

UCL - INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

**ARCL0174 NATURE, CULTURE AND THE LANGUAGES OF ART: THEORIES AND
METHODOLOGIES OF ART INTERPRETATION**

2018-19

Core module for MA in Comparative Art and Archaeology – 15 credits

Professor Jeremy Tanner

j.tanner@ucl.ac.uk

Room 105. Tel. 020 7679 1525

Office hours: Tuesday and Wednesday 11-12 or by appointment.

Turnitin Class ID: **3885689**

Turnitin Password: loA1819

Please see the last pages of this handbook for important information about submission and marking procedures, and links to the relevant webpages.

1. OVERVIEW OF COURSE:

This module introduces students to a range of key theories and methodologies of art analysis, including: iconography, style analysis, structuralism, semiotics, ethology, psychologies of art, concepts of 'naturalism', art and ornament. The topics and authors considered will range from classic approaches to art history by founding figures such as Panofsky and Wofflin, through to key recent contributions by scholars such as Whitney Davis and Gallese and Freedberg, working in the fields of the semiotics of art and neuro-art history. The substantive focus of the module will be exploring how far languages of visual art are naturally grounded in the biology of human perception, how far they are cultural constructs, analogous to language, and what the entailments might be for how we should understand and analyse visual art. It is best taken in conjunction with G353 Material and Social Contexts of Art.

MODULE SCHEDULE

Classes will be held on Wednesdays 9-11am, loA Room 412

3/10/18	1. Introductory Class
10/10/18	2. Understanding and explaining Art: concepts, theories, methods
17/10/18	3. Iconography and iconology: the German idealist tradition and beyond
24/10/18	4. Style and society
31/10/18	5. Structuralism, structural analysis and linguistic models of art
[7/11/18	<i>Reading Week – no class</i>
14/11/18	6. Semiotics and art history: pragmatism, interpretation and sensory response
21/11/18	7. Art and ethology: behavioral foundations of art
28/11/18	8. Art and Visual perception: nature and culture in art and cognition
5/12/18	9. Naturalism, schematism and representation
Essay : Submit draft for feedback: Saturday 8th December, 12pm. (I plan to return commented versions by Sunday 9th 10pm. Meetings for discussion, provisionally Monday 10th 12pm-3.45pm)	
12/12/18	10. Decorative art and the grammars of ornament
Submit revised version of essay for assessment: Tuesday 15th January = Week 2 of term 2)	

(Supplementary Topic: 11. Art, gender and sexuality: between nature and culture)

METHODS OF ASSESSMENT

For Institute of Archaeology students, and others taking the module as a 15 credit course, this module is by one standard essay of 3,800-4,200 words.

For Students taking this module as a 20 credit module (e.g. KCL, Classical Archaeology MA): In addition to the standard essay, students taking the module as a 20 credit element will be required to write an additional 1000 word report. This may take either the form of a review of a book from amongst the readings for the course, or a critical comparison of two articles in the module bibliography approaching the same issue (e.g. style, ornament) from different points of view. The books and articles chosen must come from a different topic than the one chosen for your standard essay. Your choice of book / articles should be discussed with the module tutor. This essay should be handed in by the same date as the revised version of your essay as submitted for assessment. This report will be assessed on a pass/fail basis. Students are required to pass the report element in order to complete the course.

Essay Topics: The questions are by weekly topic, and can be found at the end of the bibliography for each week's class. The dates for submission of both a draft for comment and the revised essay for assessment are specified on the module schedule. If students are unclear about the nature of an assignment, they should contact the Module Co-ordinator. The Module Co-ordinator will be willing to discuss an outline of their approach to the assessment, provided this is planned suitably in advance of the submission date.

TEACHING METHODS

The module is taught through seminars. Seminars have weekly recommended readings, which students will be expected to have done, to be able fully to follow and actively to contribute to discussion.

Students may be asked to make short presentations of case study material – in order to maximize the spread of comparative knowledge whilst ensuring the amount of reading is manageable. Such presentations will be negotiated at least a week in advance.

WORKLOAD

There will be 20 hours of seminars for this course. Students will be expected to undertake around 110 hours of reading for the course, plus 20 hours preparing for and producing the assessed work. This adds up to a total workload of some 150 hours for the course.

PREREQUISITES

Students should have some background in history of art, anthropology of art or art and archaeology

2. MODULE AIMS, OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES; MODULE ASSESSMENT

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

1. To provide an advanced, inter-disciplinary, exploration of key frameworks for the analysis and interpretation of the art of past societies, with a particular focus on theories and methods for the analysis of visual art.

2. To introduce students to the most important current research questions and the main interpretative paradigms that have dominated approaches to the understanding ancient art.

3. To develop critical faculties both in debate and in written evaluation of current research (problems, method and theory, quality of evidence).

4. To prepare students to undertake original research in the comparative study of art

OUTCOMES

On successful completion of the module students should be able to:

1. Demonstrate a good knowledge and understanding of major themes and debates concerning the cultural and behavioral foundations of communication in visual art

2. Critically analyse and present complex arguments and theories about aspects of the subject orally and in writing
3. Show a critical awareness of the contribution made by different academic disciplines and varying approaches to the analysis of visual art of past societies

ASSESSMENT DETAILS

METHODS OF ASSESSMENT

This module is assessed by means an essay of 3800-4200 words. There are essays for each of the topics covered in the weekly seminars. . **The deadlines for handing in your essay are listed on the module schedule. In the first place a draft of your essay should be submitted directly to Jeremy Tanner, by email attachment (j.tanner@ucl.ac.uk), for detailed formative feedback on the basis of which you may then revise your essay for final submission to be assessed: dates as specified on the module schedule above.**

If students are unclear about the nature of an assignment, they should contact the Module Co-ordinator. The Module Co-ordinator will be willing to discuss an outline of their approach to the assessment, provided this is planned suitably in advance of the submission date.

Word-length

Your essay should be between 3800 and 4200 words in length. The lower limit is a guideline for expected length; **the upper limit is strict, and the standard draconian UCL penalties apply for overlength essays.**

The following should not be included in the word-count: bibliography, appendices, and tables, graphs and illustrations and their captions.

Do feel free, within reason, to write detailed captions (not more than 100 words or so), pointing up specific features of images that play a role in the argument of your essay: quite a useful skill for an art historian, and allows a little wiggle room around the word limit.

In the 2018-19 session penalties for overlength work will be as follows:

- For work that exceeds the specified maximum length by less than 10% the mark will be reduced by five percentage marks, but the penalised mark will not be reduced below the pass mark, assuming the work merited a Pass.
- For work that exceeds the specified maximum length by 10% or more the mark will be reduced by ten percentage marks, but the penalised mark will not be reduced below the pass mark, assuming the work merited a Pass.

Coursework submission procedures

- All coursework must normally be submitted **both as hard copy and electronically**. (The only exceptions are bulky portfolios and lab books which are normally submitted as hard copy only.)
- You should staple the appropriate colour-coded IoA coversheet (available in the IoA library and outside room 411a) to the front of each piece of work and submit it to the red box at the Reception Desk (or room 411a in the case of Year 1 undergraduate work)
- All coursework should be uploaded to Turnitin by midnight on the day of the deadline. This will date-stamp your work. It is essential to upload **all parts** of your work as this is sometimes the version that will be marked.
- Instructions are given below.

Note that Turnitin uses the term 'class' for what we normally call a 'course'.

1. Ensure that your essay or other item of coursework has been saved as a Word doc., docx. or PDF document, and that you have the Class ID for the module (available from the module handbook) and enrolment password (this is **IoA1819** for all courses this session - note that this is capital letter I, lower case letter o, upper case A, followed by the current academic year)
2. Click on **http://www.turnitinuk.com/en_gb/login**
3. Click on 'Create account'

4. Select your category as 'Student'
5. Create an account using your UCL email address. Note that you will be asked to specify a new password for your account - do not use your UCL password or the enrolment password, but invent one of your own (Turnitin will permanently associate this with your account, so you will not have to change it every 6 months, unlike your UCL password). In addition, you will be asked for a "Class ID" and a "Class enrolment password" (see point 1 above).
6. Once you have created an account you can just log in at http://www.turnitinuk.com/en_gb/login and enrol for your other classes without going through the new user process again. Simply click on 'Enrol in a class'. Make sure you have all the relevant "class IDs" at hand.
7. Click on the module to which you wish to submit your work.
8. Click on the correct assignment (e.g. Essay 1).
9. Double-check that you are in the correct module and assignment and then click 'Submit'
10. Attach document as a "Single file upload"
11. Enter your name (the examiner will not be able to see this)
12. Fill in the "Submission title" field with the right details: **It is essential that the first word in the title is your examination candidate number** (e.g. YGBR8 In what sense can culture be said to evolve?),
13. Click "Upload". When the upload is finished, you will be able to see a text-only version of your submission.
14. Click on "Submit"

If you have problems, please email the IoA Turnitin Advisers on ioa-turnitin@ucl.ac.uk, explaining the nature of the problem and the exact module and assignment involved.

One of the Turnitin Advisers will normally respond within 24 hours, Monday-Friday during term. Please be sure to email the Turnitin Advisers if technical problems prevent you from uploading work in time to meet a submission deadline - even if you do not obtain an immediate response from one of the Advisers they will be able to notify the relevant Module Coordinator that you had attempted to submit the work before the deadline

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SEMINAR SUMMARIES

The following is a session outline and bibliography for the module as a whole, and identifies essential and supplementary readings relevant to each session. Information is provided as to where in the UCL library system individual readings are available; their location and Teaching Collection (TC) number, and status (whether out on loan) can also be accessed on the *UCL* computer catalogue system.

The required readings are considered essential to keep up with the topics covered in the module sessions, and it is expected that students will have read these prior to the session under which they are listed. Copies of individual articles and chapters identified as required reading are in the Teaching Collection in the Institute library (where permitted by copyright).

The bibliography includes more than you can reasonably be expected to read for this course, and you should probably not try, unless you are happy to sacrifice all the time you should be spending reading for other courses. It should, however, be of use to you both for preparing your essays for this course, and as a handy guide when developing your thesis topic, both at MA and PhD levels.

Please be sure to bring the bibliography with you to each class, so I can update it and suggest priorities/provide further guidance for the following week's readings.

G352 NATURE, CULTURE AND THE LANGUAGES OF ART - BIBLIOGRAPHY

2. Understanding and explaining art: concepts, theories, methods

Topic outline: This class introduces students to some of the main themes of this module through an exploration of three fundamental questions. 1) What are facts and what is theory? What role do/should conceptual schemes, and generalised discussion of conceptual schemes, play in the history and sociology of art? 2) What is "art". Is it a western (Eurocentric?) concept? What are its historical origins? What do we mean by it? Is it a concept relevant to the art of other cultures? 3) How do different conceptualisations of art affect the way we approach and analyse bodies of artistic material? What are some of the fundamental differences in the methodologies which people use in art analysis, and what are their presuppositions?

Required Readings for Class Discussion:

1. Parsons, T. 1982/1938. "The role of theory in social research", pp. 65-75 in L. Mayhew ed. *Talcott Parsons on Institutions and Social Evolution*. **(Xerox distributed)**
----- 1982/1938. "The action frame of reference", pp. 93-5 *ibid.* **(Xerox distributed)**
2. Clunas, C. 1997. *Art in China*. pp. 9-13 "Introduction" (IoA TC 1790; INSTARCH DBL CLU; ART EF5 CLU)
3. Morphy, H. 1992. "The anthropology of art", pp. 648-685 in T. Ingold ed. *Companion Encyclopaedia of Anthropology* (IoA BD ING; IOA ISSUE DESK ING2; SCIENCE ANTHROPOLOGY A2 ING; SCIENCE SHORT LOAN COLLECTION - ING)
4. Danto, Arthur, C. 1988. "Artifact and art", pp. 18-32 in S. Vogel ed. *Art/Artifact: African Art in Anthropology Collections*. New York, Center for African Art. **(Xerox distributed)**
5. Faris, James C. 1988. "'ART/Artifact': on the Museum and Anthropology", *Current Anthropology* 29 (5): 775-779 (UCL Electronic Pers - JSTOR)
6. Kristeller, P.O. 1951/2. "The modern system of the arts", *Journal of the History of Ideas* XII.4, 496-527 and XIII.1, 17-46. Reprinted in *idem* (1990), *Renaissance Thought and the Arts*. Princeton, Princeton University Press. (IoA TC 1799; ART K17 KRI; UCL Electronic Pers - JSTOR) **[Nb this is very long: if you do not have time to read in detail, skim read to pick up main points]**
7. Baines, John. 1994. "On the status and purposes of Ancient Egyptian art", *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 4:1, 67-94. (IoA TC 746; Electronic Pers - JSTOR)

Supplementary Readings

Theory: (why) do we need it and how should we evaluate it?

- Alexander, J. 1997. "The new theoretical movement in sociology", pp, 163-209 in *Neofunctionalism and After*.
- Lakatos, I. 1970. "Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes", pp. 91-196 in I. Lakatos and A. Musgrave eds. *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*.
- *Parsons, T. 1982/1938. "The role of theory in social research", pp. 65-75 in L. Mayhew ed. *Talcott Parsons on Institutions and Social Evolution*. **(Xerox distributed)**
- *----- . 1982/1938. "The action frame of reference", pp. 93-5 *ibid*. **(Xerox distributed)**
- Faris, James C. 1988. " 'ART/Artifact': on the Museum and Anthropology", *Current Anthropology* 29 (5): 775-779 (UCL Electronic Pers - JSTOR)

What is Art?

- Wollheim, R. 1968. *Art and its Objects*.
- * Clunas, C. 1997. *Art in China*. pp. 9-13 "Introduction" (IoA TC 1790; INSTARCH DBL CLU; ART EF5 CLU)
- *Morphy, H. 1992. "The anthropology of art", pp. 648-685 in T. Ingold ed. *Companion Encyclopaedia of Anthropology* (IoA BD ING; IOA ISSUE DESK ING2; SCIENCE ANTHROPOLOGY A2 ING; SCIENCE SHORT LOAN COLLECTION - ING)
- (*2)Geertz, C. 1983. "Art as a cultural system", pp. 95-120 in *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. (IoA TC 744)
- *Danto, Arthur, C. 1988. "Artifact and art", pp. 18-32 in S. Vogel ed. *Art/Artifact: African Art in Anthropology Collections*. New York, Center for African Art. **(Xerox distributed)**
- _____. 1981. "Works of art and mere real things", pp. 1-32 in *idem*. *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace*.
- *Faris, James C. 1988. " 'ART/Artifact': on the Museum and Anthropology", *Current Anthropology* 29 (5): 775-779 (UCL Electronic Pers - JSTOR)
- (*3)Goodman, N. 1981. "When is art", pp. 57-70 in *idem*. *Ways of Worldmaking*.
- Rollins, Mark. ed. 1993. *Danto and his Critics*. Oxford, Blackwell
- Brothwell, D. 1976. "Towards a working definition of visual art", pp. 10-17 in *idem* ed. *Beyond Aesthetics: Investigations into the Nature of Visual Art*.
- Gell, A. 1996. "Vogel's net: traps as art-works and art-works as traps", *Journal of Material Culture* 1/1, 15-38.
- *Kristeller, P.O. 1951/2. "The modern system of the arts", *Journal of the History of Ideas* XII.4, 496-527 and XIII.1, 17-46. Reprinted in *idem* (1990), *Renaissance Thought and*

- the Arts*. Princeton, Princeton University Press. (IoA TC 1799; ART K17 KRI; UCL Electronic Pers - JSTOR)
- Becq, A. 1993. "Creation, aesthetics, market: origins of the modern concept of art", in P. Mattick Jr. ed *Eighteenth Century Aesthetics and the Reconstruction of Art*. Cambridge. 240-254
- Platt, Verity and Squire, Michael. 2010. *The Art of Art History In Greco-Roman Antiquity*. *Arethusa* 43.2 Spring. (Special issue of the journal, addressing question of concept art in relation to classical art history: most relevant - Squires, Porter, Platt, Tanner)
- Porter, J.I. 2009. "Is art modern? Kristeller's 'Modern System of the Arts' Reconsidered", *British Journal of Aesthetics* 49: 1-24
- _____. 2009. "Reply to Shiner", *British Journal of Aesthetics* 49: 171-8
- Shiner, L. 2009. "Continuity and discontinuity in the concept of art", *British Journal of Aesthetics* 49: 159-69

Theory and method: internalists, externalists and some minimal pre-requisites for an adequate analysis of art

- [*]Bourdieu, P. 1996/1992. *The Rules of Art*. pp. 179-214 "Questions of method".(IoA TC 1788; Main Library LIT A21 BOU - 8 copies) **[Note:** Don't get too bogged down in this: key concepts to look out for and try to understand are "internalists", "externalists", and "field of cultural production" – what does Bourdieu hope to get out of this new concept?]
- Goldwater, R. 1973. "Art history and anthropology: some comparisons of methodology" pp. 1-10 in Anthony Forge ed. *Primitive Art and Society*; repr. in *Primitivism and Modern Art*. (1983), pp. 302-14

Case Studies

- Megaw, Vincent. 1982. "Western desert acrylic painting - artefact or art?" *Art History* 5, 205-18.
- *Baines, John. 1994. "On the status and purposes of Ancient Egyptian art", *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 4:1, 67-94. (IoA TC 746; Electronic Pers - JSTOR)

Essay questions: 1) Is a preoccupation with the concept "art" the prerequisite of a meaningful understanding of past visual cultures, or the primary obstacle to such an understanding.?

2) Is it possible to establish a workable concept of art? If so, what does or should such a concept look like and what would it entail for how we go about analysing art? If not, how serious a problem does this represent for historians of art?

3. Iconography and iconology: the German idealist tradition and beyond

Topic outline: This week we shall be looking at perhaps the dominant perspective in recent art history writing: iconography. The methodology of iconographic interpretation was codified by Panofsky in his classic article "Iconography and iconology". We shall look at the key components of iconographic and iconological interpretation, and the theoretical assumptions made by Panofsky in this scheme. Taylor provides a characteristic example of contemporary iconographic analysis, Panofsky's *Gothic Architecture* of iconology. We shall also explore some of the other interpretative options that Panofsky's schema effectively closed off, but which sociologists like Mannheim and Bourdieu have sought to open up, working from Panofsky's schema as a starting point. The work of Whitney Davis suggests ways in which an iconographic focus can be integrated with contemporary interests in context, power and cultural reproduction, in particular by thinking in terms of iconographic systems, grounded in aesthetic pragmatics and artistic production systems.

Required readings for Class Discussion

1. Panofsky, E. 1939. "Introductory", pp. 3-27 in idem *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic themes in the Art of the Renaissance* = "Iconography and iconology: an introduction to the study of Renaissance Art" in idem 1982 *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, pp. 26-41 (skim the second half of the essay) (IoA TC 3535 1 copy; ART BA PAN - 5 copies)
2. _____. 1951. *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*. Esp. important 1-8, 19-24, 31-42, 59-62. (Bartlett Issue Desk ARCH PAN; available as ebook via Library Catalogue)
3. Mannheim, K. 1993 (1922). "On the interpretation of Weltanschauung", pp. 136-186 in K. Wolff ed. *From Karl Mannheim*. (IoA TC 1791 - 2 copies; ANTHROPOLOGY D11 MAN - 2 copies) **Don't get bogged down in this:** the key pages are 136-8, 153-5, 173-186 – skim the rest to see where Panofsky got his ideas. What is different about Mannheim's approach?
4. Morgan, L. 1988. "Methods and aims: a definition of iconography", pp. 10-16 in idem. *The Miniature Wall-Paintings of Thera: a Study in Aegean Culture and Iconography*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).(IoA TC 194 - 3 copies; IoA DAG 10 MOR)
5. Davis, Whitney. 1989. *The Canonical Tradition in Ancient Egyptian Art*. esp. chs 1, 4, = pp. 1-7 "The argument", 59-93 "The order of iconography", (also chapter 7 if you have the time *192-224 "The explanation of invariance: toward a history of the authority of the canonical image".) (Egyptology M20 DAV- 2 copies; Issue Desk IoA DAV7)
6. Taylor, T. 1987. "Flying stags: icons and power in Thracian art", pp. 117-132 in I. Hodder ed. *The Archaeology of Contextual Meanings*. (IoA ISSUE DESK IOA HOD 13; INSTARCH AH Qto HOD) **Just skim/flick through if you are stretched for time:** what

is omitted in this study which one might think important to an understanding of art: clue – look at the pictures.

Supplementary Readings.

Key theoretical texts on iconography and iconology as method:

- **Panofsky, E. 1939. "Introductory", pp. 3-27 in idem *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic themes in the Art of the Renaissance* = "Iconography and iconology: an introduction to the study of Renaissance Art" in idem 1982 *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, pp. 26-41 (skim the second half of the essay) (IoA TC 3535 1 copy; ART BA PAN - 5 copies)
- ** _____. 1951. *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*. Esp. important 1-8, 19-24, 31-42, 59-62. (Bartlett Issue Desk ARCH PAN; available as ebook via Library Catalogue)
- **Mannheim, K. 1993 (1922). "On the interpretation of Weltanschauung", pp. 136-186 in K. Wolff ed. *From Karl Mannheim*. (IoA TC 1791 - 2 copies; ANTHROPOLOGY D11 MAN - 2 copies) Don't get bogged down in this: the key pages are 136-8, 153-5, 173-186 – skim the rest to see where Panofsky got his ideas. What is different about Mannheim's approach?
- Bourdieu, P. 1967. "Postface", pp. 135-167 to E. Panofsky, *Architecture Gothique et Pensee Scholastique*. Trans. 221-244 in Bruce Holsinger ed. *The Premodern Condition: Meivealism and the Making of Theory*. 2005. Chicag, Ill. (FRENCH E8 HOL)
- Hart, J. 1993. "Erwin Panofsky and Karl Mannheim: a dialogue on interpretation" *Critical Inquiry* 19: 534-566.
- Taylor, Paul. 2008. *Iconography without Text*. Warburg. (IoA BC 300 TAY)
- **Morgan, L. 1988. "Methods and aims: a definition of iconography", pp. 10-16 in idem. *The Miniature Wall-Paintings of Thera: a Study in Aegean Culture and Iconography*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).(IoA TC 194 - 3 copies; IoA DAG 10 MOR)
- _____. 1985. "Idea, idiom and iconography", pp. 5-19 in P. Darcque and J.-C. Poursat eds. *L'Iconographie Minoenne. Actes de la Table Ronde d'Athenes (21-2 Avril 1983)*, Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique, Supplement XI.

Case studies:

- **Davis, Whitney. 1989. *The Canonical Tradition in Ancient Egyptian Art*. esp. chs 1, 4, = pp. 1-7 "The argument", 59-93 "The order of iconography", (also chapter 7 if you have the time *192-224 "The explanation of invariance: toward a history of the authority of the canonical image".) (Egyptology M20 DAV- 2 copies; Issue Desk IoA DAV7)
- **Taylor, T. 1987. "Flying stags: icons and power in Thracian art", pp. 117-132 in I. Hodder ed. *The Archaeology of Contextual Meanings*. (IoA ISSUE DESK IOA HOD

- 13; INSTARCH AH Qto HOD) Just skim/flick through if you have time: what is omitted in this study which one might think important to an understanding of art: clue – look at the pictures.
- Boardman, J. 1972. "Herakles, Peisistratos and Sons" *Révue Archeologique* 57-72. (UCL - Electronic Periodicals)
- Osborne, R. 1983/4 "The Myth of Propaganda and the Propoganda of Myth," *Hephaistos* 5/6, 61-70. Critique of Boardman, and of iconographic programme more generally. (INSTITUTE OF CLASSICAL STUDIES)
- Furst, P.T. 1981. "Jaguar-baby or toad-mother: a new look at an old problem in Olmec iconography", pp. 149-162 in E. Benson, M. Coe and D. Grove eds. *The Olmec and Their Neighbours*.
- Joralemon, P.D. 1981. "The old woman and the child: themes in the iconography of pre-classic America", pp. 163-180 in E. Benson, M. Coe and D. Grove eds. *The Olmec and Their Neighbours*.
- Wu Hung. 1986. "Buddhist elements in early Chinese art (2nd and 3rd centuries AD)". *Artibus Asiae* 47 3/4, 263-303, 305-352. (Superb study) [Online]
- _____. 2000. "Mapping early Taoist art: the visual culture of Wudoumi Dao", in Little, Stephen. 2000. *Taoism and the Arts of China*. Berkeley. Art Institute of Chicago and University of California Press. 77-93.
- Knight, Vernon James. 2012. *Iconographic Method in New World Prehistory*. Cambridge
- Ataç, Mehmet-Ali. 2006. Visual Formula and Meaning in Neo-Assyrian Relief Sculpture *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 88, No. 1 (Mar., 2006), pp. 69-101
- Bailey, W. 2007. "The anti-rhetorical power of representational absence: incomplete figurines from the Balkan Neolithic", in Renfrew, C. & Morley, I. (eds.) (2007) *Image and Imagination: A Global Prehistory of Figurative Representation*. McDonald Institute Monographs, Cambridge. 117-126 [INST ARCH BC 300 REN]

Further reading:

- Podro, M. 1982. *The Critical Historians of Art*. (New Haven, Yale University Press).
- Cassidy, Brendan. ed. 1993. *Iconography at the Crossroads: Papers Sponsored by the Index of Christian Art, Princeton*. (ART HC ICO)
- Elsner, Jas and Katharina Lorenz. 2012. "The Genesis of Iconology." *Critical Inquiry*. Vol. 38. No. 3.
- Holly, M.A. 1984. *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History*. (Ithaca, Cornell University Press).
- Tanner, Jeremy. 2009. "Karl Mannheim and Alois Riegl: from art history to the sociology of culture", *Art History* 32.4: 755-784
- Hasenmueller, C. 1978. "Panofsky, iconography and semiotics", *J. of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*. 36: 289-301.

Argan, G.C. 1975. "Ideology and iconology", *Critical Inquiry* 2.2.

Essay question: What are the main strengths and weaknesses of Panofsky's programme in iconography and iconology? To what extent does iconography represent a valid research programme today?

4. Style and society

Topic outline: What is style? How can we describe and characterise styles? Where do our stylistic vocabularies in western art history come from, and to what extent does that effect their wider usefulness? What are the main differences between art historical and archaeological characterisations of style, and how do these relate to different disciplinary traditions/explanatory goals ? What do styles do? What can we use style for?

Required readings for Class Discussion

1. Conkey, M.W. 1990. "Experimenting with style in archaeology: some historical and theoretical issues", in M.W. Conkey and C.A. Hastorf eds. *The Uses of Style in Archaeology* pp. 5-17 (IoA AH CON - 4 copies; Issue Desk IOA CON3 - 2 copies)
2. Davis, Whitney. 1990. "Style and history in art history", pp. 18-31 in M.W. Conkey and C.A. Hastorf eds. *The Uses of Style in Archaeology*. (IoA AH CON - 4 copies; Issue Desk IOA CON3 - 2 copies)
3. Nodelman, S. 1970. "Structural analysis in art and anthropology", pp. 79-93 in J. Ehrmann ed. *Structuralism*. (IoA TC 1908 - 2 copies); also In *Yale French Studies* 36.7 (1966) : 89-103 [Online]
4. Gombrich, E.H. 1966. "Norm and form:the stylistic categories of art history and their origins in Renaissance ideals", pp. 81-98 in idem. *Norm and Form: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance vol 1*. (good analysis of Wölfflin) (ART KI 7 GOM - 4 copies; ART K5 GOM - 1 copy; ARCHITECTURE B 6:27 GOM - 1 copy)
5. Earl, T. 1990. "Style and iconography as legitimation in complex chiefdoms", pp. 73-81 in Conkey and Hastorf eds. op. cit. (IoA AH CON - 4 copies; Issue Desk IOA CON3 - 2 copies)
6. Nodelman, S. 1975 "How to read a Roman portrait", *Art in America* 63: 26-33. (IoA TC 392; IoA TC 744 - 2 copies) (Also in E. D'Ambra, *Roman Art in Context* YATES A 40 DAM)

Supplementary Readings.

Art historical and aesthetic approaches

Goodman, N. 1978. "The status of style", pp. 23-40 in *Ways of Worldmaking*.

* Schapiro, M. 1951. "Style", pp. 287-312 in A.L. Kroeber ed. *Anthropology Today*. (IoA TC 1847 - 4 copies) [Highly recommended - classic article]

Lang, Beryl. 1982. "Looking for the styleme", *Critical Inquiry* 9.2, 405-413

Wölfflin, H. 1950. (o.v. 1922). *Principles of Art History: the Problem of the Development of Style in Later Art*.

- Brown, M. 1982. "The classic is the baroque: on the principle of Wölfflin's art history", *Critical Inquiry* 9: 379-404.
- Forge, Anthony. 1973. "Style and meaning in Sepik Art", pp. 169-92 in idem. ed. *Primitive Art and Society*.
- Layton, Robert. 1991. *The Anthropology of Art*. ch. 4. pp. 150-192 "Style". (IoA BD LAY)
- Panofsky, E. 1955 (1921). "The history of the theory of human proportions as a reflection of the history of styles", pp. 55-107 in *Meaning in the Visual Arts*.
- **Davis, Whitney. 1990. "Style and history in art history", pp. 18-31 in M.W. Conkey and C.A. Hastorf eds. *The Uses of Style in Archaeology*. (IoA AH CON - 4 copies; Issue Desk IOA CON3 - 2 copies)
- Summers, D. 1989. "Form: nineteenth century metaphysics and the problem of art historical description", *Critical Inquiry* 15: 372-407
- **Nodelman, S. 1970. "Structural analysis in art and anthropology", pp. 79-93 in J. Ehrmann ed. *Structuralism*. (IoA TC 1908 - 2 copies); also In *Yale French Studies* 36.7 (1966) : 89-103 [Online]
- **Gombrich, E.H. 1966. "Norm and form:the stylistic categories of art history and their origins in Renaissance ideals", pp. 81-98 in idem. *Norm and Form: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance vol 1*. (good analysis of Wölfflin) (ART KI 7 GOM - 4 copies; ART K5 GOM - 1 copy; ARCHITECTURE B 6:27 GOM - 1 copy)
- (*)Arnheim, R. 1986 (1981). "Style as a Gestalt problem", pp. 261-273 in *New Essays in the Psychology of Art*. (ART BE ARN)
- Neer, Richard. 2005. "Connoisseurship and the stakes of style", *Critical Inquiry* 32: 1-26
- Clarke, John R. 2017. "Kaschnitz between archaeology and art", 63-74 in Achim Lichtenberger and Rubina Raja eds. *The Diversity of Classical Archaeology*. Turnhout: Brepols. [YATES A8 LIC]

Style in archaeology

- *Shanks, M. and C. Tilley. 1987. "Style and ideology", pp. 137-71 in *Reconstructing Archaeology: Theory and Practice*. (INSTARCH AS SHA; IoA ISSUE DESK SHA)
- *M. Conkey and C. Hastorf eds. 1990. *The Uses of Style in Archaeology*., pp. 1-4 "Introduction" (IoA AH CON - 4 copies; Issue Desk IOA CON3 - 2 copies)
- Hodder, M.A. 1990. "Style as historical quality", pp. 44-51 in M. Conkey and C. Hastorf eds. *The Uses of Style in Archaeology*.
- **Conkey, M.W. 1990. "Experimenting with style in archaeology: some historical and theoretical issues", *ibid.* pp. 5-17 (IoA AH CON - 4 copies; Issue Desk IOA CON3 - 2 copies)
- Wiessner, P. 1990. "Is there a unity to style", pp. 105-12 *ibid.*

- Wobst, M. 1991. "Stylistic behaviour and information exchange", in C.E. Cleland ed. *For the Director: Essays in Honour of James B. Griffin*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Anthropological Papers 62, pp. 317-42.
- Plog, S. 1983. "Analysis of style in artefacts", *Annual Review of Anthropology* 12: 125-42
- Hegmon, M. 1992. "Archaeological research on style", *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: 517-536
- Conkey, Margaret W. 2005. "Style, design and function", in Tilley, C. et al eds. *Handbook of Material Culture*. Sage, London.355-373
- Dietler, M, and Herbich. I. 1998. "Habitus, techniques, style: an integrated approach to the social understanding of material culture and boundaries", in *The Archaeology of Social Boundaries* ed. MT Stark. Washington DC: Smithsonian Press. 232-79

Case studies:

- *Earl, T. 1990. "Style and iconography as legitimation in complex chiefdoms", pp. 73-81 in Conkey and Hastorf eds. op. cit. (IoA AH CON - 4 copies; Issue Desk IOA CON3 - 2 copies)
- Kaeppler, A. 1982. "A study of symbolism in Hawaiian images", *Res* 3: 82-107.
- Cummins, T. 1984. "Kinshape: the design of the Hawaiian feather cloak", *Art History* 7: 1-20.
- Fuente, Beatriz de la. 1981. "Toward a concept of monumental Olmec art", pp. 84-94 in E. Benson, M. Coe and D, Grove eds. *The Olmec and their Neighbours*.
- Grove, D. 1981. "Olmec monuments: mutilation as a clue to meaning", pp. 49-68 *ibid*.
- *Nodelman, S. 1975 "How to read a Roman portrait", *Art in America* 63: 26-33. (IoA TC 392; IoA TC 744) (Also in E. D'Ambra, *Roman Art in Context* YATES A 40 DAM)
- Wilk, R. 2004. "Miss Universe, the Olmec and the valley of Oaxaca", *Journal of Social Archaeology* 4.1: 81-98 (UCL Electronic Periodicals)
- Hartwig, Melinda K. 2015. "Style", 39-59 in idem ed. 2015. *A Companion to Egyptian Art*. London: John Wiley and Sons. [Online]
- _____. 2011. "An examination of art historical method and theory: a case study", In Verbovsek, A., Backes, B. and Jones, C. eds. *Methodik und Didaktik in der Ägyptologie*. 313-26. [Looking at Wegner's application of Wolfflin's concepts to Egyptian painting]
- *O'Keefe, Tadhg. 2007. *Archaeology and the Pan-European Romanesque*. London; Duckworth [IoA DA 190 OKE] {interesting for comparison with Meyer Schapiro's classic art historical approach to Romanesque style}

Further Reading

- Kroeber A.L. 1956. *Style and Civilisation*.
- Matz, Friedrich. 1950. *Geschichte der Griechischen Kunst*. Frankfurt.

- Needham, Rodney. 1983. "Polythetic classification", pp. 36-55 in *Against the Tranquility of Axioms*.
- Conkey, M. 1989. "The use of diversity in stylistic analysis", pp. 121-32 in G.T. Jones and R. Leonard eds. *Quantifying Diversity in Archaeology*.
- Willey, G. 1962. "The early great styles and the rise of precolumbian civilisation" *American Anthropologist* 64: 1-24.
- Podro, M. 1982. *The Critical Historians of Art*. Yale.

Essay question: Why is style such an important, and difficult, concept for archaeologists and art historians?

5. Structuralism, structural analysis and linguistic models of art

Topic outline: In the context of the 'linguistic turn' of the 1960s and 1970s, 'language' became the master key for many of the social and cultural science, most notably anthropology and literary criticism. The influence of the linguistic turn, and in particular 'structuralism', in archaeology and art history was at its height in the following decades and has left a permanent precipitate. This class looks at how concepts ultimately derived from Ferdinand de Saussure's structural linguistics have been employed in the analysis of visual and material culture. How legitimate and how fruitful is the transposition of linguistic models into the analysis of visual and material culture? Do language and visual art share common properties as cultural systems, or is the use of linguistic models to analyse visual art nothing more than a questionable analogy?

Required readings for Class Discussion

1. Tilley, C. 1989. "Interpreting material culture", pp. 185-194 in I. Hodder ed. *The Meanings of Things: Material Culture and Symbolic Expression*. (INSTARCH AH HOD - 6 copies; IOA ISSUE DESK HOD 3)
2. Tilley, C. 1991. *Material Culture and Text: the Art of Ambiguity*, pp. 16-42 "Locating a grammar", 95-113 "A structural logic". (Science ANTHROPOLOGY C9 TIL - 4 copies; IoA AH TIL - 3 copies; SCIENCE SHORT LOAN COLL TIL; IOA ISSUE DESK TIL 1)
3. Levi-Strauss, C. 1982. *The Way of the Masks*. Pp. 12-14, 15-39 "The Salish Swaihwé", 56-66 "Meeting the Dzonokwa", 82-93 "The clue to the mystery" (also recommended: pp. 130-4, 135-148 "The nature of a style", pp. 151-2 and pp. 160-2 - on the question of time and explanation) (Science Short Loan Collection LEV, ANTHROPOLOGY E20 LEV - 3 copies; IoA Issue Desk LEV 4)
- [4. Bauman, Zygmunt. 1973. "The structuralist promise", *British Journal of Sociology* 24: 67-83 (IoA TC 1830; UCL Electronic Periodicals) **Very much worth reading if you can find time]**

Supplementary Readings.

Theory

- *Tilley, C. 1989. "Interpreting material culture", pp. 185-194 in I. Hodder ed. *The Meanings of Things: Material Culture and Symbolic Expression*. (INSTARCH AH HOD - 6 copies; IOA ISSUE DESK HOD 3)
- G. Charbonnier. 1969. *Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss.*, pp. 56-64 "Art and the group", 65-87 "Three differences", 88-100 "Natural art and cultural art", *101-116

"Art as a system of signs" (IoA TC 1849 for 'Art as a system of signs'; the book is ANTHROPOLOGY D4 CHA)

Layton, Robert. 1991. *The Anthropology of Art*. ch. 3, pp. 93-149 "Art as visual communication"

Gellner, E. 1985. "What is *structuralisme*", pp. 128-57 in *Relativism and the Social Sciences*.

(*)Bauman, Zygmunt. 1973. "The structuralist promise", *British Journal of Sociology* 24: 67-83 (IoA TC 1830; UCL Electronic Periodicals)

Garvin, Paul L. 1977. "Linguistics and semiotics", *Semiotica* 20: 101-10

Layton, Robert. 2005. "Structuralism and semiotics", in C. Tilley et al eds. *Handbook of Material Culture*. Sage. 29-42

The best introduction to structural analysis in anthropology and beyond is a set of essays by Levi-Strauss, reprinted in *Structural Anthropology*. Not their least interesting aspect is his caution about the scope and limits of the application of linguistic models, a caution that was rather lost in the linguistic imperialism of the structuralist movement more generally.

Levi-Strauss, C. 1963. *Structural Anthropology*. (New York, Basic Books). Pp. 31-54 "Structural analysis in linguistics and anthropology", 55-66 "Language and the analysis of social laws", 67-80 "Linguistics and anthropology", 81-97 "Post-script".

Case studies:

*Tilley, C. 1991. *Material Culture and Text: the Art of Ambiguity*, pp. 16-42 "Locating a grammar", 95-113 "A structural logic". (Science ANTHROPOLOGY C9 TIL - 4 copies; IoA AH TIL - 3 copies; SCIENCE SHORT LOAN COLL TIL; IOA ISSUE DESK TIL 1)

*Levi-Strauss, C. 1982. *The Way of the Masks*. Pp. 12-14, 15-39 "The Salish Swaihwé", 56-66 "Meeting the Dzonokwa", 82-93 "The clue to the mystery" (also recommended: pp. 130-4, 135-148 "The nature of a style", pp. 151-2 and pp. 160-2 - on the question of time and explanation) (Science Short Loan Collection LEV, ANTHROPOLOGY E20 LEV - 3 copies; IoA Issue Desk LEV 4)

Humphrey, C. 1971. "Some ideas of Saussure applied to Buryat magical drawings", pp. 271-90 in E. Ardener ed. *Social Anthropology and Language*. London, Tavistock.

Levi-Strauss, C. 1963. "Split representation in the art of Asia and America", pp. 245-268 in idem *Structural Anthropology*.

_____. 1963. "The serpent with fish inside his body", pp. 269-273 *ibid*.

_____. 1984 (1955). "A native community and its life-style" in idem *Tristes Tropiques* (trans. John and Mary Weightman), 229-256

Structralist Approaches to ancient Greek Art

- Bérard, C. et al. 1989. *A City of Images: Iconography and Society in Ancient Greece*. esp - pp. 11-21 "Looking at the vase" (Christine Bron and Francois Lissarrague), 23-37 "Entering the imagery" (Claude Bérard and Jean-Louis Durand), 39-57 "The world of the warrior" (Francois Lissarrague), 53-70 "Sacrificial slaughter and initiatory hunt" (Jean-Louis Durand and Alain Schnapp), 71-87 "Eros the hunter" (Alain Schnapp). (ISSUE DESK: IoA CIT; YATES A 70 CIT - 4 copies)
- Hoffmann, H. 1977. *Sexual and Asexual Pursuit: a Structuralist Approach to Greek Vase Painting*. Royal Anthropological Institute, Occasional Paper no. 34. (TC IOA 1624)
- Boardman, J. 1979. Review of Hoffmann in *Classical Review* 29, 118-20. (UCL Electronic Periodicals)
- Boardman, J. 1981. "Askoi", *Hephaistos* 3, 23-5 (ICS Stacks 20)
- Hoffmann, H. 1982. "John Boardman 'Askoi': a rejoinder", *Hephaistos* 4, 1982, 177ff. (ICS Stacks 20)
- _____ and Burkert, W. 1980. "La cuisine des morts", *Hephaistos* 2, 107-111

Essay question: What are the main strengths and weaknesses of models drawn from structural linguistics in the analysis of visual art?

6. Semiotics and Art History

Topic outline: Structuralism and semiotics are sometimes treated as virtual synonyms but there are in fact important differences between the structuralist tradition of sign analysis, founded by Saussure and best represented by the work of Levi-Strauss and his followers, and that of semiotics (the general theory of signs), most closely associated with Peirce, but part of a long tradition going back to classical Greece. This seminar will look at Peirce's distinctive conceptualisation of semiotic processes (system vs structure) and his typology of signs (icon, index, symbol), and at their implications for the understanding of visual art. Particular emphasis will be laid on Peirce's account of the material grounds of semiotic processes and the concept of the "interpretant". The case-study by Baxandall affords the possibility using Peirce's framework for thinking about the relationship between vision and other sensory systems, and the role of "synaesthesia" in the construction of aesthetic-expressive effects.

Required readings for Class Discussion

1. Iversen, M. 1986. "Saussure vs Peirce: models for a semiotics of visual art", pp. 82-94 in A. Rees and F. Borzello eds. *The New Art History*. (ART A8 REE - 3 copies; **IoA Teaching Collection 3790, 2 copies**)
2. _____. 1979. "Meyer Schapiro and the semiotics of visual art", *Block 1*, 50ff. (IoA TC 1848 - 3 copies)
3. De Lauretis, T. 1981. "Semiotics and experience", pp. 158-196 in *Alice Doesn't: Feminism: Semiotics, Cinema*. (IoA TC 1792 - 3 copies; ART QB 3 DEL)
4. Baxandall, M. 1972. *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style* - a classic study all of which is worth reading if you have not read it before, but for this class concentrate on section 2, pp. 29-106 "The period eye", esp. pp. 56ff. - read with Bourdieu. (ART KI 12 BAX 9 copies; MAIN LIBRARY ISSUE DESK BAX)
5. Bourdieu, P. 1992. "Belief and the body", pp. 66-79 in *The Logic of Practice* (ANTHROPOLOGY D6 BOU - 6 copies; Science short loan room BOU; IoA Teaching Collection 3791 - 2 copies)
6. Classen, C. 1993. *Worlds of Sense: Exploring the Senses in History and Across Cultures.*, pp. 121-138 "Worlds of sense", (pp. 37-49 "Natural wits: the sensory skills of wild children" also recommended). (IoA TC 1812 - 2 copies; ANTHROPOLOGY D23 CLA - 2 copies)

Supplementary Readings.

Theory:

- Bal, M. and N. Bryson. 1991. "Semiotics and art history", *Art Bulletin* 73, 174-208
{excellent}
- *Iversen, M. 1986. "Saussure vs Peirce: models for a semiotics of visual art", pp. 82-94 in A. Rees and F. Borzello eds. *The New Art History*. (ART A8 REE - 3 copies; **IoA Teaching Collection 3790, 2 copies**)
- * _____. 1979. "Meyer Schapiro and the semiotics of visual art", *Block* 1, 50ff. (IoA TC 1848 - 3 copies)
- McCarthy, E.D. 1984. "Toward a sociology of the physical world: George Herbert Mead on physical objects", *Studies in Symbolic Interaction* 5, 105-121.
- Jones, M.P. 1996. "Post-human agency: between theoretical traditions", *Sociological Theory* 14.3, 290-309.
- *De Lauretis, T. 1981. "Semiotics and experience", pp. 158-196 in *Alice Doesn't: Feminism: Semiotics, Cinema*. (IoA TC 1792 - 3 copies; ART QB 3 DEL)
- Rochberg-Halton, E. 1982. "Situation, structure and context of meaning", *Sociological Quarterly* 23, 455-76
- Zeman, J.J. 1977. "Peirce's theory of signs", pp. 22-39 in T.A. Sebeok ed. *A Perfusion of Signs*. (Do not get bogged down in the technical terminology here – key concepts are sign index, icon, symbol, interpretant)
- Michaels, W.B. 1980. "The interpreter's self: Peirce on the Cartesian subject", pp. 185-200 in Jane P. Tompkins ed. *Reader Response Criticism*.
- Turner, V. 1967. "Symbolism, morality and social structure", in *The Forest of Symbols*.
- Peirce, C.S. 1955. "Logic as semiotic: the theory of signs", pp. 98-119 in *Philosophical Writings*, ed. J. Buckler.
- _____. 1934. *Collected Papers*, vol. 5, pp. 272-345 = paras 411-496 (best discussions of the concept "interpretant").
- (*Marks, E. 1990. "Synaesthesia: perception and metaphor", pp. 28-40 in F. Burwick and W. pape eds. *Aesthetic Illusion*. (Good run into ethology, Napier on monsters and perceptual systems - topic 6) (IoA TC 1834)
- Tanner, J. 2000. "The body, expressive culture and social interaction: integrating art history and action theory", 285-324 in H. Staubmann, H. Wenzel eds. *Talcott Parsons. Zur Aktualitaet eines Theorienprogrammes*. Oesterreichische Zeitschrift fur Soziologie, Sonderband 6. Reprinted in V. Lidz ed. 2011. *Talcott Parsons*. (Ashgate: London) 523-562.
- Preucel, R. and Bauer, A. 2001. "Archaeological pragmatics", *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 34.2: 85-96 (UCL Electronic Periodicals)

- Layton, Robert. 2005. "Structuralism and semiotics", in C. Tilley et al eds. *Handbook of Material Culture*. Sage. 29-42
- Tanner, Jeremy. 2010. "Michael Baxandall and the Sociological Interpretation of Art", *Cultural Sociology* 4.2: 231-56 (UCL Electronic Periodicals)

Case studies:

- *Baxandall, M. 1972. *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style* - a classic study all of which is worth reading if you have not read it before, but for this class concentrate on section 2, pp. 29-106 "The period eye", esp. pp. 56ff. - read with Bourdieu. (ART KI 12 BAX 9 copies; MAIN LIBRARY ISSUE DESK BAX)
- *Bourdieu, P. 1992. "Belief and the body", pp. 66-79 in *The Logic of Practice* (ANTHROPOLOGY D6 BOU - 6 copies; Science short loan room BOU; IoA Teaching Collection 3791 - 2 copies)
- Classen, C. 1990. "Sweet colours fragrant songs: sensory models of the Andes and the Amazon", *American Ethnologist* 17.4: 722-735
- * _____. 1993. *Worlds of Sense: Exploring the Senses in History and Across Cultures.*, pp. 121-138 "Worlds of sense", (pp. 37-49 "Natural wits: the sensory skills of wild children" also recommended). (IoA TC 1812 - 2 copies; ANTHROPOLOGY D23 CLA - 2 copies)
- Schapiro, M. 1973. "Frontal and profile as symbolic forms", pp. 37-47 in idem. *Words and Pictures: on the Literal and the Symbolic in the Illustration of a Text*.
- Tanner, J. 2000. "Portraits, power and patronage in the late Roman Republic", *Journal of Roman Studies* XC: 18-50.

Essay question: What are the most significant respects in which Peirce's conception of the sign differs from either that of Panofsky or that of Saussure, and what implications do they have for the analysis of visual art?

7. Art and Ethology

Topic outline: This week we explore the biological bases of human expressive behaviour and the continuities between animal and human expressiveness. Peirce's concept of the index suggests that sometimes the connection between a signifier and its signified is not cultural but causal. The work of ethologists on animal communication systems has explored the extent to which animals are hard-wired by instinct to respond to certain visual signals. For our purposes this raises several related questions. To what extent can the insights of ethology be extended to human communication systems? Are we hard-wired to respond to certain visual stimuli? To what extent do human cultural systems like art override the kinds of biological determinants characteristic of animal communication? To what extent is aesthetic-expressive culture rooted in and determined by human biology? To what extent, how and with what effects can art exploit biologically given presuppositions for cultural purposes?

Required readings for Class Discussion

1. Dissanayake, E. 1980. "Art as a human behaviour: towards an ethological view of art", *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 38.4, 397-406. (IoA TC 1833; UCL Electronic Pers, JSTOR)
2. _____. 1988. *What is Art For?* Pp. 3-10 "Introduction", 11-33 "The biobehavioral view" (ART BE DIS; ANTHROPOLOGY E10 DIS; Science Short loan room DIS - 3 hours only)
3. Lorenz, Konrad Z. 1966. "Evolution of ritualisation in the biological and cultural spheres", pp. 173-84 in J. Huxley ed. *A Discussion of Ritualisation Behaviour in Animals and Man*. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences, 772: 251.247-56 (**best starting point**) (IoA TC 1832; UCL Electronic Periodicals)
4. Gombrich, E. 1966. "Ritualized gesture and expression in art", pp. 393-401 in J. Huxley ed. *A Discussion of Ritualisation Behaviour in Animals and Man*. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences, 772: 251.247-56; repr. in Gombrich 1979, *The Image and the Eye*, pp. 63-77. (on importance of conventionalisation and context in interpretation of ritualised gesture) (IoA TC 1846; UCL Electronic Periodicals – Philosophical Transactions etc)
5. Napier, A.D. 1986. *Masks, Transformation and Paradox*. pp. xv-xx "Foreword" (by Rodney Needham), pp. 83-134 "Perseus and the Gorgon head" (esp. 91-134, but do not get bogged down in the iconographic and nr eastern detail - skim), 135-187 "The third eye" (esp. 145-55, 166-187, but again just get the principles of the argument, detail not important - skim), 188-224 "Balinese faces and Indian

prototypes" (**the key chapter for this topic). (Anth D115 NAP, Science short loan room NAP; 'Balinese Faces etc' is on IoA teaching collection (3784 - 2 copies), but do take a look through the other chapters as well).

Supplementary Readings.

Theoretical orientations:

- *Dissanayake, E. 1980. "Art as a human behaviour: towards an ethological view of art", *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 38.4, 397-406. (IoA TC 1833; UCL Electronic Pers, JSTOR)
- * _____. 1988. *What is Art For?* Pp. 3-10 "Introduction", 11-33 "The biobehavioral view" (ART BE DIS; ANTHROPOLOGY E10 DIS; Science Short loan room DIS - 3 hours only)
- (*Rochberg-Halton, E. 1989. "On the Life concept in social theory", *Comparative Social Research* 11, 319-343. (IoA TC 1948)
- Fuller, P. 1983. "Art and biology", pp. 2-19 in *The Naked Artist*
- Turner, V. 1983. "Body, brain and culture", *Zygon* 18 (September), 221-45
- *Lorenz, Konrad Z. 1966. "Evolution of ritualisation in the biological and cultural spheres", pp. 173-84 in J. Huxley ed. *A Discussion of Ritualisation Behaviour in Animals and Man*. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences, 772: 251.247-56 (best starting point) (IoA TC 1832; UCL Electronic Periodicals)
- *Gombrich, E. 1966. "Ritualized gesture and expression in art", pp. 393-401 in J. Huxley ed. *A Discussion of Ritualisation Behaviour in Animals and Man*. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences, 772: 251.247-56; repr. in Gombrich 1979, *The Image and the Eye*, pp. 63-77. (on importance of conventionalisation and context in interpretation of ritualised gesture) (IoA TC 1846; UCL Electronic Periodicals – Philosophical Transactions etc)
- _____. 1979 (1970). "Action and expression in Western art", pp. 78-104 in *The Image and the Eye*.
- Eckman, Paul. 1977. "Biological and cultural contributions to body and facial movement", pp. 39-84 in J. Blacking ed. *The Anthropology of the Body*.
- Darwin, Charles. 1998 (1889). *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* (with introduction, afterword and commentaries by Paul Eckman).
- Brown, D.E. 1991. *Human Universals*.

Case-study

*Napier, A.D. 1986. *Masks, Transformation and Paradox*. pp. xv-xx "Foreword" (by Rodney Needham), pp. 83-134 "Perseus and the Gorgon head" (esp. 91-134, but do not get bogged down in the iconographic and nr eastern detail - skim), 135-187 "The third eye" (esp. 145-55, 166-187, but again just get the principles of the argument, detail not important - skim), 188-224 "Balinese faces and Indian prototypes" (**the key chapter for this topic). (Anth D115 NAP, Science short loan room NAP; 'Balinese Faces etc' is om IoA teaching collection (3784 - 2 copies), but do take a look through the other chapters as well).

Following are the main ethological sources for Napier's argument:

Coss, R.G. 1970. "The perceptual aspects of eye-spot patterns and their relevance to gaze behaviour", pp. 121-47 in S.J. Hutt and Corinne Hutt eds. *Behaviour Studies in Psychiatry*.

Argyle, Michael. 1972. "Non-verbal communication in human social interaction", pp. 243-269 in R.A. Hinde ed. *Non-Verbal Communication*.

_____. 1975. *Bodily Communication.*, pp. 245-6 on the gaze.

Bolwig, Niels. 1963/4. "Facial expression in primates with remarks on a parallel development in certain carnivores", *Behaviour* 22: 167-92.

Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. 1972. "Similarities and differences between cultures in expressive movements", pp. 297-314 in R.A. Hinde ed. *Non-Verbal Communication* (discussion of Japanese theatre masks?).

Eckman, Paul and Harriet Oster. 1979. "Facial expressions of emotion", *Annual Review of Psychology* 30, 527-54.

Essay questions: 1) Do biological approaches to art have a contribution to make to our understanding of specific forms of visual art, or is the ethological approach to art a reductionist dead end?

2) Should there be a dialogue between biological science and art history,? If so what should they talk about? If not, what are the boundaries of the relevance of biology to art history?

8. Art and Visual perception: nature, culture and the foundations of pictorial art

Topic outline: This topic develops our consideration of what one might call the hard-wired aspects of art and visual communication. To what extent are human perceptual systems plastic, to what extent fixed? What implications do the levels of fixedness and plasticity of human perceptual systems have for the interpretation and explanation of form in art? The two primary approaches to this question are through *Gestalt psychology* and the rather "harder" *cognitive psychology*. The boundaries between the two are somewhat blurred, especially in the 1960's and 1970's, although today Gestalt psychology is increasingly displaced by the ostensibly more "scientific" forms of cognitive psychology, which draw their basic models from computer-science and linguistics, and make considerable use of experimental evidence from *neuropsychology* to provide biological foundations for their models of mind.

A couple of broader questions to bear in mind whilst you read this stuff. All theories of art must in the nature of things make some assumptions about how the mind works. To what extent and in what ways do these assumptions actually matter or have an effect in the everyday practical work of art historians? Is it possible to do business as usual in art history irrespective of what model one adopts of how the mind (and especially visual perception) works? Does the issue differ if, for example, one is concerned with explaining why particular artistic forms achieve predominance in a particular population as opposed to just interpreting art (as in iconography or structural analysis)? Is the issue different if you are interested in comparative art as opposed to specialising in a single period and culture?

The bibliography is necessarily rather long, I am afraid: it is a huge field.

Required readings for discussion in class:

Gestalt theory and the critique of empiricist accounts of vision

1. Hochberg, J. 1972. "The representation of things and people", pp. 47-94 in E.H. Gombrich et al. *Art, Perception and Reality*. (critique of empathy theory pp. 82ff; also an excellent introduction to the range of theories of visual perception) (IoA TC 2018, 2019)
2. Neisser, U. 1971. "The processes of vision", pp. 4-11 in R. Held ed. *Image, Object and Illusion: Readings from the Scientific American*. (good clear exposition of the basics of vision) (IoA TC 1868)

Art and Neurology:

3. Ramachandran, V.S. and William Hirstein, 1999. "The science of art: a neurological theory of aesthetic experience", *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 6, no. 6-7, 15-51. (With peer commentary, pages 51-75 if you have time and inclination). (UCL Electronic Pers: nb do go to the website they recommend at the beginning of the PDF of the article, to download the plates for it, otherwise you will miss much of the point)
4. Freedberg, D; Gallese, V. 2007 "Motion, emotion and empathy in aesthetic experience" *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 11: 197-203. Idem: "Mirror and

canonical neurons are crucial elements in aesthetic response", *ibid* p. 411.
 Contra: R. Casati and A. Pignocchi, "Mirror and canonical neurons are not constitutive of aesthetic response" *ibid* p. 411. (UCL Electronic Periodicals).
Exceptionally Interesting.

Evolutionary psychology:

5. Orians, G.H. and J.H. Heerwagen. 1992. "Evolved responses to landscapes", pp. 555-579 in J.H. Barkow et. al eds. *The Adapted Mind*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press). (ANTHROPOLOGY B 36 BAR – 2 copies; PSYCHOLOGY D10 BAR; SSEES Misc.XVIII.3 ADA; also available as ebook via UCL catalogue)

Art and Cross Cultural Psychology

6. Segall, M. 1976. "Visual art: some perspectives from cross-cultural psychology", pp. 98-114 in D. Brothwell ed. *Beyond Aesthetics: Investigations into the Nature of Visual Art*. (IoA TC 1869; IoA KN BRO)
7. Deregowski, J.B. 1972. "Pictorial perception and culture", *Scientific American* November, 82-88. (UCL Online Periodicals)

Further readings for essay topic: select according to interest and focus

Art and Gestalt psychology

- (**)Arnheim, R. 1949. "The Gestalt theory of expression", *Psychological Review* 56: 156-171. (IoA TC 1865)
- _____. 1986. "Max Wertheimer and Gestalt psychology", pp. 31-8 in *idem. Toward a Psychology of Art: Collected Essays*. University of California Press.
- (*)_____. 1986. "The double edged mind: intuition and the intellect", 13-30 in *Toward a Psychology of Art: Collected Essays*. University of California Press. (IoA TC 1871)
- _____. 1967. "Wilhelm Worringer on abstraction and empathy", *Confinia Psychiatrica* 10:1 Repr. in *idem 1986 New Essays on the Psychology of Art*, pp.50-62
- (*)Gombrich, E.H. 1972. "The visual image", *Scientific American* September, 82-96, repr. pp. 137-161 in *idem 1979 The Image and the Eye: Further Studies in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation* (IoA TC 1862)
- Herva, V.P.. 2006b. "Marvels of the system: art, perception and engagement with the environment in Minoan Crete", *Archaeological Dialogues* 13.2: 221-40.
- Maginnis, H.B.J. 1990. "The role of perceptual learning in connoisseurship: Morelli, Berenson and beyond", *Art History* 13: 104-17.
- Bruner, Jerome. 1957. "On perceptual readiness", *Psychological Review* 64, 123-52.
- (*) Dissanayake, Ellen. 1992. "Empathy theory reconsidered: the psychobiology of aesthetic responses", pp. 140-193 in *Homo Aestheticus: Where Art Comes From and*

Why. (IoA BD DISS, IoA TC 2016/7) (Best part of this is pages 149ff on Gibson's account of "affordances" and the ecological approach to perception)

Art, perception and cognition

- Luria, A. 1971. "Towards the problem of the historical nature of psychological processes", *International Journal of Psychology* 6.4: 259-272 (IoA TC 1864)
- Merleau-Ponty, M. 1964. "The primacy of perception and its philosophical consequences", pp. 12-42 in *The Primacy of Perception, and Other Essays on Phenomenological Psychology, Philosophy of Art, History and Politics*. J. Edie ed. Northwestern University Press. (IoA TC)
- Segal, E. 1994. "Archaeology and cognitive science", pp. 22-8 in C. Renfrew and E. Zubrow eds. *The Ancient Mind: Elements of Cognitive Archaeology*.
- Reed, E. 1987. "Why do things look as they do? The Implications of J.J. Gibson's *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*", pp. 90-114 in A. Costall and A. Shil eds. *Cognitive Psychology in Question*. Harvester, Sussex.
- Gombrich, E.H. 1979/1974. "The sky is the limit: the vault of heaven and pictorial representation", pp. 162-171 in idem. *The Image and the Eye*. (Critique of J.J. Gibson)
- Gibson, J.J. 1952. "The visual field and the visual world", *Psychological Review* LIX, 148-51, 237.
- _____. 1971. "The information available in pictures", *Leonardo* IV, 27-35; with response by Gombrich, pp. 195-7; rejoinder by Gibson, 197-9; reply by Gombrich p. 308.
- _____. 1978. "The ecological approach to the visual perception of pictures", *Leonardo* XI, p. 227 ??, with comment of Gombrich *Leonardo* XII, pp. 174-5.
- Gombrich, E.H. 1972. "The 'what' and the 'how': perspective representation and the phenomenal world", in R.S. Rudner and I. Scheffler eds. *Logic and Art: Essays in Honour of Nelson Goodman*.
- Gregory, R.L. 1990⁴. *Eye and Brain: the Psychology of Seeing*
- Flannery, K.V. and J. Marcus. 1993. "Cognitive archaeology", *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 3, 260-70.
- Boden, M. 1994. Precis of "The creative mind: myths and mechanisms", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 17, 519-70.
- Fodor, J. 1983. *The Modularity of Mind*.
- _____. 1985. Precis of "The modularity of mind", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 8: 1-42.
- Karmiloff-Smith, A. 1994. Precis of "Beyond modularity: a developmental perspective on cognitive science", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 17: 693-745.
- Sperber, D. 1994. "The modularity of thought and the epidemiology of representations" pp. 39-67 in L.A. Hirschfeld and S.A. Gelman eds. *Mapping the Mind: Domain Specificity in Cognition and Culture*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

- Tooby, J. and L. Cosmides. 1992. "The psychological foundations of culture", pp. 19-136 in J.H. Barkow et. al eds. *The Adapted Mind*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
NB for fuller discussion of evolutionary psychology – context for Orians on landscape above.
- (*)Miller, Geoffrey F. 1992. "Sexual selection for cultural displays", 71-91 in Robin Dunbar, Chris Knight and Camilla Powers eds. *The Evolution of Culture: an Interdisciplinary View*. (Evolutionary psychology again)
- Talmy, L. 1988. "Force dynamics in language and cognition", *Cognitive Science* 12, 49-100.
- Pinker, S. 1997. *How the Mind Works*. (London, Penguin). Pp. 211-298 "The mind's eye".
(Whole book worth reading, as is anything written by Pinker.)
- Michotte, A. 1991. "The prefiguration in sensory data of our spontaneous conception of the physical world", pp. 224-244 in G. Thinés, A. Costall and G. Butterworth eds. *Michotte's Experimental Phenomenology of Perception*. Erlbaum, London.
- Solso, R. 1994. *Cognition and the Visual Arts*. MIT Press.

Art and cross cultural psychology: culture, mind and the perception of pictures

- (*)Segall, M.H. et al. "Cultural differences in the perception of geometric illusions", *Science* 139, 769-771.
- (**)Deregowski, J.B. 1989. "Real and represented space: cross cultural perspectives", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 12: 51-119. (Read Deregowski's article (pp. 51-74) and as much of the commentary as you can manage). (IoA TC 1870)
- _____. 1973. "Illusion and culture", pp. 160-191 in R.L. Gregory and E.H. Gombrich eds. *Illusion in Nature and Art*.
- Hudson, W. 1960. "Pictorial depth perception in sub-cultural groups in Africa", *Journal of Social Psychology* 52: 183-208

Neuroarthistory

- Onians, John. 2016. *European Art: a Neuroarthistory*. New Haven: Yale.

Essay topic: What role is played by human perceptual systems in the construction and experience of expressiveness in art? (Concentration on Gestalt psychology)

What contributions do cognitive science and perceptual psychology have to make to the study of art as a social and cultural phenomenon? (Concentration on cognition and perception)

9. Naturalism, schematism and representation

Concepts of "naturalism" and "schematisation" play a central role in descriptions and discriminations of different representational styles in art, but in practice it is extraordinarily difficult to pin down exactly what we mean in using those terms. Is naturalism less "conventional" than schematism, a more universal visual language than schematic art? Is "naturalism" just one kind of representational convention? Where does one (if one even can) draw boundaries between "naturalistic" and "schematic" art. To what extent does the concept of naturalism depend on the cultural experience of western art, and how does this effect the validity of our classifications and characterisations of the art of other traditions? The first part of this class will explore different conceptualisations of naturalism. In the second part, we will look at the use of the concept in three distinctive cultural contexts.

Again, a rather massive bibliography, I am afraid, but the issue is a central and complex one.

Required readings for Class Discussion

1. Gombrich, E.H.. 1982. "Visual discovery through art", *ibid.* pp. 11-39 [good summary of G's approach in *Art and Illusion*, updated to respond to critics] (IoA TC 2020/1)
2. Mitchell, W.J.T. 1986. "Nature and convention: Gombrich's Illusions", pp. 75-94 in *idem. Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology.* Chicago University Press (ART BC10 MIT - 5 copies; ANTHROPOLOGY E10 MIT- 3 copies - **one to be moved to Short Loan Coll**)
3. Bryson, N. 1983. *Vision and Painting: the Logic of the Gaze*, pp. 37-66, esp. 55ff "Perceptualism", 156-162 "Image, discourse, power". (ART BA BRY - 5 copies; **one will be placed on Issue Desk**)
4. Layton, R. 1977. "Naturalism and cultural relativity in art", pp. 33-43 in Ucko, P.J. 1977. *Form in Indigenous Art: Schematisation in the Art of Aboriginal Australia and Prehistoric Europe.* Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. [Best starting point for introduction to the issues] (ANTHROPOLOGY SA 63 UCK – 2 copies; ISSUE DESK IOA UCK 8)
5. Gombrich, E. 1977. (1961). *Art and Illusion*, pp. 99-125 "Reflections on the Greek Revolution". (ART BE GOM - 8 copies)
6. Turner, A.R. 1997. "Speaking statues" pp. 51-67 in *The Renaissance in Florence.* (London, Everyman) (IoA TC 2285 - 2 copies)

Supplementary Readings.

Three theories of naturalism:

**Layton, R. 1977. "Naturalism and cultural relativity in art", pp. 33-43 in Ucko, P.J. 1977. *Form in Indigenous Art: Schematisation in the Art of Aboriginal Australia and Prehistoric Europe*. Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. [Best starting point for introduction to the issues] (ANTHROPOLOGY SA 63 UCK – 2 copies; ISSUE DESK IOA UCK 8)

Forge, A. 1977. "Schematisation and meaning", 28-32 *ibid.*

1. Gombrich, Gestalt Psychology and the Problem of Naturalism

*Gombrich, E.H. 1982. "Image and code: the scope and limits of conventionalism in pictorial representation", pp. 278-298 in *The Image and the Eye: Further Studies in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation*. Phaidon. (ART BE GOM)

** _____. 1982. "Visual discovery through art", *ibid.* pp. 11-39 [good summary of G's approach in *Art and Illusion*, updated to respond to critics] (IoA TC 2020/1)

Wollheim, R. 1973. "Reflections on art and illusion" pp. 261-289 in *idem On Art and the Mind*.

Mitchell, W.J.T. 1986. "Nature and convention: Gombrich's Illusions", pp. 75-94 in *idem. Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology*. Chicago University Press (ART BC10 MIT - 5 copies; ANTHROPOLOGY E10 MIT- 3 copies - **one to be moved to Short Loan Coll)

*Bryson, N. 1983. *Vision and Painting: the Logic of the Gaze*, pp. 1-13 "The natural attitude", 13-36 "The essential copy" [excellent critique of Gombrich and the whole tradition of thought about naturalism in western art history] (ART BA BRY – 5 copies)

2. Norman Bryson, Structuralism and Naturalism

**Bryson, N. 1983. *Vision and Painting: the Logic of the Gaze*, pp. 37-66, esp. 55ff "Perceptualism", 156-162 "Image, discourse, power". (ART BA BRY)

*Barthes, R. 1982. "The reality effect", pp. 11-17 in T. Todorov ed. *French Literary Theory Today*. (Literature A21 TOD)

_____. 1977. "The rhetoric of the image" pp. 32-51 in *idem. Image, Music Text*.

3. Nelson Goodman: analytic philosophy and the problem of naturalism

(*)Goodman, N. 1976². *Languages of Art*. (Hackett, Indianapolis) Pp. 3-43 "Reality remade". (Philosophy N10 GOO)

- _____. 1978. *Ways of Worldmaking*. (Hackett, Indianapolis). ch. 1 "Words, works, worlds", ch 6 "The fabrication of facts".
- Wollheim, R. 1973. "Nelson Goodman's 'Languages of Art'", pp. 290-314 in *On Art and the Mind: Essays and Lectures*. (critique of Goodman's account of realism)
- (**)Mitchell, W.J.T. 1986. "Pictures and paragraphs: Nelson Goodman and the grammar of difference", pp. 53-74 in idem. *Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology*.
- Overing, Joanna. 1990. "The Shaman as a maker of worlds: Nelson Goodman in the Amazon", *Man* 25, 602-619 (not on visual art, but gives you some idea of how one might put Goodmann's ideas to use)

Some other perspectives

- Baudrillard, J. 1988. "Simulacra and simulations", pp. 166-184 in M. Poster ed. *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings*. Polity.
- *Kris, Ernst. and and Otto Kurz. "The artist as magician", ch 3 pp. 61-90 in *Legend, Myth and Magic in the Image of the Artist*.
- Nochlin, L. 1971. "The nature of realism", pp. 13-56 in idem. *Realism*. London, Penguin Books.

Case studies

- *Silver, H.R. 1983. "Foreign art and Asante Aesthetics", *African Arts* 16: 64-7 and 79-80.
good source for further refs on naturalism in African art (IoA 2022/3)
- **Gombrich, E. 1977. (1961). *Art and Illusion*, pp. 99-125 "Reflections on the Greek Revolution". (ART BE GOM - 8 copies)
- **Turner, A.R. 1997. "Speaking statues" pp. 51-67 in *The Renaissance in Florence*. (London, Everyman) (IoA TC 2285 - 2 copies)
- Lorblanchet, M. 1977. "From naturalism to abstraction in European prehistoric rock art", pp. 44- 56 in Ucko, P.J. 1977. *Form in Indigenous Art: Schematisation in the Art of Aboriginal Australia and Prehistoric Europe*. Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Morphy, F. 1977. "The social significance of schematisation in North West coast Indian art", pp. 73-76 in P.J. Ucko ed. *Form in Indigenious Art*. (Cf. Emmon on portraits)
- Watson, W. 1975. *Realistic Style in the Art of Han and T'ang*. (Ferens Lecture in the University of Hull, Hull).
- Tanner. J. 2001. "Nature, culture and the body in classical Greek religious art", *World Archaeology* 33: 257-76
- _____. 2016. "Narrative, naturalism and the body in classical Greek and early Imperial Chinese art", pp. 180-224 in J. Eslner ed. *Comparativism In Art History*. London: Routledge

*Essay questions: 1. "Is the concept of 'naturalism' indispensable to art historical analysis or an obstacle to understanding long overdue for removal?
2. How can one evaluate different theories of naturalism?"*

10. Decorative art and the grammar of ornament:

Topic outline: this session explores the categories of the "ornamental" and the "decorative" often marginalised within the dominant traditions of western art history, but of central concern in the art of many non-western cultures. We shall explore the concepts of ornament and decoration both as analytical concepts and cultural constructs, and look at a range of different approaches to the analysis and interpretation of decorative art. Key questions include: what or how does decorative art "mean"; what kind of history do decorative art forms have, and how can these histories be explained; what do the structure and elaboration of decorative repertoires depend on (universal mathematical logics, technographics, cultural arbitraries); to what extent do they vary across cultures and according to different conceptions of the decorative?

We will probably divide up the 3 Chinese bronze case studies, for presentations: each offering a very different perspective on the same problem)

Required Readings for Class Discussion

1. Rawson, J. 1984. *Chinese Ornament: The Lotus and the Dragon*, (New York, Holmes and Meier). Pp. 9-32 "Introduction" [excellent general account of the study of ornament] (IoA TC 1957 – 2 copies)
2. Nobuo, Tsuji. 1994. "Ornament (*kazari*) - an approach to Japanese culture", *Archives of Asian Art* (1994) 34-45. (IoA 2027; UCL Electronic Periodicals - JSTOR)
3. Gombrich, E.H. 1979. *The Sense of Order: A Study in the Psychology of Decorative Art*. (London, Phaidon) ch. 5 pp. 117-148 "Towards an analysis of effects". Chapter 5 crucial – if you have time, also look at: ch. 7 pp. 171-194 "The force of habit", ch. 8 pp. 195-216 "The psychology of styles" (esp. good on Riegl). (ART BE GOM – 2 copies, ANTHROPOLOGY E17 GOM- 3 copies – **one of these will go to Science Short Loan room**)
4. Gell, A. 1998. "The critique of the index", pp. 73-95 in idem *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. (Oxford, University Press) (ANTHROPOLOGY E10 GEL - 16 copies)
5. Simmel, G. 1950 (ov 1908). "Adornment", pp. 338-344 in K. Wolff ed. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. (New York, The Free Press). (IoA TC 1793 - 2 copies)

A Debate: (We will divide this up)

6. Whitfield, R. ed. 1993. *The Problem of Meaning in early Chinese Ritual Bronzes*. (IoA DBL WHI - 2 copies; ISSUE DESK IOA WHI 4)

- i. Allan, S. 1993. "Art and meaning" pp. 9-33 in Whitfield ed. 1993 (= idem. *The Shape of the Turtle: Myth, Art and Cosmos in Early China* pp. 124-60; SUNY Press, Albany 1991).
- ii. Bagley, R.W. 1993. "Meaning and explanation" pp. 34-55 in Whitfield ed. 1993. (also in *Archives of Asian Art* xlvi, 1993, 7-25.)
- iii. Rawson, J. 1993. "Late Shang bronze design: meaning and purpose", pp. 67-95 in Whitfield ed. 1993.

Supplementary Readings.

General

- **Rawson, J. 1984. *Chinese Ornament: The Lotus and the Dragon*, (New York, Holmes and Meier). Pp. 9-32 "Introduction" [excellent general account of the study of ornament] (IoA TC 1957 – 2 copies)
- Summerson, J. 1977. "What is ornament and what is not", in Stephan Kieran ed. *Ornament - VIA III* (University of Pennsylvania).
- Coomaraswamy, A.K. 1938. "Ornament" *Art Bulletin* 21, 375-82
- Staubmann, H. 1997. "The ornamental form of the iron cage: an aesthetic representation of modern society", *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society* 10.4: 591-607

Approaches

- Riegl, A. 1992. *Problems of Style: Foundations for a History of Ornament*. (Princeton University Press).
- **Gombrich, E.H. 1979. *The Sense of Order: A Study in the Psychology of Decorative Art*. (London, Phaidon) ch. 5 pp. 117-148 "Towards an analysis of effects". Chapter 5 crucial – if you have time, also look at: ch. 7 pp. 171-194 "The force of habit", ch. 8 pp. 195-216 "The psychology of styles" (esp. good on Riegl). (ART BE GOM – 2 copies, ANTHROPOLOGY E17 GOM- 3 copies – **one of these will go to Science Short Loan room**)
- David, N., J. Sterner and K, Gavva. 1988. "Why are pots decorated." *Current Anthropology* 29.3: 365-89.
- **Gell, A. 1998. "The critique of the index", pp. 73-95 in idem *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. (Oxford, University Press) (ANTHROPOLOGY E10 GEL - 16 copies)
- Grabar, O. 1992. *The Mediation of Ornament*. 1992.
- **Simmel, G. 1950 (ov 1908). "Adornment", pp. 338-344 in K. Wolff ed. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. (New York, The Free Press). (IoA TC 1793 - 2 copies)
- Steadman, P. 1979. *The Evolution of Designs. Biological Analogy in Architecture and the Applied Arts*. Cambridge.

*Sinclair, T. 1987. "'All styles are good save the tiresome kind': an examination of the pattern of stylistic changes occurring among silver candlesticks of the 18th century (1680-1780)". 39-54 in I. Hodder ed. *The Archaeology of Contextual Meanings*. (IoA TC 2024/5)

Clark, G. 1986. *Symbols of Excellence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Case studies

Tokugawa Japan:

*Rousmaniere, N.C. 1998. "Ornamental culture: style and meaning in Edo Japan", pp. 51-67 (and skim through catalogue entries pp. 70-103) in R.T. Singer ed. *Edo: Art in Japan 1615-1868*. Washington, National Gallery. (Art Folios EH5 SIN)

Nobuo, Tsuji. 1995. "The concept of the decorative in Japanese art", pp. 557-574 in *Japan and Europe in Art History*. (Tokyo)

** _____. 1994. "Ornament (*kazari*) - an approach to Japanese culture", *Archives of Asian Art* (1994) 34-45. (IoA 2027; UCL Electronic Periodicals - JSTOR)

Shively, D.H. 1965. "Sumptuary regulation and status in early Tokugawa Japan", *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 23, 123-164

Bronze Age and Imperial China

*Loehr, M. 1967. "The fate of ornament in Chinese art", *Archives of Asian Art* xxi, 8-19.

Rawson, B. 1984. "The lotus and the dragon: sources of Chinese ornament", *Orientalia* nov. 22-36.

_____. 1982. "The ornament on Chinese silver of the Tang dynasty AD 618-906." *British Museum Occasional Papers* 40.

Whitfield, R. ed. 1993. *The Problem of Meaning in early Chinese Ritual Bronzes*. (IoA DBL WHI - 2 copies; ISSUE DESK IOA WHI 4)

**Allan, S. 1993. "Art and meaning" pp. 9-33 in Whitfield ed. 1993 (= idem. *The Shape of the Turtle: Myth, Art and Cosmos in Early China* pp. 124-60; SUNY Press, Albany 1991).

* _____. 1993. "Epilogue", pp. 161-167 in Whitfield ed. 1993.

**Bagley, R.W. 1993. "Meaning and explanation" pp. 34-55 in Whitfield ed. 1993. (also in *Archives of Asian Art* xlvi, 1993, 7-25.)

**Rawson, J. 1993. "Late Shang bronze design: meaning and purpose", pp. 67-95 in Whitfield ed. 1993.

Ancient Greece and Rome

- Hauglid, R. 1947. "The Greek acanthus: problems of origin", *Acta Archaeologica* xviii, 93-116.
- Mallwitz, A. 1981. "Ein Kapitell aus Gebranntem Ton, oder zur Genesis des Korinthischen Kapitells", pp. 318-52 in *X Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia* Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Berlin.
- Mobius, H. 1929. *Die Ornamente der Griechischen Grabstelen, Klassischer und Nachklassischer Zeit.* (Berlin, Wilmersdorf)
- Strong, D.E. 1963. "Some observations on early Roman Corinthian", *Journal of Roman Studies* LIII, 73-84.
- *Dietrich, Nikolaus and Michael Squire eds. 2018. *Ornament and Figure in Graeco-Roman Art. Rethinking Visual Ontologies in Classical Antiquity.* Berlin: De Gruyter [YATES A60 SQU] (esp.Squire's introduction; Holscher; Grethlein)
- Toynbee, J.M.C. and Ward-Perkins, J.B. 1950. "Peopled scrolls: a hellenistic motif in Roman art", *Papers of the British School at Rome* xviii, 1-43
- Rowland, B. 1956. "The vine-scroll in Gandara", *Artibus Asiae* xix, 353-60.

Essay questions: 1. "To what extent are the categories of 'ornament' and 'decoration' valid or helpful categories of art historical analysis?

2. "What do you think would comprise an adequate interpretation or explanation of a system of ornament?"

Each question should be answered with reference to decorative/ornamental art from at least two cultural traditions.

11. Art, gender and sexuality: between nature and culture? *Supplementary Topic - No taught class; if you wish to work on this topic for your essay, should probably consult with the course instructor.*

Topic outline: Gender studies in art history have moved through a number of phases in the last two generations, associated with the development of feminism and women's movements. Early approaches were concerned simply to find women in history and art history, not just as objects but also as subjects and agents (recovering female artists, for example). Subsequently the ways in which power in gender relations, specifically patriarchy, shaped the representation and objectification of women in art became a major (and continuing) focus of attention. How far can we recover women's history and experience from the art of the past; how far just men's views of women? Do ancient images of women speak to women as well, as just to men and their desires? More recent work has taken gender from a focus on women to addressing the social and cultural construction of masculinity. What roles do images of men and women play in the inculcation and reproduction of gender ideologies and gender hierarchies? How far do we encounter similar visual strategies across cultures in the construction of gender hierarchy?

Core readings:

1. Berger, John. 1972. *Ways of Seeing*, Essays no 2 (picture essay) and 3 = pp. 36-43, 45-64 [Main Libray ART BA BER - 7 copies].
2. Rehak, Paul. 2002. "Imag(in)ing a women's world in Bronze Age Greece: the frescoes from Xeste 3 at Akrotiri", 34-59 in Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz and Lisa Auanger eds. *Among Women*. University of Texas Press. [Online]
3. Winter, Irene. 1996. "Sex, rhetoric and the public monument: the alluring body of Naram-Sin of Agade", 11-26 in Natalie Boymel Kampen ed. *Sexuality in Ancient Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. {nb a lot of other good case studies in this vol}[YATES A60 KAM – 4 copies; 1 to issue desk; one to ON]
4. Platt, Verity. 2002. "Viewing, desiring, believing: confronting the divine in a Pompeian house", *Art History* 25.1: 87-112 [Online] {psychoanalytic approach - Lacan etc}
5. Osborne, Robin. 1994. "Looking on - Greek style. Does the sculpted girl speak to women too", 81-96 In Ian Morris ed. *Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [YATES A20 MOR - 3 copies; 1 on issue desk]
6. Nowell, April and Melanie L. Chang. 2014. "Science, the media and interpretations of 6. Upper Palaeolithic Figurines", *American Anthropology* 116.3: 562-77 [Online]

Supplementary Readings:

Gender in Art History

- Broude, Norma and Mary D. Garrard. 1987. "Feminist art history and the academy: where are we now", *Women's Studies Quarterly* 25.1/2: 212-22. [1997 reprint In issue *Looking Forward Looking Back*]
- Davis, Whitney. 1996. "Gender", in R. Nelson and R. Shiff eds. *Critical Terms for Art History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 220-233. [ART BK NEL]
- Goffmann, Erving. 1979. *Gender Advertisements*. **{On order}**
- Pollock, Griselda. 1998. *Vision and Difference: Femininity, Feminism and the Histories of Art*. London: Routledge.
- Tickner, Lisa. 1988. "Feminism, art history and sexual difference", *Genders* 3. [Senate House Library]
- Mulvey, Laura. 1988. "Visual pleasure and narrative cinema", *Screen* 16.3: 6-18. [Online - a classic!]

Gender in Archaeology and History

- *Conkey, Margaret W and Janet D. Spector. 1984. "Archaeology and the Study of Gender", *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, Vol. 7: 1-38 [Online]
- Dowson, Thomas A.. 2000. "Why Queer Archaeology? An Introduction", *World Archaeology*, Vol. 32, No. 2, Queer Archaeologies: 161-165
- Perry, Elizabeth M. and Rosemary A. Joyce. 2001. "Providing a past for 'Bodies that Matter': Judith Butler's impact on the archaeology of gender", *International Journal of Sexuality and Gender Studies* 6: 63-76
- Nelson, Sarah. 2011. "Gender and religion in archaeology", *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion* Edited by Timothy Insoll. [Online]
- Romanowicz, Janet V. and Rita P. Wright. 1996. "Gendered perspectives in the classroom", 199-223 in Rita P. Wright ed. *Gender and Archaeology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press [IoA BD 20 WRI]*
- **Scott, Joan W. 1986. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 91, No. 5 (Dec., 1986), pp. 1053-1075. **{A classic in the field; strongly recommended if you do essay on this topic}**

Regional Case Studies

Ancient Greece

- Brown, S. 2000. "'Ways of Seeing' Women in Antiquity: An Introduction to Feminism in Classical Archaeology and Ancient Art History." In Koloski-Ostrow and Lyons eds *Naked Truths: Women, Sexuality and Gender in Classical Art and Archaeology*, 12-42.
- Dubois, P. 1988. *Sowing the Body: Psychoanalysis and the Ancient Representation of Women*. Chicago: Chicago University Press. Chapter on "Stone"
- Bérard, Claude. 1989. "The order of women", 89-107 In idem ed. *A City of Images: Iconography and Society in Ancient Greece*. Princeton.
- Osborne, Robin. 1996. "Desiring women on Athenian pottery", in Natalie Kampen ed. *Sexuality in Ancient Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 65-80
- Osborne, Robin. 1997. "Law, the Democratic Citizen and the Representation of Women in Classical Athens", *Past & Present*, No. 155: 3-33.
- Tanner, Jeremy. 2001. "Nature, culture and the body in classical Greek religious art", *World Archaeology* 33.2: 257-76
- Younger, Paul. 2002. "Women in relief: 'Double consciousness' in classical Attic tombstones", 167-210 in Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz and Lisa Auanger eds. *Among Women*. University of Texas Press. [Online]

Ancient Rome

- Kampen, Natalie Boymel. 1997. "Epilogue: gender and desire", 267-77 In A.O. Koloski-Ostrow and C.L. Lyons eds. *Naked Truths: Women, Sexuality and Gender in Classical Art and Archaeology*. London: Routledge. (esp. p. 271-2: female desire and Roman emperor)
- Kampen, Natalie. 1995. "Looking at gender: the Column of Trajan and Roman historical relief", in D.C. Stanton and A.J. Stewart eds. *Feminisms in the Academy*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press. 43-73. [ANTHROPOLOGY D 47 STA – 3 copies]
- Pollini, John. 1999. "The Warren cup: homoerotic love and symposium rhetoric in silver", *Art Bulletin* 81: 21-52
- Clarke, John R. 1993. "The Warren cup and the contexts for representations of male to male love-making in Augustan and early Julio-Claudian art", *Art Bulletin* 75: 275-94 [Online]
- _____. 1998. *Looking at Love-Making: Constructions of Sexuality in Roman Art 100 BC-AD 250*.
- *D'Ambra. Eve and Francesca Tronchin. 2015. "Gender". *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Sculpture* Edited by Elise A. Friedland, Melanie Grunow Sobocinski, and Elaine K. Gazda [Online]
- Vucetic, Sanja. 2014. "Roman Sexuality or Roman Sexualities? Looking at Sexual Imagery on Roman Terracotta Mould-made Lamps", *TRAC 2013* 140-158 [Online]

- Kampen, Natalie. 1996. "Omphale and the instability of gender", in Idem ed. *Sexuality In Ancient Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 233-46
- D'Ambra, Eve. 1996. "The calculus of Venus: nude portraits of Roman matrons", in Natalie Kampen ed. *Sexuality in Ancient Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 219-232
- Fittschen, K. 1996. "Courtly portraits of women in the era of the adoptive emperors (AD 98-180) and their reception in Roman society", 42-52 in D. Kleiner and S. Matheson eds. *I Claudia: Women in Ancient Rome*. New Haven: Yale University Press. [YATES QUARTOS A60 KLE]
- Davies, Glenys. 2008. "Portrait statues as models for gender roles in Roman society", 207-220 in *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Supplementary Volume 7*. [Online]

Mesoamerica

- Joyce, Rosemary. 2000 "A Precolumbian Gaze: Male Sexuality Among the Ancient Maya". In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*, Barb Voss and Rob Schmidt, eds, pp. 263-283. Routledge Press, London. [INST ARCH BD 20 SCH – 2 copies]
- _____. 1996. "The construction of gender in Classic Maya monuments", 167-195 in Rita P. Wright ed. *Gender and Archaeology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press [IoA BD 20 WRI]*
- Meskel, Lynn M and and Joyce, Rosemary A. 2003. *Embodied Lives: Figuring Ancient Maya and Ancient Egyptian Experience*. London: Routledge. Esp. ch 6 "Phallic culture".

Ancient Near East:

- Bahrani, Zainab. 2001. *Women of Babylon: Gender and Representation in Mesopotamia*. London: Routledge. [ANCIENT HISTORY D 65 BAH]
- Bahrani, Zainab. 1996. "The Hellenization of Ishtar: nudity, fetishism and the production of cultural differentiation", *Oxford Art Journal* 19.2: 3-16 [Online]
- Peled, I. 2016. "Visualising masculinities: the Gala, hegemony and Mesopotamian iconography", *Near Eastern Archaeology* 79.3: 159-165. {esp. on concept of hegemonic masculinities}
- Winter, Irene. 1996.. "Sex, rhetoric and the public monument: the alluring body of Naram-Sin of Agarde", 11-26 in *Sexuality in Ancient Art*.
- Assante, Julia. 2017. "Men looking at men: the homoerotics of power in the state arts of Assyria", in Ilona Zsolnay ed. *Being a Man: Negotiating Ancient Constructs of Masculinity: Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East*. London: Routledge [ANCIENT HISTORY B 55 ZSO – 2 copies]

Ancient Egypt:

- Meskell, Lynn M and and Joyce, Rosemary A. 2003. *Embodied Lives: Figuring Ancient Maya and Ancient Egyptian Experience*. London: Routledge. Esp. ch 6 "Phallic culture".
- Asher-Greve, J.M. and Sweeney, D. (2006), "On Nakedness, Nudity and Gender in Egyptian and Mesopotamian Art," in S. Schroer, ed., *Images and Gender. Contributions to the Hermeneutics of Reading Ancient Art [OBO 220]*, 123–176. Fribourg and Göttingen.
- O'Connor, D. (1996), "Sexuality, Statuary and the Afterlife; Scenes in the Tomb-chapel of Pepyankh (Heny the Black), an Interpretive Essay," in P. Der Manuelian, ed., *Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson 2*, 621–633. Boston.
- McCarthy, H.L. (2008), "Rules of Decorum and Expression of Gender Fluidity in Tawosret's Tomb," in C. Graves-Brown, ed., *Sex and Gender in Ancient Egypt*, 83–113. Swansea.
- Robins, G. (1996), "Dress, Undress and the Representation of Fertility and Potency in New Kingdom Egyptian Art," in N.B. Kampen, ed., *Sexuality in Ancient Art: Near East, Egypt, Greece, and Italy*, 27–40. Cambridge and New York
- Robins, G. (2008), "Male Bodies and the Construction of Masculinity in New Kingdom Egyptian Art," in S. D'Auria, ed., *Servant of Mut: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Fazzini*, 208–215. Leiden

East Asia

- *Childs-Johnson, Elizabeth. 1991. "Jades of the Hongshan culture : the dragon and fertility cult worship", *Arts Asiatiques*, Vol. 46 (1991), pp. 82-95
- Nelson, Sarah. M. 1991. 'The "Goddess Temple" and the status of women at Niuheliang, China' in D. Walde and N. Willows (eds), *The Archaeology of Gender* (Calgary: Archeological Association, University of Calgary), pp. 302–8
- Keightley, D. 1999. 'At the beginning: The status of women in Neolithic and Shang China', *Nannu*, 1: 1–63. {Mainly on burials, and oracle bone texts; but some discussion of funerary goods, jades etc}
- Screech, Timon. 1999. *Sex and the Floating World: Erotic Images in Japan 1700-1820*. London: Reaktion.
- Laing, Ellen Johnston. 1990. "Chinese Palace-Style Poetry and the Depiction of a Palace Beauty" *Art Bulletin*, Vol. 72, No. 2 (Jun., 1990), 284-295.
- Fong, Mary H. 1996. "Images of Women in Traditional Chinese Painting", *Woman's Art Journal*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Spring - Summer, 1996), 22-27.
- Lullo, Sheri A. 2004. "Female divinities in Han dynasty representation", 259-287 in Katheryn M. Linduff and Yan Sun eds. *Gender and Chinese Archaeology*. Oxford: Altamira. (Gender and Archaeology Series)
- Sun, Yan and Hongyu Yang. 2004. "Gender ideology and mortuary practice in Northwestern China" (Neolithic), 29-46 in Katheryn M. Linduff and Yan Sun eds. *Gender and Chinese Archaeology*. Oxford: Altamira

Prehistoric art and gender: Venus figurines and the goddess hypothesis etc

- Bailey, Douglass W. 2013. "Figurines, corporeality and the origins of the gendered body" 244-264 in Diane Bolger ed. *A Companion to Gender Prehistory*. London: Wiley. [Online]
- Bailey, Douglass W. (1994) "The Representation of Gender: Homology or Propaganda, *Journal of European Archaeology*", 2:2, 215-228
- Dixon, Alan F. and Barnaby J. Dixon. 2011. "Venus figurines of the European Palaeolithic: symbols of fertility or attractiveness", *Journal of Anthropology* 2011. [Online] {evolutionary psychology approach}
- Meskel, Lynn. 1998. "Oh my goddess: archaeology, sexuality and ecofeminism", *Archaeological Dialogues* 1998.2: 126-142 [Online]

Others

- Kaplan, F. 1993. "Iyoba, the Queen Mother of Benin: images and ambiguity in gender and sex roles in court art", *Art History* 16.3, 386-407

Essay question:

***Either:* Compare the visual strategies involved in gender representation in the art of at least three different cultural traditions. What can their similarities and differences tell us about sex and gender as phenomena - whether social, cultural or biological?**

***Or:* How far is it possible to generalise about gender representation in art across cultural traditions, and what does this tell us about gender as a category of social and cultural analysis in art history? Discuss with reference to examples drawn from at least three cultural traditions.**

APPENDIX A: POLICIES AND PROCEDURES 2016-17 (PLEASE READ CAREFULLY)

This appendix provides a short précis of policies and procedures relating to courses. It is not a substitute for the full documentation, with which all students should become familiar. For full information on Institute policies and procedures, see the IoA Student Administration Section of Moodle: <https://moodle.ucl.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=40867>

For UCL policies and procedures, see the Academic Regulations and the UCL Academic Manual:

<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/academic-regulations> ; <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/academic-manual/>

GENERAL MATTERS

ATTENDANCE: A minimum attendance of 70% is required. A register will be taken at each class. **If you are unable to attend a class, please notify the lecturer by email.**

DYSLEXIA: If you have dyslexia or any other disability, please discuss with your lecturers whether there is any way in which they can help you. Students with dyslexia should indicate it on each coursework cover sheet.

COURSEWORK

LATE SUBMISSION: Late submission will be penalized in accordance with current UCL regulations, unless formal permission for late submission has been granted.

The UCL penalties are as follows:

- The marks for coursework received up to two working days after the published date and time will incur a 10 percentage point deduction in marks (but no lower than the pass mark).
- The marks for coursework received more than two working days and up to five working days after the published date and time will receive no more than the pass mark (40% for UG modules, 50% for PGT modules).
- Work submitted more than five working days after the published date and time, but before the second week of the third term will receive a mark of zero but will be considered complete.

GRANTING OF EXTENSIONS: Please note that there are strict UCL-wide regulations with regard to the granting of extensions for coursework. You are reminded that Module Coordinators are not permitted to grant extensions. All requests for extensions must be submitted on a the appropriate UCL form, together with supporting documentation, via Judy Medrington's office and will then be referred on for consideration. Please be aware that the grounds that are acceptable are limited. Those with long-term difficulties should contact UCL Student Disability Services to make special arrangements. Please see the IoA website for further information. Additional information is given here

<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/academic-manual/c4/extenuating-circumstances/>

RETURN OF COURSEWORK AND RESUBMISSION: You should receive your marked coursework within one month of the submission deadline. If you do not receive your work within this period, or a written explanation, notify the Academic Administrator. When your marked essay is returned to you, return it to the Module Co-ordinator within two weeks. You must retain a copy of all coursework submitted.

CITING OF SOURCES and AVOIDING PLAGIARISM: Coursework must be expressed in your own words, citing the exact source (**author, date and page number**; website address if applicable) of any ideas, information, diagrams, etc., that are taken from the work of others. This applies to all media (books, articles, websites, images, figures, etc.). **Any direct**

quotations from the work of others must be indicated as such by being placed between quotation marks. Plagiarism is a very serious irregularity, which can carry heavy penalties. It is your responsibility to abide by requirements for presentation, referencing and avoidance of plagiarism. Make sure you understand definitions of plagiarism and the procedures and penalties as detailed in UCL regulations: <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/current-students/guidelines/plagiarism>

RESOURCES

MOODLE: Please ensure you are signed up to the module on Moodle. For help with Moodle, please contact Charlotte Frearson (c.frearson@ucl.ac.uk)

Information for intercollegiate and interdepartmental students:

Students enrolled in Departments outside the Institute should obtain the Institute's coursework guidelines from Judy Medrington (email j.medrington@ucl.ac.uk).

finis