

Pauline Bachmann · Melanie Klein · Tomoko Mamine
Georg Vasold (Eds.)

Art/Histories in Transcultural Dynamics

BERLINER SCHRIFTEN
ZUR KUNST

herausgegeben vom

KUNSTHISTORISCHEN INSTITUT
DER FREIEN UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN

2017

Art/Histories in Transcultural Dynamics

Narratives, Concepts, and Practices at Work,
20th and 21st Centuries

Edited by
Pauline Bachmann, Melanie Klein, Tomoko Mamine,
Georg Vasold

Wilhelm Fink

Die Publikation dieses Bandes wurde durch die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft im Rahmen ihrer Förderung der Forschergruppe 1703 *Transkulturelle Verhandlungsräume von Kunst. Komparatistische Perspektiven auf historische Kontexte und aktuelle Konstellationen* ermöglicht. The German Research Foundation (DFG) enabled the publication of this volume with funds provided for Research Unit 1703 *Transcultural Negotiations in the Ambits of Art: Comparative Perspectives on Historical Contexts and Current Constellations*.

Cover illustration:

Ernest Mancoba, Untitled, 1939, ink and watercolour on paper, 26.7 × 20.6 cm
(courtesy of the Estate of Ernest Mancoba / Galerie Mikael Andersen, Copenhagen)

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Dieses Werk sowie einzelne Teile desselben sind urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung in anderen als den gesetzlich zugelassenen Fällen ist ohne vorherige schriftliche Zustimmung des Verlags nicht zulässig.

© 2017 Wilhelm Fink Verlag, ein Imprint der Brill-Gruppe
(Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, Niederlande; Brill USA Inc., Boston MA, USA;
Brill Asia Pte Ltd, Singapore; Brill Deutschland GmbH, Paderborn, Deutschland)

Internet: www.fink.de

Einbandgestaltung: Evelyn Ziegler, München
Herstellung: Brill Deutschland GmbH, Paderborn

ISBN 978-3-7705-5939-8

Contents

Acknowledgements	7
PAULINE BACHMANN / MELANIE KLEIN / TOMOKO MAMINE / GEORG VASOLD Introduction	9
I. NARRATIVES	29
SHIGEMI INAGA Western Modern Masters Measured on the East-Asian Literati Template: Hashimoto Kansetsu and the Kyoto School of Sinology . . .	31
PAOLA IVANOV Rethinking Coevalness: Entangled History and the Objects of Ethnological Museums	47
SYLVESTER OKWUNODU OGBECHIE Art, Nationalism, and Modernist Histories: Writing Art History in Nigeria and South Africa	71
MATTHEW RAMPLEY Evolution, Aesthetics, and World Art	93
GEORG VASOLD The Revaluation of Art History: An Unfinished Project by Josef Strzygowski and His School	119
II. CONCEPTS	139
MICHAEL ASBURY Some Notes on the Contamination and Quarantine of Brazilian Art	141
MELANIE KLEIN Modes of Creation: Art Teaching in South Africa and Uganda between Theory and Practice.	153
TOBIAS WENDL Fictions, Fakes, and Authenticities: A Survey of Artistic Practices from Africa and the Diaspora	169

PARTHA MITTER Jamini Roy: Negotiating the Global from a Local Perspective	195
III. PRACTICES	207
PAULINE BACHMANN Grasping Writing and Form: Neoconcretism between Language and Object	209
BIRGIT HOPFENER Intervention Is the Answer, but What Are the Questions? Developing Criteria for a Critical Examination of Qiu Zhijie's Interventionist Project <i>A Suicidology of the Nanjing Yangtze River Bridge</i>	229
TOMOKO MAMINE Questioning Frames of Art History: Murakami Saburō's Breakthrough in <i>6 Holes</i>	247
JULIANE NOTH Comparing the Histories of Chinese and Western Landscape Painting in 1935: Historiography, Artistic Practice, and a Special Issue of <i>Guohua Yuekan</i>	265
ISABEL WÜNSCHE Transgressing National Borders and Artistic Styles: The November Group and the International Avant-Garde in Berlin during the Interwar Period.	291
IV. PLATES	308
V. APPENDIX	325
List of Contributors	327
Index	331

Acknowledgements

This volume gathers together fourteen essays originally presented at the conference *Questioning Narratives, Negotiating Frameworks. Art/Histories in Transcultural Dynamics, Late 19th to Early 21st Centuries*, which was held from 5 to 7 December 2013 at the Department of Art History at Freie Universität Berlin, and at the Ethnologisches Museum and the Museum für Asiatische Kunst in Berlin. It was the third annual conference of its kind hosted by the DFG Research Unit 1703 *Transcultural Negotiations in the Ambits of Art. Comparative Perspectives on Historical Contexts and Contemporary Constellations*, and it was initiated by the members of the Project Area C *From the Invention of "World Art" to the Decentering of Modernism*.

The research programme of the Unit includes projects on historical periods ranging from the early modern to the late modern period with a focus on the artistic entanglements, exchange, and negotiations between different geographic areas in Africa, the Americas, Asia, and Europe. One of its major aims is to unite regional and historical expertise into a broader scholarly framework that elaborates comparative methodologies and models in order to connect and enrich regional art histories without leveling out their particularities. The book's main title *Art/Histories in Transcultural Dynamics* highlights this endeavour. The term "Art(/)Histories" refers not only to the multiplicity of and potential competition between historical accounts and divergent perspectives, but also stresses the agency of artworks and their often neglected role in the making and shaping of histories. In this context *Transcultural Dynamics* serves as framing device. Here one small caveat is necessary, since we do not consider transculturality to be the ontological state or condition of cultural materials, nor a mere epiphenomenon of recent globalization tendencies. The prefix *trans*, in this case, rather indicates our emphasis on contact, connectedness, and connectivity, and we have deliberately joined it with the term *dynamics* in order to stress the openness, variety and, at times, even contradictory results of transcultural flows and processing, which may include adaptation, appropriation, translation, and transformation as well as resistance and rejection. Our attempt at contributing to the decentering of the hegemonic Western narrative of artistic modernism is combined with a critical re-evaluation of earlier efforts in developing world art histories. The book thus combines critical essays with case studies from Brazil, India, China, Japan, South Africa, Nigeria, and Uganda. As the subtitle indicates, the lines of thematic inquiry include narratives, concepts, and practices. Although heavily interwoven, they appear as major nodes within the larger art historical networks: Narratives are grounded in concepts and practices, concepts and narratives are put into action through practices, and practices in turn frame and reflect what can be conceptualized and narrated.

This volume is the result of a committed team effort and has enjoyed the generous support of various institutions. We would like to express our gratitude to the German Research Foundation (DFG), the Ethnologisches Museum, and the Museum für Asiatische Kunst in Berlin; to our colleagues at the Research Unit; and to

the invited speakers and authors who kindly agreed to contribute to this volume. We would particularly like to thank Pauline Bachmann, Melanie Klein, Tomoko Mamine, and Georg Vasold for their meticulous editorial work; Ulrike Boskamp, Alberto Saviello, Kerstin Schankweiler, and Tobias Vogt for their moderation and comments during the conference; Franziska Lesák for taking the organisation into her capable hands; Saskia Nolte, Doris Rebhan, and Philipp Zobel for their support, whenever it was needed; Hubert Graml, the photographer at the Department of Art History at Freie Universität, for his expertise in dealing with the figures; Jonathan Blower and Angela Roberts for translating and proofreading the contributions; the Department of Art History at Freie Universität for including this volume in their series, *Berliner Schriften zur Kunst*; and, finally, Andreas Knop at Wilhelm Fink Verlag for steering this project toward publication.

Berlin, February 2017

Paola Ivanov, Gregor Stemmerich, Tobias Wendl

PAULINE BACHMANN / MELANIE KLEIN / TOMOKO MAMINE
GEORG VASOLD

Introduction

Since the late nineteenth century, the conceptual and disciplinary frames of reference imposed on non-European art have undergone continuous negotiations, transfigurations, and contestations. Artists, art critics, and art historians throughout the world have challenged the categories of art that were coined in European metropolises within the traditions of academic disciplines such as art history and anthropology.

The beginnings of this process dates back to the decades around 1900 when the dissolution of the historicist paradigm created a severe crisis in European art historical writing. This crisis was characterized by a far-reaching reorientation with regard to substance and methodology. Art scholars, mainly from German-speaking countries, started to reconsider the basic principles of their discipline. They had become increasingly aware of the deficits and inappropriateness of the old, Eurocentric nomenclature, and thus one of their most pressing duties was to consider the introduction of new terms. For instance, in 1891 for the K. K. Österreichisches Handelsmuseum in Vienna's exhibition of Oriental rugs, which brought together more than 500 examples from all parts of Asia and North Africa, the then director, Arthur von Scala, demanded a critical review of the terms in use. Scala admitted that Western scholars were unable to fully grasp the significance of the ornamental design of the rugs or "... to describe it [using] a few confident words." He concluded that "[t]he existing art terminology" needed to be expanded, and that one would not be able to avoid introducing "many new words" in order "to create at least fixed designations for the individual motifs unique to the ornaments of the Orientalrugs [...], to distinguish their origins [...] and their place in the history of art."¹

The Vienna carpet exhibition went far beyond the broad, albeit superficial, Western fascination for Oriental art and culture that was popular at that time: Although nowadays rarely acknowledged, the exhibition was nothing less than a turning point in art historiography. Scala and his team—among them Alois Riegl, one of the first art historians ever to use the term *world art*—sought new ways of approaching *the Orient* and therefore challenged academic art history writing in various aspects. As a merchandiser of textiles, Scala had a limited interest in questions of aesthetics and the normative values of art. Instead, he focused on subjects like trade routes, the working conditions of the weavers, the production of synthetic colours, the differing materiality of the threads, or the meaning of copies and doublets in textiles. In contrast to the "armchair" scholars at the universities, Scala had extensive first-hand knowledge of the regions the carpets came from and the circumstances under which they had been produced. As a member of the Aus-

tro-Hungarian Expedition to Siam, China, and Japan (1868–1871) he began his collection of Asian artefacts at a young age, which he later displayed at the Handelsmuseum in Vienna. The goal of this museum was to popularize Oriental forms and to introduce them into European industrial and craft production. In pursuit of this goal, Scala regularly organized public discussions where artists, art scholars, and economists debated artistic and art historical issues within a wider, mainly economic framework, thus shedding light on the multiple relationships between *the Orient* and *the Occident*.² Scala and his colleagues at the museum were well aware that the best way to encourage serious reflection on Oriental carpets was to contact people who had lived in the regions where these items were made. He invited scholars like George C. M. Birdwood and Sidney J. A. Churchill, who had both worked for the British Empire in India and Persia respectively, to contribute to the impressive three-volume publication produced for the Vienna exhibition.

This is an early example of an encounter with art from outside Europe that questioned the conceptual and disciplinary frameworks of art history as they were executed in Europe. Indeed, it exemplifies some of the problems addressed in this volume: for example, the proper designation of non-Western artefacts, the questionable authority of art historical canons, and the need to expand academic focus to include cross-disciplinary boundaries. The rather intricate title of this anthology is thus a condensation of these and many more issues, which will be further elaborated in the following pages. We will look at how art and its multiple historiographies are entangled with specific narratives and how the theoretical paradigm of a transcultural perspective can highlight the dynamics in the formation of concepts and the practices of art.

Art/Histories

Arthur von Scala's innovations at the Handelsmuseum in Vienna and his search for new and better terms in the face of an incomprehensible wealth of *exotic* forms, was a path-breaking moment for art scholarship in Europe. He addressed all art historians who sought to overcome the Eurocentricity of their discipline in favour of a "universal art horizon."³ Indeed, his goal of enlarging the narrow, Western-centred focus of art scholarship was widely appreciated at the beginning of the twentieth century, even among those art historians who were sceptical about the benefits of this approach.⁴ And it ultimately led to a strong mistrust of the established methods of art history in general. One of the main targets of criticism was the high dependency on the older disciplines of history and philology, which for decades had provided the methodological models for art scholarship in Europe. Some of the most prominent advocates of world art history paradoxically wanted to overcome *history*, that is, the notion of a linear historic development of art. They repeatedly denounced this traditional historical approach as an "aberration."⁵ Influenced by diffusionist theories, which around 1900 were quite new and offered an alternative to the then dominant evolutionist paradigm, art scholars increasingly began to

write about synchronic models in art history, introducing terms like “cultural areas” (*Kulturkreise*) and artistic “reciprocities” (*Wechselwirkungen*). For Oskar Bayer and Josef Strzygowski (the latter strongly influenced by Friedrich Ratzel) *world art history* should not be based on the “blindly over-estimated philological-historical [...] method,”⁶ since such a method, they claimed, was not able to adequately analyse the artefacts of illiterate peoples and cultures. Instead, it was necessary to focus on what they repeatedly called the *liveliness of art*, which included engagement with contemporary artists and especially with artistic practises. It is no coincidence that Josef Strzygowski and his circle were most interested in what happened at the Bauhaus, and at art schools in general.

Another characteristic of these early attempts to write a world art history was a critical questioning of the premises of a national art history. As Michel Espagne has recently underlined, it was around 1900—when national and nationalistic narratives reached their apex in Europe—that several French, German, and Austrian art historians were proposing alternatives to the dominant discourse. Instead of praising the *national* heritage of art and looking for the origins of what was perceived as the domestic, *own* culture, and instead of tracing a linear, national development of iconographies and forms, they chose to focus on an international scope and intended to write “a history of transfers and encounters.”⁷ Since many of these art historians were experts on the art of the Late Antiquity and the Migration Period, they often carefully described processes of artistic exchanges and imbrications. Julius von Schlosser, for instance, who for years worked at the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna at the department for ancient coins (a mobile, border-crossing medium par excellence), emphasized the innovative potential of migration in general. His argument was that the process of mobility—of migrating motifs—necessarily produces a cultural surplus: it is not a case of mere replication, but rather of constant metamorphosis, generating new and innovative artistic solutions. According to Schlosser, these “transformations” (*Umwandlungsprozesse*) and “wondrous interminglings” (*wunderbarliche Durchmischungen*) were the ultimate principles of all art; they constituted the very foundations upon which all art rests.⁸ “This process is typical of the way in which old, seemingly outmoded and discarded forms are able to find a new, more vigorous lease of life as they assimilate to new, often fortuitous ideas. But it is also typical of formal development in general.”⁹

As a matter of course, one might argue that this focus on the early attempts to create a *world art history* through the revision of its terms and methods are still trapped in a Eurocentric approach. Only when European art historians were confronted with *other* art did they feel the need to expand their methodological framework and rethink the discipline as a whole, while the possibility of historicizations from other places did not play any role in this reconceptualization. Yet it shows that European art historians at that historical moment were far more open to conceptualizing art in a way that has only recently become fashionable again.¹⁰ Thus, Michel Espagne is correct to call for an investigation of these forgotten concepts and for scholars to “re-read the historiography of art from the standpoint of the accent placed on exchanges.”¹¹

In non-European contexts the responses to the art historical gaze from the *West* were expressed in various ways. The significance of the partners of European art historians during these processes of exchange as well as of the mediators and interpreters who selected, prepared, and transmitted objects and knowledge cannot be overestimated. The extension of the infrastructures released by imperialist politics accelerated the mobility of information, objects, and persons. Key figures of cultural exchange come to mind in this context, such as the Indian cultural and social reformer Rabindranath Tagore and the Japanese art scholar and curator Okakura Tenshin, who actually met Tagore in Calcutta on his travels to India in 1902 where they exchanged ideas on different conceptualizations of Asia.¹² As Inaga and Noth point out in this volume, exchanges between Japanese and Chinese art protagonists generated narratives and practices that reflected and critically responded to Western concepts and theories. As the case of Japan reveals, the introduction of the notion of *art* and its institutionalized system entailed shifts and refractions of Western concepts such as modern, avant-garde, high and low, fine art and craft. We should also remember that Western concepts were applied within Japan's own nationalist and imperialist politics in Asia.

Without non-European agents and the relatively unknown interpreters, merchants, collectors, intellectuals, and artists, there would not have been any basis for transcultural exchange. Like Tagore and Tenshin they also increasingly connected with each other beyond the contexts dominated by the West. Numerous protagonists, however, remained excluded, and there were strong disparities within these movements. The US-American writer and philosopher Alain L. Locke, for example, challenged the idea that Afro-American artists should primarily represent black experience and develop an *authentic* black aesthetics. Instead, he emphasized each artist's individuality and self-expression and criticized the concurrent tendency toward a ghettoization of black aesthetics that was actuated, in his view, by intellectuals such as W. E. B. Du Bois. Locke's volume *The New Negro* from 1925 was the cornerstone of the Harlem Renaissance in New York. His educational path led him to Oxford in 1907, where he met the later founder and president of the African National Congress, Pixley ka Isaka Seme, and eventually to the University of Berlin in 1910.¹³ In Berlin Locke studied under the sociologist Georg Simmel and amplified his interest in value theory, which culminated in his development of "cultural relativism,"¹⁴ a scientific approach to understanding different communities of values as equivalent and in relation to each other. His "principle of cultural reciprocity"¹⁵ as part of cultural relativism promoted a neutral and tolerant stance in cultural exchange and seemed to think beyond Simmel's *Wechselwirkungen*, or the reciprocal effects inherent in social dynamics.

The 1950s witnessed a new wave of interest in non-European art in the West. Due to geopolitical changes, and motivated by the need to overcome the totalitarian spirit in science and art, art historians, museum curators, writers, and critics throughout Europe were eagerly engaged in a reevaluation of non-Western art: this is certainly true for Paris where André Malraux celebrated the "langage universel de l'art"¹⁶; it is also true for Basel where the young Werner Schmalenbach wrote his

dissertation on the impact of African art on Western modernism; and it also applies to Prague where the Náprstek-Museum published its rich collection of Asian, African, and Oceanic artefacts. The German-speaking countries deserve special attention insofar as art historians such as Dagobert Frey or Karl Maria Swoboda re-animated some of the ideas of the interwar period. In 1949 Frey unfolded his theory of a comparative art history in order to illustrate the “interactive tension”¹⁷ (*wechselseitiges Spannungsverhältnis*) between the various art regions of the world. Karl Maria Swoboda in turn sought to expand the focus of art history at universities, changing the curricula and obliging his students to learn not just about European but also about Indian and East Asian art. These academic endeavours were accompanied by a political intention to broaden the general knowledge about Asian and African art. In 1954, for instance, the first volume of the *UNESCO Sammlung der Weltkunst* (*UNESCO Collection of World Art*) came out. This book series, initiated by the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization in cooperation with the New York Graphic Society, was successful, and it was soon followed by another series on *world art* entitled *Kunst der Welt* (*Art of the World*).¹⁸ This wave of publications has to be judged within a broader political framework, which once again claimed the equality of all art forms in the world—as did the simultaneous discourse on the universal language of abstraction—as a means of pacification. But it is telling that most of these books were written by Western scholars who, though constantly reflecting on the value of artistic exchanges, were obviously not very interested in collaborating with colleagues in non-European countries. As a consequence, all the above-mentioned books were written, more or less exclusively, from a Western standpoint.

In Japan, encyclopaedias on *world art* (*sekai bijutsu*) embracing Asian art histories as well as a Western canon of art history from prehistory to contemporary art had been popular since the 1930s and were re-edited in the 1950s.¹⁹ Newly founded art magazines also featured art and artefacts from different times from all over the world, thus taking up the principles represented by UNESCO and the notion of reconstruction or protection of cultural heritages. Japanese artists and critics frequently used the terms for world (*sekai*), *sekai-teki* (accepted or valid worldwide) and *sekai-sei* (world character, globality). There was a belief that “achieving both globality (*sekaisei*) and humanness will constitute the basis for freedom.”²⁰ Indeed, global entanglements were recognized as inescapable, since “the distances in the world have reduced, and from a ship on the Pacific Ocean to Tokyo, from a hotel in Tokyo to the Arabic deserts runs telecommunication. Even when we close the windows, in any form of individual life we cannot get outside the global relation (*sekai kanren*).”²¹ This global rhetoric has to be understood against the backdrop of Japan’s efforts to “catch up” not only in politics and economy but also in art, an impulse that was rooted in what Bert Winther-Tamaki has described as “artistic nationalism.”²²

Although the *world art* historians of the 1950s knew that their work had strong political implications, surprisingly they rarely questioned the implicit power constellations of art historiography and only very seldom asked how narratives, con-

cepts, and even practices were put to the service of ideologies. Instead, they shared the rhetoric of universal humanity, which was considered morally incontestable after the devastating experiences of the Second World War.

Transcultural Dynamics

As a by-product of his 1940 study on the cultural impact of tobacco and sugar production in his country, the Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz coined the term “transculturation.”²³ In a rather poetic historical analysis of the cultural, social, and economic impact of the two products in Cuba, he showed that their cultivation and use in the global economy had a seminal impact on Cuba’s ethnic and social composition. This essay was still strongly informed by the *mestizaje* discourse in Latin America that dealt with the ethnic and cultural mixing of the different people that met on the continent, namely between people of European, indigenous, and African descent. During the 1980s and early 1990s the term entered literary studies, with the Uruguayan author Ángel Rama²⁴ and the US-American literary scholar Mary Louise Pratt²⁵ as its most prominent exponents. The latter alluded explicitly to the selective character of transcultural collaboration, which shifted seemingly preassigned distributions of power and disclosed power asymmetries. Transculturation, according to Pratt, indicates a scope of action for subordinate societies and people who would “determine to varying extents what gets absorbed into their own [culture] and what it gets used for.”²⁶ Later studies more specifically claim—again with reference to Ortiz—the need to take into account the entanglement of transculturation with violence, loss, and resistance.²⁷ Others have defined a transcultural historiography as an approach that has to include a self-reflexive perspective and should follow the logic of agents involved in transcultural encounters as well as their movements and historical connections, rather than postulating traditional reference parameters such as culture, civilization, or nation.²⁸ The most recent studies have revealed a teleological or even evolutionary understanding of transcultural processes that were already implicit in Ortiz’s conception of the term.²⁹ They are positioned, however, at a distance from the rather positivistic implications in the employment of transculturality.³⁰

In this anthology we suggest a transcultural perspective rather than an ontology of transculturality. Conflicts, incommensurabilities, and specific forms of appropriation in transcultural exchanges are addressed in the same way as the power relations that accompany them. Case studies that historicize narratives, concepts, and practices are crucial to understanding a transcultural research approach as an engagement in processes rather than the description of specific conditions; they aim at abetting multiple perspectives. To speak of transcultural dynamics emphasizes the movements, migrations, alliances, and relations in the production of art and in the formation of art histories.

Social dynamics in general examine interactions and movements of individuals as well as groups of people—that is, within groups and between groups. As a re-

sult, dynamics—whether merely physical, social, or cultural—stand for a comprehension of parameters initiating processes, motions, flows, circulations and, eventually, interactions that lead to specific forms of narrations, concepts, and practices. Analysing social and cultural dynamics are thus adjoined to studies on mobilities, which was a term that was coined by the sociologist John Urry.³¹ For Urry and his colleagues “mobility research [also] includes movements of images and information on local, national, and global media.”³² However, they as well as their supporters—such as the human geographers Tim Cresswell and Peter Merriman³³—constantly point out that mobilities can only be thought of in relation to *moorings*, a concept that is also discussed by our colleagues Juliane Noth and Joachim Rees in their introduction to the volume *The Itineraries of Art: Topographies of Artistic Mobility in Europe and Asia*.³⁴ Referring to Cresswell, Noth and Rees especially emphasize the difference between his approach and earlier binary constructions such as, for example, James Clifford’s “roots” and “routes,”³⁵ and they write that here “movement and stasis are not considered categorical, but gradual differences.”³⁶ These ideas of mobility and moorings, borrowed from cultural geography, as well as the dialectical process of cultural formations, the crossing and demarcations of borders,³⁷ the de-territorialization and subsequent re-territorialization of cultural spaces are all at the core of what we consider a transcultural perspective in art history and the “overcoming of polarities.”³⁸ A similar reassessment of the workings of objects and people in motion, which are nonetheless in connection with transcultural processes, is also made by Antje Flüchter and Jivanta Schöttli, both members of the Cluster of Excellence *Asia and Europe in a Global Context* at Heidelberg University. In their publication *The Dynamics of Transculturality: Concepts and Institutions in Motion* they criticize the tendency in recent scholarship to merely perceive transculturality as a given, generalizing fact and the tendency to omit the concrete modalities of processes and the dynamics inherent to it.³⁹ Instead, they ask “how transculturality occurs and whether there is any variation in the impact or in the dynamics propelling it.”⁴⁰ With this, the somewhat vague idea of analysing dynamics and indeed transcultural dynamics within art historical narratives, concepts, and practices can be rendered more precisely by acknowledging not only the mechanisms of entangled constitutive processes beyond cultural fixations but also their variations, nuances, and hierarchies.

According to Flüchter and Schöttli, a historicization of the chronological notion of *dynamics* reveals that they are conceptualized first as merely unidirectional flows and that they eventually become systems of interaction and negotiation.⁴¹ Acknowledging interactions in transcultural dynamics in combination with postcolonial and gender-related approaches, however, must address power asymmetries; it has to be combined with a questioning of the contexts and power constellations in which such interactions took place. Different scopes of action must be examined just as closely as their potentially restricting frameworks. In this respect, Boaventura de Sousa Santos rightly warns us about the “reciprocity trap: the idea that the ‘others,’ as victims of [W]estern stereotypes, have the same power—because they have the same legitimacy—to construct stereotypes regarding the West.”⁴²

Entanglements of Narratives, Concepts, and Practices

This volume traces transcultural dynamics at the intersection between narratives, concepts, and practices of art. It critically engages with the social, political, economic, cultural, and aesthetic values and hierarchies transported by Western *master narratives*. A particular emphasis is given to core concepts of modern and contemporary art and art historiography such as the avant-garde, the modernity of art and society, and its concomitant catchwords of authenticity and originality.

In 1936, Alfred J. Barr, then director of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, presented his famous diagram of the history of abstract art for the exhibition *Cubism and Abstract Art*, building a genealogy from the post-impressionists—only men—to the two strands of abstract art: non-geometrical and geometrical. This visualization became iconic for the canon of Western modern art history although it was only one part of Barr's series of exhibitions and was followed by the exhibition *Fantastic Art, Dada, Surrealism*. Although the diagram took non-European art into consideration, it was highlighted in red, as art's *other*, together with the category *machine aesthetic*. Barr's visualization only mentioned non-European art as unspecified ahistorical *traditions* and as a source of inspiration to Western artists—a thoroughly Eurocentric approach. Something similar occurred in 1937 when Barr organized an exhibition of rock painting in which he tried to set up a dialogue between Western avant-garde and prehistoric art from Africa and Europe; the intention was to appropriate the latter in order to pursue a diachronic history of modernism that placed Western artists, such as Jean Arp or Paul Klee, at its apex.

Although responses to the Western narrative of *modern art* and *modernism* in other world regions were manifold, they had in common a heightened awareness of its rootedness in Western culture. In Japan, *modernization* (*kindaika*) began in the second half of the nineteenth century when the knowledge and the techniques of European countries and the United States were imported in order to establish the country as a modern nation state within world history. Japan's ambitions oscillated between competing with *the West* and assertion of its superiority within Asia, which paved the way for the country's growing imperialism and ultimate claim of surpassing *the modern West*. It was in this context that traditional arts and Western art, treated in different registers, were set against each other and that tradition was perceived as avant-garde if it offered something that was seen to surpass Western modernity.⁴³ Notions of Japanese tradition were also reevaluated by Western audiences and actually had a big impact on European and US-American architecture and design in the 1920s and 1930s. After the Second World War, under the motto of *inter-nationalism*, the dichotomization of Japanese tradition and Western modernity re-emerged in the reception of Japanese art. Thus, Japanese traditional cultures were seen as a resource which could be used to overcome Western modernity.

In Latin America, modernity arrived as a European model for economic growth that brought with it the implied promise of turning Latin American nation states into equal counterparts. The concept was thus formed as part of a dualism whose supposed opposite was "tradition." Néstor García Canclini was the first to question

this dualism, and he highlighted in his seminal study *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*⁴⁴ that modernity was in fact the product of interaction between different temporalities. Focusing on aesthetic issues, he also examined how modernism in Latin America was produced in the context of a colonial set of power relations and its engendered market logic, and within the ideological frameworks and philosophical accounts of modern art as coined in Europe. In the context of Latin American Subaltern Studies the concept of modernity was challenged by a focus on the coloniality of power, which identifies colonial power structures, as well as their forms of knowledge production and organization, as the constitutive factor in the state of modernity.⁴⁵ The most prominent theorists within this field, Aníbal Quijano and Walter D. Mignolo, conceptualized the “colonial matrix of power” as the *other*, darker side of modernity, which is seen as a genuinely—and in part continuing—European narrative that persists in the present day.⁴⁶ Modernity, they state, thus developed with a different vigour and potential in each region of the world.

The term *avant-garde* refers to a historical *avant-garde* of Europe that formed during the late nineteenth century and to artists that transgressed the mainstream art practices that were promoted by established art institutions and art academies in particular. Instead of taking the term *avant-garde* as a given, shifts that occur with its application in different historical contexts have to be taken into consideration. In Japan in the late nineteenth century, European art institutions and practices were introduced during the country’s modernization efforts, and both *avant-garde* art as well as academic art from Europe were imported at the same time. On the one hand, negotiations with *avant-garde* art entailed negotiations between Japanese and European traditional *and* modern art; on the other, Japanese artists and art historians sojourning in Europe and the United States during the interwar years—such as Murayama Tomoyoshi in Berlin, Okamoto Tarō in Paris, as well as Mizutani Takehiko, Yamawaki Iwao and Michiko at the Bauhaus in Dessau—provided important impulses to internationalist *avant-garde* art movements. After returning to Japan, they retranslated these *avant-garde* ideas at home. In Latin America, artists who referred to themselves as *avant-garde* in the early twentieth century primarily sought to emancipate themselves from national or regional art production. It was only in the 1950s that artists conceptualized their *avant-garde* practices as being in direct opposition to European and North American art. At the same time, and in contrast to Western artists, they collaborated largely with the recently established art institutions instead of breaking with them. In Brazil, for example, museums of modern art played a major role in the development of the *avant-garde*.

In Africa, an *avant-garde* movement, as such, did not occur in most countries.⁴⁷ In this context, one speaks rather of *avant-garde* activities that were pursued by individual artists from the continent. Artists such as Ernest Mancoba left Africa for the European centres of the *avant-garde*: Paris, London, or Berlin. Mancoba left South Africa for Paris in 1938 and later became a founding member of the CoBrA group. The difficulty and often impossibility of connecting to *avant-garde* movements in Europe, especially for black artists from Africa, is exemplified by Manco-

ba's peripheral status within this group⁴⁸ and by the neglect of his work in mainstream art historical narratives. Here, he is constructed as an *authentic* medium through which the European CoBrA members could make "immediate contact with African art."⁴⁹ Mancoba only actually came into contact with classic African art through the books he was able to obtain in the cosmopolitan atmosphere of Cape Town in the 1930s. For white South African artists it was easier to gain access to avant-garde associations in Europe. As Isabel Wünsche points out in this volume, Irma Stern, for example, was a member of the November Group, which was a platform for artistic exchange across national borders. Walter Battiss, another artist from South Africa co-founded the New Group, which later opposed the conservatism in South African art in the late 1930s but was initially formed as a union to improve working conditions for artists. Battiss was one of the first artists in the country to develop an interest in the rock art of the San, and he developed a distinctive modernistic style with reference to their art. In Egypt, the group Art et Liberté was founded by Egyptian surrealists in 1939 as part of the International Federation of Independent Revolutionary Art, FIARI for short, which was inaugurated in Mexico at the home of Frida Kahlo and Diego Rivera one year earlier. The group promoted the liberty of expression, rejected the previous oppositional stance against art from Europe, and shared FIARI's criticism of the reactionary cultural politics in Germany, Italy, and Spain in their manifesto *Vive l'art dégénéré* from 1938. Yet, apart from being open to artistic trends in Europe, artists in Egypt also reacted to the immediate social and historical situation in the country. Similar to the avant-garde in Brazil, the Egyptian surrealists did not entirely reject antecedent art production as too bourgeois. Apart from the innovative relevance of their art, they rather actuated the art scene in Cairo as part of an international network and thus countered the topos of a delayed modernity.⁵⁰

Closely connected to and intersected with the different narratives, concepts, and practices of the avant-garde and modernity were the notions of authenticity and originality, which were seemingly divided into the topoi of authenticity of the *other* and the constantly evolving originality of European and US-American art. However, tracing transcultural encounters reveals a more complex application and appropriation of these concepts.

Exploring the conceptualizations of various authenticities promises in-depth insight into transcultural phenomena, as they are highly dependent on historical contexts and transdisciplinary as well as transregional interactions. The renaissance of the concept of authenticity in recent years reflects an increasing awareness of the need to historicize anthropology and its paradigms, which used authenticity as one of its major parameters. While the concept of originality gained increasing importance in the theorization of the creative and innovative subjectivities of artists in Europe from the second half of the eighteenth century onwards, the relevance of authenticity in aesthetic discourses became apparent with the autonomy of aesthetics and the subjectification of taste that was already appearing in Dominique Bouhours' *La manière de bien penser dans les ouvrages de l'esprit* from 1687.⁵¹ This autonomy, connected to a fictive agency to authenticate, was subsequently transferred

to the figure of the artist as genius and started its inexorable march towards European modernity as well as the historical avant-garde.⁵² It is crucial, however, not only to mention but also to actually bring into focus that the concepts of authenticity and originality never included a linear development. On the contrary, both concepts always incurred severe criticism. Above all, the constructions and definitions of authenticity as well as originality have always also executed processes of othering and have included, and still include, attributions such as the *primitive*, the *naïve*, or the *aberrant* as well as specific experiences of the *other* such as suffering, trauma, and discrimination. These power asymmetries in the definition of different authenticities in particular, have rarely been addressed within the ambit of art.⁵³

Since the late nineteenth century, discourses on originality and authenticity were a central paradigm in the assessment of Japanese art in relation to a Western-centric art historical narrative. Japan's transformation project into a modern nation state and empire was considered an imitation of Western institutions and techniques. Thus, in the eyes of Western art historians, modern approaches by Japanese artists were seen as derivative while traditional arts were seen as authentically Japanese. Japanese artists and art critics were acutely aware of their peripheral position within the internationalizing art world ruled by the Euro-American centres. Their discourses and practices developed around the question of how Japanese art could achieve an "international contemporaneity"—that is, international relevance—in view of these structures either by referring to traditions or by actively engaging with the Western art movements.⁵⁴ However, the judgment of imitation and the denial of originality by both Western and Japanese art criticism continued to haunt artists in Japan up to the 1970s.

In Brazil, the discourse on originality was contested by the invention of the concept of *cultural anthropophagy* in the late 1920s. Faced with an implicit allegation of merely copying European styles and values, the poet Oswald de Andrade wrote the "Cannibalist Manifesto."⁵⁵ Drawing on the modernist primitivists' fascination for tribal cannibalism in Latin America, Andrade used anthropophagy as a metaphor for the cultural practice of *devouring* the cultural baggage of all ethnic groups in the country—namely indigenous, African, and European—in order to produce something new. The concept was then taken up by artists in the early 1970s who positioned their own production against the domination of US-American mass culture. In a historical examination of Brazilian identity, the literary critic Roberto Schwarz claims that Brazilian culture possesses an inauthentic nature, as it only exists as a copy or imitation. This had led to the existence of different Brazils with various cultural backgrounds; the European oriented culture of the upper classes and the different cultural references practiced by the uneducated masses. However, Schwarz argues that copying and imitating is a value-free cultural technique that only obtained a negative connotation when it was based on the myth of *creation ex nihilo*. And in Brazil the negative effect is increased by the social fragmentation of Brazilian society.⁵⁶

The concepts of avant-garde, modernity, originality, and authenticity as well as the artistic virtues of innovation, self-reflexivity, and criticism that trail closely be-

hind are intertwined within the history of modern art; they remain relevant criteria of contemporary art today. Yet these concepts have led to and were formed by very different narratives and artistic practices. They were highly dependent on the propositions made by artists, art historians, and theorists and their respective position within local and global networks. The concepts have thus to be traced via the different transformative processes they undergo when entering transcultural contexts or what Mieke Bal in reference to Jonathan Culler has called “enframements.”⁵⁷ Transcultural art history must take these aspects into account, and is therefore prompted to reflect on power relations and on asymmetrical, non-hegemonic constellations in art *and* art history at the same time. This, however, also means that art history must occasionally go beyond narrow disciplinary boundaries to cooperate with colleagues from other disciplines such as political sciences, social sciences, or economics.⁵⁸ The goal of this approach is to contextualize cultural phenomena and to analyse formations of discourses and practices to create a “thick translation.”⁵⁹ We therefore intend to look at the narratives, concepts, and practices at work when art is conceived, produced, presented, communicated, taught, consumed, debated, criticized, understood, misunderstood, and handed down from one generation to the next. We look at the interplays, fault lines, and conflicts between local infrastructures and discursive superstructures. And we pay special attention to the specific historical situations framing individual courses and scopes of action.

Structure of the Volume

We have grouped the case studies in this volume into three blocks: narratives, concepts, and practices. First, specific emphasis will be laid upon the reconstruction of what we would like to call the alternative historiographies of modernity. Long ignored and forgotten artistic as well as art historical narratives—most often ambitious attempts to counter the still dominant master narrative of Western modernity with its experiences of exclusion—are excavated and recalled. In the following case studies, we will thus present different readings of the art of the twentieth century.

Narratives

Contributions in this chapter examine how and under which historical conditions historiographical narrations on art have been generated in Africa, Asia, and Europe in response to the geopolitical interventions of Western countries and their aftermath from the late nineteenth century up to the twenty-first century. The increased and often enforced mobility of people, objects, and knowledge urged artists, anthropologists, art historians, and other cultural agents to construct theories and categorizations about the art of different societies. While discursive power was distributed unequally in favour of Western travellers, protagonists in perambulated cultures developed alternative narratives and counter-narratives questioning the premises of the art historiographical paradigms dominated by the West. Cultural

self-conceptions were and still are constantly contested and negotiated on all sides in this complex situation. The studies in this chapter outline the specific venues and media in which these negotiations took place, and they highlight the backgrounds and intentions of the respective agents. They examine terminologies as well as the models of legitimization and valorization which led to the invention of traditions, lineages, and genealogies.

SHIGEMI INAGA retraces transcultural entanglements of Japanese and Chinese artists and intellectuals in the first decades of the twentieth century and shows how, in this constellation, considerations of Western aesthetics stimulated the reevaluation and reinvention of Oriental traditions by Japanese artists and intellectuals. Thus, Inaga demonstrates the impacts of friction and (re)fracture in the processes of cultural translation and activates a perspective and agency that challenges the Eurocentrism of art historical narratives that are still virulent in the stories of cultural exchange between Japan and Europe. PAOLA IVANOV discusses the denial of coevalness for non-Euro-American peoples; that is, she explores a mode of thinking which ascribed to them an isolated position in time and space without contextualizing their artistic practices and transcultural encounters. Museum collections reflect the omission of Africa's shared history and transcultural connectedness as well as the resulting "hybrid" objects, in favour of a fiction of "authentic" timelessness. Acknowledging and theorizing coevalness thus mirrors both the connectedness to and autonomy from Western developments. She argues that both African and European societies have been part of the same geopolitical conditions since (at least) the fifteenth century; in the nineteenth century, for example, African as well as European societies developed specific artistic reactions to structurally similar, coeval conditions, albeit with different aesthetic results. SYLVESTER OGBECHIE makes an assessment of art historiographies. Using the examples of two anthologies from South Africa and Nigeria he elaborates on the development of national narratives of modern art and the question of the relevance of art in the production of meaning and nation building. Nigerian art history has thus far tended to highlight individuals or schools, but the new book is a more comprehensive overview of Nigeria's history and art production. It describes modern Nigerian art as being influenced by both indigenous and foreign aesthetics. Both books engage in acts of inscription, albeit under different parameters, and rewrite art history between national sensitivities and specificities as well as global interconnectedness. The fundamental question, how to write *world art* history without establishing new hierarchies and mechanisms of exclusion, is at the centre of MATTHEW RAMPLEY's essay. He critically analyses the growing amount of literature on socio-biology, whose supporters causally connect biology with cultural and artistic emanations, claiming that the natural sciences can offer an explanation for the diversity of global artistic practices. Rampley convincingly points out that these ideas are deeply rooted in scientific discourses from the nineteenth century. As a consequence, he warns of widespread Neo-Darwinist approaches and the return of evolutionary theories in the field of global art history. GEORG VASOLD also looks back into the history of the discipline, but is mainly concerned with the interwar period. He examines the activities of the

Viennese art historian Josef Strzygowski and his school, who for years eagerly struggled for a general, not just academic, acceptance of *world art history*. Vasold traces the attempts to establish an alternative and entirely new type of art historical research by establishing a worldwide scholarly network, founding journals, and even using new media such as film and radio. This highly ambitious project, however, failed in the end, not just because of methodological contradictions, but also because of Strzygowski's growing radical ideas and convictions.

Concepts

Concepts generate the specific preconditions for art historical narratives and artistic practices. They shape and are shaped by these narratives and practices; they constantly emerge anew and determine the production and reception of artistic objects; and they are penetrable and open to debates and to new encounters. In this sense, and in Mieke Bal's sense, it is important to realize that appropriating and agreeing to artistic concepts "does not mean agreeing on content, but agreeing on the basic rules of the game: If you use a concept at all, you use it in a particular way, so that you can meaningfully disagree on content."⁶⁰ More than a specific method, the analysis of concepts thus exposes the interplay between objects and their frames of reference, between artworks and mediating agents. Disagreement, defiance, and incommensurability are the self-evident dimensions of these interplays.

Apart from acknowledging a concept's restive potency when entering transcultural contact zones, the idea of its mobility needs some attention as well. Doris Bachmann-Medick, for example, rightly asks if the displacement of concepts from Western academia to other sites—geographically or disciplinary—does actually entail a critical or even provincializing stance towards them. She objects that "the magic word 'mobility' is [...] powerless unless the theories and concepts we work with become 'localized.'"⁶¹ Bachmann-Medick's plea thus brings us back to the focus of our research on transcultural *dynamics* and the necessity for an increasing awareness of unevenly distributed forms of agency. Our understanding of a transcultural perspective introduces concepts in their capacity as entanglements rather than freely travelling discursive entities. In this volume, authors attempt to reconstruct the emergence of concepts in both historic and present-day ambits of art as well as the underlying asymmetries of power and participation.

MICHAEL ASBURY's essay deals with the double vision of Brazilian contemporary art in the global art world. He analyses how the change of perception within the global art world in the particular case of Brazilian art does not necessarily abolish the problem of exclusion of *other* modern and contemporary art, but merely changes its notion and chain of arguments. Asbury uses the concept of contamination in order to investigate these changes. He argues that previously, Brazilian art was excluded from the global art world because of its supposedly derivative nature. Paradoxically, it is now exactly this nature that is highlighted as something specifically Brazilian. In her contribution MELANIE KLEIN looks at art-educational venues in

South Africa and Uganda and therein-negotiated aesthetic concepts such as the *authentic*, the *original*, or the *typically* African. By tracing the application, appropriation, and transformation of these concepts in art teaching and art production by four cultural agents of African and European origin, she reveals a transcultural panorama not only in describing the relational character of such processes but also by means of consulting their circumjacent frameworks. An attentive comprehension of these frameworks is all the more important when mapping the possibilities of artistic agency. The practice of artistic fakes and fictional projects as a way of dealing with the questions of originality and authenticity that are implicit in Western expectations of art from Africa is addressed by TOBIAS WENDL. He presents a series of meticulous case studies of contemporary artists' practices from different African countries. This contribution traces how these artists position themselves in a global art world that is still based on the Western concepts and expectations of local markers of identification, and how the artist uses these concepts and sometimes transforms its connotations. Wendl identifies approaches to *Africanness* that range from using it as a creative repository to being strategically non-committal about attributions such as African, post-ethnic, or even global. PARTHA MITTER's essay draws on the concept of modernity and its relation to non-Western art practices. He elaborates on the complex and multifaceted reasons for an increasing cultural exchange between India and especially Germany in the 1920s, and acknowledges both the authority of the Western modernist canon as well as the Indian artists who resolved this dominance with their own artistic solutions. He claims a decentred and provincializing view on modernisms in Dipesh Chakrabarty's sense and thus the relevance (and necessity—reacting to James Elkins' recent denial of such) of non-Western contributions to a global modernism. With the example of primitivism as a social critique of modernity, Mitter draws analogies between similar discourses in India and Europe. Even if there were no formal affinities, Mitter nevertheless develops the idea of structural affinity between these critical impulses as a common stance against the pitfalls of modernity. Using primitivism as a weapon for colonized people and as a way of returning the Western gaze, however, differed thoroughly from the intellectual objectives in Europe.

Practices

The essays assembled in this chapter focus on the interstice between artists and objects. Artists have always been challenged and inspired by past and present material cultures and artistic traditions from all over the world. The authors in this section treat the question of how artists deal with their actual or imaginary, theoretical or cultural mobility and versatility and how this condenses in artistic objects. They trace the different ways of relating to objects that are dependent on the place of articulation and on the cultural context that manifests in artists' practices and eventual artworks. In order to escape or to overcome the incorporation into hegemonic narratives and academic categorizations, many artists developed new ways of coping with these often ethnically, nationally, or culturally connoted as-

criptions. Highly aware of the modes and effects of how their artworks were presented and discussed, they took up a position against existing art historical narratives or produced their own, claiming self-explanatory validity for their works. The essays disclose that the artists' oeuvres often released ambiguous interpretative frameworks to contemporaneous and later audiences that were challenging established art historical narratives and categories. They reveal the ways in which the correspondent reception rather depended and continues to depend on the distribution of political, economic, social, and discursive power.

PAULINE BACHMANN examines the intersection of visual art and poetry in the Brazilian Neoconcrete movement (1959–1961). She argues that the collaborative practice of poets and visual artists changed the notion of constructivist thought and opened it up to the production of haptic and body-focused artworks. The book as a tactile object and container of language plays a central role in this. Closely exploring Lygia Pape's and Ferreira Gullar's experiments, her essay also presents a counter-narrative to the construction of Lygia Clark and Hélio Oiticica as the founders of body-centred art in Brazil. BIRGIT HOPFENER's contribution deals with interventionist and socially engaged art in China today, focusing on Qiu Zhijie's project *A Suicidology of the Nanjing Yangtze River Bridge* (2008–) and his theoretical reflections on *Total Art*. Hopfener argues that this concept has been transculturally engendered as a critique of the dualist thinking between art and life. This dualism is conceived as both the result of Western epistemology as well as Chinese social and cultural histories, which are in turn based on traditions of thought, such as Neo-Confucianism, and their concepts of the relationship between individual self, society, and history. She thus discloses the pitfalls of art historical assumptions about the relationship between criticism and interventionist art. TOMOKO MAMINE examines the challenges Murakami Saburō's work *6 Holes* (1955) poses to art historical categorization and contextualization. She demonstrates that Murakami's *6 Holes*, widely perceived as iconic for the activities of the Japanese artist group Gutai Art Association (1954–1972), defies all attempts of unequivocal determination through art historical and cultural framings and categories. The extent to which Western art historical narratives were discussed and critically adopted in China in the mid-1930s in order to re-evaluate their own artistic tradition, is explored by JULIANE NOTH. By taking a comparative look at European and Chinese art histories, Noth demonstrates how in Shanghai a handful of prominent painters sought to overcome the "crisis" and "morbidity" of Chinese contemporary art and culture. This happened at a politically precarious moment when, due to the Japanese military expansion in China, a renewed interest in traditionalist art occurred. For the Shanghai painters, European — in particular, French — art theories on impressionism and the discourse on classicism versus naturalism was a welcome means with which to revalue domestic landscape painting traditions. However, this did not happen on a purely theoretical level but also had consequences for artistic practices, since in 1930s China outdoor sketching was increasingly perceived as the hallmark of modern painting practice. ISABEL WÜNSCHE's contribution is a call for the revision of the history of Western modernity and a plea for the enlargement of the

geography of modern art. Instead of focusing on Paris and New York as the artistic centres of the avant-garde, Wünsche reminds us of the complex cultural and political situation of interwar Berlin and the role that the (now less known) November Group played in it. Far from being a homogenous art collective, the November Group was a platform of exchange for artists from various national and cultural backgrounds who represented a variety of stylistic orientations and artistic expressions. For the members of this group, who came for the most part from Eastern Europe, the basic idea of modern art lay in the intention to overcome national(istic) paradigms and discourses. Thus, the artistic and political agenda of the November Group aimed at defending the idea of crossing borders and of transgressing boundaries.

Notes

- 1 Arthur von Scala, "Vorwort" in *Orientalische Teppiche*, ed. K. K. Oesterreichisches Handelsmuseum (Vienna: Reisser, 1892), n. p.
- 2 See, for example, Rudolf von Scala, *Über die wichtigsten Beziehungen des Orientes zum Occidente in Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Vienna: Verlag des Orientalischen Museums, 1887).
- 3 Oskar Beyer, *Welt-Kunst: Von der Umwertung der Kunstgeschichte* (Dresden: Sybille-Verlag, 1923), 11.
- 4 See, for instance, Max Dvořák, "Über die dringendsten methodischen Erfordernisse der Erziehung zur kunstgeschichtlichen Forschung," *Die Geisteswissenschaften* 34 (21 May 1914), 932–936.
- 5 Beyer, *Welt-Kunst* (cf. note 3), 14.
- 6 Josef Strzygowski, *Die Krisis der Geisteswissenschaften: Vorgeführt am Beispiel der Forschung über bildende Kunst* (Vienna: Schroll, 1923), VI.
- 7 Michel Espagne, "Cultural Transfers in Art History" in *Circulations in the Global History of Art*, ed. Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, Catherine Dossin, and Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 97–112, here 107.
- 8 Julius Schlosser, *Präludien. Vorträge und Aufsätze* (Berlin: Julius Bard, 1927), 9 and 36.
- 9 *Ibid.*, 39: "Der Vorgang ist typisch für die Art, wie alte, scheinbar längst überlebte und beiseite geworfene Formen, bei einer oft zufällig herbeigeführten Anpassung an einen neuen Gedanken, neues und kräftigeres Leben als vorher zu entfalten imstande ist; er ist aber auch typisch für die Entwicklung der Formen überhaupt."
- 10 Saloni Mathur, ed., *The Migrant's Time: Rethinking Art History and Diaspora* (London: Yale Univ. Press, 2011); Marie-Hélène Gutberlet, ed., *Die Kunst der Migration. Aktuelle Positionen zum europäisch-afrikanischen Diskurs* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2011); Joaquín Barriandos, *Geoestética y Transculturalidad* (Barcelona: Fundació Espais d'Art Contemporani, 2007); DaCosta Kaufmann, Dossin, and Joyeux-Prunel, *Circulations* (cf. note 7).
- 11 Espagne, "Cultural Transfers" (cf. note 7), 107.
- 12 See, for example, Rustom Bharucha, *Another Asia: Rabindranath Tagore and Okakura Tenshin* (New Delhi: Oxford Univ. Press, 2006).
- 13 See, for example, Pamela Roberts, *Black Oxford: The Untold Stories of Oxford University's Black Scholars* (Oxford: Signal Books Limited, 2013).
- 14 Alain LeRoy Locke, "Cultural Relativism and Ideological Peace" in *The Philosophy of Alain Locke: Harlem Renaissance and Beyond*, ed. Leonard Harris (Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press, 1989), 69–78.
- 15 *Ibid.*, 73. Here, Locke writes: "The principle of *cultural reciprocity*, which, by a general recognition of the reciprocal character of all contacts between cultures and of the fact that all modern cultures are highly composite ones, would invalidate the lump estimating of cultures in terms of generalized, *en bloc* assumptions of superiority and inferiority"

- 16 Cited after: Claudia Bahmer, *Weltkunst: Formpsychologie und Kulturanthropologie in André Malraux' Kunschriften* (Berlin: Kadmos, 2006), 21.
- 17 Dagobert Frey, *Grundlegung zu einer vergleichenden Kunstwissenschaft. Raum und Zeit in der Kunst der afrikanisch-eurasischen Hochkulturen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970 [1949]), 5.
- 18 *Kunst der Welt* consisted of 51 volumes (of which 21 were dedicated to non-Western art) and aimed at analysing all the cultures of the world, in their historic, sociological, and religious foundations.
- 19 Ginjirō Ogawa et al., eds., *Sekai bijutsushi* (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1905); Yasaburō Shimonaka, ed., *Sekai bijutsu zenshū* (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1927–1930, 1930–1932, 1950–1955).
- 20 Masao Ōguchi, “Henshū kōki [Editor’s Note],” *Sekai bijutsu* 1 (1947), 128.
- 21 Sōichi Tominaga, “Sekai bijutsu no kōsei [The Formation of World Art],” *Atorie* 255 (1948), 34–36.
- 22 Bert Winther-Tamaki, *Art in the Encounter of Nations: Japanese and American Artists in the Early Postwar Years* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai’i Press, 2001).
- 23 Fernando Ortiz, *Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y el azúcar* (Madrid: Cátedra, 2002 [1940]).
- 24 Ángel Rama, *Transculturación narrativa en América Latina* (México City: Siglo XXI, 1982).
- 25 Mary Louise Pratt, “Arts of the Contact Zone,” *Profession* (1991), 33–40.
- 26 *Ibid.*, 36.
- 27 See, for example, Mark Millington, “Transculturation: Taking Stock” in *Transculturation: Cities, Spaces and Architectures in Latin America*, ed. Felipe Hernández, Mark Millington, and Iain Borden (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005), 204–233.
- 28 See Almut Höfert, “Anmerkungen zum Konzept einer ‘transkulturellen’ Geschichte in der deutschsprachigen Forschung,” *Comparativ. Zeitschrift für Globalgeschichte und vergleichende Gesellschaftsforschung* 18 (2008), 15–26; Monica Juneja, “Kunstgeschichte und kulturelle Differenz,” *Kritische Berichte* 40/2 (2012), 6–12.
- 29 Wolfgang Gippert, Petra Götte, and Elke Kleinau, eds., *Transkulturalität. Gender- und bildungshistorische Perspektiven* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2008); Dorothee Kimmich and Schamma Schahadat, eds., *Kulturen in Bewegung. Beiträge zur Theorie und Praxis der Transkulturalität* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2012); Michael Falser and Monica Juneja, eds., *Kulturerbe und Denkmalpflege transkulturell. Grenzgänge zwischen Theorie und Praxis* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2013); Jutta Ernst and Florian Freitag, eds., *Transkulturelle Dynamiken. Aktanten – Prozesse – Theorien* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2014); Alexandra Millner and Katalin Teller, eds., *Transdifferenz und Transkulturalität, Migration und Alterität in den Literaturen und Kulturen Österreich-Ungarns* (Bielefeld: Transcript, forthcoming).
- 30 Wolfgang Welsch, “Transkulturalität. Zur veränderten Verfassung heutiger Kulturen” in *Hybridkultur: Medien, Netze, Künste*, ed. Irmela Schneider and Christian W. Thomson (Cologne: Wieand, 1997), 67–90.
- 31 John Urry, *Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Routledge, 2000).
- 32 Kevin Hannam, Mimi Sheller, and John Urry, “Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings,” *Mobilities* 1/1 (2006), 1–22, here 11.
- 33 Tim Cresswell and Peter Merriman, *Geographies of Mobilities: Practices, Spaces, Subjects* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).
- 34 Karin Gludovatz, Juliane Noth, and Joachim Rees, eds., *The Itineraries of Art: Topographies of Artistic Mobility in Europe and Asia* (Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink, 2015), see in particular the introduction on pp. 9–32.
- 35 James Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1997).
- 36 Juliane Noth and Joachim Rees, “Introduction” in *The Itineraries of Art*, ed. Gludovatz, Noth, and Rees (cf. note 34), 14.
- 37 Birgit Mersmann, “Bildkulturwissenschaft als Kulturbildwissenschaft. Von der Notwendigkeit eines inter- und transkulturellen Iconic Turn,” *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 49/1 (2004), 91–109.
- 38 Juneja, “Kunstgeschichte und kulturelle Differenz” (cf. note 28), 11, our translation of “Transzendierung des Gegensatzes.”

- 39 See Antje Flüchter and Jivanta Schöttli, "Introduction" in *The Dynamics of Transculturality: Concepts and Institutions in Motion*, ed. Antje Flüchter and Jivanta Schöttli (Cham: Springer, 2015), 1–23.
- 40 *Ibid.*, 2.
- 41 *Ibid.*, 8.
- 42 Boaventura De Sousa Santos, "A Non-Occidental West? Learned Ignorance and Ecology of Knowledge," *Theory Culture Society* 26/7–8 (2009), 103–125, here 105.
- 43 Karatani Kōjin, "Japan as Art Museum: Okakura and Fenollosa" in *A History of Modern Japanese Aesthetics*, ed. Michael F. Marra (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2001), 43–52; Shigemi Inaga, "The Impossible Avant-Garde in Japan, Does the Avant-Garde Exist in the Third World? Japan's Example: A Borderline Case of Misunderstanding in Aesthetic Intercultural Exchange," *doxa* (2010), 82–89.
- 44 Néstor García Canclini, *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1995) [first published as *Culturas Híbridas. Estrategias para entrar y salir de la modernidad* (México, D.F.: Grijalbo, 1989)].
- 45 Anibal Quijano, "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America," *Nepantla: Views From the South* 1/3 (2000), 533–580.
- 46 Walter D. Mignolo, "Coloniality: The Darker Side of Modernity" in *Modernologies. Contemporary Artists Researching Modernity and Modernism*, ed. Sabine Breitwieser, exhibition catalogue Museum of Modern Art, Barcelona (Barcelona: Museu d'Art Contemporani, 2009), 39–49.
- 47 Elizabeth Harney, though, determines an avant-garde movement in Senegal in the 1970s as being in direct opposition to the restrictions of Léopold Senghor's cultural politics of Négritude. See Elizabeth Harney, *In Senghor's Shadow: Art, Politics, and the Avant-garde in Senegal, 1960–1995* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2004).
- 48 Mancoba is quoted in an interview: "The embarrassment that my presence caused to the point of making me, in their eyes, some sort of 'Invisible Man' or merely the consort of a European woman artist—was understandable, as before me there had never been to my knowledge any black man taking part in the visual arts 'avant garde' of the Western World." *Drawings and Paintings from the Studio: Ernest Mancoba*, ed. Michael Stevenson Gallery (Cape Town: Michael Stevenson Gallery, 2014), 59.
- 49 Willemijn Stokvis, *CoBrA: The Last Avant-Garde Movement in the Twentieth Century* (Aldershot: Lund Humphries, 2004). For a deeper analysis, see also Laura M. Smalligan, "The Erasure of Ernest Mancoba: Africa and Europe at the Crossroads," *Third Text* 24 (2010), 263–276.
- 50 See Adel el-Siwi, "The Egyptian Surrealists: A Contemporary Egyptian Artist's Perspective," presentation at the conference *The Egyptian Surrealists in Global Perspective*, Cairo, 26–28 November 2015. At this conference, the problem of labelling Egyptian art production with art historical categories developed in the West, namely surrealism, was also critically addressed.
- 51 Dominique Bouhours, *La manière de bien penser dans les ouvrages de l'esprit* (Brighton: Univ. of Sussex Library for the Committee for Research in French Studies, 1971).
- 52 See Steven S. Lee, *The Ethnic Avant-Garde. Minority Cultures and World Revolution* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 2015).
- 53 They have received some critical attention in anthropological studies. For the latest anthology see *Debating Authenticity: Concepts of Modernity in Anthropological Perspective*, ed. Thomas Fillitz and Jamie Saris (New York: Berghahn Books, 2013). They, as well as Regina Bendix in her volume *In Search for Authenticity: The Formation of Folklore Studies* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1997), argue for analyses that address the connection of politics of authenticity with market forces.
- 54 Reiko Tomii, "'International Contemporaneity' in the 1960s: Discoursing on Art in Japan and Beyond," *Japan Review* 21 (2009), 123–147; Ming Tiampo, "Originality, Universality, and Other Modernist Myths: A Response to the 2007 Stone Summer Theory Institute Seminars" in *Art and Globalization*, ed. James Elkins, Zhivka Valiavicharska, and Alice S. Kim (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 166–170.
- 55 Oswald de Andrade, "Cannibalist Manifesto," *Latin American Literary Review* 19/38 (1991), 38–47 [first published in Portuguese in 1928].
- 56 Roberto Schwarz, "Brazilian Culture: Nationalism by Elimination" in *Misplaced Ideas: Essays on Brazilian Culture*, ed. John Gledson (New York: Verso, 1992), 1–17.

- 57 Mieke Bal and Norman Bryson, "Semiotics and Art History," *The Art Bulletin* 73/2 (June 1991), 174–208, here 180.
- 58 Monica Juneja and Christian Kravagna, "Understanding Transculturalism. Monica Juneja and Christian Kravagna in Conversation" in *Transcultural Modernisms*, ed. Fahim Amir et al. (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2013), 22–33.
- 59 Kwame Anthony Appiah, "Thick Translation," *Callaloo: A Journal of African Diaspora Arts and Letters* 16/4 (1993), 808–819. With his concept of a thick translation, Kwame Anthony Appiah differentiates between the production of meaning through a mere translation of a text and an attempt to facilitate its understanding through contextualizing the initial text.
- 60 Mieke Bal, "Working with Concepts," *European Journal of English Studies* 13/1 (2009), 13–23, here 18.
- 61 Doris Bachmann-Medick, "From Hybridity to Translation: Reflections on Travelling Concepts" in *The Trans/national Study of Culture: A Translational Perspective*, ed. Doris Bachmann-Medick (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 119–136, here 121.

I.

NARRATIVES

