INTRODUCTION

Diagrams beyond Mere Tools

*Lukas Engelmann, Caroline Humphrey,
and Christos Lynteris*

Abstract: This special issue moves beyond an understanding of diagrams as mere inscriptions of objects and processes, proposing instead to re-evaluate diagrammatic reasoning as the work that is carried out with, on, and beyond diagrams. The introduction presents this issue's focus on 'working with diagrams' in a way that goes beyond semiotic, cognitive, epistemic, or symbolic readings of diagrams. It discusses recent research on diagrams and diagrammatic reasoning across disciplines and approaches diagrams as suspended between imagination and perception—as objects with which work is done and as objects that do work. Contributions to this issue probe diagrams for the work they do in the development of disciplinary theories, investigate their reworking of questions of time and scale, and ask how some diagrams work across fields and disciplines. Other authors shift the perspective to their own work with diagrams, reflecting on the practice and performative nature of diagrammatic reasoning in their respective fields and disciplines.

Keywords: diagram, diagrammatic reasoning, disciplines, visual devices, work

In a review of Bender and Marrinan's (2010) *The Culture of Diagram*, Martin Jay (2010–2011: 158) argues that there can be “no question that the role of the humble diagram in many different fields has been slowly earning recognition for some time.” From studies of evolutionary tree diagrams (Catley and Novick 2008; Gontier 2011), the use of diagrams in semiotics (Stjernfelt 2000), and analyses of their impact on Euclidean geometry (Miller 2007; Norman 2006) to visualizing Foucault's abstract machines (Deleuze 1988; Elmer 2003) or exploring Deleuze's philosophy (Knoespel 2001; Teyssot 2012; Zdebik 2012),

historians, philosophers, linguists, geographers, and science and technology studies (STS) scholars have over the past 20 years been dissecting and interrogating the diagrammatic heart of a number of sciences and disciplines. Of particular importance in these studies has been the examination of diagrams as epistemic images, which in the definition of Christoph Lüthy and Alexis Smets (2009: 399) refer to “any image that was made with the intention of expressing, demonstrating or illustrating a theory.”¹ At the same time, the interest shown by cognitive science in the nature of diagrammatic representations since Larkin and Simon’s (1987) classic paper on the subject has led to a proliferation of studies of ‘diagrammatic cognition’. In anthropology itself, new studies of the use of diagrams by both anthropologists (Bouquet 1996; Ingold 2007) and others (Bonelli 2015; Hallam 2008; Lynteris 2017) are markedly different from older reflections on the medium (e.g., Burr and Gerson 1965; Hage and Harary 1983) that took diagrams to simply be tools for visualizing data and data relations, but which could not in themselves add information. Moreover, as Matei Candea stresses in his contribution to this special issue, anthropologists have recently resumed their own use of diagrams “not simply as illustrations, but as key steps in argument.”

These new studies across the discipline approach diagrams in a new ontological space, where, as Lorraine Daston (2014: 320) has argued, “the distance between presentation and representation” is collapsed. Perhaps a famous literary parable summarizes this turn best. In Stefan Zweig’s ([1941] 2013) acclaimed novella *A Chess Story*, Dr B tries to salvage his sanity from the torture of “nothingness” to which he is subjected by the Gestapo by rehearsing in his head 150 historical chess matches whose diagrams were contained in a periodical he managed to steal from his torturers. When, years after his release, he comes across a real chess match on an ocean liner bound for Buenos Aires, he is both mesmerized and disoriented: “I stared at the board as if magnetized and saw my diagrams, my knight, rook, king, queen and pawns as real pieces cut from wood; to understand the situation in the match I first had to transform it back from my world of abstract notation into that of movable figures” (ibid.: 93). In his examination of the work of diagrams in architecture, Anthony Vidler (2000: 6) has argued that “operating between form and word, space and language, the diagram is both constitutive and projective; it is performative rather than representational.” A good example of this might be found in a recent body of STS scholarship on the performativity of economics that has looked in particular at the influence of diagrams and charts, both digital and analogue, in the forecasting of trends and price indexes in economic reasoning (Callon 2006; MacKenzie 2009). In this field, “chartism” was coined by Alex Preda (2007: 41) to describe a specific form of expertise in which shapes and characteristic curves of diagrams, such as “breaking gaps, flat bottoms, sauce bottoms, falling flags,” now populate the distinctive vocabulary of economists.

In this case, the economists' work with diagrams has come to shape the identity of their discipline as much as it has impacted the evaluation of economic risks and chances. Yet at the same time, as Yann Giraud (2014) has shown, the work of economic graphs, like Laffer curves, has become the object of critical examination and even parody by economists themselves (e.g., Gardner 1981), who point to the complex and indeed reflexive working of diagrams within professions and disciplines that employ them.

Our focus on 'working with diagrams' in this collection arises from the need to go beyond the semiotic, cognitive, epistemic, and symbolic reading of these visual devices that pervades the social sciences and the humanities. But why is the idea of 'work' so important when it comes to diagrams? Jay (2010–2011: 158) has argued that "the diagram has been more of a hybrid between ideas and perceptions," acting as what we may call, following historians of science Lorraine Daston and Peter Galison (1992), a 'working object'. Such objects "never duplicate a reality external to them, nor are entirely the result of pure imagination, but somehow fall productively between the two" (Jay 2010–2011: 158). So what is the work that this working object does? And why is it 'work' rather than just utility or efficacy? In other words, why is this collection about *working* with diagrams and not simply about using them?

The contributions to this special issue emphasize that diagrams inhabit a mediating space between representation and prescription, words and images, ideas and things, theory and practice, abstraction and reality. As many have pointed out before, diagrams find a strong place in key moments of scientific, technological, and intellectual innovation, leading to everyday uses in all spheres of social, political, economic, and cultural life. Conversely, employed across the disciplines as thinking tools, they hold the promise of transforming abstract ideas into graspable images and translating the unseen into intelligible and actionable form. This issue explores such transformations in relation to time (e.g., change or evolution that takes place when diagrams are copied repeatedly), scale (e.g., tiny anthropological samples used to model large theories), and cross-field transfers (e.g., diagrams originating in genetics used in anthropology, or from animation software used in architecture). But rather than attempting to define the deictic capacities of the diagrammatic across disciplines, the contributors to this special issue draw together the work that diagrams do in the development of theories. They focus on the collaborative and cooperative work that scientists, architects, or anthropologists carry out with—and on—diagrams, while considering the question of how diagrams have been made to work.

First of all, such a focus on working with diagrams enables us to move beyond representational as well as cognitive approaches. Indeed, it requires us to understand diagrams less as images, and more as visual devices. Let us take the example of the most prolific diagram in Jewish mysticism: the Kabbalistic

Tree of Life, which is generally seen as mapping “the topography of the God-head, often imagined in terms of four gradually emerging worlds and ten luminous emanations,” the Sefirot (Chajes 2016). The mapping in place in this diagram elucidates the “order and interconnections” of different emanations and the way in which this in turn forms the cosmos (*ibid.*). But the Tree of Life is not simply a description of the cosmos for philosophical contemplation—it is a working tool of Jewish mysticism. Yossi Chajes, the leading authority today on diagrammatic aspects of the Kabbalah, gives an illuminating example of this. In his essay for the British Library, “Kabbalistic Diagrams in the British Library’s Margoliouth Catalogue,” Chajes (2016) discusses the 1588 CE manuscript (Add MS 27091), which contains a number of intriguing diagrams. These are of course illustrations of the mystical text, but they are also more than just that. Take, for example, the following diagram (fig. 1) where in the center of

FIGURE 1: Arboreal diagram with rotating volvelles. Courtesy of the British Library (Add MS 27091, f. 26r). <https://www.bl.uk/hebrew-manuscripts/articles/kabbalistic-diagrams-in-the-british-librarys-margoliouth-catalogue>.

each Sefirah is visible a ‘volvelle’. These medieval astronomical instruments of concentric rotating disks, Chajes argues, “illustrate the fractal ... concept of the *Sefirot*.” But this is not simply an illustration of a cosmological fact, namely, that “each *Sefirah* contains all ten of the *Sefirot*.” Rather, Chajes maintains, it has a key practical implication: “The idea of physically manipulating the discs gives tangible expression to the importance of practicing visual variations when contemplating the divine; the structure should be perceived as alive and bearing almost infinite potential” (ibid.).

For this collection, we take two important aspects from this arboreal mystical diagram. First, not all workings with diagrams find their purpose in methods of simplification, schematization, or standardization. On the contrary, the contributions to this issue stress that diagrams might as well insist on the complexity of epidemic, anthropologic, or genetic configurations, that their production allows for pushing beyond the limits of theoretical frameworks, and that their mobilization is accompanied by translations and interferences, whereby clarity is lost rather than increased. Second, the scholarship on diagrams has predominantly focused on diagrams as products of a thought process, as the result of a research endeavor, or as the disseminated abstraction of a discovery. By contrast, our focus on the workings of diagrams enables us to also address the often ephemeral nature of diagrams within the processes of observation, analysis, research, and theorizing. Our contributions stress the co-production of epidemic theory between geographic sketches and understandings of disease: they extrapolate from spatial interior configuration to the diagrammatic conceptualization of the mind and demonstrate the sheer multiplicity of concepts in the repeated iteration of diagrammatic drawing. To this end, the articles by Spankie and Steadman in this special issue have integrated the performative nature of diagrams and diagrammatic reasoning into the development of their arguments. Both of them shift between a reading of diagrams and a diagrammatic visualization of readings.

In her contribution, Ro Spankie reads the diagram as an invitation to shift registers from theories about the mind to the design of the interior space of Freud’s study and consulting room. With reference to Mary Douglas (1991), Spankie approaches Freud’s interior as one that “exists in time and has aesthetic and cultural dimensions.” It is one that folds the spatial coordinates of rooms, in which psychoanalytic work is carried out, into the interior of the mind, whose structures Freud aimed to work out. In her contribution, Spankie, herself an architect, works with diagrams to trace the processes of translation and extrapolation between physical and psychological spaces. She emphasizes that “as a technique, diagramming—working with diagrams—shifts the emphasis from physical form or appearance to latent structure.” Following these implicit structural connections and associations, Spankie reconstructs the genealogy of Freud’s psychoanalytical mind through a close reading of

a range of diagrams, diagrammatic practices, and diagrammatic translations. This enables a different reading of Freud's work in which the significance of spatial metaphors becomes visible. Spankie suggests understanding Freud's descriptions of psychoanalysis "as a process of ordering one's thoughts in the same way as one might order one's things in a cluttered or disorderly interior." She re-engages with the kinds of visualizations that diagrams enable when she demonstrates the imprint of Freud's spatial arrangements on his diagrammatic representations of "dream structure." The article concludes by proposing the diagram as a means through which "invisible structures, rituals, and routines" are rendered visible as a contingent "visual analogy."

These cross-readings of diagrams in between spatial arrangements and theories of the mind circle around a theme that Philip Steadman, too, picks up in his epilogue to this collection: the relationship of ornament and order in and through diagrams. But Steadman asks how this relation is configured in diagrammatic processes of copying designs. He focuses on a technique of copying as applied by researchers investigating the capacities of visual memories. Rather than the expected deterioration of form and shapes toward chaos, the serial copying of drawings exposes "some tendencies toward schematization." From ornament to order, through repeated copying of drawings in experimental setups, it appears that a tendency toward diagrams can be observed. In experiments that Steadman carried out himself, pictures were "flattened out," objects were reduced to their boundaries, topological relationships were preserved, and only distances and angles changed. Without jumping to conclusions, Steadman argues that these results might indicate a diagrammatical way of thinking and a general diagrammatic tendency from ornament to order.

The mainstream of studies of diagrams places the work of diagrams in the realm of the schematization or simplification of complex processes in—or theories about—the world. Historians of science have long unpacked the use of diagrams as reductive representations of the cosmos (Kusukawa and Maclean 2006), as popularized schemes of complex physical models, or as accessible demonstrations of chemical processes (Eddy 2014). The field has usually looked at diagrams through the lens of the material culture of scientific practice and has largely been influenced by Bruno Latour's (1999) considerations of inscription. As a result, diagrams, including tables, graphs, chemical formulae, maps, and other abstract two-dimensional representations, have been addressed as a type of scientific iconography that has been mobilized by scientists to transform a scientific object into paper.

While much of the recent scholarship on the history of diagrams in science appears to follow Latour's proposition, more recent work on 'paper tools' has begun to emphasize a line of inquiry more comparable to the goals of this special issue. Beginning with the work of Ursula Klein (2003), paper tools and paper technologies were approached in the performative arrangements of laboratories

or in the post-war teaching of physics as malleable, multiple forms that incite a myriad of uses and lay the groundwork for a complex, contingent ‘diagrammatic reasoning’, for example, in the educative and multivalent production of Feynman diagrams in theoretical physics (Kaiser 2005: 18). Contrary to Latour, David Kaiser shows how the educative work physicists have done with diagrams has served to draw theories apart, rather than bring things together (*ibid.*). The perspective cultivated in recent history of science and knowledge perceives diagrams not as reductive representations of a scientific object; instead, it focuses on the “fleeting, undetectable intermediates” (Nye and Weininger 2018: 5) that diagrams have produced, for example, in the history of chemistry, and on the productive, creative, and explorative elements of the formal and data-driven reasoning of diagrammatic practices, tools, and instruments.

A similar perspective has been developed in the recent historiography of paper technologies in clinical reasoning, identifying the forms, tables, graphs, and diagrams that organize pathological discourse, not only as instruments of standardization and formalization, but also as technologies that sustain and support narrative practices and enable a way of knowing on the basis of cases (Hess 2018; Hess and Mendelsohn 2010). This perspective then resembles scholarship on the significance and meaning of maps and spatial reasoning in and through diagrams. Here, historical scholarship has long pointed beyond the idea of maps as accurate representations of territory. The political and cultural dimensions of geographical maps have been emphasized (Harley 2001), and disease maps have been considered as a “method of assemblage within which ideas are constituted and then argued about” (Koch 2011: 13).

The contributions to this special issue all engage with the curious combination of simplification and multiplication that appears to structure most of existing scholarship on the topic so far. Following Nelson Goodman (1976), Laura Perini (2013: 274) explains that in comparison to other visual representations, diagrams are “relatively non-replete” insofar as in diagrams “relatively few visible features are used to convey content.” And yet, if simplification may indeed be the case when it comes to some scientific diagrams, it cannot be said to be an inherent characteristic of diagrams as such. Indeed, to return to Chajes’s work, diagrams may be employed explicitly so as to complicate a simplified image of the world. Hence the Trees of Life deriving from the sixteenth century Lurianic school of the Kabbalah (fig. 2) are “kaleidoscopically multiplied” in comparison to earlier diagrams, such as the one examined above. Based on a more “spatial-mechanical” cosmology of emanation, which saw “higher levels of divinity ... transposed and expressed in the lower levels,” Chajes (2016) argues, Isaac Luria’s system made “diagrams more essential than ever to the aspiring kabbalist.”

When examining ‘working with diagrams’, it is worth considering how different aspects of diagrams work, or how they can be deployed and transformed

FIGURE 2: The denary tree, kaleidoscopically multiplied. Courtesy of the British Library (Add MS 27006, f. 227r). <https://www.bl.uk/hebrew-manuscripts/articles/kabbalistic-diagrams-in-the-british-librarys-margoliouth-catalogue>.

in ways that work. To what extent, for example, is the diagram's graphic form essential to its working or being workable? In some cases, like the Kabbalistic Trees of Life, form can be of the essence and cannot be substituted (as Sefirot are drawn as circles in order to represent their true spherical nature). In other cases, form can be both symbolic and conventional, but is not ontologically tied to the diagram. Take, for example, diagrams of zoonosis where animal to human infection is represented by arrows. This is, on the one hand, conventional in the sense that arrows generally convey causal relations in the sciences. But it is also

symbolic insofar as pestilence has been represented by arrows in both narrative and visual sources, from the Iliad through to the Counter-Reformation (Lynteris 2017). And yet, if in the case of the Kabbalah a diagram that does not represent spheres would not work as a Tree of Life, in the case of epidemiology a diagram that does not employ arrows can still represent animal to human infection. If working with diagrams requires, at a minimum level, the ability of a human subject to transform and revise these diagrams to fit new situations, then that subject has to know the ontological value of the components of the diagram, or risk ending up with a diagram that no longer works.

This does not, however, imply that working with diagrams means one has to necessarily end up with them. In fact, sometimes the aim of diagrams is precisely to produce something non-diagrammatic. An example is the case of Marcel Baltazard, the renowned Pasteurian who, after establishing himself as a pioneer of the scientific investigation of plague in Morocco, founded his own regional Pasteur Institute in Tehran (Mainbourg 2007). There, in the 1950s, Baltazard directed far-reaching research in sylvatic plague, especially in Iran's Kurdish areas. Visually apt,² at some point he seemed keen to develop a popular means of communicating to the public how plague could be transmitted. What he produced was a beautiful single-page comic strip titled "Propagation of Plague in Iran's Kurdistan" (fig. 3), which predates today's movement of 'graphic medicine' (Czerwicz et al. 2015) by half a century.

The comic strip shows a merion rodent dying of plague, with its fleas abandoning its cold cadaver so as to infest other rodents and eventually a turban-wearing bearded man, who appears to be scratching in evident irritation. The same man then develops first bubonic and later the contagious pneumonic form of plague, infecting his friend who in the last frame appears to be infecting another man by means of a transfer of human fleas. What lay behind this uniquely legible piece of public health communication was a far more messy and ungainly diagram (fig. 4). The protagonists of the comic strip are still there, but schemas, names, and the jumps of the fleas are rough drawings, with arrows between them. Although the details and even the context of the process are lacking, one thing is clear: here the work of the diagram is achieved by its transformation into a non-diagram—a comic strip used for public health campaigns.

At this point, it cannot be stressed enough that the work of diagrams is not limited to the work of their graphic elements, as these work only within specific non-graphic contexts. The most important—or at least immediate—of these is the surface on which diagrams are drawn. John Bender and Michael Marrinan (2010) have noted the importance of the white surface in some of the defining diagrams of modernity: the ones adorning the pages of Diderot's *Encyclopédie*. Discussing the copper plate on patisserie engraved by Robert Benard ("Pâtisier, Tour à Pâte, Bassines, Mortier &c."), the two authors stress the lack of volume

PROPAGATION DE LA PESTE AU KURDISTAN D'IRAN MALADIE DES RONGEURS "MÉRIONES" DONT L'HOMME EST LE RÉVÉLATEUR

FIGURE 3: Archives Institut Pasteur – BLT.16 – Lieu: A4/131-132, C/Travaux scientifiques, 3_ Documentation; Propagation de la peste au Kurdistan d'Iran; maladie des rongeurs "mériones" dont l'homme est le révélateur. © Institut Pasteur/Musée Pasteur

FIGURE 4: Archives Institut Pasteur – BLT.16 – Lieu: A4/131-132, C/ Travaux scientifiques, 3_ Documentation; Cycle de propagation de la peste. © Institut Pasteur/Musée Pasteur

in the figures of bowls, spoons, and so forth, which synthesize what we may call a meta-diagram of *pâtisserie*. The ‘notation’ of this diagram is in this case underlined by the lack of shadows on the white background of the figures. “This whiteness,” Bender and Marrinan assert, “is an arena of potentiality that fosters connections without fixing them or foreclosing thought experiments” (ibid.: 23). It is a whiteness that, by “permeat[ing] the plates of the *Encyclopedia*,” becomes “the field of Diderot’s *rapport* that we call correlation. We take it [to] be a virtual space whose material presence—which joins together the disparate parts of the *Encyclopedia* plates—provides support for the composite play of imagery and cognition that is the motor-energy of diagram” (ibid.). Writing about epidemiological diagrams describing animal-to-human infection (zoonosis) in the twenty-first century, Lynteris (2017: 472) has noted the still pervasive operation of the blank background: “We need to consider the relation between geometric and iconographic components (lines and figures) of the diagram and its surface as a meaningful one; indeed, as a relation whose apparent invisibility is an important analytical component of its articulation.” Lynteris follows Kenneth Knoespel (2001) in arguing that the work of the blank surface is that it allows the double operation of diagrams hinted at by their meaning in Greek: to both draw and erase (*diagrapho*). At one and the same time, in providing a surface for drawing the interrelation between significant components of zoonosis

and for erasing the ecological and social context of the latter, the white/blank surface of epidemiological diagrams makes infection appear as an objective process, free from environmental or historical referents.

But the dialectic between the ‘diagrammatic’ and the ‘diagraphic’ (i.e., erasing) work of diagrams is not limited to their oft-used blank/white background. In her article in this special issue, Nurit Bird-David examines kinship trees as “diagrammatic pilots of anthropological reasoning” (Lynteris 2017: 463), challenging us to consider how they “dis-work—in ethnographic accounts of other people’s worlds.” She asks: “*Do* these diagrammatic tools make fieldwork and its findings ‘intelligible to others’—or, rather, to the contrary, in some cases do they obscure locals’ lived-worlds and the fieldwork process?” The focus of Bird-David’s article is on small-scale societies and hunter-gatherers of South India in particular. Stressing the importance of the scalar context, she begins by interrogating the impact of mapping in anthropological accounts of and relating with other peoples. Following Alfred Gell (1998) in stressing the non-indexicality of maps, Bird-David reflects on her own cartographic practices during fieldwork in the Nilgiri region, which culminated in the commissioning of a map of her field site. The map demarcates “a territory that the foragers are described as living *in*,” but it erases what in the forager’s experience is far more crucial, that is, with whom they live—“not so much in space/system (environment, nature) but in a community of sentient beings with or alongside whom they live.” Similarly, Bird-David argues, just as maps can show us the ‘in’ but obscure the ‘with whom’, the “kinship tree has its virtues” but also carries with it a work of erasure or obscuration.

Bird-David discusses how this is brought about by reflecting on W. H. R. Rivers’s ([1910] 1968) much-adhered-to instructions for collecting kinship data and drawing kinship diagrams. Bird-David identifies three key problems. First is the fact that “Rivers’s method is rooted in using personal names” as if these were concrete bases for genealogical sorting, whereas in her ethnographic experience they are impermanent and a “shaky basis for making pedigrees.” “A second problem,” Bird-David tells us, is that Rivers “was basing the method on father, mother, child, husband and wife relations.” Demonstrating a nuclear-family-led bias of kinship, this ignored the fact that for societies like the Gorge foragers, sibblingship is the primary relation. Third, Rivers’s stress on “known status” (marriage, number of children) obscured the “performative basis of kinship relations,” or what Bird-David aptly terms the “the minute work of ‘relating’ that constitutes relations” among foragers. The three problems with Rivers’s genealogical instructions are both reflected in and complicated in actually drawn kinship diagrams. Explaining how following these instructions led her to robust but prejudiced diagrams, Bird-David begins by noting that “kinship diagrammatic tools embody a grammar of self and relations that obscures the foragers’ sense of themselves and their community.” While showing connections,

kinship diagrams emphasize individuals as nodal points while reducing the actual object of their graphic work, the connecting lines, to “add-on relations” of usually dyadic nature. This, Bird-David stresses, draws out an ontology that has no bearing with the “foragers’ primary sense of an intimate community into which one is born as a relative who is multiply connected to everyone else.” The diagrammatic work of diagrams in this case can thus be said to be the erasure of the Gorge foragers’ “performative and strategic kinship experience” whereby “each person is at once relative(s) of multiple others.”

In his contribution to this collection, Matei Candea reflects on the “distinctive power and limits of visual representation as an anthropological heuristic.” Turning his attention to the meaning and work of ‘graphic coherence’, he asks: “When is a diagram coherent? And what is it supposed to be coherent with?” Assuming a ‘practitioner’s view’ of the question of working with diagrams, Candea explores “where and to what effect diagrams accompany, prefigure, and exceed textual forms of anthropological argument.” To do this, he compares diagrams with another neglected anthropological practice: the use of algebraic formulations. Both forms of non-textual description in anthropology have been criticized as problematic for lending a (pseudo)scientific authority to non-scientific statements, and for doing little more than repeating textual context. And yet, Candea argues, there is a key difference between the work of diagrams and that of algebraic formulations in anthropology. In contrast to mathematical notation, diagrams, as a visual form, are conceptually and indeed symbolically replete: “Circles imply closure and perfection; unbroken lines seem to suggest that objects have firm boundaries.” As inherently polysemic visual forms positioned between ‘visual excess’ and ‘visual coherence’, diagrams, Candea tells us, require a textual reference or aid so that they may be read. Although this position runs against most current cognitive and epistemological studies of diagrams, it is important to consider here the ‘work’ that diagrams perform in the text-oriented context of anthropology. Could the dependence of diagrams on texts in anthropology account for their relative lack of success, both inside and outside the discipline? When read alongside other contributions to this collection, Candea’s reflections on anthropological diagrams challenge us to consider the extent to which, in some cases, diagrams may indeed become so linked to texts that they surrender their diagrammatic properties and thus deliver a creative disturbance “at the intersection of conventions and inventions.” Cutting across (but perhaps not challenging) the iconophobic bias of the discipline, anthropological diagrams-with-texts work toward new concepts on the basis of “a self-conscious play with conventional visual languages.”

If Vidler (2000: 17) is right in that, in the digital age, “the diagram becomes less and less an icon and more and more a blueprint,” we may ask here how this shift is already predicated in the work of what we may call ‘transformational diagrams’, such as epidemic maps or Conrad Waddington’s ‘epigenetic

landscape'. Just like the model, the diagram suggests a change of medium, when it takes part in the scientific elaboration of a research object (Rheinberger 2015). And like the model, any diagram presupposes the transition from traces to data to then enable the tinkering with data configurations. In early epidemiology, as Engelmann argues in his contribution to this collection, the diagram's configurations produce and sustain the conceptual understanding of epidemics as configurations. The spatial diagram supported efforts of boundary work to bolster epidemiology's "notions of complexity, to preserve system-thinking" against the deductive principles of the laboratory. For Ljungberg (2016: 142), the spatial diagram is an instrument of hybridity that not only represents and abstracts networks of relationships, but also allows for the experimental discovery of new relationships and unknown elements. Engelmann thus demonstrates how spatial diagrams were used to open the frame for an exploration of the unusual, unexplained dimensions of an epidemic, contrary to the common misunderstanding of a diagram as a condensation of that which is known. To this end, Engelmann presents two maps produced to grasp the configuration of bubonic plague, the first during an outbreak of the disease in the Russian village of Vetlianka (1878) and the second during the 1899 outbreak in the Portuguese city of Porto. Engelmann compares the map produced in the former, as a diagram drawn ahead of the identification of plague's pathogen, with the one produced after this watershed moment in the history of the disease. He thus demonstrates the persistent commitment of epidemiology to conduct inductive surveys rather than deductive investigations. As Engelmann shows, this scientific ethos is sustained through diagrams. Here, where the radical epistemological indeterminacy of induction as a hallmark of epidemiological reasoning comes into focus, he argues that it is through the working of epidemiologists with diagrams that the modern understanding of the epidemic as an abstract object, as a conceptual entity, first emerged.

In her article for this collection, Caroline Humphrey returns to Daston and Galison's (1992) idea of the 'working object' in order to examine the defining image/object of epigenetics: Waddington's much-discussed 'epigenetic landscape' diagram. Humphrey poses a key question as regards scientific diagrams: to what extent can they be said to be "illustrations" of scientific theories, hypotheses, or observations? Defining illustration as "a representational visual depiction of something, an image that uses naturalistic artistic means to make that object or idea clear and vivid," she notes that what usually distinguishes diagrams from the former is that their work is not so much representational as explanatory or indeed "constitutive." However, when one examines what, following Isabelle Stengers (1987), we may call the 'nomadic' work of Waddington's epigenetic landscape diagram, the question about what makes this so adaptable and indeed inspirational across many different disciplines and fields arises. The answer, Humphrey claims, may be sought in the "illustrative

character” of Waddington’s diagram, which, by depicting a scene, requires “the viewer to imagine the completion of a process about to take place in it.” This leads Humphrey to examine how the “visual and conceptual affordances of these diagrams can set off a process of imaginative ‘work’ in a new field.” In going beyond both cognitive and epistemological discussions of diagrams, Humphrey’s article seeks to elucidate the importance of the imagination (understood as a creative faculty in the strong, Castoriadean sense of the term) in the work of diagrams. Examining “the varied affordances of the diagram as a working object,” Humphrey’s article proposes that “diagrams can perhaps best be seen as a *means of transportation* of a set of ideas from one context to another.” But both the transformational and transportational capacity of diagrams, Humphrey stresses, is not an unconditional trait of diagrams as such. Rather, it has to do with the way in which different diagrams embody relatedness or “the relations between parts.” If for some diagrams, opting for openness, this remains both a constitutive and transformable faculty, for others relatedness is fixed or over-specified, resulting in a loss of their “imaginative potential”—these are “over-determined” diagrams that no longer entice the viewer to imagine, but instead instruct her or him “what to think.”

This special issue thus introduces scholarship that addresses the ephemeral dimensions of scientists’ interactions and collaborations with diagrams across different professions and disciplines. Moving beyond the perception of diagrams as mere inscriptions of objects and processes, we propose here an evaluation of diagrammatic reasoning as the work that is carried out with, on, and beyond diagrams. The reasoning curated in this collection can be considered diagrammatic as it is invested in the production, mobilization, repurposing, and annihilation of diagrams. “Working with Diagrams” brings together for the first time a series of articles concerned with practices and studies that highlight the significance of diagrammatic reasoning in and beyond the sciences, indifferent to any visibility or material trace of a diagram.

Acknowledgments

This special issue, entitled “Working with Diagrams,” is the result of the conference “Diagrammatic: Beyond Description?” which was held in December 2016 at the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (CRASSH), University of Cambridge. We would like to thank Oliver Wright for his help in organizing the conference; our keynote speaker, Anthony Vidler; all our speakers and delegates for their discussion and feedback on the topic of working with diagrams; and CRASSH for its generous support of the event (funded by a CRASSH conference award). We would also like to thank Yossi Chajes for discussing with us his approach to diagrams. Research leading to this article was funded by a

European Research Council Starting Grant (under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme/ERC grant agreement no. 336564) for the project Visual Representations of the Third Plague Pandemic (principal investigator, Christos Lynteris) and supported by the Challenge Investment Fund of the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Edinburgh (principal investigator, Lukas Engelmann).

Lukas Engelmann is a Chancellor's Fellow in History and Sociology of Biomedicine at the University of Edinburgh. His work focuses on the history of epidemics and epidemiology in the long twentieth century, and he is currently working on the history of epidemiological modeling. Recent publications include *Mapping AIDS: Visual Histories of an Enduring Epidemic* (2018) and, co-authored with Christos Lynteris, *Sulphuric Utopias: A History of Maritime Sanitation* (MIT Press, 2020). E-mail: lukas.engelmann@ed.ac.uk

Caroline Humphrey is a social anthropologist who has worked in the USSR/Russia, Mongolia, Inner Mongolia, Nepal, and India. Until 2010 she was Sigrid Rausing Professor of Anthropology at the University of Cambridge, and she is currently a Research Director at the university's Mongolia and Inner Asia Studies Unit. Recent publications include *A Monastery in Time: The Making of Mongolian Buddhism* (2013), co-authored with Hurelbaatar Ujeed; *Frontier Encounters: Knowledge and Practice at the Russian, Chinese and Mongolian Border* (2012), co-edited with Franck Billé and Grégory Delaplace; and *Trust and Mistrust in the Economies of the China-Russia Borderlands* (2018). E-mail: ch10001@hermes.cam.ac.uk

Christos Lynteris is a Senior Lecturer in Social Anthropology at the University of St Andrews. A medical anthropologist investigating epistemological, bio-political, and aesthetic aspects of infectious disease epidemics, he is the principal investigator of the Wellcome-funded project, The Global War Against the Rat and the Epistemic Emergence of Zoonosis. His recent publications include *Ethnographic Plague: Configuring Disease on the Chinese-Russian Frontier* (2016), *Human Extinction and the Pandemic Imaginary* (2019), and, co-authored with Lukas Engelmann, *Sulphuric Utopias: A History of Maritime Sanitation* (MIT Press, 2020). E-mail: cl12@st-andrews.ac.uk

Notes

1. For a more recent approach, see Drucker (2014).
2. An avid photographer, Baltazard also produced a film on plague that is appreciated today as a unique visual document of Iranian architecture.

References

- Bender, John, and Michael Marrinan. 2010. *The Culture of Diagram*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bonelli, Cristóbal. 2015. "To See That Which Cannot Be Seen: Ontological Differences and Public Health Policies in Southern Chile." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (n.s.) 21 (4): 872–891.
- Bouquet, Mary. 1996. "Family Trees and Their Affinities: The Visual Imperative of the Genealogical Diagram." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 2 (1): 43–66.
- Burr, Winthrop A., and Donald E. Gerson. 1965. "Venn Diagrams and Human Taxonomy." *American Anthropologist* 67 (2): 494–499. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1965.67.2.02a00260>.
- Callon, Michel. 2006. "What Does It Mean to Say That Economics Is Performative?" CSI Working Papers Series. Centre de Sociologie de l'Innovation (CSI), Mines ParisTech, August. halshs-00091596.
- Catley, Kefyn M., and Laura R. Novick. 2008. "Seeing the Wood for the Trees: An Analysis of Evolutionary Diagrams in Biology Textbooks." *BioScience* 58 (10): 976–987.
- Chajes, Yossi. 2016. "Kabbalistic Diagrams in the British Library's Margoliouth Catalogue." 29 February. <https://www.bl.uk/hebrew-manuscripts/articles/kabbalistic-diagrams-in-the-british-librarys-margoliouth-catalogue>.
- Coopmans, Catelijne, Janet Vertesi, Michael Lynch, and Steve Woolgar, eds. 2014. *Representation in Scientific Practice Revisited*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Czerwiec, MK, Ian Williams, Susan Merrill Squier, Michael J. Green, Kimberly R. Myers, and Scott T. Smith. 2015. *Graphic Medicine Manifesto*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Daston, Lorraine. 2014. "Beyond Representation." In Coopmans et al. 2014, 319–322.
- Daston, Lorraine, and Peter Galison. 1992. "The Image of Objectivity." *Representations* 40: 81–128.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1988. *Foucault*. Trans. Seán Hand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Douglas, Mary. 1991. "The Idea of a Home: A Kind of Space." *Social Research* 58 (1): 287–307.
- Drucker, Johanna. 2014. *Graphesis: Visual Forms of Knowledge Production*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Eddy, Matthew D. 2014. "How to See a Diagram: A Visual Anthropology of Chemical Affinity." *Osiris* 29 (1): 178–196.
- Elmer, Greg. 2003. "A Diagram of Panoptic Surveillance." *New Media & Society* 5 (2): 231–247.
- Gardner, Martin. 1981. "Mathematical Games: The Laffer Curve and Other Laughs in Current Economics." *Scientific American* 245 (6): 18–34.
- Gell, Alfred. 1998. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Giraud, Yann. 2014. "Legitimizing Napkin Drawing: The Curious Dispersion of Laffer Curves, 1978–2008." In Coopmans et al. 2014, 269–290.
- Gontier, Nathalie. 2011. "Depicting the Tree of Life: The Philosophical and Historical Roots of Evolutionary Tree Diagrams." *Evolution: Education and Outreach* 4 (3): 515–538.
- Goodman, Nelson. 1976. *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing.
- Hage, Per, and Frank Harary. 1983. *Structural Models in Anthropology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hallam, Elizabeth. 2008. *Anatomy Museum: Death and the Body Displayed*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Harley, J. B. 2001. *The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography*. Ed. Paul Laxton. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hess, Volker. 2018. "A Paper Machine of Clinical Research in the Early Twentieth Century." *Isis* 109 (3): 473–493.
- Hess, Volker, and J. Andrew Mendelsohn. 2010. "Case and Series: Medical Knowledge and Paper Technology, 1600–1900." *History of Science* 48 (3–4): 287–314.
- Ingold, Tim. 2007. *Lines: A Brief History*. London: Routledge.
- Jay, Martin. 2010–2011. "The Culture of Diagram (Review)." *Nineteenth-Century French Studies* 39 (1–2): 157–159.
- Kaiser, David. 2005. *Drawing Theories Apart: The Dispersion of Feynman Diagrams in Postwar Physics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Klein, Ursula. 2003. *Experiments, Models, Paper Tools: Cultures of Organic Chemistry in the Nineteenth Century*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Knoespel, Kenneth J. 2001. "Diagrams as Piloting Devices in the Philosophy of Gilles Deleuze." *Theorie, Littérature, Enseignement* 19: 145–165.
- Knoespel, Kenneth J. 2002. "Diagrammatic Transformation of Architectural Space." *Philosophica* 70: 11–36.
- Koch, Tom. 2011. *Disease Maps: Epidemics on the Ground*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kusukawa, Sachiko, and Ian Maclean, eds. 2006. *Transmitting Knowledge: Words, Images, and Instruments in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Larkin, Jill H., and Herbert A. Simon. 1987. "Why a Diagram Is (Sometimes) Worth Ten Thousand Words." *Cognitive Science* 11 (1): 65–100.
- Latour, Bruno. 1999. *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Ljungberg, Christina. 2016. "The Diagrammatic Nature of Maps." In *Thinking with Diagrams: The Semiotic Basis of Human Cognition*, ed. Sybille Krämer and Christina Ljungberg, 139–159. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Lüthy, Christoph, and Alexis Smets. 2009. "Words, Lines, Diagrams, Images: Towards a History of Scientific Imagery." *Early Science and Medicine* 14 (1–3): 398–439.
- Lynteris, Christos. 2017. "Zoonotic Diagrams: Mastering and Unsettling Human Animal Relations." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 23 (3): 463–485.
- MacKenzie, Donald. 2009. *Material Markets: How Economic Agents Are Constructed*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mainbourg, Jean. 2007. *Balta, aventurier de la peste: Professeur Marcel Baltazard (1908–1971)* [Balta, plague adventurer: Professor Marcel Baltazard (1908–1971)]. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Miller, Nathaniel. 2007. *Euclid and His Twentieth Century Rivals: Diagrams in the Logic of Euclidean Geometry*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Norman, Jesse. 2006. *After Euclid: Visual Reasoning and the Epistemology of Diagrams*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Nye, Mary Jo, and Stephen J. Weininger. 2018. "Paper Tools from the 1780s to the 1960s: Nomenclature, Classification, and Representations." *Ambix* 65 (1): 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00026980.2017.1419651>.
- Perini, Laura. 2013. "Diagrams in Biology." *Knowledge Engineering Review* 28 (3): 273–286.
- Preda, Alex. 2007. "Where Do Analysts Come From? The Case of Financial Chartism." *Sociological Review* 55 (s2): 40–64.
- Rheinberger, Hans-Jörg. 2015. "Preparations, Models, and Simulations." *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences* 36 (3): 321–334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40656-014-0049-3>.
- Rivers, W. H. R. (1910) 1968. "The Genealogical Method of Anthropological Enquiry." In *Kinship and Social Organisation*, ed. A. Forge, 97–113. London: Athlone Press.
- Stengers, Isabelle. 1987. *D'une science à l'autre: Des concepts nomades* [From one science to another: Nomadic concepts]. Paris: Seuil.
- Stjernfelt, Frederik. 2000. "Diagrams as Centerpiece of a Peircean Epistemology." *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 36 (3): 357–384.
- Teyssot, Georges. 2012. "The Diagram as Abstract Machine." *VIRUS* 7. <http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/virus07/?sec=3&item=1&lang=en>.
- Vidler, Anthony. 2000. "Diagrams of Diagrams: Architectural Abstraction and Modern Representation." *Representations* 72: 1–20.
- Zdebik, Jakub. 2012. *Deleuze and the Diagram: Aesthetic Threads in Visual Organization*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Zweig, Stefan. (1941) 2013. *A Chess Story*. Trans. Alexander Starritt. London: Pushkin Press.