

# UC Santa Barbara

## Journal of Transnational American Studies

### Title

Old Masters' Madonnas in "New World" Photographs: Instances and Impact of Interpictoriality in Lewis W. Hine's Photography

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8kj4w2x7>

### Journal

Journal of Transnational American Studies, 7(1)

### Author

Szlezák, Klara Stephanie

### Publication Date

2016

### DOI

10.5070/T871021235

### Copyright Information

Copyright 2016 by the author(s). This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

# Old Masters' Madonnas in "New World" Photographs: Instances and Impact of Interpictoriality in Lewis W. Hine's Photography

---

KLARA STEPHANIE SZLEZÁK

## I. Introduction

In a lecture presented in 1909 at the National Conference of Charities and Correction in Buffalo, New York, American photographer Lewis W. Hine described the power of pictures as follows: "Whether it be a painting or a photograph, the picture is a symbol that brings one immediately into close touch with reality. It speaks a language learned early in the race and in the individual. . . . The picture is the language of all nationalities and all ages."<sup>1</sup> And with specific reference to the photographic picture, he claims that "the photograph has an added realism of its own; it has an inherent attraction not found in other forms of illustration" (356). Although Hine makes several valid observations in these passages, his views on photography seem rather simplistic. The alleged "realism" of photography has long been drawn into question. Miles Orvell more accurately speaks of photography's "ambiguous quality," asserting that "it is both objective and subjective at the same time, a window into 'reality' and a constructed language."<sup>2</sup>

More striking than Hine's somewhat naïve assessment of photography's unique quality is his claim that "painting" and "photograph" share a universal and intuitive pictorial language that transgresses the borders of country or nation and generation or era. This universalist claim literally seems to call for objection from the culturalist camp, from whose viewpoint Hine's notion of a visual "language of all nationalities and all ages" crudely neglects culture-specific aspects of the visual rhetoric. Rather than framing Hine's notion of pictorial language as understandable across nationalities and ages in terms of the dichotomous perspective of universalism versus culturalism, a more fruitful approach, as this article proposes, may be its

understanding in terms of inter pictoriality explored in a transnational dimension. So, rather than inquiring as to whether pictures, including Hine's photographs, speak a universal language or whether they derive their connection to "reality" from the immediate culture-specific circumstances of their production and reception, this article investigates the transnational flows of visual motifs and rhetoric that have informed the composition and reception of Hine's photography.

In proposing such a reading of Lewis Hine's photography, this article partakes in the debates and reflections instigated by the "transnational turn" in American Studies, which has lastingly challenged the grand narrative of American exceptionalism and has instead redirected attention to "the historical roots of multidirectional flows of people, ideas, and goods and the social, political, linguistic, cultural, and economic crossroads generated in the process."<sup>3</sup> A large portion of American Studies research has since been (more) explicitly characterized by the "desire to transcend the national paradigm"<sup>4</sup> and by the interpretation of the United States as a "trans-nationality."<sup>5</sup> Decades before the discipline's turn toward transnational research trajectories, Randolph Bourne, a contemporary of Hine who shared his concern with Progressive Era creeds and politics, famously described the notion of "trans-national America" as "a weaving back and forth, with the other lands, of many threads of all sizes and colors."<sup>6</sup> The following reading of Hine's photography aims at understanding the pictures in terms of their "weaving back and forth" with other pictures from "other lands" as well as from preceding and succeeding generations.

Once pictures from different "nationalities" and "ages" are brought into dialogue with each other, it is their transnational inter pictoriality that secures their meaningfulness and comprehensibility. In an attempt to tackle the question of why and how Lewis Hine's photographs speak to viewers across national and generational borders, despite their firm anchoring in the photographer's commitments and the politics and aesthetics of his time, this article arrives at a conclusion similarly ambiguous as Orvell's characterization of the very nature of photography. Hine's photographs are most accurately understood in their sociohistorical and cultural contexts and unfold their pictorial potential most forcefully when viewed against their culture-specific backdrop. Yet, at the same time, Hine sought recourse to icons of Western visual culture, the dialogue with which, based on their tradition and international fame, was likely to transform his pictures into widely and enduringly intelligible visual "language." Indeed the culture-specific dimension of his photographs is often mediated through implicit or explicit references to pictorial precedents from other "nationalities" and "ages," and the transnational web of references and aesthetic exchanges can be traced beyond Hine's oeuvre and into the present day. In the following sections, this argument will be laid out with the help of selected case studies.

## II. On Copies and Quotations: Characteristics and Variants of Interpictoriality

In very broad terms, instances of pictures that relate to other pictures, as well as to the processes and ways in which they are transferred, can be called cases of interpictoriality.<sup>7</sup> As this phenomenon has a long tradition in the visual arts, a myriad of related terms used to describe it has evolved, such as imitation, copy, citation, allusion, homage, paraphrase, and parody, to name just the central ones.<sup>8</sup> The distinctions between these terms, however, are not always clear-cut.

Taking the term “citation” as their point of departure,<sup>9</sup> Martina Sitt and Attila Horányi, for instance, delimit “paraphrases” as cases in which artists tackle problems that previous artists have dealt with using their own means, and “homage” as a form of reference that, in most cases, establishes the connection (only) in the title, thus provoking the viewer to look closer and recognize the point(s) of reference (17). The term “copy” proves to be particularly complex, fanning out into four subcategories ranging from mere reproductions to revised versions and from creative copies to copies of canonized models, with an increasing degree of reinterpretation and distance from the original (15–17).

Leo Steinberg, reflecting on “the reappearance of old motifs in new art,” deplored the fact that there are “plenty of bad-mouthing caconyms for the phenomenon under discussion, but no decent name”<sup>10</sup> and suggested a separation of the competing terms into two groups. The terms in the first group, such as “inspiration” or “influence,” characterize the phenomenon as an involuntary process, denying the artist’s conscious choices. On the other hand, terms in the second group, such as “quotation,” “borrowing,” or even “stealing,” admit the artist’s intention but add the notion of wrongfulness.<sup>11</sup> All these variants share the basic common feature of establishing and expressing a relationship between two artists and their works; clear dividing lines between the natures of this relationship, however, often cannot be drawn.<sup>12</sup>

According to Valeska von Rosen, the fairly recently introduced term “interpictoriality,” which was coined following the introduction of the term “intertextuality” in the field of literary studies in the 1960s and 1970s, benefits the field of pictorial analysis in two ways. First, “interpictoriality” as a “neutral generic term” covers and subsumes the broad range of closely related or overlapping terms roughly outlined above.<sup>13</sup> Second, the term “interpictoriality” shifts the focus and objective of investigation: While more traditional approaches to the phenomenon sought to retrace the origins of cited features and determine the relations between two (or more) works, interpictoriality is primarily interested in “the function cited elements assume in a work and how they alter and contribute to its meaning” (209). In view of the multitude of interconnected, at times hardly distinguishable, terms—a disentanglement of which is not the purpose of this article—and following the focus of recent research on the constitution of meaning through interpictorial references, I

do not differentiate any further between the various (sub)kinds of visual reference and hereafter exclusively use the term “interpictoriality.”

Many of Lewis Hine’s photographs, as the following analysis of selected case studies show, make clear implicit and/or explicit interpictorial references. In these pictures, as I will show, Hine ventures beyond the depiction of his photographic subjects, mostly women and children, thereby expanding his photographic repertoire as well as the pictures’ meanings. By referring more or less overtly to other artworks and art forms, Hine not only adds to the appeal, the implications, and thus the effectiveness of his pictures (in the context of social documentary) but also redefines and repositions himself as a photographer in between the two “poles” of social documentary and art photography.

### **III. Instances of Interpictoriality in Lewis W. Hine’s Photography**

Born in Wisconsin in 1874, Lewis Wickes Hine took up photography in 1903, one year before he was appointed school photographer at the Ethical Culture School in New York City, where he had been teaching since 1901.<sup>14</sup> His first major assignment led him to Ellis Island, where he worked on a project that aimed to “reveal the new Americans as individuals, and to counter any idea that they were the worthless scourgings of Europe.”<sup>15</sup> In 1908, Hine gave up teaching and first posted the advertisement “Lewis W. Hine, Social Photography.”<sup>16</sup> That same year, Hine was employed as a photographer by the National Child Labor Committee, which made him travel all over the United States for thirteen years with the mission of bringing to the public’s attention and fighting social injustice. Ten years later, he was widely recognized as “the nation’s leading social photographer.”<sup>17</sup> When he died in New York in 1940, largely unappreciated and impoverished, he left a rich legacy of photographs. Among the best known of his photographs are his pictures of child labor throughout the US, of World War I refugees in Europe, and of the construction of the Empire State Building.

Lewis Hine’s self-conception as an artist was very complex. Although Hine categorized his work as social photography and although the larger part of this work served reformist purposes, he “defined himself as an artist and even wrote about photography as an educational and artistic tool” (xx). However, in the eyes of many of Hine’s contemporaries, the perception of photography as a tool for social criticism stood in stark contrast with its appreciation as a new art form, and the phrase “artistic tool” would have seemed an oxymoron. Photographers with a purely artistic agenda and an unambiguous self-perception as artists did not consider these two approaches to camera work compatible. Yet, as recent studies argue,<sup>18</sup> and as the following analysis will show, Lewis Hine did think of the divide as surmountable. Assessing the particular character of Hine’s photographs, art historian Beaumont Newhall identified the “emotional quality” of Hine’s “records” as the origin of their status as “works of art.”<sup>19</sup> I suggest that the photographs’ “emotional quality” was not the only source of their aspiration to the status of art.

Categorically drawing the differentiation into question, Berenice Abbott, in reference to Hine, stresses that the strict distinction between documentary photography and artistic photography reflects “simply labels,” and thus “the American desire to reduce everything to a formula.”<sup>20</sup> The photographs addressed below as case studies can be read as an attempt by Hine to overcome this conventional divide, to reveal it as merely discursive, and to enlarge his photographic repertoire without compromising the reformist intent behind his work.

The analysis and interpretation of three of Hine’s photographs as case studies, as well as their relation to preceding visuals, or “source pictures,” will support this claim. One of the most striking instances of interpictureoriality in the body of Hine’s photography is the picture he titled *Mona Lisa Madonna – Ellis Island 1905*,<sup>21</sup> in which clear allusions to pictures by artists from other “nationalities” and “ages” can be identified.<sup>22</sup> The scene shows a woman with (her?) two children,<sup>23</sup> recent immigrants from Russia, in a hall on Ellis Island, probably the Registry Room or the so-called Great Hall.<sup>24</sup> The three are seated on a wooden bench: the baby, wrapped up warmly on the woman’s lap, is on the right, and the toddler, clinging tightly to the woman, is on the left. Both children are smiling; the woman gazes downward dreamily. The group occupies approximately the lower half of the picture, while the background of the hall fills the upper part of the picture. The railing and gates to the left of the group, which helped process the immigrants, remind the viewer of the immigration context. The white of the light coming in through the window at the back is set off against the black of the walls. The window’s large dimensions, reaching all the way up to the ceiling, its semicircular shape, and its subdivision into regular, ornamented squares create a church-like atmosphere. Albeit not explicitly associating the background with a church interior, Hine himself suggested a religious dimension of the picture by designating the white semicircle as a halo; in a caption to the picture, Hine wrote, “The large window in the background becomes a halo for this Russian family, who might have been a suitable subject for a Renaissance painter.”<sup>25</sup>

By titling his photograph *Mona Lisa Madonna*, Hine directly evokes Leonardo da Vinci’s (1452–1519) famous painting *Mona Lisa*, also known as *La Gioconda*, of the early sixteenth century (ca. 1503–1506).<sup>26</sup> He draws parallels to da Vinci’s *Mona Lisa* explicitly in the title as well as implicitly in the picture’s visual rhetoric.<sup>27</sup> Looking at da Vinci’s legendary painting, it becomes evident that neither the settings nor the women’s positions correspond in the two pictures, so similarities must lie elsewhere. It is the two women’s facial expressions that prove to share common features. Both faces are oval and surrounded by dark hair or a dark scarf. Leonardo da Vinci’s “Mona Lisa” smiles enigmatically, inducing art historians to declare that “the inscrutable smile is . . . the most famous and tantalizing thing about the face. It is a knowing but equivocal expression, prompting numerous, sometimes farfetched theories.”<sup>28</sup> Hine’s “Mona Lisa” smiles so vaguely that it is impossible to tell whether she is happy or sad, relieved to have reached the longed-for shores or melancholy about having left home and loved ones behind. Neither woman’s smile reveals what she might think or feel.

Apart from the more immediate parallels between the pictures (i.e., between the physiognomies of the women and the composition as a half-portrait), their aura and a particular reading of the pictures grant further insights.<sup>29</sup> Art historians have discussed the possibility that, at some point in the creative process, da Vinci may have considered painting “Mona Lisa” as a religious personage.<sup>30</sup> Roy McMullen enumerates the features that prompt such a reading: “A somewhat saintly effect is produced by the partly undone hair falling in little curls to the shoulders, by the lack of jewelry, by the simple, undatable dress, and especially by the transparent mantle (which may be a combination of two or three large veils of varying thickness) that is draped over the head, caught in the crook of the right arm, and thrown over the left shoulder in a Greco-Roman manner” (56). The painting “does seem to belong in the series of Leonardesque religious pictures”; yet, due to the lack of “traditional identifying accessory,” McMullen asserts that “Mona Lisa” was “not finally meant to be read as a Christian heroine” (57). In such a reading of the painting, “Mona Lisa” partakes in sacred imagery, while retaining a nonspecific position beyond any denominational canon.

In addition to the ambivalent religious repertoire of the painting, the *Mona Lisa* has fascinated viewers and puzzled art historians because of the ambiguous sexuality of its subject. As McMullen elaborates, “On a more philosophical level, there was the idea that the best image of universal humanity was one that united the characteristics of both sexes and thus abolished all discord: Renaissance Neoplatonists were notably fond of the theory . . . that human beings were originally androgynous and will return to that perfect state when the divided Many are at last reintegrated into the divine One” (84). I have neither evidence nor reason to claim that Hine adhered to Neoplatonist thought, nor do I intend to discuss the degree of ambiguity in the sexuality of Hine’s “Mona Lisa.” The crucial point in this reading of da Vinci’s “Mona Lisa” that relates to Hine’s photograph is her association with “universal humanity.” Echoing McMullen’s view, art critic David Bourdon states that the “Mona Lisa has a universality that completely overshadows the individuality of its model or models.”<sup>31</sup> Referencing the *Mona Lisa* means referencing Renaissance thought, including the notion of universal humanity. Even if the compositional elements shared by the painting and the photograph may seem minor, the inter pictorial references are traceable on a more abstract level. Rather than sharing landscape or clothing details, Hine’s “Mona Lisa” shares da Vinci’s “Mona Lisa’s” vague yet manifest sacredness, as well as her symbolic value as representative of a universal humanity. The fact that Hine established this connection in the title of his photograph indicates that he perceived these connections as being of central importance.

In addition, the significance that Hine ascribed to the inter pictorial reference might have been secondary (i.e., rooted in the *Mona Lisa*’s impact and reception), rather than primary (i.e., located in the picture’s visual code proper). Leonardo da Vinci’s *Mona Lisa* is widely recognized as “a Renaissance masterpiece and one of the great artworks of all time,” with an astonishing and unparalleled number of copies and

reproductions made over the centuries and around the globe (5–6). Bourdon points out that pictures “assume a touch of class when they are called ‘Mona Lisa’” and that the “name . . . implies high quality” (6), adding the dimension of cachet to the visible pictorial reference of the *Mona Lisa*.

The foremost reason why the *Mona Lisa* has proven to be such a prolific source of both inspiration and validation for later pictures is its very universality,<sup>32</sup> as well as its ambiguity, the latter being primarily grounded in the subject’s “inscrutable smile.”<sup>33</sup> These conclusions drawn by art historians make this approach to Hine’s photograph come full circle. As an artist, Hine drew parallels to the world-famous painting explicitly in composition, title, and caption, yet the actual inter pictorial reference originated less from compositional features than from the aura and effect of the source picture. As a social reformer who aimed to direct the public’s attention to societal problems, such as prejudice against recent immigrants, invoking this renowned painting would almost have counted as “publicity work” for the cause he pursued and supported.

The second part of the photograph’s title, “Madonna,” redirects the viewers’ attention (and their reading of the picture) away from the immediate context of Renaissance art toward religious iconography.<sup>34</sup> It allows for not only the connection to a certain repertoire but also the inter pictorial reference to a specific set of pictures by another photographer.<sup>35</sup>

More specifically, Hine’s photograph is strikingly evocative of Julia Margaret Cameron’s (1815–1879) photograph *Madonna with Children* (1864), one of Cameron’s numerous photographs with a Madonna motif.<sup>36</sup> Not only do the pictures’ titles overlap in their use of the word “Madonna,” details in the visual composition of the two photographs are also remarkably similar, and they both deploy characteristic features of the Madonna iconography, despite their different photographic styles and techniques. The parallels in the constellation of the photographic subjects in the two pictures are plainly visible: both *Mona Lisa Madonna* and *Madonna with Children* center around a dark-haired woman, a mother figure, framed by an infant on the right and an older child on the left. Both groups are positioned inside, and the scenes are vaulted by, an arch separating light from dark. This bright semicircle, which suggests and is readily identifiable as a halo, is the most conspicuous indicator of sainthood, a halo being “a symbol of the sun . . . now most commonly associated with Christian saints.”<sup>37</sup> The connection between the two images via the shared Madonna motif is thus easily conceivable.

The idealized, dream-like, blurred scene in *Madonna with Children* is characteristic of Cameron’s idyllic imagery.<sup>38</sup> It is very likely that Lewis Hine was familiar with Cameron’s photographs. Not only was she “amongst the pre-eminent artistic photographers of the nineteenth century,”<sup>39</sup> but she was also the one who popularized religious-themed genre photography, which made its way from Europe to the US in the 1890s.<sup>40</sup> As even a cursory glance at her oeuvre shows, Cameron was guided in her work by an “interest in Christian subjects, usually the Madonna or Madonna and Child.”<sup>41</sup> Indeed Madonna motifs, with or without a child or two children,



are frequent in Cameron's overall work, and the repertoire includes headscarves, halos, and gazes into the distance: the works *Goodness* (1864), *Madonna and Two Children* (1864), or *Madonna and Child* (1864) exemplify this.<sup>42</sup>

While Madonna or Virgin Mary iconography, or Mariology, is more commonly associated with Roman Catholicism, theology professor and priest George H. Tavard, in his book *The Thousand Faces of the Virgin Mary*, points out that "the widespread assertion that the Reformers ignored the Virgin Mary and had no Mariology is not tenable. The continental Reformers were at one in subordinating all Mariology to Christology and in condemning prayer to the Virgin as to a mediator, but also in respecting the traditional doctrines . . . on [Mary's] sinlessness."<sup>43</sup> More crucial than the actual role that is attributed to the Madonna are the associations she evokes, independent of religious denomination: "sinlessness" is complemented by such virtues as motherly love, sacrifice, charity, faith, and strength. Similarly, literary scholar John Gatta traces the significance of the Marian mythology in American literary works emerging from distinctly Protestant contexts and more generally observes that "a notable undercurrent of interest in Mary as mythical Madonna *has* persisted in American life and letters from fairly early in the nineteenth century" into the present.<sup>44</sup>

Hine's reference to Madonna iconography needs to be set against this backdrop, and where Hine deviates from Cameron's use of the Madonna iconography is just as relevant as where he concurs with hers. Unlike Cameron's scene with its characteristic ethereal quality, Hine's scene is set in the specific environment of Ellis Island, as is unmistakably recognizable from the background, the title, and the caption. It is crucial that the semicircle, which harbors the association with a halo, is constituted by a window, as windows often symbolize freedom.<sup>45</sup> Given the political context of the photograph, this is not an insignificant detail. In the context of (mass) immigration, the notion of freedom is crucial as it was at the center of America's promise to its newcomers. As Emma Lazarus's poem on the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty proclaims, those who had left behind "[Europe's] teeming shore" in search of a better and self-determined life and were "yearning to breathe free" were to turn towards America's "world-wide welcome."<sup>46</sup> Hine's fusion in the photograph of a pronounced symbolism and the very specific context of immigration via Ellis Island assumes considerable rhetorical power in the early twentieth century, at a time when nativist, anti-immigration voices tried to undermine one of the core values and founding principles of the US—the sacrosanct freedom to try to make a better life for oneself.

Cameron's work on the Madonna theme is, however, not the only realm in which her photography enters into an inter pictorial dialogue with Hine's. It deserves further attention that her aim was to create "high" art at a time when photography was still struggling to win ground beside the established visual arts. Cameron "looked to the old masters for inspiration,"<sup>47</sup> and Pre-Raphaelite art has been identified as a major influence on her work.<sup>48</sup> This, too, seems relevant for the investigation of the inter pictorial relation between her work and Lewis Hine's. In all likelihood she served as a source of inspiration for Hine in her own right, with her idiosyncratic response to

“Old World” art. Hine’s *Mona Lisa Madonna* provides an intricate case of inter pictorial dialogue as it responds both to the visual rhetoric of “old masters” outside the field of photography and to what could be called an “old master” in the art of photography. Hine’s photograph appropriates elements of foreign visual traditions, both of European Renaissance painting and British photographic traditions, and sets them within a distinctly American context. He thus achieves at least three goals: First, he showcases his familiarity with European art and his command of its visual rhetoric. Second, he presents his individual and innovative take on artists who have come before him without crudely copying from them. And third, he manages to smoothly fuse the popularity of his source pictures—the unequalled fame of the *Mona Lisa* and the popularity of Cameron’s religious-genre photographs—with his picture, while aiming to unite artistic aspiration with a reformist political agenda.

The second case study ties in with the first on the basis of both the Madonna motif and the unambiguous reference to Renaissance painting. Hine’s 1905 photograph *A Madonna of the Tenements* takes the immigration theme off Ellis Island and into the bleak tenements of New York City’s Lower East Side.<sup>49</sup> The photograph depicts a mother sitting in a chair in a tenement room, together with her two children. The little girl is sitting on her mother’s lap, barefoot, and her hair and clothes look tattered. The mother is dressed poorly as well: she is not wearing any jewelry and has her sleeves rolled up to keep them from getting dirty from the housework. The third person in the picture, a young boy, is sitting on the right, looking just as disheveled. None of them are smiling: the mother is staring straight ahead; the little girl, with her mouth slightly open, is apathetically gazing into the distance; and the son is sadly looking up at his family. The strong emotional ties among the three figures are reflected in their physical contact: the mother clasps the girl to her breast, and the boy rests his arm on the girl’s leg. Despite this image of family union, the picture communicates a feeling of desolation and disillusionment, symbolizing the shattered hopes of many immigrants whose dreams of a better life in the “New World” did not materialize.

Hine’s *A Madonna of the Tenements* very clearly references another world-famous Renaissance painting, Raphael’s (1483–1520) *Madonna della Seggiola* (*Madonna of the Chair*, 1513).<sup>50</sup> Unlike *Mona Lisa Madonna – Ellis Island 1905*, this photograph appears to be quite meticulously arranged after the famous model. The three subjects sit in the exact same positions in relation to each other and are strongly reminiscent of the Italian masterpiece. Yet, while Hine references the composition of the painting, significant differences are to be found in the details. Raphael’s painting speaks of wealth, evident in the carved chair and the ornamented clothing; it speaks of optimism and self-confidence, evident in the facial expressions; and it speaks of faith, evident in the praying, cherubic child. Hine’s photograph, by contrast, speaks of poverty, evident in the stained clothes and bare feet; it speaks of pessimism, evident in the closed door in the background, which can symbolize a dead-end, barring escape, and a lack of prospects for the future, and thus hopelessness; and it speaks of despair, evident in

the bleak background and the facial expressions and empty gazes. While structurally and formally the two pictures are very similar, they diverge drastically in the atmosphere they communicate. Hine's picture draws its power precisely from this discrepancy. Hine intertextually appropriated those aspects of Raphael's work that he deemed would add to the strength of his own pictorial rhetoric and modified them according to his design. He thus achieved an effect that captivates the viewer in a state between the satisfaction of recognition and curiosity about change and novelty.

Unlike the popularity that Leonardo da Vinci and the *Mona Lisa* enjoy "on every continent from Asia to America,"<sup>51</sup> "the significant role that Raphael—his reputation and his works—played in American cultural life is not well known" today.<sup>52</sup> His paintings were often about "themes from ancient life, depicted in classic language," which "were remote . . . from ordinary human concerns" (17). Nevertheless one feature of Raphael's work "appealed to the prevailing taste for portraits and scenes of everyday life—his Madonnas" (17). From the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century, "America, no less than Europe, developed a pronounced taste for the Madonnas" (22), and Raphael was among those painters of Madonnas whose works were in high demand. His Madonnas were copied in large quantities, and the copies were "admired and bought and sold as reputable works of art" (22).

Hine's photograph can be seen as an indicator that Raphael's paintings inspired not only American painters, such as John Trumbull or Benjamin West, but also American photographers, and that they also inspired looser forms of intertextuality than copies. More importantly, it testifies to Hine's adroit response to the fact that *Madonna of the Chair* was a favorite of the American public (24). David Alan Brown elaborates,

The painting appealed to later generations more for its sentiment than for its composition. For Raphael not only solved the difficult problem of composing figures in a circle, he also made divinity seem accessible. The legends that grew up around the picture—that it was painted on the end of a barrel or that the model for the Virgin was Raphael's mistress—gave it the quality of belonging to everyday life. At the same time the painting represented a divine mystery. . . . Indeed, the *Madonna of the Chair* was a cultural icon. Like the *Mona Lisa* in our own day, it was recognized by people who knew nothing else about art. And it was enjoyed by people who were not experts. (24–25)

Brown's explanation of why Raphael's famous painting proved to be such a success with the American public provides a clue as to why Hine chose to reference it in his photograph. Qualities such as "accessible," "divinity," "belonging to everyday life," "divine mystery," as well as cultural iconicity, were clear assets for a social

photographer. Referencing an easily recognizable picture, appreciated for its “secular, sentimental nature” (17) and acknowledged as a masterpiece, allowed Hine to claim those same values for his picture and thus implicitly for his cause: facing social injustice is presented as an everyday concern and calls on the “sacred virtues” of charity and the Corporal Works of Mercy.

In my third case study, Lewis Hine’s photograph *Another Madonna*,<sup>53</sup> I present and discuss another version of interpictureoriality, which is markedly different from the first two cases and comparatively underrepresented in studies on interpictureoriality. I propose that in this picture Hine interpictureorially references his own photographic corpus. Unlike the first two examples, this photograph was taken not in the United States but in Europe, in 1918 at the end or in the immediate aftermath of World War I. As “after 1915 Reformist ideals and programs withered as American energies were redirected to the crisis occasioned by the first World War” and “social issues reced[ed] in importance” in the US,<sup>54</sup> Hine migrated to where social issues were more prominent—to where the war had happened. He joined the American Red Cross, documented relief programs, and created both “images designed for fundraising” and street photographs,<sup>55</sup> like the image discussed here. Out of his stay abroad came a substantial body of photographs that documented the destruction brought about by war and the plight and sorrows of war refugees.

In *Another Madonna*, Hine draws on the familiar, basic Madonna iconography: a mother figure in a head scarf, holding on tightly to her child, in the absence of a father figure. I see this photograph as an instance of Hine engaging in an interpictureorial dialogue with his own artwork for a number of reasons. One hint lies in the title of the picture.<sup>56</sup> “Another” means “being one more in addition to one or more of the same kind.”<sup>57</sup> The picture can thus be understood as an *addition* to Hine’s prior Madonna-themed photographs. “Another” further denotes being “different . . . from the one first considered,”<sup>58</sup> thus no longer the same. In that sense, Hine chose a familiar theme and pattern of composition and purposefully created a *variation* on it. In this version of the Madonna theme, the pathos of the earlier Renaissance-referencing versions is gone, and Hine’s view is much more clearly marked by sobriety in the face of the horrors of World War I. The disillusionment visible in this picture strikingly diverges from the disillusionment of the *Madonna of the Tenements*. In this wartime context, the barefoot child no longer reminds the viewers of disappointed hopes for a better and more prosperous life but confronts them with the fact that life as such, being alive, can no longer be taken for granted. After the experience of a world war, there is no longer room for sentimental references to the traditions of the art canon.<sup>59</sup> When survival is at stake, everything is stripped to the essentials.

Furthermore, Hine’s take on the question of sacredness has notably altered. Again, Hine dispenses with sentimental and conventional features and thus with (the intimation of) a halo. Instead he includes the symbol of the cross in his photograph, yet in a most adroit and equivocal manner. To the right of the mother-and-child group, the viewers see a red cross, which has assumed a sacredness of “another” dimension.

The literal reference to the work done by the Red Cross in the war coincides with the metaphoric reference to sacred iconography, deliberately playing with this duality and offering a reinterpretation of where holiness resides. If Hine's earlier Madonnas were secularized versions of Renaissance Madonnas, this Madonna takes secularization one step further, while paradoxically insisting on sacredness to alleviate the pain, harm, and sense of loss caused by war.

Lastly, Hine's photograph is sufficiently out of touch with his earlier Madonna-themed photographs, both in time and space, to be seen as a comment on them. While there are only about fifteen years between the photographs, by 1918 the world had entered a new era. And Hine had temporarily left the "New World," which had not seen war action on its territory, and had entered the "Old World," at the moment following upheaval on a scale unprecedented in its history. It did not take decades to create enough distance between Hine's earlier work and his later work. Distance was created immediately through the way world history turned out, enabling Hine to comment on his own themes and compositions.

While interpictureoriality within the work of one single artist is a rare case and one that has been just as rarely explored, I would nevertheless argue that this is what the viewers encounter in *Another Madonna*. As in the first two case studies, the criteria for interpictureoriality are fulfilled. While the first case study was an example in which the source picture(s) were referenced less evidently than in the second case study, the third study shows the degree of abstraction that interpictureorial references may assume.

#### **IV. Impact of Interpictureoriality in Hine's Photography**

Lewis Hine was acutely aware of the impact Madonna iconography had on artists and their works, as well as on viewers. In the aforementioned lecture from 1909, Lewis Hine cited George Eliot on the need for social photography: "paint us a Madonna turning her mild face upward, and opening her arms to welcome the divine glory, but do not impose on us any esthetic rules which shall banish from the reign of art those old women with work-worn hands scraping carrots, those heavy clowns taking holiday in a dingy pothouse, those rounded backs and weather-beaten faces that have been bent over the spade and done the rough work in the world. . . . let art always remind us of them."<sup>60</sup> The extent to which Hine seems to have taken Eliot's admonition seriously can be derived from the frequency with which he turned to the theme of the Madonna. The selection of pictures from Hine's extensive photographic oeuvre examined above—and these are by no means the only Madonna-themed pictures Hine took—shows that he formulated his own "esthetic rules" for the inclusion of subjects into the Madonna iconography.

The above analysis of case studies has demonstrated the presence of (different forms of) interpictureorial references in photographs by Lewis Hine. Looking for and pinning down these references can only be the first step. According to Valeska von Rosen, as cited above, the very value of the introduction of the concept of

“interpictoriality” lies in its objective to explore “the function cited elements assume in a work and how they alter and contribute to its meaning.”<sup>61</sup> Calling to mind Hine’s complex role as an artist and social reformer, cherishing and embracing art but not exclusively for art’s sake, this functionality of interpictorial references and their contribution to his works’ meanings are also manifold.

First, through interpictorial references, Hine as an artist managed to enter into a dialogue with other artists. Secondary sources unanimously portray Hine as a dedicated artist, who did not wish to devalue his artistic output through documentary purposes but rather sought to reunite both. “Hine was happiest when he was creating,” Judith Mara Gutman concluded,<sup>62</sup> and Walter Rosenblum simply called him “one of America’s great artists.”<sup>63</sup> Next to photography’s reformist impetus, Hine was not only aware of “the aesthetics of photography” (13) but inscribed his work into the discourse of photographic aesthetics. Responses to earlier artists, acclaimed works of art, and iconographic repertoires allowed him to interact meaningfully with other renowned artists, without compromising his individuality and personal emphases as an artist. Despite Hine’s aspirations as an artist, however, he “never put his political goals aside in order to satisfy the world of art.”<sup>64</sup>

Furthermore, Hine’s specific choice to reference Madonna iconography, with both its religious and its universal humanitarian implications, can be explained by his desire to appeal to the moral consciousness of a nation that practiced xenophobia, tolerated social injustice, and sanctioned child labor while at the same time invoking Christian values. Representing often “undesired” “newcomers,” the urban and rural poor, and refugees in the classic pose of the Madonna and the Child not only evidenced their capability of living Christian and/or moral values, independent of social rank and national origins, it also reminded audiences that the desirable values epitomized in the nuclear family were under threat if urgently needed reforms were not set in motion.

Finally, interpictorial references allowed Hine to reinforce the effect of his photographs as weapons in his fight for social reform. By 1918, when *Another Madonna* was taken, “Hine . . . was recognized as the nation’s leading social photographer.”<sup>65</sup> Hine’s photographs were acknowledged to be powerful and rich testimonies to the social wrongs, such as exploitation, xenophobia, and child labor, that the nation kept sweeping under the rug. Occasional interpictorial references to famed, if not legendary, pictures could only add to the potency of his pictures. Such references not only “provoke[d] instant shocks of recognition” in the viewers but also let the photographs participate in the source picture’s popularity and influence.<sup>66</sup>

## **V. “Inter-Art Traffic” on End? Madonna Turned Supermother**

Leo Steinberg, in his contribution to the volume *Art about Art*, uses the phrase “inter-art traffic” to refer to the phenomenon of interpictoriality—a phrase that is as thorny as it is intriguing for the connotations it holds.<sup>67</sup> “Traffic” implies trade and business, but, more importantly, it implies movement, transportation, and intersections. Traffic,

trade, and travel are basic parts of the human experience, just as much as they are basic parts of cultural production. More often than not, pictorial motifs do not travel independently; they travel within the frameworks of pictures that use them and in which they are encountered, viewed, and studied. Correspondingly, the Madonna motif does not necessarily “travel” throughout the world and the ages of art freely but rather as part of pictures that are continuously produced, reproduced, transferred, and consumed. It traveled to the US in a myriad of forms, including Renaissance painting and early European photography, and will continue traveling in an art world that is increasingly transnational.

The discussion of yet another picture testifies to the ongoing transnational “traffic” and appropriation of art, motifs, and images. Elżbieta Jabłońska’s 2002 photograph *Supermother* presents a recent take on the Madonna motif.<sup>68</sup> While the artist does not evoke the Madonna in the title, the iconography is readily perceived: the woman/mother figure with the son in her lap, gently holding him and gazing in the distance, a family group without a father figure. An “ironic comment on the situation of women in Poland,” the photograph turns the male hero into a female hero, Supermother, performing “everyday heroic deeds.”<sup>69</sup>

The photograph takes the inter pictorial dialogue traced in Hine’s photography to another level. *Supermother* references many variants of the Madonna iconography and daringly connects them with the very worldly repertoire of the comics genre, with the mother figure dressed in a Superman costume.<sup>70</sup> Whereas the more traditional source pictures implied the source of strength for a single mother comes from a higher being, this modern version ascribes inherent supernatural powers to the woman—or at least the expectations of such powers by the mother herself and the viewers. Inspirations from painting, photography, and comics merge in this picture to continue the inter pictorial dialogue in a transnational dimension. Just as Lewis Hine inscribed European icons into his photographs, Polish photographer Elżbieta Jabłońska integrates icons from American popular culture into her art.

In addition, Jabłońska’s treatment of the motif provides a female perspective, commenting on an array of mostly male precedents. Her work is an example of a recent trend in women’s art, as described by Whitney Chadwick: “women’s art can no longer be considered in national or even regional terms, since it reflects transnational developments in contemporary practice as well as the forces of a global art market. And it has included a wider range of materials, themes, and approaches.”<sup>71</sup> The “reiteration of performative, narrative, and autobiographical traditions” frequently takes the form of “an ironic commentary” (506), as in Jabłońska’s photography, thus extending the legitimacy of inter pictoriality.

Nevertheless, Jabłońska’s photograph brings the inherently problematic nature of inter pictoriality to the fore. Unlike many of Hine’s photographs, her picture does not give a clue, either in its composition or in its caption, as to what specific visuals could have served as source pictures. Such cases remind us that “art about art” can be very hard to trace or to identify, even if many elements seem to suggest other

pictures. It seems hardly legitimate to speak of inter pictoriality on the mere basis of one's feeling familiar with elements in a picture. Yet it is worth studying the field and purposefully looking for references: not in order to expose an artist as having "copied" or "stolen" but to reveal the multitude of meanings uncovered through inter pictorial dialogues. In this way, the readings of a picture can multiply, and, as inter pictorial references transcend the boundaries of nation, time period, and means of artistic expression, the pictorial language can be culture-specific and universal at the same time.

## VI. Concluding Remarks

In the broadest terms, Jean Lipman and Richard Marshall claim that "art is always about art, and art history is a cumulative progression of what has come before,"<sup>72</sup> in the process transgressing national boundaries. Looking back on the history of photography, Hubertus von Amelnunx points to the long tradition among photographers of recreating scenes from famous artworks.<sup>73</sup> Merely an exercise, this practice did not weaken the claim that "photography was not a bastard left by science on the doorstep of art, but a legitimate child of the Western pictorial tradition."<sup>74</sup> To some extent, Lewis Hine participated in this tradition. And yet he deviated from it. He did not reference or recreate for the sake of art alone. He positioned himself in the line of artists who did and yet crossed over the line to instrumentalize art—both his own and that of his artist predecessors.

In her seminal work *On Photography*, Susan Sontag reflects on the relation between the contexts and uses of photographs:

Socially concerned photographers assume that their work can convey some kind of stable meaning, can reveal truth. But partly because the photograph is, always, an object in a context, this meaning is bound to drain away; that is, the context which shapes whatever immediate—in particular, political—uses the photograph may have is inevitably succeeded by contexts in which such uses are weakened and become progressively less relevant. One of the central characteristics of photography is that process by which original uses are modified, eventually supplanted by subsequent uses—most notably, by the discourse of art into which any photograph can be absorbed. And, being images themselves, some photographs right from the start refer us to other images as well as to life.<sup>75</sup>

What Sontag describes here applies to Hine's Madonna photographs: the "immediate . . . political" use of the pictures has faded and they have been "absorbed" "by the discourse of art." If we, however, call to mind Abbott's claim that the distinction is



largely a titular one, and if we read the pictures against the backdrop of their inherent (functional) interpictureoriality, this is neither surprising nor negative. Hine rejected a distinction that may not have been legitimate to begin with.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Lewis W. Hine, "Social Photography: How the Camera May Help in the Social Uplift," in *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction at the Thirty-sixth Annual Session Held in the City of Buffalo, New York, June 9–16, 1909*, ed. Alexander Johnson (Fort Wayne, IN: Press of Fort Wayne, 1909), 356.

<sup>2</sup> Miles Orvell, *American Photography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 14.

<sup>3</sup> Shelley Fisher Fishkin, "Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies—Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 12, 2004," *American Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (2005): 22.

<sup>4</sup> Winfried Fluck, Stefan Brandt, and Ingrid Thaler, "Introduction: The Challenges of Transnational American Studies," in *Transnational American Studies*, ed. Winfried Fluck, Stefan Brandt, and Ingrid Thaler (Tübingen, DE: Narr, 2007), 1.

<sup>5</sup> Randolph S. Bourne, "Trans-national America," *Atlantic Monthly*, July 1916, <http://www.theatlantic.com/past/issues/16jul/bourne.htm>.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> See Valeska von Rosen, "Interpikturalität," in *Metzler Lexikon Kunstwissenschaft: Ideen, Methoden, Begriffe*, 2nd ed., ed. Ulrich Pfisterer (Stuttgart, DE: Metzler, 2011), 208.

<sup>8</sup> Carl Aigner points out the crucial role that the introduction of new visual media, particularly photography, played in the nineteenth century, not only for the further extension of the terminology but also for the development of new theoretical vistas with respect to the art of the twentieth century. Carl Aigner, "Diskurse der Bilder: Photokünstlerische Appropriationen kunsthistorischer Werke," in *Diskurse der Bilder: Photokünstlerische Reprisen kunsthistorischer Werke*, ed. Wilfried Seipel (Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien, 1993), 38.

<sup>9</sup> At the same time, the authors call into question the validity and usage of the term "citation" for its very vagueness and failure to provide methodological precision. See Martina Sitt and Attila Horányi, "Kunsthistorische Suite über das Thema des Zitats in der Kunst," in Seipel, *Diskurse der Bilder*, 20.

<sup>10</sup> Leo Steinberg, "Introduction: The Glorious Company," in *Art about Art*, ed. Jean Lipman and Richard Marshall (New York: Dutton, in association with Whitney Museum of American Art, 1978), 20.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 21. Steinberg addresses the problem that, strictly speaking, “all pictorial ‘quotation’ stands condemned as inexcusable plagiarism. . . . For one is hard put to think of a painting in which a quoted item properly credits its source” (21).

<sup>12</sup> See Sitt and Horányi, “Kunsthistorische Suite,” 18.

<sup>13</sup> Von Rosen, “Interpikturalität,” 209. Quotations from this source are my own translations.

<sup>14</sup> The biographical overview is extracted from Naomi Rosenblum, “Biographical Notes,” in *America and Lewis Hine: Photographs 1904–1940*, by Lewis Wickes Hine (New York: Aperture, 1977), 16–25; and Alan Trachtenberg, “Ever—the Human Document,” in Hine, *America and Lewis Hine*, 118–37.

<sup>15</sup> Ian Jeffrey, *Photography: A Concise History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 159.

<sup>16</sup> Karl Steinorth, ed., *Lewis Hine: Passionate Journey, Photographs 1905–1937* (Zurich: Edition Stemmler, 1996), 237.

<sup>17</sup> Daile Kaplan, introduction to *Photo Story: Selected Letters and Photographs of Lewis W. Hine*, by Lewis W. Hine, ed. Daile Kaplan (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992), xxviii.

<sup>18</sup> See, for example, Kate Sampsell-Willmann, *Lewis Hine as Social Critic* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2009), 6.

<sup>19</sup> Quoted in Kaplan, introduction, xxii.

<sup>20</sup> Berenice Abbott, preface to Hine, *Photo Story*, xiii.

<sup>21</sup> See “Lewis W. Hine – Ellis Island,” George Eastman House, accessed July 1, 2016, [http://www.geh.org/fm/lwhprints/htmlsrc/m197701770118\\_ful.html](http://www.geh.org/fm/lwhprints/htmlsrc/m197701770118_ful.html). This photograph is alternatively referenced with the titles *Mona Lisa visits Ellis Island, 1905* (New York Public Library Digital Collections) and *Mona Lisa Madonna Russian Family group at Ellis Island 1905* (George Eastman House).

<sup>22</sup> Equally famous is Hine’s 1905 photograph *Ellis Island, Italian Madonna*, which is included here for the sake of illustration but will not serve as a case study proper. See “Lewis W. Hine – Ellis Island,” George Eastman House, accessed July 1, 2016, [http://www.geh.org/fm/lwhprints/htmlsrc/m197701770125\\_ful.html](http://www.geh.org/fm/lwhprints/htmlsrc/m197701770125_ful.html).

<sup>23</sup> According to Elizabeth Cowie, “the relationship of a woman to a child is readily assumed to be that of a mother . . . drawing on a wealth of connotative systems, from the archetype of the Madonna and Child to concepts of the ‘earth mother.’” Quoted in Wendy Kozol, “Madonnas of the Fields: Photography, Gender, and 1930s Farm Relief,” *Genders*, no. 2 (1988): 11.

<sup>24</sup> The background of the picture is reminiscent of the Great Hall, which is open to the public today. Further, elements in the picture correspond to the description of the Great Hall in Barry Moreno's *Encyclopedia of Ellis Island*, such as the "iron railing for controlling immigrant crowds" and the "magnificent semicircular windows." Barry Moreno, *Encyclopedia of Ellis Island* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2004), 208–9.

<sup>25</sup> "Mona Lisa visits Ellis Island, 1905," New York Public Library Digital Collections, accessed July 1, 2016, <http://digitalcollections.nypl.org/items/510d47d9-4e80-a3d9-e040-e00a18064a99>. Hine suggests a religious reading of the picture and reaffirms the connection to the Mona Lisa, established in the title, with his direct reference to Renaissance painting.

<sup>26</sup> For images of the painting, see "Mona Lisa – Portrait of Lisa Gherardini, wife of Francesco del Giocondo," Louvre, accessed July 1, 2016, <http://www.louvre.fr/en/oeuvre-notices/mona-lisa-portrait-lisa-gherardini-wife-francesco-del-giocondo>.

<sup>27</sup> In the following, *Mona Lisa* refers to Leonardo da Vinci's painting itself and "Mona Lisa" refers to the figure depicted in painting.

<sup>28</sup> David Bourdon, introduction to *Mona Lisas*, by Mary Rose Storey (New York: H. N. Abrams, 1980), 16.

<sup>29</sup> I am aware that the term "aura" within the context of art triggers the association with Walter Benjamin's influential essay "Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit" ("The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," 1935/1936), which thematizes the uniqueness and lasting validity of works of art in an age when new media, including photography, overturned traditional modes of reception. See Walter Benjamin, "Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit," in *Illuminationen* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1969), 148–83. While these are relevant concerns within a context that explores visual copy and transfer, and opens up a myriad of further questions, the scope of this essay does not allow me to investigate them at this point.

<sup>30</sup> See Roy McMullen, *Mona Lisa: The Picture and the Myth* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1977), 56.

<sup>31</sup> Bourdon, introduction, 12.

<sup>32</sup> Bourdon identifies the painting's "lack . . . in contemporary detail" (13), especially detail that would hint at a specific historical and social context, as the reason for this universality. See also McMullen, *Mona Lisa*, 50.

<sup>33</sup> Bourdon, introduction, 16.

<sup>34</sup> This claim cannot stand without reservation and necessitates specification: the dividing line between the contexts of Renaissance art and religious iconography in Hine's picture is not absolute, since the dividing line between Renaissance art and religious

iconography is far from absolute; in fact, Renaissance painting was very often concerned with religious motifs.

<sup>35</sup> Further inter pictorial connections can be detected between the Madonna motif in Hine's photography and the Resettlement Administration (RA)/Farm Security Administration (FSA) photography of the 1930s. Leaving aside questions of inter pictoriality, Wendy Kozol, in her article "Madonnas of the Field: Photography, Gender, and 1930s Farm Relief," explores the usage and significance of secularized versions of the Madonna imagery, with a particular emphasis on confirmed and contested gender roles, in this particular body of photographs. For more detail on the Madonna motif and maternal discourses in the 1930s RA/FSA photographs, see Kozol, "Madonnas of the Fields."

<sup>36</sup> See "Julia Margaret Cameron, *Madonna with Children*," Museum of Modern Art, accessed July 1, 2016, <http://www.moma.org/collection/works/50906>.

<sup>37</sup> Philip Thompson and Peter Davenport, *The Dictionary of Visual Language* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1982), 119.

<sup>38</sup> Alma Davenport, *The History of Photography: An Overview* (Boston: Focal Press, 1991), 81.

<sup>39</sup> Joanne Lukitsh, *Julia Margaret Cameron* (New York: Phaidon, 2006), 1.

<sup>40</sup> Naomi Rosenblum, *A History of Women Photographers* (New York: Abbeville, 2010), 103.

<sup>41</sup> Lukitsh, *Julia Margaret Cameron*, 9.

<sup>42</sup> See "Goodness; Fruits of the Spirit," Victoria and Albert Museum, accessed July 1, 2016, <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O129594/goodness-fruits-of-the-spirit-photograph-cameron-julia-margaret/>; "Julia Margaret Cameron, Madonna and Two Children," Victoria and Albert Museum, accessed July 1, 2016, <http://www.vam.ac.uk/users/node/18760>; and "Madonna and Child," Victoria and Albert Museum, accessed July 1, 2016, <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O227722/madonna-and-child-photograph-cameron-julia-margaret/>.

<sup>43</sup> George H. Tavard, *The Thousand Faces of the Virgin Mary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996), 126.

<sup>44</sup> John Gatta, introduction to *American Madonna: Images of the Divine Woman in Literary Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 3, emphasis in original.

<sup>45</sup> See Thompson and Davenport, *Dictionary of Visual Language*, 252.

<sup>46</sup> Emma Lazarus, "The New Colossus," in *The Norton Anthology of American Literature: Volume B: 1820–1865*, 6th ed., ed. Nina Baym (New York: W. W. Norton, 2003), 2601.

<sup>47</sup> Lukitsh, *Julia Margaret Cameron*, 1.

<sup>48</sup> See Karen Rosenberg, “Ardent Victorian at the Lens,” *New York Times*, August 22, 2013, [http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/23/arts/design/julia-margaret-cameron-at-the-metropolitan-museum-of-art.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/23/arts/design/julia-margaret-cameron-at-the-metropolitan-museum-of-art.html?_r=0).

<sup>49</sup> See “Lewis Hine – Strip 11,” George Eastman House, accessed July 1, 2016, [http://www.geh.org/ar/strip11/htmlsrc/m198501710030\\_ful.html](http://www.geh.org/ar/strip11/htmlsrc/m198501710030_ful.html).

<sup>50</sup> See image on Wikimedia Commons, accessed July 1, 2016, [https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/0/09/Raphael\\_Madonna\\_della\\_seggiola.jpg](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/0/09/Raphael_Madonna_della_seggiola.jpg).

<sup>51</sup> McMullen, *Mona Lisa*, 1.

<sup>52</sup> David Alan Brown, *Raphael and America* (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1983), 15.

<sup>53</sup> See reproduction of the photograph in Mary Panzer, *Lewis Hine* (New York: Phaidon, 2002), 95.

<sup>54</sup> Naomi Rosenblum, *A World History of Photography* (New York: Abbeville Press, 2007), 362. Naomi Rosenblum relates this “brief eclipse of the social documentary sensibility during the 1920s” to a simultaneous development in the art world, observing that “there was less demand for photographs that give dimension to [social] concerns, and at the same time fresh aesthetic winds, generated by the Armory Show of 1913, hastened interest in the European avant-garde movements in the arts. Abstraction, Expressionism, and Dadaism were some of the new styles and concepts that made Realism and the expression of human emotion and sentiment in visual art seem old-fashioned” (362). Hine’s unbroken dedication to social documentary photography and his subsequent stay in Europe thus might indicate his skepticism towards these radical innovations in the arts.

<sup>55</sup> Panzer, *Lewis Hine*, 94.

<sup>56</sup> Titles and captions in most cases provide “clues to what the photographer had meant us to attend to, what he or she may have had in mind in making the picture.” Terry Barrett, “Photographs and Contexts,” *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 19, no. 3 (1985): 60. Terry Barrett combines both the (verbal) text accompanying an image and the pictorial code of a photograph under the term “internal context,” claiming that both are relevant for the analysis of a photograph (59). In *Another Madonna*, the wording of the title is just as significant as the titles (and caption) in the first two case studies.

<sup>57</sup> *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*, s.v. “another,” <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/another>.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>59</sup> Hine’s photography is commonly praised for doing without sentimentalism, such as in Anne McCauley’s assessment: “Hine’s photographs from the start were intended to promote legislative and governmental reform through a sympathetic but not sentimental view of his subjects” (69)—a view I fully agree with. Anne McCauley,

“Photography Comes of Age: An Image of Society,” in *A History of Photography: Social and Cultural Perspectives*, ed. Jean-Claude Lemagny and André Rouillé (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 69. When I use the term “sentimental(ism)” here with regard to works by Hine, I mean to imply that he then primarily aimed to address his viewers’ emotions and secondarily appealed to their reason.

<sup>60</sup> Quoted in Hine, “Social Photography,” 358–59.

<sup>61</sup> Von Rosen, “Interpikturalität,” 209.

<sup>62</sup> Judith Mara Gutman, *Lewis W. Hine and the American Social Conscience* (New York: Walker and Company, 1967), 26.

<sup>63</sup> Walter Rosenblum, foreword to Hine, *America and Lewis Hine*, 11.

<sup>64</sup> Panzer, *Lewis Hine*, 15.

<sup>65</sup> Kaplan, introduction, xxviii.

<sup>66</sup> McMullen, *Mona Lisa*, 1.

<sup>67</sup> Steinberg, “Introduction,” 21.

<sup>68</sup> See page 13 of the chapter “Supermatka/Supermother” on Elżbieta Jabłońska’s website, accessed July 23, 2016, <http://www.elajablonska.com/projects-more.php?id=35>.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>70</sup> In other photographs from the series, the mother figure appears dressed as Spider-Man and Batman.

<sup>71</sup> Whitney Chadwick, *Women, Art, and Society*, 5th ed. (London: Thames and Hudson, 2012), 506.

<sup>72</sup> Jean Lipman and Richard Marshall, preface to Lipman and Marshall, *Art about Art*, 6. See also Van Deren Coke, preface to *The Painter and the Photograph: From Delacroix to Warhol* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1972), x–xi.

<sup>73</sup> Hubertus von Amelunxen, “Aneignung und Simulakrum: Die Einholung des Anderen in der Fotografie,” in Seipel, *Diskurse der Bilder*, 26.

<sup>74</sup> Peter Galassi, *Before Photography: Painting and the Invention of Photography* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1981), 12.

<sup>75</sup> Susan Sontag, *On Photography* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1977), 106.

## Selected Bibliography

- Abbott, Berenice. Preface to *Photo Story: Selected Letters and Photographs of Lewis W. Hine*, by Lewis W. Hine, ed. Daile Kaplan, xiii–xiv. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992.
- Aigner, Carl. “Diskurse der Bilder: Photokünstlerische Appropriationen kunsthistorischer Werke.” In *Diskurse der Bilder: Photokünstlerische Reprisen kunsthistorischer Werke*, ed. Wilfried Seipel, 38–42. Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien, 1993.
- Amelunxen, Hubertus von. “Aneignung und Simulakrum: Die Einholung des Anderen in der Fotografie.” In *Diskurse der Bilder: Photokünstlerische Reprisen kunsthistorischer Werke*, ed. Wilfried Seipel, 23–37. Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien, 1993.
- Barrett, Terry. “Photographs and Contexts.” *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 19, no. 3 (1985): 51–64.
- Benjamin, Walter. “Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit.” In *Illuminationen*, by Walter Benjamin, 148–83. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1969.
- Bourdon, David. Introduction to *Mona Lisas*, by Mary Rose Storey, 5–53. New York: H. N. Abrams, 1980.
- Bourne, Randolph S. “Trans-national America.” *Atlantic Monthly*, July 1916. <http://www.theatlantic.com/past/issues/16jul/bourne.htm>.
- Brown, David Alan. *Raphael and America*. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1983.
- Chadwick, Whitney. *Women, Art, and Society*. 5th ed. London: Thames and Hudson, 2012.
- Coke, Van Deren. *The Painter and the Photograph: From Delacroix to Warhol*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1972.
- Davenport, Alma. *The History of Photography: An Overview*. Boston: Focal Press, 1991.
- Fishkin, Shelley Fisher. “Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies—Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 12, 2004.” *American Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (2005): 17–57.
- Fluck, Winfried, Stefan Brandt, and Ingrid Thaler. “Introduction: The Challenges of Transnational American Studies.” In *Transnational American Studies*, ed. Winfried Fluck, Stefan Brandt, and Ingrid Thaler, 1–7. Tübingen, DE: Narr, 2007.
- Galassi, Peter. *Before Photography: Painting and the Invention of Photography*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1981.
- Gatta, John. *American Madonna: Images of the Divine Woman in Literary Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

- George Eastman House Still Photograph Archive. Accessed July 1, 2016.  
<http://www.geh.org/photographers.html>.
- Gutman, Judith Mara. *Lewis W. Hine and the American Social Conscience*. New York: Walker and Company, 1967.
- Hine, Lewis W. *Photo Story: Selected Letters and Photographs of Lewis W. Hine*. Ed. Daile Kaplan. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992.
- . “Social Photography: How the Camera May Help in the Social Uplift.” In *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction at the Thirty-sixth Annual Session Held in the City of Buffalo, New York, June 9–16, 1909*, ed. Alexander Johnson, 355–59. Fort Wayne, IN: Press of Fort Wayne, 1909.
- Jeffrey, Ian. *Photography: A Concise History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Kozol, Wendy. “Madonnas of the Fields: Photography, Gender, and 1930s Farm Relief.” *Genders*, no. 2 (1988): 1–23.
- Lazarus, Emma. “The New Colossus.” In *The Norton Anthology of American Literature: Volume B: 1820–1865*, 6th ed., ed. Nina Baym, 2601. New York: W. W. Norton, 2003.
- Lipman, Jean, and Richard Marshall, eds. *Art about Art*. New York: Dutton, in association with Whitney Museum of American Art, 1978.
- Lukitsh, Joanne. *Julia Margaret Cameron*. New York: Phaidon, 2006.
- McCauley, Anne. “Photography Comes of Age: An Image of Society.” In *A History of Photography: Social and Cultural Perspectives*, ed. Jean-Claude Lemagny and André Rouillé, 62–71. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- McMullen, Roy. *Mona Lisa: The Picture and the Myth*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1977.
- Moreno, Barry. *Encyclopedia of Ellis Island*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2004.
- Orvell, Miles. *American Photography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Panzer, Mary. *Lewis Hine*. New York: Phaidon, 2002.
- Rosenblum, Naomi. “Biographical Notes.” In *America and Lewis Hine: Photographs 1904–1940*, by Lewis Wickes Hine, 16–25. New York: Aperture, 1977.
- . *A History of Women Photographers*. New York: Abbeville, 2010.
- . *A World History of Photography*. New York: Abbeville Press, 2007.
- Rosenblum, Walter. Foreword to *America and Lewis Hine: Photographs 1904–1940*, by Lewis Wickes Hine, 9–15. New York: Aperture, 1977.
- Sampsell-Willmann, Kate. *Lewis Hine as Social Critic*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2009.
- Sitt, Martina, and Attila Horányi. “Kunsthistorische Suite über das Thema des Zitats in der Kunst.” In *Diskurse der Bilder: Photokünstlerische Reprisen kunsthistorischer Werke*, ed. Wilfried Seipel, 9–22. Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien, 1993.



- Sontag, Susan. *On Photography*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1977.
- Steinberg, Leo. "Introduction: The Glorious Company." In *Art about Art*, ed. Jean Lipman and Richard Marshall, 8–31. New York: Dutton, in association with Whitney Museum of American Art, 1978.
- Steinorth, Karl, ed. *Lewis Hine: Passionate Journey, Photographs 1905–1937*. Zurich: Edition Stemmler, 1996.
- Tavard, George H. *The Thousand Faces of the Virgin Mary*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Thompson, Philip, and Peter Davenport. *The Dictionary of Visual Language*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1982.
- Trachtenberg, Alan. "Ever—the Human Document." In *America and Lewis Hine: Photographs 1904–1940*, by Lewis Wickes Hine, 118–37. New York: Aperture, 1977.
- Von Rosen, Valeska. "Interpikturalität." In *Metzler Lexikon Kunstwissenschaft: Ideen, Methoden, Begriffe*, 2nd ed., ed. Ulrich Pfisterer, 208–11. Stuttgart, DE: Metzler, 2011.