

Transcultural Histories of Art and Artisanal Epistemologies

Knowledge to Be Made

Edited by Claire Farago, Susan Lowish, and Jens Baumgarten

First published 2025

ISBN: 978-1-032-59449-1 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-45668-1 (ebk)

Knowledge to Be Made: An Introduction

Claire Farago, Susan Lowish and Jens Baumgarten

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003456681-1

The funder of the Open Access version of this chapter is
University of Melbourne



Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

Knowledge to Be Made: An Introduction *

Claire Farago, Susan Lowish and Jens Baumgarten

The global turn demands that we rethink our most fundamental assumptions about the discipline of Art History established in nineteenth-century Europe during the formative period of modern nation-states. Attention to the migration of visual culture and the conditions of its circulation has introduced research concerned with the function, reception, and power of specific kinds of images and other objects of human manufacture of all times and places. Case studies experimenting with global approaches to the history of art and material culture have opened up the discourse along many new investigative trajectories, but the compelling new research invariably emphasizes the complexity of the situations involved and the difficulty of drawing generalizations. *Knowledge to Be Made*, as we refer to the book's title in shorthand, aims to go beyond the current cumulative case study approach by contributing to the discipline from a methodological perspective. This Introduction introduces shared epistemological and ontological issues that the individual chapters pursue in depth. As much as they differ in their subject matter, evidence, and methodology, the chapters collectively situate the central art historical concern with creative processes – the language of which derives historically from European concepts of art – into broader, transcultural frameworks that include intellectual, social, economic, historical, and political factors.

This volume takes up the challenge of working productively with transcultural processes by focusing on migrating technologies, materials, and craftsmanship. How is meaning made when cultural artifacts circulate in complex networks of exchange? What can be communicated across time? How does the skillful working with materials resonate in different belief systems and practices? Can the relation between the social and the biological be articulated without imposing thought structures of European origin such as the assertion that Art is a universal phenomenon? Can we move beyond the inherited Western dichotomy between nature and culture to think differently about the ways that the social and the biological are distributed and entangled?

Knowledge to Be Made aims to de-familiarize European conceptions of artistry, to think its history anew by rethinking on a global stage what were once arguably helpful methodological tools in art history classified by artist, nation, period, and style. With so much to study, it has been important to select case studies strategically for what they can demonstrate about the complex intersection and fluid boundaries of cultural encounters. The individual chapters address processes of knowledge production in a global framework while strategically sidestepping the problematic hierarchy of the fine arts and

* Our warmest thanks to all our contributors for reviewing our Introduction and especially Jeanette Favrot Peterson for her many insightful comments on the penultimate draft.

2 *Transcultural Histories of Art and Artisanal Epistemologies*

exclusionary binomial categories of European origin such as art versus artifact, fine art versus decorative art, and other labels that downgrade or exclude many historically and aesthetically significant kinds of cultural production.

As we employ the term “artisanal knowledge,” it is not intended to contrast with “artistic” or “scientific knowledge,” but to function as a basis for studying all forms of material culture without falling into the traps of Eurocentrism. The questions now attracting attention in a transdisciplinary field of inquiry involve the nature of embodied knowing and the ways that knowledge systems operate through social networks. To address such complex signifying practices requires recognizing a network of agents connected to one another through materials, images, objects, signs, and whatever other means subjects use to relate to other subjects, whereas the inherited European art historical model of agency assumes that cognition is purely an individual mental operation. Conceiving artistic production in terms of a distributed network of agents goes well beyond the existing compass of any existing discipline. A number of fields are moving away from the inherited Western dichotomy between nature and culture to think in other terms besides the “obsolete language of innate universals and acquired traits,” to cite social anthropologist Tim Ingold’s call for a new “sociobiological synthesis.”¹ If the biological and the social are “twisted from multiple strands themselves twisted from multiple fibers,” to cite Ingold, can it help us conceive the material history of cultural production in transcultural terms without imposing European preconceptions of how the social and biological are distributed?

Since neither artifacts nor knowledge systems operate in isolation, the study of transcultural processes and artisanal practices must be political in a wide sense to analyze the power relations operating within aesthetic and cultural research. Collectively, we present a wide range of non-totalizing transcultural approaches that do not rely on universals, monolithic categories, hierarchies of genre and medium, or the reductive use of binaries. The book developed from a session at the 35th Congress for the International History of Art (CIHA) dedicated to the theme of *Migrations*, held in São Paulo, Brazil, in 2022. The session was framed in response to the following central points in the call for proposals issued by CIHA in December 2018:

Since the first manifestations of its genre, art historical texts try to understand the artistic processes of creativity as a process of migration; inventions are understood as mobile processes. The development of the figure of an artist or of a style can be seen as a complex process of migrating individuals or concepts. Migration has also been understood through its historical, political, and socio-economic aspects. In addition to this, it has been a fundamental aspect of the human experience since the beginning. ... Even before the creation of art history as a scholarly discipline in the 19th century, art and culture have been construed through the exchange of objects, concepts, and practices among a variety of territories and societies around the globe...

[F]orced migration related to the two World Wars and the many other violent conflicts around the globe, reaches an unprecedented level in the 21st century, when humankind faces new challenges brought about by different forms of transit of peoples, ideas, and images. It is precisely through its establishment as a scholarly practice during the neocolonial era, and after its own self-reflection that art history has started revising its methods and theories in regard to such a phenomenon, while attempting to articulate new ways to describe and analyze its complexity by reaching out into a transdisciplinary practice.

Our call for papers invited proposals to imagine how creativity in the form of process and especially improvisational thinking (of the kind used to solve problems, make things, play a tune, draw, and so on) might be conceived as a transcultural concept. We sought papers on practices in any media across any geographical or temporal range as a way to think through technologies of making without falling back on neocolonialist premises, including the reductive global/local binary. We encouraged proposals on the dynamic practices of Indigenous groups and on the practices of diaspora communities. We issued a challenge by posing the following question: the connection between hand and mind, *mano e ingegno*, is at the core of the Renaissance theoretical legacy. Could this core provide a basis for renewal of the discipline without falling into the traps of Eurocentrism?

As the proposals that became the chapters of this book attest, the Western epistemological regime that separates manual skill from knowledge is foreign to many Indigenous societies, where practices of making and ways of living are continuous and intimately related to spiritual systems. The knowledge of craftspeople has spiritual resonance in many Indigenous knowledge communities. From an Indigenous North American perspective, for example, “theory” is the knowledge that is made, embedded in, and carried on through the baskets, songs, rituals, and other art forms of the native culture.² Nor are these practices limited to traditional genres and audiences today. As Susan Lowish writes in her chapter on the aesthetic frameworks of contemporary First Nation artists in Australia, they hold privileged knowledge that they use to educate others on their own terms:

Yolngu art histories emphasize relationships and connections rather than categories, corpora, or chronologies; they carry the knowledge of their artistic lineages in their ancestry and in their songlines. They are also expert educators, with a passion for sharing their culture and are now also being recognized (finally) as curators, arranging their artworks according to their kinship systems.³

Thinking about alterity in transcultural terms does not mean that there is a superior or an inferior perception, rather the epistemic differences lead to different ways of making worlds. A “worlded” history in this sense conceives of the global as constituted from multiple and entangled geo-cultural perspectives, not centered on the assumed commonalities of “global” art or any other kind of universal identity. Mieke Bal’s idea of a dynamic “traveling concept,” cited by the CIHA conference organizers, is relevant here: concepts are difficult to define because they are dynamic in themselves. Tenuously established, “hovering between ordinary word and theoretical tool,” they provide insight not from what are but from what they *do*. Traveling concepts are the backbone of the interdisciplinary study of culture not because they are bounded and mean the same thing for everyone, but because they don’t: concepts are dynamic, discursively constituted sites of debate.⁴ Transculturation can refer to a concrete object or an analytic method, and in both cases “trans-” contests the discursive category of “culture” as it has been used to designate the life world of groups as internally cohesive and linguistically homogenous spheres. Instead, “transcultural” focuses on the dialogical processes through which forms emerge in local contexts within circuits of exchange. The pathways of these concrete forms are often recursive and braided in complex ways. No longer restricted to modernity, the concept of “transculturation” attends to the “dynamics of those formations past and present constituted through regimes of circulation and exchange ... to investigate the multiple ways in which difference is negotiated within contacts and encounters.”⁵

4 *Transcultural Histories of Art and Artisanal Epistemologies*

In turning to the book that we developed after the conference, we note that the 35th CIHA Congress on Migration had to be postponed for two years due to the grim existential threat posed by a migrant virus: the World Health Organization declared Covid-19 a global pandemic on 11 March 2020. Due to the continuing threat posed by the mutating corona virus even after a vaccine was developed, the Congress was eventually held as a hybrid event in January 2022. Conference delays also presented us with a serendipitous opportunity. At the suggestion of the CIHA Organizing Committee, we convened a virtual workshop in October 2021. Thanks to video teleconferencing technology, at both the conference and the workshop, we were able to interact simultaneously from 14 different time zones across the planet, with participants physically located in Europe, the Americas, Asia, and Australia. For our workshop, we read Tim Ingold on defining the core of creativity as improvisation – the problem-solving skills needed to fashion matter that are involved in everyday life.⁶ We discussed whether and how skill and ingenuity – a time-honored pair of European categories with complex histories – were applicable (or not) to other cultures. In a virtual seminar setting, we explored how artistic processes of creativity appeared from the standpoint of each participant’s professional expertise.

How does skillful working with materials resonate in and through other belief systems and practices? Our discussion of Ingold, held while we were exchanging ideas about our work prior to writing, focused on creativity defined as a historical and cultural concept. Our contributors address “making knowledge” in a wide variety of ways that cannot be resolved through conventional European schemes for classifying art by artist, style, period, place, and date. The subject matter of the individual chapters ranges from prints made by Inuit artists in the mid-nineteenth century, to the innovative technology of double-shelled domes in the Mediterranean, to Christian imagery inflected with Hindu ideas native to India, the use of aromatics and their portable receptacles, Indigenous agency preserved in a famous sixteenth-century Mexican colonial manuscript, artistic training in nineteenth-century Colombia, contemporary Brazilian international exhibition practices, Indigenous Australian artistic procedures practiced as worldmaking activities, and the artistic reconfiguration of waste in the work of a contemporary Mexican artist concerned with human-caused environmental damage. What lends coherence to such a diverse range of case studies are the authors’ interest in developing methodologies for thinking transculturally about knowledge, technology, and creativity in relational terms.

The Chapters

The inclusive category “artisanal knowledge” recognizes without drawing any hierarchical distinctions that all societies pass on their values, their aesthetic preferences, their technology, their rites, and practices. We have organized the chapters into four parts to highlight different approaches to the question of how artisanal knowledge might be conceived transculturally. Claire Farago’s theoretical Introduction in the first chapter situates our project in the field of transcultural studies. It provides a history of the European concept of artisanal epistemology and reimagines it as a tool for transcultural studies. The four parts of the book highlight the different types of issues and methodologies pursued by the authors. Chapters are juxtaposed to emphasize points of connectivity between the unrelated case studies.

The two chapters in Part I, “New Epistemologies in Formation,” have been paired because they each take a transcultural approach to documenting artistic processes of

making to recover suppressed Indigenous epistemologies. Bart Pushaw studies the transformation of Indigenous artisanal knowledge under colonial conditions in the Arctic. His focus is an album of woodcuts from the 1860s known as *Kalaallit assiliaiat* or *Greenlandic Woodcuts*. By shifting the analytical focus from subject matter and iconography to the task of making itself, Pushaw places the newly introduced process of print-making within Kalaallit epistemologies of carving and material concerns with facture. He recovers the artists' individual names and one of their depicted subject's historical identity from period sources. The Kalaallit did not prize originality or innovation to the same extent as Europeans did, nor do their epistemologies emphasize the genre or medium of an image. Their translation of image is *assiliaq*, a more general category understood in its relationship to recollection, which encompasses both visual precedents and personal memories. Pushaw describes their complicated conception of authorship to suggest why many Kalaallit found that making woodcut images was a compelling and meaningful medium in the nineteenth century. Digging into the historical circumstances that caused the colonial state to consider Inuit homes dirty and their inhabitants lazy, Pushaw finds that their Danish administrators forced the Inuit (who were also starving under colonial rule) to switch to coal from dried moss for heating. This created a great increase in soot while, at the same time, the Europeans also projected their racist notions on the Arctic environment which they characterized as non-generative and desolate. By contrast, Pushaw's chapter examines how *qanuqturniq*, roughly translated as "innovation and adaptation," was a forward-looking strategy indebted to tactical choices that enabled the Inuit to thrive in their beloved Arctic environments.

Peter Krieger also writes about the poverty of the underclass and the innovative strategies of artists, drawing upon an entirely different set of local circumstances in a postcolonial society. Krieger focuses on the contemporary artist Abraham Cruzvillegas (b. 1968) who transforms his own experience of growing up in an impoverished informal urban settlement ("slum" is the colonialist term) in Mexico City into a principle of creativity by repurposing waste as artisanal house construction *and* art materials for his gallery installations. Krieger documents several of Cruzvillegas' projects, notably *Garbage Wall* (2015) realized with an architect and a team of construction workers from the Mexican Ecological Reserve of Pedregal, REPSA (Reserva Ecológica del Pedregal de San Ángel). Tracing the conceptual migration of informal craftsmanship from urban settlements to sophisticated art galleries showcases hyper-urban realities in the Global South. Krieger argues that Cruzvillegas liberates "the epistemic potential" of his found materials by turning them into a "playful, ironic, anarchic expression of artisanal capacity and artistic ingenuity." Thus, artisanal self-construction (*autoconstrucción*) confronts the public with "an implicit political iconography, apt to generate critical environmental consciousness" without resorting to a fundamentalist environmental manifesto.

Part II offers transcultural approaches to the practices of art institutions. Patricia Zalamea provides a nuanced history of academic artistic practices connected with Republican imagery in Colombia as they developed from earlier colonial modes dependent on family workshops. After the end of *Gran Colombia* (1819–1831), which included Ecuador, Panama, Venezuela and parts of Peru and Brazil, the central entities of the *Gran Colombia* were reorganized as the Republic of New Granada, and notions of homeland and nation began to develop in the more specific sense of what today constitutes Colombia. The question Zalamea addresses is how classical artistic theory was reinterpreted and transformed in a postcolonial, emerging nation that claimed European artistic practices as its own, despite the apparent contradictions to a traditional historiography

6 *Transcultural Histories of Art and Artisanal Epistemologies*

of the history of art. On the one hand, there was no proper training academy, yet ideas about classicizing artistic principles were already in circulation; on the other hand, nineteenth-century painting moved away from colonial traditions. Zalamea studies the emergence of academicizing art in a local context through the working processes of Luis García Hevia (1816–1887), a painter and photographer specializing in portraiture, and the first to experiment with daguerreotypes in Colombia. García Hevia began applying paint on daguerreotypes, calling them “oleotipos” and publicizing their superior verisimilitude, achieved by adding color (*colorido*), which he described as possessing “all the beauty and softness of oil, and the advantage of duration offered by ancient pictures.” Confronted with a rapid sequence of changing contexts, Zalamea argues, García Hevia exemplifies the ways in which “improvisational” experiential learning operated before the founding of the first official art academy in Colombia (1873–1886). While his particular painting style, along with his attempts at founding formal academies, may be seen as the direct link between a colonial past and the development of academic art in Colombia, the actual history from the colonial subject’s point of view is more complicated: García Hevia’s artisanal approach to daguerreotypes as a special medium that could transform tradition, and at the same time produce improvisational renderings of the immediate context, signals the fluidity and independence with which European concepts and media were transformed in its postcolonial institutional setting.

Drawing quite different conclusions from the current state of art institutions in South America, Jens Baumgarten and Vinicius Spricigo co-author a study that examines transcultural, decolonizing claims made by contemporary Brazilian art museums, specifically the Museum of Art in São Paulo (MASP) and the 2023 Bienal also in São Paulo, which they compare to the Architecture Biennale in Venice and the Biennale in Venice 2024 directed by the Brazilian curator Adriano Pedrosa. Their chapter analyzes the conflicting relations between identitarian and universalist epistemes. The authors begin from the premise that decolonial discourses and practices must be evaluated on the basis of the categories they have opened up to include knowledge systems practiced by formerly excluded groups such as Indigenous and Afro-Brazilian communities. They argue that contemporary revisionist claims have served to stabilize and foster existing hierarchical power relations while creating new forms of exclusion and maintaining existing ones like the continuing exclusion of the arts of ethnically and culturally complex Roma and Sinti communities (almost one million people following the last census). The co-authors conclude that these decolonial discourses create an “epistemological mise-en-scène” that opens up the symbolic and political space but does not remodel any of its existing structures or power relationships. Terms such as identity, identity constructions, and identitarian are polemically discussed within the arts and culture debates and they also permeate all social, cultural, and political systems. This situation poses the inherent risk of creating a new essentialism based on predefined groups. As is often also the case with debates on contemporary art in Europe such as the controversies surrounding the *Documenta* exhibitions over its past several iterations, these discourses and practices about identity constructions contradict or even annihilate open, intersecting, transcultural processes of communication that build community by recognizing diversity and practicing equality.

Part III, consisting of three chapters, features “Material Flows/Circulating Objects” as its organizing principle. Jeanette Favrot Peterson studies the beautifully illuminated encyclopedia produced in the viceroyalty of New Spain between 1575 and 1577 known as the *Florentine Codex*, compiled by the Franciscan missionary Bernardino de Sahagún and his Indigenous collaborators. Given the Euro-Christian matrix in which Sahagún’s team

worked, she asks whether we can locate the craftsman's approach of "thinking through making" with the Indigenous creators. Did they continue to assert their *tlahcuiloh* (painter-scribe) heritage, an ancient profession of recording knowledge? Sahagún arrived in New Spain with the expectation that Amerindian cultures had no "writing" and, therefore, were not only absent a history but also lacked the guiding precepts for conducting an orderly society. Instead, the Spaniards encountered several intricate Mesoamerican sign systems that archived their calendrical system, divine beings, and dynastic histories. Even as Spanish officials rushed to destroy these records for alleged heretical information, their very existence contested a notion of European superiority anchored upon alphabetic record-keeping. Additionally, in Indigenous bookmaking, the early colonizers found a well-developed "material complex," defined by historian of science Pamela H. Smith as an assemblage of the raw materials, practices, and meanings assigned to the end products. Peterson wonders how such a materialist epistemology affects our transcultural reading of the European conceptual hierarchy in evaluating books. She finds that the engagement of the Indigenous makers with their views of an animate nature and its raw materials validates using the new methodologies of materiality and artistic practice in constructing an art history of Latin American visual culture to compensate for the paucity of archival and biographical data. Beyond the technical and material components of their profession, the *tlahcuilohqueh's* self-representation in the Nahuatl texts and imagery also reveals a more conceptual construct that inspires and elevates their artisanship. For the *tlahcuilohqueh*, technical expertise was an important, but only one, component of creativity. As members of the *toltecatoyotl*, an ancient and highly esteemed class of Nahua artisans, the *Florentine Codex* painter/scribes were perceived as learned transmitters of cultural knowledge. We cannot precisely locate the impulse of this creative spirit, nor its overlap with European notions of genius or *ingegno*, but there was recognition that superior innate talent was not simply controlled by the dexterity of the hand (*mano*). Peterson supplies an appendix on how Indigenous artists were trained in two Franciscan venues during the early contact period.

In the next chapter, Erin Benay focuses her study of artisanal epistemology in a transcultural framework on the "peripheral" Jesuit mission in the modern-day state of Kerala, India, where the advent of a material culture of Christianity was complicated by a pre-existing community of Christians. Tracing their lineage to the arrival of Saint Thomas Apostle in the first century, Thomas Christians were a vital part of the economic and spiritual life of the Malabar coast long before the arrival of the Jesuits. During the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, stone architectural supports such as archways and columns, wood ceiling beams, and small-scale sculpture were important sites for the display of religious images in Thomas Christian churches and Hindu temples alike. By virtue of their material, the method of carving, *and* their decorative motifs, these sculptural components acted jointly as functional supports and as embodiments of devotion. A diverse group of precolonial and colonial carved objects, ranging from stone crosses to baptismal fonts to chalices, were largely made by non-Christian artisans for a diverse Christian community. By focusing on the formal and material properties of these objects as evidence of how they were made, despite the absence of written documentation, it is possible to understand how Christian art in India was and is *Indian* and not simply a reflection of European ideals. Not just a marginal footnote to a supposedly mainstream Christian production in Goa either, they did significant work in the creation of an autonomous religious tradition. At the same time, objects like the monumental stone cross in Kaduthuruthy are not fully legible unless understood as part of a local, dynamic tradition

changing through its vastly increased engagement with European, and specifically Roman Catholic, people, traditions, and concerns. Benay argues that such monumental crosses were part of a more systemic (and understudied) effort to harmonize previously existing Thomas Christian visual traditions with the liturgical goals of the Counter-Reformation introduced by the Jesuits. At the same time, the centrality of baptism in the practice of Thomas Christians was established at the outset and maintained in oral traditions. To cite another example of pluralistic practices that were maintained from precolonial times, diminutive bells placed on liturgical objects did more than their tiny stature would imply – they contributed an additional auditory layer to the Mass that may have evoked sensorial memories drawn from a different set of cultural performances. The imaginative articulation of an ancient form of Christianity had long incorporated not only the motifs of Hindu imagery, but the function of those images as well.

Next Leah R. Clark examines receptacles for aromatics as agents of artisanal knowledge that carried technology, knowledge, and social practices with them without texts. Aromatics and spices served a variety of purposes in the early modern world as medicines, cleaning agents, seasonings for food, and perfumes to scent both the body and the air. Serving as both diplomatic gifts and commodities, such objects document complex patterns of imitation, borrowing, and translation that open new methodological perspectives based on close observation of the objects themselves. Clark's examples include the production and use of ceramics in colonial Mexico within the framework of a longer, global history of ceramic making as well as the use of aromatics in the early modern Mediterranean when empires and states contended over trade routes, land borders, and religious differences. Viewed transculturally, *albarelli* and Mamluk metalwork convey the complexities of trying to disentangle origins and provenance for objects that reveal the close production and transfer of materials and motifs across the Mediterranean and further afield, while the trade in spices signals larger cross-cultural trade and diplomatic networks.

The two chapters in Part IV also deal with the fluid movement of ideas and techniques that cannot be reduced to binary oppositions. The authors develop approaches to methodology that we describe as “Knowledge-Sharing Models.” The section opens with Dario Donetti and Lorenzo Vigotti's co-authored study of the technology of double-shelled domes as migrating inventions that traveled between Europe and the Mongol Empire. Evidence of continuous streams of communication that persisted between Florence and Iranian cities throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, such as Tabriz and Soltaniyeh, provides a scenario in which news and people traveled fast and oral communication played a major role. Situating the double-shelled dome within this broader Mediterranean context, their essay provides extensively documented grounds for a new system of classification of medieval and early modern domed structures: one based on the process of making with a focus on material qualities and technical devices inspired by the parallel between Brunelleschi's dome in Florence and the mausoleum of Oljaitü. Following from the innovative work of the Italian conservator Piero Sanpaolesi (1971), who contested traditional Western-centered narrative that Brunelleschi's design for the Florentine cathedral dome is a unique invention without precedent, they present an ambitious research hypothesis that challenges this canonical view by reshaping the traditional boundaries of the discipline in a transcultural historiographical framework. Donetti and Vigotti question architectural history's typological tools in favor of a more inclusive understanding of the history of construction. Rather than proposing a study of the evolution of isolated forms, Donetti and Vigotti pursue an architectural history of materials

relationally by drawing attention to the circulation of technical knowledge. In light of the historical evidence that they combine from a wide variety of archival, historical, and material sources, the oral transfer of the technology employed at both Soltaniyeh and Santa Maria del Fiore gains historical plausibility, especially in a mercantile world of dominating material culture. They argue that study of technological innovations, when seen in such a transcultural perspective, opens the traditional boundaries of architectural history to a more inclusive understanding of the evolving history of construction.

The last chapter, by Susan Lowish, also advocates for change in art historical methodologies by strengthening the relationships between peoples and disciplines, rather than reinforcing traditional distinctions. She turns to an entirely different context for studying material technologies transculturally. In what was to be a co-authored piece, Lowish draws upon more than a decade's worth of conversation, collaboration, and co-teaching to present aspects of the life and work of a senior Marrakulu and Yolngu community leader from northeast Arnhem Land, Australia. Mr. Waṅambi (recently deceased) increasingly utilized a range of multi-media technologies in his artistic practice. This chapter delves into the details of his favorite lecture subject – the materials and techniques of bark painting – to consider the deeper personal, historical, and epistemological significance behind his choice of subject matter. Lowish suggests that the artist's nearly ritualized revelation of unique materials and specific technologies of making has interrelated and inseparable economic, philosophical, historical, social, and political meanings. For her, witnessing the process of making has provided an opening into Yolngu ontological foundations and provided insight into the Yolngu practice of bestowing gifts of artworks upon visiting dignitaries and politicians as a means for delivering powerful political messages.

On the Value of Creative Misunderstanding

A book about transcultural processes and artisanal practices must be political in a broad sense to analyze the power relations operating within aesthetic and cultural research. Questions of hegemonic and non-hegemonic discourses remain a central topic for art history. The Brazilian anthropologist, Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, states that the basic method of anthropology is comparison, but he does not fall into the trap of binary construction.⁷ In his research he denies ontological dualism. Hence comparability does not mean translatability (translations are always interpretations). This is fundamental for understanding the juxtapositions, superimpositions, and complex constitutions of transcultural concepts of creativity. We open this volume with his idea of creative *misunderstanding*. An equivocation is not just a “failure to understand,” but a failure to understand that understandings are necessarily not the same. They are not related to imaginary ways of “seeing the world” but to the real worlds that are being seen. Viveiros de Castro continues that, while we may have killed the Creator some time ago, we are still left with the other half of the whole that had been posited precisely by the now-absent God – namely science: the transcendence of transcendence created immanence. This insight can be applied specifically to the context of the arts, literature, music, visual, and performative arts, and their concepts of creativity. Despite modern efforts to *dispose* of dualism, for Viveiros de Castro they only create monism, that is, the *denial* of dualism. Therefore, his lesson in perspectivism consists of concepts of pluralism and multiplicity. Viveiros de Castro's critique of his own discipline could be easily extended to the field of art history.

Notes

- 1 Tim Ingold, “Prospect”, in *Biosocial Becomings: Integrating Social and Biological Anthropology*, ed. Tim Ingold and Gisli Palsson (Cambridge University Press, 2013), 1–21, at 8.
- 2 Alexander Watkins, “Teaching Inclusive Authorities: Indigenous Ways of Knowing and the Framework for Information Literacy in Native Art,” in *Disciplinary Applications of Information Literacy Threshold Concepts*. ACRL. He draws from Māori art historian Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (Zed Books, 2012). Other publications along similar lines are Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, *Ch’ixinakax utxiwa: On Practices and Discourses of Decolonization* (2010 Spanish ed.), trans. Molly Geidel (Polity Press, 2020); Clara-Sue Kidwell, *Native American Knowledge Systems* (Balestier Press, 2019); Shawn Wilson, *Research Is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods* (Fernwood Publishing, 2008). And dealing specifically with art in a national context, Amy Lonetree, *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums* (University of North Carolina Press, 2012).
- 3 Susan Lowish, “Material Concerns: Experiential Teaching and Learning with First Nations Artists in Australia,” Chapter 10, this volume, pp. 182–200.
- 4 Mieke Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide* (University of Toronto Press, 2002), at 11–13. Bal cites “intersubjectivity” as a “good example of a flexible kind of concept” that binds power with the “transmittability of knowledge,” with what is included and excluded.
- 5 Monica Juneja and Christian Kravagna, “Understanding Transculturalism,” in *Transcultural Modernisms: Model House Research Group*, ed. Fahim Amir et al. (Sternberg Press, 2013), 25. See further discussion in Chapter 1, which provides a theoretical and historiographical framework for the volume.
- 6 We read Tim Ingold, “Rethinking the Animate, Re-animating Thought,” *Ethnos* 71, no. 1 (2006): 9–20, DOI: 10.1080/00141840600603111; and Tim Ingold and Elizabeth Hallam, “Creativity and Cultural Improvisation: An Introduction,” in *Creativity and Improvisation*, ed. Elizabeth Hallam and Tim Ingold (Berg, 2007), 1–24.
- 7 Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, *The Inconstancy of the Indian Soul: The Encounter of Catholics and Cannibals in Sixteenth Century Brazil* (Prickly Paradigm Press, 2011).