### 2015 YCCSA SUMMER SCHOLARSHIP PROJECT SUBMISSION

This form is for prospective project supervisors to submit their projects to be included in the YCCSA Summer Scholarships Programme for 2015.

It is the purpose of the Summer School that any projects submitted are interdisciplinary in nature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>4/2/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Supervisor’s Name</td>
<td>Helen Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Supervisor’s Department</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-supervisors’ name(s) and Departments</td>
<td>Beatrice Demarchi Archaeology (BioArCh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Thinking Ornament Between Disciplines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Project Description | Within Archaeological Science specific ways of considering ornament have developed. These include the scientific (biomolecular) analyses of the materials constituting ornaments, from proteins trapped in shells for 150,000 years to elemental composition of pigments. Such analyses generate large databases, which supposedly reveal important information about ancient adornment. Frequently such interpretations are unchallenged, because of the aura of exactitude attributed to scientific data.

Within art history- particularly within architectural history, ‘decoration’ has occupied a subordinate position to ‘structure’. Thus ‘structure has long been privileged as more significant and as diagnostic marker of artistic ‘greatness’. ‘Decoration’ is seen as added on ‘afterwards’; structure has been seen (partly following art/ craft binary divisions) in terms of ‘masculinities’ and decoration as ‘feminine’ and ‘feminizing’. More recently however, architectural historians an theorists, including Jacques Derrida, Mark Wigley, Giuliana Bruno and others, have challenged these oppositions and their conventionalized treatment.

This project questions such assumptions and opens out the question of interpretation beyond this approach to those developed in History of Art and Architecture. However, we want to mobilize scientific approaches to enrich and question orthodoxies that have arisen in art historical conventions. Thus the project permits an opportunity to trace how conventions in Archaeological Science and Art History have developed and in what ways they criss-cross, overlap and diverge. |
The student may choose one artefact (building, cave, or body adornment for example) in relation to questions and practices from apparently divergent fields. The choice of topic and approach is completely open, but will be chosen in collaboration with the two supervisors. We are happy to accommodate materials and topics posited by the student, but can also make suggestions based on our expertise in the following fields: biochemistry and analytical chemistry, prehistory (including issues of status, gender, labour division, cognitive evolution), art history and theory, spatiality, architectural and urban history and theory, 15thC-18thC European visual culture and religion, gender and sexuality, feminism and social class.

### Required skills
This might be of particular interest to students with interests in or across any of the following areas: archaeology, art history, architecture, history, philosophy, gender & sexuality, sociology, anthropology, religious studies, biology, medicine, feminism.

### Project dates
Both supervisors will be available throughout the summer, except short absences.

### Other information
This is an exciting opportunity for a student to explore the relationships of disciplinary conventions and to challenge assumptions that develop and become conventionalized within disciplines and fields, particularly assumptions about the usefulness of scientific language and disciplinary paradigms applied to ‘decoration’ and ‘ornament’.

### References
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When complete, please email the form to sarah.christmas@york.ac.uk