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I.

Screens are not only optical devices. Since the 15th century the English word screen, as well as the French écran, the Italian schermo, the German Schirm, has denoted objects that perform functions other than supporting a projected representation. A screen was a contrivance for warding off the heat of a fire or a draft of air, a partition of wood or stone dividing a room or building in two parts, a wall thrown out in front of a building to mask the façade, a tactical deployment of soldiers to conceal the movement of an army, an apparatus used in the sifting of grain and coal. It was a filter, a divide, a shelter, a camouflage. These functions underscored not so much the optical qualities of a screen, but rather its environmental character—its nature as a prop to be used within and towards a space. The primacy of the optical character of the screen only emerged in the first decades of the 19th century, when the word started to designate the surfaces supporting projected images in spectacles like the magic lantern or the Phantasmagoria. And yet this meaning was barely registered in dictionaries until the end of the century; only with the advent of cinema, and later of television, did the screen acquire its most common present-day sense.

Quite paradoxically, then, the current explosion of screens—the “development” and “improvement” of screen technologies—lends a new currency to these old and seemingly antiquated meanings of the word screen. Digital and social media expand the functions of screens beyond the optical.
Surveillance cameras provide a protection and a defense from the outside. In retrieving information computers sieve data according to users’ needs. Hand-held devices help to create an existential bubble in which users can find an intimacy and a refuge even in public spaces. Global Positioning Systems parse the territory and identify right and wrong routes. Interfaces underline a separation between different worlds and keep a door open between them. Pixelated media-façades envelop entire buildings and hide them from the view. Screens have become again filters, shelters, divides, and camouflage. They remain surfaces that display images and data, and yet their opticality is deeply rooted in their spatial and environmental conditions.

How may we better grasp this back and forth between the two main modalities of the screen? How are we to interpret its past identification with an optical device and its present repossession of environmental resonances? We will hazard some tentative short answers. Hopefully, they will help us not only to retrace the history of the screen in a novel perspective, but also to revise and reverse a still largely dominant idea of the screen.

2. Let’s begin with a radical statement. A screen is not a pre-existing object. We can’t delineate a screen “as such,” as if it were a freestanding and self-contained device existing independently of its context. A screen becomes a screen through an apparatus and in connection with a set of practices that produce it as screen. Habitual exposure to a screen may well have a naturalizing effect, causing the process underpinning its production to withdraw from perception. Screens then look like something available for an already established use—

something ready-to-hand, in Heidegger’s terms. And yet what is always at stake is an ensemble of elements—an assemblage—characterized by a certain disposition and sustaining certain types of operations. This disposition and these operations recall the main functions that we have already mentioned: supporting a representation, filtering external elements, sheltering internal components, dividing a space, concealing, etc. Once the assemblage comes together, all of its components, regardless of their materiality, can become a screen.

The orientation either toward the optical or toward the environmental can consequently be read in connection with the emergence of certain kinds of assemblages, either aimed at intercepting, directing, and entertaining the gaze, or at arranging space so that it becomes more functional and/or safe. The screen is a function of these assemblages—its performance or role being tied not to its substance or its physicality, but to its affordance and its availability. It is not by chance that in early cinema there are many fixtures that can perform as a screen, from glass surfaces to white walls, and from translucent surfaces to canvases. If they become a screen it is because they fit an overall design and support a set of operations.

3. What matters is not the being but rather the becoming of the screen. In this process of becoming-screen, there are no clear preconditions. Why a set of elements coalesces in an assemblage, and which elements coalesce, is the effect of the coalescence rather than its cause. Even the functions that an assemblage can perform are an effect of its constitution. An assemblage
produces a support, a filter, a shelter, or a camouflage because the elements are disposed in a certain way and induce specific operations, rather than because it responds to a previous need or a pre-assigned task. The birth of an assemblage is not necessarily the final stage of a teleological course of development: it looks much more like a “Big-Bang” from which a new universe of opportunities and relations surfaces.

The metaphor of the “Big-Bang” underlines the idea that the constitution of an assemblage implies not causality but contingency and conjuncture. On the one hand, it is something which “happens”—it is an “event.” We can express the same idea by saying that an assemblage is something that “emerges” within a field of possibilities and circumstances: something that was potentially there suddenly materializes, with its fixtures, its dispositions, and its operations. The becoming-screen, as well as its orientation towards the optical or the environmental, has the quality of an emergence. On the other hand, an emergence is always an emergency; it responds to urgency. In this sense, we cannot exclude the presence of active forces that exert a certain pressure on the constitution of an assemblage—or, better, that help it to happen. These forces may also lead the device in one direction or another: the screen’s optical turn likely had to do with the political and economic interests that in early modernity pushed writing and imagining procedures toward “visualization,” to use Bruno Latour’s word; the current screen’s environmental re-orientation likely responds to the needs of a society that, obsessed more by control than discipline, as Gilles Deleuze would say, finds itself ill-at-ease with the surveillance of both macro- and micro-territories. In the same vein, we cannot exclude the presence of a project in a proper sense—the obsession of an individual, or a research by a company—that pushes for the creation of an assemblage. After all, devices deal also with patents and copyrights.

And yet the possible reasons that underpinned the emergence of an assemblage can be detected only after the fact. Which means that, post-facto, we recognize as pre-conditions something that the assemblage itself helped define. These pre-conditions were not present as such until the birth of the assemblage; it is the birth of the assemblage that unfolds these pre-conditions and produces them as such.

4.

So, the identification of what causes the emergence of an assemblage is an effect of its emergence. It is what happens later that shapes our detection of what there was before. This is equally true for the precursor of an assemblage. The pre- is a consequence of what comes after: a pre-cinema or a pre-digital does not exist without the advent of cinema or digital.

Media historians have to keep this principle in mind, if they want to escape some usual pitfalls of media archaeologies: a purely chronological order of facts, a causal explication of the events, and a teleological interpretation of the innovations. This is particularly important when the focus is on the screen. The history of screen practices that Charlie Musser brilliantly inaugurated with his research on pre-cinema, as well as the screen archaeology that Erkki Huhtamo envisioned in his still illuminating text “Elements of Screenology”, must find their foundation in this “after”: every time the temptation of the “pre” takes the lead, the enterprise shows its weakness. Put in other terms, a historical account must be grounded not on an idea of a simple past, but on an idea of
An example—even though roughly-cut and sharply summarized—could help. Let’s think of the Panorama and Phantasmagoria. First of all, it is worth noticing that they were born almost in the same year: Robert Barker’s Panorama patent, in Edinburgh, dates to 1796; the first phantasmagoria shows of Etienne-Gaspard Robert, known as Robertson, at the Pavillon de l’Echiquier in Paris, date to 1797. Parallel experiments, like Paul Philidor’s, were in the same chronological perimeter. The two dispositives shared the goal of showing a spectacle to a gathered audience in a dedicated interior space. They mobilized an emerging need for exposition and exposure, and, at the same time, they created a location for it, a purpose-built facility for the Panorama, and an old ghostly edifice for the Phantasmagoria. The opticalization of the screen retained a spatial or environmental component.

Nevertheless, both dispositives revolved around an optical element, one or more surfaces intended to support a visual representation. Curiously, no one of these surfaces was termed “screen,” even though they all displayed characteristics of what would come to be known as a screen. In the Panorama we have “a circular building or framing erected” on which “the painting may be performed,” or, if “done on canvas,” may be “upended” (these words are Barker’s): basically, we have a wall. In the Phantasmagoria we have what Robertson called “mirrors,” a class of objects that includes proper mirrors as well as translucent surfaces, whose function is to hold images, mostly projected. In the Panorama the screenic nature of the building's walls would never be fully recognized. The Phantasmagoria, by contrast, will become the first medium to attract the definition of screen for its surfaces. Phantasmagoria, more than...
The Panorama, would apparently represent the transition to the optical. The two assemblages diverged even more in the way in which they articulated the cultural and technological resources they nevertheless shared. Indeed, each dispositive ideally enlisted a competing set of elements. The Panorama resumed representational techniques activated by frescoes, landscape watercolors, and military sketches. It entailed the use of perspective, and consequently it recalled the camera obscura; it also practiced an unframed depiction of a scene (whose potential model was Baciccia’s ceiling in the Baroque Chiesa del Gesù in Rome), and large formats. The Phantasmagoria, by contrast, drew from the magic lantern (Athanasius Kircher, Kaspar Schott), and enacted a composite spectacle (more akin to a theatrical performance) recalling rituals of initiation and the Wunderkammer. The effect was the creation of two different backgrounds—two diverse potential archaeologies.

Finally, the two assemblages brought to the fore divergent ideological purposes. The Panorama staged an appropriation of the world and a celebration of history. It moved within a culture of Empire, where what mattered was a territory (that had been in some way conquered and protected) in which a circulation of commodities and extraction of resources is possible. The Phantasmagoria went beyond such a territory. It put spectators into contact with the kingdom of the dead, it unfolded uncanny aspects of the surrounding reality, and it raised curiosity and fears. It did not simply move within a culture of magic: it also tested spectators’ emotional reactions. In this sense it dealt with an interior world and with a spiritual reality, as well as our capacity to cope with them both. In a way, the Panorama spoke of a geographical expansion while the Phantasmagoria spoke of a transcendental network. The former was a political machine, the latter a psychoanalytical one.

With the Panorama and the Phantasmagoria we have two different tracks toward the optical, two different legacies to which to refer, and two different types of instances to be voiced and embodied. The concurrent emergence of these assemblages provides two conceptual maps through which to read the past and the present, and consequently two divergent frameworks in which a screen finds its allocation. These maps would endure through the entirety of the 19th century, establishing distinctions but also complementarity. For example, the Phantasmagoria was used to define every situation in which imagination, dream, false consciousness, etc., comes to the fore—suffice it to recall Marx’s characterization of the commodity fetish. The Panorama went even farther: from a mode of representation, it became a term aimed at defining the reality that was represented—in particular, a landscape when appearing in its entirety and magnificence. The two cognitive maps sharpened the distinction between diverse domains of visuality, and yet mutually collaborated for visuality’s full emergence. The advent of film would rearticulate these maps and bring visuality to its climax.

Let’s stay for a while on the dynamics that underpin the emergence of an assemblage. Before it has coalesced, or before it has been recognized as a new reality, it can perpetuate antecedent forms. We have already seen how in the early-19th-century the magic lantern was associated with the microscope; similarly, in early-20th-century cinema was still often identified as the evolution of the magic lantern. Once an assemblage emerges along with its disposition
and its practices, the old forms are retroactively severed from the new ones and can be identified as their ancestors—once the magic lantern is recognized as such, the microscope becomes a pre-device; the same happens with cinema and the magic lantern. In this way, a lineage is created post facto. The consequence is that implicitly when the two assemblages overlap, and explicitly when they are linked through an idea of family, a certain “memory” of the past is preserved—even though this past is an effect of the present.

An assemblage’s particular nature can bolster this “memory” and transform it into an autonomous force. Indeed, an assemblage is an entity that summons a number of components, many of which were parts of previous dispositives, and includes them in a new constellation, characterized by a different disposition. This process of detachment/reassignment can be ascribed to the wider movement of de-territorialization and re-territorialization that Deleuze and Guattari considered so typical of late capitalism. Undoubtedly, it illustrates the procedures through which most of the modern media are created. What matters here is the very fact that such a process authorizes some forms of retention: if it is true that the components, included in a new constellation, tend to change their functions, it is also true that in some case, overtly or secretly, they can replicate the functions performed earlier. These old functions generally constitute a sort of leftover: in the new constellation they represent a point of dissipation, if not of disturbance. And yet they give a sort of “thickness” to the new assemblage: they provide ways of working that for the moment must be kept in reserve, but that can also be considered as a possible or even a prospective use of the dispositive. The old functions are still there, even if in standby; the new constellation can activate them when necessary.

This retention of the past enables a medium to secrete within itself other potential media. From this point of view, we must rephrase McLuhan’s famous motto. It is likely true that the content of a medium is always another medium; but it is even truer that in the folds of a medium other, hidden media persist. Contingent circumstances, based on the conjuncture of active forces, external and internal, will determine—or co-determine—when, if at all, these media disclose themselves again.

7.

Again, an example could help. Cinema is undoubtedly the assemblage that perfected the screen’s optical turn. The silver screen is the epitome of something purely instrumental to a viewing: not by chance, classical film theory considered it not only at the service of moving images, but also ready to disappear behind them—incurring in this way a true paradox, since it often conceded the status of reality to a representation made of shadow and light, and denied materiality to a prop made by real fabric. With cinema the screen fully entered into its second stage. And yet it did not lose its previous resonances. In film theory it is also possible to find voices that recall the original meanings of the word. For example, a consideration of silver screen as a filter that allows the fictional events to pour into the film theatre is recursive in many novels, but also in the critical notes of a writer like Joseph Roth, and it is central in one of the last texts by Sergei Eisenstein, devoted to stereoscopy. A definition of silver screen as a divide that separates the fictional world and the world of the everyday is heralded by the Filmology movement, in particular by Albert Michotte who speaks of a “segregation of spaces.” The
idea that the silver screen is a sort of shelter emerges in some film reviews of 1920s and 1930s, which make fun of the fact that adventure movies and exotic documentaries are screened in comfortable film theatres that allow spectators to feel protected; the image of a shelter is also evoked with political implications by Siegfried Kracauer in his description of the salaried masses as “homeless,” and it would find its ultimate instantiation in Stanley Cavell’s considerations that at the movies spectators are “absent” to the fiction, and consequently not as “exposed” to events as real witness are. Finally, the main thesis of the so-called Apparatus theory is that the silver screen, in displaying an image close to the real, hides the only reality which matters, a mode of production: in this sense it works as a camouflage.

This body of scattered but not whispered statements delineates a true counter-genealogy to the silver screen. Its emergence is put under the sign both of a break—the optical turn—and of retention—the persistence of environmental connotations; and its alleged specificity is contradicted by the presence of multiple functions. The consequences of such a counter-genealogy are twofold. On the one hand, cinema can disclose its concealed undergirding: at the moment it is a quintessential visual art, it is also a constitutively environmental medium. On the other hand, cinema can discover a potentiality: since the environmental functions attached to old screens have seemingly been relocated in other devices, belonging consequently to other fields, cinema can claim that in its folds it hosts other media.

The analytical framework offered by our example enables us to reconsider the current explosion of screens. Their environmental connotations represent a discontinuity, but not an antagonistic break with respect to the optical. As cinema demonstrates, screens always retained the full memory of their functions in the form of a potentiality ready to surface. This lets us return to cinema its rightful share: its multifaceted nature provides a relevant background from which new media can emerge. Many of the contemporary artworks, and in particular installations inspired by film and exploring the allocation of screens in space, perfectly understand this derivation. At the same time, our counter-genealogy of the movie screen authorizes an extension of media archaeology beyond its usual borders into a broader and necessarily interdisciplinary project. If not only film, but every medium is able to hold potential media in its folds, there are no exclusive lineages: “ancestors” come from everywhere. Consequently, it is correct to find specific archaeological threads for the contemporary media—for example, radar as a predecessor of the computer screen—but it is more appropriate to take into consideration the wider processes of de-territorialization and re-territorialization that ground an assemblage. Media archaeology becomes an open field.

The screen never was exclusively optical, and opticality was never exclusively located in a few specific media. This would be equally true for environmental screens: in light of their emergence today, we must also look at their own potentialities, and detect their own hidden sides.

Francesco Casetti
Genealogies of the Excessive Screen is a project supported by a Mellon Sawyer grant that looks to examine the proliferation and transformation of screens in contemporary culture in a new historical light. The aim is to construct an interdisciplinary genealogical investigation that would recover and rethink an environmental history of screens. Co-organized by Yale professors Francesco Casetti, Rüdiger Campe, and Craig Buckley, the initiative challenges the idea that the present proliferation of media screens represents an expansion of models derived from the movie screen. Up to the middle of the 19th century, screens denoted a wide range of environmental elements and functions, from furniture that protected against heat, cold, and wind, to spatial partitions, surfaces concealing the presence of observers, legal protections, false architectural facades, the diversionary maneuvers of soldiers, hunting blinds, psychic as well as physical membranes, and more. By the end of the century, screens had primarily come to denote an optical surface associated with projected images. The project invites scholars to reconsider the obscured, eccentric, and diverse environmental manifestations of the screen, and asks how recovering this lost environmental history might enable us to rethink the problem of the screen today.

By inviting scholars from different fields, the Mellon Sawyer Seminar will be an opportunity to bring together work that has engaged the topic from differing, yet complementary, perspectives. The initiative will also develop an important collaboration with The Yale University Art Gallery, with the Yale Center for British Art, with the DMCA, and with the Whitney Humanities Center.
Three-Day Working Session: What is a Screen?
Events begin at 1:30pm in the Lecture Hall, Yale University Art Gallery

Wednesday, February 15
W.J.T. Mitchell, The University of Chicago
In conversation with
Francesco Casetti, Rüdiger Campe,
and Craig Buckley, Yale University
“Screening Nature”

Thursday, February 16
John Durham Peters, Yale University
In conversation with
Kathryn Lofton, Yale University
“Projection and Protection: On the Deep Optical and Ballistical Intersections of Screens”

Friday, February 17
Noam Elcott, Columbia University
In conversation with
Keely Orgeman, Yale University Art Gallery
“Material, Human, Divine. Notes on the Vertical Screen”

Three-Day Working Session: The enlightened Screen
Events begin at 3pm in the Auditorium, Yale Center for British Art

Wednesday, April 19
Antonio Somaini, Sorbonne Nouvelle, Univ. Paris 3
In conversation with
Keller Easterling, Yale School of Architecture
“Atmospheric Media”

Thursday, April 20
Barbara Stafford, The University of Chicago
In conversation with
Dudley Andrew, Yale University
“Strange Shadows: The Magical Sublime”

Friday, April 21
Tim Barringer, Yale University
In conversation with
Katie Trumpener, Yale University
“The Panorama as Global Landscape”
Sessions in Fall 2017
Events begin at 5pm at the Whitney Humanities Center, 53 Wall Street

Tuesday, September 5
Philippe Alain Michaud, Centre Pompidou Paris
In conversation with
Rizvana Bradley, Yale University
“Screens, where and when?”

Tuesday, September 19
Juliet Fleming, New York University
In conversation with
Paul North, Yale University
“Screens and writing”

Tuesday, October 3
Bernard Geoghegan, University of Coventry
In conversation with
Joanna Radin, Yale University
“Screens and networks”

Tuesday, October 17
Rey Chow, Duke University
In conversation with
Brian Kane, Yale University
“The Screen in Sound: toward a Theory of Listening”

Tuesday, October 31
Gundula Kreuzer, Yale University
In conversation with
Kurt W. Forster, Yale School of Architecture
“Theatrical Screens”

Tuesday, November 14
Yuriko Furuhata, McGill University
In conversation with
Marijeta Bozovic, Yale University
“Screens, Surveillance, Warfare”

Tuesday, December 5
Ariel Rogers, Northwestern University
In conversation with
Brigitte Peucker, Yale University
“Immersive Screens”
Seminar Organizers

Francesco Casetti is the Thomas E. Donnelly Professor of Humanities and Film & Media Studies at Yale University. Previously he taught in Italy, where he served as President of the scholarly society of Film and Media Studies, and he has held visiting professorships at Paris 3 La Sorbonne Nouvelle, the University of Iowa, and Harvard. His most recent book is *The Lumière Galaxy: Seven Key Words for the Cinema to Come* (2015), a study on the reconfiguration of cinema in a post-medium epoch.

Craig Buckley is Assistant Professor of History of Art at Yale University. He received his PhD from Princeton University in 2013. He is the editor of *After the Manifesto: Writing, Architecture, and Media in a New Century* (2014). Currently, he is completing a book project entitled *Envisioning Assembly: The Persistence of Montage in Postwar European Architecture*, which analyzes the prevalence of montage in the visual imaginary of architectural culture in Europe during the long 1960s.

Rüdiger Campe is Professor of German and Comparative Literature at Yale University. Before coming to Yale, he taught at Johns Hopkins and Essen University, and held visiting professorships at NYU, Konstanz, Siegen, European University at Frankfurt/Oder and other institutions. His most recent publications include *Game of Probability: Literature and Calculation from Pascal to Kleist* (2012; German, 2002) and *Re-thinking emotion. Interiority and Exteriority in Pre-Modern, Modern, and Contemporary Thought* (2014), co-edited with Julia Weber.
Anna Shechtman is a third-year Ph.D. student in English Literature and Film & Media Studies at Yale University. Her research interests include the history of the media concept, gender and sexuality studies, and Post-45 American literature and film. Her writing has appeared in Slate, The American Reader, and the Los Angeles Review of Books, where she is a film editor. She also writes crossword puzzles for the New York Times.

Lisa Åkervall is Assistant Professor of Film Studies with a specialism in Digital Theory and Practice at Trinity College Dublin. She was a postdoctoral research fellow in the “Media and Mimesis” research center at Bauhaus-University Weimar and Visiting Assistant Professor at Yale University. Her research focuses on emerging questions in digital aesthetics, affect theory, and the cultural techniques of neoliberalism, as well as traditional questions of spectatorship and cinematic experience. Her monograph Kinematographische Affekte. Die Transformation der Kinoerfahrung is forthcoming and her second book project is titled A Postcinematic Aesthetics of Neoliberalism.

Bernard Dionysius Geoghegan is a senior lecturer at Coventry University. In fall 2016, he was Visiting Associate Professor at Yale University. He also works as a curator for the Anthropocene Project at Haus der Kulturen der Welt. His research investigates how changes in media technology interweave with changes in popular culture, science, and the physical environment. He has edited essay collections on media philosopher Gilbert Simondon, on media and the occult,

Graduate Student Team

Regina Karl is a Ph.D. candidate in Germanic Languages and Literatures and Film & Media at Yale University. She earned her Master’s degree in Comparative Literature and History of Art from LMU Munich while also having studied at Sorbonne and ENS Paris as well as UC Berkeley. She is currently writing her dissertation on “Cheiropoiesis. The Hand as Symbol and Symptom around 1900.” Other fields of interest include psychoanalysis and film/literature, visuality in the 19th and 20th century as well as contemporary media studies.

Andrew Vielkind is a Ph.D. candidate in History of Art and Film & Media Studies at Yale University. His research interests include avant-garde and experimental cinema (particularly the works of Stan Brakhage, Ken Jacobs, Ernie Gehr, Hollis Frampton, and Tony Conrad), post-war art, new media, expanded cinema, and media archaeology. His dissertation explores the intersections between experimental cinema practices during the Cold War period and theories of information, communication, and cybernetics.

Swagato Chakravorty is a Ph.D. student in History of Art and Film & Media Studies at Yale University. He works at the interstices of screen practices, screen architectures, and spectatorship. He holds an interdisciplinary M.A. in Cinema & Media Studies at the University of Chicago. He hopes to pursue a dissertation focusing on architectures of projection since 1989. For 2015–16, he was a Mellon Museum Research Consortium Fellow in the Department of Media and Performance Art at the Museum of Modern Art, New York.

Anna Shechtman is a third-year Ph.D. student in English Literature and Film & Media Studies at Yale University. Her research interests include the history of the media concept, gender and sexuality studies, and Post-45 American literature and film. Her writing has appeared in Slate, The American Reader, and the Los Angeles Review of Books, where she is a film editor. She also writes crossword puzzles for the New York Times.
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Lisa Åkervall is Assistant Professor of Film Studies with a specialism in Digital Theory and Practice at Trinity College Dublin. She was a postdoctoral research fellow in the “Media and Mimesis” research center at Bauhaus-University Weimar and Visiting Assistant Professor at Yale University. Her research focuses on emerging questions in digital aesthetics, affect theory, and the cultural techniques of neoliberalism, as well as traditional questions of spectatorship and cinematic experience. Her monograph Kinematographische Affekte. Die Transformation der Kinoerfahrung is forthcoming and her second book project is titled A Postcinematic Aesthetics of Neoliberalism.

Bernard Dionysius Geoghegan is a senior lecturer at Coventry University. In fall 2016, he was Visiting Associate Professor at Yale University. He also works as a curator for the Anthropocene Project at Haus der Kulturen der Welt. His research investigates how changes in media technology interweave with changes in popular culture, science, and the physical environment. He has edited essay collections on media philosopher Gilbert Simondon, on media and the occult,

### Seminar Participants

**Tim Barringer** is Paul Mellon Professor of History of Art at Yale University. His research focuses on art of Britain and the British Empire from the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries. His books include *Reading the Pre-Raphaelites* (1998), *Men at Work: Art and Labour in Victorian Britain* (2005), *Opulence and Anxiety* (2007), and *Before and After Modernism* (2010). He has also co-curated several exhibitions such as *American Sublime: Landscape Painting in the United States, 1825-1880* (2002). He is co-editing a forthcoming volume entitled *Viewing Platform: Perspectives on the Panorama*, which reassesses the panorama in 19th and 20th century painting and film.

**Rey Chow** is Anne Firor Scott Professor of Literature at Duke University. She has specialized in the making of cultural forms such as literature and film, and in the discursive encounters among modernity, sexuality, postcoloniality, and ethnicity. Her book *Primitive Passions* was awarded the James Russell Lowell Prize. Before coming to Duke, she was Andrew W. Mellon Professor of the Humanities at Brown University. In her current work, Chow is concerned with the legacies of poststructuralist theory, the politics of language as a postcolonial phenomenon, and the shifting paradigms for knowledge and lived experience in the age of visual technologies and digital media.

**Yuriko Furuhata** is Associate Professor in the Department of East Asian Studies and a faculty member of the World Cinemas Program at McGill University. She works in the areas of film and media theory, Japanese cinema and media studies, visual culture, and critical theory. She is the author of *Cinema of Actuality: Japanese Avant-Garde Filmmaking in the Season of Image Politics* and has on media theorist Friedrich Kittler. His essays and translations appear in journals including *Critical Inquiry, SubStance, IEEE Annals on the History of Computing*, and *Theory, Culture & Society*.

**Noam M. Elcott** is Associate Professor of Modern and Contemporary Art and Media at Columbia University. His research focuses on Europe and North America, with an emphasis on interwar art, photography, and film. Elcott is the author of *Artificial Darkness: A History of Modern Art and Media* (2016). He is currently at work on *Art in the First Screen Age: László Moholy-Nagy and the Cinefication of the Arts*, which traverses interwar painting, architecture, photography, film, theater, and exhibition design in the age of cinema. Elcott is an editor of the journal *Grey Room*. His articles have appeared in leading journals like *October* and *Aperture*.

**Juliet Fleming** is Associate Professor of English at New York University specializing in Renaissance literature, the history of the book, and literary theory. She is the author of *Graffiti and the Writing Arts of Early Modern England* (2001) and *Cultural Graphology: Writing After Derrida* (2016). In her most recent work, Fleming draws from Jacques Derrida’s theories of psychoanalysis and deconstruction in order to examine the print culture of early modern England. Along with Bill Sherman and Adam Smyth, she edited a special edition of *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* that explored printed books in the early modern period.

**Rey Chow** is Anne Firor Scott Professor of Literature at Duke University. She has specialized in the making of cultural forms such as literature and film, and in the discursive encounters among modernity, sexuality, postcoloniality, and ethnicity. Her book *Primitive Passions* was awarded the James Russell Lowell Prize. Before coming to Duke, she was Andrew W. Mellon Professor of the Humanities at Brown University. In her current work, Chow is concerned with the legacies of poststructuralist theory, the politics of language as a postcolonial phenomenon, and the shifting paradigms for knowledge and lived experience in the age of visual technologies and digital media.

**Yuriko Furuhata** is Associate Professor in the Department of East Asian Studies and a faculty member of the World Cinemas Program at McGill University. She works in the areas of film and media theory, Japanese cinema and media studies, visual culture, and critical theory. She is the author of *Cinema of Actuality: Japanese Avant-Garde Filmmaking in the Season of Image Politics* and has
published articles in journals such as Grey Room, Screen and New Cinemas. She is currently working on a book exploring the historical connections between Japanese expanded cinema and video art, multimedia environments, and security technologies.

**Bernard Dionysius Geoghegan.** [see Associated Scholars]

**Gundula Kreuzer** is Associate Professor of Music at Yale University. Her research interests embrace the history and theory of opera, with a special focus on aspects of performance, staging, technology, mediality, and sound; music and politics; German and European cultural history since the late 18th century; Verdi and Wagner. Kreuzer is currently finishing a book called Wagnarian Technologies. Her first book, *Verdi and the Germans: From Unification to the Third Reich*, won several awards. Kreuzer also edited *Verdi’s Instrumental Chamber Music* and serves on the Editorial Boards of the *Journal of the American Musicalological Society* and Wagnerspectrum.

**Philippe-Alain Michaud** is an art historian and film curator at the Centre Pompidou in Paris. He is the author of *Aby Warburg and the Image in Motion* (2004), which extends Aby Warburg’s theories of iconology into the domain of new image-making technology, such as the Daguerreotype, the chronophotography of Étienne-Jules Marey, early cinema, and the dances of Loie Fuller. At the Centre Pompidou he has curated numerous exhibitions on the relationship between cinema and contemporary art, such as *Hans Richter: A Journey Through A Century*.
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