
NO
REPRESENTA-
TION

WITH-
OUT
CIRCULATION

François Brunet

Introduction: *No Representation without Circulation*

Argument

Art history finds one origin in the conservation and transmission of precious objects worth guarding against loss or theft, worth displaying, moving and removing, selling or ceding sometimes. Long-standing practices of the field include narratives of the lives and peregrinations of artists; connoisseurship of artworks as transient things, with histories of provenance, exhibition, publication, reception, and collection; and mapping of series of objects related by technique, subject, motif, or style, evincing geohistorical patterns of spread, migration, transformation, and influence. Such practices of connoisseurship have been made easier, indeed possible, by the expansion of techniques of reproduction. Art historians have long learned not only to make and use reproductions but to regard them as harbingers of a "conquest of ubiquity," in Paul Valéry's 1928 phrase, and of what Walter Benjamin called, in his famous 1936 essay, a "loss of the aura," or disconnection of the art object from its "hic et nunc." While early cinema participated in what Benjamin called a "liquidation" of tradition by recasting national histories and heritages into mass spectacles aimed at world stages, modernism, or some of its currents, capitalized on mechanically produced and reproduced imagery—from cinema, photography, and the illustrated press—as a new condition of art, its making, and its relationship to reality, space, and time. By the second half of the twentieth century, much thinking on art had come to identify reproduction and communication as defining categories of "modernity."[1] Since Pop Art, at least, the discourses of reproduction, multiplicity,

Gilbert Munger, "Uinta Range, Colorado—Canon of Lodore" (detail, see fig. 2).

instantaneity, dematerialization, and de-territorialization have become prevalent in the production and reception of art and culture.

Thus in almost any account of art history or art theory, even before the end of the twentieth century, one is bound to encounter some notion of circulation: not, perhaps, in the original meaning of "circular" or cyclical motion, but in the looser modern sense of "transmission or passage"—of money, news, and just about anything—and, more broadly, "currency" or "use."[2] Whether we think of princely jewels and the histories of their transmissions, the writing of an entry in a catalogue raisonné, the spread of a "school" such as Impressionism, the reproductive trail of painting's icons from the *Mona Lisa* to *American Gothic*, or the patterns of exhibition and marketing of art in the twentieth century, we are readily convinced that any history of art is bound to be a geography, that it implies maps of locations, trajectories, and distributions of objects, images, and ideas, and that the history of modern art, especially, must rank circulation among its most significant phenomena.

Now if we turn to the digital era, which is also the era of globalization and the Internet, it is obvious that circulation has become more than just one significant aspect or context among others. Processes of dissemination and dematerialization have multiplied exponentially, fostering the common perception that the "old" question of reproduction (and its relationship to original, reality, simulacrum, etc.) is behind us and that something more powerful is altering the existence of images, texts, data, and objects. In the realm of the visual, the "lives of images," in W. J. T. Mitchell's terms,[3] consist in endless mediations and re-mediations of "visibilities" (and other modes of communicability) that need not retain any materiality or uniqueness to circulate virtually, and yet tend to lay claim to a strong link to reality—the reality of their own circulation, to begin with. Digital-native students expect images (if not objects) to move, multiply, and disseminate virtually and instantaneously; they measure the worth of digital things by the statistics of their circulation (somewhat like earlier generations did for news, ads, or television shows); they appraise virality before they observe form or content.

In this context, the naïve (but tempting) question arises: How did pictures "circulate" before the Internet? Or, in a slightly less naïve form: If today's *speed* (or ease) of image circulation is unprecedented, does it not point to a long-term *need* (or wish) for circulating pictures, at least in the modern period, in conjunction with the rise of the market economy and the increasing mobility of goods and people?

To generalize the point: Is it not the case, whether historians like it or not, that the power of circulation and discourses on circulation today tends to recast contemporary thinking on art history, if not history in general, in the prism of circulation, mobility, trade, and the "social life of things"?[4] Hence a methodological reformulation: How do we attend to the logic of circulation without projecting the economy of today's digital culture, its patterns of rapid expansion and its fantasies of total and immediate circulation, onto a long-term, general history of circulations?

Indeed, a collection of essays like this one cannot be merely an archaeology of today's modes and issues of circulation. When circulation is chosen as a theme for an installment in a series aimed at outlining key concepts in the field of American art history, its particular contemporary prevalence cannot in itself dictate the terms of a discussion that must reach far and wide. As a critical category, circulation requires a broad construction, which could be approached somewhat like this: How have pictures and objects—in different periods—acquired meaning, worth, agency, form, even aesthetic status, by moving, or, more generally, by gaining "currency" or "use"? In the present volume, then, circulation is understood in the broadest possible sense, that is, as something larger than movement, and also larger than reproduction: spatial, but also temporal; material as well as intellectual; international, intercultural, intermedial; always hinting at the possibility of circularity (when an artwork "returns," transformed or not, to where it came from); and always measured against the possibility and the reality of noncirculation. In other words, in this book "circulation"—like "picturing" in the inaugural volume of the Terra Foundation Essays—identifies a conceptual avenue for thinking about not just one facet or moment of American art but its total historical condition as a site of evolving relations between things, images, and ideas.[5] And consequently, this book's leading argument is that circulation can and must be construed as a shaping factor in the history of American art and its global reach, from the eighteenth century to the present.

This book aims, then, at a long-term history of circulations in and of American art—or art of the United States—shaped as it has been from its earliest period by constant intercourse with other political, economic, and cultural forces and situations both within and outside of North America. The Revolutionary era is well known for its efforts in multiplying and circulating American pictures, as exemplified by Gilbert Stuart's prolonged output of commissioned likenesses of George Washington, a striking blend of economics and aesthetics that answered an equally striking conception of "original copies."[6] This early context inspires the

title of this introductory essay, which alludes to the American colonists' rallying cry against taxation, suggesting that the social and political economy of circulation is, in the American context, a recurring, long-standing condition of making art, and acknowledging at the same time that while the regime of representation is traditionally defined as aesthetic, concepts such as circulation and mobility echo an increasingly prevalent economic approach to culture.[7] The negative, "no representation," is here to remind the reader that not all images circulate in equal volumes or similar modes: the history of circulations encompasses the history of noncirculations. In the American context, understood as a succession of historical situations rather than an essentialized cultural identity, failure of circulation has often amounted to failure of representation; and if one had to draw a "lesson" from the contributions in this volume, perhaps it would be that, in the history of American art, imperatives and impacts of circulation have often preempted choices of representation.

As already suggested, this argument may seem obvious today, or at least easily accepted in view of contemporary trends in American art history, where scholars increasingly engage with the broader field of visual culture, often defined as the integration of moments and forms of "picturing" in broad political and economic circuits.[8] In fact, however, this argument concerning circulation is not so obvious when one considers a longer stretch of historiography and criticism; and it is useful here, as a way of better characterizing the relative novelty of this approach, to briefly consider, by contrast, two opposing conceptions that, although considered obsolete by most now, previously were vastly influential. The first one is modernism, or rather one formulation of its aesthetic theory, as it addresses the relationship of art to "life" and as it opposes, in art history, the methods associated with historicism. The second is nativism, an older and longer tradition of thinking on American art, as it attempts to construe the Americanness of American art in isolation from foreign scenes and models. This discussion eventually leads us back, through more recent critiques of these conceptions, to the state of circulation today and in this volume.

Circulation, Its Opponents and Proponents

Modernism is a much deeper and more complex trend than is often claimed;[9] and in this section, I am only alluding to a well-known theory, loosely associated with modernism, that defines the work of art as a self-contained, autonomous, and stable vessel of meaning, with meaning construed, in this framework, as essentially ideal and

ahistorical. I am referring to the writings of Clement Greenberg (1909–1994), specifically to his landmark essay "Avant-Garde and Kitsch" (1939).

Greenberg's text not only ignores circulation but barely uses the vocabulary of motion, unless it is to define "kitsch" in opposition to true art. If the "avant-garde" does "move" in this essay, it is only to "'detach' itself from society" and "keep culture moving" along a high ridge of pure aesthetic progress, away from the "public" and "subject matter." The avant-garde is not only separated from material conditions such as motion and the "public" scene, implicitly dominated by utilitarian and mercantile concerns. It is separated from social "meanings" because it is ontologically defined as a form of art that "cannot be reduced in whole or in part to anything not itself." Conversely, Greenberg pictures "kitsch," a "product of the industrial revolution," as art that moves—materially, geographically, socially. In its worldwide expansion, kitsch "wipes out" all preexisting culture, turning art into something commercial and industrially uniform: "today the native of China, no less than the South American Indian, the Hindu, no less than the Polynesian, have come to prefer to the products of their native art, magazine covers, rotogravure sections and calendar girls."[10]

The explanation for this "triumph" lies not in social-historical conditions, such as economics or propaganda, or, obviously, in a latter-day conception of circulation as a sort of macrotechnological or anthropological structure, of the kind Marshall McLuhan theorized thirty years later in *Understanding Media* (1964). It lies in an inherently "predigested" status of kitsch or low art, an art that, as in the historical paintings of the Russian Ilya Repin (1844–1930), and, superlatively, in Norman Rockwell's cover art for the *Saturday Evening Post*, delivers ready "effect" for the enjoyment of the masses, instead of demanding this effect from the spectator's reflection. The opposition of "avant-garde" and "kitsch" reflects a sociocultural opposition between the "cultivated spectator" and the "unreflective" one. For the purposes of this discussion, it is striking to observe that kitsch is to avant-garde what motion is to stillness, or motion to emotion, and to highlight the "values" associated with either polarity. The "peasant" who enjoys Repin's paintings values effect, drama, and, at bottom, subject matter, continuity of art and life, and narrative power. The cultivated spectator values "plastic qualities" insofar as they are a "cause" for an effort of his or her own, an exercise of reflection that builds on discontinuity, "remove," or abstraction from any context. There is no room in this

conception for the notion of circulation as anything but external, if not detrimental, to the proper, "reflective" pleasure of art, which belongs to a separate realm of the ideal, and is best evidenced by abstract form (as is made further evident in Greenberg's 1955 essay on "American-type painting"). Conversely, kitsch is permeated not only by excessive intelligibility but, ultimately, by continuity, or contiguity: it manifests itself by its expansion in space and culture; it succeeds by staging effects contiguous to their causes; like the higher form of art, but in a much more ostensible way, it rejects "discontinuity between art and life"; it requires and generates narratives, instead of "absolute" aesthetic ideas. Circulation, in this reading, might almost be called the criterion of Greenberg's divide between avant-garde and kitsch.

Does this mean that in elevating circulation to a category of art history, we run the risk of confusing (American) art and kitsch? It should be noted, here, that Greenberg's conception is critical rather than historical, that it is rooted in the context of the 1930s, and that his stringent demand to separate art from kitsch and reflection from circulation was not shared by all art historians of his day. Published in the same year as Greenberg's essay on "avant-garde and kitsch," Erwin Panofsky's *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* was developed after the author's move to Princeton and written in English, and it introduced to American academic readers methods of iconography, more generally the so-called historicist tradition. While the so-called modernist model would often define itself in opposition to historicism, Panofsky's book offers, I would argue, a global approach to art history as a history of circulations and contexts.

Without rehearsing the theoretical framework of iconology, I want to draw attention to Panofsky's method of analysis of his immediate subject field, "humanistic themes in the art of the Renaissance." This field is constructed entirely as one of migrations and mutations—we might say circulations, although Panofsky does not use this word. He analyzes the humanistic themes of the Renaissance as the accumulated results of historical mutations and geographical migrations, where a given "motif" or portion of a motif changes forms and meanings with different cultural and economic conditions. The analysis relies crucially on the careful mapping of migrations of motifs over space and time, as in the example of the ambiguous "type" of Salome-Judith, or the young woman portrayed with a decapitated head and either a sword or a platter, where Panofsky—with the help of photographic reproductions—follows the transformative migration of the motif over northern Europe in the sixteenth century. Following

the method developed by Aby Warburg in his *Mnemosyne Atlas* project in the 1920s, Panofsky establishes spatial and temporal circulation—of artists, but also of their patrons; of ideas, as well as motifs and some materials, such as pigments, for instance—as a primary mechanism of the history of art. His history functions primarily on the iconographic level and yet constantly foregrounds spatial circulation in the analysis of artistic reinterpretation, reformulation, or what Panofsky calls "pseudomorphosis," a notion that today might be called "refiguration." It is certainly worth noting, as a clue to the relevance of this method to American visual culture, that Panofsky introduces pseudomorphosis visually with a reproduction of an American bank logo of the 1930s reemploying the motif of "Father Time" (fig. 1).[11] This is, then, an art history that gives governing power to circulations of objects, artists,

1
"Father Time," from Erwin Panofsky, *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* (1939; New York: Harper & Row, 1972), 69.

III. FATHER TIME

PIERO DI COSIMO'S secular compositions, based as they are on an almost Darwinian evolutionism and often harking back to a primitive world prior to every historical age, are an extreme and practically unique manifestation of the general tendency to revive the '*sacrosancta vetustas*.' As a rule this tendency confined itself to resuscitating antiquity in the historical sense of the term, Piero himself was, as we have seen, an archaeologist, as well as a primitivist. However,

the reintegration of classical motifs and classical themes is only one aspect of the Renaissance movement in art. Representations of pagan divinities, classical myths or events from Greek and Roman history which, iconographically at least, do not reveal the fact that they were products of a post-mediaeval civilization, exist of course in large numbers. But even larger, and much more dangerous from the viewpoint of orthodox Christianity, was the number of works in which the spirit of the Renaissance did not confine itself to reinstating classical types within the limits of the classical sphere, but aimed at a visual and emotional synthesis between the pagan past and the Christian present. This synthesis was achieved by various methods which could be applied separately and in combination.

The most widely used method might be called the *re-interpretation* of classical images. These images were either invested with a new symbolical

69

and motifs in space and time, down to this implausible occurrence of an ancient pagan emblem in the commercial landscape of modern New York, where meanings are essentially linked to forms, but where both forms and meanings are unstable, historical, and linked to material and intellectual *movements*.

Thus at the same time Greenberg sought to extricate modern art from contexts and meanings in order to locate form as a "reflective" realm of aesthetic pleasure, conceived as an antidote to the stultifying effects of what Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer would describe a bit later as the "culture industry,"[12] Erwin Panofsky explored the opposite path, seeking to historicize artistic forms and meanings as the traces of material and intellectual circulations. The fact that both texts (along with Benjamin's essays) were published on the eve of World War II—after Panofsky fled Nazi Germany for the United States, and as Greenberg witnessed the contest of commercial and political propagandas—reminds us that art history, and particularly the history of circulations, is not a peaceful field of abstract speculation. In this last connection, it is worth mentioning artists of the interwar period, especially those affiliated with Futurism, Dadaism, and Surrealism, whose work foregrounded circulation and mobility as both sources for artistic creation and pressing realities of life and art in ominous geopolitical contexts: one thinks more particularly, in the American context, of Francis Picabia and his "mecanomorph" portraits of the *291* circle in the late 1910s, and of Marcel Duchamp's *Boîte-en-valise*, begun in 1935 and hastened to completion during the period of the artist's forced exile in 1940–1941.

In the 1930s, meanwhile, neither the modernist nor the historicist models of art theory and history could suffice to characterize a period of American art that was deeply impregnated by domestic sociopolitical issues and, more specifically, the quests for American pasts, American scenes, and American arts.[13] Without entering into a discussion of regionalism and its battles with high modernism and abstraction, I use this juncture as a transition to an older and larger conception of American art, one associated with the label "nativism," which needs to be mentioned here precisely on account of its durable defense of native genius as a spontaneous, homegrown value, and therefore as something independent from historical patterns of circulation. What needs emphasis here is that in the nativist tradition, circulation is paradoxically a very relevant, arguably overarching issue—but negatively, as something to be either denied or rejected as beyond the pale of what concerns the history of American art. One only needs to

leaf through the pages of William Dunlap's *History of the Rise and Progress of the Arts of Design in the United States* (1834) to observe how the author establishes, emphatically if parenthetically, circulation and noncirculation of American artists within and outside of the United States as the subject of his book. Thus the beginning of the first chapter, devoted to the painter of portraits and genre scenes Charles Robert Leslie (1794–1859), states that in spite of British claims to the contrary, "Charles Robert Leslie is an American, and received his first instruction as a painter in America, and imbibed his taste and love for the art before he left the country to study systematically in Great Britain."[14] Similarly, in Dunlap's long chapter 9, unequally divided between Henry Inman (1801–1846) and Thomas Cole (1801–1848), the historian insists on the latter's passion for America and its landscapes and extensively quotes the artist about his disappointments in Europe. Dunlap nonetheless reveals the necessities of circulation in Cole's early and mature career, from the urge to escape what Neil Harris later called the "burden of portraiture" to his reluctant decision to travel to England to perfect and, like earlier and later American painters, to display his work.[15]

This story of laborious emancipation by overt or tacit confrontation with what Ralph W. Emerson called "the muses of Europe" was repeated over and over for more than a century. Thus one finds a familiar pattern of argument in James T. Flexner's 1962 *History of American Painting* (though Flexner's history begins in the colonial period and is therefore a history of painting in America rather than in the United States), specifically in its third volume, *That Wilder Image*.[16] Flexner essentially rehearses the nativist doctrine that had been Dunlap's and Cole's biographer Louis Legrand Noble's when he insists in his foreground that "some of the most effective exemplars of the Native School never went abroad. Those who did cross the ocean set out, even if quite young, not as raw students. . . . They had no desire to be born again." Urging readers to quit their "French eyeglasses," Flexner gives nativism its modern formulation, reminiscent of Frederick Jackson Turner's frontier hypothesis, when he defines American genius as the reflection of "broad environmental forces," rather than the reaction to "the influence of painters on painters, of pictures on pictures."[17]

While this "environmental" conception of American art's originality was furthered by major exhibitions and publications at least into the 1970s, I do not need to prolong this presentation, or detail the subsequent, powerful revisions that have transformed the understanding of

Thomas Cole's approach to landscape, history, and nationality, the American "school" of landscape painting, and the nativist construction as a whole.[18] Beyond landscape, recent discussions of the national paradigm in the history of American art have shown increasing reluctance to adopt the nativist argument, seen as a form of exceptionalism, and a growing concern to reframe, if not to relinquish, the whole discussion of the "Americanness of American art," particularly by seeking to internationalize the writing of its history.[19] This has meant, among other measures, substituting historical processes of "Americanization" for the essentialist view of "Americanness," and, perhaps most obviously, emphasizing exchanges and encounters with diverse "non-American" or non-WASP artistic and cultural traditions, as well as the input and heritage (or lack thereof) of these traditions in currents and institutions of American art.[20]

From the standpoint of this volume, however, attempts at internationalizing or decentering narratives of American art remain of limited importance, because their main operative concept is that of identity (and its subcategory, nationality), conceived often as condition, sometimes as meaning, of the artwork, and echoing older approaches of art as a window onto civilization. Increasingly sophisticated studies of international patterns of encounter and exchange, leading up to the approach known as transnationalism, have emphasized mediation, migration, hybridization, and even circulation as key concepts.[21] Still, international and transnational approaches have often remained bound to the primacy of message over medium, of identity over dissemination, or of representation over circulation. The departure from this approach—the notion that mobility presides over representation—is what gives importance to Jennifer Roberts's *Transporting Visions: The Movement of Images in Early America* (2014). A critical summary of Roberts's compelling thesis on the "movement of images" in the Early Republic serves here to open up a refined formulation of the present book's argument.

Roberts starts by acknowledging a certain commonality between the eighteenth-century context and the present time, through the notion of "visual communication"; this may strike readers as an example of the archaeological stance I presented above as both tempting and questionable. Her next premise similarly echoes the argument on economics and aesthetics outlined above: pictures in colonial America and the Early Republic were often mixed with commodities, rather than subjected to the "normative conditions of visibility and aesthetic distinction" that had, in the European context, come to define art.

The economic basis of early American art links up to Roberts's main thesis, according to which pictures in this period, like commodities, could "register the complications of their own transmission" and include in their very composition a "formal preprocessing of the distances they were designed to span"; and yet in its successive chapters on John S. Copley (1738–1815), John J. Audubon (1785–1851), and Asher B. Durand (1796–1886), the book's argument goes well beyond an economic interpretation. In keeping with the frameworks of material culture and mobility studies, the thesis reverses the order of sequence and priority between the realms of composition (or representation) and transportation (or circulation). Here circulation (or "transit," as Roberts prefers to write) is not a peripheral story of display, publicity, spread, distribution, and influence, but something like a *motif*, visible in the "pictorial expressions" themselves. The major illustration of the thesis is Copley's *Boy with Squirrel* (1765), a painting that was designed for the purpose of being sent to London for exhibition. For Roberts, the water glass on the table represents in several ways "the plight of the task of the painting itself" in its planned transit across the ocean, while the "flying squirrel" serves not only as a projection of North American life and science on the London stage but, as a "convertible" body, as "the most perfect mammalian analogue imaginable of a stretched canvas in transit," and finally, in its "well-rounded" bodily presence, a kind of pictorial emblem of empiricism.[22] The title *Transporting Visions*, then, refers not only to material processes of transporting pictures but to the ways visions of America in transit could "transport" makers and viewers alike into a form of rapture over the immensity of such space and hardship.

This unusual form of reflexivity points, beyond the postcolonial situation, to what Roberts calls the paradox of portability. Portability, integral to the historical emergence of pictures from the Renaissance on, worked to "liberate [the picture's] internal space of representation from the external space through which it moved," and for this very reason it obscured the burdens of transportation. The "geographic autonomy of the picture format" eventually led to the "aesthetic autonomy" of art, in Kantian (and Greenbergian) terms. Roberts contends in contrast that "geography inhabits pictures," as objects that move in space. In North America and its transoceanic relations in the eighteenth century, the geographical determination of pictures was all the more tangible since distances were great and obstacles many. Distances, obstacles, and delays, according to Roberts, were "not merely passive intermissions" but productive systems themselves. Art, like business,

confronted these obstacles and participated in the "systems devised to minimize the effects of delay, decay, and mistransmission."[23] The perplexed economy of transit stands in contrast to André Malraux's somewhat utopian notion of a "museum without walls," and all the more forcefully to the digital era's fantasy of immediate dissemination. It foregrounds weight, scale, materiality, time, and space as primary constituents of not just circulation but picturing, reminding readers of the digital age that pictures are objects and emphasizing transmission and mistransmission as long-standing issues. Yet at the same time Roberts's thesis produces a striking paradox.

While Roberts thus establishes a seductive "aesthetics of transit" as a recurring *motif* of early American art, the thesis also oddly amounts to a re-centering of art history's task on "pictorial expression." To put it bluntly, it is as if, starting from an anti-Greenbergian approach, identifying art as visual communication, and claiming a productive intervention of "life" into "art," or of "context" into the "text," Roberts came full circle in the end to reinstate the art object as an absolute, self-reflexive, and self-sufficient totality, which preregisters the imagined curve of its own movement so vividly that it no longer requires any "outside" documentation to deliver the full history of its circulation. This is a caricature. Roberts's book as a whole fully demonstrates that the history of the movement of images is far more complex than any particular picture maker could inscribe in a painting. Furthermore, it argues compellingly for including art history in a more material history, a history of things (and especially of commodities and the monetary system, in Audubon's case), thereby drawing further away from a Greenbergian model. Still, this attempt to make movement a component of the picture itself carries the risk of neutralizing the more mundane circulation of pictorial objects, or rather, of marginalizing aspects of circulation (not to mention noncirculation) that are beyond the pictorially expressible. Hence the relevance of what I call an "a-pictorial" approach of circulation.

The A-pictorial Approach: Photography, Reproduction, and Circulation

Circulation is both more and less than movement, and it far exceeds the realm of the pictorially representable. The history of art is filled with examples of circulations that were never destined to happen: reuses of objects that were never imagined to be reused, apparitions of pictures that were never intended to be seen. Most importantly, reproductive media have fostered an unchartable dissemination of

pictures over space and time. Their multiplicity is invisible; their history is unrepresentable. Reproduction, as such, opens up a space of multiple circulations that defeat the picturable process of physical transit, or even mobility. In fact, reproduction has frequently been motivated by the effort to counter the countless risk factors affecting the integrity of pictures and objects, especially in transit. War, fire, theft, confiscation, death, forgetting, loss—not to mention acquisition, relocation, reuse, appropriation, reinterpretation, recycling, and so on—have determined the historical courses and cultural meanings of (art) objects to a very large extent, while reproduction has been, historically, born out of the urge not only to distribute but to safeguard copies of originals. This perspective on reproduction inspires the "a-pictorial" approach of circulation, which I illustrate by turning to photography.

Upon publication of the first photographic processes in 1839, the greatest promise associated with the new invention, at least from a utilitarian perspective, was the unimaginable ease with which it "reproduced" visible objects. Though the fidelity of such "reproductions" would be debated for decades, we should not underrate the appeal of the idea of reproducing the visible world: in the nineteenth century, the most obvious cultural effect of photography was a new portability—of pictures (as early as the 1850s, specialized photographers made a business of reproducing works of art) but also of sights of the world. Let us recall Oliver W. Holmes (1809–1894) musing on stereoscopic travel ("I stroll through Rhenish vineyards, I sit under Roman arches, I walk the streets of once buried cities, I look into the chasms of Alpine glaciers, and on the rush of wasteful cataracts") and the attendant experiences, or fantasies, of de-corporealization ("and leave my outward frame in the arm-chair at my table, while in spirit I am looking down upon Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives"). Holmes predicted dematerialization: "Every conceivable object of Nature and Art will soon scale off its surface for us." Immaterial forms would contribute to stereographic collections and "a comprehensive system of exchanges."[24] Armchair travel and the promise of what Holmes called in the same text a photographic "Bank of Nature" were two horizons of photographic reproduction that motivated the oft-repeated link, in nineteenth-century discourse, of photography, telegraphy, and the railroad as agents of what the post-Romantic generation called the "annihilation of space and time." These new media did not necessarily express motion: photographic views were usually supposed to function simply as transparent windows on other places. They nonetheless acted as powerful "conducting" channels, emblematic of the Industrial Revolution.[25]

2
Gilbert Munger, "Uinta Range, Colorado—Canon of Lodore," from Clarence King, *Report of the Geological Exploration of the Fortieth Parallel*, vol. 1, *Systematic Geology* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1878), plate V. Chromolithograph, 8½ × 6 in. (20 × 15 cm). US Geological Survey, Ft. Collins, CO.

3
Timothy H. O'Sullivan, "Canon of Lodore, Green River," 1872, for Clarence King, *Geological Exploration of the Fortieth Parallel*. Albumen print from glass-plate negative on card mount. Library of Congress, Washington, DC. Prints and Photographs Division, LOT 7096, no. 72.

The archival record of nineteenth-century surveys of the American West is a great case in point. It comprises not only thousands of photographs but a whole array of graphic art including paintings, prints, maps, panoramic views, and atlases, as well as a huge shelf load of illustrated books, a prodigious amount of archival matter including hundreds of geographical, botanical, and mineralogical drawings, and an untold number of natural objects and artifacts.[26] Survey art, as it is sometimes called, was geographical in several senses. Aimed at depicting the land, it produced a pictorial record that included many "first" views of little-known places, usually made in a detailed, legible style. The makers of "views," whether painted, drawn, or photographed, were artists working in collaboration and sympathy with explorers, such as painter Gilbert Munger (1837–1903) and wet-plate photographer Timothy H. O'Sullivan (1840–1882) with geologist Clarence King (1842–1901) (figs. 2–3).[27] These views served both the "immobility" of archives and mapping (the purpose of preservation and centralized representation) and the movement of "traveling knowledge" (the purpose of circulation).[28] They were transported, reproduced, and disseminated for the sake of geographical science, American expansion, and American art. Gilbert Munger's oil pictures, which the painter usually preferred to finish on the spot, were transferred to color lithographs in illustration of King's reports, but also for the art market; research on Munger has shown that he became a prominent painter in the 1870s–1880s, especially after he moved to Europe and started to paint in a style closer to Barbizon.[29] Recent research on the photographs of the Geological Exploration of the Fortieth Parallel, or "King Survey," has revealed the extent of their international circulation in the 1870s, through European world's fairs, geographical congresses, and the international stereoview business.[30] The following discussion aims at illustrating how pictorial and a-pictorial polarities can be combined in the analysis of circulation.[31]

In an album of King Survey photographs preserved at the Library of Congress are two large views by Timothy O'Sullivan of a ridge of basalt "columns" in Nevada, which are captioned "Karnak, Montezuma Range, Nevada" (figs. 4–5, one caption with quotation marks around "Karnak" and the other without). These, like all others in the album, are pictures that "registered the complications of their own transmission." All "views" produced by the wet-collodion-on-glass method registered these complications, whether unwillingly through specks of dust, cracks in the glass, overexposure, or underfixing, or felicitously as demonstrations (not necessarily ostensible) of skill, care,

4
Timothy H. O'Sullivan, "'Karnak,' Montezuma Range, Nevada," 1867, for King, *Geological Exploration of the Fortieth Parallel*. Albumen print from glass-plate negative on card mount, 7⅞ × 10⅝ in. (20 × 27 cm) (image), 16¾ × 21¾ in. (42.5 × 55.2 cm) (mount). Library of Congress, Washington, DC. Prints and Photographs Division, LOT 7096, no. 76.

5
Timothy H. O'Sullivan, "Karnak, Montezuma Range, Nevada," 1867, for King, *Geological Exploration of the Fortieth Parallel*. Albumen print from glass-plate negative on card mount, 7⅞ × 10⅝ in. (20 × 27 cm) (image), 16¾ × 21¾ in. (42.5 × 55.2 cm) (mount). Library of Congress, Washington, DC. Prints and Photographs Division, LOT 7096, no. 77.

and caution in successfully producing, preserving, and transporting as perfect (or, we might say, *pictorially invisible*) "views" as possible of remote, inaccessible places unknown to the world at large. When the scene depicted was as strange, eerie, and even forbidding as this ridge in Nevada, there was, as often noted, a dimension of awe. Perhaps this awe is what O'Sullivan intended to foreground by frequently inserting in the view an observer figure, usually visibly intent on the serious work of scrutinizing a rock structure, but also sometimes animated by a semiburlesque attitude of bemusement, skepticism, or sheer theatricality. By doing this, Clarence King's photographer did engage in a measure of compositional reflexivity that may, at least from our vantage point, be interpreted as a pictorial expression of the projected transit of the "view" to some remote, urban setting in New York or London where other observers unfamiliar with the scenes would gaze on them.

When Clarence King or his team labeled this site and these views "Karnak, Montezuma Range, Nevada," they performed an act of "naming the view," in Alan Trachtenberg's words,[32] that was less geological than it was artistic, intercultural, and intermedial, though it is difficult to determine to what extent the names designated observable, visual, or pictorial features of the scenery. The name "Montezuma" was inspired by the Aztec emperor—popularly associated with gold—and used a metaphorical reference to a bygone "Indian" empire to signify the rise of a white American one. (Incidentally, as Martha Sandweiss has demonstrated, the significance of photographs of the West lies as much in the omissions they embodied and circulated as in their existence as "views.")[33] The ridge of crumbling basalt "columns" was named Karnak, King explained, for pictorial reasons: "The steep slopes are formed of sharply divided columns, still in situ, resembling a pile of architectural ruins and suggesting the name of Karnak."[34] "Karnak" was a place-name and a cultural icon, popularized by an abundance of travel literature and imagery, that triggered cultural references to Egypt, architecture, possibly religion, and certainly antiquity; in Nevada, it participated in the ongoing monumentalization of the West. It is even possible that O'Sullivan's photographs were inspired by anterior photographs of Karnak, Egypt, such as those made in the 1850s by the American calotype artist John B. Greene (1832–1856) (figs. 6–7), or the more popular stereographs made by Francis Frith (1822–1898) for the London Stereoscopic Company. Such high-profile photographic endeavors definitely involved, among other contexts, scientific and artistic competition with European precedents and references. Thus, with this caption, O'Sullivan's views of "Karnak"

6
John B. Greene, "Karnac. Salle hypostyle. Mur du Nord. Face extérieure N°1," 1853, from the album *Sculptures et inscriptions égyptiennes* (Paris, 1853–1854), plate 92. Salt paper print from calotype negative, 8 5/8 × 11 7/8 in. (22 × 30 cm). Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France, Paris, Folio Z129C, Pl. 92.

7
John B. Greene, "Karnac. Salle hypostyle. Mur du Nord. Face extérieure N° 3," 1853, from the album *Sculptures et inscriptions égyptiennes* (Paris, 1853–1854), plate 94. Salt paper print from calotype negative, 9 × 11 7/8 in. (23 × 30 cm). Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France, Paris, FolioZ129C, Pl. 94.

8
Detail of mount card for fig. 4, showing handwritten caption with quotation marks around the name "Karnak."

may be said to function as pictorial expressions not only of sites in Nevada but of their cultural destinations as learned (and creative) geographical images.

In one of the two handwritten captions at the Library of Congress, however, "Karnak" is put between quotation marks (fig. 8), suggesting jocularity or uncertainty about this exotic appellation, and reminding us that such captions are ephemeral and context sensitive. The same views were labeled differently in other sets: "Rhyolite ridge, Trinity Mountains" in the Ashburner collection at the Bancroft Library; "Ridge of columnar trachyte, Western Nevada" in a large portfolio preserved at the Paris Société de Géographie. The quotation marks and the existence of more sober "geological" captions concur with the noncommittal postures of the observer figures to suggest that the photographs were also intended as "views," pictorially unremarkable images, "reproductions" of sites destined for circulation and recirculation in endlessly renewable purposes of communication. Some may say that such a relativist view of visual expression as semantically open communication is really suited to images, especially utilitarian ones, and what Jennifer Roberts calls the "incomplete subjectivity" of moving pictures,[35] in opposition to what is called art, understood even in loosely Greenbergian terms as a realm of objects that are defined and appreciated independently from their circulations. As it is one of the purposes of this volume to explore the ways in which circulation *makes* American art, I can only begin here to answer this objection.

Photographs from the nineteenth-century surveys of the West have not only circulated (and recirculated) in countless contexts as documents, first for geographical purposes, later as historical sources. Perhaps more than any other component of the rich legacy of the surveys, they have been rediscovered and recirculated, since the twentieth century, as significant creations of American culture and ultimately of American art. Given the number of books and exhibitions devoted to them, their ever-increasing value on the art market, and their conspicuous presence in major museum collections, and after so many rephotographic, experimental, and iterative art endeavors have engaged these survey photographs, it has become necessary to consider the photographic "record" of the nineteenth-century surveys as a full-fledged artistic heritage.[36] With this conviction one is led to revisit their original circumstances, and notice among other things that they were not only destined to function as illustrative material but also clearly envisioned for exhibition purposes (in world's fairs, especially). Circulation and recirculation of these photographs resulted not only in spreading a visual knowledge and an aesthetic appeal of western landscapes but, with the passage of time and the growing appreciation of photography, in creating a corpus of "primitive" American landscape art. Views initially destined to circulate as transparent images of remote sites came later to recirculate—in part thanks to the large "wake" left by their original circulations—as key works of a native American tradition: an important example of how art can be made by circulation and recirculation.

Many other examples of this process of making (American) art by circulation or recirculation could be added here, such as the photographic collection of the Farm Security Administration, in which delayed, redirected, and renewed circulations of "documentary" photographic enterprises originally supported by institutional strategies with professed utilitarian goals served as channels for making American art. Certainly the logic of artistic recycling is not limited to institutional photography, as is suggested by the recent valorizations of collections of amateur photographs, or even the recent reemergence of the once-suppressed corpus of lynching postcards—a case of "delayed circulation" that has generated a lot of attention.[37] But circulation does not interest us, the contributors to this volume, only in the way it mixes art with nonart, or makes art out of what was once at the furthest remove from acceptable or accepted definitions of art. Circulation concerns us, first and foremost, as a generic procedure to be acknowledged in the social history of American art. In sum, then,

we propose to use circulation (and noncirculation) as a methodological concept that is apt—particularly in the American context—to supplement the more abstract notions of visibility and invisibility, and to anchor the logic of representation and nonrepresentation in a material history.

Scope and Outline of the Book

Our book, then, envisions the phenomenon of circulation in its broadest extension—and not as a merely spatial and synchronic phenomenon. Once again, circulation is not only motion; it is also currency, and, at least to a certain extent, circularity, recirculation, or recurrence of signs and objects within a given cultural territory; reproduction, reuse, re-mediation, repurposing, and return of the same are components of circulation just as essential as physical transportation, as are noncirculation, suppressed circulation, and delayed circulation. This makes the "field" immense, and any encyclopedic ambition pointless. Thus we agreed to approach the theme through a series of transversal investigations, focusing on specific objects, rather than through a more formalized catalogue of media, genres, or periods. Four of the five essays focus on one broad trend of American art, associated with one historical moment but not limited to it, and examine within this framework a variety of modes of circulation. One essay takes the opposite route, by offering a case study of one specific art object. Thus this book aims at indicating the boundless diversity and the convergent pervasiveness of circulations in the history of American art.

A greater diversity of objects and horizons could certainly be envisioned. This volume tends to adopt a fairly traditional topology, positing American art primarily in relation to western Europe and especially France. This transatlantic orientation may be seen as a bias, and as such it is open to criticism. Nevertheless, it also has a virtue, which lies in its affiliation with the nativist tradition: whereas in this tradition, circulation to and from Europe tends to be bracketed out, in this volume, circulation or communication with Europe—as well as other regions—is presented as a factor of development, and, perhaps more importantly, of the growing reach of American art. The transnational "bonus" of circulation—in the many cases of American artists, works, and pictures that were exported to Europe to gain visibility and "came back" richer or more creditable as art—is recalled and given new illustrations, while in the cases of photography, cinema, and the illustrated press especially, circulation of American productions is

shown to produce not just new American art but new international artistic standards. As already said, however, we do not construe circulation as purely or primarily an international phenomenon; and while Europe is on the horizon of the essays, their true focus is on the general economy of circulation. Indeed, while the geographical framework of this volume may be traditional, it is less conservative in its choice of media, since every chapter but one addresses reproductive media (printed illustrations, press photography, cinema, and popular imageries), following our primary attention to the modern conditions of circulation as dissemination—synchronic multiplicity and diachronic recycling. Finally, because no obvious artistic or conceptual hierarchy of media, works, or subjects emerged from the contributions, we thought it efficient to present the "story" in a roughly chronological order, which takes readers from the American Revolution to the so-called digital revolution—two key events, certainly, for any history of circulation.

The American Revolution and the transatlantic traffic of memorial or civic art it generated is a classic as well as a new field for studying circulation in American art, which has recently followed the "Atlantic turn" of political and cultural history.[38] Our volume opens with the essay by J. M. Mancini, entitled "American Art's Dark Matter," which takes up our concern with the economy of reproduction and recirculation by tracking visual histories of the American Revolution over a period of more than a century, through the comparison of a 1783 French collection of engravings to a landmark illustrated text of American history from 1898. Mancini sets out to uncover processes of forgetting and suppression—concerning particularly the role of Spain and its imperial aspirations, more generally the "clash of empires," in the Revolutionary sequence. These processes must be considered against the better-known phenomena of visual circulation and their effects of repetition and concentration. Circulation works "negatively" as well as "positively"; besides the more direct procedures of iconoclasm, destruction, and censorship, the repetition and concentration resulting from repeated selective circulation of landmark episodes and their illustrations end up producing what Mancini calls "uncirculation" (i.e., willful or at least "not-random" noncirculation) of other episodes and images—in this case in the service of nationalist or imperialist narratives. Independently of its specific argument, this essay fittingly introduces our perspective by addressing circulation jointly with recirculation and noncirculation, and aligning these complex processes with the history of reproduction and illustration.

Stimulating links are thus established with the next contribution, Thierry Gervais's essay, "Shifting Images," a synthetic history of American news photography between the Civil War and World War II. The essay's first focus is on the little-known early development of photojournalism during the imperial wars of the turn of the twentieth century (especially the Russo-Japanese War of 1904), revealing how the categories of "art" and "history" were fused in the illustration of current events. Like treatments of the Spanish-American War by both press illustrators and more-famous artists, illustrations of the "new" wars incorporated overt and covert reminiscences of earlier wars and their images. Gervais's larger emphasis is on a history of press illustration as art, rather than mere circulation of photographic records or reproductions. This approach leads to a valuable description of the several layers of circulation that align the history of news illustration with a history of art envisioned, in a roughly Panofskian model, as a history of migrations and mutations: the movement of images between different media, and the ways in which processing and reprocessing photographs transform them into artificial, artful, and artistic pictures; the movement of published images between different publications, which also demonstrates the interplay of the professional cultures of picture editors, designers, and publishers with those of photographers; and the movement of picture makers, designers, and even publishers between different national and professional contexts. In so doing, the essay also significantly renovates a history that has often been approached in strictly American and strictly photographic terms, focusing excessively on the single story of *Life* magazine.

The turn of the twentieth century, and a certain Henry Adams–like anxiety over the course of American history, again form the backdrop of our third contribution, which is also our case study, placed at the center of this volume for both chronological and substantive reasons. Hélène Valance's essay on Whistler's *Portrait of the Artist's Mother* takes us through a long history of the painting's life, extending from 1871 to the present day, to show in some detail how inseparable the meaning (or, one might say, the proper iconological reading) of James McNeill Whistler's most famous picture—perhaps the most famous pre-1900 American painting in France—is from the rich and contradictory history of its circulations, recirculations, and noncirculations. Valance gives a glimpse of today's culture industry of digital spoofs of this and other "icons" of American painting, which serves as a token example of digital circulation. But the story of Whistler's painting is also an illustration of a larger effect, which one might call

"felicitous miscommunication," and which, like Roberts's "mistransmission," has been a significant part of the history of American art. In Valance's title, the phrase "rematriating Whistler" strikingly encapsulates a process of "miscommunication" that is not only international, but manifold, and not the result of any one critic's particular mistake, but rather the reflection of Whistler's own effort at multiplying the picture's meanings through its circulation. The essay's task is not to reveal Whistler's "true" artistic intention, or his "true" relationship to his mother, but rather to demonstrate how the artist exploited the combined circumstances of the painting's genesis and his situation in Paris to serve an unambiguous ambition of *circulating* this picture, with its ostensible iconography of filial piety, as a statement of modern art.

A partially similar method, aimed at characterizing international circulation as the source of a transnational American art, is taken up in Tom Gunning's essay, which asks humorously, "Did the French invent the American cinema?" It is important to remember here, as Gunning does in his introduction, that early cinema emblematized the twentieth-century version of "connecting" or "circulating" pictures, not only because, like lithographs and stereographs in the nineteenth, its industrial base used mass production technology to distribute similar images everywhere, but because these were moving images, which, more efficiently than the colors of lithographs or the 3-D effect of stereographs, maximized the illusion of transporting "life" into a picture. Gunning's main point, however, is more about felicitous miscommunication than about illusionism. The essay takes up the well-known "international" story of the beginnings of cinema to probe patterns of exchange and interpenetration between not only competing technological models of moviemaking and movie viewing, but also cultural and critical approaches of what constituted cinema as art, primarily in somewhat-forgotten French texts of the pre–World War II period and then in the better-known context of the *Nouvelle Vague*. Again, however, the transnational construction of American art is only part of the story; what is observable here is not just the critical hybridization of national characters—for instance, the encounter of a certain highbrow, snobbish French taste with the display of raw virility in American westerns—but another example of how American pictures were transformed into American art by virtue of being circulated outside their explicitly intended audiences.

Finally, Frank Mehring's essay, "How Silhouettes Became 'Black,'" brings the same methodology to perhaps maximal expansion, spatially and chronologically as well as theoretically. The essay retraces the

complex and largely unexplored ways in which the eighteenth-century art of the silhouette, a typically white "bourgeois" mode of imaging the self, later applied to racialist stereotyping, "became 'black'" in the context of the Harlem Renaissance—again, through a dense network of international transactions that need to be viewed as willful recirculations, or decontextualizations—to serve later, in the language of Apple products, as the depoliticized surrogate for a fantasized universal code of communication. With this dense narrative of what is actually a very large history, Mehring brings together many of the shared concerns of our volume. As an image traced, so to speak, by its subject, the silhouette is a modern echo of myths of the invention of picturing as a double process of transfer of "life" into "art" and dissemination of images in society. As a pervasive mechanism of imagery of European bourgeois selfhood, converted into a visual trope of racial typology and then reappropriated by African American and Africanist artists in the service of a generalized "positive" image of blackness, the silhouette emblematizes the ways in which processes of circulation and recirculation tend to deindividualize particular pictures and specific historical moments of picturing (picturing identity, especially) to produce, eventually, the kind of catchall, empty symbolic forms exemplified by the iPod ads and, more generally, by Internet memes.

As this brief summary confirms, the range of topics covered in this volume is all too limited. Our hope, of course, is that our choices may stimulate further discussion. For this purpose perhaps it is not idle to rephrase, in closing, some of our main shared ideas. First, as far as spatial circulation is considered, this volume repeatedly addresses the transatlantic conversation that has long stood as a pillar of American art history. While it also seeks to reckon with other histories, as well as reversals, digressions, and various material patterns of mobility, above all this volume aims at redirecting this transatlantic conversation toward other horizons than the Americanness of American art, by positing circulation not as a factor of, or hindrance to, artistic identity (or nationality) but as a general condition of the making of American art. It is well known by now that intercultural circulations opened American art to transcultural constructions. What emerges from this collection of essays is that the logic of circulation marginalizes the notion of identity because it exceeds the transit of representations, and especially representations of identity, national or other. Turning to Jacques Rancière's work, we might propose that circulation works toward what he calls a generalized "aesthetic regime": in a nutshell, a regime where anything and everything can be or

become art—especially by being circulated out of its "native" context, and in which American art has perhaps better and more constantly succeeded than European art of the same period.

By the same token, it is clear that circulation exceeds the spatial dimension and requires diachronic perspectives. Our volume charts some examples of the unpredictable trajectories of recycling, derivation, and re-mediation that accompany or directly ensue from circulation. In so doing, it combines the two paths of analysis I called pictorial and a-pictorial. Indeed, in this volume, artworks are often approached as archival and communicational objects, composite image-texts, generic images, and even ideas of images, as much as singular, specific "picturings." Several of the essays scrutinize the productivity of these archival or ideal objects, pictures and texts intertwined, in patterns of reception and appreciation but also in the processes of making art. And here lies the great benefit, as well as the greatest risk, of instating circulation as a critical category: because the analysis of circulation constantly and necessarily exceeds the description of material, spatial movements, or transmissions of singular images, circulation stands to become, ultimately, another name for history. Such a generalized and dematerialized view of history is perhaps what the digital culture of seemingly total, immediate circulation in a website gallery invites everyone to embrace. It is not, probably, one that most art historians would readily accept.

This is why in closing it is useful to recall our insistence on the "negative" histories of circulation. For every object that circulates, how many don't? For every picture that appears, how many disappear? For every archive that is digitized, how many are destroyed? Ultimately, if, as we suggest, circulation has been a shaping factor of American art, to what extent have noncirculations, absences, invisibilities, negations, and destructions also been determining factors in its history? To what extent, then, is it true that what has not been circulated has not been represented, or made into art for that matter? In the age of the Internet and the digital image, this is certainly a relevant question, as students, if not scholars themselves, work under the fantasy that every picture that exists must exist online and the parallel fallacy that what is not visible online does not exist. May this volume offer a reminder of the allied modes of presence and absence, speech and silence, visibility and invisibility, and, against the fallacy of a totally and definitely visible history, a reminder of the visual historian's task to constantly contest and renovate received "galleries" by circulating or recirculating what has not, or not sufficiently, been circulated before.

This essay was nourished by my conversations with the contributors to this volume, especially during a seminar at Université Paris Diderot in 2014–2015. I acknowledge the valuable input of the anonymous reviewers and that of Rachael DeLue, series editor.

1 See Hollis Clayson, "Circulation," in *Is Paris Still the Capital of the Nineteenth Century? Essays on Art and Modernity, 1850–1900*, ed. Clayson and André Dombrowski (New York: Routledge, 2016), 189–93.

2 See *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "circulation" (2009 draft additions especially), for the analysis of the phrases "in circulation" and "out of circulation." The word originated in the sixteenth century in the sense of "circular motion" or "rotation" before acquiring that of "distillation" of liquids and that of "circuit of the blood" in the seventeenth century and the modern sense of "transmission" in the nineteenth century.

3 W. J. T. Mitchell, *What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2006).

4 Arjun Appadurai, ed., *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

5 Rachael Z. DeLue, introduction to *Picturing*, ed. DeLue, Terra Foundation Essays (Chicago: Terra Foundation for American Art, 2016), esp. 21–23.

6 See Linda J. Docherty, "Original Copies: Gilbert Stuart's Companion Portraits of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison," *American Art* 22, 2 (Summer 2008): 85–97, esp. 88–89.

7 On a generalized economics of "exchange" as a paradigm for the analysis of cultural modernity, see Stephen Greenblatt, ed., *Cultural Mobility: A Manifesto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

8 For a definition of visual culture as a primarily sociopolitical field of meaning production, see Nicholas Mirzoeff, *An Introduction to Visual Culture*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2009). DeLue argues for a more inclusive approach in the introduction to *Picturing*, 23–25.

9 See Rosalind Krauss, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1985); T. J. Clark, *Farewell to an Idea: Episodes from a History of Modernism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999); and Michael Leja, *Reframing Abstract Expressionism: Subjectivity and Painting in the 1940s* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997). In an echo to Michael Leja's exploration of Abstract Expressionism as an artistic form resonant with mainstream cultural expressions, Jacques Rancière, in *Aisthesis: Scenes from the Aesthetic Regime of Art* (2011), trans. Zakir Paul (New York: Verso, 2013), traces a long history of modernism as seeking the fusion of art and life, against the vision of modernism as an elitist, separatist artistic culture.

10 Clement Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," in *Art and Culture: Critical Essays* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), 5, 6, 9, 12.

11 Erwin Panofsky, *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* (1939; New York: Harper & Row, 1972), 12–14, 70–71, 69.

12 Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments* (1944), ed. Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007).

13 Wanda Corn, *The Great American Thing: Modern Art and National Identity, 1915–1935* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

14 William Dunlap, *History of the Rise and Progress of the Arts of Design in the United States*, new ed. (Boston: C. E. Goodspeed, 1918), 1.

15 Neil Harris, *The Artist in American Society: The Formative Years* (1966; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 56–89.

16 James T. Flexner, *History of American Painting*, vol. 3, *That Wilder Image: The Native School from Thomas Cole to Winslow Homer* (1962; New York: Dover, 1978). See my extended commentary in "Toward a Transcultural History of American Landscape Images in the Nineteenth Century," in *A Seamless Web: Transatlantic Art in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Cheryll L. May and Marian Wardle (Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), 3–10.

17 Flexner, *That Wilder Image*, xii–xiv.

18 Angela Miller, *The Empire of the Eye: Landscape Representation and American Cultural Politics, 1825–1875* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993); Alan Wallach, *Thomas Cole: Landscape into History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994); Andrew Wilton and Tim

Barringer, eds., *American Sublime: Landscape Painting in the United States 1820–1880* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002).

19 See Barbara S. Groseclose and Jochen Wierich, *Internationalizing the History of American Art: Views* (Philadelphia: Penn State University Press, 2009), esp. 6–7.

20 See the following major surveys: Frances Pohl, *Framing America: A Social History of American Art*, 3rd ed. (London: Thames & Hudson, 2012); David Bjelajac, *American Art: A Cultural History*, 2nd ed. (London: Pearson, 2004); and, more crucially, Angela L. Miller, Janet C. Berlo, Bryan Wolf, Jennifer L. Roberts, eds., *American Encounters, Art, History, and Cultural Identity* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson-Prentice Hall, 2008).

21 See especially Miller et al., *American Encounters*; and, for a larger framework of transnational studies, Chiara de Cesari and Ann Rigney, eds., *Transnational Memory: Circulation, Articulation, Scales* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014).

22 Jennifer Roberts, *Transporting Visions: The Movement of Images in Early America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014), 1–2, 17, 49.

23 Ibid., 2–4. Roberts explains her debt to the various poststructuralist critiques of transparency (pp. 9–10 and notes).

24 Oliver W. Holmes, "The Stereoscope and the Stereograph," *Atlantic Monthly* 3, 20 (1859): 746–48.

25 See Leo Marx, *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), 194.

26 Although there is still no comprehensive study of this vast corpus as a whole, useful approaches to several aspects of it are found in Edward C. Carter III, ed., *Surveying the Record: North American Scientific Exploration to 1930*, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1999).

27 See Weston Naef, ed., *Era of Exploration: The Rise of Landscape Photography in the American West* (New York: Metropolitan, 1975).

28 Jennifer Tucker, "How Well Do Photographs Travel? Some Reflections on Photographs as Moving Images" (keynote address, "Exchanging Photographs, Making Knowledge," De Montfort University, June 21, 2014).

29 Michael D. Schroeder and J. Gray Sweeney, *Gilbert Munger: Quest for Distinction* (Afton, MN: Afton Historical Society Press, 2003).

30 François Brunet, "Showing American Geography Abroad in the Victorian Era: The International Reception of the King Survey Work," in *Timothy H. O'Sullivan: The King Survey Photographs*, ed. Keith Davis and Jane Aspinwall (Kansas City, MO: Hall Family Foundation/ Yale University Press, 2011), 185–93, and references cited therein. See also Carol M. Johnson, "Through Magic Lenses: Timothy H. O'Sullivan's Stereographs from the King and Wheeler Surveys," in *Framing the West: The Survey Photographs of Timothy H. O'Sullivan*, ed. Toby Jurovics (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press/ Smithsonian Institution, 2010), 161–73.

31 The section that follows borrows, in revised form, from my essay cited above, "Toward a Transcultural History of American Landscape," 10–20.

32 Alan Trachtenberg, "Naming the View," in *Reading American Photographs: Images as History, Mathew Brady to Walker Evans* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1989), 119–64.

33 Martha Sandweiss, *Print the Legend: Photography and the American West* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002).

34 Clarence King, *Systematic Geology*, 644, quoted in Toby Jurovics, "Framing the West," in Jurovics, *Framing the West*, 225n33.

35 Roberts, *Transporting Visions*, 11.

36 See especially Mark Klett et al., *Third Views, Second Sights: A Rephotographic Survey of the American West* (Albuquerque: Museum of New Mexico Press, 2004).

37 On lynching photographs and their "re-mediation," see Ken Gonzales-Day, *Lynching in the West, 1850–1935* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006); and the artist's projects, "Hang Trees" and "Erased Lynchings."

38 See "Objects in Motion: Art and Material Culture across Colonial North America," ed. Wendy Bellion and Mónica Domínguez Torres, special issue, *Winterthur Portfolio* 45, 2/3 (Summer/Autumn 2011), esp. the editors' introduction.