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ABSTRACT

Rooted in the long-established traditions of European still life painting, my fine art photography is an attempt to reinvigorate the genre as a vehicle for social critique and inter-personal understanding. Although my thematic scope has previously explored issues such as familial loss and absence; the hidden narratives of found items; and the problematic culture of bodily enhancement products, my current project, New Colonial, is more overtly political and an articulation of my uneasy relationship with the history of the still life genre itself. The project is divided into two series (Curiosities and Souvenirs) both of which explore issues of historical and contemporary colonialism, consumerism and power. This paper, therefore, will provide insight not only into the project's conceptual underpinnings, but also the way in which my visual and technical processes are a direct response to art history and on-going cultural phenomena.
New Colonial:
How can the Still Life Genre Confront its Past?

The *Curiosities* project consists of a series of still life compositions which are arranged to subtly reference the 'cabinet of curiosities' tradition (Appendix 1.1 and 2.1). These 'cabinets' have been described as Renaissance precursors to modern museums which displayed ‘the bizarre’, ‘the wonderful’ and ‘the uncategorized’ (Mauriès 2011, p.43). Many of the unusual items represented within them were in fact 'specimens collected during foreign exploration' or ‘sent back […] by missionary expeditions’ (ibid., p.161), and so they formed part of a discourse through which Europeans described and understood the world beyond them. The items which I depict in my still life arrangements, however, are significant for being cultural ‘keepsakes’ accumulated by modern day European tourists. Additionally, the accompanying series, *Souvenirs*, provides an extensive catalogue of international artefacts that have been removed from their original cultural origins and transformed into ornaments or mementoes, and the project thus suggests the detrimental effects of modern tourism on traditional cultural practices.

The tourist souvenirs which I have photographed were sourced through two separate channels. The majority were borrowed from families around the UK, having been brought back from foreign travel or received as gifts from other European tourists (Appendix 1.2). The rest of the souvenirs were purchased from EBay and online souvenir companies. It is also important to acknowledge that the *New Colonial* project focuses exclusively on a particular type of souvenir: objects that were chosen because they have a long heritage, are/were culturally significant for the people who created them, and, consequently, the ubiquitous realm of fridge magnets, stationary, t-shirts etc. was excluded (although, of course, these would have their own equally important story to tell). Furthermore, although it was not possible to represent each nation within the project, I did aim for some degree of geographical representativeness, and this was not simply a matter of ‘tokenism’ or ‘inclusion’. It was essential conceptually in order to suggest that cultures around the world are subjected to the problematic effects of mass tourism.
To adequately contextualise the *New Colonial* project, however, it is important first to consider the economic, religious and political frameworks in which the Golden Age of European still life art was conceived. Various explanations have been offered for the genre's proliferation during the late 16th to late 17th century. Norbert Schneider (1994) and Norman Bryson (1990, p.96) argue that it was largely due to the 'new problem of massive oversupply' and the rapid rise of mercantile wealth in Western Europe. These prosperous merchants invested in still life painting because they 'wanted to express their prestigious position and their identity' (Schneider 1994, p.107), both of which were fundamentally linked to the world of desirable objects. Such grandstanding is evident in Jan Davidzoon de Heem’s *Still Life with Fruit and Lobster* (1648/9), for example, which demonstrates the sheer extent of the owner's wealth and trade network through the objects it depicts: golden chalices, luxury fabrics and fabulous quantities of expensive food (Appendix 2.2).

Nevertheless, as explained in Simon Schama’s *The Embarrassment of Riches* (1991), such luxury and its celebration were deeply problematic within the context of Christian ideology. Indeed, it was argued that an inseparable relationship exists between luxury and sin, as can clearly be perceived in John Calvin's *Commentary on Isaiah* (n.d. 2.12):

'Riches bring self-indulgence, and superfluity of pleasures produces flabbiness as we can see in wealthy regions and cities (where there are merchants) [...] Therefore, because wealth is generally the mother of extravagance [...] the Jews brought God's judgement upon themselves by the lavish way they decorated their houses'.

From the Late Middle Ages, still life art was therefore conventionally employed to communicate such theological theories and moralising messages. The most notable and enduring of these didactic tropes are perhaps the *Vanitas* or *Memento Mori*. Within this tradition, worldly goods and treasures were often depicted in a state of disorder or decay alongside skulls, hourglasses, dead or dying flora, etc. (See Appendix 2.3, for examples). These images functioned as a reminder of death and encouraged the viewer to focus on spiritual fulfilment, rather than the decadence and impermanence of the material world. The genre was therefore seen to communicate primarily through a complex system of 'disguised symbolism' (Schneider, p.17), but this high-mindedness is only a part of a still life's actual effect. Overall, the display of traditional still life objects (and the luxurious
paintings themselves) served, paradoxically, to establish both the wealth and moral superiority of the owner.

For me, however, the ostentatious display which we find, for instance, in Willam Kalf’s *Still Life with Nautilus Cup* (1662) (Appendix 2.4) is intensely problematic, not because of its unchristian materialism, but because it is inextricably connected to the hidden realities of European colonial expansion. In this context, conventional still life objects like exotic fruit, shells, flowers, and even oriental rugs, are fundamentally political. This moral issue is, however, regularly overlooked, and even when Bryson (1990) and Schneider (1994) allude to the impact of European colonialism on the still life genre, they do so only to comment on allegorical issues and remain uncritical of the origins of these luxury goods. Schneider, for example, merely describes how sugar from the New World began to usurp honey as a symbol of ‘spiritual sweetness’ (Schneider, 1994 p.89) while ‘corn cob’ from the Americas became ‘a symbol of the growing Christian faith’ (ibid. p.198). In stark contrast to this, my photographic projects draw attention not to spiritual issues or hidden symbolism, which are generally perceived to be the main substance of still life imagery, but to the economic and cultural origins of objects.

This focus is evident throughout the project, but can be seen most readily in the texts which accompany the each photograph in the *Souvenirs* catalogue. The following North American example is typical (Appendix 1.3):

**Canadian Inuksuk**

The earliest examples of inuksuk consist of a single large upright stone. For many peoples of the Arctic, these are navigation markers, or indicators of stored supplies, fishing points and trade routes. Human-shaped inuksuk proliferated after the arrival of European Missionaries.

Made in China: $7.50
This souvenir inuksuk, a typical piece of ‘Canadiana’, is thus shown to be a product of historical, contemporary, local and international factors. Additionally, it is implied that an inuksuk is at least as much –if not more- about its purpose as it is about aesthetic appearance or style, and nor is it seen as an immutable artifact. As a collection, therefore, Souvenirs serves to emphasize the material conditions which originate each souvenir, problematize our reading of tourist keepsakes in general, and encourages a more critical and historically-aware response to the souvenir arrangements presented in the Cabinets series (Appendix 1.1). In light of this information, these still life arrangements discourage a reading based on abstracted symbolism, spiritual concerns, or the mere display of ‘special’ objects.

On a purely aesthetic level, the works of seventeenth-century painters like Jan Davidszoon de Heem, Jacob Vosmaer, and Willam Kalf in particular, are key influences (Appendix 2.4 and 2.5). My use of precise arrangements, perspective and looming black space -to focus attention and emphasise the rich colours of my subject matter -originates from my appreciation of their paintings. Furthermore, the majority of my photographs are studio-lit in a way which alludes to the style of the Old Masters’ paintings, and each photograph is taken on a either a Nikon D800 or a digital Hasselblad. This technology is preferred specifically because the style of still life painting which I aim to reference is meticulous, and so large-scale, highly-detailed image production is appropriate as it helps to emphasize parallels between the images and claim parity of significance for my subject matter.

In fact, within contemporary still life photography there are many artists who continue find inspiration from seventeenth-century still life creations. Kevin Best (2010), Ori Gersht (2006, 2007) and Evelyn Hofer (1997) have all produced high-quality images which, stylistically and aesthetically, echo traditional renaissance painting. However, while Best and Hofer’s images are visually superb, they generally lack an identifiable new concept (Appendix 2.6). Consequently, they appear to be mere technical exercises that complacently reproduce the
values of the past and turn a blind eye to the unique concerns of the present. This tendency for still life art to appear detached from contemporary political concerns is something which I strive to address in my creative practice.

Gersht's *Blow Up* (2007) and *Pomegranate* (2006), however, appropriate the language of traditional still life in order to dramatically subvert our expectations and question the nature of the genre itself (Appendix 2.7). In her review of his work, Kim Bell (2011) interprets Gersht's images of exploding fruit and flower arrangements as 'a rejection of the genre's loyalty to objects' (a loyalty which Bryson previously celebrated as an 'assault on the prestige of the human subject' (1990, p.61)). Whether we agree with Bryson’s opinion that still life’s *anti*-anthropocentrism has important benefits, or with Bell’s suggestion that object-gazing might neglect or be indifferent to some aspects of human experience, both arguments highlight the genre’s fixation with material culture and suggest that the omission of human presence is of considerable consequence. For this reason, and despite conspicuous differences in theme and concept, Ori Gersht’s work serves as one of my major influences, in the sense that he subtly foregrounds issues of human suffering and human agency.

Conversely, a lot of traditional still life art has been (and continues to be) intentionally distant, holding the viewer at arm’s length both spatially and symbolically. Indeed, Bryson (1990) even identifies the inclusion of the table’s front edge in an image to signify that the objects depicted are removed beyond the viewer’s reach. Other painters like Adrian van der Spelt (1658) and Wolfgang Heimbach (c.1660) depicted a more obvious barrier in the form of a curtain and a window, and this highlights how the still life genre is preoccupied with issues of ownership, property and control (Appendix 2.8). Gersht’s photographs in *Blow Up* (2007) and *Pomegranate* (2006), on the other hand, break this myth of untouchability and distance in dramatic fashion, and the nature of this traditional ‘hands-off’ dynamic is something which I critically engage with in my *New Colonial* series, too. In contrast to Ori Gersht, however, my photographic project does not involve interacting with or doing violence to my objects (instead, it is my belief that such cultural souvenirs are already the victims and symbols of violence).

In fact, by having the tourist souvenirs presented in cabinets, locked display cases or high up
on presentation shelves, my photographs in *Curiosities* deliberately emphasise the still life tradition of 'you can look, but you cannot touch', and draw attention to the abnormal context of display. Moreover, the incongruity of having such items as, for example, an Egyptian scarab amulet and a Mayan calendar on show in a British living room poses questions about the social and cultural (in)significance of these possessions, and suggests a parallel between the Renaissance display of colonial goods and the display of contemporary travel souvenirs.

The work of the postcolonial scholar Edward Said is especially important in understanding the phenomenon of tourist souvenirs. In *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (1995), he discusses the ways in which the West dominates and has authority over the East through a mode of representation which he calls Orientalism. He describes this as a 'discourse' through which the non-European is perpetually represented as the inferior 'Other'. Key to his theory, then, is the belief that the idea of the East was practically invented by Europe, as it 'construct[ed] for itself an object of knowledge called the Orient' to thereby assume and maintain power over it (Childs and Williams, 1997, p.100). Drawing broadly on this theory of representation and power, my exploration of tourist souvenirs suggests that, owing to the global rise of mass tourism, folk culture in general is now universally subject to a process and discourse similar to Orientalism.

Indeed, many souvenirs can be thought of as what Nicholas Mirzoeff terms ‘items of difference’ (2009 p.131). They are deemed interesting and selected as mementos precisely because they represent something about the host culture which is ‘Other’ and so can be used to ‘retell’ the culture back home (Mirzoeff 2009, p.134 and Bunn 2000, p.241). As with Said’s Orientalism, then, the souvenirs both produce and maintain a ‘knowable’, highly-simplified understanding of a folk culture, regardless of whether that culture is Eastern or Western.

An Orientalist discourse has been identified in many seventeenth-century still-life paintings, which are said to represent the East in shockingly simplified terms as 'exotic', 'luxurious' and 'sensual'. I believe, however, that the tourist souvenir is now one of the primary vehicles for the proliferation of Orientalism. A real-life example perhaps illustrates why: having spent
several months working for a non-governmental organization in Nigeria, an Englishman returned home carrying two souvenirs: a ceremonial spirit mask and an imitation Fulani bow. These items have been chosen as symbols of a rich heterogeneous culture, and transmit very specific ideas about Nigeria and Africa in general (perhaps that it is 'mysterious', 'wild' and 'dangerous'). By photographing the spirit mask in its new context, and its (debased) role as a memento, *New Colonial* poses questions about the meaning of souvenirs and the way in which tourists seek to purchase and remember an 'authentic' cultural experience which perhaps never existed.

John Urry’s concept of the ‘Tourist Gaze’ (2002) is especially useful here. According to Urry, ‘the tourist gaze’ is about ‘expectations and anticipation’ (2002, p.3). Specifically, the collective effect of the mass media means that individuals travel abroad with a preconceived idea of what the host culture is like and the things which they want to experience while away from home. The tourist gaze, then, is concerned with ‘the collection of signs’, so when English visitors see a dashiki-clothed Nigerian man making wood carvings, what they capture in the gaze is timeless, primitive and authentic Africa (2002, p.3). Many of the souvenirs photographed in *New Colonial* are therefore a record of signs collected by the tourist gaze. For example, the scarab amulet (Appendix 1.4) is a potent sign of ‘mysterious’ and ‘superstitious’ Egypt, while the love spoon (Appendix 1.5) signifies ‘twee’ and ‘rural’ Wales.

In light of Urry and Said’s theories of representation, it is also crucially important that my images of foreign cultural artefacts attempt to avoid contributing to the discourse of Orientalism or feeding the tourist gaze. *Souvenirs*, the accompanying catalogue-style collection of images, functions therefore to both highlight and problematize this process. It provides an overview of the kinds of objects used as mementos and encourages the viewer to question why these objects might have been chosen for this purpose while other objects were not. My belief is that, by compiling a selection of images showing what souvenirs European people brought home from their travels, the viewer will reflect as much on what this reveals about the nature of being a tourist, as on what the souvenirs say about the country of origin. In addition to this, my use of text to describe such things as an item’s cultural origins, the context in which it was bought, and the materials used, might, also, help
to suggest how the tourist market is a warping presence. The word 'souvenir' might then become a synonym for reduction, simplification, and cultural commodification.

In fact, within the contemporary field of Tourism Studies, numerous scholars have written about the potentially negative consequences of tourism on the host culture (see, for example, Franklin 2003; Page and Connell 2009; Palmer 1994; Urry 2002). Research has found evidence that traditional ways of life can be almost completely wiped out and replaced by a profitable service economy (Page and Connell 2009), expectations of ‘the tourist gaze’ can oblige natives to pander to stereotypes in order to subsist (Palmer 1994), and previously significant cultural artefacts can be turned into endlessly (re)produced money-making commodities. It is this commodification of culture engendered by (or for) the tourist dollar which underpins the central argument of my photographic practice.

One of the ways in which the impact of global tourism and the media can best be understood, however, is through an understanding of Jean Baudrillard’s theory of Simulacra (1981). This describes the ways in which signs have taken on new significance in post-modern society, and are now being substituted for the real itself. For example, we understand different cultures through representations in books, photographs, magazines and television programs, and so tourists look for these fictive signs as proof of a genuine experience, rather than experiencing a foreign culture ‘naturally’. According to Baudrillard, the ‘media’ and ‘contemporary consumer culture’ (Leitch et al. 2001) are morally culpable because, as we now understand the world through images, we expect the real world to live up to these fake representations.

The idea of media-influenced simulacra underpins my photographic exploration of tourism as a form neo-colonialism. In fact, many of the souvenir items which I photographed are now mass-produced specifically for the tourist market and, in the wake of this economic pressure, it is common for the ostensibly traditional items to be cheaper, less refined versions which make use of non-traditional materials (Hitchcock 2000, p.12). Additionally, the tourist gaze would likely ignore anything it regards as ‘modern’ (i.e. ‘inauthentic’) or which otherwise defies its preconceived expectations, and so the types of souvenirs which are often bought represent, according to Stanley (2000, p.245), a fossilised view of culture. In a sense, therefore, some (if not all) of my photographs can be read as representations of
representations, as the original no longer exists. To illustrate this point, one might consider the mass-produced Welsh love spoons which have long ceased to be made by would-be suitors (Appendix 1.5). Furthermore, from a Baudrillian perspective, the photographic medium has long been complicit in the creation of simulacra, and I believe it is therefore fitting that photography should be used in an attempt to readdress the problem.

Moreover, the tension between the souvenirs’ status as both debased simulacra and cultural treasures, or as desirable objects and vehicles of orientalism, positions my photography in dialogue with the traditional categorisations of ‘megalography’ and ‘rhopography’. Charles Sterling (1981) explains that in still life painting megalography is ‘the depiction of those things in the world which are great’ (luxury goods) while rhopography depicts ‘things which lack importance [...and relate to] the ordinary business of daily living’ (such as a humble meal). Seventeenth-century Dutch still life painters like Pieter Claeszoon (Appendix 2.9) gloried in ennobling and transforming rhopographic subject matter through technical excellence and the uniqueness of personal vision (Arden 1998). My photographic arrangements in New Colonial, however, can be said to expose the problems of such a binary distinction. The rhopographic 'ennobling' of tourist mementos (both through their being put on display and then photographed in a way which is aesthetically appealing) is, paradoxically, a form of degradation, as it banishes use and meaning, leaving only appearance and material value. In engaging with this paradox through my photographs, it became apparent that, in a world beset with advertising imagery, it has become somewhat difficult to aestheticize the ordinary in still life photography without simultaneously evoking notions of financial value.

With this in mind, the visual style that I employed in Souvenirs is purposefully tailored to evoke and explore specific cultural and historical connotations. The catalogue shows each tourist souvenir photographed separately against a solid black background. Every item is studio-lit in a way to suggest a high-quality product photograph (Appendix 2.10), and the very act of presenting the images in the form of a catalogue conjures ideas of consumerism and desire. Perhaps even more importantly, however, my photographic style is also highly reminiscent of the kind of images currently produced for museum catalogues and websites (See, for example, Appendix 2.11).
While the examples provided in the Appendix 2.10 and 2.11 overstate the similarities through a carefully chosen sample, there nevertheless remains an interesting relationship between the two photographic worlds. In fact, there appears to have been a significant change in the style of museum photography in recent years. Looking back at what might be called the 'old academic style' (Appendix 2.12), it is evident that there was a greater tendency to employ flat lighting and to depict the object more neutrally or even as a document (sometimes the items are actually photographed within their display cases). In comparison, many modern museum images are more dynamic and glamorous, as they utilise a dramatic style of lighting that seems first to have been employed in the retail/commercial field, and then appropriated by the museum industries.

The aesthetic parallel between product and contemporary museum imagery is an aspect of contemporary still life photography which is both unsurprising and highly revealing. It shows how museums –'the "temples" of our material culture' –might be working to transform history into a mere stockpile of things we would like to own (Jennings 2012). Even if it is not the case that one is to anticipate owning the glamourized, 'sacred original', then highly-aestheticized imagery might lead us to the museum gift shop to vicariously share in the glamour through its replicas and legion postcards. Indeed, Michael Hitchcock’s study of souvenir culture revealed that when buying souvenirs abroad ‘tourists orient themselves by museum collections’ (2000, p.5). By tacitly referencing this relationship, my photographic project is an attempt to highlight issues of materialism, and, as museum catalogues normally show items which are obsolete (or even from extinct civilizations), there is also an implicit suggestion that these souvenirs might herald the end of the cultural practices they denote. This is especially pertinent if one accepts Linda Nochlin’s claim that ‘only on the brink of destruction, in the course of incipient modification and cultural dilution, are customs, consumes, and religious rituals [etc. …] seen as picturesque’, which cultural souvenirs undoubtedly are (1991, p.50).

A further inspiration for my particular photographic style was taken from Raphael Dallaporta's *Antipersonnel* (2004). In this series, Dallaporta photographed a wide variety of landmines in such a way as to make them appear to be beautiful, luxurious items (Appendix 2.13). Ellen Wallace's (2004) review of his photographs describes them in the following way:
'Simply framed, starkly displayed [...] they are at first sight remarkable for their aesthetic value.

View five and wonder at the art, view two more and shivers start to go down your spine as the realization sinks in'.

This double impact, which is achieved through emphasising a contrast between appearance and purpose, is something which Dallaporta inspired me to integrate in several of my own projects. Usually, this is achieved through the use of text alongside an image which produces a double reading. In Souvenirs, in particular, a short factual statement about the souvenir is intended to puncture any instinctive reaction to view the cultural artefacts as potential acquisitions or to appreciate them solely at an aesthetic level (See Appendix 1.6).

The significance of this text, the catalogue presentation, and the museum aesthetic, all bring issues of ‘framing’ to the foreground. Henrietta Lidchi (1997, p.165), for example, argues that meaning is not innate and that ‘the value of objects resides in the meaning that they are given -the way they are encoded’. Therefore, considering the way in which all of the souvenirs are isolated culturally, spatially and temporally from the context of their origin and production, it would be impossible to make them signify in the same way for a British viewer as they might for the originator. Owning to this, my project deliberately avoids making any claims to the truth and attempts to provide a balanced commentary on how they are traditionally seen and how they are currently used.

Another fundamental consideration which influences my work is related to the role of the viewer. Quite a large amount of what is written above belongs to the elusive world of authorial intention, but, as Roland Barthes argued, ‘the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author’ and ‘every text is eternally written [in the] here and now [of the viewer]’ (1968). This means that, regardless of my objectives, the eventual meaning of those images and the souvenirs depicted therein rests with the viewer, and so my photographs could potentially be complicit in reaffirming the Tourist Gaze. Nevertheless, while it might be impossible to control a viewer’s response, New Colonial tries to organise his/her experience of the images in such a way as to highlight the problems of representation which have been identified above. Specifically, the strangeness of the context of display in Curiosities; the satirical mirroring of cabinets of curiosities; the implicit
irony of the *Souvenir* catalogue; the information provided about way in which the items are currently made and sold in a tourist environment, and, finally, the title, *New Colonial*, all contribute to problematize the ostensibly innocuous culture of holiday mementos.

In summary, my on-going photographic practice originated from a personal desire to understand, and even expand upon, the complex relationship between the still life genre and colonialism. The images represent an attempt to highlight how issues of colonialism continue to influence our day-to-day existence, and to pose questions about how tourism and our interest in other cultures is caught up in issues relating to the commodification of culture. In wider terms, it is hoped, too, that the project successfully emphasises the validly and importance of the still life genre as a platform to address important human issues. As with all of the souvenirs I have photographed and documented, the still life genre deserves to be seen and experienced as something more than decorative.
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Appendix 1

1.1) Example cabinet of curiosity arrangement (and detail)

1.2) Example souvenirs

Chinese Dragon Mask  Bulgarian Martenitsa  Cameroonian Fertility Doll
Canadian Inuksuk

The earliest examples of inuksuk consist of a single large upright stone. For many peoples of the Arctic, these are navigation markers, or indicators of stored supplies, fishing points and trade routes. Human-shaped inuksuk proliferated after the arrival of European Missionaries.

Made in China: $7.50
H.6.5cm x W.4cm
Animal Bone

Andean Rainmaker

Said to evoke the rain spirits, the Rainmaker stick is used by numerous indigenous peoples across Latin America. It is traditionally made from hollowed-out cactus and decorated with symbols of the rain. Sold in Mexico and North America as a ‘novelty instrument’.

Made in Colombia: $9000
H.25cm x W.8cm
Bamboo

Cameroonian Fertility Doll

Dolls without clothes are used as children’s toys. When adorned, however, a doll is may become a surrogate baby for a woman who wants to become pregnant.

This doll came with an information sheet (in English) and a certificate of authenticity.
Made in Cameroon: $7.50
H.10cm x W.8cm
Treated Wood and Plastic Beads
Appendix 2

2.1)

Georg Haintz, *Wunderkammer*, 1666-1672
from Mauriès, P., 2011, p.48

Kunst-und Naturalienkammer at Halle, Germany.
from Mauriès, P., 2011, p.26

Anonymous, *Dell’historia naturale* (1599)
from Mauriès, P., 2011, p.10

2.2)

Jan Davidszoon de Heem, *Still Life with Fruit and Lobster* (1648/9)
2.3]

Pieter Claesz, *Vanitas Still Life* (1630)

Philippe Champaigne, *Vanitas* (c.1671)


2.4)

William Kalf, *Still Life with Nautilus Cup* (1662)
2.5)

Jacob Vosmaer, *A Vase with Flowers* (c.1618)

Jan Davidszoom de Heem, *Still Life with Fruit, Flowers, Glasses and Lobster* (c.1660)

2.6)


2.7)

Ori Gersht, Blow up No. 3 (2007)

Ori Gersht, Pomegranate (2006)

2.8)

Adrian Van Der Spelt, Flower Still-Life with Curtain (1658)

Wolfgang Heimbach, Woman Looking at a Table (c.1660)

2.9)

Pieter Claeszoon, Still Life with Pewter Pitcher, Mince Pie, and Almanac (c.1630)

Pieter Claeszoon, Still life with a glass of beer and smoked herring on a plate. (1636),
2.10)

David, J., *Untitled (Guitar Pedal)* (2013)  
Apple, *IPhone Titanium* (2009)

2.11)

*Mausoleum of Halikarnassos* (2007)  
*Mosaic mask of Quetzalcoatl* (2007)

2.12)

Williams, D., 1985  
Quirke, S., 1996.  
2.13)