HOLLY SHAFFER

INTRODUCTION

The Graphic Arts: Replication and the Force of Forms

The graphic arts emphasize design, be it in the arts of drawing, painting, engraving, etching, or other print media, from the techniques of producing a single image to the composition of the page, the album, or the book. This volume of *Ars Orientalis* focuses on how interlocking practices of making, collecting, compiling, and publishing graphic arts across Asia and between regions in Asia and Europe encouraged the replication, and also the subtle transformation, of forms, opening up new possibilities for interpretation.¹ The essays focus specifically on the steady replication of readily identifiable forms—whether portraits, general types of people, flora or fauna, ornament, books or other objects, or even the materials of making themselves, like paper—as well as their production in artist workshops, libraries, and publishing houses and their collection in albums, books, or other compendia. In short, the articles engage with the creation and reception of forms and how they wander.

In focusing on the replication of forms, this volume returns to debates that have stimulated scholars for the last century.² It does so self-reflexively, seeing these writings as part of the textual discourse that is in dialogue with the visual one under discussion.³ Yet, the volume aims to add to the existing scholarship by focusing primarily on Asian workshop practices of replication, attending to the processes by which forms moved across cultures and the question of how they were resituated over time, and by interweaving Asian and European historiographies of replication.

These essays specifically engage with replicating forms in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In this era, manual and mechanical processes of replication were in use simultaneously within specific cultures as well as across cultures, particularly in commercial ventures. Noticing the intersection of reproductive technologies raises questions not only about production and reception but also about the associations between media and meaning.⁴ In addition to inquiries about materiality and processes of production, we find that many of the artists, collectors, and publishers discussed here developed—or perpetuated—taxonomies of form.⁵ These forms range from books and objects in Korea to the personification of musical modes in India to the portrayal of exotic foreigners in Ottoman lands and the British visualization of viruses in Sri Lanka. This impulse to classify, and the circulating figures that resulted, urge us to think carefully about the force of forms, both as a creative and a reductive conduit employed to devastating effect by colonial states, among other regimes.

QUICK CITATION

Shaffer, Holly.
“Introduction: The
Graphic Arts: Replication
and the Force of Forms.”
Ars Orientalis 51 (2021):
1–26.

In this introduction, the essays that follow are framed by the two key themes—replication and the force of forms—and by aspects of the historiographies of the modes that they address. We begin by focusing on practices of replication in Asia, particularly in the context of the Islamic world and South Asia, and then move to European technologies of reproduction and publication practices. The goal here is to follow loosely two historiographic chains in order to see the methods of scholarship that they propose and the potential in interweaving their approaches, as well as to present a way of reading the integrated method of the essays that follow.

Copying Practices and Wandering Forms

We begin with this drawing: a man with short, shaggy hair and a garment that creases and folds according to his posture draws on a sheet of paper (fig. 1). The man is hunched, with brush in hand over paper supported by a board resting on his knee. The page is blank, unless we consider the paper itself, flecked with remnants of the fibers like cotton or flax that would have been pulped, pressed, dried, and burnished to make the page. The sure and expressive qualities of the line that articulate the form of the artist, and the possibilities that the blank page on his knee present to him, make this drawing conscious of its own artistry. Yet the work also presents the method for its replication. If we look closely, we find tiny pinpricks that register the option to dust charcoal over the holes in order to transfer the design to a sheet placed beneath.

This single drawing embodies an artistic practice of copying. It gestures to previous drawings at the same time as it projects its design forward to future iterations. Indeed, such a series of images, known as a *silsila* (chain) in Arabic and other languages that incorporated Arabic vocabulary, presents its own manner of timekeeping, its own system of linked relationships. These can be specific—an artist emulating a previous work of art—or a looser network of shared forms that artists drew on imaginatively. The artist who drew this drawing of an artist from mid-seventeenth-century Safavid Iran pulled from a lineage of such forms that include referential chains. In one drawing, the son of the renowned artist Reza ‘Abbasi (ca. 1565–1635), Shafi ‘Abbasi (active ca. 1628–74), has depicted an artist—perhaps himself—finishing the petals of a flower (fig. 2). In another, Reza ‘Abbasi’s student, Mu’in Musavvir (active 1635–97), has drawn his teacher painting the figure of a foreigner (fig. 3).

The painting within a painting in figure 3 is reminiscent of an earlier chain of images that began with an Ottoman artist drawn by a Venetian painter who worked at the Ottoman court in the late fifteenth century (fig. 4).⁶ In 1544–45, this painting was integrated into an album for the Safavid prince Bahram Mirza (1517–1549), where it may have served as the source for the Persian adaptations of the composition, but not before it was copied in Ottoman as well as Mughal lands. In another version of the drawing, an Ottoman artist has brightened the colors of the dress and, like Reza ‘Abbasi’s student, has painted a man into the painting within the painting (fig. 5). In this chain, an artistic genealogy contains an artistic geography. Alongside lineage, this series offers a way to think about linked relationships among forms spatially, here moving across Ottoman and Safavid spheres and interacting with Venetian circles. Curiously, the geographic expanse is pictured at times within the pictures, in the form of the foreigner drawing or being drawn, whether European, Ottoman, or Safavid in costume. When the geography stretches to India, it affords different nuances. In a subsequent iteration in Mughal lands, the artist clearly knew a version of the Safavid or Ottoman painting well enough to imitate it closely (fig. 6).

FIGURE 1. Seated man painting or writing, probably Iran, Isfahan, first half of 17th century. Ink and opaque watercolor on paper, page: 11.2 x 8.6 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Fletcher Fund, 1976, 1976.183

In other examples, however, the form of the “artist drawing” may not connect to a known intermediary image, or the connection has loosened to such an extent that the form floats free. In eighteenth-century India, an artist in Jodhpur painted an artist painting a flower akin to Shafi’ ‘Abbasi’s drawing (fig. 7; see fig. 2). Whether or not the later artist knew the earlier work specifically, another one in the chain, or left it to the viewer to make such connections is unknown. Here the artist has pointed his inquiry further towards the representation of art and nature. The flower does not resemble those with delicate white petals growing behind the figure, but rather an exquisite pink specimen, the design of which can be rendered across the arts, such as on the bottom edge of the subject’s finely delineated sash.⁷

FIGURE 2. Left: Old man with spectacles, Iran, Isfahan, Safavid period (1501–1736), 1640s. Ink and color on paper, 10.8 x 8.3 cm. Right: Shafi' 'Abbasi (active ca. 1628–74; attributed), young man drawing a flower, Iran, Isfahan, Safavid period, 1640s. Ink and color on paper, 10.4 x 6 cm. Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, Purchase—Charles Lang Freer Endowment, F1953.17a-b

Replication thus not only connects artists and forms across time and space but also allows for a certain amount of flexibility. As long as artists maintain the key qualities that make an earlier design recognizable, they can adjust the point of attention in the work or expand its references, personalize it, misinterpret it, or make mistakes.⁸ In another drawing from eighteenth-century India, an artist has inhabited the general form of the “artist drawing” with his fellow artist, a man named Gangaram Tambat (fig. 8).⁹ In this case, the artist not only has turned an abstract motif into a specific portrait but also has inserted a little-known local artist into a lineage of courtly painters in sure but sketchy lines. In contrast to such intimacy, other versions admit haste. In another example, back in Safavid lands, the artist has carefully followed the rubric of an “artist drawing,” depicting the hunched pose, beautifully rendered fabric, and paper ready at the knee, but the artist in the work doesn’t have a pen or brush with which to draw (fig. 9)!

These chains of images of an artist drawing or painting—some based on known precedents, others more diffuse—graph the persistence of one form alongside the extent of its geographic spread, across Ottoman and Safavid territories and South Asian lands, and the form’s temporal breadth from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century (although surely extending further back and continuing to the present).¹⁰ The composition persisted, in part, because artistic, collecting, and compilation practices reinforced one another, as David Roxburgh has discussed in reference to the Persian album.¹¹ Collectors and practitioners compiled drawings,

FIGURE 3. Mu'in Musavvir (active 1635–97), portrait of the artist Reza 'Abbasi, Iran, 1673 or 1674. Gouache and gold painting on paper, image: 18.7 x 10.3 cm; illuminated frame: 32.4 x 21.3 cm. Princeton University Library, Princeton, NJ, Garrett Collection, inv.no.95G

paintings, prints, calligraphy, and illumination in albums known as *muraqqa'*, from the Arabic word meaning “patched” or “mended.” Such albums could serve as collections of prized paintings juxtaposed for consideration (as seen in fig. 2) or, as Roxburgh writes, as “storehouses of models and visual ideas” that “involved the repeated reworking of a compositional unit,” as seen on a fifteenth-century page (fig. 10).¹² In this case, the compiler brought these drawings

FIGURE 4. Gentile Bellini (ca. 1429–1507; attributed), seated scribe, Constantinople (Istanbul), ca. 1479–80. Opaque watercolor and gold on paper, frame: 49.2 x 37.5 x 36.8 cm. Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, P15e8

together to relate their designs and to offer a model for working artists. A smudge has been left over the fox's outline (at center right) from sprinkling charcoal over the pounces to transfer the design (also seen in fig. 1); brush-marks from testing the ink appear at lower right; and the remnants of a border drawn around a page that has since been removed are visible.¹³

The act of reprising an iconic unit could be a practical act of design as well as an artistic source of inspiration or play. This "repetition and response," as Molly Aitken has termed the practice in Rajput painting, highlights artistic copying as an agentive practice of conversation among artists across borders and time periods that participates in, and expands on, tradition,

FIGURE 5. Portrait of a painter, Turkey, probably Istanbul, Ottoman period (1299–1922), late 15th century. Opaque watercolor and gold on paper, overall: 28.7 x 18.8 cm. Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, Purchase—Charles Lang Freer Endowment, F1932.28

as seen in the artists' varied repetitions and responses to the form of the "artist drawing" (see figs. 1–9).¹⁴ Yet, circuits of artists, objects, and intermediary figures, like collectors, librarians, and dealers, participate in the dissemination of images. In her essay in this volume, Yael Rice engages with painters' repeated reproduction of visual forms and compositional units. While these provided a means for makers and collectors to forge authorial and affiliative claims to historical images, individuals, and events, Rice turns our attention to the embodied artistic practices, mobile book technologies, and socially networked processes that enabled these phenomena.

FIGURE 6. Portrait of a Persian painter, India, Mughal period (1526–1857), first quarter of 17th century. Ink, color, and gold on paper; H. 31 cm. The al-Sabah Collection, Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyyah, Kuwait, LNS 57 MS. © The al-Sabah Collection

Beyond the material and intellectual practices of replication, commercial artists also standardized their productions for the sake of efficiency. Sunglim Kim, in her essay in this volume, identifies a series of drawings that Korean artists in the Joseon dynasty (1392–1897) used as models for producing panels of *chaekgeori*, paintings of “books and things,” that they could mix and match as per the demands of their clients. Here, copying can be seen as a modular, economic strategy alongside a social practice that linked artists and collectors to earlier traditions, such as European and Chinese traditions of displaying objects, in this case. Kim’s essay points to an extensive historiography of replication in East Asian art. For instance, with regard

FIGURE 7. Self-portrait of a painter at work, India, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, ca. 1750. Opaque watercolor and gold on paper, image: 14.3 x 9.2 cm; sheet: 18.4 x 9.2 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art, Bequest of William P. Wood, 1996, 1996-120-17

to China, Lothar Ledderose has argued that a systematic attention to modularity that depended on assembling “objects from standardized parts” existed across the arts. He writes that “these parts were prefabricated in great quantity and could be put together quickly in different combinations, creating an extensive variety of units from a limited repertoire of components.”¹⁵ Yet a workshop’s stated emphasis on standardization could also mask the actual diversity of its production. In his essay in this volume, Devin Fitzgerald contrasts the streamlined visual representation of papermaking in early modern China with the heterogeneity of the types of paper and places of production that he identifies through a range of manufacturers’ stamps.

FIGURE 8. Portrait (possibly) of the artist Gangaram Tambat (active 1790s), India, ca. 1790. Watercolor and graphite with pen and black ink on medium, slightly textured, cream laid paper; sheet: 20.3 x 13.7 cm. Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, Paul Mellon Collection, B1977.14.22416

Replication drove the continuity of forms, but the two interlock with the activities of compilation and publication, or mobile book technologies, to use Yael Rice's concept. The album's patchwork of different arts, some created for the specific project and some collected, aided the movement and contemplation of forms. While books emphasized aggregation (literally, or through graphic design), their method of collection necessarily pointed to their potential disaggregation and dispersal.¹⁶ Single folios, albums, or libraries could be inherited, sold, or plundered; the materials then could be taken apart and framed anew by different patrons in different locations. In fact, all of the pictures of an "artist drawing" discussed thus far have been removed from previous housing, be it a book, album, or other space of safekeeping. In various museums, they have been conserved as individual works, except for those that already had been joined together, such as Shafi' 'Abbasi's drawing of an artist drawing that sits adjacent to another image of a man scrutinizing a page through his spectacles (see fig. 2).

Gwendolyn Collaço engages with this "world-seizing" quality of the album in her essay in this volume, by contemplating the wide range of arts imported from Central Asia, Europe, India, and Iran that were resold on Istanbul's market and also reworked by Ottoman artists to produce new and refurbished paintings for commercial sale. She draws attention to how consumers not only sought these arts for inclusion in their albums but also recast them by ascribing new

FIGURE 9. Seated artist with his drawing board, Iran, Isfahan, ca. 1600. Ink and opaque watercolor on paper, 35.7 x 23.3 cm. Aga Khan Museum, Toronto, AKM192

identities to the figures depicted, or enlisted artists who overpainted elements and further adapted forms into local aesthetics. Ünver Rüstem takes the question of adaptation in a different direction by focusing on printing processes in Istanbul. In his essay, he addresses a novel form of cartographic cartouche that Ottoman engravers developed by reconfiguring European baroque motifs. Rüstem observes how “wandering forms,” even a seemingly simple ornamental design, “could be fixed, localized, and disseminated anew” to become sites of “cross-cultural mapping.”

FIGURE 10. Assemblage of drawings depicting many subjects, known as the Topkapi Workshop Album, Iran and Central Asia, ca. 1400–1450. Ink on paper, folio: 68 x 50 cm. Topkapi Palace Museum, Istanbul, H.2152, fol. 86a. The Copyright Owner is The Presidency of the Republic of Turkey, The Directorate of National Palaces Administration

A double-page celestial map that Rüstem highlights visualizes the connection between the aggregator of images—in this case, the printing house—and the resultant movement of forms across the globe, or in this print, the sky (fig. 11). He suggests that the engraver, named Mıgırdıç, drew on both Islamic traditions of figural star charts and specific Western publications to emblemize the Mütferrika press for which he worked as a house of learning. Mıgırdıç's adaptation of a Western-style building, nestled between feathery leaves at the base of the print in Rüstem's description, seems to mark this processing of baroque forms in an Ottoman milieu, perhaps even as a portrait of the press itself.

The Printing Press and Typical Forms

The essays in this volume chart the adaptation of forms in their production and reception across geographical and temporal expanses. They also point to a paradox: in order to maintain their force, forms must stay stable enough for their pictorial affiliations to be identifiable, yet also flexible enough to accommodate new owners and contexts. Scholars of European print have focused on the evolving technologies of the printing press and role of the publishing house in the development and reuse of forms, as well as the potential of these technologies for sameness.¹⁷

The invention of the printing press is visualized in two idealized printing workshops in *Nova Reperta* (New Inventions of Modern Times; 1588) by Johannes Stradanus (1523–1605).¹⁸ On

FIGURE 11. Mıgırdıç Galatavi, celestial map, from Katib Çelebi (1609–1657), *Kitāb-ı Cihānūmā* (Istanbul: İbrahim Mütferrika, AH 1145/1732). Ink (copperplate), color, and gold on paper. Uppsala University Library, Bokband 1800-t. Orient. 1, double-page plate between pp. 27 and 28

the left, the production of a book is shown from typesetting to inking, pressing, and drying the printed sheets, while on the right, engravers copy, process, and print visual designs (fig. 12). In nineteenth-century England, the publishers of *The Penny Magazine* reflected on the earlier image of a “Dutch Printing-Office” in their contemplation of the new printing technologies that they used to disseminate their magazine widely (fig. 13).¹⁹ In comparison to the “slow and profitless toil” of earlier printers, the author lays out the modern method for “works in very large demand”: stereotyping.²⁰ In this process, the type and illustrations were set and then cast into a solid (stereo) metal plate to allow for cheap and quick reproduction, as manifested by this page of the magazine. While the process was laborious, the benefits were immense for a magazine that sought the “diffusion of knowledge.”²¹ Such publications not only could be mass produced but the casts of the pages and individual woodcuts also could be sold separately to other countries. For the purposes of these publishers, this method directed “the popular reading” of multiple countries “into the same channels.”²²

Yet the qualities that made stereotype a technology of global mass reproduction also lent it the figurative definition with which we are familiar, in which a form—be it a person, place, or object—is associated with a set of simple, often reductive characteristics, remaining unchanged.²³ Since Partha Mitter published his seminal book *Much Maligned Monsters*, which traces the shifting meanings of the European prints of India, in 1977, and Edward Said published *Orientalism* in 1978 on the similar effects of prejudice in the literary sphere, sustained interest has arisen in how stereotypical concepts of other cultures develop and become reified through the technology of print and other media.²⁴ In the 1950s, William Ivins argued that the matrix of engraved lines or aquatint tones, for instance, could translate any image—painting, drawing, or sculpture—into the printed medium’s “net of rationality.”²⁵ Once viewers were able to recognize the matrix of lines, tones, or dots, any subject became legible through the medium’s format. Further, in Ivins’s terms, the mechanics of print could create an “exactly repeatable pictorial statement,” which lent authority to the printed image in contrast to manual forms of replication.²⁶

Scholars also have emphasized, however, that prints could be readily manipulable when the plate was updated or copied anew (and, therefore, not necessarily “exactly repeatable”) as well as purposely designed to allow for reuse, thus undercutting claims to authority.²⁷ In his investigation of the production of exoticism in Dutch publishing houses in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Benjamin Schmidt has observed that illustrations of landscapes, portraits, and the manners and customs of foreign peoples and places were designed at once to be easily recognizable but also to be general enough that they could be recycled in varied contexts.²⁸ The same print of a serpent charmer, for example, could be used to illustrate an account of Brazil or of India as long as it signaled the exotic. Such an image is seen in a print of a man “shewing tricks with serpents” that publishers placed in different sections of *Voyages and Travels in the East and West Indies* by Johan Nieuhof (1618–1672), first published in Dutch in 1682, in various scales and languages in different editions, such as in an English version from 1732 (fig. 14).²⁹

Thus, while prints could perpetuate the production of a relatively steady composition, their mobility brought them before radically different audiences and opened them to constant reinterpretation.³⁰ For example, the print of the serpent charmer was reused by the English minister and author John Platts (1775–1837) in 1827 in his *The Manners and Customs of All Nations* (fig. 15). The hand-colored image was reduced not only in size but also in awe from earlier descriptions. Platts determined that India held “nothing so common as dancing serpents.”³¹

FIGURE 12. Above: Jan Collaert I (ca. 1530–1581), after Jan van der Straet, called Stradanus (1523–1605), *New Inventions of Modern Times (Nova Reperta)*, The Invention of Copper Engraving, plate 4, “The Invention of Book Printing” (Philips Galle, ca. 1600). Engraving on paper, sheet: 20 x 27 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1934, 34.30(5). Below: Jan Collaert I, after Jan van der Straet, called Stradanus, *New Inventions of Modern Times (Nova Reperta)*, The Invention of Copper Engraving, plate 19, “The Invention of Copperplate Engraving” (Philips Galle, ca. 1600). Engraving on paper, sheet: 20 x 27 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1949, 49.95.870(10)

FIGURE 13. "The Commercial History of a Penny Magazine, No. III," *Monthly Supplement of The Penny Magazine of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge*, October 31–November 30, 1833.

Stereotyped wood engraving and type on paper, 29 x 20 cm. Indiana University, Bloomington. Digitized by Google

Yet the design persisted beyond any verity to the practice that it once claimed, far enough to reveal the European matrix of its contrived subject and design. The Japanese artist Ishikawa Tairō (1762–1818) consulted the illustrations in Nieuhof's *Voyages and Travels* not to sketch Brazilian or Indian figures, but to understand the modeling and composition of European examples (fig. 16).³²

Prints—"lightweight, relatively inexpensive, and easily transportable," in Aaron Hyman's terms—not only depicted peoples and objects from across the world but also were used by artists and publishers across cultures. They could serve as source designs for other media as well as the means for invention, even if the resultant images, including paintings, paradoxically were rooted in the "act of copying" prints.³³ Such "exchanges between print and other media," as Edward H. Wouk has noted, can set off "chain reactions of images and objects."³⁴ This intermediality could lead to surprising configurations along with high-lighting instability in the relationships among media, form, and meaning. The "constant

task of assigning equivalences, the back-and forth between source and product, and the inevitable differences of time and space,” as Wouk writes, “can result in a loss of meaning and overall coherence.”³⁵

The contradictory pairing of stability and flexibility in a standardized form can be propelled through the technology of production, as well as medium and design, to shift meanings in reception. My essay in this volume focuses on the French publishing house Firmin Didot and its reliance on a collection of Indian albums of paintings housed in its library, among works that the publishing house collected from around the world, for its publication *Le Costume historique* (1888). By tracing the transformation of the Indian paintings (already embedded within histories of replication in South Asia) into a chromolithographic format, the essay identifies how forms were interpreted imaginatively as well as harmfully across cultures through their media and designs.

The stability and instability of forms is also at stake in Anna Arabindan-Kesson’s essay. Arabindan-Kesson presses on the seeming coherence of British medical reports to reveal the underlying indeterminacy in the colonial representation of tropical medicine, specifically of the disease called parangi in Sri Lanka. By tracing the accumulation of information around a single boy and his image, in photography, watercolor, and print, she simultaneously documents the creation of a British “pathology of disease” from the British Empire’s imperial holdings while recognizing the interconnections of these territories as a means for a disease’s spread. In the process, she confronts the dual meaning of the term “viral” as a description of viruses and as the rapid and unpredictable circulation of information. In the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, Arabindan-Kesson’s question gains urgency, for “who,” as Arundhati Roy wrote, “can use the term ‘gone viral’ now without shuddering a little?”³⁶

Yet, these past few years have shown that there is no stopping the dizzying relay of information. The essays in this volume are concerned with the standardization of forms and formats as well as their continuous replication and dissemination. They help us to reckon with the structural tenacity of visual types and taxonomy.

Art History and Taxonomy

Art histories across the globe have contended with the serial replication of typical forms as icons, motifs, or stereotypes for centuries, but art history as a European discipline has a specific relationship with replication. The field is founded on the study of artworks reproduced in prints and photographs. The repercussions of “the work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction,” as Walter Benjamin (1892–1940) framed it in his famous essay, bear examination specifically through the taxonomies that art history has developed in its use of reproductive images as the basis for study.³⁷

The promise of an image data bank as a key to the underlying rationale of art has driven the modern study of forms.³⁸ Before the German art historian Johann Winckelmann (1717–1768) was able to travel to Rome in 1755, he formed key conceptions of the “noble simplicity and quiet grandeur” of antique sculpture from engravings and casts in Dresden.³⁹ Other eighteenth-century scholars like William Jones (1746–1794) or Richard Payne Knight (1751–1824) relied on prints to develop comparative models of the connections among gods or iconic forms common in Greece, Italy, Egypt, and India.⁴⁰ Over the long nineteenth century, prints, and then photographs, became a source for charting the rise and decline of arts, the continuity of ornamental styles, or binary aesthetic principles, like linear and painterly or plane and recession in the formulations of Heinrich Wölfflin (1864–1945).⁴¹

FIGURE 14. "A Malabar Shewing tricks with Serpents." Copperplate engraving on paper, 34.3 x 21.3 cm. From Johannes Nieuhof (1618–1672), "Remarkable Voyages & Travels . . . of the West and East Indies," in *A Collection of Voyages and Travels*, vol. 2 (London: printed by Awnsham and John Churchill, 1732). Robert J. Del Bontà Collection, Freer Gallery of Art and Arthur M. Sackler Gallery Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, Gift of Robert J. Del Bontà, 2014 and 2015, FSA_A2014.06_1.29b

The study of reproduced forms therefore could be particular to a culture or move across cultures; it also could afford a psychic or aesthetic current. Aby Warburg (1866–1929) tracked the gestures and tropes, or *pathosformel*, that continuously recur in paintings, sculptures, and performances through the photographic reproductions of art that he collected, organized, and reorganized on black cloth. He titled this project the Mnemosyne Atlas (1924–29), as if a constellation of human memory (fig. 17).⁴² In the case of André Malraux (1901–1976), the photograph of art became the art in his *Musée Imaginaire*, or Museum without Walls (1947–65). Here, the photographic reproductions became part of the process of abstracting forms from a wide range of cultures to identify universal aesthetic themes.⁴³ These studies of form or “formalism” reveal that the art historian can be understood as a type of anthropologist. As David Summers has analyzed, form became a means to characterize “the style of the school, the country, the race,” or the human mind writ large.⁴⁴ Éric Michaud has stated this categorization of cultures by way of art (even in order to see beyond them to a universal) more bluntly: the “genealogy of art history,” he writes, is rooted in “race and blood.”⁴⁵

FIGURE 15. "Dancing Serpents." Hand-colored engraving with etching on paper, 21 x 12.3 cm. From John Platts (1775–1837), *The Manners and Customs of All Nations* (London: Fisher, Son & Co., 1827). Robert J. Del Bontà Collection, Freer Gallery of Art and Arthur M. Sackler Gallery Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, Gift of Robert J. Del Bontà, 2014 and 2015, FSA_A2014.06_1.30

In her projects, the contemporary artist Annu Palakunnathu Matthew confronts the role of anthropology in art history and the audacity of stereotypes. In her photographic work *An Indian from India*, she juxtaposes a nineteenth-century photograph of an American or "Feather Indian" with herself, a "Dot Indian . . . from India" (fig. 18). Through her lens, these two images are shown to be exchanged easily one for the other; from the photographic format to the designation of "Indian" and the exotic composition, they are recognized as mutable. Matthew's work embodies the portal that art presents in connecting distant places, times, and peoples, and the colonial taxonomies that sought to make sense of them through the shorthand of stereotype.

Matthew's project resonates with one that Warburg undertook during a trip to America in the early twentieth century, in which he acted as an anthropologist as well as an art historian. In his subsequent "Lecture on Serpent Rituals," which he gave in 1923, Warburg brought together the drawings and photographs of Pueblo Indian engagements with serpent symbols that he had witnessed in the American Southwest with Greco-Roman and

FIGURE 16. Ishikawa Tairō (1762–1817), “Malabaarse lantlopers die slangen laten dansen,” from *Ransho mosha-jō* (Album of Copies of Dutch Writings), late 18th–early 19th century. Ink on paper, 32.6 x 23.8 cm. Private collection, Japan

Christian depictions of snakes that he had studied in artistic reproductions and would move among the panels of his Atlas (see fig. 17).⁴⁶ While Warburg reckoned with the serpents that he saw according to their survival through time, as something mythic rising through the human psyche, Matthew compels us to question the human orchestration of a form’s persistence.

Warburg’s lecture and Matthew’s photographs provide a curious continuity of the chains of the previous sections. Warburg’s lecture adds a link to the series of “serpent charmers” that, at different junctures in time, represented Brazilian, Indian, or European peoples, and in the last instance also served as an example of European printed arts in format and composition (see figs. 14–16). Warburg’s Atlas also opens a formal connection to the format of Persian, Mughal, and Ottoman albums (see fig. 10); both contain similarly sized images brought together to explore a common theme, or to find new meanings or ideas through juxtaposition. We can even imagine the image of Warburg’s Atlas, which contained art with serpents, placed on a black panel alongside the chain of engraved serpent charmers, and a page from a Persian, Mughal, or Ottoman album with drawings of the “artist drawing” to study the forms and formats of art history. Together, these admit contradictory forces: the wrangling of images into a chain that makes sense, and the acknowledgment that those images will loosen and defy the chain’s evolving taxonomy.

The chains of images that we have traced alongside the historiographies to which they gesture have been honed for the sake of juxtaposition. The historiography of Ottoman, Safavid, and South Asian copying practices and wandering forms sketched here has stressed the positive, innovative qualities within copying and has foregrounded artistic lineage primarily within manual forms of replication in the graphic arts of drawing and painting, and their collection in albums. In contrast, the historiography of European publishing houses and typical forms has drawn our attention to the negative potential of the reductive associations between people and of characteristics within mechanical reproduction, specifically in technologies of print and in publication formats like newspapers and travel books. Clearly, European copying

FIGURE 17. Aby Warburg (1866–1929), first version of the Mnemosyne Atlas, March–May, 1928. Panels 19 and 25.
© Warburg Institute Archive, University of London

practices can be imaginative and artist-driven, just as the “artist drawing” implies, and Islamic and South Asian copying practices can be reductive and classificatory, like those of Europe can be. No single “European,” “Safavid,” “Ottoman,” or “South Asian” mode exists! “Why tend to taxonomies, then,” Matthew’s photographs seem to whisper. “Why revive the very stereotypes that people consistently try to overcome?”

FIGURE 18. Annu Palakunnathu Matthew (born 1964), *An Indian from India*, 2004–7.

Pigment print on paper, sheet: 30.1 x 48.3 cm. © Annu Palakunnathu Matthew courtesy sepiaEYE, New York

In her essay in this volume, Matthew discusses a recent project in which she has turned her attention to processes of reactivation. She asks why Indian soldiers who fought in World War II on behalf of the British remain unremembered. Her question is not only political but also archival. In her essay, she points to a photograph that a friend sent of her grandfather, Lt. Col. Gopal Chakraborty, which elucidated her project (fig. 19). Matthew writes that, “The striking photograph provided an immediate face and a visceral connection to one of these two and a half million Indian soldiers.” In a museum collection, this soldier most likely would have been labeled “unknown,” but in a family archive, the photograph remains animated by the story that it prompts.

Here, Matthew addresses another aspect of taxonomic practice. It is the reception of the image that can flip back and forth between known and unknown, portrait and type, a participant—be it a person, an object, a medium, or a design—that is alone or part of a collective or lineage. In “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” Benjamin wrestled with the political potential of copies in contrast to the loss of the aura of the original image, but he also considered the punctuated life of the multiple. A “plurality of copies,” Benjamin writes, means that the reproduction is “permit[ed] . . . to meet the beholder . . . in his own particular situation,” which “reactivates the object reproduced.”⁴⁷ This insight bears weight for the artist or art historian who becomes one person in a chain of those who receive and reactivate objects.

This volume of *Ars Orientalis* is driven by the fact that the history of art has shown consistently that artists have developed taxonomies of visual types and that any number of publics

FIGURE 19. Lt. Col. Gopal Chakraborty (1922–1981), ca. 1944. Scan of original family photo. Courtesy of Monisha Nayar-Akhtar and Yamini Nayar

have been open to receiving them, over and over again. By acknowledging this impulse and striving to identify the processes underneath the creation of standardized forms, whether such processes lean neutral, negative, positive, or resist this type of assessment altogether, we can begin to trace their countless, complicated histories. The authors writing in this volume take care in explicating the multiplicity of copies in their studies, in weaving together various histories and chains of images, and in considering the reactivation of persistent forms.

Holly Shaffer, PhD (Yale University), 2015, is an assistant professor of the history of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century art and architecture at Brown University. Her research focuses on arts that either were created or collected across cultures, primarily between South Asia and Britain, and their reformulation over time. Her publications include *Grafted Arts: Art Making and Taking in the Struggle for Western India, 1760–1820* (Paul Mellon Centre with Yale University Press, expected 2022; winner of the AHS Edward Cameron Dimock, Jr. Prize in the Indian Humanities), *Adapting the Eye: An Archive of the British in India* (2011), and essays in *The Art Bulletin*, *Art History*, *Journal18*, *Modern Philology*, and *Third Text*. In 2013, she served as guest curator of *Strange and Wondrous: Prints of India from the Robert J. Del Bontà Collection* at the Freer Gallery of Art and Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution. E-mail: holly_shaffer@brown.edu

---

Notes

I would like to thank the editors of *Ars Orientalis*, especially Massumeh Farhad, Sana Mirza, and Melanie Klein, as well as Meredith Gamer, Sonal Khullar, Evelyn Lincoln, and Jeffrey Moser for their thoughtful edits and references, and the

volume's authors for their insightful contributions. I also wholeheartedly thank Debra Diamond and Bob Del Bontà, under whose guidance I developed this issue at the Freer Gallery of Art and Arthur M. Sackler Gallery. In addition, I thank Brown University, the Getty-ACLS postdoctoral fellowship, and the Smithsonian Postdoctoral Fellowship in the History of Art for supporting this project.

- 1 Many terms exist for the making of copies or multiples; I have chosen to use the term "replication" to emphasize the attention given in this introduction and volume to chains of forms and their force, be it stylistic, relational, or psychic. Replication is also a relatively neutral term that is used in a range of disciplines and fields. See, for example, Whitney Davis, *Replications: Archaeology, Art History, Psychoanalysis* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996); and Patricia Berger, "Pious Copies," in Berger, *Empire of Emptiness: Buddhist Art and Political Authority in Qing China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2003), 124–66.
- 2 These are vast fields, so in brief, for such debates in the history of the book, see Marshall McLuhan, *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962); Elizabeth Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998); David McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript, and the Search for Order, 1450–1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Miles Ogborn, *Script and Print in the Making of the English East India Company* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007); Cynthia J. Brokaw and Peter F. Kornicki, *The History of the Book in East Asia* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2013); and Hala Auji, *Printing Arab Modernity* (Leiden: Brill, 2016). In the history of art, see Walter Benjamin, *The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility, and Other Writings on Media*, ed. Michael W. Jennings, Brigid Doherty, and Thomas Y. Levin (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008); William Mills Ivins, Jr., *Prints and Visual Communication* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1953); Partha Mitter, *Much Maligned Monsters: A History of European Reactions to Indian Art* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977); Vishakha N. Desai, "Reflections of the Past in the Present: Copying Processes in Indian Painting," in *Perceptions of South Asia's Visual Past*, ed. Catherine B. Asher and Thomas R. Metcalf (New Delhi: American Institute of Indian Studies, 1994), 135–47; Lothar Ledderose, *Ten Thousand Things: Module and Mass Production in Chinese Art* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000); Molly Aitken, *The Intelligence of Tradition in Rajput Court Painting* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010); Evelyn Lincoln, *Brilliant Discourse: Pictures and Readers in Early Modern Rome* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014); Suzanne Karr-Schmidt and Edward Wouk, eds., *Prints in Translation, 1450–1750: Image, Materiality, Space* (New York: Routledge, 2017); David Roxburgh and Mary McWilliams, eds., *Technologies of the Image: Art in Nineteenth-Century Iran* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017); Julie Nelson Davis, *Partners in Print: Artistic Collaboration and the Ukiyo-e Market* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2021); and Sonal Khullar, ed., *The Arts of the Book in South Asia* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, expected 2022), among many other works and fields.
- 3 See note 1. This volume also speaks to earlier volumes of *Ars Orientalis*, such as Nebahat Avcioglu and Finbarr Barry Flood, eds., "Globalizing Cultures: Art and Mobility in the Eighteenth Century," *Ars Orientalis* 39 (2009); and Sugata Ray, ed., "The Language of Art History," *Ars Orientalis* 48 (2018).
- 4 See McLuhan, *Gutenberg Galaxy*; W.J.T. Mitchell, *Picture Theory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Stephen Bann, *Parallel Lines: Printmakers, Painters, and Photographers in Nineteenth-Century France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001); Hans Belting, *An Anthropology of Images: Picture, Medium, Body*, trans. Thomas Dunlap (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011); Roxburgh and McWilliams, *Technologies of the Image*; and Karr-Schmidt and Wouk, *Prints in Translation*, for example.
- 5 See Erwin Panofsky, *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* (1939), for one of the foundational texts on form and meaning.
- 6 Scholars have attributed this work to Gentile Bellini (ca. 1429–1507). See the digital catalogue of the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, <https://www.gardnermuseum.org/experience/collection/10755> (last accessed March 24, 2021).
- 7 See Shailka Mishra, "Painting at the Court of Jodhpur: Patronage and Artists," in *Dakhan 2018: Recent Studies on Indian Painting* (Hyderabad: Jagdish and Kamla Mittal Museum of Indian Art, 2020), 108–35.
- 8 See Desai, "Reflections of the Past in the Present," 135–47.
- 9 On Gangaram Tambat, see Holly Shaffer, *Grafted Arts: Art Making and Taking in the Struggle for Western India, 1760–1820* (New Haven and London: Paul Mellon Centre with Yale University Press, expected 2022).

- 10 On charting the temporal and geographic spread of Dutch prints, see Stephanie Porras, "Going viral? Maerten de Vos's St. Michael the Archangel," in *Netherlandish Art in its Global Context*, ed. Thijs Weststeijn et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 54–79.
- 11 See David J. Roxburgh, *The Persian Album: From Dispersal to Collection* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005).
- 12 David J. Roxburgh, "Persian Drawing, ca. 1400–1450: Materials and Creative Procedures," *Muqarnas* 19 (2002): 45. See also David J. Roxburgh, ed., *An Album of Artists' Drawings from Qajar Iran* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Art Museums, 2017).
- 13 Roxburgh, *Persian Album*, 100–101, and the entire third chapter on workshop practices.
- 14 Aitken, *Intelligence of Tradition*, 155–209. See also Debra Diamond, "The Politics and Aesthetics of Citation: Nath Painting in Jodhpur, 1803–1843" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2000).
- 15 Ledderose, *Ten Thousand Things*, 1. On replication in China, see also Jeffrey Moser, "Learning with Metal and Stone: On the Discursive Formation of Song Epigraphy," in *Powerful Arguments: Standards of Validity in Late Imperial China*, ed. Martin Hofmann, Joachim Kurtz, and Ari Daniel Levine (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 135–76; Jonathan Hay, "The Reproductive Hand," in *Between East and West: Reproductions in Art*, ed. Shigetoshi Osano (Cracow: IRSA, 2014), 319–33; and Winnie Wong, *Van Gogh on Demand: China and the Readymade* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2013). For reasons beyond the editors' control, the essays on replication in Japan did not proceed to publication and are missed. An extensive historiography of replication in the graphic arts in Japan exists, along with fascinating current scholarship. In brief, see Davis, *Partners in Print*; Jeannie Kenmotsu, "The Color Revolution: Printed Books in Eighteenth-Century Japan" (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2016); Chelsea Foxwell, *Making Modern Japanese-Style Paintings: Kano Hogai and the Search for Images* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015); and Allen Hockley, *The Prints of Isoda Koryūsai: Floating World Culture and Its Consumers in Eighteenth-Century Japan* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002).
- 16 See Yael Rice, "The Global Aspirations of the Mughal Album," in *Rembrandt and the Inspiration of India*, ed. Stephanie Schrader and Catherine Glynn (Los Angeles: Getty Museum, 2018), 61–77.
- 17 See, for example, Benjamin Schmidt, *Inventing Exoticism: Geography, Globalism, and Europe's Early Modern World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015); Francis Haskell, *History and Its Images* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995); and Johns, *Nature of the Book*.
- 18 See Lia Markey, ed., *Renaissance Invention: Stradanus's Nova Reperta* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2020), and the digital component, <https://dcc.newberry.org/?p=14403> (last accessed April 1, 2021).
- 19 "The Commercial History of a Penny Magazine, No. III," *Monthly Supplement of The Penny Magazine of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge*, October 31–November 30, 1833, 464–72. See Patricia Mainardi, *Another World: Nineteenth Century Illustrated Print Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017).
- 20 "Commercial History of a Penny Magazine," 465.
- 21 "Commercial History of a Penny Magazine," 471.
- 22 "Commercial History of a Penny Magazine," 471.
- 23 "stereotype, n. and adj.," OED Online; and "stéréotype, subst. masc.," TLFi Online (Le Trésor de la Langue Française informatisé), <http://stella.atilf.fr/Dendien/scripts/tlfiv5/search.exe?23;s=3860431485;cat=0;m=st%82r%82otype> (last accessed March 2020).
- 24 See Mitter, *Much Maligned Monsters*; Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978); and Sanjay Subrahmanyam's recent consideration of these two works in Sanjay Subrahmanyam, *Europe's India: Words, People, Empires* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017).
- 25 William Mills Ivins, Jr., *Prints and Visual Communication* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1953), 70. Scholars have expanded this argument to include not only printed mediums but also the legibility of aesthetic formats, such as the picturesque. See Douglas Fordham, *Aquatint Worlds: Travel, Print, and Empire, 1770–1820* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019).
- 26 See Stephen Bann, "Antiquarianism, Visuality, and the Exotic Monument: William Hodges's A Dissertation," in *Traces of India: Photography, Architecture, and the Politics of Representation, 1850–1900* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 62–85.
- 27 See Jesse Feiman, "The Matrix and the Meaning in Dürer's Rhinoceros," *Art in Print* 2.4 (November–December 2012): 22–26; and Porras, "Going viral?"
- 28 See Schmidt, *Inventing Exoticism*.
- 29 Benjamin Schmidt, "Mapping an Exotic World: The Global Project of Dutch Geography," in *The Global Eighteenth Century*, ed. Felicity Nussbaum (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 34–35.
- 30 Edward H. Wouk, "An Anthropology of Print," in *Prints in Translation, 1450–1750: Image, Materiality, Space*, ed. Suzanne Karr-Schmidt and Edward Wouk (New York: Routledge, 2017), 1–18; see also Graham Larkin and Lisa Pon, "The Materiality of Printed

- Words and Images," *Word and Image* 17.1–2 (2001): 1–6, and the essays in that volume.
- 31 John Platts, *The Manners and Customs of All Nations* (London: Fisher, Son & Co., 1827), 750.
  - 32 I am grateful to Caitlin Karyadi for alerting me to this fascinating exchange, and thank her for her help in accessing the image.
  - 33 Aaron M. Hyman, "Inventing Painting: Cristóbal de Villalpando, Juan Correa, and New Spain's Transatlantic Canon," *The Art Bulletin* 99.2 (2017): 103–4.
  - 34 Wouk, "Anthropology of Print," 3. See also Roxburgh, *Technologies of the Image*; and Margaret S. Graves and Alex Dika Seggerman, eds., *Making Modernity in the Islamic Mediterranean* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, forthcoming).
  - 35 Wouk, "Anthropology of Print," 8.
  - 36 Arundhati Roy, "The pandemic is a portal," *The Financial Times, Life & Arts*, April 3, 2020, <https://www.ft.com/content/10d8f5e8-74eb-11ea-95fe-fcd274e920ca> (last accessed April 4, 2020).
  - 37 The title of Benjamin's famous essay, first written and published in German, has been translated in numerous ways, most recently as "The Work of Art in the Age of Technological Reproducibility." I have decided to use the earlier translation due to the impact of the translator's use of the word "reproduction" on the art history that followed, although I draw on insights gained from both of the following English translations. Walter Benjamin, *The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility, and Other Writings on Media*, ed. Michael W. Jennings, Brigid Doherty, and Thomas Y. Levin (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008); and Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction (1936)," trans. Harry Zohn, in *Photography in Print: Writings from 1816 to the Present*, ed. Vicki Goldberg (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988), 319–34.
  - 38 For a recent exploration of replication and the "western canon," see Kristopher W. Kersey, "The Afterlife of the Western Canon: Archive and Eschatology," *The Art Bulletin* 102.4 (2020): 121–45. Kersey's essay also draws together European secular conceptions of reproductive art with Buddhist ideas concerning the religious merit of copying. While devotion is not the focus of this volume, the religious dimension of copying is a critical part of the history of replication. See, for example, Berger, "Pious Copies," 124–66; and Christine Göttler and Mia Mochizuki, eds., *The Nomadic Object: The Challenge of World for Early Modern Religious Art* (Leiden: Brill, 2018).
  - 39 See Alex Potts, "I. Inventing a History of Art," in *Flesh and the Ideal: Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), <https://www-aaepportal-com.revproxy.brown.edu/?id=-14694> (last accessed March 2, 2021).
  - 40 William Jones, "On the Gods of Greece, Italy and India" (1784); and Richard Payne Knight, *An Account of the Remains of the Worship of Priapus* (1786). See Peter Funnell, "The Symbolic Language of Antiquity," in *The Arrogant Connoisseur: Richard Payne Knight, 1751–1824*, ed. Michael Clarke and Nicholas Penny (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982), 50–64.
  - 41 James Fergusson, *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture* (1876); Alois Riegl, *Problems of Style: Foundations for a History of Ornament* (1893); Heinrich Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History* (1915). On these types of publications, see Tapati Guha-Thakurta, *Monuments, Objects, Histories: Institutions of Art in Colonial and Postcolonial India* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004); Christopher S. Wood, *The Vienna School Reader* (New York: Zone Books, 2000); and Christopher S. Wood, *A History of Art History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019).
  - 42 Georges Didi-Huberman, *The Surviving Image: Phantoms of Time and Time of Phantoms: Aby Warburg's History of Art*, trans. Harvey Mendelsohn (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2017). An adjacent literature on form is found in the field of psychoanalysis, such as in Sigmund Freud's attention to dream imagery or Carl Jung's to archetypes.
  - 43 See Walter Grasskamp, *The Book on the Floor: André Malraux and the Imaginary Museum*, trans. Fiona Elliott (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2016); and Gregory Levine, "Malraux's Buddha Heads," in *A Companion to Asian Art and Architecture*, ed. Rebecca Brown and Deborah Hutton (Chichester, West Sussex; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 629–54.
  - 44 David Summers, "'Form,' Nineteenth-Century Metaphysics, and the Problem of Art Historical Description," *Critical Inquiry* 15.2 (Winter 1989): 374. Another key text in the historiography of form is Henri Focillon, *The Life of Forms in Art* (New York: Zone Books, 1992).
  - 45 Éric Michaud has argued that the "Germanic-led invasions of the Roman Empire" undergirded eighteenth- and nineteenth-century art historians' determination that "artistic styles" were "dependent on race and blood." See Éric Michaud, *The Barbarian Invasions: A Genealogy of the History of Art*, trans. Nicholas Huckle (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2019), 2–3.
  - 46 Aby Warburg, "A Lecture on Serpent Ritual," *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 2.4 (April 1939): 277–92.
  - 47 Benjamin, "Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction (1936)," 324.