

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48



1 Jeff Wall, *Shapes on a Tree*, 1998. Silver gelatin contact print, 24.4 × 19.4 cm. Photo: © Jeff Wall.

INTRODUCTION: PHOTOGRAPHY AFTER CONCEPTUAL ART

DIARMUID COSTELLO AND MARGARET IVERSEN

This special issue of *Art History* aims to open up a debate about what is at stake in contemporary photographic art. It forms part of a large AHRC-funded research project, 'Aesthetics after Photography', which focuses on the challenges that recent art photography poses for aesthetic theory. A collaborative and cross-disciplinary endeavour, the research project is directed by Margaret Iversen of the Department of Art History and Theory at the University of Essex and Diarmuid Costello of the Philosophy Department, University of Warwick. They have also guest edited this volume. The papers' original incarnation was as a two-day session at the annual Association of Art Historians conference held at Tate Britain, London, in 2008. We called for papers that addressed substantive theoretical or aesthetic issues raised by photography of the post-1960s period as an artistic medium, particularly in light of the oft-heard claim that the arts now inhabit a 'post-medium' condition. Our goal was to explore the remarkable shifts in the dominant forms of photography as a mainstream contemporary art, as opposed to a specialist domain, notably the significance of its apparent transformation from anti-aesthetic to aesthetic medium of choice. This can be seen in the way in which the 'a-' or 'non-aesthetic' uses of photography associated with various conceptual, proto-conceptual and post-conceptual practices of the 1960s and 1970s, and their documentation, gave way in the 1980s to the self-consciously 'anti-aesthetic' practices of postmodern appropriation, only to be overtaken in turn by the large-scale pictorial, frequently digital, colour photography that has dominated photographic art since the 1990s. This last is a form of photography that is often compared to painting in the range of aesthetic effects to which it aspires. Certainly, it has been welcomed by museums, galleries, and the market in these terms.

One way we approached our theme was by taking up Jeff Wall's claim that recent photography represents a turn away from conceptual art – 'the last moment of the pre-history of photography as art' – and exploring its implications. One critical question this raised is whether the majority of recent photographic art is merely 'after' conceptual art in a weak historical sense, or whether it is truly *post-conceptual* in the more substantive sense of not merely coming after, but also internalizing and building upon the lessons of conceptual art. In practice, this has meant dealing with the way photography was conceived within the original conceptual practices of, say, Ed Ruscha, Bernd and Hilla Becher, Douglas Huebler

1 and Mel Bochner, on the one hand, and the pictorial photography of, say, Jeff
 2 Wall, Thomas Demand, and Andreas Gursky, on the other. There is still a temp-
 3 tation to see the early book works of Ruscha and the industrial archaeology of the
 4 Bechers, in particular, as establishing the conceptual, pictorial, and aesthetic
 5 ground upon and from which ambitious photographic art has since developed or
 6 diverged. Broadening the scope to consider less often examined exponents of
 7 photography within conceptual art complicates this picture. Moreover, some
 8 contemporary artists' work can be seen to combine 'pictorial' and 'conceptual'
 9 elements: Roni Horn's colour photographic books, for example, fall into this
 10 hybrid category. In any case, it was our hunch from the beginning that several of
 11 the critical divisions that structure writing on this body of work – between
 12 conceptual and pictorial, the aesthetic and the anti-aesthetic, etc. – are frequently
 13 over-determined and exaggerated. In their different ways, the papers collected
 14 here explore this hybrid condition.

15 Given the importance of Ruscha's books for the subsequent history of
 16 photography as art, it is not surprising that there are two papers on the subject
 17 that intersect in interesting ways. In her paper, 'Auto-maticity: Ruscha and
 18 Performative Photography', Margaret Iversen argues that the titles of Ruscha's
 19 books provide a verbal 'score' to be filled out by specific photographic realizations
 20 or performances. His practice is thus tied to a legacy of Duchamp that stems
 21 particularly from his instruction-framed piece, *Three Standard Stoppages*. Referring
 22 to his groundbreaking 1963 book, *Twentysix Gasoline Stations*, Ruscha explained
 23 that the title was formulated in advance of taking the photographs; in other
 24 words, it provided the nub of an instruction which he then duly carried out along
 25 Route 66. This suggests that Ruscha was engaged in a very specific kind of artistic
 26 activity – that is, following a predetermined route in his car and systematically
 27 recording just the gas stations. This pervasive auto-maticity (instruction, car,
 28 route, camera) is what makes the books perplexing and different from other
 29 photography books such as Robert Frank's *The Americans*. Iversen aims this argu-
 30 ment against that offered by Jeff Wall's essay on conceptual photography, 'Marks
 31 of Indifference' – an essay that is frequently cited in this volume. Wall positions
 32 the work of Ruscha and other artists of the period in relation to 'non-autono-
 33 mous', that is, photojournalistic or amateur photography which, Iversen
 34 contends, fails to capture his deliberately affectless, depersonalized, repetitious,
 35 deadpan use of the camera. By conceiving of the books as instructional perfor-
 36 mance pieces, Iversen brings out the open-ended, experimental character of other
 37 works such as *Thirtyfour Parking Lots* or *Royal Road Test* (both from 1967), where an
 38 instruction is performed 'blindly' in order to see what will happen.

39 Aron Vinegar's paper is also concerned with Ruscha's photography. In 'Ed
 40 Ruscha, Heidegger, and Deadpan Photography', Vinegar connects the frequent use
 41 of the term 'deadpan' to describe Ruscha's work with Stanley Cavell's remarks on
 42 Buster Keaton's face and Martin Heidegger's notions of mood and attunement.
 43 Benjamin Buchloh's influential essay, 'Conceptual Art 1962–69: From the
 44 Aesthetic of Administration to the Critique of Institutions', consolidated the
 45 characterization of Ruscha as deadpan, by claiming that Ruscha's photographic
 46 practice emerged from Duchamp's and Cage's legacy of an 'aesthetic of indiffer-
 47 ence', and that his 'deadpan' approach to photography was characterized by the
 48 acceptance of a 'universally valid facticity'. However, as Vinegar demonstrates,

1 this vocabulary of 'indifference', 'facticity', and the 'deadpan' has never been
 2 explicitly tied back to its rich vein of philosophical sources. His paper sets out to do
 3 just this by exploring issues of 'indifference', 'equanimity', and 'facticity' set out in
 4 Heidegger's *Being and Time*. He also shows how these notions intersect with Stanley
 5 Cavell's intriguing comments on Buster Keaton's 'stone face' – his characteristic
 6 expression of equanimity when confronted by whatever the world might throw at
 7 him. On this reading, deadpan emerges as not so much a mode of rhetorical
 8 delivery – and certainly not as ironic – but rather as the sign of a much deeper
 9 receptiveness to the world that is perhaps best understood in the light of Heideg-
 10 ger's notion of *Stimmung*, those fundamental moods or attunements characteristic
 11 of *Dasein's* way of being in, and openness towards, the world in which it finds itself.
 12 So construed, deadpan is an even-tempered and resolutely non-judgemental
 13 receptiveness to the world – hence the 'Every' in *Every Building on Sunset Strip*.

14 Coming from quite different directions, then, Iversen's and Vinegar's papers
 15 on Ruscha nonetheless converge around the ideas of receptivity and openness and
 16 their aesthetic significance. Read together they implicitly point towards deeper
 17 aesthetic questions about the embodiment of reflective judgement (in the
 18 Kantian sense of that term) in art. Given the themes of Vinegar's paper, it is
 19 notable that Heidegger glosses the notion of 'disinterestedness' fundamental to
 20 Kant's theory of aesthetic judgement in terms of the 'unconstrained favouring'
 21 and 'free granting' of what appears. Such considerations clearly cut against the 'a-'
 22 ' or 'non-'aesthetic ways in which ideas such as the deadpan have typically been
 23 conceived in art history and criticism since the late 1960s.

24 Sarah James's paper, 'Subject, Object, Mimesis: The Aesthetic World of the
 25 Bechers' Photography', considers the equally influential practice of Bernd and
 26 Hilla Becher, regarded by many critics as another foundation stone of photo-
 27 graphic art since the 1960s. Taking issue, similarly, with anti-aesthetic portrayals
 28 of their work and its underlying motivation, James employs Theodor Adorno's
 29 culturally and historically contemporaneous notion of 'mimesis' to foreground
 30 the mimetic relation to the world at the core of the Bechers' project – its
 31 relentless attempt to embody concretely a form of subjectivity adequate to its
 32 objects, and in so doing 'redeem expression' – which she understands in an
 33 Adornian light as a somatic responsiveness to the world prior to discursive
 34 thought. Examining the recent views of Blake Stimson and Michael Fried on the
 35 subjective and objective aspects of the Bechers' photography, she offers an over-
 36 arching view that would make sense of them both, implying that in so far as the
 37 two critical readings she canvasses only capture one side of the relation their
 38 work foregrounds, both remain incomplete when taken on their own. To this end,
 39 she argues that Adorno's aesthetic thought, notably his central and multivalent
 40 category of mimesis, offers a way in which to frame the relation of the subject and
 41 the object figured by the Bechers' photography, and in doing so to situate it
 42 within the context of a particular moment in German history. In this way, the
 43 Bechers' rejection of subjectivity and their pursuit of an objective photography
 44 are contextualized in relation to the 'post-Auschwitz taboo on beauty', and the
 45 ideology of anti-ideology that dominated West German cultural politics of the
 46 1950s. Hence, despite the obvious differences between the context and meaning
 47 of the Bechers' use of photography and Ruscha's, here, too, an ethics of receptivity
 48 and openness to the world and the objects within it is evidently in play.

1 Moving on from these influential proto-conceptual practices, the next pair of
 2 papers looks closely at individual projects in the less widely examined practices of
 3 Douglas Huebler and Mel Bochner. Gordon Hughes' paper focuses on the shift
 4 from Huebler's early systems-based photographic practice to his later use of
 5 photographic portraiture as a means to undercut the very systems that appar-
 6 ently govern his practice. To this end, he shows how the work reveals its anti-
 7 systematic nature by flouting its self-imposed constraints: Huebler includes a
 8 number of 'tells' to alert his viewers to the fact that the official claims for his
 9 practice are not to be taken at face value. As an example of this strategy, Hughes
 10 pays particular attention to Huebler's *Variable Piece #105, London, 1972*. This
 11 purports to pair photographs of eighteen mannequins taken at two-minute
 12 intervals on Oxford Street in London, with a photograph of the next passerby of
 13 the same sex as the mannequin that Huebler encountered. In Hughes' account,
 14 this piece is a key example of Huebler's attempts simultaneously to negate both
 15 the text-based systems that appear to structure a number of systems-based
 16 photographic practices, including his own, and the egregious expressivity of
 17 contemporaneous New York school photographers. This is why Huebler employs
 18 photographic *portraiture* in the context of his ostentatiously leaky systems. The
 19 fact that Huebler contravenes his own constraints to pair mannequins with look-
 20 alikes negates the former, while the use of look-alikes itself raises the spectre, but
 21 only the spectre, of the surrealists' use of doubles to tap into the Marvellous.
 22 Huebler's work consistently drains such motifs of their once uncanny affects,
 23 which, Hughes argues, should be seen as a riposte to the use of such motifs by
 24 various New York school photographers, including Diane Arbus and Helen Levitt,
 25 in their attempt to reinvigorate the expressivity of photographic portraiture.

26 Luke Skrebowski's essay, 'Productive Misunderstandings: Interpreting Mel
 27 Bochner's Theory of Photography', also focuses primarily on a single photographic
 28 work by a conceptual artist: Bochner's self-reflexive examination of photography in
 29 *Misunderstandings (A Theory of Photography)* (1967–70), a series of photographs on
 30 index cards of hand-written fallacies about the nature of photography. Like several
 31 other contributors to this volume, Skrebowski takes aim at Wall's partisan history
 32 of photo-conceptualism, particularly his use of this history to legitimate a practice
 33 of photographic tableaux, the terms of which his own practice may then be seen to
 34 fulfil. Despite appearing to fulfil Duchamp's hope that photography would render
 35 painting 'despicable', the most prominent outcome of photography's success turns
 36 out to be, ironically, the emergence of photography as a bona fide mainstream fine
 37 art medium through which to reinvigorate the Western tradition of picture-
 38 making. Skrebowski understands the implications of Bochner's work to be a thor-
 39 oughgoing critique of such picture-making *avant la lettre*, which he argues is
 40 premised on a partial and highly motivated reading of conceptual art's 'failure' to
 41 undermine the ability of canonical artistic media to function as ontological guar-
 42 antors of their works' existence as art. By re-conceiving photography as informa-
 43 tion, Skrebowski argues, Bochner sought to undermine or at least place *en abyme*, by
 44 means of a complex sequence of iterations, inversions, and partial fabrications, the
 45 iconic indexicality widely taken to be photography's irreducible, medium-specific
 46 characteristic. That is, the apparent necessity that photographs are always, and
 47 only, depictions of whatever was before the camera at the moment of exposure, and
 48 as such occupies the correct causal relation to the resulting image.

1 Moreover, much like Huebler's reading of *Variable Piece #105, London, 1972*,
 2 Skrebowski's account of Bochner's *Misunderstandings* includes a number of 'tells'.
 3 These include Bochner's admission that the series contains a number of invented
 4 fallacies and a lone picture card that seems to show an impossible image, a
 5 negative of a Polaroid, itself a negative-less positive process. Such clues, particu-
 6 larly the latter, caution us against taking what the work appears to document at
 7 face value, and in doing so reveal Bochner's theoretical hand. Taken together with
 8 his photographic work more generally, *Misunderstandings* thus functions as a self-
 9 reflexive interrogation of photographic ontology that refuses to reduce photo-
 10 graphy to its depictive function. As such, Bochner's photography constitutes both
 11 a neglected moment in photo-conceptualism, and an anticipation of more recent,
 12 post-digital worries about the ontology of the photographic image.

13 One of several obvious tensions that animate the papers in this volume can be
 14 highlighted by the juxtaposition of Skrebowski's defence of the aims of a radical
 15 conceptual critique of the aesthetic and Mark Godfrey's close reading of Roni's
 16 Horn's series of photographic books which she has been publishing since 1990. The
 17 photographs in *To Place* (1990–2006) document particular geographic, architectural,
 18 and cultural features of Iceland's landscape, while suggesting a range of possible
 19 relationships between photography, drawing and object making, as well as between
 20 various photographic genres. In his essay, 'Roni Horn's Icelandic Encyclopedia',
 21 Godfrey contextualizes this project in relation to the history of post-conceptual
 22 photographic practices and artists' books, arguing that Horn uses the form of the
 23 archive and encyclopedia to undo rather than cement categories and definitions. In
 24 this respect at least, her project resembles Huebler's systematic undoing of systems.

25 Iceland has a paradoxical attraction for Horn: it is a place of Deleuzian
 26 'becoming', whose geological identity is mutable, while at the same time, it is a
 27 landscape which allows her to feel centred. These two meanings are commu-
 28 nicated through the ways in which photographs are presented to the viewer/
 29 reader of the books that make up *To Place*. The books and the photographs within
 30 them suggest the paradoxical possibility of a kind of identity as a perpetual state
 31 of becoming firmly rooted in and by the world. This is perhaps best realized in the
 32 sixth volume of *To Place*, *Haraldsdóttir* (1996) which consists of series of photo-
 33 graphs of Margrét, a young woman that Horn photographed immersed up to her
 34 neck in pools of water. The changing light, weather, and water temperature are
 35 reflected in the close-up portraits – explaining the name of the installation
 36 version of the series, *You are the Weather*. In this piece, portraiture is captured in
 37 the process of becoming landscape. In sum, Horn uses various aspects of post-
 38 conceptual photography (seriality, archiving, text/image relationships, the book
 39 form) to quite different ends to those of either Bochner or Wall. Since her work is
 40 neither a critique of pictorial aesthetics, à la Bochner, nor straightforwardly an
 41 extension of the pictorial tradition, à la Wall, it effectively problematizes some of
 42 the oppositions that structure the field this volume addresses.

43 The final three papers in the volume focus on more obviously pictorial
 44 photography. In her paper, 'Thomas Demand, Jeff Wall and Sherrie Levine:
 45 Deforming "Pictures"', Tamara Trodd focuses on photography's absorption of
 46 other media. Taking inspiration, like Godfrey, from Deleuze – in this case, the
 47 notion of the body without organs – Trodd understands the recent return to
 48 pictorial photography by way of an analogy with the body. If composition can be

1 understood metaphorically in bodily terms, then Wall's compositions may be seen
2 as deformed and twisted bodies, since his photographs are often made up of the
3 disjointed remnants of past pictures that his work cannibalizes. This reading is
4 clearly aimed against both Wall's claims for his own work and the use to which
5 Fried has put them to claim his work for a revitalized modernist aesthetics of the
6 picture. Trodd characterizes this 'force' of pictorial deformation she takes to be
7 operative in both Wall and Demand, and the reanimation of dead pictorial
8 remnants on which it turns in Wall, as 'uncanny'. This serves to pitch her account
9 directly, if unintentionally, against Hughes' call for a moratorium on the use of
10 this term in critical writing on photography. One obvious test of who is right here
11 will turn on whether Trodd's reading of Wall and Demand manages to imbue this
12 notion with critical life and productivity once more.

13 Fried is similarly the target of Trodd's reading of Demand, whose work she
14 characterizes – against Fried's interpretation of it as allegory of 'intendedness as
15 such' – as 'visceral'. Trodd understands Demand's pictures, with their painstakingly
16 crafted but lifeless cardboard structures, not merely in terms of a sealed
17 space interior to the photograph, but in terms of the *body's* visceral interior,
18 which extends, in Demand's exhibition designs, to the entire space of the gallery,
19 and the relation between different works within his oeuvre. On Trodd's reading,
20 this culminates in an account of how Demand's photography is 'propped', inter-
21 medially, on the body of sculpture ingested by photography. Photography, so
22 construed, is a 'body without organs' – that is, without internal, self-supporting,
23 organization – in so far as it is internally dependent on something external,
24 namely, sculpture. The analogy with Wall, which is by no means perfect, is that
25 Demand's photographs feed off the body of sculpture in ways reminiscent of
26 Wall's relation to the corpus of past painting. What is 'uncanny' in all this,
27 according to Trodd, is that it serves to reanimate the remnants of the medium
28 upon which Demand's photography feeds, rather than creating a new medium in
29 pictorial photography. In this respect, Trodd sees Demand as much as an inheritor
30 of Sherrie Levine's strategies of appropriation as of Wall's relation to other media.
31 On the resulting account, neither Wall nor Demand can be used to support the
32 terms of a reinvigorated modernist aesthetics.

33 Not surprisingly, given our starting point, and the immense influence of his
34 work and criticism on recent debates about photography, the final two papers
35 engage directly with the work of Jeff Wall. Wolfgang Brückle's paper asks why
36 Wall is held in such high esteem by art historians, having been championed early
37 on by T. J. Clark and Thomas Crow in response to Wall's claim to fulfil Baudelaire's
38 call for a 'painting of modern life', albeit in photographic form, and more recently
39 by Michael Fried, who has picked up on Wall's penchant for self-consciously
40 absorptive tableaux. In 'Almost Merovingian: On Jeff Wall's Relation to Nearly
41 Everything', Brückle argues that such esteem is partly a result of the way in which
42 Wall's writing self-consciously positions his own work in relation to both art
43 history in general, and the theories of specific art historians in particular, and
44 partly a result of the way in which his work self-consciously integrates and cross-
45 breeds a vast array of art-historical sources and genres from both the post-
46 Renaissance Western pictorial tradition and the straight tradition in twentieth-
47 century photography, which Wall has been increasingly ready to admit into his
48 overall oeuvre.

1 Of the two, it is the latter case on which Brückle focuses here. The argument is
 2 supported by Wall's strategic amendments to his own back-catalogue, his gestures
 3 of inclusion and exclusion and reworkings of past works in ways that are
 4 designed, in part with an art historian's eye to context formation and value
 5 creation, to shape the reception of his own work. In this context, Brückle focuses
 6 on Wall's reworking of a single image from *Landscape Manual* (1969), one of his
 7 earliest conceptual works, which pre-dates his official *catalogue raisonné*, as *After*
 8 '*Landscape Manual*' (1969–2003), a banal stand-alone black and white image. This
 9 serves as Brückle's key to understanding the 'integrative drive' of Wall's work.
 10 Contra Trodd, far from being pictorially 'deforming', even such basic divisions as
 11 'cinematographic' and 'documentary' are integrated as so many stylistic and
 12 genre resources within his overall practice. Thus, unlike many writers on Wall,
 13 Brückle understands Wall's project as fundamentally *synthetic*: far from creating
 14 individual tableaux, as is often claimed, individual works only gain their full
 15 meaning from his increasingly complex and self-referential corpus as a whole.

16 In this respect, Wall's practice might be thought to mirror Gerhard Richter's:
 17 just as Richter's colour charts or photo-paintings only take on their full significance
 18 in relation to his overall practice of painting, so individual black and white 'docu-
 19 mentary' images or 'cinematographic' light-box tableaux only take on their full
 20 significance in relation to Wall's oeuvre as a whole. Unlike Richter, however, Wall's
 21 integrative drive brings together his works' range of genres, tropes, models and
 22 media sources in the service of a certain vision of realism. In this respect, Wall
 23 inherits Walker Evans's notion of 'documentary style'; that is, a conception of
 24 documentary according to which the documentary no longer picks out a non-artistic
 25 journalistic function but a problem of artistic style. In doing so, Brückle claims,
 26 Wall's greatest achievement is to have conferred upon photographic art something
 27 like the gravity of the canonical arts' relation to their own histories. For all their
 28 differences, then, Brückle and Trodd concur in contesting Fried's appropriation of
 29 Wall as an inheritor 'across a jagged breach' of the project of modernist painting.

30 Christine Conley's paper, '*Morning Cleaning: Jeff Wall and the Large Glass*',
 31 likewise takes aim at Fried's appropriation of Wall, in this case by contesting head-
 32 on his reading of a specific work, *Morning Cleaning*, *Mies van der Rohe Foundation*,
 33 *Barcelona* (1999). Contra Fried, for whom this absorptive tableaux exemplifies Wall's
 34 renewal of the anti-theatrical aims of high modernist painting, Conley takes
 35 Marcel Duchamp's *Large Glass* as the model for its structuring tensions, which
 36 prevent any 'intercourse' between the animate/inanimate, male/female figures,
 37 between Alejandro, the window cleaner, and Georg Kolbe's sculpture of a female
 38 nude, *Dawn*. While acknowledging the work's absorptive motifs, Conley takes issue
 39 with Fried's gender-neutral analysis, bringing out with considerable ingenuity a
 40 number of formal and iconographic parallels between *Morning Cleaning* and the
 41 *Large Glass*, – from Mies's cruciform column and Duchamp's horizontal division of
 42 the glass, through the window cleaner's squeegee and the chocolate grinder's
 43 bayonet, to the gender division and thematics of liquids in both.

44 Rather than simply projecting Duchamp's allegory of frustrated desire
 45 wholesale onto *Morning Cleaning*, however, Conley reads it as a 'Duchampian delay'
 46 within the historical context of the (reconstructed) German pavilion designed by
 47 Mies van der Rohe for the 1929 International Exposition in Barcelona. Mies's
 48 original building is known largely through thirteen master prints known as

1 *Berliner Bild-Bericht* photos. A temporary structure dismantled after only seven
 2 months, on the eve of National Socialism, it has long been regarded as encap-
 3 sulating the defeated utopian aspirations of the avant-garde; its reconstruction as
 4 museum-cum-tourist attraction further hollows out whatever utopian social
 5 hopes it might once have embodied. By bringing this context to bear, her paper
 6 opens onto a reading of *Morning Cleaning* beyond Duchamp's tale of arrested
 7 sexual desire, pointing allegorically to the frustrated dreams of the avant-garde
 8 meaningfully to engage the working class. This is a central tenet of both Wall's
 9 critique of conceptual art, and his interpretation of Dan Graham's *Alteration to a*
 10 *Suburban House* (1978), which Wall reads as 'counter-memorial' to the defeatism of
 11 conceptual art's critique of art, and which Conley takes as the background
 12 context for *Morning Cleaning*. By bringing such a wealth of reference and inter-
 13 textuality to her interpretation of the work, in its relation to Wall's other works
 14 and writings, Conley's paper implicitly bears out Brückle's claims for the rich
 15 interdependence of Wall's corpus, while flagging a range of meanings with
 16 respect to class and gender for which there is no place in Fried's account of it as a
 17 marriage of absorptive tableaux with the aspirations of high modernist painting.
 18

19 This overview cannot do full justice to the nuanced accounts of particular works
 20 and theorists that mark many papers in this volume. It does, however, indicate
 21 the extent to which art history becomes closely entwined with criticism in many
 22 of them. Throughout, one finds an interleaving of traditional art-historical,
 23 philosophical and historical contextualizing of the object, with a more first
 24 person, visual, sometimes partisan, engagement with it. This is in large part
 25 owing to the relatively recent historical focus of the papers collected in this issue
 26 and the different protocols and conventions of art history 'proper' and criticism:
 27 where one demands an objective, detached or non-judgemental discourse, the
 28 other calls for a form of writing that is evocative and sometimes metaphorical,
 29 and includes the aesthetic, emotional and critical responses of the viewer. Where
 30 one is historical and interpretative, the other has both descriptive and normative
 31 dimensions, entailing that one take a stand on the value of the art in question.
 32 The interpenetration of these modes of writing about art reflects the permeability
 33 of contemporary art theory to philosophical and theoretical issues at large in the
 34 culture more generally and, in so far as artists are equally open to these same
 35 cultural forces, this explains the responsiveness of ambitious art to critical
 36 theorization. The intertwining of such forms of writing characterizes what the
 37 editors would claim to be a feature of the best contemporary writing about art.

38 Another feature of the collection as a whole is the extent to which the claims
 39 of individual papers hold clear implications for the arguments of others. This is so
 40 probably because two issues in particular structure the argument of many of the
 41 papers, in part no doubt as a response to our original call for papers: Wall's
 42 history of photo-conceptualism and the implications of his practice, and Fried's
 43 critical positioning of recent photographic practice as an inheritance of the
 44 absorptive pictorial tradition, and the aims of high modernist painting. Enough
 45 has been said already about the Wall essay, but the terms of Fried's argument may
 46 need to be spelt out more clearly here.

47 Even when it is not explicit, it should be clear by now that Fried's recent
 48 articles and book on photography served for many of the authors represented here

1 as a provocation and a challenge. Fried's claim, in brief, is that photography
 2 matters as art as never before because it has become the medium that raises the
 3 question of its own status as art most acutely. This, the argument runs, is because
 4 photography's mechanically produced (and reproduced) character – notably the
 5 causal, optical-chemical mechanisms underlying its indexicality – conspire to
 6 make the photograph resemble an object as much as, if not more than, a picture. In
 7 Fried's terms, this is an 'ontological' worry about photography per se, rather than a
 8 merely contingent worry about certain photographs, which arises as a result of the
 9 way in which photographs as a kind of image come into existence. As such,
 10 objecthood is a risk posed internally by the causal substrate of the photographic
 11 process that photographic artists must neutralize so as to secure their photo-
 12 graphs' existence as art. As will be apparent to those who know Fried's criticism
 13 well, the photographers in Fried's canon now occupy a position vis-à-vis the threat
 14 of objecthood that the work of Frank Stella and Anthony Caro occupied for him
 15 over forty years ago. The structure of the argument is similar – albeit with a greater
 16 stress on the dialectic between what Fried now calls 'to be seenness' (rather than
 17 theatricality) and 'absorption' *internal* to the works held to triumph over object-
 18 hood; it is the artists and the medium in which they work that have changed. This
 19 has much to do with the significance of Wall for Fried's canon, given the nego-
 20 tiation between cinematographic and documentary (the tropes of the 'staged' and
 21 the 'straight') throughout Wall's oeuvre, and the foregrounding of his work's
 22 artefactuality – its status as an object in the world among other objects – by means
 23 of his light-box constructions, given their substantial projection from the wall.

24 Much like minimalism, then, photography precipitates a crisis of the picture
 25 and thereby places a particular burden on the photographic artist to establish
 26 their photographs' credentials as pictures, and ultimately as art, rather than
 27 mere objects. The artists selected by Fried are thus seen to deploy various strate-
 28 gies for establishing their work's existence as art, many of which involve
 29 procedures quite alien to the sort of digital manipulation sometimes likened to
 30 painting with pixels. Think, for example, of Thomas Demand's idiosyncratic
 31 practice of building models of paper and cardboard to photograph, rather than
 32 photographing what his models represent directly. This is interpreted as estab-
 33 lishing a thoroughgoing intentionality – in Fried's words, a Demand photograph
 34 is 'a wholly intended object'. Without some sign of this assurance, the photo-
 35 graph, much like the 'literalist' object according to 'Art and Objecthood', makes
 36 no particular demands upon viewers, who are thereby given free reign to
 37 substitute their subjective experience of the work for the meaning intended by
 38 the artist. The work, as Fried paraphrased Donald Judd, need only be 'interesting'.

39 In the heat that will no doubt be generated by Fried's claim to see in recent art
 40 photography a renewal or inheritance of the project of high modernist painting,
 41 what is likely to pass unnoticed is that Fried's argument, *like that of his critics*,
 42 implicitly rests on some widely accepted, but highly contentious, assumptions
 43 about the relation between causality and intentionality in photography. What
 44 would need to be established, to get Fried's claim about photography's distinctive
 45 *internal* relation to objecthood off the ground, is that a photographer's use of the
 46 causal mechanisms at his or her disposal is different *in kind* to, say, a painter's use
 47 of the mechanisms at his or hers. But why think that? Take, for example, gravity's
 48 effects on oil as opposed to acrylic when allowed to run off an unprimed vertical

1 canvas, or the viscosity of a particular thinner combined with the properties of a
2 particular means of application and the weave of a particular canvas, given its
3 particular absorptive properties. The skilful painter (think of Morris Louis)
4 manipulates all these *causal* interactions in the service of his or her ends. As Joel
5 Snyder has consistently argued, there is no principled difference between photo-
6 graphy and any other medium in this regard: the photographer employs a parti-
7 cular camera, lens, aperture and shutter speed, and sets all manner of other
8 variables, including lighting, filters, and (in principle) choice and temperature of
9 processing and developing solutions in the service of their particular ends. Being a
10 skilled practitioner is being able to employ or, better, *act through* such means to
11 achieve the end envisaged. The critic who claimed that, because the transfer of
12 paint from brush to canvas in Titian or Velàzquez is governed by causal laws the
13 result cannot be art, would sound foolish indeed. The interesting question is why
14 we seem so tempted to entertain what, *prima facie*, look like analogous claims
15 about photography: wouldn't it be akin to saying that, given all the mechanical
16 operations of a piano in the causal chain between depressing the keys and
17 generating the resulting sounds, there is no such thing as the art of piano playing?

18 In sum: the use of digital technologies by Wall, or of models by Demand, may
19 have foregrounded the intentional activity of photographers, but it was always
20 there. Though it is *possible* for a photograph to be produced entirely by accident (a
21 curtain blown by the wind knocks over a Polaroid camera and trips the shutter) or
22 entirely naturally (the impression of a static lace curtain on a patch of wall faded by
23 the sun is arguably a cameraless, agentless photograph), the use of the photo-
24 graphic apparatus by artists and photographers has always been saturated by
25 intention. This does not, however, conflict with the fact that many artists, including
26 photographers, delight in harnessing chance effects and making accidents happen.
27 Though it falls beyond the scope of this introduction to deal with this in detail,
28 what is striking here is the degree to which art history and photography theory
29 share several of the foundational, but arguably contentious, assumptions of the
30 philosophy of photography when it comes to understanding photography's nature
31 as a mode of picture-making. It would take more space than is available to us here
32 to establish this, so we will simply note that it is one of the aims of the broader
33 research project of which this volume forms a part to interrogate such issues with
34 the resources that art history and philosophy offer when brought into dialogue.

35 Despite the obvious impact of Fried's interventions, none of the papers
36 collected here follows him in claiming that the most ambitious recent photo-
37 graphic art is such because it asserts its own status as art in ways that renew the
38 anti-theatrical aims of high modernist painting. Yet neither, it should be noted,
39 do they accept the countervailing postmodern perception of photography as the
40 anti-aesthetic medium *par excellence*, in virtue of its mechanical nature and
41 causal basis. Rather, several seek out the deeper aesthetic dimension of works that
42 might at first blush seem to negate aesthetic engagement. One way in which they
43 do this is by positioning the work concerned in relation to longer historical
44 lineages or to a wider cultural field. It is probably significant that, where the work
45 of the presiding genius of the anti-aesthetic gesture is invoked, Duchamp is
46 represented, not by the readymade, but by his elaborate *Large Glass*. The impli-
47 cation would seem to be that work not included in Fried's cannon does not
48 occupy some *terrain vague* of objecthood, but forms part of alternative traditions.

1 As such, the essays collected here suggest that photography after conceptual
 2 art may present broader implications for the larger field of art history and
 3 criticism. Conceptual art and its theoretical framing would at one time have been
 4 construed as announcing the demise of the privilege, if not the bare sensory
 5 necessity, of the aesthetic reception of works of art, in so far as the locus of the
 6 work was deemed to be the idea or statement. As a consequence, the photographs
 7 and texts associated with conceptual art have not always been looked at as
 8 carefully as they might. At least on the evidence of the papers presented here, this
 9 perception of the art of the period and its legacy is no longer ascendant. At the
 10 same time, however, another conclusion to be drawn from this collection is that it
 11 no longer seems essential to the work of criticism to operate with a strong notion
 12 of medium. Rather, the papers explore what we have termed the hybrid condition
 13 of art since the 1960s. If, for Fried, all art worthy of the name is the product of an
 14 intention to extricate the work from its entanglement in everyday contingency
 15 and indeterminacy, then this might be taken to imply that the critical task is one
 16 of specifying the medium. Fried and Rosalind Krauss seem to concur on this
 17 point, even if Krauss proposes a more limited application to the notion to the
 18 work of individual artists, such as James Coleman's adoption of the slide show as
 19 his 'medium'. In Krauss's usage, by contrast, the alternative risks of overstating
 20 the capacity of individual artists to invent media *ex nihilo*, and thereby under-
 21 mining the possibility of a work counting as *an instance* of what is by nature a
 22 publicly shareable category, by simultaneously depriving that notion of its
 23 publicity – are pushed to the fore. Be that as it may, what seems to be contested in
 24 many of the papers in this issue is the residual emphasis on the medium in both
 25 Fried and Krauss. None of the authors represented here seems particularly exer-
 26 cised about disciplinary boundaries or medium specificity: photography mingles
 27 freely with graphic art, text, sculpture, painting, performance and so on. Even so,
 28 Fried's argument will not go away because now, as in 1967, he has touched on the
 29 nerve that runs through the art of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries,
 30 namely, that a great deal of the art of the period constitutes itself as such
 31 precisely by calling into question artistic autonomy, authorial agency, medium
 32 specificity and its conventions. Ironically, ruling out such work as art worthy of
 33 serious consideration turns out to have been just the provocation required to
 34 motivate the most sustained criticism of that very work.

Acknowledgements

35 The editors of this volume gratefully acknowledge the support of the AHRC, who
 36 funded the three-year 'Aesthetics after Photography' research project from which
 37 this volume arises. We would also like to thank: the individual authors for their
 38 good humoured and timely responses to our numerous requests for clarifications,
 39 rewrites and the like; Dawn Phillips and Wolfgang Brückle, our two research
 40 fellows on the AHRC project, for their expertise and unflagging input more
 41 generally; David Peters Corbett and Sam Bibby at *Art History* for their invaluable
 42 editorial assistance and advice; Julian Stallabrass for his perceptive comments on
 43 the drafts; and Marko Daniel, Madeleine Keep and Victoria Walsh at Tate for their
 44 support and first class organization at the 2008 AAH from which the majority of
 45 these papers originally derive.

ABSTRACT AND AUTHOR

Q1

Diarmuid Costello is Associate Professor of Philosophy, University of Warwick. He co-edited (with Dominic Willson) *The Life and Death of Images: Ethics and Aesthetics* (Tate/Cornell, 2008) and (with Jonathan Vickery) *Art: Key Contemporary Thinkers* (Berg, 2007). His articles at the intersection of aesthetics and art theory have appeared in *The British Journal of Aesthetics*, *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, *Critical Inquiry*, *Rivista di Estetica*, *Angelaki*, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Art*, *Philosophy Compass* and various collections. He is working on two longer projects, 'Aesthetics after Modernism' and 'On Photography'. He is Co-Director (with Margaret Iversen) of the AHRC research project 'Aesthetics after Photography'.

Margaret Iversen is Professor in the Department of Art History and Theory, University of Essex, England. Her most recent book is *Beyond Pleasure: Freud, Lacan, Barthes* (2007). Her other published books include *Alois Riegl: Art History and Theory* (1993); *Mary Kelly* co-authored with Douglas Crimp and Homi Bhabha, (1997); *Art and Thought*, edited and introduced with Dana Arnold (2003). Forthcoming books are *Writing Art History* (co-authored with Stephen Melville) and *Chance*. She is Director (with Diarmuid Costello) of a three-year interdisciplinary AHRC-funded research project, 'Aesthetics after Photography'.

UNCORRECTED PROOF

WUK-AHIS 706 Webpdf:09/19/2009 09:38:41 673719 Bytes L3 PACES:n operator=gs.favishmkap 9/19/2009 9:38:50 PM

