

Monica Juneja, *Can Art History Be Made Global? Meditations from the Periphery*, 2023.

A Tentative of the book Review. Contribution to the New Indology from a Transcultural Approach

Shigemi INAGA, Kyoto Seika University

0. Preliminary

Let me begin by clarifying my standpoint and relation to the author of the book *Can Art History Be Made Global? Meditations from the Periphery* under review here. At the beginning of the 1980s, I was a colleague of Monica Juneja, a fellow foreign doctoral student of Jean Laude (1922-1983), professor of art history, and ethnology at Université Paris I, Panthéon-Sorbonne. As a specialist of French avant-garde art and its relation to African Art, Jean Laude was one of the pioneering scholars *avant la letter* of what we today call Global Art History. Being enrolled in his class, however, was a result of “contingencies,” out of any predicable expectations (I use the term of “contingency” here as this key-notion is going to be examined later in the review in the context of “globalization”).

Jean Laude’s premature death led to the dispersal of his former Ph.D. students, and it was only 16 years later, in the year 2000, when I was asked to give a series of lectures at the Institut für Kunstgeschichte Ostasiens at Universität Heidelberg, that I came across a familiar name at Heidelberg University, my former classmate, Monica Juneja, who holds the professorship of Global Art History at the Heidelberg Centre for Transcultural Studies.

Monica Juneja’s book *Can art history be made global?* aims at responding to the challenge of the “global turn” in the humanities. In the first chapter the author provides a critical historical overview of the discipline of art history with a focus on world art history discourses mainly in German speaking academe. In the second chapter she analyzes the early formation of Eurasian visions – iconography and visual representations in historical archives. The third chapter questions how the notion of modernism has been dominantly understood as an attribute to the West. Based on this, chapter 4 revises the center-periphery divide rooted in a modern western temporal and spatial regime. In so doing the following chapter 5 conceives of contemporary global relations as mutual.

Like Monica Juneja (M.J. hereafter), I have been interested in art and cross-cultural exchange (mainly bilateral between, say Japan and Europe). My starting point as a Japanese citizen, was the revision of “le Japonisme” in Europe and North America in the second half of the 19th Century from a cross-cultural point of view. My interest was to reexamine “Japonisme” as a connecting point between the former concepts of “Chinoiserie” or “Orientalism” (18th-19th c.) and the following discourses of “Primitivism” (20th Century) formulated through the lens of a Western perception of the world as global. Being one of the first readers of E. W. Said’s *Orientalism* (1978) in Japan, I was also

sensitive to the mutual frictions and conflicts observed in contact cultural zone¹s. In the meanwhile images of the West, as articulated by the “Rest” also entered the global scope of art, requiring reciprocal mutual understanding. Yet post-colonial critical theories have revealed the fallacy/impossibility of egalitarian reciprocity, as the terms of incompatibility or incommensurability (discussed infra.) show. The lack of epistemic neutrality or symmetry has come to the fore. As a comparatist, I have been frequently asked to intervene in international conferences dealing with such axiological inequalities in art and literature². Based on such experiences, rather than following the conventional form of an academic book review, I wish to attempt an exchange of ideas in dialogue with the present book.

1. Reviewer's background

For this purpose, and to clarify my own positioning, I will first provide a brief self-introduction. It was in 1987 that I had the chance to take part in a small intellectual group named Transcultura (1987), in search of “reciprocal-anthropology,” between the West and the Rest, with Léopold Sédar Senghor (in M.J.:p.194)³ and Umberto Eco, as the two main initial “*maestri*”.⁴ Since then, I have elaborated a geological model (in parallel with the present author: p.291) to explain cross-cultural faults or folds (p.257; based on Japan's ecological and geological conditions; an archipelago with frequent earthquakes and under the climate of monsoon), a model which invalidates geographical or geopolitical boundaries (on which clings Naoki Sakai-p.137-and the review will come back to this at the end in terms of “la Terre” or the planet Earth). I also articulated the idea of a climatic and meteorological model for the transcultural transformation in art (the “art” here is so multi-faceted that it can hardly be reducible to a stable “global” measurement or template of “Fine Arts”). Thanks to Kavita Singh's initiative in Sydney on the very subject, the reviewer also had the chance of examining

¹ For example, among many others, S. Inaga «L'orientalisme en peinture--représentation de l'autre et ses limites», *The Force of Vision, Proceedings of International Conference of Comparative Literature in Tokyo 1991*, vol.2, 1995, pp.563-571. or “Crossing Axes: Orientalism and Occidentalism in Modern Visual Representations of Manchukuo (1931-1945)”, Evgeny Steiner ed., *Orientalism/Occidentalism: Languages of Cultures vs. Languages of Description*, Moscow: Sovpadenie, 2012, pp.93-114.

² Among many others, S. Inaga, “Crime, Literature and Religious Mysticism: The Case of the Japanese Translator of Salman Rushdie's Satanic Verses,” Manfred Schmeling and Hans-Joachim Backe eds., *From Ritual to Romance and Kvita SinghKaKBeyond: Comparative Literature and Comparative Religious Studies*, Proceedings of the ICLA Conference at Jacobs University, Bremen, August 6-8, 2008, Königshausen & Newmann. 2011, pp.45-58. “Freedom in Suffering and Freedom of Suffering: The Case of Japanese Translator of Salman Rushdie's Satanic Verses-Hitoshi Igarashi in Memoriam,” *Literature and Religion* (The Korean Society for Literature and Religion), Vol. 10, no. 2, pp.229-251; vol. 2 Special Issue, Freedom of Suffering, June 30, 2005, pp.133-152. «Altérité et épiphanie», *Dédale*, Maisonneuve & Larose, automne 1995, Nr.1, pp.127-142. “Negative Capability of Tolerance--the Assassination of Hitoshi Igarashi”, *The International Conference on Cross Cultural Communication and Mutual Understanding*, University of Chicago, 12-17 Sep. 1992, *The Condition of Reciprocal Understanding*, University of Chicago, 1995, pp.304-336.

³ The page numbers in the following parenthesis (occasionally following the inverted commas) are that of the book by M.J. under review. Please refer to the indicated pages for the verification of the facts and descriptions.

⁴ For this small group, see, among others, *Connaissance et Réciprocité*, Actes du Colloque organisé par l'Institut International pour une Connaissance Réciproque de Civilisations, Louvain-la-Neuve, 25-27, mai 1987, Presses Universitaires de Louvain (U.C.L.), CIACO Editeur, 1988. Shigemi Inaga (ed.) *Crossing Cultural Borders, Toward the Ethics of Intercultural Communication: Beyond Reciprocal Anthropology*, International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 2001. *Le renversement du Ciel*, Sous la direction de Alain le Pichon et Moussa Sow, CNRS éditions, 2011. I do not enter into the comparison between the above mentioned understanding of the “transcultural” and M.J.s conceptualization of it (esp. pp.20-30), as the key term has already become a “buzzword” as M.J. indicates (pp.26-27, with a long list of major theorization in English speaking cultural sphere in the note 47). The reviewer's view of the “transcultural” is to avoid a stiffened “theoretical straitjacket” (p.27) which will be unpacked further in this review essay.

the “piracy” in cross-cultural maritime transactions in the scope of globalizing world history in the last 500 years (since the symbolic “1492” up to the end of the 20th c.)⁵. In the process, I also developed the idea of “haptic plasticity” emerging in cross-cultural contact zones and pondered on a “psycho-somatic ethics in the age of a meta-and multiverse” in the Anthropocene. As is well known, the term Anthropocene designates how our current geological period, with its ecological crises, has been shaped by human activity. Even after the definitive extinction of *homo sapiens* in the future human traces and heritage will remain buried in the soil.⁶

I am amazed by the fact that such panoply of methodological approaches that I have also been interested in (like, “Transcultural” “piracy,” “geographical” approach and “planetary” concern in the age of the Anthropocene) have also been of interest for M.J. and have been duly explored and meditated in the meticulously researched book under review. I will try to deploy my own views in exchange with M.J.’s arguments. How does my thinking on Global Art History (G.A.H. hereafter) relate to M.J.’s? What is our respective, common interest and understanding of the “global” in general and G.A.H. in particular--especially, in terms of periphery-in/bottom-up mechanism?⁷

On the issue of how to write a connected global art history through transcultural inquiries, or my reaction to M.J.’s conceptualization of art as a discursive site of transculturation, the final part of the present review will provide my tentative proposal conceptualized as a South- and East-Asian dialogue (and not confrontation) with M.J..

I have previously published a short paper “Is art history globalizable?” (2007). This essay serves as my basic starting point.⁸ My intention here is to extend my previous views in relation to M.J.’s book so as to support and supply additional arguments to M.J.’s current position⁹.

⁵ Kavita Singh (organizer) Symposium “*All at Sea*” Piracy, the Indian Ocean, and Art History, The University of Sydney, March 21-23, 2012, as well as S.Inaga (ed.) *Pirate's View of the World History, A Reversed Perception of the order of Things*, Kyoto, Shibunkaku shuppan (in Japanese), 2017. Proceedings as well as papers on the issue, see, S. Inaga (ed.) *A Pirate's View of World History—A Reversed Perception of the Order of Things From a Global Perspective*, The 50th International Research Symposium 第50回国際研究集会, International Research Center for Japanese Studies 国際日本文化研究センター, August 31, 2017, 174pp. With the following introduction “Piracy and the Jigsaw Puzzle Without a Piece,” pp.9-18. and a paper Chapter12 “A Pirate's View of the History of Art Commerce: Beyond an Oceanic View of Civilizations,” pp.107-125. Another book S. Inaga edited in Japanese 『海賊史観からみた世界史の再構築：交易と情報流通の現在を問い直す』思文閣出版 2017年3月 852頁 (*Pirate's view of the world history : a reversed perception of the order of things*, 852pp.) collecting papers in Japanese not included in the precedent English proceedings.

⁶ For more detail see, S. Inaga (ed.) *Avidya on the Spide's Web, In Search of Psycho-Somatic Ethics in the Age of Meta-and Multiverse*, Tokyo: Kacho-sha (in Japanese with English summary), 2023.

⁷ As for my view of theory production from the “periphery,” to be examined in confrontation with M.J.’s present endeavor, and my own ideas about the extending intellectual repository of art history as a way to challenge and transform the discipline, I am currently preparing an essay entitled: “A Reflection from the Outside of the Regime of Sémiocratie--Theory as foreign curio in a cultural “Galapagos” archipelago ?” (forthcoming). To avoid repetition, I omitted this part from the present review.

⁸ S. Inaga, “Is art history globalizable?” in James. Elkins, *Is Art History Global?* New York: Routledge, 2007, pp.249-278; A personally updated version is available on my private web site, together with the academic output in relation to the above-mentioned approaches: <https://inagashigemi.jp.org/>

⁹ In addition, just as M.J.’s criticism of the anthropocentric approach in her postscript (p.285, 292), I have also published my own criticism to the still strongly anthropocentric “ANT vs. SPIDER” debate between Bruno Latour (p.328) and Tim Ingold (p.324). The dichotomic world view --between predator and its prey, or the clear-cut distinction between active-positive agency and its negative-passive victim etc. --in which both distinctive thinkers are still trapped in-- is what the reviewer thinks it necessary to overcome, in search of the “cracks” and “fault lines” of the web of language and theoretical “scaffolding” (p.292) that human beings are fatally equipped with/embedded in. See, S.Inaga, “On the Validity of Spider-Web Model: Reflection on the History of scholarship-in reference to Tim Ingold’s *Being*

2. (In-) Commensurable or (in-)compatible?

The issue of “commensurability” has been at the center of recent discourses of global art history—As Monica Juneja explains in detail throughout the book. What is judged as “incommensurable” is conventionally excluded from the category of Fine Arts and thus not included in what is considered relevant by the academic discipline of art history (As is shown in Introduction: pp.34-35). What is at stake with regards to the issue of “incommensurability”? Who and what decides what is commensurable/incommensurable? Such are the very crucial questions which I wish to discuss in dialogue with M.J. here. What power, knowledge and institutional structures are at stake? To illustrate the issue in addition to the cases M.J. explains, let me provide further useful examples:

Countless indeed are the examples which raised problems in this regard: For example, while relics of Buddhism statues were included in the Western Fine Art Collection from the beginning of the 20th c¹⁰, they were “declassified” from their native religious contexts to be transferred to the “museum” as “cultural heritage” (both are regarded as typically “Western” “modern” institutions, and both “Western” and “modern” are already questionable notions). While the *Magiciens de la Terre* exhibition at the Centre Pompidou in 1989 at the end of the Cold War period, (to be critically treated below) invented several non-Western African and Asian “artists,” the entry of “non-monotheists” –like Buddhists-- were categorically questioned in the admission policy of the Kassel Documenta at around the same time (ca.1995-1997).¹¹

To go back and focus on Indian Art at the beginning of the 20th Century, Gandhara Statues were known to be highly valued by the British colonial rulers and scholars, in reference to Greek Hellenism. In contrast, they sarcastically spoke ill of Mathura statues (like George Birdwood; p.223) which the Indian nationalists and sympathizers (like Ananda K. Coomaraswamy or Ernest B. Havell; p.168) highly appreciated as incarnation of “essential Indianness.” Whereas the latter hated Gandhara sculptures as they were “contaminated” or “polluted,” as they claimed, by the Greek bad influences.

As this infamous controversy shows, the artistic relevance is judged in terms of “compatibility” with the canon of Greek antiquity (typically Euro-centric value judgement), on the one hand, while irrelevance was declared in terms of “incompatibility” with the putative “essential Indianness”, on the other (anti-colonial resistance, closely connected with the Swadeshi Movement).

While I prefer to use the term “(in-)compatibility” (value judgement of quality), Monica Juneja stresses on the term of “(in-)commensurability” (originally a strictly numerical notion in mathematics). The reason of my choice in terminology is as follows: According to my understanding, the later term stemmed from the philosophical debate on the issues of “paradigm shift” and “scientific revolution” in the discipline of philosophy and history of science. Let the reviewer briefly recall the scholarly debate on the writing of the history of science to elucidate how the opposition of compatibility vs. commensurability was obliquely transferred to the field of studying Art history:

Alive,” in , Inaga (ed.) *In Search of Psycho-somatic Ethics in the Age of Meta- and Multi-verse*, Tokyo, Kachôsha, 2023, pp.299-310, with an English summary, pp.4-5.

¹⁰ The British Museum contains a huge marble Buddha Statue donated at the 1936 Great China Exhibition etc., as well as the Boston Museum of Fine Art, and MET of course. In the case of France, already in the second half of the 19th century, see S. Inaga: «Théodore Duret et Henri Cernuschi, journalisme politique, voyage en Asie et collection japonaise», *Ebisu*, Nr. hors serie, hiver 1998, pp.79-94. The paper treats the case of Cernuschi Museum as well as Guimet Museum in Paris.

¹¹ See, Jean-Hubert Martin, “Who is afraid of Redskins, the Yellow Peril and Black Power?” in *Memory and Oblivion, Proceedings of the XXIXth International Congress of the History of Art*, Dordrecht: Academic Publishers, 1999, pp.961-964, esp. p.963. Though the author does not explicate the date, the circumstances allow us to suppose that the question was raised in the process for the preparation of the Kassel Documenta, 1997.

While Thomas Kuhn argued that Copernican Heliocentric theory was judged incompatible with the previous Ptolemaic theory, Karl Popper maintained that both systems are mathematically commensurable with each other, and sternly attacked Kuhn's idea of "paradigm" as a hideous residue of Hegelian totalitarian thinking. This exchange allows the reviewer to recontextualize G.W.F. Hegel's view of world history.

Hegel's famous remark on Asian stagnation ideologically sustained and justified the Western colonization of Asia (and the Rest). But, ironically enough, his idea of *Zeitgeist* allowed the Asian scholars to recognize the self-fulfilling evolution of their own civilization—in refutation of Hegel's own thinking. The above-mentioned "Essential Indianness" could be nothing other than a variant of Hegelian "Geist" to be found at the core of a national history. At the same time, the notion of "world art history" has been constructed as a process of deployment of the "Western" perception and understanding of the world, faithfully dictating Hegelian idea of "*Phänomenologie des Geistes*."

Thus, the dialectics of center-periphery between the colonizing West and colonized Rest is intricately implicated in the German notion of *Weltkunstgeschichte* (not necessarily reducible to the notion of "commensurability"--to be returned later). And the recent notion of Global Art History (hereafter G.A.H.) may be observed as a side-effect of the global shift in real politics, namely the independence of Asia-African countries in the 1960s¹². The quest of national or ethnic identity has gradually shifted, however, in the post-colonial era into the respect of hybridity and alterity, in tandem with the massive immigration after the collapse of the Cold War Iron Curtain in 1989: the former Western metropolises of colonial empires are by now inhabited by massive ex-colonial non-Western workers and intellectuals, including major influential theory-oriented thinkers.

These demographic dynamics also brought about drastic shift in value judgement (namely in terms of "(in-)compatibility"): if the search for unconditional cultural integrity (in terms of (in-)commensurability) with the West was previously the goal for the non-Western scholars, excessive assimilation to the ex-colonizers' culture has become inadmissible. In contrast, ethnic diversity has become tolerably accepted and even promoted, and avoidance of too much homogeneity has even become a social requirement (all over the world, or at least in the cultural spheres under "Western" value judgement). However, from around 2020s, in the reviewer's observation, xenophobic nationalism has again gained momentum world-wide and the discontent with multi-ethnic society has become a dominant trend, revealing psychological reaction to, and retreat from, the global cultural hybridization. M.J. makes a clear distinction between the hybridization (heterogeneous) and globalization (homogeneous)-with which I willingly agree, while I don't share M.J.'s continuous investment in the idea of the "universal," M.J. seems to cling to, in the reviewer's understanding¹³.

Upon this premises, I add my own observation as follows: As the (legitimate) claim of LGBTQ or LGBTQ2S+ shows, globalization (unifying process) turns out to be incompatible with the principle of multiculturalism (diversity oriented), so long as globalization is defined as the unification of regulation measurements. I see globalization as an imperative (and imperial) mode of unification

¹² The idea of center vs. periphery was specifically elaborated in Japan by a cultural anthropologist and semiotician, Masao Yamaguchi (1931-2013). In the final part of his *Glory and Misery of the Black Continent* (Vol. 6 of the series *World History* (1977), Yamaguchi states that "Africa should not be colonized by the Western style chronological historiography" (1977, reedited as *History of Africa*, Kodansha Academic paperback ed., 2023, p.471). This statement is also relevant to the historiography of African Art, and in extension to that of Global Art History.

¹³ As for the reviewer's opinion on the notion of "universal", see: s. Inaga, "How to Measure 'Unique' or 'Universal'? Comparison in Crisis or Crisis in Comparison," Redakcja Naukowa, Beata Kubiak Ho-Chi, Jędrzej Greń ed, *Unique or universal. Japan and its Contribution to World Civilization*, Volume 1. 100 Years of Japanese Studies at the University of Warsaw, Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa, 2023, Published online, pp.71-92.

according to standardized tools, for example the imperative use of English—to make everything measurable-i.e. commensurable by force).

Let the reviewer clarify his polemical point: The global standardization of human rights cannot tolerate polyvalent axiological diversity. Yet this multi-cultural intricacy (explained in the above paragraph with the LGBTQ, etc.) simply shows that the (mutual-relational) notion of “compatibility” cannot avoid arbitrary psychological love-hate value judgement. And globalization as a process can hardly attain ultimate stable and commensurable unification of measures, but it rather manifests itself as an interminable and successive conflicts between commensurable and non-commensurable variables (in a strictly mathematical terminology) in search of canonicity or concealed cultural hegemony (which may be articulated in a disguised form of financial capital). Thus, globalization risks being easily attuned to, and domesticated by, global capitalism, which I find historically deeply rooted in colonial structures of exploitation.¹⁴

What can the Global Art history mean under such precarious conditions? To this question, the reviewer sees Monca Juneja trying to reply in this meticulously crafted groundbreaking *Magnum Opus*.

3. *Weltkunstgeschichte and Zeitgeist*

The first chapter of the book examines the genealogy of World Art Studies, especially in terms of *Weltkunstgeschichte* in German speaking cultural sphere (detailed in p.22 note 38), as it was particularly articulated from the beginning of the 20th c. As stated above, I look into this discourse through Alexander Humbolt’s *Kosmos* and the Hegelian *Entwicklung* of Western perception of the world (cf.p.250), which, in my opinion, has already provided the ideological bases to the above-mentioned idea of *Weltkunstgeschichte*. As a comparatist, critical of recent translation studies, I agree with the author that an attempt of seamless flat mapping of an inclusive History, or Atlas, of World Art is a “pitfall” which M.J. cautions as “difficult to avoid” (p.74)¹⁵.

I argue that such an ambition of globalization with universal criteria (biological one in the case of Neuroarthistory --p.75--is no exception) is what Global Art History (in differentiation from World Art History) should definitively avoid as a “mission impossible” (as it cannot exclude notorious biological determinism or eugenic selections--so long as it clings to the criteria of (in-)commensurability). G.A.H. has been described (by M.J.) as an interminable arena of conflicts between inclusion and exclusion; (which I perceive as) an elliptic locus oscillating in an orbit of “gravity balance” of the overlapping “magnetic fields” of cultural spheres in my own terminology;¹⁶ either in the attraction-repulsion between the metropolitan centers and regional peripheries (M.J.), or –in addition--in the vertical structure of listing mechanism between the local products (law-vernacular) and global circulation (high-global)—just like the dynamics of (domestic vs. international) stock market (S.I.). The former horizontal-meteorological model can be illustrated –I argue--through a

¹⁴ See S. Inaga, “You Say Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité? --Japanese Critical Perceptions of the Idea of Europe: A Preliminary Reflection for the Regeneration of Universal Humanism,” Vladimir Biti, Joep Leerssen, and Vivian Liska ed, *The Idea of Europe: the clash of projections*, Volume: 37, European Studies, Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 25 Mar 2021, pp.121-135.

¹⁵ The “world atlas” reveals the plain fact that the flattening the cultural heterogeneity advanced hand in hand with the expansion of Western “*Weltanschauung*” which inevitably implies homogenized criteria and value judgement.

¹⁶ See S. Inaga, “Is Art History Globalizable?” in *op.cit.*, p.279 and, S. Inaga “Cultural Gap, Mental Crevice, and Creative Imagination: Vision, Analogy, and Memory in Cross-Cultural Chiasms,” *Journal of Aesthetics and Phenomenology*, London: Routledge, 2020, Published online, 18pp.

cultural weather forecast type satellite monitoring, the latter vertical-geological model as cracks, fault lines or folding strata in geological cross-sections.

Among the Asian precursors experiencing this (weather or seismic) oscillations -on the elliptic orbit (as above mentioned) as well as the “cracks” and “fault lines” (I am proposing these metaphors so as to avoid ordering the world according to binary structures, and yet I am not quite sure if M. J. would agree with such models, based on natural science), I can easily name (in extension of M.J.’s observation) Rabindranath Tagore, the first Asian laureate of the Nobel Prize in literature and in association to him, a Japanese, Tenshin, Kakuzô Okakura, who invented the idea of “being in the world” (p.76-to be exploited by M. Heidegger as “In-der-Welt-Sein”)¹⁷. Both of them successfully introduced their English writings in the Western “high culture” market; Bengali poetry (1913) and Japanese Tea ceremony (1906) respectively obtained their “civil rights” by detecting the porosity in the cumbersome colonial barriers—two cases which reveal the blind spots of the colonial rules (as ironically stated by Rudyard Kipling as “White Man’s Burden” in 1899); rare successful cases which I analyzed elsewhere in terms of “piratical transactions”—by following Kavita Singh’s proposal of the “piracy’s view of G.A. H., as mentioned earlier¹⁸.

Let us add here, that the desire of “putting the world in a book” (as M.J. explains as a desire of compiling W.A.H. or G.A.H. as a textbook: p.77), like the “Livre” Stephane Mallarmé dreamed of in repetition up until his last years,¹⁹ invites us to refer to *La totalité et l’infini* by Emmanuel Levinas (1961) as well as to the question of Deleuzien *Différence et répétition* (1968) : the former rejecting the idea of “totality” as a categorical mistake, which opposes to it the idea of “infinity” as a “Calling-Gift from God,”²⁰ the latter recognizing the identity as something which reveals itself as a difference-noticed only in the repetition (and to which the current review returns again at its conclusion). Both reflections show the illusion –*mâyâ* in Indian classics-- of the human capacity of grasping the Truth, as the ultimate Truth always escapes the “grasping” (“*begreifen*”).

In the reviewer’s opinion, a similar truth of “*Unbegreiflichkeit*” (“in-compre-hensibility” in its etymological acception) is plastically searched for by such an artist as Akasegawa Genpei (1937-2014), anti-artist and writer, who famously invented a “*Canned universe*” (1964), a modern reinvention of Chinese “Fairylad in a pot.” 壺中天 (Chinese folkloric idea of Fairylad which is contained in a pot). Stripping the external label of a crab can and pasting it inside the cylinder before re-sealing the tin rid--a typical trick of inside-out, a reversal of container and contained, which converts positive into negative. The artist couple Christo (1935-2020) and Jean-Claude (1935-2009), who used to package famous historical monuments, did not take Akasegawa’s converting inside-out operation seriously. And yet, we can see here, in Akasegawa, one of the most convenient and witty ways of “putting the world art history in a can” along with Huang Yong Ping’s (1954-) famous ironical table rasa, *The History of Chinese Painting and A concise History of Modern Painting Washed in a Washing Machine for Two Minutes* (1987; then later doing the same by using French and Chinese communist newspapers in 1989; noted by M.J. in p.252).

¹⁷ See S. Inaga, “Japanese Philosophers Go West: The Effect of Maritime Trips on Philosophy in Japan with Special Reference to the Case of Watsuji Tetsurô (1889-1960),” *Japan Review*, No.25, 2013, pp.113-144, esp.p.120, and Yoshiaki Yamashita, *Identität als Unverborgenheit*, Würzburg, Elgon Verlag, 2009, SS. 148-9, note 34.

¹⁸ S. Inaga, “A ‘Pirates’ View’ of Art History,” *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, vol.XXVI, Josai University, December 2014, pp.65-79. The paper was originally presented at the Kyoto Prize winning workshop of Gayatri C. Spivak and later delivered at the JNU in Delhi thanks to Rustom Bharucha and Kavita Singh.

¹⁹ « le monde existe pour aboutir à un livre » is Mallarmé’s famous statement reported several times. For more detail see, among others, Jacques Schérer, *Le Livre de Mallarmé*, Paris: Gallimard, 1957; 1977.

²⁰ Emmanuel Lévinas, *Totalité et infini, essai sur l’extériorité*, Martinus Nijhoff, La Haye 1965, p. 67.

Here are undoubtedly two Dadaist responses to what the G.A.H. can be all about, demarcating the end of the Western Avant-garde and the dawn of Post-Cold War era²¹. This historicity is simply showing that in the 1960s-1980s in the Far-Eastern cultural sphere, there were successive attempts at taking a *tabula rasa* approach and flipping the Western Canon of World Art History upside-down. These artistic acts resonate with M.J.'s analyses of Indian modern art in a global context, in so far as they serve to reinforce the relevance of M.J.'s observation "from the periphery" of South Asia by providing justifying examples from East Asia.

4. (Ir-)Relevance of comparison

As it is impossible to cover all the topics treated in the *opus magnum*, I hereafter limits myself to punctual commentaries for the sake of relevant comparisons on the following three points: first the notions of "finish", "finished work" respectively, second the category of "space-time" and third the definition of image-*Bild* (the German terminology of "*Bildwissenschaft*" is hardly covered by "visual studies").

First, the notions of "finish," "finished work." Monica Juneja introduces Ernest Grosse (1862-1927) (p.5; p.127) as a German speaking researcher of *Kunstwissenschaft* as well as *Weltkunstgeschichte* (already mentioned) in the first half of the 20th Century. In order to even strengthen M.J.'s argument, I wish to evoke another German scholar, Curt Graser (1879–1943). As a cosmopolitan, student of Asian Arts (as this aspect in him is often overlooked by German scholarship): Curt Glaser was a scholar who tried to put into question the Western-centered aesthetic value judgement by assiduously consulting Oriental and Asian Arts. Befriended with many Japanese intellectuals, just like Ernest Grosse before him, this German scholar with Jewish background proposed to read Édouard Manet's spontaneous drawings in comparison to the Oriental ink brush work 水墨画, so as to destabilize the supremacy of the Western obsession of the "finished work"²². As is well known, "*fini*" (finish) was the absolute requirement in "modern" academic Fine-Arts teaching in the West—salon paintings to begin with; but the Oriental ink-brush practice did not respect nor follow these Western criteria, and preferred preserving the creative expressive process as it emerges, and thus offered a positive counter-argument to defend and celebrate the "unfinished" works by Manet, impressionists up to Cézanne etc. This later leads to the idea of "*non-finito*" (Joseph Gantner etc.)²³.

Second, the space-time construction. Paul Cézanne's world-wide reception in the 1920s also implies cross-cultural aesthetic negotiations between the East and the West²⁴. The "primitivism" of Tetsugorô Yorozu (mentioned by M.J. in p.150) deserves further analysis in this "cosmopolitan" context, as his work marks the crossroad of Chinese Southern Sung ink-splash tradition and French

²¹ On the « *Seinsabhängigkeit* » of the notion of artistic avant-garde, see. S. Inaga, "The Impossible Avant-Garde in Japan," *The Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature*, No.41, 1993, pp.67-75. The original French text is reproduced as "L'impossible avant-garde au Japon," *Le renversement du Ciel*, Sous la direction de Alain le Pichon et Moussa Sow, CNRS éditions, octobre 2011, pp. 369-389, pp.612-613. The text is originally written as a theoretical criticism to the "presentationist" show at the Centre Georges Pompidou: *Le Japon des avant-gardes* (1986-7).

²² See S.Inaga, «Une esthétique de rencontre; ou l'affinité de l'Impressionnisme avec le Japonisme comme un malentendu et sa conséquence paradoxale au cours de l'implantation de l'Impressionnisme au Japon», *Word and Image*, vol.4, n° 1, 1988, pp.139-147, esp. notes 16 & 20.

²³ Joseph Gantner, *Il problema del "non finito" in Leonardo, Michelangelo e Rodin*, Vallecchi, 1954

²⁴ S. Inaga, "Between Revolutionary and Oriental Sage: Paul Cézanne in Japan," *Japan Review*, No.28, International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 2015, pp.133-172.

Fauvism and German expressionism. The “spatiality” in Cezanne comes also into focus²⁵. Beside the world art approach of Josef Strzygowski (analyzed in detail; pp.60-74, etc.), Dagobert Frey, belonging to the same *Wiener Schule*, must be cited in this very time-space problematics. In fact, Frey’s *Vergleichende Kunstwissenschaft* (1949) is worth being rehabilitated as a forerunner of David Summer’s *Real Spaces* (2003: cf. pp.76-77) in that Frey systematically compares and classifies different architectonic approaches to the sacredness among the world “high-culture” monuments and proposes a typology of human figures in spatiotemporal movement²⁶. And yet, such ambitious globalizing cultural comparisons in terms of space-time configuration (including that of David Summer’s) faces a drastic need of methodological readjustment²⁷. This leads to the following third point.

Third, the idea of image-Bild. With the recent exploration of virtual spaces and proliferation of digital avatars, the border of real and imaginary has blurred to such a degree that the resurrection of material culture (from Alfred Gell to Tim Ingold etc.) can no longer be separated from the search of *Undingliche Dinge* (Vilém Flusser) or the non-physical realm explored by the virtual realities. A *Bild-Anthropologie* (2006) as proposed by Hans Belting can be taken into account here, as Belting questions the usual understanding of the “image” and reinterprets it in terms of the brain’s ability of crafting mental images and projecting them onto outer space through hand and finger manipulation (*Le gest et la parole* by André Leroi-Gourhan on prehistorical cave painting, should also be associated to it, as the originating moment of image-making). In conjunction to it, the animistic belief that “you are observed by the forest,” as was examined by Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenological approach to Cézanne (*L’Oeil et l’esprit*, 1960), is subject to further investigation. In fact, human mental activities do not reside so much in the brain’s neuron system alone (usually believed as the center of subjectivity for cognition) as are articulated on the surface of the skin in mutual contact (as it were, in the grammatical mode of a “middle-voice”) with the (observing) environment of which the (observed) human agent itself is the constituent²⁸. At this point, we are no longer sure *where* the G.A.H. can be located (in the brain? on the projecting screen of outer world? or in the ultimate “Book” or “Museum” which Mallarmé dreamed? or on the intersubjective and virtual or imaginary contact zone floating in between?).

Remarkably, even these not yet fully investigated aspects do not escape Monica Juneja’s exploring endeavor (as all these topics are neatly treated and touched upon by M.J.’s book, in my understanding). From this point I wish to extend my own view in reference to M.J..

²⁵ S. Inaga, “Classical Chinese Aesthetic Ideals meet the West: Modern Japanese Art as a Contact Zone,” *Japan Review*, No.37, International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 2022, pp.7-28. This paper demonstrates the crucial methodological limitations of East-West comparison that Lilian Brion-Guerry proposed in her classical analysis of the space construction in *Cézanne et l’expression de l’espace*, Paris; Albin Michel, 1966.

²⁶ See, S. Inaga, “Is Art History Globalizable?” in *op.cit.*, p.275. The paper demonstrates complicated (mis-)translation process in aesthetic notions between German “Einführung” and the Chinese *Qiyun Shengdong* 氣韻生動 (misleading translated as “Spiritual rhythm and vital movement”). Rigorous philological examination of the cross-cultural translation ultimately leads to invalidate any trans-linguistic comparison of technical terms.

²⁷ D. Summer does not examine the Chinese notions in his discussion on mimesis and representation in *Critical Terms for Art History*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1996pp.3-16. Though understandable, the omission reveals a methodological difficulty in the cross-cultural translation of visions and terminology. For the reviewer’s “historical investigation” (cf. M.J. p.36, note 63) on the issue, see S. Inaga, “Classical Chinese Aesthetic Ideals meet the West...(note supra. 25). See also, among many others, Monica Juneja, “Global Art History and the “Burden of Representation”,” in Hans Belting et al eds. *Global Studies: Mapping Contemporary Art and Culture*, Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2007, pp.274-297, partly reintegrated in the present work.

²⁸ See S. Inaga, *In Search of Haptic Plasticity: Souls touching each other, Forms interwoven*, University of Nagoya Press, 2016 (in Japanese with English Summary). The book is based on reflections from Plato, Aristotle, to Paul Valéry or Gilles Deleuze (*Le Pli*, 1988) while referring to neurological experiments.

5. *Beyond South Asia—Toward a collective solidarity of the peripheries*

The reviewer happens to be the translator into Japanese of *Ce que parler veut dire* (1981) by P. Bourdieu (overlapping several papers included in *The Field of Cultural Production*, 1993, p.154). By the term of “field” (“champ” in French) the author (Monica Juneja) indicates the “nexus” of “intersecting forces” for artistic creation as well as the behavior manners (“*habitus*” --not explicitly mentioned by M.J.—) of the agents implicated, by taking up the case of India.²⁹ The present reviewer is also indebted since long to Partha Mitter and Tapati Guha-Thakurta’s works on Indian modernism which he (Shigemi Inaga) tried to put in parallel with Japanese contemporary cases³⁰. Such methodological concerns and research experiences in parallel between India and Japan leads him (Shigemi Inaga) to the next topic, namely, the direct exchanges between India and Japan³¹. In fact, this cross-cultural scope allows to liberate the issues from the “segregated pocket” named “area studies” at the “off-centers” (as M. J. judiciously worries about: p.32-3) and help reshape planetary configurations (“planetary” being a constant key-term throughout the book in reference to Dipesh Chakrabarty, ex. p.283) of the historical realities in an academic discipline dealing with globalization. This aspect of the planetary dimension is where I finally see my own approach resonating particularly closely with M.J.’s.

I am convinced that shedding light on Indian Japanese transcultural relations helps to formulate a different perspective on Global Art History. Let us take the most obvious two examples. On the one hand, the pan-Asian spiritual network which Okakura tried to establish during his stay in colonial India (1901-2; cf.p.162, 212) through his publications such as *The Ideals of the East* (1902) and in his personal contact with Vivekananda, Sister Nivedita and the Tagore families.³² On the other, the crossing over of A. K. Coomaraswamy (p.161; 1877-1947) with Muneyoshi Yanagi (1889-1961) in their (independent) efforts to rehabilitate the vernacular popular crafts as an Eastern alternative aesthetic manifest in confrontation with the West³³. These two cases eloquently show the complex ramifications of the not yet clearly detected underground “coevalness” and solidarities in spiritual and intellectual networking. Consider the three uprisings that all took place in 1919, the March 1st in Korea, the Amritsar Massacre on April 14th in India, and the Mai 4th movement in Beijing, China. If the reviewer is not mistaken, these three (co-)incidents have never been mentioned as a sign of “coevalness” in the Modern World Art History, despite Okakura’s implication in the ideological formation of the idea of “Asia is one” —as a protest to the forthcoming Partition of Bengal (1905), and Yanagi’s direct involvement in the Korean and Indian uprisings (1919) through his unprecedented promotion of vernacular popular crafts (1925). To better understand the “contingencies” of these political

²⁹ For a similar consideration on the modernizing process of Japanese art scene, and its insertion in the world market, see S. Inaga, «De l’artisan à l’artiste au seuil de la modernité japonaise ou l’implantation de la notion de Beaux-Arts au Japon», *Sociologie de l’art*, No.8, 1995, pp.47-61.

³⁰ See, S. Inaga, *Images on the Edge, a Historical Survey of East Asian Trans-Cultural Modernities*, University of Nagoya Press, 2014 (in Japanese with English summary.), which includes, in Japanese translations, previously published English and French papers relevant in this context.

³¹ The awkward shifting of identity between “the reviewer,” “he” and “I-me” demonstrates logical displacement of the subject’s viewpoint according to the context and roles the agent assumes, thereby simulating Cézanne’s practice of plural viewpoints in his space construction. This shifting identity will be discussed soon later in the main text.

³² S. Inaga, “Tenshin Okakura Kakuzō and Sister Nivedita; on an intellectual Exchange in Modernizing Asia,” ed. Agnieszka Kozyra and Iwona Kordzińska-Nawrocka, *Beyond Borders: Japanese Studies in the 21st Century: in Memoriam Wiesław Kotański*, Proceedings of International Conference, Warsaw, May 2006(2007), pp.90-95.

³³ S. Inaga, “A.K. Coomaraswamy and Japan: A tentative overview,” Madhu Bhalla ed, *Culture as Power: Buddhist Heritage and the Indo-Japanese Dialogue*, Routledge India, India, 2021, pp.109-131.

engagements—closely related with artistic awakening of the “East”, a renewed view of Global Art History must replace the old concept of West-centric World Art History.

On a technical level, global comparative studies of the ways how the Renaissance linear perspective was assimilated, digested, misunderstood or rejected differently in various locations on the earth would help testing the universal validity of the Western canon/conceptual framework.³⁴ This task is partially examined by M.J. (p.89) and developed in her fine analysis in the postscript (pp.288-289). Further research through a globalizing comparative analysis, I am arguing, will allow us to go beyond the limit of such “blanket concepts” as “hybrid” in cross cultural *métissage* or creolization processes that M.J. rightly criticizes from the beginning (p.20, 27-29)³⁵. This also requires thorough reflections on the notion of “transculturation”—another conceptualization and key term in M.J..

On “transculturation” let me here clarify my position so as to prepare my argument in the final part of the review.

Firstly, in the Afro-European context, P. Picasso’s discovery of the “fetish” or the “spirits” in African masks should be liberated from André Malraux’s “Musée imaginaire” (p.190). While Malraux’s understanding was to “exorcise” the African mask from the fetish, Picasso’s appropriation consisted, in reality-- and despite his confession--, of liberating the African spirits to exorcise Western artistic canons—the academic linear perspectivism in the Beaux-Arts, to begin with ³⁶.

Secondly, in El Anatsui’s re-cycled metal tapestries covering the façade of Palazzo Fourtuni in the Venice Biennale (2007) lies a hidden retaliation strategy of hierarchical upside-down. Why? Because the Western “face” was literally covered and wrapped by a “mask” of African fabric, made of metals originally provided by the third world—epitomizing the turn-over in the commercial and cultural transactions between the North Atlantic West and the Global Asia-African South³⁷.

And thirdly, materiality is also at stake when M.J. writes about the “mud” (p.253), that was despised in the West, but highly valued in the non-western ceramic-pottery. See, Beret Winther-Tamaki, *Tsuchi, Earthy Materials in Contemporary Japanese Art* (the University of Minnesota Press), 2022.

And how the cow’s excretion so precious in India (p.291) is rejected from the museal white cubes for hygienic reasons. The reviewer may willingly add that the curatorial policy of conservation also stands against local customs: Tibetan sand mandala –presented at the Parisin *Magiciens de la terre* show (the review will soon return to this exhibit) -- should be destroyed and purified immediately after the ritual, by pouring the used sand into the natural and fresh water-current in the mountain valley so as to avoid evil and malefic crystallization (cf. p.274). The installation made of edible cocky caused political trouble in China-Tibetan contemporary art exhibit, for the reason of ethical and religious customs which turned out to be “incompatible”: Chinese hospitality was perceived as a sacrilege from the Hindu-Tibetan side, etc. The work in question was Song Dong’s *Mandala City for Eating*, installation in Kathmandu, 2017³⁸.

³⁴ S. Inaga, «La réinterprétation de la perspective linéaire au Japon (1760-1830) et son retour en France (1860- 1910)», *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, n° 49, 1983, pp.29-49.

³⁵ On creolization, see. S. Inaga, “Van Gogh’s Japan and Gauguin’s Tahiti reconsidered,” *Ideal Places East and West*, International Research Center for Japanese Studies, March 31,1997, pp.153-177.

³⁶ S. Inaga, «Le projet de l’histoire de l’art mondial de Malraux : Résurrection ou mise à mort de -l’œuvre -d’art ?», *Malraux vu du Japon, Roman, essai et arts*, Classiques Garnier, 2023, pp.153-168.

³⁷ S. Inaga, “Bricolage: Towards a *Scripture*: A Proposal of a New Concept,” *Critical Interventions (Journal of African Art History and Visual Culture)*, Number 9/10, Spring 2012, pp.49-62.

³⁸ It must be admitted that this religion related controversy is highly political in the current inter-Asian cultural climates.

6. Museum conservation vs. “magicians” as “stationary nomad”

The examples above question the premise of perennity or longevity of an artwork. This is also one of the basic premises of the “Western” modern museology (including the Communist regimes). What is regarded as artwork in the Western Museology in general, is expected to be eternally kept intact in the museum as it is stipulated in the politics of conservation. Whereas decay and loss are programmed in other cultural spheres, like Japan and elsewhere.³⁹ The temporal instability of artworks is mediated and articulated through a material aesthetics of ephemerality and “processuality.” The reviewer here puts the Western curatorial imperative and museal custom of conservation in question. Ephemerality and transience cannot be precluded from the aesthetic considerations in a global perspective—in terms of (in-)compatibility (i.e. question of “qualia”), if not that of (in-)commensurability (reducible to quantified capitalistic or financial regulations). Clay pieces are destined to destruction both in Persian poems *Rubaiyat* attributed to Omar Khayyam (1048?-1131?) and in Indian hymn to Shiba with such an expression as “break every cup from which you drink”⁴⁰. In this “Oriental (?)” context, physical destruction of the objects may be a necessary condition for the spiritual liberation (p.232) which leads to the meditation on the afterlife (“*Nachleben*” to use Abi Warburg’s terminology: p.45, 89) of the broken objects or ruins (p.222, 241, including fragmented torsos). Here the relations between Art and Earth comes to the fore (as proposed by M.J., in Chapter V), and the author (M.J.) cleverly and predictably focuses her critical reflection on the *Magiciens de la terre* show at the Centre G. Pompidou in 1989. Indeed, the mediators between Art (human activities) and Earth (polysemic as “la Terre” “le Monde” or “the Globe”: p.245) have been named (not without pejorative connotation) “magicians” in the Western common language.

Let us finish this (irrelevant) review by considering the role of such “magicians.” He or she knows how to communicate with non-humans which lie beyond the limits of verbal language. Bestowed with capacity of transformation, the magicians easily transgress the boundary of self-identity that ordinary people cannot cross. This is why transborder can be chosen as “casting actors” (p.257) without becoming “passive objects of epistemic violence” the “nomadic curators” (p.35) tend to exercise. Thanks to their multi-layered identities, they are not bothered by the question of ethnical “authenticity” (p.259), supposed to be “incompatible” with (North Atlantic Western) modernity. For, their “magic” consists of invalidating such dichotomic distinctions between “authentic” and “fake” in their life and death, and beyond the border of “real” and “virtual” or even “spiritual,” if you prefer...

The show *Magiciens de la Terre* aimed at featuring and invoking such unclassifiable “indigenous” while the organizers’ not without recognizing the contradiction in the curatorial classification they had to impose upon the invited “native artists.” As Monica Juneja relevantly claims, geographical, ethnic, stylistic or chronological order may well be put into trouble and invalidated—whether or not it was the initial intention of the Parisien show. Thanks to “magicians,” the dead can communicate with the living, as the past can merge in the present to prepare the future (chronological rigor as a historiographical requirement as well as strict geographical limitations in professional specialization tend to dissolve and reject such trans-historic, trans-regional, global communications).

³⁹ On the issue, see S. Inaga, «La vie transitoire des formes - Un patrimoine culturel à l'état d'*eidos* flottant», *Le Sanctuaire d'Ise : Récit de la 62e Reconstruction*, Sous la direction de Jean-Sébastien Cluzel et Nishida Masatsugu, Mardaga, 2015, pp.145-155. A theoretical reflection on the issue is fully developed in S. Inaga, “Global Perception of the Modernity in Question: How to Redefine “Modernity” in Retrospect : So as to Readjust the Digitalized Global Scale Model ,” CIMAM 2015 Annual Conference, How Global can Museum be? The National Art Center, Tokyo, Roppongi Academy Hills, November 7-9, 2015.

⁴⁰ Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, *The Dance of Siva*, Dover publication ,1965, p.61

Here, a methodological anachronism (again Warburgien idea) defying the chrono-political order serves as a wizard's wand ⁴¹. Before provisionally concluding, let us recapitulate the main points. (1) Levinas (as mentioned above) reminds us that the Calling comes unpredictably and in contingency from afar. (2) The consciousness of a "self-identity" is nothing but a retrospective recognition that one can obtain as a "loss" in a no longer repeatable sameness, i.e. "difference" –like the nostalgia-*Heimweh* caused by the inevitable alteration of aging or social and environmental mobility (as the reviewer has already pointed out in reference to Gilles Deleuze's *Difference and Repetition*). (3) The exorcism is a liberation from one's local experience beyond center-periphery reciprocity (as was the case with a Pablo Picasso's exorcism). In sum, as Monica Juneja rightly states, to "salvage a timeless world" (p.259) is a simple illusion. To illustrate this fact, let me summon one more final person:

Akino Fuku (1908-2001), a distinguished Japanese woman painter, was one of such "magicians." Fascinated by the Mithila painting (p.261) and other Indian living vestige, Akino frequented the Subcontinent since her first invitation to Visva Bharati campus in Santiniketan in 1962 ⁴². Her itinerary as a vagabond, incarnating tradition and modernity at the same time, allowed her to encounter regional female painters or weavers during her stay in India. Her case may be well contrasted with the case of say, Amrita She-Gil (p.194). Further, the triangular mutual relation encompassing India, Japan and Mexico (Frida Kahlo), with Octavio Paz as a key agent (p.268), allows us to visualize another planetary G.A.H. in its making—"planetary" here implies an ecological dimension the book invokes, out of the yoke of any market hegemony.

Yet we should not forget that the promotion of "magicians" into gigantic international art market as "global indigenous" can also lead to tragic ending (One sad case is reported in connection with Japan: p.275). As stated by M.J., it must be remembered that representing "local essentialism" may constitute a spiritual betrayal to one's own ancestors or homeland(s), causing a psychosomatic alienation the "magicians" are not exonerated from, in the current global market system which dominates the world today. The claim of a "stationary nomad," an obvious oxymoron, advanced by Korean diaspora artist Nam Jun-Paik (1932-2006) remains a prophetic message in this regard ⁴³. These East-Asian axes (Akino Fuku & Nam Jun-Paik) would help, in the future, to further develop the achievement of the present masterpiece, beyond its current inquiry, mainly focused on South Asia, so as to open a yet another scope of incompatible Global Art Histories.

⁴¹ On anachronism in A. Warburg, see Didi Huberman, *L'Image survivante*, Paris: Minuit, 2002. Throughout the world, magician, fools or tricksters are privileged and (often sacred) art agencies to transgress secular social conventions. See William Willeford, *Fool and His Scepter: A Study in Clowns and Jesters and Their Audience*, Northwestern University Press, 1969. Yamaguchi Masao (supra. note 14) connects methodological anachronism with the fool's tricks.

⁴² Among her Indian writings and sketches, Akino Fuku, *The Song of Baul* বাউল, Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1992 (in Japanese), which touches upon not only Bengali poets in vagabond but also Mithila paintings.

⁴³ S. Inaga, "Kegon/Huayan 華嚴 View and Contemporary East Asian Art: A Methodological Proposal," *Cross Sections*, Vol.5, The National Museum of Modern Art, Kyoto, MoMAK, 2013, pp.2-25. Please note that this article, written under the request of the Western scholarship, has been rejected three times for publication in Western and English academic periodicals –because of its methodological incompatibility and irrelevance--before finally accepted in a state-run modern and contemporary art museum in Japan, based in Kyoto, with the delay of no less than 5 years.