Gayk normally writes perceptively on the interrelationships of art and literature.

The final essay, by Paul Binski, has already been invoked several times in this review. It is styled as an 'afterword' rather than a chapter, possibly because it consists of reflections on pervasive (and transnational) themes relevant to study of late medieval sculpture and does not mention alabaster reliefs. Among the themes is the poetics of stone as represented in medieval writing. Alabaster has a distinctive poetics of melancholy, loss, and vulnerability (p. 272), due largely to its association with a poignant episode in the gospels and the use made of it for tombs. The evocative photograph included as Fig. 9.3, showing the effect of natural backlighting on the face of a French alabaster effigy, is ideally keyed to the argument. Binski also explains what is wrong with the materiality theory offered in anthropological accounts of medieval art (Carolyn Bynum and Hans Belting are cited), namely that the idea that power resides in materials (itself a kind of vitalism) allows no space for the agency of form, which is produced by the intelligent and dextrous application of craft and artistry. The vitalist effectively leaves the artist out of art, and in doing so, subverts the basic idea of art. Form becomes an epiphenomenon. Logically, however, it is the forms created by skilled artists which impart power to materials, not vice versa. Nothing significant for the history of art proceeds from a raw lump of stuff. This point, which would not have needed championing twenty years ago, is now apropos, and comes as an antidote to much recent and lazy thinking about art. A refreshed focus on crafting and its affects is proposed as the basis of a 'new aesthetics' (pp. 272–7), which Binski has already done much to develop in his work of the past decade.

To conclude, *Reassessing Alabaster Sculpture* is a volume of mixed results. It leaves plenty of scope for more work on topics including the settings, purposes, and functions of alabasters, the taste for English alabasters in mainland Europe, the individual life courses of sculptures that have been broken, rediscovered, and redisplayed, and other things.[10] However, its overall contribution to the study of alabasters is significant, and the book is recommended on this basis to anyone working on late medieval English art.

Notes

1. Kim Woods, *Cut in Alabaster: A Material of Sculpture and Its European Traditions, 1350–1550* (Turnhout: Brepols / Harvey Miller, 2018); Lloyd De Beer, 'Reassessing English Alabaster Carving: Medieval Sculpture and Its Contexts' (PhD thesis, University of East Anglia, 2018); Zuleika Murat (ed.), *English Alabaster Carvings and Their Cultural Contexts* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2019); Marian Debaene (ed.), *Alabaster Sculpture in Europe (1300–1650)* (Turnhout: Harvey Miller / Brepols, 2022). Only slightly older are Karin Land, *Die englischen Alabastermadonnen des späten Mittelalters* (Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf University Press, 2011); and Aleksandra Lipińska, *Moving Sculptures: Southern Netherlandish Alabasters from the 16th to 17th centuries in Central and Northern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).
2. Francis Cheetham, *English Medieval Alabasters, with a Catalogue of the Collection in the Victoria and Albert Museum* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1984); Francis Cheetham, *Alabaster Images of Medieval England* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2003).
3. Paul Williamson (ed.), *Object of Devotion: Medieval English Alabaster Sculpture from the Victoria and Albert Museum* (Alexandria, VI: Art Services International, 2010).
4. Catherine Yvard, 'The Metamorphoses of a Late Fifteenth-Century Psalter (Harl. MS 1892)', *eBritish Library Journal*, 2011 <https://www.bl.uk/eblj/articles/2011-articles> [accessed 27 January 2023].
5. Kathryn A. Smith, "'A Lanterne of Lyght to the People": English Narrative Alabaster Images of John the Baptist in Their Visual, Religious, and Social Contexts', *Studies in Iconography*, vol. 42, 2021, pp. 53–94.
6. Paul Binski, *Gothic Sculpture* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 2019).
7. Edward S. Prior and Arthur Gardner, *An Account of Medieval Figure-Sculpture in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), pp. 388, 425.
8. Henry Wharton (ed.), *Anglia Sacra*, 2 vols (London: Richard Chiswell, 1691), vol. 1, p. 375. In the context, 'feretra' seems more likely to refer to tombs than relic-shrines of another form.
9. See e.g. Paul-Andreé Lemoisne, *Gothic Painting in France: Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (New York: Hacker Art Books, 1973), pl. 19 (Parisian, *c.* 1400).
10. On the breakage and reclamation of alabasters, see Stacy Boldrick, *Iconoclasm and the Museum* (London: Routledge, 2020), pp. 54–84.

doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/oxartj/kcad006

Morris Hirshfield and Art History in the Making

Chloë Julius

Richard Meyer, *Master of the Two Left Feet: Morris Hirshfield Rediscovered* (London: MIT Press, 2022), 204 colour illns, 320 pp., ISBN 9780262047289, hardback $59.95

Richard Meyer's new book on Morris Hirshfield trades in surprises. Of these, perhaps the most startling is a photograph taken by Herman Landshoff of Leonora Carrington, Andre Breton, Max Ernst, and Marcel Duchamp posing alongside Hirshfield's 1941 painting *Nude at the Window (Hot Night in July)*. The year is 1942, the setting is Peggy Guggenheim's apartment, and the painting is the second of Hirshfield's to enter Guggenheim's collection. Hirshfield (1872–1946) was a Jewish Eastern European immigrant tailor, slipper-maker, and self-taught painter from Brooklyn – at the time of Landshoff's photograph, he had only been painting for five years. The photographed scene places Hirshfield's painting in intimate proximity with the other four artists: Breton, Duchamp, and Ernst stand behind the large canvas, gazing at its titular nude figure, whilst Carrington sits next to it, a gourd balanced on her crotch. Although Hirshfield himself is notably absent (more on this later), that his painting is not only revered by the three men but also seemingly inspires Carrington's provocative gesture, puts his work at the centre of a conversation between four key players in the international avant-garde of the 1940s.

For those schooled in what Meyer calls 'dominant accounts of modernism' (p. 200), accounts that – however various – disaggregate self-taught artists like Hirshfield from trained artists like Carrington, Ernst, and Duchamp, the Landshoff photograph would be especially surprising. Meyer counts himself as a student of this particular art-historical orthodoxy; his book is an attempt to come to terms with – and challenge – this education. Rather than merely serve up its many surprises, therefore, this book seeks to interrogate the grounds by which incidents like the Landshoff photograph have become surprising. At stake here is a question of history, and to be specific, art history. Art history is where Hirshfield's contribution to that 1940s conversation has been – as Meyer has it – 'written out' (p. 8). As such, his book takes as its starting point the gap between the fame Hirshfield enjoyed whilst he was alive and the relatively obscure place that he occupies within art history today. It is in that vein that this review will also proceed.

From the standpoint of Hirshfield's present, his current obscurity was far from a given. After gaining representation from the gallerist Sidney Janis in 1939, over a short space of two years Hirshfield's paintings were included in group exhibitions at Janis' gallery, the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), Albright Art Gallery, and the Brooklyn Museum. In 1942, Hirshfield's work was selected for Breton's landmark exhibition *First Papers of Surrealism*. Duchamp, who had notably installed the exhibition's artworks amongst a network of criss-crossed string, also designed the catalogue – Hirshfield was one of the few artists whose work was granted an illustration. From this early exposure, Hirshfield also garnered praise from Piet Mondrian and Pablo Picasso. In an article for *Partisan Review* published in the same year as Breton's exhibition, the then-ascendent art critic Clement Greenberg claimed that Hirshfield would 'hold his own against any competition' of contemporary American painters.[1] A year later, Hirshfield had his first solo exhibition – it was mounted at MoMA.

Meyer describes the context in which Hirshfield's art first flourished as art history 'in the making' (p. 206). This could be glossed with the qualifier 'American' – the art history of the European émigré artists living in New York during this period was somewhat further along. The contingency of this description principally applies to those American artists, like Hirshfield, who were starting out in an America that was appearing increasingly less hostile to contemporary art. It is therefore on the battleground of American post-war art that, to borrow Meyer's wording, the 'winners and losers [had] yet to be declared' (p. 206) – by the end of the 1940s, Hirshfield's place on the latter half of this equation was all but secured. Although his paintings continued to be shown after the 1940s, this happened at fewer regular intervals and at less prestigious venues. It took MoMA twenty-seven years to show Hirshfield's work again after his retrospective in 1943, and between that showing and the next, there was an even longer lag of four decades.[2]

Hirshfield died in 1946, a mere nine years after he had embarked on his painting career. Yet his diminishing exposure after the 1940s has less to do with his death and much more to do with the fate of the category into which he was slotted: the 'modern primitive'. Popularised by art historian Robert Goldwater in his 1938 book *Primitivism in Modern Painting*, 'modern' was used to distinguish the so-called 'primitive' pre-historic and non-Western art from the art produced by unschooled artists based in the industrialised west, and – crucially – to distinguish *those* artists from the so-called 'folk' artists of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[3] Meyer sees a virtue in preserving this category, however untenable it may have become, because it retains the conscious and deliberate line that was drawn between the 'modern primitive' and modernism in the 1930s and 1940s. This is how Hirshfield's paintings were originally framed, yet if 'modern primitive' names the context in which his work first circulated, it also points to the historical no-mans-land in which it currently resides. Once the art history of American art of the 1940s was made, there was no place for 'modern primitives' like Hirshfield.

In light of this predicament, the stakes introduced by this book's subtitle – *Morris Hirshfield Rediscovered* – are significantly raised. Artist and art history go hand in hand in this monograph; to 'rediscover' the former, the latter must be made anew. For Meyer, this does not mean throwing out the art history that made Hirshfield obscure and going back to the beginning, as if merely by replaying the 1940s today a new version might emerge. Moreover, the critical thrust of this book is not directed at Hirshfield's post-1940s framing, even if Hirshfield's invisibility within this art-historical landscape gives Meyer his impetus. Rather, Meyer's historiographic intervention principally focuses on Hirshfield's 1940s present. While much can be learned from the fruitful and meaningful exchange that took place between self-taught and trained artists during the early days of America's modernist chapter, to 'rediscover' the art of the former group still requires a reconsideration of the terms under which that relationship was established. On this score, the book's main title – *Master of the Two Left Feet* – is also instructive.

Referring to the tendency for Hirshfield's painted figures' feet to appear in duplicates rather than as mirror images, the moniker was first introduced by a reviewer in *Arts Digest* in 1943 and has swirled around the Hirshfield literature ever since.[4] Although 'master of the two left feet' was originally devised to mock, Janis latterly channelled the jibe into a more generous reading, one that found a precedent in the Hittite reliefs of 2000 BC, whose figures also shared this quirk, as well as Hirshfield's earlier occupation as a slipper-maker (as Janis points out, a salesperson's samples

rarely come in pairs).[5] Connecting both the negative and positive connotations of the 'master of the two left feet', however, is a certain refusal to ascribe intention to this distinctive feature of Hirshfield's paintings. Whether products of his lack of training as a painter or his actual training as a slipper-maker, the left feet lining his canvases are viewed as mistakes, mistakes that Janis attempts to smooth over by finding an art historical precedent. Meyer's titular reappropriation of this moniker is, therefore, double-edged. By claiming that Hirshfield's mastery of the two left feet reveals his 'unique vision as a painter' (p. 14), Meyer destabilises the critique of this aspect of his paintings. By locating this vision within the logic of each individual painting, Meyer pokes holes in Janis' art-historical advocacy.

Thus, on this particular rediscovery mission, past and present are equal targets: the Hirshfield that emerges from Meyer's book is constituted by a reconsideration of the terms that made him visible in the 1940s as well as those that have made him invisible today. Meyer makes his intervention on both counts by establishing agency at the core of Hirshfield's art. Jettisoning the naïveté that bolstered the curatorial and scholarly engagement with self-taught artists in the late 1930s and 1940s, Meyer presents Hirshfield as an artist in total command of his abilities. This cuts directly against the 'instinctive sense of color and design' that Jean Lipman emphasised in her 1938 article 'A Critical Definition of the American Primitive'.[6] Along with Goldwater, Lipman helped lay the scholarly foundations for the 'modern primitive' in the late 1930s. The curatorial foundations were provided by MoMA's first director, Alfred Barr, in the 1938 exhibition *Masters of Popular Painting*. Although these efforts predate Hirshfield's 1939 debut, in Meyer's view they:

> foreshadow the ways in which Hirshfield was made into a modern primitive artist in the 1940s. By using the word 'made,' I mean to underscore the construction of the artist as utterly, even laughably, unworldly at the very moment his work was embraced by some of the most sophisticated curators, collectors and artists of the day (p. 80).

In remaking Hirshfield in 2022, Meyer affirms his worldliness by returning his paintings to the sphere of intention, and by returning Hirshfield himself into the world in which he moved. Unlike the Landshoff photograph, which implied that Hirshfield's place amongst the avant-garde was secured solely by his paintings, Meyer emphasises the active role that Hirshfield himself played in his marketing as an artist. Thus, if Goldwater, Lipman, Barr, and Janis framed Hirshfield as a 'modern primitive', Meyer is keen to point out that this was done in collaboration with Hirshfield, who was not 'a clueless bystander' in his critical framing, but rather 'understood that the best way to make a modern primitive is to do it yourself' (p. 98).

In Janis' estimation, Hirshfield could be categorised as a Jewish artist as well as a 'modern primitive'. Janis guest-curated Hirshfield's MoMA retrospective, and it was his curatorial decision to include an illustrated diagram that substantiated Hirshfield's painting's many references. Under the heading 'Racial and Religious Factors at Play', Janis enumerated the specifically Jewish references in Hirshfield's painting *Inseparable Friends* (1941), which he claimed included a reference to the Ten Commandments, the festival of Channukah, *tzitzit* (tassels on a ritual Jewish garment), as well as some Yiddish wordplay.[7] While stressing the vital role that Janis played in Hirshfield's career, as with his treatment of the category 'modern primitive', Meyer pushes back on certain aspects of Janis' framing of Hirshfield as a Jewish artist. Hirshfield made three paintings that dealt with explicitly Jewish themes: *Moses and Aaron (Of Delicious Recoil)* (1944); *Daniel in the Lion's Den* (1944); and *Rabbi* (1946). These works are dealt with sensitively in the chapter titled 'The Jewish American', but they are principally treated as anomalies in Hirshfield's wider practice. Departing from Janis, Meyer privileges Hirshfield's Jewish context over his paintings' relatively scant Jewish content. Yet, perhaps counter-intuitively, Meyer's divergent version of a Jewish artist actually brings Janis closer to Hirshfield's art.

Like Hirshfield, Janis had cut his teeth in the garment industry, or, as it was familiarly known to Yiddish speakers at the time, the *schmatter* trade. Although Janis was born in New York and Hirshfield in Poland, Janis' grandparents had made the same nineteenth-century journey from Eastern Europe as Hirshfield. Both men were shaped by the immigrant experience that had marked the lives of so many of America's new and fast-growing Jewish population in the early twentieth century. Meyer takes seriously the ways in which Janis and Hirshfield's trajectories map onto a broader history of Jewish American immigration and entrepreneurship, which he uses to flesh out his assertion that 'their unlikely collaboration lies at the heart of a long overlooked story of modern art and self-invention' (p. 56). Meyer does not, however, locate the decidedly Jewish coordinates of this 'unlikely collaboration' within Hirshfield's paintings themselves. In so doing, Meyer rejects not only Janis' own reading but also the tendency that has gathered momentum in scholarship since the 1990s to read Jewish content back into the work of Jewish American artists who – on the whole – did not put it there to begin with.[8] Instead, Meyer offers a much more organic way of understanding the multiple and various intersections between Jewish American artists, critics, and art historians and the avant-garde circles within which they moved.

Amongst these historiographical interventions, Meyer never loses sight of Hirshfield's art. This is important to note, as it is towards the 'visual power and pleasure' of

Hirshfield's art and not his historiographical omission that Meyer points to justify his book project. The introduction goes so far as to claim that Meyer 'will not be disappointed if some readers take this as a "picture book" insofar as pictures are fundamental to its purpose and design' (p. 14). Audacious – from the perspective of an art historian – and provocative, this deference to the visual is precisely what is demanded by paintings which, according to Meyer, 'reward attentive looking' (p. 16). As such, Meyer's readings – although pleasing in their own right – always return his reader to the work. Early on, Meyer establishes what he calls a 'textile imagery' in his visual analysis, locating within Hirshfield's art the traces of his professional training; for example, in the way in which his painted skies appear almost wool-like, and how the division of his compositions seem to follow the conventions of pattern-cutting. This is just one instance of many in which Meyer provides his reader with a language for aesthetic engagement; his written observations are there to facilitate looking, not reading.

Faced with the challenge of an artist that art history has overlooked, Meyer chooses to look, and look carefully. This choice is bolstered by the book's inclusion of a catalogue of Hirshfield's work, which comprises about a third of its total page count. Expertly assembled by the curator and art historian Susan Davidson, and, as with the other sections, generously illustrated, this exhaustive resource provides a visual compendium of Hirshfield's contribution, inviting – in Meyer's wording – 'future scholars, students, curators and admirers of Hirshfield' (p. 16) to embark on their own projects of careful looking. This gesture of academic generosity, although principally pegged to Davidson's catalogue, tacitly recognises the limitations of Meyer's own art-historical treatment of Hirshfield. Close-looking breeds blind spots, and while Meyer's engagement with Hirshfield is almost as comprehensive as Davidson's catalogue is exhaustive, there are certain gaps that similarly open out his monograph to future scholarship. One such gap is the question of why the 'modern primitive' in general, and Hirshfield's art in particular, fell out of favour in the 1950s. In her 2015 article on Janet Sobel, another self-taught Jewish artist from Brooklyn, Sandra Zalman met this question head on. For Zalman, the demise of the 'modern primitive' is linked to the ascension of abstract expressionism, the former homegrown American modernism necessarily unseating the latter one.[9] Meyer addresses this post-1940s development obliquely in his reference to the 'dominant accounts of modernism' that rendered Hirshfield invisible, but those accounts are namechecked and not unpacked.

Instead of dwelling on Hirshfield's invisibility, therefore, Meyer primarily focuses on what is visible: the case for his inclusion in art history in this book is made on the basis of his art, not his exclusion. While this partial view may defer certain questions to future Hirshfield scholars, it might also liberate them from the imperative to correct art history rather than make it anew. And a new art history is certainly on the table in this book, which takes aim at art-historical shibboleths without ever becoming polemical, and which is self-consciously accessible, approachable, and 'jargon-free' (p. 17). Most refreshingly, Meyer assertively positions himself within the book, eschewing the tradition for art historians to remain at a distance from the art they discuss. Meyer's encounters with Hirshfield's work are peppered throughout the book, which even includes a chapter that recounts Meyer's ultimately abortive attempt to uncover a mysterious element in Hirshfield's first painting *Beach Girl* (1939). In the afterword, Meyer draws himself ever closer to the material by bringing in his own family history: like Hirshfield, his maternal grandmother also came to the New York garment industry by way of Eastern Europe.

The afterword serves up one final surprise: a photograph of Meyer's grandmother on the beach in which her pose and attire mirrors that of the female subject in *Beach Girl*. Here, the uncanny synthesis between author and protagonist is more affirmative than it is revelatory. This image, along with Meyer's accounts of his own encounters with Hirshfield's art, leads back to the paintings. The point here is not to implicate Meyer or his family within Hirshfield's story, but rather to reveal the kinds of discoveries that close looking can yield. If a single thread could be woven through this diverse book, it would be this decidedly aesthetic proposition. 'We look at art', Meyer concludes, 'not to confirm the assumptions we already had about the world but to disrupt them' (p. 222). Remaining open to disruptions – and surprises – is precisely what this book demands of its reader. In return, Meyer opens up art history, allowing Hirshfield to be rediscovered in the context of an art history 'in the making'.

Notes

1. Clement Greenberg, 'Three Current Art Books', *Partisan Review*, vol. 9, no. 2, March–April 1942, p. 128.
2. After MoMA's 1943 retrospective, Hirshfield's work was included in a 1970 exhibition titled *Naïve Paintings*, which – as Meyer points out – was only on view for six days in the Trustees' room rather than in any of the public galleries; forty-one years later, Hirshfield's painting was shown in 2011 as part of a collection display.
3. This periodisation was underscored in Greenberg's review of Jean Lipman's 1942 book *American Primitive Painting*, which began by asserting that '"primitive" painting belongs to the Industrial Age', and which crucially distinguished between American 'primitive' art and folk art. Clement Greenberg, 'Primitive Painting [1942]', in John O'Brian (ed.), *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism; Volume 1: Perceptions and Judgements* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1986), pp. 109–13.
4. Peyton Boswell, 'Comments: Master of the Two Left Feet', *Arts Digest*, vol. 17, no. 18, July 1943, p. 3.
5. Jean Lipman, 'A Critical Definition of the American Primitive', *ART in America, and Elsewhere*, vol. 26, October 1938, pp. 171–7.
6. Jean Lipman, 'A Critical Definition of the American Primitive', *Art in America*, 1938.

7. Janis, 'Morris Hirshfield', pp. 189–97.
8. Such scholarship variously ascribes an assimilatory impulse to the propensity for Jewish artists (and critics) to elide Jewish content in their work, thereby justifying its retroactive positioning within the work. See: Lisa Bloom, *Jewish Identities in American Feminist Art: Ghosts of Ethnicity* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2006).
9. Sandra Zalman, 'Janet Sobel: Primitive Modern and the Origins of Abstract Expressionism', *Woman's Art Journal*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2015, pp. 20–9.

doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/oxartj/kcad004

Cultural Transfer and Its Discontents: Recent Scholarship on the Mobility of Early Modern Prints

Todd P. Olson

Heather Madar (ed.), *Prints as Agents of Global Exchange, 1500–1800* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2021), 87 b&w illns, 322 pp., ISBN 9789462987906, ebook €123,99, ISBN 9789048540013, hardback €124

Aaron M. Hyman, *Rubens in Repeat: The Logic of the Copy in Colonial Latin America* (Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute, 2021), 150 colour and 12 b&w illns, 320 pp., ISBN 9781606066867, hardcover US$70

> I became aware that the backward countries of the world are and have been those that have not learned to take full advantage of the possibilities of pictorial statement and communication, and that many of the most characteristic ideas and abilities of our western civilization have been intimately related to our skills exactly to repeat pictorial statements and communications.[1]

In the oft-ignored colonial and civilisational discourse in the beginning lines of the oft-cited *Prints and Visual Communication*, repetition was central to 'Western' domination. Disparities in visual technologies and capacities for identical reproduction in the 'West' were the engine for the surveillance of subject peoples and an emergent third-person plural possessive epistemological discourse. The storage of graphic information, as distinct from material resources, emerged from the administrative challenges faced by the expansion of empires and consequent long-distance surveillance. As Anthony Giddens argued, 'storage capacity is a fundamental element in the generation of power through the extension of time-space distanciation'.[2] In Giddens's formulation, the surveillance of a subject population entails the unilateral collation of information (the 'storage of authoritative resources') in conjunction with coercion. Although Giddens emphasises the development of alphanumeric writing as a response to the administration of societies of increasing scale, collecting, picturing, printing, printmaking, and archiving were central to the administration of empire. Bruno Latour expands this notion of print technologies by using the all-encompassing term 'inscription'. He emphasises that the colonial project was facilitated not only by Ivins's notion of the immutability of the print, but also by its mobility – cultural transfer and circulation – based on the principle of seriality.[3] As Rose Marie San Juan succinctly stated, 'in early modern Europe images start to move'.[4]

There has been at least a generation of early modern art historians who have turned away from the monographic monument study and have looked to the serial print medium as an object of study. Much of this scholarship has emphasised materiality over image, multiples over singularity, and workshop practices in conjunction with authorship. The printer's plate or woodcut was inscribed with both *fecit* and *inventio* in reverse. Although attention to individual authorship still dominates some quarters, most notably the marketplace, the emphasis on the print medium's workshop practices has been a space where the 'death of the author' has enjoyed some room to manoeuvre in a discipline that never fundamentally went through the growing pains of Structuralism. Peter Parshall and Lisa Pon, among others, have studied the material traces of vernacular religious print cultures. The movement of prints made after circulating corporate drawings, such as Jerome Nadal's visualisation of Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises* in his *Evangelicae Historia Imagines*, as described by Walter Melion, shifted the emphasis of art history away from both individual invention and the reproductive print, from *invenit* to *fecit*. The chain of material and pictorial transmission did not cease: Claire Bosc Tiessé describes the copying of Nadal's engravings in seventeenth-century Ethiopia. Evelyn Lincoln has chipped away at the monolithic 'European print' by turning to vernacular reception and multi-ethnic print production in Rome. Andrea Bubenik has traced the repetition and afterlife of Albrecht Dürer's prints. Stephanie Porras has studied the 'mobility of prints as objects' and the 'traffic in images' between the Southern Netherlands and the Viceroyalty of Peru as well as the Philippines. Bronwen Wilson, Michael Gaudio, Joseph Monteyne, and Sean Roberts have made major contributions to expanding the geographic and theoretical range of print studies. Yael Rice described the assimilation of sixteenth-century German and Netherlandish prints into Moghul albums, where the burin and the calligraphic reed pen found parity. Christina Cruz González described the transmission of Pontius's engraving after a composition by Peter Paul Rubens in the Santos of Northern New Spain (New Mexico). Stephanie Leitch traces the afterlife of Dürer's *Rhinoceros* as the woodcut was appropriated by natural philosophers: the pachyderm drifted from