ArtHist.net

Sessions at RSA (Chicago, 30 Mar-1 Apr 17)

Renaissance Society of America (RSA) 2017 Conference, Chicago, The Palmer
House Hilton, Mar 30–Apr 1, 2017
Deadline: Jun 3, 2016

H-ArtHist Redaktion

Call for Papers for the following sessions:
[1] Localizing the state apparatus
[2] When Theory Fails? Artistic Practices in the Early Modern Period
[3] Artifice and Anti-Naturalism in Renaissance Architecture

--

[1]
From: Barbara Uppenkamp <barbara.uppenkamp@web.de>
Date: 20.05.2016
Subject: CFP: Localizing the state apparatus

Localizing the state apparatus: early modern administration buildings in a global perspective

Deadline: June 3, 2016

During the emergence of the early modern state apparatus, administration buildings became an important means of governance. French hôtels de l'Intendances, priories and monastic office buildings, government buildings in a ruler's domain or in a foreign territory served the administration of local communities, to collect and store goods, fees and contributions. We may think of the casas grandes or casas reales of the haciendas in the Spanish colonies, buildings of the Portuguese padroado in India, or houses of the Dutch trading companies in Asia and America. The buildings provided space for public gatherings on days of hearing, office rooms for administrative staff and rooms for rulers or their representatives, guests and servants. The architecture served diverse practical functions and also visualized a governor's claim to power.

This session aims to assemble research on early modern administration buildings in a global perspective. Possible contributions may refer but are not limited to the function of such buildings, their structure, their decoration, or their specific role in the definition and the governance of territories. Interdisciplinary and cross-cultural topics are encouraged.

To submit a paper proposal for this session, please send a Word or PDF document to Dr. des. Kristina Hagen [kristina.hagen@rps.bwl.de] and Dr. Barbara Uppenkamp [barbara.uppenkamp@web.de] by June 3, 2016. Please ensure that the document includes the presenter's first and last name; academic affiliation and title (or "Independent Scholar"); e-mail address; paper title (15-word maximum); abstract (150-word maximum); short CV (300-word maximum; please follow the CV guidelines and models on http://www.rsa.org/page/2017Chicago).

--

[2]

From: Ivana Vranic <ivana7vranic@gmail.com>

Date: May 22, 2016

Subject: CFP: When Theory Fails? Artistic Practices in the Early Modern Period

When Theory Fails? Artistic Practices in the Early Modern Period

Deadline: Jun 3, 2016

Despite recent critiques, art historians have maintained the assumption embedded in Giorgio Vasari's Vite that art theory preceded and hence defined art practice in the early modern period. Arguably, Vasari's preference arose from his inability to fully define artistic practice; if an artist or an artwork did not fit Vasari's theoretical construct, he pointed to flaws in artists' character or biography, dismissed them, and so undermined their contemporary reputation and subsequent recognition. The ramifications of this approach can be observed in the modern preference given to written rather than visual evidence; the text before the object.

And yet because art objects often failed to illustrate art texts art historians have often overlooked the ways in which early modern artists led and participated in the dialogic (and not dichotomous) relationship of theory and practice by producing objects that challenged and disturbed theoretical discourses. What precisely was this relationship? In what discursive ways did the artists contribute to or evade art theory in their art practice? How did working artists push against or place themselves within a discourse that became ever more the purview of writing artists?

We invite papers that consider such questions in order to illuminate the relationship between art theory and art practice in the early modern period. Potential topics might include, but are not limited to:

- works that blur the distinctions between mediums, materials, and subjects;
- artists who borrowed from practices and techniques of making in other materials or mediums;
- the contributions or responses to prevailing art practices and art theory by foreign artists, materials, and forms;
- the relationship(s) of the so-called 'high' arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture to the 'low' arts;
- the place of the workshop, apprenticeship system, or the consequence of multiple hands in the completion of a work.

Please send your abstract of up to 150 words, along with a title, keywords, and a short CV to Bradley J. Cavallo (tuc70074@temple.edu) and Ivana Vranic (ivana7vranic@gmail.com) by June 3.

--

From: Elizabeth J. Petcu <elizabeth.petcu@kunstgeschichte.uni-muenchen.de>

Date: May 22, 2016

Subject: CFP: Artifice and Anti-Naturalism in Renaissance Architecture

Artifice and Anti-Naturalism in Renaissance Architecture

Organized by Elizabeth J. Petcu, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Deadline: Jun 3, 2016

Architecture should imitate nature—this was the mandate that Vitruvian literature conveyed to architects and other readers from the fifteenth century on. Yet despite the widespread sway of that ideal, architects often subverted the norms of architectural naturalism through devices such as fictive or broken tracery, illusionistic treatment of materials, false apertures, or deceptively "floating" supports. Scholarship has traditionally cast artificiality and anti-naturalism in Renaissance architecture as manifestations of a lingering, Gothic-era affinity for architectural wit, or as products of a subversive, Mannerist aesthetic. Nevertheless, the restrictions of site, patron, and budget, and the demands of tradition and taste all motivated cases of architectural artifice and anti-naturalism in this era as well. What could be gained by considering architectural displays of artifice and anti-naturalism as more than symptoms of style?

This session will explore artificiality and anti-naturalism in Renaissance architecture beyond the conceptual frameworks and chronological confines of the Gothic and of Mannerism, considering their broader implications for early modern discourse on architectural imitation. The conversation might address any number of questions, including:

- What cultural pressures and artistic priorities motivated designers to reject the ideal of architectural naturalism as defined by Vitruvian literature?
- How might we compare manifestations of architectural anti-naturalism to performances of architectural artifice? Where do the two categories intersect, and how do they differ?
- How might we relate displays of artificiality or anti-naturalism in structure to those that occur in architectural materials, techniques, and ornament?
- What do performances of artificiality in Renaissance architecture tell us about paradigms of naturalism and architectural imitation in this era?

The session welcomes papers centered on specific case studies from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries, culled from any geography or cultural context.

Please submit a circa 250-word abstract and a short CV by June 3 to:
elizabeth.petcu@kunstgeschichte.uni-muenchen.de

Reference:
CFP: Sessions at RSA (Chicago, 30 Mar-1 Apr 17). In: ArtHist.net, May 23, 2016 (accessed Jun 3, 2026), <https://arthist.net/archive/13054>.