

Contested Holdings

Museums and Collections

Editors

Mary Bouquet, University College Utrecht, and

Howard Morphy, The Australian National University, Canberra

As houses of memory and sources of information about the world, museums function as a dynamic interface between past, present and future. Museum collections are increasingly being recognized as material archives of human creativity and as invaluable resources for interdisciplinary research. Museums provide powerful forums for the expression of ideas and are central to the production of public culture: they may inspire the imagination, generate heated emotions and express conflicting values in their material form and histories. This series explores the potential of museum collections to transform our knowledge of the world, and for exhibitions to influence the way in which we view and inhabit that world. It offers essential reading for those involved in all aspects of the museum sphere: curators, researchers, collectors, students and the visiting public.

Recent volumes:

VOLUME 14

Contested Holdings: Museum Collections in Political, Epistemic and Artistic Processes of Return

Edited by Felicity Bodenstein, Damiana Oțoiu and Eva-Maria Troelenberg

VOLUME 13

Transforming Author Museums: From Sites of Pilgrimage to Cultural Hubs

Edited by Ulrike Spring, Johan Schimanski and Thea Aarbakke

VOLUME 12

Exchanging Objects: Nineteenth-Century Museum Anthropology at the Smithsonian Institution

Catherine A. Nichols

VOLUME 11

Extinct Monsters to Deep Time: Conflict, Compromise, and the Making of Smithsonian's Fossil Halls

Diana E. Marsh

VOLUME 10

The Witness as Object: Video Testimony in Memorial Museums

Steffi de Jong

VOLUME 9

Visitors to the House of Memory: Identity and Political Education at the Jewish Museum Berlin

Victoria Bishop Kendzia

VOLUME 8

Museum Websites and Social Media: Issues of Participation, Sustainability, Trust, and Diversity

Ana Luisa Sánchez Laws

VOLUME 7

The Enemy on Display: The Second World War in Eastern European Museums

Zuzanna Bogumił, Joanna Wawrzyniak, Tim Buchen, Christian Ganzer and Maria Senina

VOLUME 6

Exhibiting Europe in Museums: Transnational Networks, Collections, Narratives, and Representations

Wolfram Kaiser, Stefan Krankenhagen and Kerstin Poehls

VOLUME 5

Borders of Belonging: Experiencing History, War and Nation at a Danish Heritage Site

Mads Daugbjerg

For a full volume listing, please see the series page on our website:
<https://berghahnbooks.com/series/museums-and-collections>

Contested Holdings

Museum Collections in Political, Epistemic and
Artistic Processes of Return

EDITED BY

FELICITY BODENSTEIN, DAMIANA OȚOIU AND
EVA-MARIA TROELENBERG



berghahn
NEW YORK • OXFORD
www.berghahnbooks.com

First published in 2022 by
Berghahn Books
www.berghahnbooks.com

© 2022 Felicity Bodenstein, Damiana Oțoiu, Eva-Maria Troelenberg

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system now known or to be invented, without written permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Bodenstein, Felicity, editor. | Oțoiu, Damiana, editor. | Troelenberg, Eva-Maria, editor.

Title: Contested holdings : museum collections in political, epistemic and artistic processes of return / edited by Felicity Bodenstein, Damiana Oțoiu and Eva-Maria Troelenberg.

Description: New York : Berghahn Books, 2022. | Series: Museums and collections ; volume 14 | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2021040501 (print) | LCCN 2021040502 (ebook) | ISBN 9781800734234 (hardback) | ISBN 9781800734241 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Cultural property--Repatriation--Case studies. | Human remains (Archaeology)--Repatriation--Case studies. | Museums--Collection management--Moral and ethical aspects--Case studies. | Museum exhibits--Moral and ethical aspects--Case studies.

Classification: LCC CC135 .C6295 2022 (print) | LCC CC135 (ebook) | DDC 363.6/9--dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021040501>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021040502>

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-80073-423-4 hardback

ISBN 978-1-80073-424-1 ebook

CONTENTS

<i>List of Illustrations</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xi
Introduction <i>Felicity Bodenstein and Damiana Oțoiu</i>	1
Part I. From Objects Back to People: Ways of Life and Loss	
Chapter 1. The Value of Art – a Human Life? Works of Art in the Crosshairs of the Persecution of Jews under National Socialism <i>Ulrike Saß</i>	23
Chapter 2. Return as Reconstruction: The Gwoździec Synagogue Replica in the Museum of the History of Polish Jews <i>Ewa Manikowska</i>	44
Chapter 3. <i>The Other Nefertiti</i> : Symbolic Restitutions <i>Ruth E. Iskin</i>	65
Part II. The Subject of Return: Between Artefacts and Bodies	
Chapter 4. Blurring Objects: Life Casts, Human Remains and Art History <i>Noémie Etienne</i>	81
Chapter 5. Of Phrenology, Reconciliation and Veneration: Exhibiting the Repatriated Life Cast of Māori Chief Takatahara at the Akaroa Museum <i>Christopher Sommer</i>	96

Chapter 6. Ancestors or Artefacts: Contention in the Definition, Retention and Return of Ngarrindjeri Old People <i>Cressida Fforde, Major Sumner, Loretta Sumner, Tristram Besterman and Steve Hemming</i>	117
Part III. ‘The Making of Law’: Politics and Museum Ethics	
Chapter 7. A Long-Term Perspective on the Issue of the Return of Congolese Cultural Objects: Entangled Relations between Kinshasa and Tervuren (1930–80) <i>Placide Mumbembele Sanger</i>	139
Chapter 8. ‘How Would You Like to See Your Great-Grandfather in a Museum?’ The Issue of ‘Human Dignity’ in Repatriation Processes (Cases Involving French Museums) <i>Cristina Golomoz</i>	163
Chapter 9. (De)Museifying Collections of Physical Anthropology: The Display and/or the Restitution of Human Remains of Indigenous Peoples from Southern Africa <i>Damiana Ofoiu</i>	175
Part IV. Partial and Paused Returns	
Chapter 10. Baroque Returns: The Donations and Reuses of Francesco Gualdi <i>Fabrizio Federici</i>	197
Chapter 11. Getting the Benin Bronzes Back to Nigeria: The Art Market and the Formation of National Collections and Concepts of Heritage in Benin City and Lagos <i>Felicity Bodenstein</i>	220
Chapter 12. What Future for Looted Syrian Antiquities? The Clash between the Law and Practice for the Repatriation of Cultural Property to Countries in Crisis <i>Erin Thompson</i>	242
Conclusion. Unfinished Projects of ‘Decentring’ Western Museum Practices <i>Felicity Bodenstein, Damiana Ofoiu and Eva-Maria Troelenberg</i>	266
Index	285

Part II

THE SUBJECT OF RETURN
BETWEEN ARTEFACTS AND BODIES

Chapter 4

BLURRING OBJECTS

Life Casts, Human Remains and Art History

Noémie Etienne

Fabricated through the contact between people and materials, casts are at the frontier between artefacts and human bodies. Their meaning is highly connected to the context of their production and exhibition. Moreover, life casts are not easily classified or defined. They challenge the way societies have divided particular fields (such as art and the sciences) and disciplines (such as art history and anthropology) and, more broadly, produced knowledge. At a time of intense discussion about the role and place of museums, casts appear as singular objects whose multiple and complex production histories raise questions about what they really are and where they belong. Exploring their uses over time through a couple of case studies, in this chapter I will share some thoughts about these specific objects and how they are both blurred and blurring in a context of political debates about provenance and ownership.

Casts of human bodies taken in anthropological contexts are not at the heart of art history. In fact, casts are often set aside in the larger discussion conducted by art historians, except when they relate to the Italian Renaissance, a period that I will therefore briefly evocate below, and the nineteenth century, when they came back to the forefront of discussions about sculpture (Papet 2001). In art historical discourse, casts indeed occupy a specific place in the history of sculpture (for casting after death, see, in particular, Krass 2012). Produced though a mechanical process, they stand on the threshold between arts and crafts, invention and reproduction. Thus, precisely for these reasons, their presence in the

realm of sculpture generated debates, calling into question the definition of art itself.

However, life casts are part of the current discussion about repatriation and decolonization, to which this chapter seeks to contribute (see Arndt 2018, and Bodenstein et al., forthcoming). Indeed, casts in plaster are everywhere in the museum world: not only in art museums, but in each anthropology or natural history institution's storage and, more and more frequently, (re-)exhibited in museum galleries. They are one of the many tools of knowledge production, but also domination and classification widely used since the beginning of physical anthropology in Europe and the United States (and elsewhere). From the nineteenth century, anthropologists used life casts to record and study the physical appearance of human beings, focusing on the face, but sometimes also the hands, feet, arms or chest. In addition to photographs of faces and profiles, anthropologists were among the many scientists who made extensive use of casts to produce records, with the casts sometimes being developed into busts and used as museum tools for didactic purposes or in exchanges with other museums.

In this chapter, I would like to emphasize the specific case of life casts taken in upstate New York by the anthropologist Arthur C. Parker and the sculptor Caspar Mayer in order to create dioramas, the life-sized displays used to exhibit objects with the help of plaster figures in front a painted background.¹ I will then connect life casts to an earlier European tradition in which the identity of the sitter or the maker was often recorded; these casts are estimated to be more valuable by art historians. Finally, I will contrast such casts with more common work produced in an anthropological milieu. In this context, the sitter's and the maker's identities were often anonymized. The current trend of re-exhibiting these casts in museums generates a certain discomfort.

Indeed, even if they look similar nowadays, the numerous painted masks that can be found in museum storage are by no means all the same. The quality of life casts can vary in terms of the material and artistic skills involved, often reflecting their different contexts of production and the ambitions of their makers. Their origins and provenance need to be retraced by art historians and historians of sciences through a close inspection of the objects and the archives associated with them, in order to better understand the narratives they can convey – and the ways in which they should be dealt with in museums in the future.

Casting People in Albany

The set of dioramas based on life casts that was created in Albany, the capital of the State of New York, by the anthropologist Arthur C. Parker in around 1910 represents a special case. The particularity of these dioramas is connected to the museum's location – an administrative city very close to many Native reservations – and the background of its main protagonist – a curator of Onondowahgha, Seneca (Haudenosaunee, Iroquois) descent on his father's side who was largely self-taught as an anthropologist.² Parker was not alone in creating this work. In order to fabricate dioramas representing the different Nations of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, Arthur C. Parker employed the German sculptor Caspar Mayer. Parker was introduced to Mayer, who had emigrated to the United States in around 1900, by the anthropologist Franz Boas, himself an immigrant who worked at the American Museum of Natural History from 1896 to 1905.

In making the dioramas, Parker asked people he knew personally or people in his extended network to serve as models. Consequently, the museum archives contain a large part of the correspondence between Parker and these models. Unlike other anthropologists, such as Lidio Cipriani, whom I will briefly mention below, he did not cast the individuals in a systematic way, but personally chose people whose physical features he admired and wanted to include. Furthermore, Mayer signed the casts with his initials, claiming a certain authorship over his production. By crafting the majority of the figures for the museum's dioramas in New York and Albany in the period before the First World War, Caspar Mayer and Arthur C. Parker made a significant contribution to the visual culture of museum anthropology in North America in the early decades of the twentieth century (Etienne 2017).

Even if their approach was peculiar, the making of dioramas nevertheless encompassed a significant amount of basic negotiation and pragmatic decisions. For instance, it was more difficult to convince Indigenous women to be casted. Therefore, Parker decided that the resulting deficit in casts could be remedied by using White bodies and affixing Native American arms and faces: 'I have no females available and if he went ahead he would have to do as other museums do – use White models for the bodies – and attach Indian arms and head.'³ This seems to suggest a mixture of White and Indigenous figures. The same was also done with casts of men and women. On 14 July 1909, the director of the New York State Museum (NYSM), John M. Clarke, wrote to Parker to tell him

that one of the figures made at Albany seemed problematic to him: 'I am more than ever convinced, after repeated views of the model, that it is a woman's face on a man's body.'⁴ Indeed, mannequins were produced and arranged according to the requirements of the museum's organization, even if they aimed (and, for the public, pretended) to be a true depiction of reality.

Furthermore, the violence of colonization and the defiance of the people had an impact on the casting process, even when it was supervised by a local actor. In addition, the whiteness of the artistic materials – and its potentially political undertone – did not go unnoticed by the models. An anecdote recounted by Arthur C. Parker conveys how the experience must have felt for the models: 'One Onondaga woman whose face I was casting lost confidence just before the plaster hardened, and clawing it from her head, rushed to a watering trough, scolding me the while for conspiring with the government to transform her into a white woman!'⁵ The woman was afraid of being made physically and symbolically white. Her distrust related to the colour of the plaster applied on the skin, an impression that was reinforced by the sense of confinement that models felt as the plaster hardened. The whiteness of the material was as important as the casting procedure itself in the sense of oppression felt by the models, who were paid for their services.

Nevertheless, the quality of Parker and Mayer's casts is particularly high. The imprints were delicately taken and the casts were painted with a glossy substance in order to underline the specific texture of eyes and lips. Their afterlife is similarly remarkable. The dioramas were dismantled in the 1990s. Following the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), requiring federal institutions to return human remains and sacred cultural items that had been criminally taken, certain artefacts exhibited in the dioramas, such as the masks used for the New Year ceremony, were returned to the local community. More surprisingly, certain plaster mannequins that had formed part of Parker's dioramas were repatriated or, more precisely, given on indefinite loan to the Shako:wi Cultural Center, which opened in 1996 a few dozen kilometres from Albany, the capital of New York State and the location of the NYSM. The centre is a log cabin that serves as a meeting house, as well as a work and exhibition space. Several of the figures created by Parker and Mayer are exhibited today on the second floor of this institution. The diorama was dismantled. The little fictional scene that it represented no longer exists. The figures have been separated and placed in individual exhibition cases, with labels detailing the identities of the individuals represented: their names, forenames and professions.

Since they were made from life casts and have been individually re-exhibited, the figures are now presented as portraits of people to whom names have been restored – thus inscribing the cast in another European artistic tradition, that of the hyper-realist portraits involving casting evocated in the first part of this chapter. As I mentioned above, Parker personally knew the models chosen for his dioramas, but the transformation of these figures into types had made their bodies temporarily anonymous – even if the archives I consulted preserved many traces of them. Now they have been renamed and re-exhibited in this new space. Far from being deemed politically incorrect, these figures seem to be cherished by the community for their capacity to preserve the memory of the deceased, whose identities are retraced by the new labels.⁶

Mimesis, Memory and Materiality

Art history has shown an interest in portraits based on life casts, even if it has rarely concerned itself with objects created in anthropological contexts. Indeed, art historical research has until now mainly focused on casts of people whose identity was better recorded, be it through the name of the sitter or that of the artist. In his book *La ressemblance par contact*, Georges Didi-Huberman, for instance, has demonstrated the disruptive power of life casts in art history. The discipline of art history, described by the French art historian and philosopher as being obsessed with the concept of mimesis, is, in his view, nevertheless resisting to integrate life-casts in its narration (Didi-Huberman 2008). According to him, the Panofskian tradition that dominated the discipline in the twentieth century purposely avoided taking casts into account due to their mechanical dimension. However, as Didi-Huberman reminds us, life casts in sculpture were a topic of great interest in early German art historical discourse. Indeed, a vast body of literature developed in the first decades of the twentieth century, exploring the connection between mimesis, memory and materiality. However, life casts made in the context of anthropology, natural history or popular culture are rarely mentioned.⁷

Almost a century before, the German art historian Julius von Schlosser considered the hyper-realistic tradition of portraits produced in wax during the fifteenth century in Florence (von Schlosser 1911). Similarly, Aby Warburg studied *boti*, the effigies used as ex-votos and displayed, among other places, in the church of the Santissima Annunziata in Florence at the time (Warburg 1902). More recently, a new research trend has been developing, involving first and foremost German and

North American scholars who study the interconnection between portraits, resemblance and indexicality. Much of this research explores bust portraits and reliquaries, discussing the connection between lifelikeness, casts and the representation of individuals (see, for instance, Kohl 2013 and Panzelli 2008).

Such studies are also grounded in the research conducted at the beginning of the twentieth century by Charles Sanders Peirce, who distinguished between iconicity and indexicality: 'firstly likeness or, as I prefer to say, Icons, which serves to represent their objects only in so far as they resemble them in themselves; secondly Indices, which represents their objects independently of any resemblance to them, only by virtue of real connections with them, and thirdly Symbols, which represents their objects, independently alike of any resemblance or any real connections' (Peirce 1998: 460–61).

Wax, plaster and clay are the most common materials used to create life-casts. As many authors have emphasized, Renaissance portraits based on life casts are both icons and index: they represent individuals through iconicity and their similitude is based on the close contact between the material and the sitter. Such portraits are ubiquitous in different time periods. They exist in different media, such as the glazed terracotta made by the Della Robbia's workshop during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In the *Resurrezione Antinori*, for instance, there is a large-scale glazed terracotta lunette by Giovanni della Robbia, now preserved in the Brooklyn Museum in New York. The figure of the donor, a member of the Antinori family, situated on the left of the panel made of glazed terracotta, is a portrait. The size (slightly smaller than life size due to the contraction of the clay) and the naturalistic qualities, reinforced by the glazing varnish developed by the Della Robbias, evoke a portrait that might have been sculpted using a funerary mask and imprint.⁸ Many of the realistic-looking sculptures made by the artist Guido Mazzoni are based on life casts, reworked and integrated into standing figures. This tradition is grounded in the work of canonic artists such as Donatello or Andrea del Verrocchio. In the work of Mazzoni, even some accessories and costumes seem to be based on castings (see Vaccari 2009: 86).

Life casts were often taken after death. This is true, for instance, of Filippo Brunelleschi's mask, which was taken by his apprentice Andrea Cavalcanti at Buggiano in 1446 and is still on display at the Museo dell'Opera del Duomo in Florence. This mask is a full bust, including face, neck, chest and shoulders. The eyes are closed and have not been opened. The cast was not reworked as a terracotta sculpture, as in the examples I just mentioned, but kept as it was. Before the object is fired, the artist can

make alterations. Art historian Jeannette Kohl recalls the Florentine interest in truthful representation, which extended to displaying dead faces in representational contexts. As she explains, quoting Vasari again, there were death masks and portraits in plaster and terracotta in every house in Florence (*ibid.*: 62). Such masks, and life casts more broadly, embodied the absent and perpetuated his or her existence in the household or the city. As Kohl explains, the association between individuals and their casts is so strong that, after the Pazzi conspiracy of 1478 and, in particular, after the Medici family's exile of 1494, the production of cast-based images of Lorenzo reached its peak (Kohl 2013: 60). In this case, casts were indeed used and diffused in order to represent the exiled rulers. They were almost a substitute for the bodily presence of the man who had left Florence.

Life casts serve as substitutes – at least partly – for human beings. They preserve something of the living person from contact with whom they originated. For this reason, they have also traditionally been connected to relics. Indeed, parts of human bodies, known as relics, were frequently displayed in anthropomorphic sculptures, which often gave a generic face to the saints. A reliquary made by Donatello is often mentioned as the first object that really gave a saint a portrait-like face (Moskowitz 1981). Furthermore, according to German art historian Martin Gaier, clay, a typical material for life casts, is so closely associated with human remains that it almost equated to them. Studying the reliquary and bust of San Laurent preserved in the church of San Lorenzo in Florence, previously attributed to Donatello and today attributed to Desiderio da Settignano, the author suggests that the choice of terracotta and the liveliness of its treatments, with traces of fingers visible on the surface, make the bust of Saint Laurent a plausible portrait and almost a reliquary, even without the presence of relics. Thus, according to the author, terracotta itself becomes the guarantee of individuality and almost a substitute for flesh and human remains (Gaier 2012).

The long association between certain materials (wax, plaster and clay) and life casts has yet to be explored by art historians in the context of another part of the field: life casts taken as part of anthropological projects. The quality of such objects can be surprising, as I have indicated in relation to the example of Albany. And if the identity of the artist in many such projects is unknown, this lack of study is less the result of the disappearance of sources than it is of the disinterest of scholars. As I have emphasized in the case of Albany, the sculptor Caspar Mayer was mentioned in a significant amount of archive material and even signed his production. Rather, the lack of knowledge regarding anthropological life casts is due to the legitimate yet limiting concern of the discipline about

(high) art and a tendency to overlook works made in other contexts. However, the tools of art historians – that is, their specific knowledge about materiality and techniques, their capacity to identify the multiple hands involved in the artworks and their expertise in decoding the meaning of visual production – can highlight the complexity of objects such as life casts and reconstruct their making and nuance, helping to determine how they could be handled in the future.

Re-exhibiting Life Casts (or Not)

Lastly, I would like to consider a brief selection of casts taken during world fairs or colonial expeditions during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and how they are currently visible (or not) in museum galleries. I will suggest that their omnipresence in museums of diverse disciplines constitutes one of the future challenges for museums, in particular in the fields of natural history and anthropology. As complex objects with long histories, I have shown that casts are deeply connected to questions of death, relics, human remains, identities and ancestors. On the one hand, some plaster moulds literally include human remains, such as the hair of the model encrusted in the material, as in the case of many examples in the collection of the American Museum of Natural History in New York, all of which are stored in a garret and not on view in the galleries (for more on this material, see Etienne 2017, 2020 and 2021). On the other hand, the violence of colonial history has affected such works and the surviving objects in museum storage embody the power imbalance between people – evident in the parable about the model who feared that she would be whitened through the casting process.

Nowadays, different anthropological or natural history museums demonstrate an interest in, if not an anxiety about, the possession and visibility of their casts. Certain re-exhibition projects reveal the uneasiness surrounding such objects, as well as the difficulty accessing the casts in storage. Museums such as the Museum of Mankind in Paris try to re-exhibit them (Blanckaert 2015). The Museum of Mankind, first inaugurated in 1938 in Paris, was recently renovated. In 2015, the museum reopened and proposed a new approach to its collection (many objects having been transferred to the newly opened Quai Branly Museum). Among other changes, a gallery in the museum presents many painted life casts, re-exhibited and rearranged in a display intended to show both the diversity of humankind and the tools used by physical anthropology and anthropometric scientists to create such casts. Thus, the casts speak,

come alive and address audiences in a variety of languages through audio and video animations.

Other institutions, such as the Anthropology Museum of Florence, conserve a significant number of plaster casts produced during various campaigns, reflecting the (sometimes dark) history of the institutions. A large part of the collections housed at the Florentine museum is made up of casts taken by Lidio Cipriani, a promotor of Italian Fascism, who, in 1938, signed the 'Manifesto della Razza', a text promoting the purity of the Italian 'race' written by a group of ten male scholars (Cecchi and Stanyon 2014). Cipriani had travelled to Africa multiple times from 1927 and many of the casts exhibited in the museum were created by him. However, it is difficult to access this collection. It has been impossible, despite repeated demands, to access the collection of life casts in the museum's storage. Recently, a display aiming to show the variety of humankind was created. The masks, however, also tell another story. Indeed, the plaster casts are of modest quality. The junction between the imprint of the faces and the bust is visible. In terms of the painting, one colour is uniformly applied to the whole face. The result is a standardized, simplistic vision of a face that doesn't closely resemble a human face (see Feldman 2008). The casts were produced by an amateur cast-maker and convey poorly elaborated and racist representations of humankind. In comparison, the life casts produced in the United States under the supervision of the Seneca anthropologist Arthur C. Parker in around 1900 were more masterly. They demonstrate a variety of skin tones implemented by the collaborating artists.

Many examples convey other attitudes towards such works, including in connection to dioramas. In her work on South African museums, the historian Annie Coombes discusses an installation created in the Iziko South African Museum, Cape Town's natural history museum (founded in 1825). This diorama represents people of Khoi-San origin,⁹ who were violently persecuted during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In 1952, the commission for the 'preservation of Bushmen' was established by the apartheid regime. Its goal was to ensure the 'purity of specimens' (Coombes 2003: 211). The Khoi-San, it was perversely argued, provided insight into the roots of humanity and their society was to be preserved as evidence of primitive, if not prehistoric, humans (idem: 206–42, see also Pietersen 1996; Douglas and Law 1997; Nutall and Coetzee 1998; Jackson and Robins 1999).

This diorama was made in 1950, during the early years of the apartheid regime, but the figures are older; they were based on life casts made of the Khoi-San population by the taxidermist James Drury in 1911.

The installation was dismantled in 2002. Beginning in the 1980s, several forms of mediation were undertaken in order to present this diorama to the public, with explanatory panels being added (see also chapter 9 in this volume). In 1996, an exhibition entitled *Miscast* opened in the South African National Gallery in Cape Town, exhibiting moulds of the casts from the diorama. The idea was to draw attention to the political implications of different museological choices.

Miscast proved controversial. At the time of its opening, debates on the repatriation of Sarah Baartman's human remains were a key topic in intellectual and emotional discourses in South Africa (Coombes 2003: 222; Goodnow 2006: 18; see also chapters 8 and 9 in this volume). Baartman had become a symbol of the dispossession of the Khoi-San and their struggle to reappropriate their culture. The similarity between life casts and human remains seemed to make their exhibition intolerable, even in the form of resin moulds or for a critical exhibition such as *Miscast*. The particular status of these casts is illustrated by the homages paid to the diorama itself. Dawid Kruiper, leader and medicine man of the ≠Khomani San, had brought members of the Khoi-San nation to the Cape Town Museum of Natural History to pay tribute to the casts in the early 1990s. The statues were famous and considered ancestors (Dawid Kruiper quoted by Gordon et al. 1996: 269).

The cast of Sarah Baartman's body, as well as her skeleton, was exhibited at the Museum of Mankind from 1816 until 1976 (Boëtsch, Snoep and Blanchard 2012: 45–46; see also Blanckaert 2013). Her cast was then withdrawn from exhibition but not repatriated, despite a repatriation proposal made by the French museum. Indeed, those responsible for repatriation refused to return the casts, which were deemed highly but insufficiently indexical and therefore not equivalent to human remains (Esquerre 2011: 233). The issue of casts now became the responsibility of the museums that had them in their collections. A spokesperson for the Museum of Mankind stated: 'A request for restitution could only be made in respect of human remains. When we welcomed the South African representatives, we asked them: "Do you want the casts too?". They replied: "No, that's your problem"' (ibid.).

In 2011, however, another position was adopted in relation to the life casts in Cape Town. After a series of consultations with different stakeholders, the museum direction accepted the recommendation made by the Committee on Human Remains to consider the body casts made by James Drury as unethically collected human remains (Davison 2018, see also chapter 9 in this volume). The casts were classed as human remains and viewing them was prohibited. This change of epistemological status

is significant. It also goes beyond the diorama. In 2013, all life-casts were removed from the galleries, except for a few casts made with the full consent of the sitters. Even if this decision raises the question of what exactly 'consent' is in a colonial context, the unbalanced power relation became one of the criteria for removing life casts from public view. I believe that these examples invite museum professionals and academics to become aware of the complexity and sensitive nature of life casts and the important differences between these life casts and similar-looking artefacts that have yet to be studied by art historians.

Conclusion

The casts do indeed represent a problem for museum professionals and for scholars. It seems likely that one of the next challenges for museums of anthropology will be the conservation, exhibition and possible restitution of such casts, which can be found in large numbers in all such institutions. Some institutions have already attempted to establish forms of mediation, which range from placing them out of sight in the museum reserves to establishing new and different forms of exhibitions. In contrast, in 2016, an exhibition devoted to German colonialism at the German Historical Museum in Berlin did not exhibit the casts, but rather presented the moulds, sealed and behind glass, in which the casts were replicated. In any case, the particular place of casts in Western (art) history, which can be traced at least as far back as the Renaissance, explains the sensitivity surrounding these objects that are deeply connected to memory and human remains. Life casts are blurred because they are constantly reworked in order to construct different conceptions of bodies and races. They also blur our epistemological categories and challenge academics and museum professionals.

As I suggested, casting occupies a peculiar place in the history of material culture: the technique of casting and the lifelikeness of the result are so closely associated with human bodies that the presence of life casts creates a certain malaise. (This is also the reason why, for instance, I choose to not reproduce any image of life casts in this chapter.) Furthermore, the context of violence, domination and colonization in which most casts in anthropological enterprises of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were produced is often visible in the casts themselves: fixing the expressions of forced models, they testify to a violence that the museum curators and scholars have to confront nowadays. In the context of the proclaimed decolonization of the museum world, this

embarrassment is mediated by different procedures. I believe that this process will intensify. Moreover, it is my conviction that scholars can help in this process. Art historians, among others, can retrace the particular histories of such casts: through close observation of the material objects and the reading of archives, it is possible to understand how they were made and even to reconstitute the identity of their creators, providing important knowledge for historically contextualizing the casts and reconstructing the conditions of their production.

In parallel, casts resurface in contemporary art, in which they are used purposefully. From the 1990s, the figure of the artist as 'ethnographer' emerged. Such artists engage in openly thematized research activity. They adopt the formal codes but also the objects of the scientific world, as in the case of Fiona Pardington, an artist of Māori origin, who (re) photographs plaster castings made in the early nineteenth century by Pierre-Marie Alexandre Dumoutier, an anatomist and founder of the Phrenology Society of Paris. It is not only the ethnographic approach that is updated in this work, but also its historical products, its traces and its archives (Baker and Rankin 2011). Pardington does not do her own surveys, but rather uses old, potentially problematic anthropological material. She re-enacts these plaster faces stored in the reserves and restores the names of the models in the titles of her photos. Such work thus brings to light the identities of the people studied, whose singularity had been – partially and temporarily – erased.

Noémie Etienne is Professor of Art History at the University of Bern and a specialist in the fields of early modern art, global conservation, heritage and museum studies. She was previously the Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow at the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University and a postdoctoral fellow at the Getty Research Institute in Los Angeles. She is currently leading a research project on the exotic in Europe between 1600 and 1800. Recent publications include *Exotic Switzerland? Looking Outward in the Age of Enlightenment* (Diaphanes, 2020, co-editor), *Les autres et les ancêtres. Les dioramas de Franz Boas et d'Arthur Parker à New York, 1900* (Les Presses du réel, 2020) and *The Art of the Anthropological Diorama* (De Gruyter, 2021).

Notes

1. This case study is taken from my books, Etienne 2020 and 2021. The writing of this chapter has benefited from a stay as a fellow at the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence in 2019, and I would like to thank Hannah Baader for her invitation.
2. Regarding this important but little-known figure, see the biography by Porter 2001 and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2009.
3. Albany, New York State Museum Archives (henceforth NYSM), Life Group, file 2, 8 February 1912, letter from Arthur Parker to John M. Clarke.
4. Albany, NYSM, Life Group, file 1, 14 July 1909, letter from John M. Clarke to Arthur Parker.
5. Albany, NYSM, Life Groups, file 7, 23 July 1924, letter from Arthur Parker to Arthur Pound.
6. Oral communication from the centre's director, Candice Watson, 2013.
7. Exceptions include the casts made from architecture. See, for instance, Flood 2004.
8. Giovanni della Robbia, *Resurrezione Antinori*, c. 1520, glazed terracotta, 174 x 364 x 33, New York, Brooklyn Museum, inv. 99.5. See Gentilini 2017: 45–47.
9. The term covers two ethnic groups, formerly called Hottentot (Khoikhoi) and Bushman (San).

References

Primary Sources

Albany, New York State Museum Archives (NYSM), Life Group, files 1, 2 and 7.

Secondary Sources

- Arndt, L. 2018. 'Corps sans repos, voix en errance. Moulages raciaux et masques surmoulés dans des collections muséales et des interventions artistiques, en France et en Allemagne', *REVUE Asylon(s)* 15. Retrieved 13 November 2019 from <http://www.reseau-terra.eu/article1405.html>.
- Baker, K., and E. Rankin (eds). 2011. *Fiona Pardington: The Pressure of Sunlight Falling*. Dunedin: Otago University Press.
- Blanckaert, C. (ed.). 2013. *La Vénus hottentote: entre Barnum et Muséum*. Paris: Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle.
- . 2015. *Le Musée de l'Homme, histoire d'un musée laboratoire*. Paris: Editions Artlys/Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle.
- Bodenstein, F. et al. 2022 (forthcoming). *Traces. Les manifestations du (dé)colonial au musée*. Paris: Horizons d'attente.

- Boëtsch, G., N. Snoep and P. Blanchard (eds). 2012. *The Invention of the Savage: Human Zoos*. Arles: Actes Sud.
- Cecchi, J.M., and R. Stanyon. 2014. *Il Museo di Storia Naturale dell'Università degli Studi di Firenze. Le collezioni antropologiche ed etnologiche*. Florence: Firenze University Press.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, C. 2009. *Inheriting the Past: The Making of Arthur C. Parker and Indigenous Archaeology*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Coombs, A.E. 2003. *History after Apartheid: Visual Culture and Public Memory in a Democratic South Africa*. London: Duke University Press.
- Davison, P. 'The Politics and Poetics of the Bushman Diorama at the South African Museum', *ICOFOM Study Series* 46 (2018): 81–97.
- Didi-Huberman, G. 2008. *La ressemblance par contact: archéologie, anachronisme et modernité de l'empreinte*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.
- Douglas, S., and J. Law. 1997. 'Beating around the Bush(man!): Reflections on "Miscast: Negotiating Khoisan History and Material Culture"', *Visual Anthropology* 10(1): 85–108.
- Esquerre, A. 2011. *Les os, les cendres, et l'État*. Paris: Fayard.
- Etienne, N. 2017. 'Dioramas in the Making. Caspar Mayer and Franz Boas in the Contact Zone(s)', *Getty Research Journal*, 9: 57–74.
- . 2020. *Les autres et les ancêtres. Les dioramas de Franz Boas et d'Arthur C. Parker à New York, 1900*. Dijon: Les Presses du réel.
- . 2021. *The Art of the Anthropological Diorama: Franz Boas, Arthur C. Parker, and Constructing Authenticity*. Boston and Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Feldman, J.D. 2008. 'Contact Points: Museums and the Lost Body Problem', in E. Edwards, C. Gosden and R. Philips (eds), *Sensible Objects. Colonialism, Museums and Material Culture*. Oxford: Berg, pp. 245–67.
- Flood, F.B. 2004. 'Signs of Violence: Colonial Ethnographies and Indo-Islamic Monuments', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Art* 5(2): 20–51.
- Gaier, M. 2012. 'Die Büste als Reliquie', in M. Gaier, J. Kohl and A. Saviello (eds), *Similitudo Konzept der Ähnlichkeit in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, pp. 165–81.
- Gentilini, G. 2017. 'La Resurrezione Antinori di Giovanni della Robbia: genesi e fortuna, memorie et significati', in *Da Brooklyn al Bargello. Giovanni della Robbia, la lunetta Antinori e Stefano Arienti*. Genova: Sagep Editori, pp. 45–47.
- Goodnow, K. 2006. 'Why and When Do Human Remains Matter: Museum Dilemmas', in J. Lohman and K. Goodnow (eds), *Human Remains and Museum Practices*. London: UNESCO, pp. 16–21.
- Gordon, R., C. Rassool and L. Witz. 1996. 'Fashioning the Bushman in Van Riebeeck's Cape Town, 1952 and 1993', in P. Skotnes (ed.), *Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen*. Cape Town: South African National Gallery, pp. 256–71.
- Jackson, S., and S. Robins. 1999. 'Miscast: The Place of the Museum in Negotiating the Bushman Past and Present', *Critical Arts: South-North Cultural and Media Studies* 13(1): 69–101.
- Kohl, J. 2013. 'Casting Renaissance Florence: The Bust of Giovanni de' Medici and Indexical Portraiture', in P. Motture, E. Jones and D. Zikos (eds), *Carvings, Casts and Collectors: The Art of Renaissance Sculpture*. London: Victoria and Albert Museum, pp. 58–71.

- Krass, U. 2012. *Nah zum Leichnam*. Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag.
- Moskowitz, A. 1981. 'Donatello's Reliquary Bust of Saint Rossor', *The Art Bulletin* 63(1): 41–48.
- Nuttall, S., and C. Coetzee (eds). 1998. *Negotiating the Past: The Making of Memory in South Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Panzelli, R. (ed.). 2008. *Ephemeral Bodies. Wax Sculptures and the Human Figure*. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute.
- Papet, E. (ed.). 2001. À fleur de peau. Le moulage sur nature au XIXe siècle. Paris: RMN.
- Peirce, C.S. 1998. *A Sketch of Logical Critics, 1911*, in *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings*, 2 volumes. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, vol. 2.
- Pietersen, C. 1996. 'Miscast: Negotiating Khoisan History and Material Culture', *South African Historical Journal* 35(1): 135–39.
- Porter, J. 2001. *To Be Indian: The Life of Iroquois-Seneca Arthur Caswell Parker*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- von Schlosser, J. 1911. 'Die Geschichte der Porträtbildnerei in Wachs: Ein Versuch', *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, Bd. XXIX, Heft 3.
- Vaccari, M.G. 2009. 'Guido Mazzoni e Antonio Begarelli: Due Mastri della terracotta tra tecnica e problemi di conservazione', in G. Bonsanti and F. Piccinini (eds), *Emozioni in Terracotta: Guido Mazzoni Antonio Begarelli, Sculture del Rinascimento Italiano*. Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini Editore, pp. 85–90.
- Warburg, A. 1999. 'The Art of Portraiture and the Florentine Bourgeoisie: Domenico Ghirlandaio in Santa Trinità. The Portraits of Lorenzo de Medici and his Household' (1902), in *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity: Contributions to the Cultural History of the European Renaissance*. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute, pp. 435–51.