1959. *Social and Cultural Mobility*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Urry, John. 2007. *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cultural Transfer

Michel Espagne coined the term "cultural transfer" in the 1980s. Within this framework, Espagne offers to rethink the relationship between the center and the periphery, incoming and outgoing parties, and the relationship between influence and power (Espagne and Werner 1988).

The most basic definition would be to conceptualize cultural transfer as the global mobility of words, concepts, images, persons, money, weapons, and other things. Such a pragmatic understanding, indebted to Stephen Greenblatt's notion of "cultural mobility," is offered as a starting point for interdisciplinary debate on transfer processes (Greenblatt 2009, 2). However, cultural transfer does not mean transfer between static and essentialized "cultures" or the transfer of objects and ideas as they already are, but their reinterpretation, rethinking, and re-signification. Thus, Peter Burke significantly extended the term "cultural transfer" with the concept of "transculturation" emphasizing this exchange in transcultural processes (Burke 2000). It is not a one-way influence, but a reciprocal transfer and appropriation, which generates a new "hybrid" culture.

Central to cultural transfer research is that it refrains from using the concepts of "nation" and "state" and, instead, employs the term "cultural zones" to stress that those entities do not exist in a purely homogenous form. Each cultural zone is the result of a merging of different interwoven cultural elements. Cultural transfer is thus closely linked to the "entangled histories" approach (‣ **Entangled Histories**). In studying cultural transfers, it is important to identify enclaves of exchange and their agents (Werner and Zimmermann 2006).

Hence, the most promising use for the concept of cultural transfer is in subverting the positivist notion of national entities and identities. While cultural transfer studies initially were preoccupied with describing interconnections between Central European nations, the concept has since been applied to more dynamic (global, local, continental, areal, etc.) cultural formations. Postcolonial and gender-related approaches help to acknowledge interactions in transcultural dynamics and question the contexts and power constellations in which such interactions took place (Mitterbauer 2011).

In the process of transfer and migration from one cultural situation to another, objects fall into a new context and take on new meaning. Accordingly, the transfer of aesthetic forms, knowledge, and ideas can be

understood as an act of acculturation, appropriation, and cultural exchange, resulting in a new hybrid aesthetic. The notion of "migratory aesthetics" (Bal and Hernandez-Navarro 2011) opens a framework to investigate aesthetic and socio-political dimensions of migratory cultural products and objects that are active in social, political, and institutional spaces and networks.

The focus on these dynamics emphasizes the movements, relations, translations, and entanglements in the production of art and artefacts as well as in the formation of art histories. The concept of cultural transfer offers a process-oriented approach and a cultural framework for the discipline to apprehend this process and integrate it into the analysis of objects and concepts.

Sonja Hull
Pia Wiesner

REFERENCES

Bal, Mieke, and Miguel Á Hernandez-Navarro, eds. 2011. *Art and Visibility in Migratory Culture: Conflict, Resistance, and Agency*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Burke, Peter. 2009. *Cultural Hybridity*. Cambridge: Polity Press (first published 2000 as *Kultureller Austausch*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp).

Espagne, Michel, and Michael Werner. 1988. *Transferts. Les relations interculturelles dans l'espace franco-allemand.* Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.

Greenblatt, Stephen. 2009. *Cultural Mobility: A Manifesto.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mitterbauer, Helga. 2011. "Postkoloniale Konzepte in der Erforschung kultureller Transferprozesse." In *Überbringen – Überformen – Überblenden. Theorietransfer im 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Dietlind Hüchtker and Alfrun Kliems, 75–92. Cologne: Böhlau.

Werner, Michael, and Bénédicte Zimmermann. 2006. "Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity." *History and Theory* 45 (1): 30–50.

Decolonizing

The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines decolonization as the "withdrawal from its former colonies of a colonial power; the acquisition of political or economic independence by such colonies." The key words in that definition are "withdrawal" and "acquisition," terms that connote sober financial transactions carried out by mutual agreement. While the term came into being to describe a historical process in the twentieth century (Jansen and Osterhammel 2017) that, contrary to clean text book and dictionary formulations, was a messy, often violent process "[pitting] imperial rulers against colonial subjects" and often "anticolonial nationalists against one another" (Kennedy 2016, 2), "decolonizing" as a verb has since been used as an active process in academic scholarship. Attempts to decolonize a field include the critique and deconstruction of the dominance of colonial and imperial epistemological structures within a field, for instance, art history. Making the important distinction between the decolonial and postcolonial, Walter Mignolo constructs decoloniality as an analytic, endowing it also with programmatic power by moving "away and beyond the post-colonial," because "post-colonialism criticism and theory is a project of scholarly transformation within the academy" (Mignolo 2007, 452). Thus, theorist of art and archaeology, Yannis Hamilakis argues that "the decolonization of Greek archaeology is its divorce from both the colonial ideology and practice and the national imagination." How does the process of decolonization work in this case? It "requires," Hamilakis writes, "the emergence of a range of counter-modernist archaeologies, a process that paradoxically necessitates a reconnection with some of the elements of these pre-national archaeologies" (Hamilakis 2008, 2). While Hamilakis attempts to produce a new methodological framework for archaeology, Hannah Feldman's recent study on art and representation in twentieth-century France provides another

useful way to understand decolonizing as a process. Reframing the decades that have until recently been characterized as "post-war," that is, a continuing state of conflict, by highlighting "the significance of subaltern political agendas on establishing modern French visual and spatial cultures" (Feldman 2014), her project illustrates the relationship between temporal categories constructed within art history and what it means to mobilize "decolonizing" as a verb in the construction of art historical narrative.

Sria Chatterjee

REFERENCES

Feldman, Hannah. 2014. *From a Nation Torn: Decolonizing Art and Representation in France, 1945–1962*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hamilakis, Yannis. 2008. "Decolonizing Greek Archaeology: Indigenous Archaeologies, Modernist Archaeology and the Post-colonial Critique." In *A Singular Antiquity: Archaeology and Hellenic Identity in Twentieth-Century Greece*, edited by Dimitris Damaskos and Dimitris Plantzos, 273–284. Athens: Benaki Museum.

Jansen, Jan C., and Jürgen Osterhammel. 2017. *Decolonization: A Short History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kennedy, Dane Keith. 2016. *Decolonization: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mignolo, Walter D. 2007. "Delinking: The Rhetoric of Modernity, the Logic of Coloniality and the Grammar of De-coloniality." *Cultural Studies* 21: 449–514. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162647.

Detail

The detail is a category whose status has varied throughout history. Lexical definitions highlight both its subordinate nature as a minute part of a greater whole and its dynamic character (e.g. expressions such as "going into detail"; OED 1., 4.a.). This use shows an inherent polarity of significance and insignificance. Indeed, in classicism the detail stood in stark contrast to the "Ideal" as being void of any "particularities," carrying a somewhat negative connotation (Schor 2007, xlii). Further testifying to the notion's inherent tension, the detail can be traced discursively in the history of photography, where the concept lies at the core of the dispute around the medium's status as an art or science (see e.g. Daston and Galison, 2006, 125–137; Denton 2002).

Since the nineteenth century, it has gained increasing independence with regards to its relation to a whole (Olbrich et al. 1989, "Detail"). It has become a point of departure for free associations and interpretation, thereby acquiring the ability to point beyond itself towards the abstract and a larger context. One genre in which this becomes evident is the essay (Sandywell 2011, 272). In visual discourse, Alois Riegl's book *Stilfragen* (1893) employs the same strategy of putting details in larger contexts, arguing that one object can be representative for the *Kunstwollen* or "will to art" of an entire culture (Troelenberg 2011, 227). Thus, a downside, especially within visual discourse, is that the detail is reduced to the status of example, and this seems to ring particularly true within a cross-cultural paradigm. After Edward Said (1978, 712) coined the subcategory of the "Oriental detail" to highlight the exhaustive attention awarded to it as part of an "Oriental essence" in Orientalist scholarship, Linda Nochlin subsequently famously introduced this notion into art history in her essay "The Imaginary Orient," where she critiques the obsession of Orientalist painting with adding such "authenticating details" (Nochlin 1983, 122). The "Oriental detail" emerges here as a critical term that, though springing from the imagination, still lays claim to veracity. This tension is a general quality of the detail, as it points to the relation between the individual and the directed gaze, ultimately revealing the efficacy of what might be called a "generalizing detail."

A more affirmative take is offered by Naomi Schor in her book *Reading in Detail* (Schor 2007 [1987]), where she historically traces the emergence of the detail since classicism and methodologically inscribes it with the feminine as a contraposition to the phallocentric ideal, in order to assert the detail's importance and—once again—growing independence in post-modernist culture; a view shared by Mieke Bal (2006, 13–17) who posits that feminist discourse applied to a detail is capable of circumventing the generalizing mechanism.

Nochlin and Schor's more or less contemporary characterizations stand in tension to each other and exemplify the detail's historical, geographical, and inherent ambiguities and ambivalences. Its status as part of a whole and connection to ideologies is what ultimately renders the detail a problematic category. Even when construed as independent, it is always sustained by other agencies. At the same time, it is this very quality that lends the detail a potentially constructive and powerful discursivity.

Isabella Krayer

REFERENCES

Bal, Mieke. 2006. *Kulturanalyse.* Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Daston, Lorraine and Peter Galison. 2007. *Objectivity.* New York: Zone Books.

Denton, Margaret. 2002. "Francis Wey and the Discourse of Photography as Art in France in the Early 1850s: 'Rien n'est beau que le vrai; mais il faut le choisir.'" *Art History* 25 (5): 622–648.

"Detail." In *Oxford English Dictionary (OED).* Accessed September 13, 2017. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/51168?rskey=wKElnW&result=1#eid.

Nochlin, Linda. 1983. "The Imaginary Orient." *Art in America* 71 (5): 119–131, 187–191.

Olbrich, Harald. 1989. "Detail." In *Lexikon der Kunst: Architektur, bildende Kunst, angewandte Kunst, Industrieformgestaltung, Kunsttheorie*. Leipzig: VEB E.A. Seemann Verlag.

Schor, Naomi. 2007 [1987]. *Reading in Detail: Aesthetics and the Feminine*. London: 1987. Reprint, London: Routledge (quotes here are from the Routledge edition).

Said, Edward. 1987. *Orientalism.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Sandywell, Barry. 2011. *Dictionary of Visual Discourse: A Dialectical Lexicon of Terms.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Troelenberg, Eva-Maria. 2011. *Eine Ausstellung wird besichtigt. Die Münchner "Ausstellung von Meisterwerken muhammedanischer Kunst" 1910 in kultur- und wissenschaftsgeschichtlicher Perspektive.* Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang.

East / West

The terms "East" and "West" have historically been used to differentiate between the geographic expanse of Europe (writ large) and the Near, Middle, and Far East. This ambiguous and spatially amorphous terminology remains rooted in nineteenth-century Orientalist rhetoric, colonial ideology, and European expansionism (Shalem 2012). With his seminal book, *Orientalism* (1978), Edward Said introduced a critical assessment of East / West relations, proposing an unequal power dynamic between the European and non-European lands (‣**Orientalism**) (Burke and Prochaska, 2008). In the years since, many publications have worked to complicate and problematize the binary structure of Said's approach to Orientalism, including the notion of provincializing Europe and, more recently, the concept of shared cosmopolitan exchange across geographical space regardless of regional boundaries (Bozdoğan and Necipoğlu, 2007; Chakrabarty 2000; Hackforth-Jones and Roberts 2005; Fraser 2017; Makdisi, 2002). Postcolonial and transcultural studies have established a polycentric map that charts multidirectional flows of cultural exchange (‣**Circulation**). This transcends deep-rooted, polarizing

language and works to revise issues of terminology. It emphasizes the movement of images and ideologies across time and space, rather than just from place to place, thus transcending both national borders and the assignment of artists into national schools (‣**Nation**).

By questioning fixed labels and utilizing geographically specific terminology, we can reorient the conversation away from the myth of a world that is divided longitudinally into supracontinental blocks of "East" and "West" (Lewis and Wigen 1997). One solution—as is debated by scholars in the field of Middle Eastern studies—is perhaps to name the city we are talking about—Isfahan, for example, instead of East, or Paris rather than West. Thus, when we shift the way we speak and write, we expand not only the semantics of art history but also the epistemological binaries that limit reciprocal exchange, while at the same time enhancing how knowledge is formed through cross-cultural contact by moving beyond the spatial and cultural constructs of the Orient and Occident, East and West. This shift allows for the discussion of objects to be more than simply "Eastern" or "Western," revealing their material journeys and migratory histories to be multi-dimensional, multi-cultural, cosmopolitan, and politically complex narratives, and thus untethering these loaded terms from their Eurocentric and Orientalist heritage.

Erin Hyde Nolan

REFERENCES

Bozdogan, Sibel and Gülru Necipoğlu. "Entangled Discourses: Scrutinizing Orientalist and Nationalist Legacies in the Architectural Historiography of the 'Lands of Rum.'" *Muqarnas* vol. 24 (2007).

Burke, Edmund, and David Prochaska. 2008. *Genealogies of Orientalism: History, Theory, Politics*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2012. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fraser, Elisabeth A. 2017. *Mediterranean Encounters: Artists between Europe and the Ottoman Empire, 1774–1839*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Hackforth-Jones, Jocelyn, and Mary Roberts. 2005. *Edges of Empire: Orientalism and Visual Culture*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Lewis, Martha W, and Kären Wigen. *The Myth of Continents: A Critique of Metageography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Makdisi, Ussama. 2002. "Ottoman Orientalism." *American Historical Review* 107: 768–796.

Said, Edward W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Shalem, Avinoam. "What Do We Mean When We Say 'Islamic art'? A Plea for a Critical Rewriting of the History of the Arts of Islam." *Journal of Historiography* 6 (2012): 1–18.

Empathy

The uses and definitions of "empathy" are often vague and variegated, which is evidenced by the craze over the term in both popular and academic realms in recent decades. Today's most common understanding of empathy links closely with its etymological cousin and English precedent "sympathy," which was put forth by David Hume and Adam Smith in the eighteenth century as a kind of fellow feeling, enabling comprehension of another person's thoughts and thereby a more ethical response to them. "Empathy" itself was first translated into English from the German *Einfühlung* in 1909 (Curtis 2009, 11, n. 2), a term that involves a more all-encompassing, corporeal response. This is due in part to *Einfühlung's* substantial role in nineteenth century aesthetic discourse. Whether relating to the perception of objects, images, and spaces or to the understanding of other people, "empathy" surfaces as a recurring experiential and epistemological

instrument within art historical and transcultural studies.

Einfühlung's roots reach back to the late eighteenth century. For Herder, the verb denoted a possibility to understand, "feel-into," bygone cultures, while early German Romantics like Novalis came to regard it as a kind of spiritual merging with the natural world (Currie 2011, 83). Nineteenth-century philosophers, psychologists, and physiologists then analyzed the act of perceiving objects and spaces, its bodily involvement and, later, its subjective emotionality, in light of *Einfühlung* (Mallgrave and Ikonomou 1994). As the nascent art historical field was substantiating itself as a more "scientific," academic discipline, a generation of art historians were drawn to *Einfühlung* studies, including those that employed laboratory results to explain the experience of art. Similarly, the legacy of late nineteenth-century aesthetics inspired phenomenological and hermeneutic usages of empathy, thereby shifting its meaning towards "interpersonal understanding." The most prominent example of an art historian reacting to notions of empathy is Wilhelm Worringer's *Abstraktion und Einfühlung* (1907).

The discovery of mirror neurons in the 1990s catalyzed a resurgence of studies that incorporated empathy into their analytical vocabulary. The scientific findings suggested that humans and non-human animals were soft-wired to experience the mental state of others, and thus our species was, above all, pro-social. Moreover, empathy came to be seen as a concept capable of bridging the sciences and humanities, inspiring many forays into aesthetic experience both by art historians and neuroscientists (e.g. Onians 2008). This ultimately cast empathy as a central figure within debates over interdisciplinarity in general and affect studies in particular.

While empathy and mirror-neuron discourse in relation to images received critique for its positivist epistemology, an "anti-" or "against"-empathy camp has also recently resisted the popularly promoted aspects of empathy as a kind of moral guide and cure-all for human conflict. Within transcultural studies, Carolyn Pedwell then evaluated empathy from various angles, including as a reductive "affective technology for 'knowing the other'," which can work to benefit the interests of globalized corporations and neoliberal agendas (Pedwell 2014, 8). Empathy thus emerges as an ambivalent yet critical term in analyzing the contact both between individuals and the objects they encounter.

Westrey Page

REFERENCES

Currie, Gregory. 2011. "Empathy for Objects." In *Empathy: Philosophical and Psychological Perspectives*, edited by Amy Coplan and Peter Goldie, 82–95. New York: Oxford University Press.

Curtis, Robin, and Gertrud Koch, eds. 2009. *Einfühlung: Zur Geschichte und Gegenwart eines ästhetischen Konzepts.* Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink.

Mallgrave, Harry Francis, and Eleftherios Ikonomou, eds. 1994. *Empathy, Form and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics, 1873–1893*. Santa Monica: Getty Research Institute.

Onians, John. 2008. *Neuroarthistory: From Aristotle and Pliny to Baxandall and Zeki*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pedwell, Carolyn. 2014. *Affective Relations: The Transnational Politics of Empathy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Worringer, Wilhelm. 1907. "Abstraktion und Einfühlung: ein Beitrag zur Stilpsychologie." PhD diss., Universität Bern.

Entangled Histories

When Frantz Fanon stated that "Europe is literally the creation of the Third World" (1963, 102) and when Walter Mignolo titled his book about the colonization of the so-called New World *The*

Darker Side of the Renaissance (1995), both pointed to the fact that the history of Europe or the West can only be understood as a relational one. To accommodate this from a methodological point of view, several suggestions have been made from the late 1990s on. Historian Sanjay Subrahmanyam began to write "connected histories" about the cultural, economic, and political interrelations between Eurasian empires of the early modern age (1997). Shortly afterwards, social anthropologist Shalini Randeria argued the case for what she calls "entangled history" or "entangled histories" (1999 and 2002, respectively), shifting her attention to the modern era and a global field. In collaboration with historian Sebastian Conrad, Randeria broadened and refined her concept (Conrad and Randeria 2002). Together with cultural anthropologist Regina Römhild, she adapted it to contemporary conditions (Randeria and Römhild 2013). Around the same time as Conrad and Randeria, historian Michael Werner and sociologist Bénédicte Zimmermann presented their idea of an *Histoire croisée*, which raises similar questions based on a critique of notions like *internationaler Vergleich* (international comparison) and *Transfergeschichte* (history of transfer) (Werner and Zimmermann 2002).

In her 1999 essay, Randeria lists four reasons for adopting her concept of entangled history. First, presuming multiple modernities enables us to discuss different notions of modernism in Europe and outside; it allows us to compare different non-Western cultures or societies and focus on bilateral as well as multilateral configurations (‣**Multiple Modernities**). Second, considering more than one modernity and accepting colonialism as a vital part of the—material and ideological—construction of Europe generates the need for historical re-considerations. Third, a pluralistic attempt offers the opportunity to account for the heterogeneity within non-Western societies and shed light on the presence of Europe in non-Western cultural contexts. Fourth, more attention must be paid to questions like: Who is talking? What language is being used? What categories are being applied? After all, defining and employing the instruments of discourse is an essential factor of cultural hegemony (Randeria 1999, 93–94). In their introduction to the anthology *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus* (Beyond Eurocentrism), Conrad and Randeria add other aspects such as the importance of discussing the—often quasi-colonial—interactions within Europe. They stress that entangled histories do not just concentrate on commonalities or reveal processes of sharing, but also investigate the marking of distinctions and notions or acts of separation. This means that "interaction" should not be misunderstood as implying benevolence or equality, because most of those interactions (even within Europe) have been structured in asymmetrical, hierarchic, or violent ways. More generally, the focus of the authors is less on the history *of* entanglement and more on history *as* entanglement, as the interacting entities are a product of their interdependencies (Conrad and Randeria 2002).

Matthias Weiß

REFERENCES

Conrad, Sebastian, and Shalini Randeria. 2002. "Einleitung: Geteilte Geschichten – Europa in einer postkolonialen Welt." In *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus: Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften*, edited by Sebastian Conrad and Shalini Randeria, 9–49. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus.

Fanon, Frantz. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.

Mignolo, Walter D. 1995. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality, and Colonization*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Randeria, Shalini. 1999. "Geteilte Geschichte und verwobene Moderne." In *Zukunftsentwürfe: Ideen für eine Kultur der Veränderung*, edited by Jörn Rüsen, Hanna Leitgeb, and Norbert Jegelka, 87–96. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus.

———. 2002. "Entangled Histories and Uneven Modernities: Civil Society, Caste Solidarities and Legal Pluralism in Post-Colonial India." In *Unraveling Ties: From Social Cohesion to New Practices of Connectedness*, edited by Yehuda Elkana, Ivan Krasstev, Elisio Macamoa, and Shalini Randeria, 284–311. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus.

Randeria, Shalini, and Regina Römhild. 2013. "Das postkoloniale Europa: Verflochtene Genealogien der Gegenwart – Einleitung zur erweiterten Neuauflage (2013)." In *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus: Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften*, edited by Sebastian Conrad, Shalini Randeria, and Regina Römhild, 9–31. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus.

Subrahmanyam, Sanjay. 1997. "Connected Histories: Notes towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia." *Modern Asian Studies*, 31 (3): 735–762.

Werner, Michael, and Bénédicte Zimmermann. 2002. "Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung: Der Ansatz der *Histoire croisée* und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 28: 607–636.

Europerie

Considering similar terms like "européennerie" (Thomas 2009, 115), "europeanoiserie" (Kleutghen 2012, 83), and "euroiserie" (Hay 2015, x), "europerie" seems to be not only the easiest to pronounce, it is also by far the oldest one. It was coined in 1937 by Bruno Kisch who primarily used it to describe Chinese export porcelain that was decorated according to European tastes, as well as Europeanizing objects that were produced for the home market and favored by domestic customers for their exotic appeal (‣**Exoticism**) (Kisch 1937, 274–276).

Ignoring this latter aspect, Erich Köllmann (1954, 446) did not regard Kisch's neologism as a suitable counter term to the much more common "chinoiserie"—an expression that recently has been challenged from a post-colonial perspective (Weststeijn 2016, 13). Still, there are a number of reasons to stick to the noun "chinoiserie" and its derivations. First, the word, which is French in origin, has to be respected as a historical one that came into use at the peak of the phenomenon itself, in the mid-eighteenth century (Köllmann 1954, 439). Second, it emerged around 1750, a time when Europe and China still met at eye level. Third, although the terminology was not consistent during the second half of the eighteenth century, the French did make a distinction between artefacts imported "from China," for which they used the phrase *de la Chine*, and European works in "Chinese fashion," which they described as *façon de la Chine*, *à la chinoise*, or *lachinage* (Köllmann 1954, 439–440). The same holds true for the organization of the Kupferstich-Kabinett (print room) of the Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, where more than two thousand woodprints from China and other Asian countries were kept separate from the chinoiseries and labelled as "*La Chine*" and "*La Chine Europeenne*," respectively (Bischoff 2017, 23). The naming as well as the collecting or storing practices indicate that there was—at least in some environments—an awareness of the fact that chinoiseries were the result of a mediated gaze or of appropriation (‣**Appropriation**). In other words, just as the chinoiserie tells us something not about China, but about the way Europe *saw* China at a specific moment in their long-running entangled histories, the europerie tells us something about China's awareness and imaginations of Europe at a certain time (‣**Entangled Histories**).

As Kisch explained and later authors like Hay, Kleutghen, Thomas and others have further elaborated (using the variety of terms mentioned above), europeries and chinoiseries function complementarily—which means that,

in both cases, analysis has to take into account aesthetic and economic aspects as well as technical, social, and political issues. Expanding our view, the term "europerie" may also have potential to serve as a counter term to "turquerie" and "japonaiserie". And it is up to future research to, perhaps, apply and adapt it to the exchanges between Europe and other regions or cultural contexts like Persia, the West African kingdoms (including Dahomey and the Benin Empire), or the Aztec culture in the early modern age and beyond.

Matthias Weiß

REFERENCES

Bischoff, Cordula. 2017. "'... allerhand Sinesische Vorstellungen'. Zur Rezeption von Asiatika in der Grafiksammlung Augusts des Starken." In *Wechselblicke: Zwischen China und Europa 1669–1907 / Exchanging Gazes. Between China and Europe 1669–1907*, edited by Matthias Weiß, Eva-Maria Troelenberg, and Joachim Brand, 22–41. Petersberg: Michael Imhof.

Hay, Jonathan. 2015. "Introduction." In *Qing Encounters: Artistic Exchanges Between China and the West*, edited by Petra ten-Doesschate Chu and Ning Ding, vii–xix. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute.

Kisch, Bruno. 1937. "Europerien auf China-Porzellan." *Artibus Asiae*, VI (3 / 4): 272–282.

Kleutghen, Kristina. 2012. "Staging Europe: Theatricality and Painting at the Chinese Imperial Court." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 42: 81–102.

Köllmann, Erich. 1954. "Chinoiserie." In *Reallexikon zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, vol. III, edited by Ernst Gall, and Ludwig H. Heydenreich, 439–481. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller.

Thomas, Greg M. 2009. "Yuanming Yuan / Versailles: Intercultural Interactions between Chinese and European Palace Cultures." *Art History*, 32 (1): 115–143.

Weststeijn, Thijs. 2016. "Introduction: Global Art History and the Netherlands." In *Netherlandish Art in Its Global Context*, edited by Thijs Weststeijn, Eric Jorink, and Frits Scholten, 7–26, Leiden: Brill.

Exoticism

Exoticism can be understood as one of a constellation of discourses by which Europeans have engaged with and represented racial and cultural differences. Related artistic movements include primitivism (‣**Primitivism**) and the more specific and geographically bound movement, Orientalism (‣**Orientalism**). The term "exotic" was first used in Europe in the fifteenth century to denote things—imported foreign flora and fauna, not people (Célestin 1996, 217). The term "exoticism" was coined in the early nineteenth century to describe both European experiences with foreign people and the translations and representations of those encounters back home.

Art historian Carol Sweeney argues that the primitive and the exotic are the two primary generic categories into which the vast majority of encounters, colonial or otherwise, between Europeans and those they deemed "others" can be divided (‣**Othering**). Temporally, the exotic and the primitive both reflexively stand in for the past in relationship to a European present that is seen as developing and changing while the time of the "other" stands still (Fabian 1983, 1). Sweeney, however, makes the distinction that the "primitive" was more often associated with ideas of a pre-rational savage, while discourses of the "exotic" were more concerned with "difference as emblematic of a paradisal 'elsewhere', a geographical otherness characterized by plentitude and harmony" (2004, 8–13). Broadly speaking, these different categories of the "other" have also often been split along geographic

lines. As Hal Foster writes, it is typically a case of "malefic Africa versus paradisal Oceana" (1985, 53). The Middle and Far East, Polynesia, and Islamic North Africa have been most often categorized as exotic, whereas sub-Saharan Africa and its diasporas in the Caribbean and the Americas have been treated as primitive. Peter Mason, alternatively, describes exoticism as diverging from Orientalism insofar as it depends on the decontextualization and recontextualization of its object and is therefore "indifferent to ethnographic or geographic precision and tends to serve imaginative rather than concretely political ends" (1998, 3). While it is questionable whether Orientalism is always concerned with an accurate representation of its subject and whether exoticism can be disassociated from the politics of colonialism, this differentiation points to how exoticism is most strongly associated with a nineteenth century European engagement with the "other" in terms of romantic fantasies and as a source for formal and thematic motifs.

Within art history, exoticism has been most often used to describe movements within the decorative arts. The term denotes both radical cultural or racial difference and the process by which this otherness is experienced by a traveler and translated, collected, displayed, represented, or otherwise domesticated for consumption back home. Exoticism developed hand in hand with the rise of international exhibitions in the West in the nineteenth century. During this period, "exotic" objects were also held up as a model of art uncorrupted by industrial capitalism (Oshinsky 2004).

In the 1950s, as postcolonial thinkers and political activists diagnosed European representations of otherness as a tool of colonial power, exoticism became a key point of their critique (Forsdick 2001, 28). In the essay "Racism and Culture," Frantz Fanon argues that exoticism was used as a means to simplify, objectify, and neutralize colonized cultures. He criticizes the denial of coevality between European countries and their "others" as an explicit strategy in support of colonial power (Fanon 1967). These interventions have deeply shaped postcolonial critiques of exoticism. More recently, exoticism has been positioned in opposition to other models for cultural encounter such as hybridity (‣**Hybridity**) and related processes like creolization and diaspora, which are premised on the production of new transcultural forms rather than exoticist encounters that depend on notions of essentialized cultural difference (Bhabha 1994, 56).

Alison Boyd

REFERENCE

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Célestin, Roger. 1996. *From Cannibals to Radicals: Figures and Limits of Exoticism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Forsdick, Charles. 2001. "Travelling Concepts: Postcolonial Approaches to Exoticism." *Paragraph*, *Francophone Texts and Postcolonial Theory* 24 (3): 12–29.

Fanon, Frantz. 1967. *Toward the African Revolution: Political Essays*. Translated by Haakon Chevalier. New York: Grove Press.

Foster, Hal. 1985. "The 'Primitive' Unconscious of Modern Art." *October* (34): 45–70.

Mason, Peter. 1998. *Infelicities: Representations of the Exotic*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Oshinsky, Sara J. 2004. "Exoticism in the Decorative Arts." *Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000–. http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/exot/hd_exot.htm.

Sweeney, Carole. 2004. *From Fetish to Subject: Race, Modernism, and Primitivism, 1919–193*5. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Expanded Contact Zone

Mary Louise Pratt defines "contact zones" as "social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out in many parts of the world today" (Pratt 1991, 34). She writes that the term "contact zone" is "an attempt to invoke the spatial and temporal co-presence of subjects previously separated by geographic and historic disjunctures, and whose trajectories now intersect" (Pratt 1991, 8). If for Pratt, a "contact" perspective is about the ways in which "subjects are constituted in and by their relations with each other" (Pratt 1991, 8; see also Pratt 2008), it is useful to think of recent work that has broadened the scope of academic scholarship to take both human and non-human subjects seriously. The expanded contact zone takes Pratt's formulation further to consider how the co-presence of humans with other biological creatures as well as hybrid, digital, and technological life forms plays out in a contact context. Donna Haraway, for instance, has, throughout her career, highlighted the role non-humans play in shaping technoscience and reshaping our notions of subjectivity, gender, kinship, and species-being. She claims that these non-humans are not passive recipients of human agency but socially active partners (Haraway 1997). The relationship between human beings and technologies is not one of exploitation but of mutual adaptation (Haraway 2007). The intersection of the trajectories of forms of human and non-human life has engaged a wide range of contemporary scholarship in anthropology, the environmental humanities, and increasingly in art history studies.

The expanded contact zone also allows for a deeper and wider scope with which to understand asymmetrical power relations at crucial meeting points between encounters of biological and techno-capital processes and subjects. Anna Tsing's work on the matsutake mushroom, for example, provides an incisive account of the relation between capitalist destruction and collaborative survival within multi-species landscapes (Tsing 2015). In the realm of art and museum studies, the art exhibit "The Multispecies Salon," that traveled from San Francisco to New Orleans to New York City, attempted to ask, through artworks and anthropological modes of inquiry, what happens when natural and cultural worlds intermingle and collide (Kirksey 2014). New modes of inquiry into such encounters have given the contact zone new life, while at the same time providing a longer historical scholarly trajectory in which to examine these evolving relationships.

Sria Chatterjee

REFERENCES

Haraway, Donna Jeanne. 1997. *Modest–Witness@Second–Millennium. FemaleMan–Meets–OncoMouse: Feminism and Technoscience*. London: Psychology Press.

———. 2007. *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kirksey, Eben. 2014. *The Multispecies Salon*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 1991. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession*: 33–40.

———. 2008. Imperial Eyes. *Travel Writing and Transculturation.* London: Routledge.

Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. 2015. *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fragment

Traditionally, the fragment is the remnant of a decomposed whole, the result of fragmentation and closely intertwined with time. As such, it has

a history and symbolizes ephemerality (Tronzo 2009). Ruins, in this sense, are fragments *par excellence* and many texts indeed use the two terms interchangeably (e.g. Schnapp 2014; Böhme 1989). Paradigmatically, the fragment points to death, lost cultures, and memory, to a violent "tearing apart" and destruction (Glauch 2013, 53). It is what is presently left: archaeological, material, and thus collectable. Since the second half of the eighteenth century, philology has become increasingly interested in the fragments of ancient societies as a way to understand them (Most 2009, 15). In a more abstract sense, the term "fragment" can also denote a text. The German Romanticist Friedrich Schlegel, for example, famously introduced the textual—that is, "created" (Tronzo 2009)—fragment as a literary form complete in and of itself (Most 2009, 15–16), thus in a way foreboding the (post-)modernist focus on the fragmentary, particularly with regard to aesthetics, notable examples being Walter Benjamin's *Arcades Project* and, in the visual arts, Analytic Cubism. Benjamin (1988 [1933]) also discussed how the fragment became entrenched into the discipline's methodological foundations, for instance through the writings of Alois Riegl. The fragment contains and entails cultural and historical meaning that can be scaled up to "broader contexts" (Lang 2006, 151). Materiality and meaning, through time then, become inextricably intertwined. Hence, the fragment emerged as a trope or metaphor of (Post-)Modernity in various fields in the humanities (for art history see, for example, Nochlin 1994).

The notion of the fragment thus rests on two pillars: a bygone past and abstract thought, with the aspiration to both completion and division. The problematic nature of the fragment as a means to extrapolate history lies in its claim to represent a totality. Especially with regard to the notion of eurocentrism, this understanding has been strongly disputed. In this respect, the fragment is often spoken of in terms of discontinuity, for example with reference to the *de facto* "discontinuous history of imperial meaning-making" (Pratt 2008, 7). The created fragment, in turn, acknowledges its discontinuity and embraces it on the grounds that the perception of a whole is impossible (Balfour 2009). As a category, then, the fragment encourages a reevaluation of modes of perception in the sense that all fragments, even remnants, are created.

Isabella Krayer

REFERENCES

Balfour, Jan. 2009. "'The Whole is Untrue': On the Necessity of the Fragment (after Adorno)." In *The Fragment: An Incomplete History*, edited by William Tronzo, 82–91. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute.

Benjamin, Walter. 1988 [1933]. "Rigorous Study of Art." In *October* 47 (1988), 84–90.

Böhme, Hartmut. 1989. "Die Ästhetik der Ruinen." In *Der Schein des Schönen*, edited Dietmar Kamper and Christoph Wulf, 287–304. Göttingen: Steidl.

Glauch, Sonja. 2013. "Wie 'macht' man Fragmente? Schrift und Stimme als Träger des Fragmentarischen." In *Fragmentarität als Problem der Kultur- und Textwissenschaften*, edited Kay Malcher, Stephan Müller, Katharina Philipowski, and Antje Sablotny, 51–68. Munich: Wilhelm Fink.

Lang, Karen. 2006. *Chaos and Cosmos. On the Image in Aesthetics and Art History.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Most, Glenn W. 2009. "On Fragments." In *The Fragment: An Incomplete History*, edited by William Tronzo, 8–20. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute.

Nochlin, Linda. 1994. *The Body in Pieces: The Fragment as a Metaphor of Modernity*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 2008. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation.* London: Routledge.

Schnapp, Alain. 2014. *Was ist eine Ruine? Entwurf einer vergleichenden Perspektive*. Göttingen: Wallstein.
Tronzo, William. 2009. "Introduction." In *The Fragment: An Incomplete History*, edited by William Tronzo, 1–7. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute.

Gender

Transcultural studies have served as a productive interlocutor for gender studies in efforts to examine the contingency of the terms by which gender, race, ethnicity, and class are studied and debated as closely interwoven and relational categories. Still, many theorists of postcolonialism have for a long time ignored the gendered dynamics of imperialism (McClintock 1995). The lingering effect of Orientalism's Western male gaze in producing stereotypes of eastern women is well documented (e.g. Ahmed 1982), but at the same time Said's model of Orientalism has also been criticized for its binary notion of power structures which hardly allows for the kind of multilayered or differentiated viewpoints that describe aspects of gender and difference (‣**Orientalism**). McClintock argues that "Sexuality as a trope for other power relations was certainly an abiding aspect of imperial power" (1995, 14), as colonial women experienced the power structures of imperialism very differently than colonial men.

Scholars such as Lowe (1994), moreover, have shifted the discussion to a focus on Orientalism's heterogeneity and the many voices and varying power structures it involves. These transcultural perspectives on women and Orientalism have drawn attention to the active role of women both in determining the image of the other and in renegotiating gender roles in the empire through the encounter with the colonized other.

Reina Lewis has emphasized the importance of theorizing and studying the history of the terms "race," "ethnicity," and "gender." A critique that takes the contingency of these terms into account would, she argues, avoid models of binary opposition in feminist discourse, for instance of bad imperialism and good feminism (Lewis 1996). In *Gendering Orientalism*, Lewis offers the critique that most cultural historiographies of imperialism analyze Oriental depictions *of* women, while completely ignoring the perspectives of women themselves. Her work shows that women indeed took part in Orientalist cultural production and that the dynamics of the imperial discourse influenced their work. Since women did not have direct access to male positions of Western superiority, their work resulted in representations of cultural difference that are distinct from those usually focused on in Orientalist scholarship. While Lewis' work focuses on the role of women and the category of gender in the context of Orientalism, her argument can readily be extended to other situations of cross-cultural contact. Analyzing the production and reception of representation by women is particularly crucial as it develops an additional layer of ideological interrelation of both race and gender in the colonial discourse (Lewis 1996).

In a related argument, art historian Viktoria Schmidt-Linsenhoff emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between the variety of gendered perspectives in colonial discourses and visual representations, as this further reveals a wide range of viewpoints. She points to the importance of avoiding binary oppositions of a female vs. male gaze and, instead suggests analyzing the visual production of women as individual aesthetic decisions made at certain points in history (Schmidt-Linsenhoff 2010).

The projects of McClintock, Lowe's, Lewis, and Schmidt-Linsenhoff are indebted to and exemplify an intersectional approach that shifts the focus to the intertwined processes by which notions of gender, race, ethnicity, and class are produced and instrumentalized in intercultural encounters. These interdisciplinary discussions also shed light on feminism's origins in a Western,

liberal context and on questions of the term's status or usefulness as a benchmark in transcultural discussions (cf. e.g. Weber 2001). Starting in the 1970s, women of color, in particular, have therefore criticized the eurocentrism of feminism and demanded the "recognition of racial difference and diversity among women" (McClintock 1997, 7). In the context of both transcultural studies and gender studies, the approaches outlined above involve asking how gender and race were negotiated within transcultural encounters.

Frederika Tevebring
Anna Sophia Messner

REFERENCES

Ahmed, Leila. 1982. "Western Ethnocentrism and Perceptions of the Harem." *Feminist Studies* 8 (3): 521–534.

Lewis, Reina. 1996. *Gendering Orientalism: Race, Femininity and Representation*. London: Routledge.

Lowe, Lisa. 1994. *Critical Terrains: French and British Orientalisms*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

McClintock, Anne. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge.

Schmidt-Linsenhoff, Viktoria. 2010. *Ästhetik der Differenz: Postkoloniale Perspektiven vom 16. bis 21. Jahrhundert: 15 Fallstudien*. Marburg: Jonas.

Weber, Charlotte. 2001. "Unveiling Scheherazade: Feminist Orientalism in the International Alliance of Women, 1911–1950." *Feminist Studies* 27 (1): 125–157.

Heritage

In the contemporary period, heritage has been normatively read and understood through the framework provided by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) as the "legacy" of material objects, natural landscapes, and ecosystems, and, more recently, intangible attributes inherited from past generations, whose safeguarding is considered paramount for present and future generations (UNESCO, 25 C / 4 1989, 57).

Such international documents, conventions, and recommendations as the one setting out the guidelines for the nature of world heritage also exist as part of a longer genealogy of efforts made towards studying, classifying, and protecting material culture across the world, prompted by fears of its destruction and looting during times of conflict. These genealogies reflect first and foremost the fact that heritage, its identification, documentation, conservation, and promotion has always been transnational in nature, owing to the contexts in which encounters with cultural diversity and difference emerged: those of imperial and colonial enterprise. A critical reevaluation of existing ideas and approaches to heritage is therefore needed.

Middle Eastern heritage, for example, has tended to be overwhelmingly associated in the popular imagination as well as in scholarly writing and archaeological work with the antique period and the unearthing, preservation, and protection of its material traces in the region. In recent decades, the region has been depicted as "a repository of precious archaeological resources constituting a universal world heritage, but a heritage that requires control and management by Western experts and their respective governments" (Meskell and Preucel 2008, 315).

The categorization and delineation of heritage sites and objects is intimately related to colonial practices and ideas about "tradition" and "modernity." Examples abound about how the classification and preservation of Middle Eastern objects, buildings, or crafts under different colonial regimes were central to discourses that sought to portray a particular image of the societies under their rule.

An emerging focus on the critical reassessment of the production of cultural heritage as well as the entanglement of material and immaterial

heritage has meant that, in recent decades, concerns about and analyses of heritage sites and practices have been able to offer more complex accounts of the legal, moral, cultural, affective, political, and increasingly economic (due to its inclusion in tourism and real-estate circuits) stakes for local and transnational actors involved (Herzfeld 2010; Falser and Juneja 2013).

Cristiana Strava

REFERENCES

Falser, Michael, and Monica Juneja, eds. 2013. *Kulturerbe und Denkmalpflege transkulturell: Grenzgänge zwischen Theorie und Praxis*. Bielefeld: transcript.

Herzfeld, Michael. 2010. "Engagement, Gentrification, and the Neoliberal Hijacking of History." *Current Anthropology* 51 (S2): 259–267.

Meskell, Lynn, and Robert W. Preucel, eds. 2008. *Companion to Social Archaeology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

UNESCO, 1989. *Draft Report of Commission IV. General Conference Twenty-Fifth Session Commission IV*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Hybridity

Hybridity is a term often used in relation to migration and syncretism and understood as a result of adaptation, fusion, or mixing. Accordingly, hybridization is considered a process that unfolds when coexistence becomes interaction, thus describing moments, dynamics, or intermediate realms that eventually result in transformation. It can have a temporal dimension referring to transitions between historical periods, but also a more geographical or culturalist one (Burke 2009). Like many of the terms and concepts that seem to have experienced a particular boom since the most recent wave of transcultural studies, "hybridity" was, in fact, already a familiar term in academic debates around the beginning of the twentieth century. Initially relevant mostly to scholars of religious studies or literature, then studied by scholars of Afro-American or Latin-American cultures, the concept was later taken up by anthropologists, before migrating on a larger scale into cultural history and related disciplines since around the turn of the millennium.

It is important to note that an awareness of hybrid phenomena has had a fundamental impact on the way we look at internal diversities of cultures such as that of Europe, which had long been regarded as rather monolithic or centralized entities (Burke 2016). At the same time, hybridity has become an increasingly crucial category for transcultural processes.

The most important—and probably most debated—use of hybridity concepts is now found in postcolonial theory where they are linked to an understanding of cultural spaces beyond static homogeneity (Bhabha 1994; Sieber 2012). In this context, hybridity's connotation as a reciprocal, though not necessarily symmetric, constellation that emphasizes deliberate or immanent agency on both sides, while also accounting for the power relations typically inherent in colonial exchanges (Burke 2009; 2016), becomes a substrate of transcultural modernities (Sieber 2012, 103).

The use of the term "hybridity" is often intertwined with metaphors categorized by Peter Burke (2016, 21) as either metallurgic ("melting pot"), linguistic ("creolization"), or culinary ("salad"). Yet the most critical figure of thought in this context is probably the connotation conjured up by the binary between "hybridity" and "purity," which is a value-free model in the realm of chemical or biological sciences, but can become value-laden and problematic when translated into cultural history or anthropology, as it has the potential of being linked to judgmental othering or, indeed, to racist agendas in terms of both real politics and historical interpretation (Ha 2005; Steward 2011).

Hybridity can therefore even be considered a kind of litmus test for the quality of cross-cultural studies, as its productive epistemic potential can only exceed its problematic connotations when used in an argument that, on the whole, is at a safe distance from any hierarchical or essentialist thinking. Under these conditions, the term "hybridity" is most commonly and productively used as a methodological tool for the analysis of new or for the reinterpretation of known material. Moreover, we find it applied as an adjective to characterize cultural and artistic practices, archaeological traces, or objects in the transcultural field—an approach that, in turn, is able to shift our understanding of the spaces, temporalities, and trajectories in which said objects are located or circulate (see e.g. Wolf 2009, ▸**Circulation**). Accordingly, "hybridity" may also be understood as an underlying paradigm for the multitude of methods in current interdisciplinary humanities and their dynamics and interrelations (see Preston Blier 2005). In sum, the notion of "hybridity" provides a test case for the intersections between the content and shape / structure of critical postcolonial thinking (see Sieber 2012, 99).

Eva-Maria Troelenberg

REFERENCES

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Burke, Peter. 2009. *Cultural Hybridity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

———. 2016. *Hybrid Renaissance: Culture, Language, Architecture*. Budapest: Central European University Press.

Ha, Kien Nghi. 2005. *Hype um Hybridität*. Bielefeld: transcript.

Preston Blier, Suzanne. 2005. "Transcending Places: A Hybrid, Multiplex Approach to Visual Culture." In *Anthropologies of Art*, edited by Mariet Westermann, 89–107. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sieber, Cornelia. 2012. "Der 'dritte Raum des Aussprechens' – Hybridität – Minderheitendifferenz. Homi K. Bhabha: *The Location of Culture*." In *Schlüsselwerke der Postcolonial Studies*, edited by Julia Reuter and Alexandra Karentzos, 97–108. Hamburg: Springer VS.

Steward, Charles. 2011. "Creolization, Hybridity, Syncretism, Mixture." *Portuguese Studies* 27 (1): 48–55.

Wolf, Gerhard. 2009. "Fluid Borders, Hybrid Objects: Mediterranean Art Histories 500–1500, Questions of Method and Terminology." In *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence. The Proceedings of the 32nd International Congress in the History of Art*, edited by Jaynie Anderson, 134–137. Melbourne: The Miegunyah Press.

Masterpiece

The "masterpiece" in art historical discourse describes a unique work of art that is considered one of the finest, outstanding examples in relation to a particular aspect or a certain period, artist, or style. There is no single definition of the term, but, generally speaking, a masterpiece not only is claimed to be of central importance to art history, but also meets universally applicable aesthetic criteria—predominantly aesthetic standards of Western art.

In the past, the term "masterpiece" was regarded above all as an indicator of an artwork's "museum quality" (Danto 1990, 112). This for a long time concerned mainly Western art objects. The very basic concept of the masterpiece can be traced back as early as Plato's *Ion*, where Socrates draws a strict line between arts and crafts and points to disparate quality characteristics for art production (Danto 1990, 119). Etymologically, the term "masterpiece" derives from the Dutch word *Meesterstuk* or, alternatively, the German word *Meisterstück*, referring to a piece of work craftsmen in medieval Europe produced to apply for guild membership. Accordingly, the term is closely linked to the person with the highest

professional qualification in crafts in a guild, the master craftsman.

Hans Belting (1998) stresses the rise of the concept of masterpieces following Hegel's definition of something absolute and unconditional with the development of the arts in general. The emergence of autonomous artworks only emerged later and goes hand in hand with the birth of modern art, art museums, and the canonization of art in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Belting 1998, 11). Depending on the context, different concepts of the "masterpiece" oscillate between a more technical, material, and a more idealistic notion.

Art historians have discussed the concept of the masterpiece and its many implications in-depth and recent debates reconsider the notions of masterpieces and canons (**‣Canon**) as based on Vasari and the Western tradition (Locher 2012, 32). At the same time, anonymous yet technically outstanding artworks in other traditions are also considered masterpieces, suggesting that quality can be objectively determined (Halbertsma 2007, 22). To help themselves and to prove authenticity, people referred to these anonymous artists as "masters" of for example specific regions (Vogel 1980, 133–142). As the art historical canon has opened itself up to greater diversity since the modern period, the classical canon is still referenced today, but often in terms of a critical historiographic reconsideration (Harris 2006, 185–186).

The perspectives of postcolonial or gender studies with their emphasis on functions of both aesthetic and social differences have contributed to this critique by questioning established yet vague criteria such as "greatness" (Troelenberg 2017). Museum practice, particularly in the wake of the postcolonial turn, is currently very much confronted with such questions, as the notion of the museum as an idealistic "temple of masterpieces" is being increasingly challenged by its understanding as a place of active exchange (Troelenberg 2017).

The key issue does not seem to be the identification of masterpieces in art history and museum practice, but rather the question of why concepts such as "masterpiece" are used and what their usage implies (Danto 1990, 112).

Maria Sobotka

REFERENCES

Belting, Hans. 1998. *Das unsichtbare Meisterwerk: Die Modernen Mythen der Kunst*. Munich: C. H. Beck.

Danto, Arthur C. 1990. "Masterpieces and the Museum." *Grand Street* 9 (2): 108–127.

Halbertsma, Marlite. 2007. "The Call of the Canon: Why Art History Cannot Do Without." In *Making Art History. A Changing Discipline and its Institutions*, ed. Elizabeth C. Mansfield, 16–31. New York: Routledge.

Harris, Jonathan. 2006. *Art History: The Key Concepts.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Locher, Hubert. 2012. "The Idea of the Canon and Canon Formation in Art History." In *Art History and Visual Studies in Europe: Transnational Discourses and National Frameworks,* ed. Matthew Rampley, Thierry Lenain, Hubert Locher, Andrea Pinotti, Charlotte Schoell-Glass, and Kitty Zijlsman, 29–40. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Troelenberg, Eva-Maria. 2017. "Images of the Art Museum: Connecting Gaze and Discourse in the History of Museology: An Introduction." In *Images of the Art Museum: Connecting Gaze and Discourse in the History of Museology,* ed. Eva-Maria Troelenberg and Melania Savino, 1–31. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Vogel, Susan Mullin. 1980. "The Buli Master, and Other Hands" *Art in America* 68 (5): 133–142.

Microhistory

Amidst the polarized swirls of historiographical discourse in 1970s Italy, a group of scholars affiliated with the Bologna periodical *Quaderni Storici* first coined the term *microhistoria*. In

a canonical series of books published in the 1980s, the group developed the concept further to denote a methodical and theoretical practice of historical research. By means of in-depth study of historical particulars, it reconstructs history from the bottom up. As such, it forms a counterpoint to the generalizing meta-narratives and distorting large-scale quantitative analyses of macrohistory.

In its early stages, the concept of *microhistoria* witnessed significant definitional and methodical discrepancies. Looking back, Carlo Ginzburg described it as the label of a historiographic box still waiting to be filled with content (Ginzburg 1993, 169). Methodologically, microhistorical studies start out from the analysis of particulars, be it individuals, small-scale social networks, or enveloped case studies. In the process, they reveal previously unobserved factors from which it is possible to induce well-founded assertions about the overarching connections and fundamental questions of history (Levi 1991, 97–98).

In a nutshell, microhistorical studies evince three main characteristics: 1) a focus on particular areas of study, but not in the vein of a mere investigation of historical details; 2) an emphasis on the agency of individuals as opposed to abstracting history into impersonal structures; 3) the induction of broader connections from the particular. On the historiographical stage, microhistory evolved as a reaction to quantitative models of social history that presume patterns to consistently weave through historical periods.

Since the 1960s and 1970s, contemporary cultural anthropology increasingly honed in on questions of daily life, oral history, and cultural-historical topics. Such aspects cannot be decoded by means of general and universally valid rules but only through an understanding of individual entities and their interrelated functioning in a systemic frame of reference (Magnússon and Ólafsson 2017, 4–5; see also Magnússon and Ólafsson 2013).

Unconstrained by rigid methodical or theoretical rules, microhistorical perspectives spread across various fields in the 1980s and 1990s. While the German school evolved from empirical investigations of daily life, Americans focused on individuals' agency in effecting social change. These developments were, and still are, accompanied by critiques of microhistorical approaches that, among other issues, center on the inductive reasoning from the particular to the general (Appuhn 2001, 107–111).

Microhistorical methodologies have meanwhile made major inroads in areas beyond the realm of historical studies, including in novel, interdisciplinary fields such as cultural studies. In each of those fields, microhistorical studies aim to counterbalance methodological nationalism, determinate structuralism, and Eurocentrism. Hence, they do not serve merely to complement a global historiography, but rather shed a new light on global history through detailed knowledge of specific sources, agents, and entities (‣**Agency**). Moreover, by studying historical particulars of transregional and global scope, asymmetrical relations and differences can be addressed critically (Epple 2012). This suggests applying microhistory as a theoretical axiom to transcultural studies and discourses on global art, which requires rejecting any conception of cultures as ethnically contained and territorially confined spaces and allows a better understanding of the concepts, agency, and mobility involved in the production, display, and reception of images and objects. Cultures are thus placed in an overarching, global context, while taking into account their continuously unfolding transformations and dynamic intertwining (‣**Entangled Histories**).

Elahe Helbig

REFERENCES

Appuhn, Karl. 2001. "Microhistory." In *Encyclopedia of European Social History from 1350 to 2000*, edited by Peter N. Stearns, 105–112. New York: Scribner.

Epple, Angelika. 2012. "Globale Mikrogeschichte: Auf dem Weg zu einer

Geschichte der Relationen." In *Im Kleinen das Große Suchen*, edited by Ewald Hiebl and Ernst Langthaler, 37–47. Innsbruck: Studienverlag.
Ginzburg, Carlo. 1993. "Mikro-Historie: Zwei oder drei Dinge, die ich von ihr weiß." *Historische Anthropologie,* 1 (2): 169–192.
Levi, Giovanni. 1991. "On Microhistory". In *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, edited by Peter Burke, 93–113. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Magnússon, Sigurður Gylfi, and Davíð Ólafsson. 2017. *Minor Knowledge and Microhistory: Manuscript Culture in the Nineteenth Century.* New York: Routledge.
Magnússon, Sigurður Gylfi, and Davíð Ólafsson. 2013. *What is Microhistory? Theory and Practice*. New York: Routledge.

Multiple Modernities

In the twentieth century, the concept of modernity has been constitutive for the social sciences as an organizing paradigm that focuses on a fundamental reorganization of the relation between state and society, including central spheres like economy, religion, and culture (Eisenstadt 2000). The dominant understanding of modernity—as the designation of an epoch and as a conceptual term for paradigmatic social change ("modernization")—has been tied to the idea of a uniform and teleological societal development characterized by industrial technological progress, secularization, and enlightenment. At the same time, it was conceptualized in opposition to the "pre-modern" and to "tradition." As a consequence, all societies that did not conform to the normative European model were excluded from being modern. Imperialism, of course, provided the material basis for this rationale. In contrast to this, the Israeli sociologist S. N. Eisenstadt (2000) coined the term "multiple modernities" and pushed for a theoretical reconsideration of the very idea of "modernity": "The essential idea behind the multiple modernities thesis is that 'modernity' and its features and forces can actually be received, developed, and expressed in significantly different ways in different parts of the world" (Smith 2006, 2).

The theoretical premise of European modernization as a blueprint for the world has also had serious consequences in other disciplines. In art history, it meant that European art (from the last quarter of the nineteenth century on) could be, and indeed was, considered modern and avant-garde, while non-European art was not. The new theoretical foundation of a plurality of modernities and modernizations opened up new ways for art history in a global context (Moxey 2009). Starting at the end of the 1990s, exhibitions like "Die Anderen Modernen – Zeitgenössische Kunst aus Afrika, Asien und Lateinamerika" (*The Other Moderns – Contemporary Art from Africa, Asia and Latinamerica*, House of World Cultures, Berlin) (Hug 1997) challenged the European canon (‣**Canon**) of "modern art." But while the notion of "other" modernities still seems to stabilize the dominance of Western modernity as the center of development, the concept of "transculturality" puts forward a relational perspective. Modernity has always been entangled (Randeria 2005 ‣**Entangled Histories**) and modern art could only emerge in the contact zone. Recent approaches in art history, such as Kobena Mercer's "Cosmopolitan Modernisms" (2005) or Christian Kravagna's concept of "transmodernity" (2017), emphasize that contacts and cooperations in the twentieth century were a prerequisite for the relevant artistic practices. In case studies focusing on the era of anti-colonial and anti-racist movements, Kravagna highlights artistic and theoretical counterprojects and -narratives to the exclusivity of Western modernity. The fact that the project of decentering Western Modernity is still far from being completed underscores the relevance of transcultural approaches in art historical research.

Kerstin Schankweiler

REFERENCES

Eisenstadt, Shmuel N. 2000. "Multiple modernities." *Daedalus* 129 (1): 1–30. (Special Issue "Multiple Modernities")

Hug, Alfons, ed. 1997. *Die Anderen Modernen: Zeitgenössische Kunst aus Afrika, Asien und Lateinamerika*. Heidelberg: Edition Braus.

Kravagna, Christian. 2017. *Transmoderne: Eine Kunstgeschichte des Kontakts*. Berlin: b_books.

Mercer, Kobena, ed. 2005. *Cosmopolitan Modernisms*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press and Iniva Institute of International Visual Arts (vol. 3 in the Annotating Art's Histories series).

Moxey, Keith. 2009. "Is Modernity Multiple?" Accessed February 2, 2018. http://www.columbia.edu/cu/arthistory/courses/Multiple-Modernities/moxey-essay.html.

Randeria, Shalini. 2005. "Verwobene Moderne: Zivilgesellschaften, Kastenbindungen und nicht-staatliches Familienrecht im (post)kolonialen Indien." In *Jenseits von Zentrum und Peripherie: Zur Verfassung der fragmentierten Weltgesellschaft*, edited by Hauke Brunkhorst and Sérgio Costa, 169–196. Munich: Hampp (Zentrum und Peripherie 2).

Smith, Christian. 2006. "On Multiple Modernities: Shifting the Modernity Paradigm. University of Notre Dame." Accessed April 11, 2011. www.nd.edu/~csmith22/documents/MultipleModernities.pdf.

Nation

There is no generally accepted definition of a "nation," nor is there any general consensus on the time from which one can speak of a "nation." Peter Alter (1985, 19), for example, questions the very possibility of a systematic definition of the term. Early conceptions of nation defined it as a group of people who shared history, traditions, and culture, sometimes religion, and usually language. Scholarly discussions revolve principally around different conceptions of the nation: the political nation, the civic nation, and the nation defined by culture. Benedict Anderson's publication *Imagined Communities* (1983) offers a much-quoted reference and useful starting point for the debate. In his view, nations are imagined communities and thus not natural entities, but rather fictitious and phantasmal structures.

In general, a sense of a nation as a "cohesive whole" results from the presence of collective elements which are rooted in the nation's history, such as traditions, memories of national experience, and achievements or visual codes, for example national symbols and flags (see Smith 1991, 14).

The often-referenced definition by Deutsch, "Eine Nation ist ein Volk im Besitz eines Staates,"[1] suggests that the foundation of a state precedes the nation's establishment. Nation-building outlines the social developments that are necessary to construct national unity. The term was first established in the 1950s regarding western industrialized countries (see Almond 1960; Pye 1962; Deutsch 1966). Since the 1990s, the term nation-building is commonly used in research on nationalisms. It is to be understood in a narrower sense than "nation formation" (James 1996), the broad process through which nations come into being. At the same time, it is crucial to differentiate between the terms "state-building" and "nation-building." While a nation often consists of an ethnic or cultural community, a state is a political entity with territorial boundaries and a high degree of sovereignty. Many states are nations, but there are many nations that are not fully sovereign states (Richmond 1987). The nation itself may be fictitious (see Bhabha 1990), but nonetheless nationalisms construct strong myths and uniform narratives suppressing phenomena that do not correspond to the guiding ideas of the respective nation. "Since every search for identity includes differentiating oneself from what one is not," writes Seyla Benhabib, "identity politics is

always and necessarily a politics of the creation of difference" (Benhabib 1996, 3–4). There is—in an essentialist sense—no such thing as one national identity. Different identities are discursively constructed according to audience, setting, topic, and substantive content. National identities are therefore malleable, fragile, and, frequently, ambivalent and diffuse (see Smith 1991, 3–8).

With the formation of nation states in the modern era, the relationship of art and nation became an important issue as "it serves as an indicator of social and political change" in the "search for renewed identity and national consciousness" (Karnouk 1988, 1). Particularly in the age of post-colonialism, the process of decolonization and nation-building required new narratives and forms of cultural and artistic expression in the newly independent nation states of the former colonized countries. In search for national art and modernity, different cultural movements in Africa, for instance, liberated themselves from "European cultural imperialism" and "sought inspiration in African forms, themes, and history" (Enwezor 2001, 13–14; see also Chatterjee 2007). In many societies, the visual arts remain the source of nationalist imagination. Through objects, artists reflect on nationalism and identities—not only as a personal experience but also as realities and metaphors. The artistic outcome concerns the aesthetics emerging from the concepts of nations and not—or not necessarily—the concepts themselves.

Sonja Hull
Pia Wiesner

ENDNOTE

1 A nation is a people in possession of a state.

REFERENCES

Almond, Gabriel Abraham, and James Smoot Coleman, eds. 1960. *The Politics of the Developing Areas*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Alter, Peter. 1985. *Nationalismus*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Anderson, Benedict R. O'G. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Benhabib, Seyla. 1996. *Democracy and Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bhabha, Homi K., ed., 1990. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge.

Chatterjee, Partha. 2007. *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Deutsch, Karl W., and William J. Foltz. 1966. *Nation Building in Comparative Contexts*. New York: Atherton Press.

Enwezor, Okwui. 2001. "The Short Century: Independence and Liberation Movements in Africa, 1945–1994. An Introduction." In *The Short Century: Independence and Liberation Movements in Africa, 1945–1994,* edited by Okwui Enwezor, 10–16. Munich: Prestel.

James, Paul. 1996. *Nation Formation: Towards a Theory of Abstract Community*. London: Sage Publications.

Karnouk, Liliane. 1988. *Modern Egyptian Art: The Emergence of a National Style*. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press.

Pye, Lucian W. 1962. *Politics, Personality, and Nation Building: Burma's Search for Identity*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Richmond, Anthony H. 1987. "Le nationalism ethnique et les paradigms des sciences sociales." *Revue Internationale des Sciences Sociales* 39 (1): 3–19.

Smith, Anthony D. 1991. *National Identity*. London: Penguin Books.

North / South

The terms "North" and "South" have been introduced as a result of the reordering of the global map at the end of the Cold War in the late 1980s to conceptualize the relationship of and binary opposition between Euro-America and

Africa, South Asia, Latin America, and the Middle-East. In recent decades, these terms have come to be used and established as a system of classification in various fields such as academic scholarship and politics in order to describe and define countries with "high and low human development indexes" or "spheres amalgamating countries that donate (global North) or receive foreign aid (global South)" (Angosto-Ferrandez 2016, 16). Against this background, it is important to note that, in a cultural context, the word "South" has become accepted as a substitute for terms such as "Third World" or "Developing World" (Wolvers et al. 2015) and phrases such as "East / West" (‣**East / West**) or "the West against the rest" (Hall 2007). The binary opposition of "North" and "South," in particular, has been controversially debated since its inception, as has the term "South" itself, especially in view of its terminological precursors. Thus, on the one hand, "South" emphasizes empowering aspects, as it is understood as less hierarchical or evolutionary, notably in the context of globalization. On the other hand, there are obvious limitations to this binary concept and its definition not just with regard to geographical boundaries, geopolitical classification systems, or economic divisions (Wolvers et al. 2015), as some countries oscillate geographically and economically between "North" and "South" and others show internal social, political, and cultural differences that are as crucial as those between countries of the "global North" and the "global South" (Angosto-Ferrandez 2016, 17).

In the postcolonial era, the dissolution of colonial power relations and the rise of globalization and transnationalism became increasingly important for the production and reception of contemporary art from the "South" (Enwezor and Okeke-Agulu 2009, 18–19). Okwui Enwezor sees the growing interest in contemporary art and culture especially from so-called "marginal" regions of the "South" as an effect of the geopolitical changes in the late 1980s. Furthermore, he argues that the emergence of contemporary African art is a "consequence of the crisis of traditional African art due to colonialism" and "of the encounter with new paradigms of artistic production generated by African responses to European modernity" (Enwezor and Okeke-Agulu 2009, 12).

The year 1989 in particular marks an important turning point with regard to the reordering of the global art map: Transnational exhibitions such as "Magiciens de la Terre" in Paris and biennials such as the third edition of the "Bienal de la Habana" in Cuba established transnational, "North-South" as well as "South-South" networks. In the years that followed, artists and art practices from the "South" became increasingly visible and an important, prominent part of the contemporary global art world (Filipovic 2010). The notion of an encounter of different cultural spheres with regard to a geographical mapping of the contemporary art scene was also highlighted in the title and the topics of the magazine of documenta 14, "South as a State of Mind." Against the background of the humanitarian crisis, the two cities hosting the 2017 edition of documenta, Kassel and Athens, were understood as "real and metaphoric sites [...] where the contradictions of the contemporary world, embodied by loaded directionals like East and West, North and South, meet and clash" (Latimer and Szymczyk 2015). According to Monica Juneja, it is especially the "cartography of contemporary art, which encompasses several continents and encounters with diverse cultures," that constitutes an important challenge for art history which, as a discipline, is rooted in and built upon strict geographical definitions of culture (2011, 276).

Anna Sophia Messner

REFERENCES

Angosto-Ferrandez, Luis Fernando. 2016. "The Value of Everything and the Price of Nothingness." In *Anthropologies of Value: Cultures of*

Accumulation across the Global North and the Global South, edited by Luis Fernando Angosto-Ferrandez, 1–30. London: Pluto Press.

Enwezor, Okwui, and Chika Okeke-Agulu. 2009. *Contemporary African Art since 1980.* Bologna: Damiani.

Filipovic, Elena, ed. 2010. *The Biennial Reader: An Anthology on Large-Scale Perennial Exhibitions of Contemporary Art.* Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz.

Hall, Stuart. 2007. *Formations of Modernity.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Juneja, Monica. 2011. "Global Art History and the 'Burden of Representation.'" In *Global Studies: Mapping Contemporary Art and Culture,* edited by Hans Belting, Jacob Birken, Andrea Buddensieg, and Peter Weibel, 274–297. Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz.

Latimer, Quinn, and Adam Szymczyk. 2015. "Editors' Letter." In *South as a State of Mind,* 6 (1). Accessed March 14, 2018. http://www.documenta14.de/en/south/12_editors_letter.

Wolvers, Andrea, Oliver Tappe, Tijo Salverda, and Tobias Schwarz. 2015. "Introduction." In *Concepts of the Global South: Voices from around the World,* edited by Andrea Wolvers, Oliver Tappe, Tijo Salverda, and Tobias Schwarz. Accessed March 13, 2018. http://voices.uni-koeln.de/2015-1/conceptsoftheglobalsouth.

Object Ethnographies

The study of material culture has been at the origin of several cognate disciplines (archaeology, anthropology, art history, museum studies), all of which have developed related and, at times, competing interpretations of and theorizations for dealing with objects, broadly defined. Two major and still influential theoretical directions were outlined in 1986 by Arjun Appadurai and Igor Kopytoff in a collected volume that introduced the idea of "the social life of things" as a means of going beyond Marxist understandings of commodities and goods intended for circulation. By focusing on "things-in-motion," Appadurai sought to illuminate the processual nature of value-creation, as well as the potential of all things to be commodified (1986, 5, 13). Kopytoff's "cultural biographies" were similarly process-oriented, aiming to illustrate the contexts and cultural processes through which objects became invested with various registers of meaning and value. In Kopytoff's view, in order to be able to understand these registers it is necessary to examine the biographies of "things" beyond moments of production and exchange.

Building on this conceptual work and analytical conclusions, Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett's "ethnographic objects" helped spur further ways of thinking, particularly about the construction of museum objects and practices as part of processes of detachment (1991). Similarly, in recent decades, scholars of material culture, art historians, and anthropologists have produced crucial theoretical reflections and nuanced accounts of "things" ranging from ethnographic objects to performance art (Buchli 2002; Henare et al. 2007; Schechner 2003). Associated with the "material turn," these approaches engaged for the first time directly with the "thingness" of objects, allowing for a sustained focus on the sensory and material properties of artefacts. This recent and growing body of work has made it possible to research and write about objects in a way that fleshes out social history, culturally constructed meanings, aesthetic aspects, and politics of engagement.

While this body of work acts as a necessary corrective for the methodological imbalances produced by earlier commodity-focused approaches (Appadurai 1986; Miller 1995), it continues to be divided along either object-focused or biography-focused lines of inquiry (Hahn and Weiss 2012; Hoskins 2006, 78). Moreover, dealing with objects, especially ones whose

histories of production, provenance, circulation, and display are entangled in what might be termed "politically inexpedient" contexts (Smith 2007)—which is frequently the case with transcultural art histories—requires further rethinking of the methodological tools at our disposal.

A move from object biographies towards object ethnographies can help balance previous display and performance-centered approaches with the methodological apparatus and self-reflexive stance of the ethnographer. Such an ethnographic approach to the study of material culture would not simply add ethnography to already established methods of dealing with objects, but instead synthetically and symmetrically combine two methodological practices and traditions. Within this framework, objects and their histories are understood as contingent, context-bound, co-produced, and co-productive of dynamic social, cultural, aesthetic, economic, and political relations. This approach aims to balance a focus on the material properties of an object with a close attention to the micro-histories, mundane processes, and constellations of actors engaged and entangled with the object or objects in question.

In the context of transcultural object histories and trajectories where the "things" in question exist in a complex web of relations of production, circulation, and meaning, such ethnographic approaches to object biographies have the ability to make visible previously hidden processes and relations, while making room for ambiguity and ambivalence. As such, they do not preclude aiming for deep and "holistic contextualization" (Miller 2016) that can work against tendencies to fetishize and fix the meaning of material culture. By requiring that objects always be considered through their placement within relationships and networks of production and engagement, bio-ethnographic analyses can help foster much-needed nuanced and critical accounts of material culture.

Cristiana Strava

REFERENCES

Appadurai, Arjun. 1986. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buchli, Victor. 2002. *The Material Culture Reader.* Oxford: Berg.

Hahn, Hans Peter and Hadas Weiss, eds. 2013. *Mobility, Meaning and Transformations of Things: Shifting Contexts of Material Culture Through Time and Space*. Oxbow Books.

Henare, Amiria, Martin Holbraad, and Sari Wastell, eds. 2007. *Thinking through Things: Theorising Artefacts Ethnographically*. London: Routledge.

Hoskins, Janet. 2006. "Agency, Biography and Objects." In *Handbook of Material Culture*, edited by Christopher Tilley et al., 74–84. London: Sage.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 1991. "Objects of Ethnography." In *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, edited by Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine, 17–78. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Kopytoff, Igor. 1986. "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process." In *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, edited by Arjun Appadurai, 70–73. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, Daniel. 2016. "The Internet: Provocation." Correspondences, *Cultural Anthropology.* Accessed June 20, 2017.

———. 1995. "Consumption and commodities." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 141–161.

Schechner, Richard. 2003. *Performance Theory*. New York: Routledge.

Smith, Laurajane. 2007. "Empty gestures? Heritage and the politics of recognition." In *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights*, edited by Helaine Silverman and D. Fairchild Ruggles, 159–171. New York: Springer.

Orientalism

The term "Orientalism" was originally applied to Western philological and historical studies focusing on the so-called 'East' and particularly its scriptures. In artistic and art historical contexts, it also frequently serves as an umbrella term for representations of the Muslim world or Asia, mostly in traditional costume, painting, and photography. At the same time, it covers the appropriation of Islamic or Asian styles, particularly in the applied arts and architecture. "Orientalism" can thus be a geographical reference to the aesthetic or decorative systems of diverse regions reaching from the Maghreb (North Africa), the southeastern Mediterranean, and the Middle East via the Iranian world and Central and Southeast Asia to Japan and China. With the rise of postcolonial studies, and especially since Edward Said's groundbreaking work of the late 1970s (Said 1978), the term "Orientalism" has taken on a decidedly critical connotation, underscoring often asymmetric relations of power, knowledge, and representation, particularly in imperialist and colonial contexts. Said's argument has itself triggered lively debate and controversy (e.g. Macfie 2000). While increasingly differentiated, the discourse on Orientalism has revealed imaginary or generalizing narratives about "the Orient" that involve an implicit association with the feminine, with backwardness, or with binary ideas of the exotic picturesque vs. Western rationality. Critical post-colonial research thus demonstrates how Orientalism has operated—and often still operates—as an instrument for Western modernity's teleological idea of historical ascent and development: The orientalist subject—whether presented in affirmative and idealized, or in ridiculing or vilifying ways—is routinely seen as the ultimate other that stands outside modernity (‣**Multiple Modernities**).

While Said refers mostly to academic and literary Orientalism, his reassessment of the term has also led to an increasingly critical approach toward Orientalist art and design (see e.g. Sievernich and Budde 1989; Nochlin 1989; Benjamin 2003; Del Plato and Codell 2016; Koppelkamm and Mueller 2015; Pouillon and Vatin 2015; Troelenberg 2018). The wide qualitative range of scholarly work on Orientalism is linked to several aspects deriving from the subject itself as well as from its academic context: For one, Orientalism is very much shaped by different national histories and scholarly cultures. Thus, many manifestations of French Orientalism are to be considered against the immediate background of colonialism, while German Orientalism generally appears much more characterized by an indirect, often idealistically or spiritually informed approach. For another, there is a certain dialectic inherent in Orientalist art: iconographically, in terms of its preference for non-figurative patterns, many examples of Orientalist art carry strong historicizing or romanticizing connotations. In their decorative approach to what is often labelled as 'ornament', they often do not do justice to the complex meanings of non-naturalistic systems of representation which carry cultural significance, such as the vegetal motives subsumed under the term 'arabesque'. At the same time, however, numerous nineteenth and twentieth-century artists have regarded the reference to non-European source cultures as a gateway to abstraction, a catalyst in the search for modern style (e.g. Brüderlin 2001). Yet another important aspect is that scholarship is becoming increasingly aware of Orientalism's multidirectional trajectories that go far beyond the notion of the so-called Western world as the only receiving end. The growing interest in multiple modernisms worldwide has shed important light on the more local functions of Orientalism, for instance related to modernization processes within the Islamicate world (see e.g. Troelenberg 2015), as well as on transregional Orientalisms beyond the common "East-West" demarcation lines (e.g. López-Calvo 2012).

As these very general observations already suggest, there is no single homogenous manifestation of

Orientalism in art, but rather a multitude of Orientalisms across space and time that are directly interrelated with the multiplicity of transcultural modernity. (This key-term is partly derived from Troelenberg 2018).

Eva-Maria Troelenberg

REFERENCES

Benjamin, Roger. 2003. *Orientalist Aesthetics: Art, Colonialism, and French North Africa, 1880–1930*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brüderlin, Markus, ed. 2001. *Ornament und Abstraktion: Kunst der Kulturen, Moderne und Gegenwart im Dialog*. Cologne: Dumont.

Del Plato, Joan, and Julie F. Codell. 2016. *Orientalism, Eroticism and Modern Visuality in Global Cultures*. London: Routledge Taylor et Francis Group.

Koppelkamm, Stefan, and Ilze Kļaviņa Mueller. 2015. *The Imaginary Orient: Exotic Buildings of the 18th and 19th Centuries in Europe*. Stuttgart: Edition Axel Menges.

López-Calvo, Ignacio. 2012. *Peripheral Transmodernities: South-to-South Intercultural Dialogues between the Luso-Hispanic World and 'the Orient'.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Macfie, Alexander L., ed. 2000. *Orientalism: A Reader.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Nochlin, Linda. 1989. "The Imaginary Orient." In *The Politics of Vision: Essays on Nineteenth-Century Art and Society*, edited by Linda Nochlin, 33–59. New York: Harper and Row.

Said, Edward W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Sievernich, Gereon, and Hendrik Budde. 1989. *Europa und der Orient: 800–1900*, Exh. Cat. Berlin: Berliner Festspiele, and Gütersloh: Bertelsmann.

Troelenberg, Eva-Maria. 2015. "Drawing Knowledge, (Re-)Constructing History: Pascal Coste in Egypt." *International Journal of Islamic Architecture* 4 (2): 287–313.

———. 2018. "The Modern Diffusion of Islamic Styles." *The Encyclopedia of Asian Design*, vol. 4: *Transnational, and Global Design Issues.* Published online. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Pouillon, François, and Jean-Claude Vatin. 2015. *After Orientalism: Critical Perspectives on Western Agency and Eastern Re-Appropriations*. Leiden: Brill.

Othering

The term "other" has a long tradition in the humanities and social sciences. It emerges across disciplines as a mental construct based on perceived differences from a subject's identity, i.e. in many ways an antithesis that plays out on intersubjective, interpersonal, or societal levels.

The notion of the other can be found among idealistic philosophical beliefs as early as Pratyabhijñā philosophy (fl. ca. 925–950 AD) (Ratié 2007, 314). Hegel brought the discussion to a new level by focusing on self-consciousness and its relation to the construction and distinction from others (Popal 2009, 67). Psychoanalysis then further probed the other's role in intrapersonal development; while Freud focused largely on sexual identity (Hall 1997, 237), Lacan, as pointed out by Evans (Evans 2002), emphasized subjectivity and distinguished between the "big Other"—with a capital "O"—and the other with a lowercase "o," indicating their inherent power relations. Here, the O/other is a kind of external consciousness or point from which the subject sees itself. While the "other" is a reflection or projection of the ego (illusory otherness), the capitalized "Other" designates fundamental alterity, an otherness that exceeds the imaginary (Evans 2002, 38–40).

Othering as a key term for postcolonial studies was coined above all by Gayatri Spivak (Popal 2009, 67). Spivak (1985) investigated power relations in the larger context of imperial discourses and described the process through

which colonization creates otherness. Following the Lacanian differentiation of O/other, her usage of Other describes the colonizing Other, the oppressor, whereas the other is the so-called "mastered" subject. For Spivak, the formation of the O/other is a mutually dependent process in which the O/other are established simultaneously (1985, 133–139). Continuing the mapping of other/ing within postcolonial and cultural fields, Homi Bhabha (Bhabha 1994, 66–84) underlined the paradox of stereotypes and the creation of otherness, while others investigated the fetishism, voyeurism, and the "regimes" of representation involved in othering (Hall 1997, 264–276).

Some fields have especially arisen to challenge the effects and mechanisms of othering inherent to their own disciplines. Johannes Fabian's metacritique of anthropology (Fabian 2002), for instance, identified how its writing relegates persons of study, others, to an earlier, more primitive temporality, while anthropologists are understood to exist here and now. This denial of coevalness for the other also relates to a geographical distancing and the traditional distinction between centers and peripheries (Fabian 2002, 25–37). Recent calls for more global approaches in art historiographical debates reveal the field's struggle to position "non-European" art in their canon (**‣Canon**)—a canon shaped in no small part by nineteenth-century nationalist German art history survey books (Shalem 2012). Western art remains the principle focus and persistent point of departure of so-called global art histories where art not originating from Europe is still viewed as "the other" (Shalem 2012; Leeb 2012), as the widely used term "non-European" illustrates. Many scholars suggest that, in order to move towards a truer "global" approach, it is critical to teach and perceive (art) histories of diverse times and regions not as if they existed independently, but rather as being embedded in networks of connectivity, in contact zones.

Westrey Page
Maria Sobotka

REFERENCES

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Evans, Dylan. 2002. "other/Other." In *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*, edited by Dylan Evans, 135–136. London: Routledge.

Fabian, Johannes. 2002. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hall, Stuart. 1997. "The Spectacle of the 'Other.'" In *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, edited by Stuart Hall, 225–279. London: Sage Publications/The Open University.

Leeb, Susanne. 2012. "Weltkunstgeschichte und Universalismusbegriffe: 1900/2010." *kritische berichte. Zeitschrift für Kunst- und Kulturwissenschaften* 40 (2): 13–26.

Popal, Mariam. 2009. "Heine und der Orient? Zwischen Subjektivität und Veränderung oder wie das Andere nach Deutschland kam – sah – und – ?" In *Fremde, Feinde und Kurioses: Innen- und Außenansichten unseres muslimischen Nachbarn,* edited by Benjamin Jokisch, Ulrich Rebstock, and Lawrence Conrad, 67–74. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Ratié, Isabelle. 2007. "Otherness in the Pratyabhijñā Philosophy." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 35 (4): 313–370.

Shalem, Avinoam. 2012. "Dangerous Claims: On the 'Othering' of Islamic Art History and How It Operates within Global Art History." *kritische berichte. Zeitschrift für Kunst- und Kulturwissenschaften* 40 (2): 69–86.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1985. "The Rani of Simur." In *Europe and Its Others: Proceedings of the Essex Conference on Sociology of Literature, July 1984, Volume 1*, edited by Francis Barker, Peter Hulme, Margaret Iversen, and Diana Loxley, 128–151. Colchester: University of Essex.

Periphery

The term "periphery," which can be qualified as a border zone or outer edge, suggests a binary geographic model in which there is a core area surrounded by a perimeter region. Thus, this theoretical concept can be defined equally by what it is not: central, innermost, median.

The center / periphery model was first introduced by sociologists in the 1970s to explain economic networks and structures. In his multi-volume magnum opus, *The Modern World-System,* first published in 1974, Immanuel Wallerstein imagined the concept of center / periphery on a global scale. Building on the work of Karl Marx, Fernand Braudel, and Andre Gunder Frank, Wallerstein argued that, beginning in the early modern period and continuing until the present day, a "core" of several dominating capitalist countries, primarily those of Europe and North America, emerged in economic and political relation to areas that were on the "periphery" or a developing "semi-periphery," i.e. Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

The fundamental concepts of this world-system theory subsequently found life in a range of disciplines across the humanities. The division of the world between center and periphery, the haves and the have nots, was swiftly identified by theorists like Edward Said (1978) as the heart of colonial and postcolonial discourse. As a result, the veneer of impartiality suggested by a model based on space or topography began to be questioned, with subsequent generations of academics working to uncover the subjective nature of and imbalance of power within colonial structures. What's more, scholars like Said and Homi Bhabha (1994) noted the inherent ambivalence and instability of this binary configuration, and a number of theories such as transculturation, intertextuality, and hybridity have emerged to refuse and deconstruct a strict boundary between center and periphery, especially in terms of cultural production.

Most recently, the concept of the "periphery" has been marshaled to describe understudied material within the imagined geography of a particular branch of study, all part of an effort to globalize or de-center the humanities tradition at large. Within art history, the call to question the long-standing eurocentrism in the field has been particularly resonant (Elkins 2007). Various critics have called to dismantle or at least heavily revise the conception of a hierarchical artistic canon (‣**Canon**) that has been so dominant within the discipline. At any rate, the ongoing search to incorporate actors and material on the periphery prompts researchers to continue working to construct a truly "horizontal" history of art.

Emily Neumeier

REFERENCES

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Elkins, James, ed. 2007. *Is Art History Global?* London: Routledge.

Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.

Photo Archive

As many scholars have already acknowledged, photography is about materiality, seriality, multiplicity, and the mechanized industrial production of images. If so, what are the organizing structures for these vast and uncontainable bodies of photographic objects? The archive, as an informational and intellectual resource, provides an institutional framework for understanding the management of photographs as well as the networks in which they

circulated (Derrida 1996; Sekula 1986). The archive has been imagined as a broad historic "depot" for the storage and transmission of historic material. It is, according to Robin Kelsey, "not an institution or set of institutions, but rather a system enabling and controlling the production of knowledge" (Kelsey 2007, 9). Archives unify not only knowledge or information through text and image, but whole territories of empire (Richards 1993). In addition to being bodies of information and documentation, photo archives operate as image ecosystems and transnational interlocutors that connect cultures, people, ideas, and institutions; as such, they constitute an important category for a transcultural art history. Within the archive, as Elizabeth Edwards has so eloquently noted, "there is a dense multidimensional fluidity of the discursive practices of photographs as linking objects between past and present, between visible and invisible and active in cross-cultural negotiation" (2001, 4). By thinking and reading photographs as three-dimensional objects that are active in social, political, and archival spaces and networks, they emerge as agents in complex and international migratory processes. These migratory experiences shape cultural, spatial, and temporal borders as well as become inscribed into the body of the photographic archive. In other words, it is in archival spaces that photographic biographies are enacted (Caraffa and Serena 2015, 9). Based on their biographies in various collections, photographs (and their related hierarchies of value) emerge as objects shaped by a reciprocal rather than a unilateral discourse. Whether telling tales of dormancy or display, the archive generates histories of photography that are intimately entwined with institutional narratives and political discourse. To this end, especially in modern transcultural contexts, photographs and photographic archives can be placed within an institutional milieu, which in turn illuminate mechanical representations (and their myriad reproductions) as symbols of a national, historical, and temporal imaginary. In the digital age, the photographic archive is confronted with new challenges and forced to ask new questions. The more recent emergence of boundless and pervasive photographic images complicates their storage, circulation, and deletion within Internet and social media archives (Baladi 2016).

Anna Sophia Messner
Erin Hyde Nolan

REFERENCES

Baladi, Lara. 2016. "Archiving a Revolution in the Digital Age, Archiving as an Act of Resistance." *ibraaz*, 010/03. Accessed January 9, 2018. https://www.ibraaz.org/essays/163/.

Caraffa, Costanza, and Tiziana Serena, eds. 2015. *Photo Archives and the Idea of Nation*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Derrida, Jacques. 1996. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Translated by Eric Prenowitz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Edwards, Elizabeth. 2001. *Raw Histories: Photographs, Anthropologies and Museums.* Oxford: Berg.

Kelsey, Robin Earle. 2007. *Archive Style: Photographs and Illustrations for U.S. Surveys, 1850–1890*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Richards, Thomas. 2011. *The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire*. London: Verso.

Sekula, Allan. 1986. "The Body and the Archive." *October* 39: 3–64.

Primitivism

The term "primitive" has historically meant many different things: From an early Christian usage to mean simply "original," to a negative connotation in the Enlightenment as an early stage of human development, to an inverted celebration of that very quality by some twentieth-century thinkers, or, alternatively, for others a belief that primitive art and experience were a universal

spiritual quality. Therefore, the term "primitive" and, by extension, "primitivism" are best understood according to their political valences and uses in a particular context (Pan 2001, 29).

Within art history, the term "primitivism" has been most used to describe "the interest of modern [Western] artists in tribal art and culture, as revealed in their thought and work," in which, in parallel to Orientalism (‣**Orientalism**), "it refers not to the tribal arts in themselves, but to the Western interest in and reaction to them" (Rubin 1984, 1). This twentieth-century artistic mode of primitivism has often relied on geographic constructions of difference (i.e. center / periphery ‣**Periphery**, ‣**East / West**, Africanism) and, perhaps even more crucially, temporal ones. Primitivist thinking often claims "temporal distance" and denies coevalness between the primitive "Other" (‣**Othering**) and the modern subject even when they are contemporaries (Fabian 1983, 1). Within this social and political context, definitions of primitivism run the gamut from calling it "a function of colonial discourse" (Araeen 1987, 8), to a "reciprocal relationship" that consists of "modalities of empathy" (Severi 2012, 27). As Ruth B. Phillips has argued, primitivism's very ambiguities allowed it to function not simply as a tool of the colonial West but as "the primary engine of modernism's global dissemination" enabling modern art's "global adaptability" as it was employed for different reasons by artists all over the world (Phillips 2015, 6). As Partha Mitter has pointed out, however, these visual "borrowings" between cultures are often received differently, which reflects social, cultural, and political asymmetries. Accordingly, in what Mitter terms the *Picasso manqué syndrome*, while Picasso has often been deemed a genius for looking to African sculpture to inspire cubism, an African artist is likely to be treated as belated or inauthentic if she looks to cubism to inspire her own art (Mitter 2008, 534–538).

Primitivism has served in the twentieth century as both a mechanism for artists, curators, academics, and collectors to freeze other cultures as part of a permanent past, whether to demean or celebrate them as such, and as a way for artists to explore and re-evaluate—albeit under uneven conditions—new content and forms from both their own and others' visual traditions. In these ways, a critical and analytic study of how primitivism works, in both historic and contemporary contexts, can reveal underlying assumptions, stereotypes, and ideologies that structure aesthetic practices and the reception of art.

Alison Boyd

REFERENCES

Araeen, Rashid. 1987. "From Primitivism to Ethnic Arts." *Third Text* 1: 6–25.

Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mitter, Partha. 2008. "Interventions: Decentering Modernism: Art History and Avant-Garde Art from the Periphery." *Art Bulletin* 90: 531–548.

Pan, David. 2001. *Primitive Renaissance: Rethinking German Expressionism*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Phillips, Ruth B. 2015. "Aesthetic Primitivism Revisited: The Global Diaspora of 'Primitive Art' and the Rise of Indigenous Modernisms." *Journal of Art Historiography* 12: 1–25.

Rubin, William. 1984. *"Primitivism" in 20th Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern*. New York: Museum of Modern Art.

Severi, Carlo. 2012. "Primitivist Empathy." *Art in Translation* 4: 99–130.

Resilience

The term "resilience," which describes the capacity to bounce back after a deformation, to adapt to uncertainty, or to recoil and recover from changes and setbacks, has its primary, very empirical origin in

the technical sciences and engineering. As a concept—or a paradigm often referred to as "resilience thinking"—it is also integral to the language of psychology, sociology, and a number of related fields. It is most commonly used in the context of policies towards international development and global change and has come to be employed particularly since the financial crisis of 2008 (Brown 2016). To date, resilience does not appear to be very established yet in written scholarship on visual studies or art history, but we may currently witness the migration of this concept into our discipline: Recently, "resilience" has been appearing with significantly increasing frequency (see e.g. Meyen 2015).

The fact that resilience seems to be increasingly moving center stage in the critical humanities as well as in artistic practice—particularly where they engage in critical contemporary debate—might in itself be an interesting indicator for the self-conception of academic and artistic agency today. Resilience thinking has, for instance, been criticized for opening the doors to neoliberal individualization of risk and responsibility and lacking awareness for change-inducing power structures and resulting asymmetries. At the same time, resilience as understood in psychology and philosophy is framed in terms of empowerment and emancipation (Nida-Rümelin and Gutwald 2016; Bollig 2014). It is thus a polyvalent term that links diverse epistemic frameworks between the first and second modernity.

Resilience addresses the relation between individual identities and systems, which often plays an important role in cross-cultural exchange processes. As the paradigm of resilience thinking becomes relevant in moments of change and especially change-inducing crisis, it may provide a productive, though not celebratory or affirmative approach to colonial and post-colonial constellations. Spelling out a processual, diachronic perspective, it links the notions of *longue durée* and the microhistorical (‣**Microhistory**), thus reconciling two paradigms of the humanities that often stand in opposition to one another.

The concept of resilience also has a particularly prominent function within the framework of ecosystems; in this context, interesting observations about a so-called "edge effect" have been described, underlining the notion of resilience in the sense of an adaptive capacity in transitional areas (Turner et al. 2003). In encapsulating border phenomena between different cultures and ecosystems alike, this provides a close analogy to the concept of contact zones (‣**Expanded Contact Zone**), describing cultural diversity and flexibility as a result of productive exchange and border crossing.

Resilience thinking provides a potentially very broad epistemic framework for art history and visual studies. This means that the relation between art or visual practices and the concept of resilience is by no means unambiguous or unidirectional. For instance, artistic techniques and practices as well as artworks and artifacts can survive (or be resurrected) through multiple practices of resilience—a mechanism that may be considered an active and reciprocal response to claims for asymmetric, often institutionally framed "salvage paradigms" (Clifford 1989). In turn, these practices can shape and enhance resilient identities of communities or individuals in situations of crisis. Thus, it may be not only an analytical tool but also a policy device that feeds into notions of cultural heritage and canons, challenging privileges of interpretation.

Eva-Maria Troelenberg

REFERENCES

Bollig, Michael. 2014. "Resilience – Analytical Tool, Bridging Concept or Development Goal? Anthropological Perspectives on the Use of a Border Object." *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 139 (2): 253–279.

Brown, Katrina. 2016. *Resilience, Development and Global Change*. London, New York: Routledge.

Clifford, James. 1989. "The Others: Beyond the 'Salvage' Paradigm."

Third Text: Third World Perspectives on Contemporary Art and Culture (March 6): 73–77.
Meyen, Michael. 2015. "Resilienz als diskursive Formation: Was das neue Zauberwort für die Wissenschaft bedeuten könnte." *Resilienz.* Accessed June 2, 2017. http://resilienz.hypotheses.org/365.
Nida-Rümelin, Julian and Rebecca Gutwald. 2016. "Der philosophische Gehalt des Resilienzbegriffs. Normative Aspekte." *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 67 (3): 250–262.
Turner, Nancy J., Iain J. Davidson-Hunt and Michael O'Flaherty. 2003. "Living on the Edge: Ecological and Cultural Edges as Sources of Diversity for Social-Ecological Resilience." *Human Ecology* 31 (3): 439–461.

Return

In her foundational study, *The Return of Cultural Treasures*, Jeannette Greenfield (1989) privileged the term "return" over repatriation or restitution, writing that it "may also refer in a wider sense to restoration, reinstatement, and even rejuvenation and reunification" (Greenfield 1989, 368). The term "return" can, in fact, be used to encompass cases of both restitution and repatriation. Restitution tends to refer to cases that allow for a return to an owner based on property rights and is most often the term employed when dealing with displaced art works in situations of armed conflict, notably "Nazi-looted art," while "repatriation" is largely used in relation to returns based on ethical considerations pertaining to human remains and sacred objects in indigenous communities (Bienkowski 2015, 433). The notion of return encompasses the phenomenon of the physical return of objects as one aspect of a broad set of practices that are essentially related to ethical rather than legal considerations. According to Michael Skrydstrup, "[r]eturn is not a debate about reparation in a judicial sense, but about goodwill, ethics and what is at times referred to as 'natural justice'" (2010, 63). It can also be usefully related to the notion of "recovery" bridging from the physical to the symbolic impact of return, as it points to the "healing through the restoration of cultural losses and the psychic damage those losses have caused" (Coombes and Phillips 2013, I). In James Clifford's *Returns* (2013) it appears as a much larger process of resilience and decentering.

"Return" is thus particularly useful when thinking about historic cases, notably related to colonial contexts which lie outside the bounds of current legal jurisdictions. Practices related to return include dialogue with source communities and former owners, and they situate museum collections in an essentially social and relational perspective, tying objects back to former contexts (Bouquet 2012, 152) and leading to the development of new and specific ritual forms of return ceremonies which have become an object of study in their own right (Roustan 2014). The notion of return potentially unsettles not only the object's perceived permanence of place but also the ontological and epistemological interpretations produced by the museum. In particular, it contributes to dissolving the notion of specimen, as the process of return implies focusing on specific trajectories that lead to stronger individuation of objects, a process that is particularly exemplary in the case of human remains. It also underlines the museum's role as a form of soft power, calling on new actors and forms of curation, producing objects with more hybrid or heterogeneous biographies and identities that question traditional categories of classification.

Felicity Bodenstein

REFERENCES

Bienkowski, Piotr. 2015. "A Critique of Museum Restitution and Repatriation Practices." In *The International Handbooks of Museum Studies*, 431–453. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Bouquet, Mary. 2012. *Museums: A Visual Anthropology*. London: Berg.
Clifford, James. 2013. *Returns: Becoming Indigenous in the Twenty-First Century*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
Coombes, Annie E., and Ruth B. Phillips. 2013. "Museums in Transformation: Dynamics of Democratization and Decolonization." In *The International Handbooks of Museum Studies,* xxxiii–lxiii, edited by Sharon MacDonald, Helen Rees Leahy, Andrea Witcomb, Kylie Message, Conal McCarthy, Michelle Henning, Annie E. Coombes, and Ruth B. Phillips. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
Greenfield, Jeanette. 1989. *The Return of Cultural Treasures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Roustan, Mélanie. 2014. "De l'adieu aux choses au retour des ancêtres: La remise par la France des têtes māori à la Nouvelle-Zélande." *Socio-anthropologie* 30: 183–198.
Skrydstrup, Martin. 2010. "What Might an Anthropology of Cultural Property Look Like?" In *The Long Way Home: The Meaning and Values of Repatriation*, edited by Paul Turnbull and Michael Pickering, 57–80. New York: Berghahn Books.

Spolia

The term "spolia" designates reused ancient materials, most often stones incorporated into newer buildings. In antiquity, the term denoted war booty or spoils. An extension from "hide", it suggests an analogy between taking the armor from a fallen enemy and skinning an animal. The current meaning was introduced by sixteenth-century antiquarians. In a 1519 letter to Pope Leo X, Raphael uses the word "spolia" to educate the pope about how to recognize high quality ancient works in a context of lesser artistic quality (Kinney 1997, 122).

In the European context, the circulation of and trade in spolia was particularly widespread from late antiquity until the thirteenth century. The reasons were often practical, as ancient sites were used as quarries while at the same time being acknowledged for their historical value. The study of spolia emerged in the 1930s and has focused on the incentives behind the reuse of older materials. The term's martial origins link it to the practice of taking objects from other cultures separated in space, time, or politics from one's own. In scholarship, the use of spolia has often been explained either as a deliberate reference to the ancient past or as a matter of pure practicality. With regard to the latter, it is often assumed that the desacralization of pagan buildings stripped them of all meaning and reduced them to quarries (Sanders 2015; Kiilerich 2005). However, the prominent reuse of pagan spolia in many medieval churches suggests that those "foreign" elements were reinterpreted through a Christian lens and given new importance (Esch, 2005).

Recent scholarship has shifted away from describing spolia as a purely practical or illicit practice, instead considering them as an example of a form of local engagement with the past that falls outside academic categories (Brilliant and Kinney 2001; Siapkas 2017; see also ‣**Allelopoiesis**). The usefulness of the term "spolia" has also been questioned. Based on the term's origin in Renaissance antiquarianism and its close association with the reuse of ancient Greek and Roman materials, it does not seem able to adequately reflect ancient or non-European notions of the significance of reused materials (Kinney 1997, 118).

It should also be considered whether all reused objects transferred into a new context can be seen as spolia, including, by extension, ideas, captives, architectural forms, ornaments, or portrayed objects, since of all these function as topographical and historical references.

Frederika Tevebring
Lisa Heese

REFERENCES

Brilliant, Richard, and Dale Kinney, eds. 2011. *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Esch, Arnold. 2005. *Wiederverwendung von Antike im Mittelalter: Die Sicht des Archäologen und die Sicht des Historikers*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Kiilerich, Bente. 2005 "Making Sense of the Spolia in the Little Metropolis in Athens." *Estratto Dalla Rivista Arte Medievale Nuova Serie*, 4: 95–114.

Kinney, Dale. 1997. "Spolia, damnatio and renovatio memoriae." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 42: 117–148.

Sanders, Guy D.R. 2015. "William of Moerbeke's Church at Merbaka: The Use of Ancient Spolia to Make Personal and Political Statements." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 84 (3): 583–626.

Siapkas, Johannes. 2017. *Antikvetenskapens teoretiska landskap Volym I: Från Laokoon till Troja*. Lund, Nordic Academic Press [forthcoming in English translation].

Translation

Traditional notions of the translation process emphasize the search for and use of equivalencies across languages to render an original text comprehensible to a foreign audience. Schleiermacher, Goethe, and, later, early twentieth-century thinkers, however, began to deconstruct the unilateral notions inherent to this view that translations should resemble the inalterable and authoritative original (Langenohl, Poole, and Weinberg 2015, 175–179). Walter Benjamin, for instance, unsettled the stability of the original by describing translation as calling out both languages into a kind of third space between them, heightening self-reflection in the process, and opening the languages to mutual transformation. Literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin then re-assessed the construction of meaning itself, arguing that it is produced in dialogue between subject and world. In this analysis, all situations or stagings of a text, including translational ones, release potential for new meaning.

These radicalizing notions of translation began to migrate beyond literary theory, supported by poststructuralist and postcolonial approaches. The traditional "cultural translation" practiced by anthropologists, which searched for corresponding phenomena across cultures to "learn" them like a language (Burke 2009, 55), increasingly witnessed criticism that resisted the conception of cultures and languages as fixed, homogeneous entities, and rather highlighted the negotiation and change at play within social and cultural encounter. This critical shift amounted to what Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere announced in 1990 as a "cultural turn" in translation studies, while Doris Bachmann-Medick (2009) proclaimed a "translational turn" within cultural studies. These "turns" involve a focus on bilateral transformations within encounters and the valorization of deeper entanglements, displacements, and multiplicities. They also maintain an awareness of and resistance to hegemonic forces and the tendency towards "monolingualism," which would insist on others finding corresponding meanings to a "Western" original "language" (see Hall and Chen 1996).

Translation, particularly in reference to its definition as the movement or conversion of things to another place or into a new medium, also frequently traces object mobility, its "routes" rather than "roots," as James Clifford (1997) famously wrote. Objects here are thus conceived as translated and translating entities whose meanings arise in negotiations and histories of cultural encounter. Museums can similarly be read as translating institutions; by inscribing objects into narratives that are comprehensible to a foreign audience, they function through the creation of spaces that are palpable or "real" to the new

observer. The perceived authenticity of the object thus relies on the translation, which can be seen as a kind of spectacle or performance, of the original object.

Westrey Page

REFERENCES

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. 2009. "Introduction: The Translational Turn." *Translation Studies* 2 (1): 2–16.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1980 [1934–1935]. "The Word in the Novel." *Comparative Criticism Yearbook* 2: 213–220.

Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere, eds. 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter.

Benjamin, Walter. 1996 [1923]. "The Task of the Translator." In *Selected Writings*, vol. 1, edited by Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings, 253–263. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Burke, Peter. 2009. *Cultural Hybridity*. Cambridge: Polity.

Clifford, James. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hall, Stuart, and Kuan-Hsing Chen. 1996. "Cultural Studies and the Politics of Internationalization: An interview with Stuart Hall by Kuan-Hsing Chen." In *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, edited by David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, 392–408. London: Routledge.

Langenohl, Andreas, Ralph J. Poole, and Manfred Weinberg, eds. 2015. *Transkulturalität: Klassische Texte*. Bielefeld: transcript.

Visuality

The term "visuality" emerged in the early nineteenth century to describe a metaphorical way of seeing, tying it to the notion of understanding (Mirzoeff 2011, 2). The *OED*, for example, defines visuality as "[t]he state or quality of being visual or visible to the mind; mental visibility." The paradigm of visuality, albeit akin to visual theories and methodologies (see e.g. Rose 2012), is highly asymmetrical, as it presupposes a center of perception where an object can be mentally grasped and rendered recognizable, ultimately involving the agency of "the authority of the visualizer" (Mirzoeff 2011, 2). Knowledge and sight are thus historically intertwined, making visuality a quality of history itself (and pointing beyond this to Michel Foucault's notion of "discourse"). In recent decades, visuality has been criticized as being culturally constructed. Many authors have discussed this notion, including John Berger in *Ways of Seeing* (1972), W. J. T. Mitchell in his numerous publications on image and picture theory, and Nicholas Mirzoeff in *The Right to Look* (2011). This debate is fueled mainly by the fact that Western culture in particular is defined by ocular-centrism, having favored sight as "the noblest sense" since antiquity (Sandywell 2011, 591). In his discussion of the 1889 World's Fair, Timothy Mitchell (1989, 221) exemplifies this condition of the "Western World" as a "thing to be viewed" and constructed with an agenda of representation.

What we see is determined by how we see, and this poses a number of problems. Sight, originally thought to be the most objective sense, is now "presented as highly unreliable" (Hertel 2016, 184–185). Detecting a crisis of visuality in all areas of visual culture, Mirzoeff (2011, 6) pointedly notes "that the visibility of visuality is paradoxically the index of that crisis." This crisis is a result of the realization that the correlation of sight, knowledge, and authority is, in fact, a misconception based on imagination. As such, visuality increasingly coalesces with the notion of spatial thinking and with semiotics, where a dialectic between the icon (after Charles S. Peirce) and visuality becomes evident (Bal 2006, 21–24).

In postcolonial criticism, visuality has been more closely defined and inscribed as a historical mode of perception and of establishing power by colonizers (e.g. Pratt, 2008). This

field-specific use carries a pejorative connotation, although a reversal can be observed where sight is moved away from its mental property towards its corporeality (Mirzoeff 2011; Hertel 2016). In cultural theory, by comparison, Mieke Bal (2002; 2006) uses the term in its most basic definition as a "mental image," thereby pointing to its metaphoricity. By extension, this points to areas worth rethinking in terms of visuality: language as charged by visual tropes, and narrative theory, both dimensions related to the mental and the imaginary. The underlying implication is for visuality to be deconstructed and methodologically reevaluated not with regards to sight, but to language.

Isabella Krayer

REFERENCES

Bal, Mieke. 2002. *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 2006. *Kulturanalyse.* Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Hertel, Ralf. 2016. "The Senses in Literature: From Modernist Shock of Sensation to Postcolonial and Virtual Voices." In *A Cultural History of the Senses in the Modern* Age, edited by David Howes, 173–194. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Mirzoeff, Nicholas. 2011. *The Right to Look: A Counterhistory of Visuality.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mitchell, Timothy. 1989. "The World as Exhibition." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31 (2): 217–236.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 2008. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation.* London: Routledge.

Rose, Gillian. 2012. *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to Researching with Visual Materials.* London: SAGE Publications.

Sandywell, Barry. 2011. *Dictionary of Visual Discourse: A Dialectical Lexicon of Terms.* Farnham: Ashgate.

"Visuality." In: *Oxford English Dictionary (OED).* Accessed September 7, 2017. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/224006?redirectedFrom=visuality&.