

**Is Art History Globalizable?
A Critical Commentary from a Far Eastern Point of View**

Published in James Elkins ed., *Is Art History Global?*

London and New York: Routledge, 2007

Personally corrected version for Home page

Corrections 28-29-30 Mars 2006, 2 March 2007; 20 June 2007

Shigemi Inaga

I missed the chance to attend the roundtable. Reading through the transcription of the meeting, I was at the same time frustrated by the fact that I wasn't there, and also relieved. Indeed my absence not only accounts for the difficulty of realizing a global art history as a professional gathering (the total absence of Asian in the panel, which a Japanese alone can hardly cover) but also suggests an invariant of an aesthetic creed or prejudice about Japan: Japanese aesthetics is characterized by its constant failure in or refusal of representing itself whenever occasion is provided. Hence, my absence could be interpreted as a faithful practice of Japanese aesthetics.

To represent oneself on an international arena is not an easy task for an Asiatic who has a full-time job as a civil servant in his/her own country. March is no less a cruel month than April, as it is the ending of an academic year (in Japan, if not in China and Korea). Administrative obligations prevent our compatriots from attending events taking place in the West. Besides, it would be almost impossible for any foreigner to imagine the business of Japanese society unless they were involved in it. For someone who is constantly overcharged and "débordé" in the domestic market of 'literary hack', it is extremely hard to come up with extra requests from abroad. Besides, so as to gear up for the Western market, one is asked to use a language (English, to begin with) which is practically never in use as a means of communication and writing, so long as one is conducting education and research in the faculty of letters at Japanese universities.

It so happened that when I noticed the silly double booking both for domestic consumption and for export to an international arena, it was simply too late. My lecture in Japan had already been publicly announced. At the very moment when the conversation was recorded at the University College Cork, at the opposite side of the planet, I was giving a public lecture in a Japanese local city on the *Hiroshima Murals*, realized by the late Iri and Toshi Maruki 丸木 位里・俊 from 1950 up to the 1970s. The series of wall paintings served as a propaganda machine for the world peace movement during the Cold War period and are now in a private museum built in commemoration of the artists. The *Hiroshima Murals* have become internationally famous both in the East and the West and have been much publicized through an album edited by John Dower, a specialist in Japanese modern history and author of the future prize-winning *Embracing the Defeat*. Yet, in the academic field of art historical research in Japan, even nowadays such works are rarely mentioned.¹

It may be of some interest to note that art historical research in Japan mainly emphasizes old masters and inventories of Buddhist relics. Contemporary artworks with highly charged political connotations have been rejected from Japanese academia despite (or rather as the aftermath of) student revolts in the late 60s, and that exclusion continued into the late 1990th. Those who discuss Maruki's endeavor are categorized either as activists (from "old Marxist" to New Left) or scholars interested in "cultural studies" — which the mainstream (male-dominant, positivist and a-politically formalist) art historians still tend to repudiate as an intrusion made against the *status quo* of "normal" art historical research.

The destiny of works done in commemoration of the atomic bombing could have been an appropriate subject for the Twenty-First International Congress of the Art History in Amsterdam in 1996. Indeed the main theme of the congress was "Memory and Oblivion" and there were sections such as "The Art of Commemoration" and "The Modern Memorial: Victors and Victims of War." However, no Japanese speakers took up war memorials for discussion. Moreover, only four paper proposals were accepted in total from the members of the Japanese Association of Art History, which has more than two thousand five hundred members. And by a strange fate of selection, all four Japanese proposals were put in the poster section, in a clear distinction from proposals made by the scholars and students based in Europe and North America. The Japanese reluctance to speak and the Western unwillingness to give

voice to their irrelevant stammer are consistent tendencies in the majority of international humanities meetings (except for psychology and some associations specifically for Japanese studies).

This small anecdote in the guise of an introduction — and to make my apologies for not attending — will suffice to suggest the multi-layered difficulties that globalizing art history has to face as a rigorous discipline. In the following analysis, I will subdivide my presentation into three parts, following more or less faithfully the conversation at the University College Cork. First I will discuss institutional problems relative to academic disciplines. Second, space-time frameworks must be questioned, along with geographical boundaries. Third, I will address conceptualizations of key critical terms and their applicability, especially in terms of the political power relationships between center and periphery. Although I am going to provide as many references as possible, it is simply impossible to give exhaustive references. I therefore confess from the beginning that the notes remain highly personal and that I am neither capable of covering, nor qualified to cover, all the fields that must be taken into consideration under the rubric of present question.

I Western Art History and Non-Western Arts

The most prominent obstacle to the globalization of art historical research is the fact that the International Association for Art History [CIHA] has not been, and is not, even now, worthy of the name. At best, it is an international association, with global attendance, mainly dedicated to the study of Western art history. The so-called Oriental art history may well sporadically and whimsically be included in the research program (for example thanks to the personal initiative of Henri Focillon in 1921, just to mention an example from the founding days).ⁱⁱ Yet Asia (and the Orient, if you prefer) is a territory reserved for “orientalists” as far as Western scholarship is concerned. The profound knowledge of the East elaborated by the tradition of Oriental studies (which Edward W. Said criticized as a form of colonial usurpation) is conserved within a closed circle of initiated specialists.ⁱⁱⁱ

Despite their mastery of difficult Eastern languages and incompatible social customs, most Orientalists in the West have remained more or less at the periphery of the scholarly world, although their modesty, reserve, and devotion to their marginalized professional specialties is occasionally appreciated as a distinguished qualification in the *monde savant*. Even so, they seldom dare to venture out of their protected domain so as to address the ordinary public (with some exceptions, such as René Grousset in France).^{iv} Proud of their specialization, and in the interest of self-protection, they tend to scornfully criticize laymen’s careless access to their academic sanctuary within the ivory tower. And this tendency of self-imposed isolation has been mimicked by “native” Orientalists in the Orient without their suspecting that their own behavior is itself a caricature that inevitably oscillates between the pride of domestic authority in the periphery, and the humiliation of a foreign informant at the center of an academic hierarchy.

Indeed, most of the top ranking Eastern scholars of the pre-W.W.2 period in the East have been so busy catching up with the Western development of the discipline that they have satisfied themselves with the acquaintance they have made with the distinguished Western scholars in their own fields of research. During the pre-war period and up until in the late 1970s, each Japanese scholar returning from the Western “center” proudly displayed his (and rarely her) faithfulness to the Western masters in token of his (or her) authority.^v

In Oriental studies, however, the same attitude inevitably resulted in a double alienation and caused an irritating double bind. While in the West you are expected to behave yourself as an authority and connoisseur of Japanese art history, when you return to your own country, you have to manifest your perfect mastery of the latest Western scholarship. To make things worse, most of the Western scholars and amateurs preferred *ukiyo-e* block prints, whereas this domain of popular imagery in the late Tokugawa period had been scornfully disdained by the Japanese *literati* class and looked down upon by academic scholars indoctrinated in the classical canon of the Western art.

In order to pretend to be universal, one is forced to deny the cultural value of art (one’s own art, as it were) that has been highly appreciated by one’s own Western teachers. The irony of this double refraction may partly account for the complicated psychological inferiority complex that Japanese scholars of pre-war period could not overcome — or rather could not help awkwardly revealing. (A similar uneasiness is felt by African art historians, as witness the harsh criticism to the MoMA *Primitivism in the 20th Century* show.)^{vi}

The other side of the coin manifested itself as a nationalistic statement, which characterized the founding days of modern Japanese art history. *L’Histoire de l’art du Japon*, the first official account of the Empire of the Rising Sun, was compiled at the occasion of *L’Exposition universelle* in Paris in 1900. Previously, a rudimentary guide to Japanese ceramics had been published at the Paris World Fair in 1878 at the heyday of *Japonisme*, so as to satisfy European

amateurs' eagerness to identify their Japanese pottery. Yet "arts and crafts" (including pottery) were not sufficient to prove the existence of "Fine Arts" in the Japanese Empire. Something equivalent to the Greek classic period had to be "excavated" from the forgotten relics of Buddhist antiquities. The first attempts at such an inventory took place in the 1880s and 1890s; the periodization of 7th and 8th centuries. Buddhist temples in Nara and Kyoto from the 7th Century. was proudly demonstrated in Paris so as to rectify and discredit Western amateurs' "misconception" of Japanese civilization.^{vii} To have a clear idea of the paradigm shift that *L'Histoire de l'art du Japon* tried to manifest, it would be enough to have a glance at the description on a print craftsman. Hokusai had been regarded by many French amateurs as the peak of the history of Japanese painting as a whole, and he became an object of praise in Louis Gonse's *L'Art japonais* (1883) and Edmond de Goncourt's monographic study *Hokousai* published in 1896. In *L'Histoire de l'art du Japon* in 1900, however, only thirteen lines were given to his life, placing him among the craftsmen of *ukiyo-e* print manufacture.^{viii} Thus, the authentic discourse of Japanese Art History, with a claim to universality, was re-invented (in Eric Hobsbawm's sense) in Westernizing Japan so as to meet the Western expectation and to satisfy national dignity.

(It would not be useless, in this context, to mention that in contemporaneous India, and especially in Calcutta, attempts were made to establish a "national consciousness" under the Swadeshi nationalist movement by boycotting British products. As Partha Mitter and Tapati Guha-Thakurta have shown, it was in this context that the notion of "essential Indian-ness" was launched mainly by A.K. Coomaraswamy, E. B. Havell, and Sister Nivedita, so as to conceive a new national Indian art history. By refusing to accept any influence from abroad as a beneficial factor in Indian art history, they discredited the value of the Gandhara Buddhist sculptures which had been highly appreciated in earlier Western scholarship because of their affinity with the Greco-Roman canon.^{ix})

A Japanese author, Okakura Kakuzô (岡倉覚三・天心 1863-1913; better known by his sobriquet Tenshin) was in charge of the editorship of *L'Histoire de l'art du Japon* and also directly involved in the nationalistic formation of Indian art history as an idea through his publication of *The Ideals of The East* (1904), which he completed during his first stay in India. Incidentally the book ends with the slogan: "Victory from within or mighty death without." Being a close friend of Isabella Stuart Gardner, Okakura contributed to the collection and display of the Department of Oriental Art at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. Clearly, he had it in mind to show the cultural heritage of Oriental civilizations to the Western public so as to obtain universal recognition of the Oriental art history as the indispensable companion to its Occidental counterpart. This intention was also held by Western art historians of the following generation who, like Henri Focillon, tried to establish a Universal art history by realizing a synthesis of Eastern and Western scholarship during the cosmopolitan epoch between the two World Wars.^x

And yet, it must not be overlooked that in his *Book of Tea* (1906), Okakura clearly manifested his unwillingness to present and appreciate Oriental Art in a Western fashion. Relying upon Taoist scriptures and Zen Buddhist concepts, Okakura tried to persuade Western readership that the Eastern cult of spiritual aesthetics and immaterial beauty is in sharp opposition to Western physical and material beauty. The emptiness of the tea house, he argues, is hardly compatible with the Western type trophy-display of museum collections and the practice of tea ceremony would not be easily assimilable to Western art appreciation, which puts excessive emphasis on the visual at the detriment of the pleasures of the other four senses. Okakura also insisted on the fact that in Asian art history, fine arts could hardly be clearly distinguished from arts and crafts and he (unsuccessfully) coined an alternative term of *kogei* (refined arts 巧藝) so as to cover all the branches of handmade artistic creation.^{xi} Thus a theoretical resistance to the fallacy inherent in an attempt at globalizing art history was clearly formulated by the pioneer of the Oriental art history at the beginning of the 20th century.

II Art History as Academic Institution and Discipline

This birth trauma, so to speak, was repressed during the process of institutionalizing art history as an academic discipline. And the repressed would inevitably return, revealing innate obstacles to the globalization of the discipline. It was in 1916 that the chair of art history was inaugurated at the Imperial University of Tokyo, with Taki Seiichi (瀧精一 1873-1945) being the first recipient. Several imperial universities in Japan followed suit (including the Keijô University in Seoul from 1926, as Korea had been "annexed" to Japan since 1910, while in the Taihoku Imperial University in Taiwan, inaugurated 1928, the department of Art History was not established). There were few chairs in the prewar period. A critical assessment of Meiji Era scholarship made by Kishiro Shûichi (木代修一 1898-?) in 1936

counts no more than 30 scholars covering art history, archaeology and aesthetics, but there is no similar assessment for the following years.^{xii}

Among legendary scholars of international renown, let me mention just three names. Ômura Sêgai (大村西崖 1868-1927) is known for his studies in Chinese sculpture and painting; his books were translated into Chinese in the pre-war period and served as basic references for connoisseurs.^{xiii} The framework of the Oriental art history in Japan was delimited by the generation of Ômura, with its strong antiquarian overtones, and it has not been seriously questioned until recently. It must be also indicated that in the first series of *Selected Relics of Japanese Art (Shinbi taikan)* (『真美大観』 in 20 volumes, 1899-1908) to which Ômura cooperated, the explanation of each plate is given in two languages (a Sanskrit scholar, Takakusu Junjirô 高楠順次郎 1866-1945, disciple of Max Müller, wrote English commentaries), but in the following volumes of *Selected Relics of Oriental Art (Tôyô Bijutsu Taikan)* (『東洋美術大観』 in 15 volumes, 1908-1918), the explanatory text was written only in Japanese. In the long run, the initial delimitation of the discipline of Oriental art history resulted in its relative isolation from Western scholarship and contributed to the lack of interest among the next generations of Japanese Oriental scholars in modern and contemporary Asian art. (It was only in 1999 that the Fukuoka Asia Museum was inaugurated as the first public institute to deal with modern and contemporary Asian Art.)

The most famous Japanese art historian in the West may be Yashiro Yukio (矢代幸雄 1890-1975). A disciple of Bernard Berenson, Yashiro published *Sandro Botticelli* (1925) in English; it remains a major Japanese contribution to the Western art historical scholarship. In this book, Yashiro is known to have introduced retouched photographs framing only the relevant details of works to aid identification. He is also remembered as the First Director of the Institute for Art Studies (美術研究所 inaugurated in 1930). Later he published his lifework, *Essences of Japanese Art* (『日本美術の特質』 1944/65), which discusses national characteristics according to four terms: impressionistic, decorative, symbolic and sentimental. Based on the author's wide span of knowledge, and bridging the West and the East, the book tries to examine a branch of Asian artistic creation from the perspective of the universal standards of the day. Though apparently old fashioned in its nationalistic approach, this monumental synthesis would be worth being critically scrutinized, so as to measure the possibility of a global art history and to detect the limit of applicability of Western criteria. However, the book remains inaccessible to Western scholarship because it has not been translated.^{xiv} Let me add the name of Shimada Shûjiro (島田修二郎 1907-94), who produced a generation of specialists in Japanese and Chinese art history at Princeton University in the United States in the post-war period. His contribution, comparable to that of Wen Fong, must be also judged in terms of globalizing the discipline of Asian art history.^{xv}

However, none of these names (let alone the multitude of Asian scholars) were mentioned either in Udo Kulterman's readable *Geschichte der Kunstgeschichte* (1981 et seq.) or in Germain Bazin's *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art* (1986), on account of a structural triple blindness. First, any Oriental contribution to Western art historical research is by definition supplementary or auxiliary. Second, the domain of Oriental studies is not included in the "histories of art history," as "history" here implicitly means "Western art history," excluding by definition Orientalist territories. And third, rigorous contributions made by Oriental scholars on Oriental art in Oriental languages are simply non-existent to those who have no access to the working languages in question (as they are "monopolized" by Orientalists).

Here the problem of working language must be reexamined in relation to the discipline's periodicals. Okakura founded *Kokka* 『国華』 magazine in 1889, following the model of a *Burlington Magazine* or *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (treating mainly Japanese Art). Yashiro founded another periodical, *Bijutsu Kenkyû*, 『美術研究』 in 1932 (including Oriental Art). Both remain basic research periodicals. Though pioneering endeavors in their founding days, these periodicals kept concentrating on the inventory and description of individual artworks and paid little attention to the later development in methodological discussions. In the post-war period *Bijutsushi* (『美術史』 *Journal of Art History*, as it was initially named, founded in 1949) of the Japan Art History Society, was added (Western Art is included). It is true that most of these periodicals insert English summaries of their main articles. Yet these publications remain inaccessible to ordinary art history students in the West, and it is a logical consequence that no serious attention is paid to them except for the small circle of Oriental studies specialists. The same would be true of Chinese and Korean periodicals which are piled on the shelves of East-Asian research libraries.

To what extent do these Japanese journals care about the globalization of the discipline? It must be said that the persistence of the self-imposed tradition of formal and iconographical analysis means they remain ignorant of theoretical considerations. While Saussurean linguistics and structuralism was already highly fashionable in the 1970s (*Cours de linguistique générale* (1916) was translated into Japanese as early as 1928 provoking academic debate in pre-war period and Michel Foucault's *Les Mots et les choses* (1967) was translated into Japanese in 1974), such critical apparatus was not introduced in academic periodicals of art history until in the 1990s, and recent Western studies on the social functions of art and art institutions have been mainly overlooked; they have been seen as simply irrelevant to the kind of art historical research that has been conducted by specialists of Japanese and Oriental art.^{xvi} It was not until the 1990s that gender studies was introduced, mainly thanks to feminist art historians (the Western latest import, from Leeds and North America, and to add here "as always!" would be politically incorrect), requiring drastic reform in the conservative Japanese Association of Art History.^{xvii}

III. Two Layers of "Global Art History"

When we ask: Is art history global? We have to divide the question into two levels. First there are the artworks that constitute the corpus of what I will call Global Art History (G.A.H.). Second is the level of the disciplines that contribute to understanding the G.A.H. Quite often the two levels are confused. And worse, Western scholars tend to overlook the fact that the superimposition of these two layers (objects, and agents of research) on geographical and geopolitical contexts makes the resulting permutations extremely complicated. Without entering into the details of institutional history, let me make one statistical remark before analyzing three structural problems embedded in the discipline at present.

Even in the postwar period, the number of chairs of art history in Japan has been relatively limited when compared to those in North American academia. Among ninety-nine national universities (the category of "national university" itself was dissolved in 2004), only eight had a department of art history (and occasionally aesthetics). Several of the main private universities and fine arts colleges (among the total of 989, consisting of 526 private universities and 463 private colleges as of 2003) are equipped with departments of art history. However, in most of the national and municipal universities, an art historical education is subordinate to the curriculum of the faculty of education. Power relationships in the academic market place must be carefully examined in terms of distribution of these educational conditions. In Western institutions, it is Western art history that maintains dominant position vis-à-vis those sectors "relegated" into peripheral departments with titles such as Asian and African Languages and Cultures, in which the discipline of Oriental art history occupies a very precarious position. In the Japanese case, the following three factors are pertinent in understanding these conditions.

First, the triple juxtaposition of Western, Oriental and Japanese art histories remains a basic structure of Japanese scholarship. Oriental art history may be subdivided into Indian (that is ancient Buddhist) art history and Chinese art history. In both branches, (if not in Western and Japanese branches of art history) the modern era is excluded by definition, although it is partly recuperated by such non-art historians as linguists and cultural anthropologists who study "minor" cultures. Because there are very few professorships in the national universities, most of institutes cannot afford to have a specialist in both fields (that is, China and India) of Oriental art history. The three branches of Western, Oriental, and Japanese art have little in common, except for the illusory conviction that they belong to the one and same community of art historians.

Second, in most of the leading universities, architectural history is not put with art history in the humanities but is taught in the Department of Architecture in the Faculty of Technology. (The latter is a Japanese reinterpretation of the Prussian model of *Technische Hochschule*.) Scholars of the pioneering generation, such as Itô Chûta (伊東忠太 1867-1954), founding father of world architectural history in Japan, and Sekino Tadshi (関野貞 1867-1936), an engineer, indefatigable archaeologist, and experienced fieldworker of tumuli and ancient Buddhist architecture in Korea and China, worked together with Ernest F. Fenollosa (1853-1908) and Okakura in their early investigations. In the following years, because of specialization, art historical research in Japan lost contact with historians of architecture, and it is only in recent years that several joint projects around the university museum have rehabilitated these pioneers from long disregard and academic oblivion.^{xviii}

Third, the affinity between art history and aesthetics differs considerably in the two major imperial institutions in Tokyo and Kyoto; their divergence can be accounted for by their histories. While the graduates from the Department of Art History in Tokyo University show little interest in aesthetics, students at Kyoto University who major in

Western art willingly discuss Western aesthetics and philosophy. In Tokyo, aesthetics and art history belong to different departments (one in History, the other in Philosophy), which were definitively separated in 1966, while in Kyoto the two disciplines remain together (though the future remains uncertain, due to recent rush of institutional reforms).

These three factors intersect with each other so as to enhance the specific academic style of each institution.^{xix} In addition to these initial conditions, the so-called “vertical isolationism” of Japanese academic units is also relevant. Students in Japanese and Oriental art history with an inclination toward antiquarian studies are mainly interested in a positivist approach; they limit themselves to documentation and biographical and iconographical analysis. They show little interest in recent Western methodological discussions. Students in Western art, by contrast, tend to be more directly influenced by the latest Western intellectual trends. They happily and willingly digest theoretical ideas coming from abroad (so long as theories were fashionable in the West), and yet they usually show little interest in Japanese art. On the other hand, students of modern Japanese art don’t feel fully entitled to talk about Western scholarship because of their poor mastery of foreign languages. And thirdly, there is little professional communication between students of Ancient and Modern Japanese art.

These divergences in professional interest notwithstanding, Japanese academia as a whole has shown extremely high curiosity regarding information that comes from abroad. In the prewar period, many students in aesthetics and philosophy studied in Germany, and after World War II, their destinations became more diverse. Main German classics in art history were translated into Japanese in the pre-war period. Wölfflin’s *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, for example, was available in Japanese as early as in 1936 and Riegl’s *Stilfragen* in 1942. (It should not be forgotten — though the fact has been repressed for so long — that many pre-war Chinese students who had studied in Japan could have had easy access to these Japanese translations. A considerable number of Western books in art history and aesthetics, both modernist and Marxist, were retranslated into Chinese from Japanese during the Chinese Republic period [1913-1949]. Statistical and biographical studies as well as research of readership remain to be done on these prewar period translations into Chinese of Western books.)

To make a long story short, let me note that most of the classics in art history (Wölfflin, Riegl, Dovřák, Antal, Gantner, Wittkower, Hauser, Goldwater, Benesh, Francastel, Pevsner, Friedländer, Badt, Panofsky, Sedlmayr, Gombrich, etc) were available in Japanese by 1970, and were integrated into the costly series of *Bijutsu Meicho Sensho* (*Masterpieces in Art History*, 美術名著選集 from the publisher Iwasaki Bijutsusha 岩崎美術社, naturally the series does not include any non-Western authors!).^{xx} But it remains unclear if Japanese undergraduate students always found these translations readable. Though reading requirements (such as are common in North America) did not exist in the Japanese university curriculum, students at the top universities were normally eager to read books by the latest celebrities. Eric Auerbach, Eugenio D’Ors, Ortega y Gasset, G. R. Hocke, Carl Jung, and George Steiner, to mention just a few, were on the reading lists of students in the humanities in the late 1960s. Clement Greenberg, Michael Fried, Harold Rosenberg, and Nelson Goodman were favorite names among students of American contemporary art and art criticism. Among British authors, modernists like Roger Fry, Clive Bell, and Herbert Read were well known in Japan. Kenneth Clark’s (1903-83) television series on “Civilization” had an unprecedented success at the end of the 1960s. Japanese viewers of the epoch did not have any skepticism about the program’s “Euro-centrism” and they were satisfied with the clear introduction provided by Takashina Shûji (高階秀爾 1932-); for each broadcast he supplied comparative information on contemporary Japanese art and history. Illustrated excerpts of Clark’s books were among the most popular English readers in general education classrooms of Japanese universities in the 1970s.

By the late 1970s, the so-called “Three-Divine Apparatus” (Althusserian Marxism, Saussurean linguistics, and Lacanian psychoanalysis) was at the disposal of Japanese students. Jurgis Baltrušaitis, René Huyghe, Hubert Damisch, Louis Marin, Jean-François Lyotard, Jean-Claude Lebensztejn, Pierre Bourdieu, Philippe Junod, and Michel Thévoz (but not, at that point, Daniel Arasse) were among the French and francophone authors whose translations were anticipated around 1980 by curious students in art history and aesthetic theory. A new course of “Culture and Representations” was inaugurated in the 1980s at the Komaba campus of Tokyo University, where Jacques Lacan, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, and Jean-François Lyotard, among others, had already been invited. The strong intellectual presence of that post-structuralist course at the Komaba campus complemented the more authoritative and conservative academic disciplines of aesthetics and art history at the Hongô campus. Extremely extended reading lists of Western visual cultures were provided mainly by Takayama Hiroshoi (高山宏 1947-) from the mid 1980s; they were enthusiastically consumed by young students.

A critical survey of the entrance examination for the post-graduate in art history in Japan in the last several decades will provide us with an insightful overview of one possible form of “Global Art History.” Though far more conservative in methodological approach than the voluntary reading lists of the students in aesthetics, the art history department seems to take it for granted that an exhaustive knowledge of empirical “Global Art History” is a minimum requirement for admission. Candidate students are requested to give detailed descriptions of artists and their works arbitrarily selected from a vast area ranging from Western to Oriental art history and covering the span of art from the Paleolithic period in Asia Minor to Chinese painting and Buddhist iconography. In the same token, it would be of some interest to glance at the *Shinchō Encyclopedia of World Art* (新潮世界美術事典 1985), so as to get an idea of the Japanese vision of “world art.” Without explicitly stipulating any editorial criteria governing the inclusion or omission of entries, the encyclopedia presents an imaginary “Global Art History” as it was conceived by the collaboration of more than 500 Japanese specialists. Incorporating more than 16,000 heterogeneous items of Western, Oriental and Japanese art and artists in a single volume, it successfully gives an illusion that G.A.H. is a closed and complete universe.

And what about the monthly magazines like *Geijutsu Shinchō* (『芸術新潮』 *New Currents in Fine Arts*, to give it a literary translation)? Probably no other monthly in the world covers such a wide variety of topics in art and fashion in such a sophisticated journalistic style. The only problem is that it is written in Japanese and remains inaccessible to those who do not understand it. Here the question arises once again: is the “Global Art History” we are searching for accessible only to a Japanese readership? This ironic situation reminds me of the imaginary ideal language of Marauí to which Umberto Eco often refers. Every foreign language can be translated into Marauí, he says, because of its incredible flexibility, but the Marauí language itself cannot be translated into any foreign language. By substituting Japanese for Marauí, we might gain a more realistic notion of what Global Art History might be all about.

As a counterpart to this dystopian nightmare of the hidden globalization of world art history, it might be a good idea to revalue the so-called “belatedness” of the Chinese situation. Consider Roland Barthes (1915-1980) as an illustration. Widely translated into Japanese from the end of the 1960s, partly because of the author’s personal tie with the *Empire des signes* (1970), Barthes remained practically unknown to Chinese intellectuals before being revealed at the beginning of the 21st century. The notion of binary opposition turned out to be in harmony with Chinese dichotomous way of thinking, and Barthes’s critiques of structuralist binarisms (especially his introduction of such third terms as *bruissement* or *significant flottant* and his intoxication with the *plaisir du texte*, *subtilité*, or the *saveur of l’obtus*) could not have been more fascinating for young Chinese specialists. While Barthes in Japanese (what Kojève called the *snobisme pure*) cannot be anything more than an object of nostalgia within the closed circle of French studies around the turn of the 21st century, he has been newly rediscovered and exploited in postmodern China “After Theory” (in Terry Eagleton’s phrase).^{xxi}

IV. Category Mismatches and Conceptual Conflicts

Barthes may turn out to be a good metonymic guide or stepping stone in thinking about the global applicability of certain critical concepts. The French term *écriture*, for all its ambiguity, served as a magic wand, enabling Barthes to conceptualize what he believed to have discovered in *l’Empire des signes* — where signs are devoid of the “signified” and the “signifier” floats on the surface of the *sémiosphère*, as if it might define the antipode of French *sémiocratie*. In his famous passage on *tempura*, the French semiotician intentionally traces a parallel between the process of calligraphic performance and the way the Japanese cook who does not cook (“cuisinier qui ne fait pas cuire”) prepares an eel (although Barthes must have been confused because eel would not be served at *tempura* counter). Approaching a culture of ideogram and visuality through phonocentric analytical devices was, by definition, an impossible task. *Écriture* seems to designate all that escapes Western theoretical baggage.^{xxii}

Calligraphy, as an exercise of *écriture*, possesses a distinctive social status in the cultural spheres under Chinese influence and is hardly compatible with calligraphy in the Western sense. In the Far Eastern *literati* tradition, calligraphy was not clearly distinguished from painting. In fact Far Eastern painting is not really “painting” but an extension of *écriture* which covers letters and images at the same time (such terms as “letters” and “image” are irrelevant terminology *in stricto sensu*, but we have to rely upon them for convenience’s sake). “Calligraphy and painting” (書画 *shūhuà* in Chinese and *shoga* in Japanese) is a single classificatory category in the conservation of cultural properties. When the European academic definition of fine arts was introduced in Japan in 1880s, it provoked a harsh controversy. The question of whether calligraphy should be included in or excluded from the category of fine arts

was the point at issue. The controversy was literary a “lutte de classement” (as Pierre Bourdieu says), as the struggle of the classification directly affected the policies of Westernizing museum administration.^{xxiii}

The opposition still remains nowadays. In the last twenty years, some Japanese art historians specialized in the institutional history of modernist Japanese art proposed that the discipline of art history is a modern invention and a Western import, because — so they said — corresponding theoretical baggage had not previously existed in the Far East (their reasoning was a sort of Occam’s razor!). Most Chinese specialists in Japan furiously disagree with this interpretation. For them the glorious Chinese tradition was perfectly equipped with an art historical apparatus before the intrusion of Western institutions. To ignore the history of writing on art in the Far East, and to eliminate such writing from the discipline of art history, would entail a hideous distortion to historical reality. Clearly these Chinese specialists conceive their discipline in continuity with the Eastern tradition, to which Western institutions remain an addendum.

The different social status of calligraphy in the East and the West is at the core of this recent controversy. The issue also reminds us that in many non-Western countries the category of Western fine arts has not yet been legitimized. Many attempts have been made in the modern era to implant Western fine arts as a subject in non-Western countries. Fine Arts schools have been founded, exhibitions organized, and public sculptures commissioned. Such investments often caused nationalistic reactions. In some cases, the fine arts initiatives have been seen as attributes or relics of Western cultural imperialism; that has been the case in mainland China as well as in many Islamic countries. Such boycotts of Western products can easily jeopardize G.A.H.

How is it possible to realize a Global Art History, when the very definition of the corpus of fine arts, ostensibly to be included in G.A.H., is in dispute? One very optimistic and “imperial” option would be to declare that one’s own criteria are valid throughout the world, and to apply them globally in order to constructing a “musée imaginaire” for G.A.H. I will not repeat here the criticism that I made of this possibility at the occasion of *Le Japon des avant-gardes* show at the Center Georges Pompidou in 1986-7. By systematically eliminating every domain of artistic creation where no equivalent can be found in Western avant-garde, this huge exhibition helped the French public form a firm but tautological conviction: everything recognizable as partaking of the avant-garde in Japan is a Western imitation; and everything original in Japan does not fall into the category of avant-garde. Only the group *Gutai* 具体 attracted the French public’s interest because it had influenced the Parisian art scene and had therefore been authenticated *a posteriori*. The logical coherence of the selection in *Le Japon des avant-gardes* perfectly epitomized the grandeur and misery of auto-intoxication. Applying one’s own prefabricated category by force, to foreign realities, only testifies to the cultures’ mutual incommensurability.^{xxiv}

Similar conflicts continue to appear whenever Western authorities force non-Western art to lie in a Procrustean bed, whether the bed is assimilatory (as in *Magiciens de la Terre*, commissioned by Jean-Hubert Martin, which contributed to the invention of “artists” among Tibetan monks and Ghanaian coffin makers) or eliminatory (as in the Kassel Dokumenta, where artists from non-monotheistic Oriental cultures were once said to be inappropriate).^{xxv}

And yet it must be said that the Asiatic is no more authorized than the Westerner to serve as the ultimate judge of Asian culture. A foreign insight into unknown realities is sometimes capable of realizing unexpected serendipities. And the shock effect of the contact zone is a good example of *das Unheimliche* or Jan Mukařofský’s *Ostraniene*, which was to become Brecht’s *Verfremdung*. Such a moment can become transfigurative. An electric discharge or a chemical reaction occurs, delivering a rich and salutary message and casting an unexpected light on a hidden political desire for domination — a desire that any attempt at a G.A.H must try to snuff out.^{xxvi} This brings me to the problem of universal applicability of certain operational concepts.

V. Translatability of Operational Concepts

In the Kantian understanding, time and space are two basic meta-concepts in which the specificities of cultural spheres may be articulated. This paradigm has been called into question in Neo-Kantian philosophy. Needless to say, Panofsky’s early essay “Perspektive als symbolische Form” is based on his misunderstanding of Ernst Cassirer’s notion of “Symbolische Formen”; he argued that Renaissance linear perspective is not universal but culturally bound; and his argument is simply misleading because of its reliance on an apparent divergence of perspectival drawing from the projection on the human retina.^{xxvii} Samuel Edgerton’s argument on the lack of rationality in pre-modern Chinese thinking was based on the Chinese incapacity to understanding linear perspective, as witness the incomprehensible illustration inserted in a Chinese encyclopedia. And yet we have to make a clear distinction between the potential

possibility of rational thinking and its relevance to the society. Besides, “rationality” itself changes meaning in space and time. Mechanics, for example, did not fall into the Chinese traditional category of “rationality.”^{xxxviii}

As James Elkins points out, the fact that the term “space” does not appear in any Renaissance books on architecture testifies to the fact that Kantian “space” is a meta-concept which remained outside the particular concerns of Italian *Quattrocento* artists. No less than “space,” concepts such categories as “artist” or “art history” are also retrospective projections of the particular interests posterity has taken in the Renaissance, as Michael Baxandall and Charles Hope, among art historians, and Michel de Certeau in a different context, have already stressed.^{xxxix} And yet this does not necessarily prevent us from setting up an inevitably “anachronistic” category of “fine arts” or “art history” and applying them to “our” field of investigation (supposed as “our” territory) so as to single out “pertinent” deeds and events.

When it comes to the concept of time, Walter Benjamin’s warning seems indispensable, especially in historiography: discontinuity in history tends to be concealed by the very effort of recapitulating the discredited past. Rehabilitation creates a false continuity thereby eliminating the phases of disruption where the tradition was interrupted. Quite logically, the interruption itself is made invisible by the paradigm (in Thomas Kuhn’s sense) that the interruption has created.^{xxx} The same danger is concomitant with any attempt at G.A.H.

As an illustration, let me analyze a Chinese case where an effort to maintain chronological ties apparently subverts Western codes of pictorial representation. Western viewers are often astonished to see many imperial seals covering the surface of precious Chinese paintings. To such an extent that the depicted landscape seems damaged or is almost obscured (especially in the case of the Emperor GanLong 乾隆帝). For European amateurs this could be nothing but an impermissible violation to the autonomy of the depicted reality. And yet, for Chinese connoisseurs, the superimposition of seals by generations of the royal owners may be a guarantee of the respect the object has been accorded. The partly obliterated landscape supports layers of authenticating chronological inscriptions. Such inscriptions and seals mark an involvement in historicity. Of course, such an explanation is rarely furnished by Chinese experts in the domestic market. It is only on contact with perplexed Westerners that the native informant is obliged to fabricate a justification in defense of his or her own social custom and practice.

As the custom of imperial inscription suggests, it is an open question if the notion of “representation” is applicable to Chinese landscape painting. What is at stake is less the representation of nature, and more the representation of inner nature (I will discuss the irrelevance of the term “representation” below). Consequently, the picture plane itself is not considered something to be seen; amateurs prefer penetrating into the pictorial space as if they were wandering in the depicted landscapes. Marguerite Yourcenar noted this secret when she narrated a story of an Oriental painter who disappeared in his own painting. Yet she intentionally hid her real source (Lafcadio Hearn’s retelling of a Japanese legend) and restaged the story into a Chinese fantasy.^{xxxi} Ônishi Hiroshi (大西廣 1937-), a former research curator at the Metropolitan Museum, was fully aware of these elisions and misattributions that ordinary Western readers overlook. In the Japanese translation of *Die Legende vom Künstler* by Ernst Kris and Otto Kurz (1934), he added an extended fifty page essay on Chinese and Japanese legends of artists.^{xxxii} Regrettably, Indian, Persian and Arabic legends are still uncollected. And unfortunately, I dare say, the Japanese version’s “globalizing” addendum is not yet re-translated into any Western languages.

One of the frustrations that Orientals frequently feel in considering books such as *Critical Terms for Art History* is the complete disregard of Oriental traditions.^{xxxiii} In *Critical Terms*, David Summers’s chapter on “Representation” does not mention Chinese practice — an understandable omission, but an omission nonetheless. Oriental experience simply does not fit into the discussion on “representation,” as if nothing from Asia were relevant in this context. Probably the only remedy in Western languages is a paper by Imamichi Tomonobu (今道友信 1923-), who argues that there is a “complementary relationship” between Western and Eastern aesthetic theories. Whereas the Western aesthetic tradition shifted from a classical theory of representation (since Plato) to modern expressionism (in Wassily Kandinsky) at the beginning of the 20th Century, Oriental aesthetics shows almost simultaneously a reverse shift from a classical veneration of personal expression (and therefore not a “representation”) to a modern creed regarding realistic representations. Though attractive and comprehensible as a hypothesis, this argument relies upon the author’s own belief in the applicability of Western binary concepts to Oriental realities, and the compatibility of Western and Eastern concepts. By its very nature Imamichi’s argument, sustained by his firm Catholicism, lies beyond objective verification, and lacks a proper philological framework for comparison.^{xxxiv}

If a student wants to make an intercultural comparison between Western linear perspective and the Chinese notion of “three distances” 三遠 set forth by Kuo Hsi (or Guō Xī in Pinyin transcription; 郭熙 ca. 1120-90), for example, he or she might be requested to attend to these elementary philological precautions that Imamichi willingly sacrificed. Indeed, a strict philology would make it simply impossible to propose any cross-cultural comparison: hence the isolation of the Orientalists. It must also be pointed out that similar comparisons between Chinese and Western notions of spatial construction were very popular from the late 1920s through the 1940s in China and Japan. At the height of nationalistic self-consciousness, intellectuals in Asia were busy establishing an Oriental aesthetics in rivalry with the Occidental.^{xxxv} The result was a highly schematic contrast between a posited Western superiority in the analytical handling of the material world, and the supposed Eastern superiority in an intuitive approach to holistic spirituality.

It was in this context that Guō Xī’s passage from the *Lofty Message of Forest and Streams*, 『林泉高致』 as well as Xiè Hè’s (謝赫 479-502) notion of the “rhythmical vibration of vital movement” (氣韻生動 *qì yùn shēng dòng*) were singled out as milestones of Chinese thinking and proofs of Oriental superiority (because they came before apparently equivalent formulas in the West). Even the lack of explanatory power of ancient Chinese terms was not regarded as a weak point but appreciated as a profound virtue. One may well discuss and measure the practical value and limit of efficiency of such Oriental conceptual tools in comparison with the Western terminologies. But it is no less important to keep a watchful eye on the ideological motives that have mobilized these terms as “relevant” counterparts of Western concepts in a given historical context.

The importance of *qì yùn shēng dòng* (and the proposed English translation, “rhythmical vibration of vital movement,” already reveals the difficulty and danger of semantic migration) was recognized by Sinologists such as Ise Senichirō (伊勢專一郎 1891-1948), Sono Raizō (園頼三 1891-1973; the translator of Kandinsky’s *Über das Geistige in der Kunst*), and Kinbara Seigo (金原省吾 1888-1958; he proudly boasted to have coined the term “Oriental Aesthetics”), as well as the Chinese theoretician Fēng Zǐkǎi (豐子愷 1898-1975). Those Oriental aestheticians located the latest development in European aesthetics in Theodor Lipps’s (1851-1914) idea of *Einfühlung*. They thought they recognized its affinity with *qì yùn shēng dòng*. It must already be evident that Imamichi is indebted to such precedent scholars, even though he added some necessary sophistication when he proposed his hypothesis to the Western aestheticians in the 1960s.

The notion of 間 *ma* that Elkins suggests has also been exploited by several Japanese so as to communicate a subtle but tangible notion which, however, is hardly translatable. *Ma ga nukeru* (“there is a hole in the *ma*”) means “to look silly.” *Ma ni au* (“to meet the *ma*”) means “to arrive at the destination in time” and also “to be appropriate and on the spot,” bridging space and time simultaneously. *Ma wo motasu* (“to keep up with the *ma*”) means “being on good terms with the circumstances.” The famous Postmodernist architect Isozaki Arata (磯崎新 1931-) chose the concept of *ma* as the key term for an exhibition he organized in Paris in 1978, called “Ma Espace-Temps.” Carefully avoiding the danger of mystifying an exotic notion, Isozaki tried to re-create the moments where the “gap” emerges, like the *chōra* in the *Timaeus*, between pre- and post-linguistic realities, at a phase prior to the articulation between *chronos* and “space-as-emptiness.” Instead of forcing *ma* onto Cartesian coordinate axes, Isozaki reversed the whole process of thinking (hence his refusal to rely on such terms as “in-between-ness” or “pause” which are only retrospective rationalizations) and named each of the subdivided nine sections of the exhibition by borrowing familiar terms from everyday experience in Japanese language, of which the French equivalents are curiously lacking or depreciated.^{xxxvi}

Augustin Berque’s conceptual reflections beginning with his early *Vivre l’espace au Japon* (1981) are suggestive for understanding Isozaki’s project. By reevaluating the “step-by-step” (*pas-à-pas*) approach to the living environment, in reference to James J. Gibson’s “affordance,” Berque clarifies the methodological limits of the Western perspective of geometrical spatial construction. Here we come close to the notion of *Pradakṣana* as an ambulatory itinerary in the procession. With each step you take, your relationship with outer reality vacillates. Berque comes to the conclusion that in Japanese spatial construction it is not the individual agents of action but the intermediary space of “mediation” that is valorized so as to guarantee semiotic circulation. By privileging the neologism of the “communization” (that is “to cause things to be held in common”) of signs instead of verbal “communication,” Berque later elaborated the idea into “médiance.”^{xxxvii}

Curiously enough, similar propositions had been advanced by several Japanese scholars, and their terminologies may be relocated as precedents of Isozaki’s and Berque’s conceptual hyper-sophistication. Based on his study of German philosophy, Tsudzumi Tsuneyoshi (鼓常良 1887-1981; Tsuzumi Tsuneyoshi in Hepburn

transcription) coined the term *Rahmenlosigkeit* 無框性 (“framelessness”) in his *Die Kunst Japans* (1928) so as to characterize the specificities of Japanese artistic style. Compared to the European *Kunstwollen* toward autonomous and individual *Konstruktion*, Japanese aesthetics is collective and lacking in a clear distinction between inside and outside. This framelessness, according to Tsudzumi, may account for many particularities of Japanese art, whether it be the permeability and fusion of different genres in the historical process of literary or artistic development or the free combination and superposition of different layers or elements in artistic and musical creation, which a later generation theoreticians in the West would call “intertextuality” and “palimpsest.”^{xxxviii} One may easily detect the reason of the success of his German publication if one thinks of the contemporary paradigm shift E. Cassirer had described in his monumental *Substanzbegriff und Funktionsbegriff* (1910), which Tsudzumi illustrated, as it were, with Japanese art.

Itô Teiji (いとうていじ 1922-), student of Japanese architecture, had also experienced difficulty in explaining some of the common features of Japanese spatial devices to English-speaking audiences. For lack of a better term, he mobilized such terminologies as “intermediate space,” “gray zone,” or “in-between-ness,” all of which both separate and connect several spatial units.^{xxxix} On a visit to Japan, Paul Claudel (1868-1955) was amazed to see movable paper walls and gliding doors, which allow free communication between an interior and an outside garden, and which can be adjusted to the motions of sunlight and changes in temperature, or set in harmony with the four seasons. This opened flexibility and highly practical adaptability to nature were recognized almost as the antipodes of French rigid rationality. And yet, Claudel found them curiously agreeable.^{xl}

The “not-yet-separated” phase of space and time, which the *ma* notion designates, was in good tune with phenomenology, both in its reduction of an abstract intellectual framework and in the recovery of a *Lebenswelt*. Indeed the *Lebensraum* can never exist apart from temporality. The sense of “being seen by the forest” which Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908-61) pointed out in his *L’Oeil et l’esprit* (1964), may be a variant of the mystical experience of “being-viewed-by-the-god” which the sanctuary transmits to itinerant pilgrims.

In this context, let me also refer to Dagobert Frey (1883-1962), because his *Grundlegung zu einer vergleichenden Kunstwissenschaft* (1949) tried to compare and classify different approaches to the sacredness in representative monuments of main cultural spheres and proposed a typology of human figures in movement by analyzing sculpture and statues. To be more faithful to Frey’s initial intention, however, the narrow definition of fine arts would not suffice. The intuitive sense of “being touched” is more fully developed in martial arts, one of whose thinking practitioners is Tokitsu Kenji (時津賢児 1947-), the authors of *La voie du Karaté, pour une théorie des arts martiaux japonais* (1979). Tokitsu elaborates the notion of *ma* in close relation with *haptinomie* (the principle of touching and combining). Without mystifying the physical experience in the combat, he convincingly demonstrates that control of the in-between-ness of one’s own self in front of one’s opponent, who is in constant movement, cannot be reduced to a simple mathematical topology of physical power and speed. *Ma wo yomu* (“to read the *ma*”) becomes an essential technique in the human relationships.^{xli}

“Kriegeskunst” may also have a legitimate position in a widened conception of “Kunstwissenschaft.” No one can deny the possibility that martial arts might be included in a G.A.H., perhaps in relation to performance art. To realize this possibility must be, after all, extremely “touching” as both entail “touching.”

VI. Elusiveness of an Elliptic Orbit

To put my lengthy commentary to an end, two remarks may be necessary.

First, the idea of appropriating foreign concepts so as to achieve a renewal of one’s own discourse is a common strategy in the West. Both Richard Muther (1860-1909) in his *Geschichte der Malerie im 19. Jahrhundert* (1893-4) and Julius Meier-Graefe (1867-1935) in his *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Moderne Kunst* (1904) inserted chapters on Japanese art between their chapters on Western Realism and Impressionism. Those were not, of course, simple subterfuges to simulate a G.A.H.; both authors were convinced that the intervention of *Japonismus* was indispensable for the development of Impressionism. Thus, in their interpretation, the European tradition was renewed by its impact with the Far East. The same was said of Fauvism and Cubism, of Matisse’s Moroccan experience, and the impact of African art on Picasso. In the same vein, Hubert Damisch’s (1927-) strategy of relying on Chinese images in his *Traité du trait* (1995), seems to faithfully retrace the same traditional (!) scheme of European dialectics on the level of methodology in critical discourse.

It is not my intention to accuse such an approach of Euro-centrism, self-aggrandizement, or auto-justification. But I am not of the opinion that an appropriation of the Other for the benefit of one’s own interest can lead to a G.A.H.

Is this a limit of the G.A.H.? Fortunately Damisch's approach as a self-disqualified "alphanumeric eye" relieves him of the temptation to usurp the Other. One may easily trace here an affinity with R. Barthes's self-confessed ignorance of putatively impenetrable Japan. Referring to the Barthesian notion of "*punctum*" as opposed to "*studium*," Damisch concentrates his attention on the marking of the initial break line (*trait-brisure*), which cannot manifest itself without damaging the very condition of its manifestation. By referring to the initial act of articulation of the universe, which retraces the origin of the oracular scripture incised into on the turtle's shell of the Yin Dynasty, Damisch voices his expectation of another art history which is resolutely different ("l'attente d'une histoire résolument autre"), a history which emerges through the fissure dissolving the monolithic continuity ("solution de continuité") of the illusory G.A.H.

xliii

Second, I have demonstrated that most of these theoretical concepts emerged from the authors' contact with foreign environments and uninitiated audiences. Such notions as *ma*, *Rahmenlosigkeit*, "gray zone," and "intermediary space" would not have been coined or mobilized were it not for the authors' interest in explaining something to strangers who were mainly in a linguistically dominant position. The things needing explanation were so familiar to the "natives" (who occupied the linguistically subordinate position) that they had not paid particular attention to them. The "conceptual scaffolding" of Western scholarship therefore contributed to the invention of such terminologies. Indeed, it has been mainly Western attention that has resulted in the exploitation of "relevant" foreign terminologies (always "relevant" for Western scholarly discussion) for the West's own benefit (which, however, would not necessarily make harm those non-Western scholars already "contaminated" by Western scholarship, including the present author).

One must be careful of the distortions that such extraction of terminology from its initial contexts, for the sake of global application, might easily cause. The temptation of an "expanded and more inclusive art history" contains the original sin of universalism. Isozaki for example did not want to show the *ma* exhibition in Japan, because he thought it would be tautological to present it there. It might also have aroused Japanese suspicion about the hyperbolic fetishism of the French regarding *things Japanese*. Such French claims of possessing the ultimate degree of judgment ("*la dernière instance*") in aesthetic judgment might have been accused of arrogance by the local culture. In contrast, one must also note that basic terms (in the West) like "expression" or "representation" suddenly lose their semantic stability and methodological reliability once they are confronted with other realities constructed with different grammars and syntaxes, and articulated with wholly different vocabularies and taxonomy.

In a translation from a phonographic Indo-European language to the Chinese language, based on ideograms, the paradigmatic network of vocabularies is almost completely reshuffled, if not entirely destroyed. The devastating confusions which occur in the process of transmission are hardly noticed by ordinary users, who are satisfied with practical communication. Even bilingual speakers tend to forget the gap they constantly cross, because conventional translation paralyzes critical consciousness. But a person who is located in between — a conversant Japanese interlocutor, sandwiched between a Chinese and an English speakers — may well be able to assist at an otherwise impossible border crossing.

Concealed underneath apparently normal communication, two almost incompatible semantic fields are constantly crashing into each other. The network of etymology in European languages can hardly survive when remodeled into the combinations of Chinese ideograms. The two systems cannot be interrelated with one other without an almost complete reconnection of the semantic distribution. In Chinese the relation between "presentation" (表現/表象/表示 in Chinese; 提起/提示 in Japanese) and "representation" (表現/再現/表象 etc. in Chinese; 表象/再現/上演/代表 in Japanese) is no longer visible; what's worse, the conceptual distinction is often confusing because the terms are hardly differentiated from each other. The conjunction of "expression" (表現/表出) and "impression" (印象) cannot be grasped if the original spelling is not provided in brackets — and this is aside from the confusions that arise among Chinese, Japanese and Korean translations. The inevitable adjustments and qualifications make it extremely difficult to understand philosophic discussions, because binary oppositions in the original are frequently altered and dissolved into new sets of conventional Chinese binary oppositions. (Oriental nationalist scholars who know only Chinese terminology often believe, wrongly, that their own conventional Chinese binary pairs are globally or cross-culturally valid and easily translatable, and they tend to take the lack of translatability as proof of the "cultural invasion by Western imperialism".)

It is easy to talk about "displacement" (as James Clifford does), "heterotopia" (as in Michel Foucault) or "contingency" (Richard Rorty's term), but experiencing them is quite another matter. Linguistically speaking at least,

and at least for some Orientals philologically conscious of cross-cultural translation, the utopia of a Global Art History would mean perpetually orbiting along the elusive locus of an ellipse whose two centers are the Western and the Chinese.^{xliii} Without fetishizing elusive concepts from abroad (although at the same time, I have to say that the Baudelairean words “contingent,” “ephemeral,” and “elusive” summarize the Japanese aesthetics and testify to its *modernité*), let us recognize once for all that the idea of a Global Art History is itself a highly elusive and elliptical concept (eternally moving in an elliptical orbit), just as the Japanese version of a Global Art History remains elusive and elliptical to Western viewers.

ⁱ John W. Dower and John Junkermann, *The Hiroshima Mural* (Kôdansha International Ltd., 1985); 小沢節子 Kozawa Setsuko, 『「原爆の図」描かれた<記憶>、語られた<絵画>』 *Genbaku no Zu: Egakareta kioku [The Hiroshima Mural: The Depicted Memory, The Narrative Painting]* (Tokyo: 岩波書店 Iwanami Shoten, 2002); and 稲賀繁美 Shigemi Inaga, 「戦争画とへ平和画のあいだ」 “Sensôga to Heiwaga no aida” [Between War Painting and Peace Painting], 『あいだ』 *Aida* 113 and 114 (2005).

ⁱⁱ Henri Focillon, “L’estampe japonaise et la peinture en Occident,” *Actes du Congrès international d’histoire de l’art à Paris en 1921* (Paris, 1923). See also Sadao Fujihara, “L’Extrême-Orient d’Henri Focillon,” *La vie des Formes, Henri Focillon et les art*, (exhibition catalog, Musée des Beaux-Arts de Lyon, 2004), pp. 241-48.

ⁱⁱⁱ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978). The Japanese translation by 今沢紀子 Imasawa Noriko was published from 平凡社 Heibonsha in 1986, with an important commentary by 杉田英明 Sugita Hideaki.

^{iv} René Grousset, *Bilan de l’histoire* (Paris: Plon, 1949).

^v Cf. Sukehiro Hirakawa, *Japan’s love-Hate Relationship with the West* (Kent: Global Oriental, 2005) gives a nationalistic but masterful overview of the problem.

^{vi} *Primitivism in 20th Century Art*, exhibition catalog, edited by William Rubin (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1988). The Japanese translation, with an important critical commentary by 吉田憲司 Yoshida Kenji, is: (Kyoto: 淡交社 Tankôsha, 1995). See further James Clifford, *Predicament of Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988).

^{vii} Shigemi Inaga, “Cognition Gap in the Recognition of Masters and Masterpieces in the Formative Years of Japanese Art History,” in *Japanese Hermeneutics*, edited by Michael Marra (Honolulu: Hawai’i University Press, 2003), pp. 115-126. Recent studies have revealed that 蛭川式胤 (1835-1882) Ninagawa Noritane’s 『観古図説』 *Kanko Zusetsu* (or *Kwan-ko Dzu-setsu* [(1877)]) contributed to the drastic change of the Western view of Japanese ceramics in the late 1880s. See Imai Yûko, “Changes in French Tastes for Japanese Ceramics,” *Japan Review*, International Research Center for Japanese Studies, No 16 (2004):101-127.

^{viii} Shigemi Inaga, “The Making of Hokusai’s Reputation in the Context of Japonisme,” *Japan Review*, International Research Center for Japanese Studies, no.15 (2003): 77-100. The persistence of the Western and “international” view of the Japanese art history may be epitomized by Henri Focillon’s oddly “anachronistic” *Hokousai* (1916/25), and its divergence from the Japanese “domestic,” aristocratic and academic conception may be testified to by Akiyama Teurukazu’s *La Peinture japonaise* in Skira edition (1961) which remains a classic.

^{ix} Partha Mitter, *Art and Nationalism in Colonial India 1850-1922* (Cambridge University Press, 1994), Tapati Guha-Thakurata, *The Making of New Indian Art* (Cambridge University Press, 1992); *Monuments, Objects, Histories: Institutions of Art in Colonial and Postcolonial India* (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004).

^x Shigemi Inaga, “Un destin de pensée,” in *Approches critiques de la pensée japonaise XXe siècle*, edited by Livia Monnet (Montréal: Presses Universitaires de Montréal, 2003), 329-48.

^{xi} Shigemi Inaga, “The Making of Museums and Collections in Modern Japan with Special Reference to the Construction of “Asian Art” and “Japanese Art,” International Symposium, “Interpreting Asian Cultures in Museum,” at the British Museum, March 2000 (unpublished; Japanese translation as 「近代の国家コレクションと民間コレクションの形成」 『記号学研究』 *Studia semiotica* 21, 2001, pp.75-101). Okakura’s conception of “arts and crafts” may well be compared with A.K. Coomaraswamy’s *Medieval Sinhalese Art* (1908) in the light of the medievalism of William Morris.

^{xii} 木代修一 Kishiro Shûichi, 「美術史」 “Bijutsushi [Art History],” in 『明治以降における歴史学の発展』 *Meiji ikô ni okeru Rekishigaku no Hatten [Development of History as a Science since Meiji Era]*, edited by 歴史教育研究会 Rekishi Kyôiku Kenkyû Kai [Committee for the Historical Education Studies] (Tokyo: 四海書房 Shikai Shobô, 1933), pp. 247-323. 『日本における美術史学の成立と展開』 [*The Establishment and Development of The Discipline of Art History in Japan*] (東京国立文化財研究所, 2001; exclusively in Japanese), despite its huge volume (504p.) limits its investigation to the early stage of the discipline and shows the impossibility of any exhaustive overview.

^{xiii} 吉田千鶴子 Yoshida Chizuko, 「大村西崖の美術批評」 “ÔMURA Seigai no bijutsu hihyou,” [Art Criticism by ÔMURA Seigai], 『東京芸術大学美術学部紀要』 *Tokyo Geijutsu Daigaku Bijtsugakubu Kiyô* [Bulletin of the Faculty of Fine Art, Tokyo national University of Fine Arts and Music], no. 26 (1994): 1-35.

^{xiv} See 『矢代幸雄資料展』 *Archive* [sic] of *Yashiro Yukio* (Kamakura and Hayama: 神奈川県立近代美術館 The Museum of Modern Art, 2005). 藤原貞朗 Fujihara Sadao, 「美術史学と国際主義 1920年代の美術史家の国際的成功とその意味」 “Internationalism and the Study of Art History: The International Relationship of the Art Historians in the 1920s and its Significance,” (in Japanese), *Art Forum* “21, no. 9 (2004): 90-95; 高階秀爾 Takashina Shûji, 「解説」 “Commentary,” to 矢代幸雄 Yashiro Yukio, 『世界に於ける日本美術の位置』 *Sekai ni okeru Nipponbijutsu no Ichi* [The Position of Japanese Art in the World], 1956 (Tokyo: Kôdansha, 1988), pp. 200-10.

^{xv} John Rosenfield, “Japanese Art Studies in America since 1945,” in *The Postwar Development of Japanese Studies in the United States*, edited by Helen Hardacre (Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill, 1998), 161-194. Numerous regrettable errors in the spelling of French intellectuals (Marcel Lacan, instead of Jacques Lacan, to begin with) mentioned in this important paper suggest not only the author’s forced pretence of putting forward the “Japanese Art Studies in America” to the height of leading theoretical scholarship in humanities but also its baseless-ness in the respectable but marginalized discipline.

^{xvi} On the latest development of the research in the social history of art conducted in Japan around 1985-95, see the following critical overview: Shigemi Inaga, “De l’artisan à l’artiste au seuil de la modernité japonaise,” *Sociologie de l’art*, no. 8 (1995): 47-61.

^{xvii} 『美術とジェンダー』 *Bijutsu to Jendâ* [Art and Gender], edited by 鈴木登幾子 Suzuki Tokiko, 千野香織 Chino Kaori and 馬淵明子 Mabuchi Akiko (Tokyo: Brücke, 1997); and *The Present, and the Discipline of Art History in Japan* [1997] *An International Symposium* (Tokyo: Tokyo National Research Institute of Cultural Properties/ Heibonsha, 1999). See also my critical review and overview of the symposium, 「<今日日本の美術史学を考える>を聴いて」 『あいだ』 *Aida Extra* no. 25 (January 1998): 2-15. Concerning the debate in which my review is involved, see Ayako Kano, “Women? Japan? Art?: Chino Kaori and the Feminist Art History Debates,” *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, Center for Inter-Cultural Studies and Education, Josai University, vol.XV (Dec.2003): 25-38. In this report Kano mistranslates my key passages and comes to an incorrect conclusion. See also *Art and Gender 2, Intersecting Visions*, edited by T.Suzuki, A. Mabuchi, Ikeda Shinobu and Kim Hyesheon (Tokyo: Brücke, 2005).

^{xviii} Exhibition, 『建築家 伊東忠太の世界展』 *Kenchikuka Itô Chûta no Sekai Ten* [Itô Chûta, An Architect’s World], Tokyo, Watarium Museum; Ôsaka, Kirin Plaza Ôsaka, 2003. See 『伊東忠太を知っていますか』 *Itô Chûta wo shitteimasuka* [Do you know Itô Chûta?], edited by 鈴木博之 Suzuki Hiroyuki (Matsudo: 王国社 Ôkokusha, 2003); and 『関野貞 アジア踏査』 *Sekino Tadashi Ajia Tōsa* [Sekino Tadashi, Asian Expeditions], (Tokyo: 東京大学・東京大学博物館 The University Museum and The University of Tokyo, 2005). No English explanation is provided in these important publications.

^{xix} Shigemi Inaga, “The Invention of a Discipline and its Social Background: Art History in Westernizing Japan” A Critical (Re-)view,” unpublished paper initially written in 1998 as a contribution to the failed project of a book tentatively entitled “*Art and its History*,” which remains unpublished as of February 2006.

^{xx} The full list of the 岩崎美術社 Iwasaki Bijutsusha series can be consulted in the following site: <http://www.oibijutsukan.com/iwasaki-books.html>. Naturally the publisher does not monopolize the publication of Western art history and many other translations have been published by other editors.

Among the prominent editors in recent years, let us mention in particular

- ◆ 平凡社 Heibonsha Limited, Publishers (<http://www.heibonsha.co.jp/>),
- ◆ ありな書房 Arina Shobô (<http://www.jade.dti.ne.jp/~arina/>),
- ◆ スカイドア Skydoor (<http://www.skydoor.co.jp/>),
- ◆ 彩流社 Sairyuusha Corporation Ltd. (<http://www.sairyuusha.co.jp/>), and
- ◆ Brücke (no website homepage available).

For an overview of the intellectual atmosphere in Japan in the last 25 years, see 「現代思想の109人」 “Gendai Shisô no 109 nin” [109 Prominent Figures of Contemporary Thought], numéro special hors série of 『現代思想』 the *Revue de la pensée d’aujourd’hui* 6-7 (1978). 「ブックガイド 現代思想の22冊」 “Book guide 22 books of Contemporary Thought,” Special issue of 『現代思想』 the *Revue de la pensée d’aujourd’hui* 14 no. 1 (1986); 『美学の方法』 *Methodes of Aesthetics*, edited by 今道友信 Imamichi Tomonobu, vol. 3 of 『講座美学』 *Aesthetics* (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1984); 『西洋美学のエッセンス』 *Essence of Western Aesthetics*, edited by 今道友信 Imamichi Tomonobu (Tokyo: ぺりかん社 Pelican, 1987), and 「現

代思想を読む 230冊」“Gendai Shisô wo yomu 230 satsu” [230 Books: A Reading List of Contemporary Thought], special issue of 『現代思想』 the *Revue de la pensée d'aujourd'hui* 29 no. 15 (2001). These references are exclusively given in Japanese.

^{xxi} For the proceedings of a recent international symposium on Roland Barthes, held in Japan, with an important Chinese contribution by 董強 Dong Qiang, “Alors Barthes? Barthes et la Chine, un rendez-vous manqué,” see *Roland Barthes, Résonance des sens*, University of Tokyo, Center for Philosophy, *Bulletin*, no. 2 (2004).

^{xxii} 稲賀繁美 Shigemi Inaga, 「黄金の三角地帯を目指して」 [In search of The Golden Triangle: from *Roland Barthes, Résonance des sens*], 『あいだ』 *Aida* 97 (January 20, 2004) 32-35 which provides a critical assessment of the above mentioned symposium.

^{xxiii} 小川裕充 Ogawa Hiromitsu, 「書画と美術：‘今日本の美術史学を振り返る’に寄せて」 [Calligraphy and Painting versus Art: On the International Symposium “Today, Looking Back on Japanese Art History Studies,”] 『美術史論叢』 *Bijutushi Ronsô*, no.14 (1997-8): 157-66. On this controversy, also see my “The Invention of a Discipline,” above mentioned in the note xix. Cf. Anne-Marie Christin (éd.), *Histoire de l'écriture : de l'idéogramme au multimédia* (Paris : Flammarion, 2001), which claims to establish a global theory of *écriture*, including Arabic and Far-Eastern practices.

^{xxiv} Shigemi Inaga, “L'impossible avant-garde au Japon,” in *Connaissance et Réciprocité*, edited by Alain le Pichon (Louvain-la-neuve : Ciaco éditeur, 1988), pp.197-207. This was retranslated into English by Margaret MacDonald as “The Impossible Avant-Garde in Japan: Does the Avant-Garde Exist in the Third World?: A Borderline Case of Misunderstanding in Aesthetic Intercultural Exchange,” *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature* 41 (1993): 67-75.

^{xxv} Jean-Hubert Martin, “Who is Afraid of Redskins, the Yellow Peril and Black Power?,” in Wessel Reinink and Jeroen Stumple (ed.) *Memory and Oblivion, Proceedings of the XXIXth International Congress of the History of Art*, (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999) pp. 961-64.

^{xxvi} Here, as as I understand it, is the best potential of John Clark's, unprecedented endeavour, published as *Asian Modern Art*, (Honolulu: Hawai'i University Press, 1991).

^{xxvii} Erwin Panofsky, “Die Perspektive als “Symbolische Form”,” *Vorträge des Bibliothek Warburg, 1924-5* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1927): 258-330. Japanese translation by 木田元 Kida Gen et al as 『<象徴形式>としての遠近法』 (Tokyo: 哲学書房 Tetsugaku Shobô, 1993). It is true that the retina is concave, but the projection of vanishing lines on a flat paper set vertically in relation to the eye does not show any divergence from the mechanical tracing of the linear perspective. Precisely the same form is traced on the retina. In this sense Panofsky was mistaken to recognize a “psycho-physiological” construction in linear perspective. As for S. Edgerton's account on Chinese rationality, see “The Renaissance Artist as Quantifier,” in Margaret A. Hagen (ed.) *The Perception of Pictures* (New York: Academic Press Inc. 1980).

^{xxviii} On linear perspective in a transcultural context, see Shigemi Inaga, “La réinterprétation de la perspective linéaire au Japon (1740-1830) et son retour en France (1860-1910),” *Actes de la recherches en science sociale* 79 (1983): 29-46.

^{xxix} Michael Baxandall, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972; Japanese translation by 篠塚二三男 Shinozuka Fumio et al, as 『ルネサンス絵画の社会史』 from 平凡社 Heibonsha in 1989); Michel de Certeau, *L'Écriture de l'histoire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1975; Japanese translation by 佐藤和生 Satô Kazuo as 『歴史のエクリチュール』 from 法政大学出版局 Hosei University Press, in 1996).

^{xxx} See Walter Benjamin, *Passage*, (Japanese translation by 今村仁司 Imamura Hitoshi, 三島憲一 Mishima Ken'ichi et al. as 『パッサージュ論』 from 岩波書店 Iwanami Shoten, 1993-5, in 5 vols.) N 9a, 5; also Pierre Bourdieu, *Les règles de l'art* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1998; Japanese translation by 石井洋二郎 Ishii Yôjirô, as 『芸術の規則』 from 藤原書店 Fujiwara Shoten in 1995-6, in 2 vols.), p. 507, n. 38.

^{xxxi} Marguerite Yourcenar, *Les Nouvelles orientales*, reprinted in *Oeuvres romanesques* (Paris: Gallimard, 1982), pp. 1143-53; Shigemi Inaga, “The Painter Who disappeared in the Novel, Images of an Oriental Artist in European Literature,” in *Text and Visuality, Word and Image Interactions III*, edited by Leo Hoek and Peter de Voogd, (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994), pp. 117-27. For a more penetrating challenge to the Western visual theory of representation, see Shigebumi Tsuji, “The Holy in the Dust: A Japanese View of Christendom's Cult of the Non-Representational,” in *Seeing the Invisible in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, edied by Giselle de Nie et. al. (Utrecht: Brepols, 2005), pp. 185-209.

^{xxxii} Ernst Kris and Otto Kurtz, *Die Legende vom Künstler, Ein geschichtlicher Versuch* (1934); Japanese translation by 大西廣 Ōnishi Hiroshi et al, 『芸術家伝説』 (Tokyo: ペリかん社 Pelikan sha, 1989).

^{xxxiii} *Critical Terms for Art History*, first edition, edited by Robert S. Nelson and Richard Schiff (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996; Japanese translation by 加藤哲弘 Katô Tetsuhiro, 鈴木廣之 Suzuki Hiroyuki et al as 『美術史を語る言葉』 from Tokyo:ブリュッケ Brücke, 2002).

^{xxxiv} Imamichi Tomonobu, “L’expression et son fondement logique,” *Revue internationale de philosophie* 52 (1961). The English translation is in *Modern Japanese Aesthetics: A Reader*, edited by Michael Marra (Honolulu: University Hawai’i Press, 1999), pp. 220-8. The problem of compatibility in cross-cultural comparative studies in aesthetics was examined by the same author in his “Compatibilité et contrariété,” presented in le Collège international de philosophie à Teheran in 1977.

^{xxxv} Shigemi Inaga, “Images changeantes de l’art japonais: Depuis la vue impressionniste du Japon à la controverse de l’esthétique orientale (1860-1940),” *JTLA: Journal of the Faculty of Letters* [The University of Tokyo, Aesthetics] 29 (2006 :forthcoming). Korean translation: “Japanese Art in Transition: How the West Perceived the Essence of Oriental Aesthetics,” 『美術史論壇』 *Art History Forum* 18 (2004): 171-97.

^{xxxvi} 磯崎新 Isozaki Arata, 『建築における日本的なるもの』 *Kenchiku niokeru Nihonteki namono* [Japanese-ness in Architecture] (Tokyo: 講談社 Kōdansha, 2003), pp. 83-105. An English translation is forthcoming from the MIT Press. Despite the fact the the *Ma-espace-temps* exhibition was later held in Japan, Isozaki here refuses to recognize it. On Isozaki’s reflexion on *chōra*, see www.anycorp.com/, accessed February 2006.

^{xxxvii} Augustin Berque, *Vivre l’espace au Japon* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1981). See also his “La logique du lieu dépasse-t-elle la modernité” in *Approches critiques de la pensée japonaise XXe siècle*, edited by Monnet (see above note x).

^{xxxviii} Tsudzumi Tsunejoshi, “Die Rahmenlosigkeit des japanischen Kunststils,” *Zeitschrift für Aesthetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* Band 22, Heft 1 (1928); and Tsudzumi, *Die Kunst Japans* (Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1929); Japanese adaptation by the author: 鼓常良 『日本藝術様式の研究』 (Tokyo, 章華堂 Shōkadō, 1933).

^{xxxix} Itō Teiji, *The Garden of Japan* (Tokyo: Kōdansha International, 1984); adapted into Japanese by the author as いろいろ ていじ 『日本デザイン論』 *Nippon Design Ron* (Tokyo: 鹿島出版会 Kashima Shuppan-kai, 1988).

^{xl} Claudel, “Ça et là,” *Connaissance de l’est* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1907/1913), pp.114-16.

^{xli} Kenji Tokitsu, *La voie du karaté- pour une théorie des arts martiaux japonais* (Paris: Seul, 1978); *Les katas: arts martiaux & transformations sociales au Japon* (Paris : Dèslris, 2002).

^{xlii} Hubert Damisch, *Traité du trait*, (Paris :Réunion des Musées nationaux, 1995) pp.19-38, 182-88. Though Damisch does not mention the fact (which is favourable for his working hypothesis), the Chinese character 創 *chuang* designating the opening, means at the same time “creation” and “wound.” See Shigemi Inaga, “La blessure créatrice entre poterie et la sculpture, ou Yagi Kazuo entre la tradition japonaise et l’avant-garde occidentale” (paper read at the international symposium, « La Rencontre du Japon et de l’Europe : Images d’une Découverte » Strasbourg, Université Marc Bloch, 8 déc. 2005, forthcoming).

^{xliii} On the elliptic structure of Aby Warburg’s project see 田中純 Tanaka Jun, 『アビ・ヴァールブルク 記憶の迷宮』 *Aby Warburg: Das Labyrinth des Gedächtnisses* (in Japanese) (Tokyo: 青土社 Seidosha, 2001) pp.237-244. For an overview of recent Japanese scholarship in visual studies, see *Art History Forum* (in Korean), special number on “Depiction and Description,” edited by Shigemi Inaga 20 (2005), published by the Korean Center for Art Studies, which ambitiously aims at realizing G.A.H.

P.S.

As for Wolfflin in China (much talked about in the book, *Is Art History Global?*). A chapter treating the introduction of the Western art history as a discipline in China must be written, together with the ways it was accepted, rejected by, or juxtaposed with, the Chinese scholarship and connoisseurship. The following is only a preliminary sketch (not even an outline) of what is, by now, already known to Japanese specialists who are interested in the issue.

The first book in China with the title of “Art History” : *Meishu shi*(美術史) is published by Jiang Dan 姜丹(1885-?), in 1917, including painting, sculpture, architecture and crafts, in a way quite faithful to the Western taxonomy. The author was a graduate from the Nanjing Higher Normal School (my translation). Founded in 1902 the school hired more than 20 Japanese teachers. The Department of painting was the first to be established in China, and the teaching was conducted by 5 Japanese teachers (with the only exception of Chinese painting, which was taught by a Chinese teacher). The term *Meishu* was in use around 1897 and 1911 saw the publication of “series on Art” 美術叢書。

Two books with the title of *Chinese Art History* followed, 『中国美術史』 one by Chen Shihui 陳師曾 for the use of Beijing Art College (1925), the other by Pan Tianshou 潘天寿(1897-1971) used at Shanghai Art college (1926). Despite their titles, the books are simple compendium of the biography of artists and explanation of dynasty which would help art students understand the chronological outline, and obviously not intended to the literati class readers. *The Complete History of Chinese Painting* 『中国画学全史』 (1929) by Zheng Chang 鄭昶(1894-1952) marks the next step through his strong will of realizing an overview and unified narration. Conceived under the 5.4 Nationalist movement, the book, fully illustrated, tried to reply to the demand of the

New intellectual trend and welcomed by such Westernized intellectuals as Cai Yuanbai 蔡元培(1868-1940, then, President of the Beijing University). The neologism *Huashue* 画学 also testifies to Zheng's scholarly intention.

In contrast, *Historical Transition in Chinese Painting* 『中国绘画变迁史綱』 (1932) by Fu Baoshi 傅抱石(1904-1965) distinguishes itself by the use of vernacular language 白話 as well as by its attempt at the systematic reconstruction of the Chinese traditional connoisseurship. The book also emphasizes Chinese nationalistic essentialism as is differentiated from the Eastern neighbor (meaning Japan). Fu later came to Japan to study Oriental Art History under the guide of Kinbara Sheigo (金原省吾 whom I mentioned) at the Imperial Art University 帝国美術大学 (private institution) and upon return to China, published *A Chronological Table of Chinese Fine Art* 『中国美術年表』 by referring to Japanese precedent examples. Curiously, Fu does not show any traces of influence of a Wölfflinian style analysis, despite his training under prominent Japanese art historians of the period, like Taki Seiichi, Tanaka Toyozō or Fukui Rikichirō. It may be worth mentioning that Fu Baoshi, himself being a painter, thus contributed to the Chinese way of studying Art history without taking into account the Western “*Stilfragen*”. This literati tradition continues even nowadays both in the Mainland and in Taiwan, where prominent and influential publications on Chinese painting are mainly proposed by scholarly painters, and not by scholars trained in the (Westernized) art historical discipline.

The only exception in this lineage –and here I finally come to my point in this P.S.—may be the case of Teng Gu 滕固 (1901-1941), who stayed in Berlin from 1929 for 4 years. His *doktorarbeit* can be traced through a report by Ku Teng “Chinesische Malkunsttheorie in der Tang und Sungzeit“, *Ostasiatische Zeitung*, Neue Folge, 10-11, 1934-5. (Teng Gu being the Pinyin transcription for Teng Ku). Upon his return, Teng publishes in Chinese *A History of Painting of Tang and Sung Dynasties* (1933). In several of his papers in Chinese, his effort to introduce methodologies after Wölfflin 威尔佛林 is evident, as he was explicitly trying to apply the contrast of *Zeichenrisch* 吴道玄 to *Malerisch* 李思训 or *Linear-Malerisch* on Chinese pictorial styles: if the former characterize the Tang Dynasty, the later help understand the development during the Sung Dynasty, etc. His writings are now available in China (from 2003, his collected papers have been published). It is curious to note that the recent translation of Wölfflin in China in 1999 is more or less coincidental with the rehabilitation of the pioneering work by Teng Gu.)

Teng seems to have strived to overcome the conventional and vernacular compilation of biographies of the masters and have tried to give a “universal” outlook to the development of the Chinese painting history. Later Teng enlarged his investigation on Stone engraving of the Han Dynasty and tried to institutionalize the preservation policy of cultural heritage. In Nanjing, he became the core responsible person to set up the Association of the Chinese History of Arts 中国艺术史学 in 1937, integrating main historians, archaeologists and literary scholars (many of whom had previously stayed either in the West or in Japan). The “Arts” here mentioned cover not only “Painting and calligraphy” but also archeological relics of excavated bronze ritual wares.

Mr. Maromitsu Tsukamoto, curator of the Yamato Bunka-kan, who recently published the outline which I summarized above, points to an intriguing question in connection to the First overseas Chinese Exhibition held in London in 1935, namely, International Exhibition of the Chinese Art. For the first time pieces conserved in the Imperial Palace and other locations were exhibited. However between the Shanghai preparatory exhibition (April 1935) and the London exhibition at the Burlington House (from Nov. 1935 to March 1936), the focus was clearly different. In Shanghai, the presentation was made following the “authentic” classification of the Qing Dynasty imperial collection, which put emphasis on bronze, ceramics and stone wares, and only few specimens of Buddhist statues were presented (for the obvious reason that it did not fall into any classifying category in the taxonomy of the Ganglong 乾隆 Imperial Collection, and stone Buddha statues were part of the Chinese epigraphy). In London, in contrast, foreign collectors lent willingly their Buddhist statues as they had been already highly appreciated as sculptures constituting “Fine Arts”. Needless to say, this inclusion of Buddhism in high-art stems from European tradition of Indian archaeology with which the Japanese modern investigation into domestic religious relics (1888-97) showed strong affinity, as it had classified many surviving Buddhist statues from the antiquity among the national treasures. The exclusion of the Chinese perspective from the London show is no less evident. The Western category of Fine-Arts remained incompatible with that of the Chinese Imperial treasures, as the West regarded the latter as belonging to inferior category of applied or decorative arts.

Yashiro Yukio (1890-1975, whom I mentioned), then, Director of the Art Research Center in Tokyo, was involved in the conception of the London show as a foreign adviser. The extent and the depth of his influence still remains to be scrutinized. Still it must be emphasized that Chinese scholars present themselves as couriers, and who will become founding fathers of the Taiwan Imperial Museum in the post war period, were not given public voice. It was Yashiro who gave public lectures during the exhibition and

was treated as the representative spokesman of the Oriental art during the show (Kenneth Clark, for example, seems to be deeply influenced by Yashiro's view, despite the opinions of the Western archaeologists specialized in China). Whether it may be attributed to Yashiro himself or not is still an open question, it is at least clear that the Japanese way of showing the treasure of the Chinese Art to Western public in the 1936 turned out to be divergent from the Chinese "native" and imperial conception. And at the same time, this show prompted the creation of the Association of the Chinese History of Arts by the initiative of such Westernized scholars like Teng Gu, who stayed in Shanghai to have a look at the exhibit.

The premature death of Teng Gu in 1941 at the age of 40 during the Sino-Japanese War resulted in the loss of Wölfflin's legacy in Chinese art historical scholarship. His initiative of implementing German scholarship in Chinese art historical study did not take root either. In Communist China, the national project of the *General Inventory of the Chinese Ancient Painting* (from 1961) was conducted by connoisseurs of antiquarian background. How to evaluate the survival of the "native tradition" in front of the "global standard" would entail interesting questions (as in Sunman Gupta's assessment in p.247; I wonder if S.G. himself is already a contesting "Westerner" despite of himself, but anyhow). In contrast, Japanese scholarship in Chinese painting is basically absorbed in the academic research, as it is epitomized by the monumental *General Catalogue of Chinese Painting* (the project was initiated by professor Suzuki Kei 鈴木敬, and completed by professor Ogawa Hiromitsu 小川博充 (1983-2003); accessible cpdb.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/index.asp). (This would explain Prof. Ogawa's reaction to the "Western hegemony" in art historical research in note 103) As for Taiwan, where the main body of the Imperial Collection is relocated, it was only in 1971, that Chang Fucong 蔣復璁 (1899-1990), Director of the Imperial Palace Museum, and an intimate friend of Teng Gu from their pre-war Berlin days, founded the first section of Chinese Art History in the History Department of the Taiwan University.

*Maromitsu Tsukamoto, "Yashiro Yuko and Teng Gu," *Bi no tayori* (in Japanese), Yamato Bunka-kan, Spring, 2006, No.154.