

The concept of intersectionality emerged in the 1980s in the context of Black feminism and critical race theory (CRT). Since then, intersectionality – which describes interacting forms of discrimination and perspectives on them and refers to both a theoretical approach and a political practice – has established itself as a travelling concept throughout the disciplines and fields of action of the social sciences and humanities.¹ Intersectionality is generally dedicated to identifying and combating social injustice. In the course of its dissemination, museums and exhibitions have also been opened up as intersectional terrain. In interaction with critical exhibition practices, approaches in museology and curatorial studies are creating a growing awareness of existing multidimensional discrimination in this field and, at the same time, developing solutions to overcome it.² Demands for diversified and appropriate (re)presentation, accessibility and mediation are increasing, as are reflexive interventions and structural reforms. At the same time, social resistance to these very changes is forming. It ranges from tactical obfuscation and symbolic appeasement, pinkwashing, and tokenism, to program and budget cuts, and cultural-political influence in conjunction with conservative to fascistic counter-movements. This issue ties in with this current, tense situation and asks whether and to what extent intersectionality, as a phenomenon and as an analytical perspective, must not only be seen in the present, but can also be applied retrospectively to art exhibitions. In doing so, it deliberately places this fluid concept in an exhibition-historical context.

Intersectionality ...

The history of the term intersectionality began concretely in the late 1980s, when the Black American lawyer Kimberlé Crenshaw coined it in her groundbreaking essay *Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex. A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine* (1989).³ With the concept of intersectionality, she sought to make visible the multiple, interwoven forms of discrimination and social inequalities to which Black women are subjected on the basis of the categories of race and gender ascribed to them. She introduced the vivid metaphor of the street intersection – an image that illustrates the convergence of forms of discrimination such as sexism and racism and the associated risk of harm, while also raising questions about the particularism and universalism of claims to protection.⁴ However, if intersectionality is understood in a substantive rather than a literal sense, its history can be traced back in many different ways. Long before they came to be conceptualized in theoretical terms, the struggles were carried out within social movements. When Crenshaw coined the term, she explicitly acknowledged Black feminists such

as Sojourner Truth and Anna Julia Cooper, who in the 19th and early 20th centuries had already highlighted the double discrimination of Black women on the basis of gender and race.⁵ These early critiques of *white* feminism form a central line of flight that is anchored in social movements and extends to the Black feminist struggles of the 1970s and 1980s in the United States, for example in the socialist-influenced Combahee River Collective and its associated figure Audre Lorde as well as central protagonists such as Toni Morrison, Alice Walker, Angela Davis, and bell hooks.⁶ Through diverse political and historical analyses grounded in anti-racist social critique, these debates reveal a common goal: not merely to empower women of color, but to intervene in social conditions in a transformative way.⁷

The concept of intersectionality now resonates far beyond Crenshaw's legal focus on Black and female-read people. By broadening its categories to include class, sexual orientation, age, religion, and disability, it serves as a «contextualized analysis of social injustice» in many disciplines and fields of practice, promising to address their «differences and heterogeneity».⁸ Its scope thus encompasses «social structures, institutions, symbolic systems of order, representations, norms, social practices, and subject formations».⁹ However, the use of the term remains controversial. Transformative and emancipatory approaches are contrasted with identity-based and liberal ones.¹⁰ In addition to the possibly inadequate road intersection metaphor, areas of friction include the *white* academic or Eurocentric appropriation of the concept; its status – as a metaphor, discourse, theory or even paradigm; the methodologies associated with it; the definition, weighting, and interpretation of categories of discrimination – as ontological or historical, context-specific or transferable.¹¹ Precisely because of the controversial debates surrounding it, the popularity of the concept of intersectionality also requires historical and systematic reflection from the perspective of our field of research, without reducing the discussion to the absolutization of a particular theory, method or practice.¹²

... and exhibition history

From our point of view, art-historical exhibition history is particularly suited to this cause, since it has been investigating the material, institutional, and cultural conditions under which art becomes public for some four decades – whether through analyses of the art exhibition as a form, as a practice, or through consideration of the art exhibited – and thus takes a fundamentally socio-historical perspective. Since its inception, this field of work has been linked to an art history that developed in the 1970s, in the «new art history» as a «social history of art» (T. J. Clark) and in the West German context of the Ulmer Verein (with Jutta Held, Martin Warnke and Detlef Hoffmann) from a materialist Marxist perspective, to name but two striking examples. In addition to the production of art, the focus shifted to the ways in which it is presented, the conditions under which it is published and how it is mediated.¹³ At the latest since the 1960s, however, the powerful means, politics, and conditions of exhibiting have been the subject of institutional critique from within the arts themselves. The critical questioning of the art and exhibition business through artistic strategies by, among others, Hans Haacke and Mierle Laderman Ukeles, as well as activist-artist associations such as Where We At and the Art Workers Coalition, laid the foundations on which an art-historical exhibition history could be built. In this issue we follow an understanding of exhibition history as part of the outlined social history of art, which takes into account not only the contexts and historical

conditions of the publication of art, but also the relations and conditions of the production of exhibitions.

Since then, however, the boundaries of exhibition history have been fluid, permeated by concepts, tools, and impulses from related disciplines, especially museology, curatorial studies, and critical art and exhibition practice.¹⁴ Against the backdrop of a global expansion of this field of work, various tendencies are currently at odds with each other: a canonical one that perpetuates a *white*, male-dominated «Western» art history; a revisionist current that reflexively questions and extends this; and scattered corrective studies that are not necessarily connected to each other or to established exhibition histories. Such «area studies» focus on historical exhibitions that have not yet been adequately addressed, examining aspects such as race, geographical location, gender or sexual orientation.¹⁵ Exhibitions by women or gender non-conforming, African-American or Asian artists, as well as LGBTQIA+ art, are thus academically analyzed.¹⁶ In most cases, a category of discrimination, such as gender, geographical marginalization or sexual orientation, is the guiding principle for the focus. However, as early as 2010, the cultural studies scholar Simon Sheikh, among others, noted in his examination of canonization processes that additive methods do not solve the dilemma of representation in exhibition history either. Instead, he provocatively argued for the abolition of the canon in favor of a «conceptual» exhibition history.¹⁷ The conceptual historian Reinhart Koselleck, to whom Sheikh refers, understands concepts as linguistically formulated experiences that store and shape historical realities of life.¹⁸ Accordingly, they are inextricably linked to social history, to the structures, practices, and experiences, as well as to class relations, social movements, and institutions that shape societies over time.

Against this backdrop, we ask whether intersectionality, as a *concept grounded in social history* in this sense, can become a productive term for exhibition history in both its literal *and* substantive understanding – a term that not only questions the consolidation of existing canons, but also avoids a particularization of this field of work. Can intersectionality contribute to critically questioning consensus-building processes while at the same time raising awareness of the gaps that arise when definitions are based exclusively on a single category?

Exhibition history – intersectional?

Many attempts at defining (art) exhibitions link them to socio-political conditions, not only in the present, but since the beginnings of modernity and the developments of the 20th century. This is done in contexts that anchor the (art) exhibition in the capitalist, imperial, and colonial project of European modernity. In the course of the emergence of a bourgeois public sphere, it is described as a disciplining apparatus of power that shapes and legitimizes self-perception and the perception of others through the generation and visualization of knowledge, for example in the interest of nation-building (Tony Bennett after Michel Foucault); as a social ritual that habitualizes modes of distance by removing exhibits from their original contexts of meaning (Dorothea von Hantelmann); and as a contact zone where cultures collide and conflicts are played out – a phenomenon inextricably linked to the continuities of the historical, asymmetrical power relations of colonialism and slavery (after Mary Louise Pratt).¹⁹ Since at least the 1960s, other approaches have attested to the self-reflexive and transformative qualities of (art) exhibitions, which are the basis of their aesthetic *and* social effectiveness: as an (institutional) critical – artistic or

curatorial – form that addresses its own conditionality and situatedness (James Timothy Voorhies; Tristan Garcia/Vincent Normand); as a bracketing that interrupts practical contexts and opens them up for renegotiation (Kathrin Busch/Burkhardt Meltzer/Tido von Oppeln); as a meaning-producing and actionable relational context (Beatrice von Bismarck; Nora Sternfeld/Luisa Ziaja).²⁰ What these approaches have in common is that they ascribe to the (art) exhibition a role in the production, representation, reflection or negotiation of social relations.

If we now transfer intersectionality as a concept to exhibition history, the specific social anchoring of the art exhibition can come to the fore in the analysis: its ability to reinforce or invalidate social inequalities. In the exhibition mode, too, intersectionality refers to the phenomenon of intertwined forms of discrimination on the one hand, and to the strategies for making them visible and overcoming them on the other. We therefore propose not only to examine current or historical art exhibitions that themselves take into account or address intersecting mechanisms of discrimination and oppression, but also to understand intersectionality as a constitutive phenomenon of art exhibitions – that is, to examine how such mechanisms of power are reproduced within them.

This concern is linked to the question of possible methodological approaches. Intersectionality was launched with the aim of «systematically» questioning and refuting «essentialist ideologies of homogeneous actuality, such as social categories» in their interaction, and examining the respective relationships between the categories.²¹ Research into exhibition history that takes up intersectionality could therefore draw on a relationship-theoretical method.

In her 2017 publication *Beziehungswise Revolution. 1917, 1968 und kommende*, Bini Adamczak analyzes *Beziehungsweisen* (modes of relationship) from a Marxist, anti-capitalist and queer-feminist perspective, not only through their actors, but also by focusing on the in-between and the conditions under which relations arise, exist, and are reproduced.²² In the context of art exhibitions, an analysis of modes of relationship could reveal the specific ways in which *intersectional* relations come into play.

At the beginning of the issue, we, the editors, discuss with Jeannine Tang the methodological challenges of combining intersectionality and exhibition history.²³ The authors' contributions provide insights into an intersectional exhibition historiography mostly by examining those exhibition contexts that derive a positive inclusion criterion from experiences or structures of intersectional discrimination: through contemporary case studies which, as Shirin Graf shows in her contribution on the exhibition *One Day We Shall Celebrate Again: RomaMoMA* at documenta fifteen (2022), critically destabilize ethno-cultural categories of identification based on multiple forms of social oppression, but also through historical case studies.²⁴ A case in point is the Marxist-feminist-informed exhibition *Working Women/Working Artists/Working Together*, curated by Candace Hill-Montgomery and Lucy R. Lippard at Gallery 1199 in New York City in 1982, whose experimental exhibition text we reprint here, with commentary by Fiona McGovern.²⁵ The exhibition featured collectively produced works by women artists, mostly women of color, and members of the left-wing workers' union District 1199, which was particularly committed to the concerns of Black and Latin American female hospital staff.²⁶ By addressing the impact of specific overlaps of class, gender, race, and other categories both within and outside the field of art, such exhibitions contribute to the elaboration of what

is now called intersectionality. Intersectional discrimination can thus be traced and understood in its expository interactions across historical structures.²⁷ In her contribution, Carina Engelke shows that the *Events* series organized by The New Museum in New York between 1980 and 1983 brought together various curatorial and artistic practices of multiply marginalized actors and local communities as a discursive exhibition event. Criteria of social exclusion became the occasion for a temporary institutionalization that took up the critique of activists and artists and briefly transferred it to the engine room of the art world.²⁸

The fact that even exhibitions that declare the institutionalized field of art to be the target of intersectional critique produce their own exclusions – an aspect that Silvia Cammarata highlights on the basis of the expository activities of the Guerrilla Girls and their ambivalences – is another central insight of an exhibition history that focuses on intersectionality.²⁹ This approach mistrusts a polarization of positive and negative discrimination and instead allows contradictions to be grasped where they materialize. By focusing not only on *one* category of identity or identification, in this case gender, but also on social belonging and political engagement, Clarissa Ricci anchors the exhibitions of women artists she examines in society.³⁰ By scrutinizing the participation of women artists and cultural workers in the Venice Biennale in the 1970s, Ricci reveals the connection between the case studies and a transnational history of feminisms in their relationship to left-wing movements. The third contribution to the debate series by the AG Kunstgeschichte mit links of the Ulmer Verein centers on exhibition history. By focusing on the relationship between art history and schooling, art education, and exhibition practice, it also connects directly with the theme of this issue. These sites of agency played a central role within leftist initiatives and discussions in West Germany following the 1968 uprisings. In the interview with the art historian Irene Below, the concerns of a critical and emancipatory approach to art education since the 1970s come to the fore – concerns that were closely tied to questions of class and accessibility to exhibitions.

This issue was preceded by a call for papers intended to ensure both historical and thematic breadth and to highlight the plurality of possible approaches. In November 2024, a workshop was held at the University of Applied Arts and the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna, which brought together most of the authors and aimed to create a common basis for discussion.³¹ In line with the academic socialization of the contributors, the examples discussed are predominantly located in the United States and Europe, and thus in regions of the Global North, where the concept of intersectionality continues to be widely discussed in academic contexts. Although the contributions are not only about balancing representations, but also about understanding structures, the compilation of the issue simultaneously points to gaps, to the situatedness of academic production and – at least it is hoped – reveals necessary future research perspectives. In this respect, we understand both the work of the authors and this journal issue itself as a contribution to current and historical debates – as part of a community of discussion that works to open up rather than confine situated perspectives and is dedicated to the question of how a social-historical exhibition history can be written under the sign of intersectionality.

Translation: Gérard Goodrow

- 1 Intersectionality can refer to «both the thing itself and the view of the thing, where the boundary between the two uses is fluid»; Katrin Meyer: *Theorien der Intersektionalität zur Einführung*, Hamburg 2017, p. 18 [translated]. For more on intersectionality as a «traveling theory» (after Edward Said), see, for example, Gudrun Axeli-Knapp: «Intersectionality» – ein neues Paradigma feministischer Theorie? Zur transatlantischen Reise von «Race, Class, Gender», in: *Feministische Studien* 23, 2005, no. 1, pp. 68–81.
- 2 Sonke Gau/Angeli Sachs/Thomas Sieber (eds.): *Museum und Ausstellung als gesellschaftlicher Raum. Praktiken, Positionen, Perspektiven*, Bielefeld 2024; Martina Griesser-Stermscheg et al. (eds.): *Widersprüche. Kuratorisch handeln zwischen Theorie und Praxis*, Berlin/Boston 2023; Katya García-Antón (ed.): *Art and Solidarity Reader. Radical Actions, Politics and Friendships*, Amsterdam 2022; Susanne Gaensheimer/Julia Hagenberg (eds.): *Wem gehört das Museum? Whose Museum is it? museum global – Perspektiven zur Kunstvermittlung. Perspectives on Art Education*, Cologne/Düsseldorf 2020.
- 3 Kimberlé Crenshaw: *Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex. A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics*, in: *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1, 1989, art. 8, pp. 139–167, <http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8>, last accessed on 5 May 2025; idem: *Mapping the Margins. Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color*, in: *Stanford Law Review* 43, 1991, no. 6, pp. 1241–1299. In this context, Crenshaw was explicitly referring to women. In light of this historical background, we are choosing not to use a more gender-inclusive language here.
- 4 For more on the legal perspective, see Eike Marten/Katharina Walgenbach: *Intersektionale Diskriminierung*, in: Albert Scherr/Anna Cornelia Reinhardt/Aladin El-Mafaalani (eds.): *Handbuch Diskriminierung*, 2nd ed., Wiesbaden 2023, pp. 132–145, esp. pp. 133–140. In order to overcome conceptual limitations, further alternative concepts such as «interdependencies» (Isabell Lorey), «trans-locational belongings» (Floya Anthias), and «assemblage» (Anna Amelina) have now been proposed; see Isabell Lorey: *Kritik und Kategorie. Zur Begrenzung politischer Praxis durch neuere Theoreme der Intersektionalität, Interdependenz und Kritischen Weißseinsforschung*, in: *transversal*, October 2008, https://transversal.at/transversal/0806/lorey/de#_ftn6, last accessed on 5 May 2025; Floya Anthias: *Translocational Belongings. Intersectional Dilemmas and Social Inequalities*, New York 2021; Anna Amelina: *Theorizing Large-Scale Societal Relations Through the Conceptual Lens of Cross-Border Assemblages*, in: *Current Sociology* 69, 2021, no. 3, pp. 352–371.
- 5 Crenshaw 1989 (as note 3), pp. 152, 160.
- 6 Meyer 2017 (as note 1), pp. 27–35. See esp. The Combahee River Collective: *A Black Feminist Statement* (1977), in: Zillah R. Eisenstein (ed.): *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*, New York 1979, pp. 362–372. See also Natasha A. Kelly (ed.): *Schwarzer Feminismus. Grundlagentexte*, Münster 2019; this volume brings together source texts by Black feminists since 1851 and documents both the continuity of intersectional inequalities and the growing references the authors make to one another. Nevertheless, it was Crenshaw who first made the concept visible to the *white* majority society; see *ibid.*, p. 12. The prehistory of intersectionality discourse also includes the theory of *triple oppression* – the triple oppression of colonized women – developed in the 1940s in Britain by the Pan-African communist Claudia Jones, which was later referenced in the early 1970s by the New York-based magazine *Triple Jeopardy*, the publication of the Third World Women's Alliance (TWWA). See Tom Holert: «Ca. 1972». *Gewalt – Umwelt – Identität – Methode*, Leipzig 2024, S. 95–96.
- 7 Since 1968, the (West) German women's movement has focused on the intersections of gender and class, while in the 1980s and 1990s, the reappraisal of colonial history and Audre Lorde's stays in Berlin increasingly brought Black German and diasporic perspectives into feminist discourse. Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodríguez explored these often overlooked beginnings of the German-language intersectionality debate; see *Intersektionalität oder: Wie nicht über Rassismus sprechen*, in: Sabine Hess/Nikola Langreiter/Elisabeth Timm (eds.): *Intersectionality revisited. Empirische, theoretische und methodische Erkundungen*, Bielefeld 2011, pp. 77–100. See also Sedef Gümen: *Geschlecht und Ethnizität in der bundesdeutschen und US-amerikanischen Frauenforschung*, in: *Texte zur Kunst*, 1994, no. 15, pp. 127–137; Meyer 2017 (as note 1), pp. 35–41.
- 8 Nikita Dhawan/María do Mar Castro Varela: *Postkoloniale Theorie. Eine kritische Einführung*, Bielefeld 2015, pp. 298–299 [translated].
- 9 Marten/Walgenbach 2023 (as note 4), p. 132 [translated].
- 10 The materialist Marxist critique of an identity-oriented, liberal understanding of intersectionality argues that the focus on identity differences obscures capitalist mechanisms of exploitation and individualizes social oppression because it views the subject as an intersection of different forms of discrimination, thereby reproducing neoliberal processes. See, for example, Marina Vishmidt: *Between Equal Rights: Representing Class and Other Struggles in the Image Field*, in: Malcolm Bull/Jacopo Galimberti: *Contemporary Art and Class. Reassessing an Analytical Category*, Oxford Art Journal 45, 2022, no. 2, pp. 307–323, here p. 311.

11 For more on the successive appropriation of the concept of intersectionality, see Helma Lutz: Intersectionality, in: Enzo Colombo/Paola Rebughini (eds.): *Framing Social Theory*, London/New York 2023, pp. 76–93, here pp. 80, 82; Nikita Dhawan/Maria do Mar Castro Varela: Intersektionalität und ihre Kritiker*innen. Postkoloniale Queer-Feministische Dilemmata, in: Anna Sabel/Natalia Amina Loinaz/Verband binationaler Familien und Partnerschaften (eds.): *(K)ein Kopftuchbuch. Über race-, Religions- und Geschlechterkonstruktionen und das, wovon Kopftuchdebatten ablenken*, Bielefeld 2023, pp. 39–63. Dhawan and Castro Varela warn against «overlooking the specifics of a given context» (ibid., p. 39) [translated]; for more on the transferability of analytical categories, see ibid., pp. 44; for a more general discussion of the status of the concept of intersectionality, see Meyer 2017 (as in note 1), pp. 122–127. The influential intersectionality researcher Patricia Hill Collins, for example, regards intersectionality as a «critical social theory» that analyses multiple forms of oppression and privilege in their interaction: Intersectionality as Critical Social Theory, Durham 2019. For more on the methodologies of intersectionality research, see Meyer 2017 (as note 1), pp. 108–119; for more on the status of the categories, see Lutz 2023 (as note 11), p. 78.

12 The *art-historical* reception of the intersectionality debate in general requires a separate investigation that goes beyond the scope of this issue. However, we feel it is important to emphasize here that in German-speaking art history, scholars began working on this topic around the time of the 6th Conference of Women Art Historians in Trier in 1995, though without explicitly referring to the term. In the introduction to the anthology *Projektionen. Rassismus und Sexismus in der Visuellen Kultur* (1997), which emerged from this conference, Viktoria Schmidt-Linsenhoff was the first to provide a historical and contemporary outline of the problem area for art history, which had long been excluded even by feminist-materialist art historians. It was only the criticism of Black feminists and women artists of color that broadened the «debates that Marxist and non-Marxist feminists had in the 1970s about the hierarchy of oppression based on class and gender», so that «identity-forming aspects such as sexual orientation, age, class, nation, ethnicity, religion, skin color, etc.» must no longer be understood «as additive additions to a gender identity grounded in the body», but rather as constitutive in their interaction. Viktoria Schmidt-Linsenhoff: Einleitung, in: Annetgreit Friedrich et al. (eds.): *Projektionen. Rassismus und Sexismus in der visuellen Kultur*, Marburg 1997, pp. 8–14; see also Hildegard Frübis/Edith Futscher (eds.): *Intersektionalität. Ungleichheiten im Gemein*, in: FKW. Zeitschrift für Geschlechterforschung, 2014, no. 56; as well as the issue of the Viennese magazine *Bildpunkt* on the topic of intersections, autumn 2021, no. 58.

13 See: Timothy James Clark: The Conditions of Artistic Creation, in: *Times Literary Supplement*, 24 May 1974, pp. 561–562; in the context of the Ulmer Verein, see the debate about the Historisches Museum Frankfurt, which reopened in 1972, Detlef Hoffmann/Almut Junker/Peter Schirmbeck (eds.): *Geschichte als öffentliches Ärgernis oder: Ein Museum für die demokratische Gesellschaft*, Fernwald 1974, and the interview with Irene Below by Isabelle Lindermann and Fiona McGovern in this issue, pp. 74–85. For more general information on the exhibition history of the Ulmer Verein, see Henrike Haug/Andreas Huth/Isabelle Lindermann: Mit links: Perspektiven einer kritischen Kunst- und Ausstellungsgeschichte, in: Sebastian Hammerschmidt/Kaja Ninnis/Charlotte Püttmann (eds.): *(De-)Politicising Art Studies. Marxist Traditions since 1968 (= Kunst und Politik. Jahrbuch der Guernica-Gesellschaft, vol. 27)*, Göttingen 2025, pp. 1–18.

14 For a survey of these, see Maria Bremer: Art-Historiographical Exhibition Analysis. Assessing the Role of Exhibitions in the Historiography of Art, in: Luise Reitstätter/Carla-Marinka Schorr (eds.): *Methods of Exhibition Analysis*, Bielefeld 2025 (forthcoming); Anke te Heesen: On the History of the Exhibition, in: *Representations* 141, 2018, no. 1, pp. 59–66; Felix Vogel: On the Canon of Exhibition History, in: Ruth Iskin (ed.): *Re-envisioning the Contemporary Art Canon. Perspectives in a Global World*, London/New York 2017, pp. 189–202; Ana Bogdanović/Maria Bremer: Expanding the Field of Art History. Entanglements with Exhibition History, in: *Zbornik Matice Srpske za likovne umetnosti*, 2016, no. 44, pp. 249–259; Linda Boersma/Patrick van Rossem: Rewriting or Reaffirming the Canon? Critical Readings of Exhibition History. Editorial, in: *Stedelijk Studies* 2, 2015, <https://stedelijkstudies.com/journal/rewriting-or-reaffirming-the-canon-critical-readings-of-exhibition-history/>, last accessed on 8 May 2025; Luisa Ziaja: Ausstellungsgeschichten. Ansätze der Historisierung im Kunstfeld, in: ARGE Schnittpunkt (ed.): *Handbuch Ausstellungstheorie und -praxis*, Vienna et al. 2013, pp. 23–36; Teresa Gleadowe: Inhabiting Exhibition History, in: *The Exhibitionist* 4, 2011, pp. 24–30; Julian Myers: On the Value of a History of Exhibitions, in: ibid., pp. 24–28; Christian Rattemeyer: What History of Exhibitions?, in: ibid., pp. 35–39. Exhibition history is not only produced academically, but also by exhibitions themselves; see Beatrice von Bismarck: *Curatorial Histories, Entangled Forms*, in: idem/Rike Frank (eds.): *Off(f) Our Times. Curatorial Anachronics*, Berlin 2019, pp. 82–89.

15 Maura Reilly coined the term «area studies», but referred to curatorial strategies, not exhibition history studies; idem: What is Curatorial Activism?, in: *Curatorial Activism. Towards an Ethics of Curating*, London 2018, pp. 17–33, here pp. 25–29.

16 Catherine Dossin/Hanna Alkema: *Women Artists Shows-Salons-Societies. Towards a Global*

- History of All-Women Exhibitions, in: Artl@s Bulletin 8, 2019, no. 1, art. 19, pp. 5–13, <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/artlas/vol8/iss1/19/>, last accessed on 8 May 2025; John Tain (ed.): *Uncooperative Contemporaries. Art Exhibitions in Shanghai in 2000, Cologne/London 2020 (Exhibition Histories)*; Nana Adusei-Poku (ed.): *Reshaping the Field. Arts of the African Diasporas on Display, Cologne/London 2022 (Exhibition Histories)*; Bas Hendrikx (ed.): *Queer Exhibition Histories*, Amsterdam 2023.
- 17** Simon Sheikh: *On the Standard of Standards, or, Curating and Canonization*, in: *Manifesta Journal* 11, 2010/11, pp. 13–18, here p. 18.
- 18** Reinhardt Koselleck: *Sprachwandel und Ereignisgeschichte*, in: *Merkur*, 1 August 1989, no. 486, <https://www.merkur-zeitschrift.de/1989/08/01/sprachwandel-und-ereignisgeschichte/>, last accessed on 8 May 2025.
- 19** Tony Bennett: *The Exhibitionary Complex*, in: *New Formations*, 1988, no. 4, pp. 73–102; idem: *Exhibition, Truth, Power. Reconsidering 'The Exhibitionary Complex'*, in: Quinn Latimer/Adam Szymczyk (eds.): *The documenta 14 Reader*, Munich/London/New York 2017, pp. 339–400; Dorothea von Hantelmann: *Art Institutions as Ritual Spaces. A Brief Genealogy of Gatherings*, in: Tristan Garcia/Vincent Normand (eds.): *Theater, Garden, Bestiary. A Materialist History of Exhibitions*, Berlin 2019, pp. 251–258; idem/Carolin Meister (eds.): *Die Ausstellung. Politik eines Rituals*, Zurich/Berlin 2010; Mary Louise Pratt: *Imperial Eyes. Travel Writing and Transculturation*, London/New York 1992; James Clifford: *Museums as Contact Zones*, in: idem (ed.): *Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*, Harvard 1997, pp. 188–219; most recently, Thomas Sieber: *Erkundungen in der Kontaktzone. Zur konstitutiven Konflikthaftigkeit von Museen und Ausstellungsinstitutionen*, in: *Gau/Sachs/Sieber 2024* (as note 2), pp. 59–71.
- 20** James Timothy Voorhies: *Beyond Objecthood. The Exhibition as a Critical Form since 1968*, Cambridge, Mass. 2017; Tristan Garcia/Vincent Normand: *Introduction*, in: Garcia/Normand 2019 (as note 19), pp. 11–23; Kathrin Busch/Burkhardt Meltzer/Tido von Oppeln: *Vorwort*, in: idem (eds.): *Ausstellen. Zur Kritik der Wirksamkeit in den Künsten*, Zurich/Berlin 2016, pp. 7–10; Beatrice von Bismarck: *Das Kuratorische*, Leipzig 2021, esp. p. 29; Nora Sternfeld/Luisa Ziaja: *What Comes After the Show? On Post-Representational Curating*, in: *OnCurating* 14, 2012, pp. 21–24.
- 21** Sophie Schasiepen/Jens Kastner: *weil die soziale Wirklichkeit komplex ist ... intersections im Gespräch mit Gln Bali und Paula-Irene Villa Braslavsky*, in *Bildpunkt*, 2021, no. 58, https://igbildendekunst.at/bildpunkt_/weil-die-soziale-wirklichkeit-komplex-ist/, last accessed on 8 May 2025 [translated].
- 22** Bini Adamczak: *Beziehungsweise Revolution. 1917, 1968 und kommende*, Frankfurt am Main 2017, p. 243. Her concept has already been taken up to some extent in curatorial studies, particularly in the endeavor to grasp the relational dimension of curatoriality; see Bismarck 2021 (as note 20), p. 43.
- 23** pp. 19–25.
- 24** pp. 63–73.
- 25** Lucy R. Lippard/Candace Hill-Montgomery: *Working Women/Working Artists/Working Together*, in: *Woman's Art Journal* 3, 1982, no. 1, pp. 19–20; reprinted here, pp. 26–29, with a commentary by Fiona McGovern, pp. 30–32. We would like to thank the authors for their kind permission.
- 26** The exhibition followed on from earlier projects, such as *Women and Work. A Document of the Division of Labor in Industry*, presented by Mary Kelly, Kay Hunt, and Margaret Harrison at the South London Art Gallery in 1975; see Friederike Sigler: *Arbeit sichtbar machen. Strategien und Ziele in der Kunst seit 1970*, Munich 2021, pp. 79–88.
- 27** Approaches to reinterpreting historical phenomena from an intersectional perspective emerged in interdisciplinary alliances; see Barbara Leonardi (ed.): *Intersections of Gender, Class, and Race in the Long Nineteenth Century and Beyond*, Berlin 2018.
- 28** pp. 43–52.
- 29** pp. 53–62.
- 30** pp. 33–42.
- 31** We would like to thank our colleagues at the Institute of Art Theory and Cultural Studies at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna as well as Eva Kernbauer and her colleagues at the Department of Art History at the University of Applied Arts Vienna for their support of the workshop and the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna for the additional funding of this issue.