

Media/Knowledge: American(ist) Epistemic Formats 1900/2000

Ruth Mayer & Alexander Starre

It is a truism to say that the ongoing media shift to the digital era radically changes the production, dissemination, and archival of information and knowledge. As instructors and researchers in American Studies programs at two German universities, we have been strongly affected by the push and pull of media in our daily professional lives. As scholars of American media history, on the other hand, we are aware of continuities, traditions, and pre-histories of the medial status quo. Much of what is identified as radically new today resonates with past novelties and their (often forgotten) cultural impact.

In the realm of teaching, “media competency” has been a buzzword for quite some time now, though the term often refers quite exclusively to students’ proficiency with computer-based formats. The standardized course evaluation forms used by many institutions of higher learning now regularly feature an inquiry as to whether instructors used multiple media to support and enhance their classes. Implicitly, such queries suggest that electronic media are indispensable tools of all university-level courses, regardless of their content. Without wanting to read too much into such bureaucratic paperwork, we think that it indicates the extent to which the classroom—the arena in which knowledge is circulated, if not always successfully transmitted—has evolved into a miniature media ecology. These days, academic core performances such as teaching, but also presentations, panels, or publications, are conducted by and on the grounds of increasingly professionalized and foregrounded media performances.

While the topic of media as pedagogic tools deserves an independent treatment, the present essay focuses on media both as objects of Americanist analysis and as potential subjects or agents within the research process itself. We come to this issue each with our own academic history and its attendant expertise (we hope) and biases (we fear). One of us (Mayer) has a long-standing interest in American media history and visual culture, focusing on bygone media ensembles and on discontinued media forms with their complex reference to present-day media practices. The other (Starre) has explored the relationship of contemporary American fiction to the printed codex—a medium that has been declared passé for literature for over two decades. Between the two of us, we have published on literature, film,

television, comics, Internet culture, music, photography, as well as magazines and other periodicals. Less visibly, but perhaps no less importantly, our research required the use of a host of—old and new—media technologies, among them the inevitable computer in numerous shapes and sizes, but also VHS, DVD, and CD players, USB drives, scanners, cameras, microfilm readers, and—not to forget—pen and paper. To think of the humanities researcher as the proverbial “lone wolf” already appears inaccurate in view of the expansion of collaborative work required for grant applications, interdisciplinary research groups, and international networking. Embedded in the media technologies of scholarly work and teaching, today’s humanist then becomes an indeed formidably connected individual.

Working with a media focus for an extended period yields a certain way of looking at cultural artifacts—a perspective that lingers on even when one enters a field that is not as media-saturated as American (popular) culture of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. We are writing this essay jointly to think through methodological concerns that have informed our work for some time. Each of us is interested in how specific cultural, institutional, and medial shifts in the US at the turn of the twentieth century altered predominant epistemes and introduced new forms, practices, and protocols of knowledge. A decade ago, the annual conference of the German Association for American Studies addressed the feasibility of redescribing our discipline in toto as a form of media studies (“American Studies as Media Studies,” Gottingen, 2006). By and large, “media” has come to accompany “literature” and “culture” as one of the most common terms in self-descriptions of the field. But we are wary of using the term merely in its narrower sense as a shorthand for the productivity of technical media (which would form a solid research category next to “literature” and within “culture”). Instead we conceive of media more broadly (and, alas, more messily) as dispositifs of cultural communication and negotiation with an autonomous (though not self-sufficient) agency, capable of generating meaning rather than only disseminating it. By this token, the formula “American Studies as Media Studies” implies that American Studies has entered a stage in which its objects and its tools converge. It is surely no coincidence that this “medial turn” becomes manifest at a moment in time that is marked by the upheavals of large-scale digitization. Digital media have the peculiar tendency to expose the mediality and the contingency of communication systems that were formerly held to be transparent and stable. Likewise, the current fascination of the humanities with “knowledge” as an object of historical and cultural analysis correlates with growing anxieties about the status of humanistic knowledge in its own right.

Despite the widespread rhetoric of medial and epistemic crises—from the “death of the book” to the “decline of the humanities”—the present moment possesses exceptional potential for our field to rethink itself and to attune its methodologies to the new media situation. Working with the Kittlerian

chronological pairing of "1900/2000," we propose to use the media of the past to shed light on the media ecology of the present—and vice versa. Since this is meant as an open-ended inquiry, we will stick to the literal meaning of the term "essay" and tackle these concerns in seven individual "attempts." Each of the following headnotes contains a thesis, while the progression from item to item is not structured as a straight line of reasoning. Rather, each section approaches the issue from a slightly different point of view and encapsulates an independent critical statement. These parts therefore do not need to be read in the order they appear.

Within power/knowledge, there is media/knowledge

In *Discipline and Punish*, Michel Foucault outlined the interrelation of power regimes and epistemes that would inform the genealogical analyses of his later writings. For the sake of argument, we have substituted the word "media" for every instance of the word "power" in the original of the following passage:

We should admit... that media produce knowledge ...; that media and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no media relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time media relations, (modified from Foucault 27)

This statement, we claim, not only makes sense, but effectively foregrounds an aspect of Foucauldian knowledge archeology that has been largely absent in Americanist appropriations of the method. Admittedly, there is some verbal slippage here, as the phrase "media relations" does not quite contain the argumentative punch conveyed by "power relations." The idea that shifting intermedial relations shape epistemes, however, appears valid to us. If "media and knowledge directly imply one another," how can we even use one of these entities to make sense of the other?

Such an appropriation of Foucault for media-centered purposes owes a lot to the work of Friedrich Kittler. In his seminal book *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter*, Kittler charged that Foucault had been mostly oblivious of the medial strictures that informed his archives of written and printed records. Discourse analysis, Kittler argued, needed to be reinvented through the lens of media in order to study the expanding ensemble of modern communication technologies. With this critical stance, writes Geoffrey Winthrop-Young, Kittler "plays Marx to Foucault's Hegel by turning discourse analysis onto its media-technological feet" (59). In our take on the issue, we share a robust understanding of the materialities of communication, while we would like to offer a different concept of the "materialities" under investigation, in line with Jane Bennett and others. We thus argue that the critical force of materialist readings hinges on the definition of the "matter" at hand,

which should go beyond media technologies to comprise an extended range of things and non-human agents participating in social communication.

To speak of media/knowledge, then, means to insist on the generative power of media in epistemic communication. Cultural knowledge co-depends on the inscription devices and storage technologies available to create, store, and disseminate it. Conversely, the predominant epistemes of a given culture influence the way individual media are deployed and valorized. We do not claim that "media are behind everything," just as Foucault never simply argued that "power is behind everything." We prefer a more humble critical approach to media/knowledge focused on what Foucault called "micro-physics," i.e. the "dispositions, manoeuvres, tactics, techniques, functionings" (26) that regulate the relationship between the embodied individual and formations like "American culture" or the modern nationstate. Even while we advocate for a capacious media concept, we still second the slogan articulated by media historian Lisa Gitelman: "Specificity is key" (8).

Digital reproductions bring us closer to, but also alienate us from the affordances of historical media

Historical media studies have obviously benefited tremendously from digitization. We now have immediate and free access to a wide variety of resources through YouTube, the Internet Archive, or other platforms and online collections that process and showcase historical and contemporary films, radio programs, television shows, recordings of live events, and much more. We can retrieve underground comic strips and browse arcane pulp novels or avant-garde magazines with a short print-run and limited circulation; and these resources are growing as we write. Documents that gathered dust in the back rooms of libraries and on archive shelves, sources that were thought lost or were inaccessible to researchers who happened not to live in Washington, New York, or Los Angeles, are now at our fingertips. Of course, not everything can be accessed, but we all notice how much we have come to rely on finding everything "somewhere" on the Internet, when we fail to locate at least a book preview on Amazon or a clipping on Google Books. As media scholars we are blessed with research conditions that our predecessors could only dream of.

Yet we also need to be aware of the implications of this particular unfolding of the nexus of media and knowledge. As Richard Abel has pointed out, digital formats have a leveling effect, suggesting an all-comprising representativity of the material at hand, which may be misleading. In addition, research with digitized sources draws upon a toolbox of research methodologies that come at a price. Where formerly scholars sifted through

pages and pages of records in hardcopy or on microfilm, they now enter keywords into search engines and are rewarded with immediate results. These results may very well obliterate dimensions of the object under investigation that do not correlate with the researcher's vocabulary of choice or her particular focus. In addition, search portals "can be unreliable and/or inconsistent: an exact word or phrase and specific date may lead to rich material when checked one day, yet lead nowhere at another time" (Abel 9).

Research has always been up against contingency, but there are historical periods that seem more concerned with the overwhelming force of unprocessed data than others. At the turn of the twentieth century, cultural theorists and publicists worried about the impact of "hyperstimulus" and "neurasthenia" (Singer); today we would rather invoke the impact of stress and the symptoms of burnout, but we seem to be referring to strikingly similar matters. These concerns resonate in the field of media studies, too, when scholars search for means of getting a grip on "big data." As Ilka Brasch pointed out, the nineteenth-century obsession with information management and data processing corresponds to the digital age's preoccupation with the precisioning of navigational tools, search engines, and ever-new means of charting large sets of information. Reflecting on past methods and their shortcomings may help us to become aware of our own predicament, and face the fact that contingency should be accounted for because it will never be eliminated: random observations, accidental findings, and unintended discoveries should be acknowledged as core elements of humanities research rather than as side effects or glitches.

As American Studies turns toward questions of knowledge, it needs to cover a more diverse set of media than prior humanities research

It is readily apparent that American Studies has identified "knowledge" as a promising denominator for future research. For one, issues of knowledge informed the largest cluster of papers at the "Looking Forward, 2014" conference, from which this volume springs. The guiding theme of the annual meeting of the German Association for American Studies (DGfA) in 2015 also addressed various "knowledge landscapes" on the North American continent. How our field will tackle this issue, though, remains an open question. From the broad reaches of intellectual history to the established field of the sociology of knowledge or the emergent interest in a poeology of knowledge, there is a host of viable paths to be pursued and terminologies to be adapted. Perhaps closest to home lies the vast amount of research in German Studies published in recent years on the intersection of *Literatur und Wissen*. By and large, work on this topic has initiated conversations on the function of literary discourse as a repository for cultural knowledge, often cast in opposition to "cold hard science." As Rita Felski holds, reading for

knowledge has been and continues to be one of the major forms of engagement with literary texts, even though this mode is often shunned both in formalist and in sociological takes on the literary field (Uses 77-104).

On a more fundamental level, literary and cultural studies find themselves in an excellent position to continue the “constructivist” tradition of knowledge studies, as pioneered by Ludwik Fleck and Thomas Kuhn. Both Fleck and Kuhn were less concerned with the epistemological status of scientific facts than with the social processes that endowed certain discoveries with truth value while ignoring others. In their foregrounding of rhetoric, narrativity, and metaphor, the discursive practices of localized, historically specific knowledge cultures lend themselves very well to our disciplinary modes of analysis and interpretation. Literary writing has no premium on the circulation of cultural knowledge, even though it occupied a central place in the American media ecology around 1900.

The emergence of new formats, such as the middlebrow mass magazines *Munsey's* and *McClure's* in the 1880s and 1890s, affected not just the amount and the nature of information that could be circulated; it also championed new styles of communication. Turn-of-the-century magazines, Janice Radway writes, “functioned symbiotically with the apparatus of scholarly knowledge production” and implied by their serial publication and their stylistic preferences “that knowledge was evolving [and] that the new was always better than the old” (225). With their lavish illustrations, middlebrow magazines also fueled visual forms of communication that would dominate the new media environment of American popular culture by the early decades of the twentieth century. As Johanna Drucker argues, scholars in the humanities have focused for too long on the artistic and entertaining functions of visual forms, while neglecting their epistemic potential. From the perspective of what Drucker terms “visual epistemology,” the iconographies of charts, information graphics, illustrations, and digital interfaces do not merely serve to illustrate information—they create knowledge.

Instead of approaching an individual medium or art form and parsing the epistemic dynamics encoded within, we therefore propose to shift the attention to the cross- and transmedial generation, channeling and processing of modes of knowing. This would also allow us to engage with pre-histories of what these days tends to be filed as “convergence culture” (Jenkins), a phenomenon strongly associated with a millennial digitized media ecology. Again, the divide 1900/2000 may prove fruitful to account for resonances and repercussions across time. It is important, though, to avoid a mere projection of present-day terminologies and concerns onto past texts and contexts. Instead, we envision digging up forgotten, submerged, or discontinued constellations of the past in order to examine and re-view our current understanding of media/knowledge.

"Media ecology" is a useful shorthand term, but also a challenging methodological claim

Long relegated to the fringes of post-McLuhanite criticism, the concept of "media ecology" has lately circulated more widely. In his recent study of technology fetishes in literary modernism, Mark Goble can casually speak of an "early-twentieth-century media ecology" (14) without having to follow this up with lengthy definitions. Sure enough, an ecological modeling of mediascapes has many advantages. The analogy to natural habitats and biological systems, for example, stresses the internal complexity and the potentials for change and evolution over time. Furthermore, the concept insinuates that medial change in one place goes hand-in-hand with change in another place. The invention and adoption of a new medium will therefore always influence the entire constellation of all other available media. To cultural scholars, such metaphorical renderings of complexity are naturally appealing, as they reinforce our predilection for complicating issues, multiplying readings, and privileging open-endedness, fluidity, and irresolvability.

Yet how does one reconcile the universal trope of an all-encompassing media ecology with a critical reading of one film, one sound recording, or one book? Can there even be such a thing as an "ecological close reading"? While we have no simple answers for these questions, we hold that an ecological outlook on media history has two distinct methodological consequences. For one, ecological analyses have little use for one-dimensional determinisms that play off medial dimensions against discursive content. As such, an ecological argument would not subscribe to the logic of "form follows function" (or vice versa). Rather, it would seek to understand the feedback loops and the recursive interactions between matter and meaning or between form and content—much as biologists explore the interplay of organisms and environments.

A media ecological account that is worth its salt would also not resort to simplistic modellings that separate text from context. Based on Bruno Latour's extensive writings on actor-network theory, Rita Felski and Frank Kelleter have recently suggested new modes of reading that attempt to better map the distributed agencies embodied in and activated by ensembles of medial artifacts. Felski advocates for a type of "mid-level reading," that neither buys into the romantic notion of the autonomous artwork nor follows the explanatory logic of the sociologist's "bird's-eye view" ("Latour" 741). Kelleter holds that textual readings can take on the form of network analysis when we treat a text "not [as] something that is but [as] something that does" (Serial 4). In his essay in this volume, he further stresses the importance of contextualization, understood as "the reconstruction of a text's most lively communications and absorptions." The practice of contextualizing, then, is not an activity that rests with the critic alone. If we take media seriously as

historical actors, we have to look for all the ways in which medial artifacts themselves create new contexts. To move within an ecology means moving slowly and cautiously; it means following multiple paths and perspectives (intertextual references, medial affinities and differences); finally, it means to shirk from using "ecology" as a neat theoretical shortcut instead of as a challenge to trace more connections.

Complexity is not a category exclusive to present-day media ecologies

When he described post-millennial television culture as "complex TV," Jason Mittell created a veritable buzzword, which signals well beyond the subject matter of contemporary popular TV series, indicating a pervasive new poetics of medial expression in our time (Mittell, "Narrative"). Complexity, for Mittell, is constituted by modes of medial storytelling that make strong demands on their viewers' processing skills, establishing a high degree of medial and narrative self-awareness and a tangle of cross-references. It thus complicates the serial flow of the individual narration and implements numerous transmedial interfaces and nodes. The crucial prerequisite for this kind of storytelling is the medium not of television, but more specifically of the DVD and then of digital streaming services (Mittell, *Complex* 38), which allow for repeated, concentrated, "active" viewing by a "discerning viewer." According to Mittell, this type of viewer differs markedly from earlier "presumably distracted and indiscriminating" audiences (38). Once more, current practices of media use are thus mapped in contradistinction to older habits and strategies, which are then variously presented as less sophisticated or more authentic, depending on the media scholar's leaning.

But the digital age does not hold a monopoly on complexity—at least if one approaches the category from the vantage point of reception. The modalities, functions, and technical parameters of complexity have undeniably changed over the last 100 years, but entertainment has always also been work. As an exemplary case of a tight conjunction of storytelling and media formatting, the cliffhanger epitomizes this circumstance. In the days of rewatchability, the cliffhanger has become one tool of sophisticated televisual storytelling among many others. In the past, the cliffhanger was the tool of serial narration. In accordance with their function as basic narrative devices, literary and filmic cliffhangers tended to be seen as simple, straightforward, and functional. In silent and sound film serials, which acted as a primary form of serial entertainment until television took over in the 1940s, new episodes started routinely with recap scenes that appeared like virtual repetitions of the earlier episode's cliffhanger. Yet these recaps rearranged or complemented the previously seen to ensure the narrative's

continuation: instead of falling from a bridge onto the train tracks far below, the heroine can thus be seen landing safely on a freight train rushing by underneath. Sometimes, however, the recap simply cheated, as exemplified in the serial *A Woman in Grey* (1920). At the end of episode 8, for instance, the heroine can be seen falling through a hole into a deadly trap, while the next episode has her turn around before the drop and walk away (Mayer, "Running Late"). In the days of rewatchability, such maneuvers come across as flaws, gaffes, or technical crudity. But when seen in the context of their original implementation, they appear as markers of continuity and coherence which simultaneously exhibit the precarious character of these epistemic conditions: highlighting the fact that the "larger picture" and the "whole story" are matters of perspective and ongoing negotiation.

The "work" the film serial requires of its audiences is not the "cognitive workout" (Steven Johnson qtd. in Mittell, "Narrative" 29) that contemporary TV viewers have to perform. Rather, the film serial inveigles its audiences to engage in equally challenging routines of meaning-making, asking them to constantly rethink, revise, and pull into doubt what they took for granted, and to work their way through the narrative on the grounds of highly unstable sets of information (images and narratives). Together with other pre-digital media practices and media forms, the film serial may be taken as an incentive to stop looking for an ongoing "narrative" of media evolution and rather focus on the breaks and reboots, the ruptures and disconnects (the fake cliffhangers, as it were) in media history.

Brevity is a core epistemic media format of 1900/2000, morphing from professional practice into an aesthetics of efficiency

Shortness may very well be the exemplary form of modernity. Around 1900, the "new" media of communication and entertainment responded to the demands of a "high-speed society" (Rosa and Scheuermann, *High-Speed Society*) by way of contraction: more than ever before, conciseness in form equaled velocity in transmission. Industrial capitalism in its relentlessly globalizing thrust hinged upon a media network of transnational reach and called for short and fast packages of "information" or "news." In close conjunction with this agenda of efficiency and fastness, the institutions of mass culture (or the "culture industry") embraced short and fast formats conveying "thrill" or "fun." Institutions of higher learning from research universities to libraries and academic publishers likewise exemplified this dialectics of communication: they subscribed to efficient norms of communication, but nevertheless flooded the world with ever more publications and paperwork. To handle this informational excess, one needed professional management systems such as the Dewey Decimal Classification (1876) and expert selection guides such as the Catalog produced by the

American Library Association in 1893, which listed the 5,000 volumes any public library should own (Starre). A central component of the habitus of new professionals in many lines of work was the skill to fit content to form. Businessmen who could compress market data into telegraph messages, copywriters who distilled advertising strategies into slogans, librarians who categorized books and wrote synopses—they all reduced and produced the noises of modernity. Short forms were used to standardize knowledge and to facilitate communication, to accelerate exchange and to minimize contingency in societies under time constraints. In many respects, the very idea of the “masses” was fashioned through a highly mediated and mediatized enactment of large-scale simultaneities of production and reception, of people “here” and “there” taking in the “same thing” at the “same time” in ever more intricate routines of (imagined) simultaneity, synchronicity, and collectivity which thrived on the modalities of brevity, immediacy, and up-to-dateness.

All of these parameters are very much with us today. We take our cue from Hartmut Rosa’s contention that the period between 1880 and 1920 and the period from 1989 until today constitute complementary “thresholds” for the conceptualization of temporality from the vantage point of acceleration (300). The short forms which helped to chart and manage the increasingly complicated world(s) of modernity resonate with the short forms of digital communication: with tweets, microblogs, YouTube clips, and all sorts of technical tools that alleviate navigation, orientation, and organization by means of interfaces and summaries—allowing us to manage contingency rather than indulging in the hope of doing away with it (Gamper and Mayer; Mayer, “Post-Cinema”). Brevity and conciseness foster the impression of precision and efficiency which need to be seen not only as integral elements of global media economies then and now, but also as constitutive elements in the generation of a modern and modernist aesthetics of efficiency.

The contemporary moment of media shift calls for a praxeology of Americanist knowledge production and a renewed commitment to writing as method

In his reply to Emory Elliott’s presidential address on the transnational turn at the 2006 American Studies Association meeting, Winfried Fluck asked “What kind of knowledge do we need?” At the time, Fluck criticized the ways in which Americanist criticism either subscribed to a wholesale revisionism aimed at dismantling the ideological foundations of the US nation state or resorted to a diffuse globalist perspective that negated many of the historical and cultural specificities of the formation that calls itself “America.” While these debates continue into the present, the eponymous question of Fluck’s essay takes on a slightly different meaning when set

against recent developments in American higher education. For one, the corporatization of the US university system has been driving up student debt, while shifting the hiring preferences for university leaders from seasoned professors to business-friendly managers and catalyzing the slow decline of state funding for public universities. At the same time, the rise of information technology has subliminally fostered an ethos of efficient production and communication. As Alan Liu argues, this critically affects humanistic knowledge:

After all, while the technological measure of the new discourse paradigm is postindustrial efficiency coupled with flexibility—that is, the ability to say anything to anyone quickly—the measure of academic knowledge is also historical, social, philosophical, artistic, and public (nonproprietary) diversity—for example, the ability to say anything to anyone fully, richly, openly, differently, kindly, or slowly. (52)

So to ask “what kind of knowledge do we need?” in the present situation is not only to ask for the historical or aesthetic validity, the ethical stakes, or the political potential of our work. This query should also give us pause to reflect on our practices of knowledge production.

Within scholarly jargon, “practice” is one of many terms that can be both terrifically illuminating and terribly obfuscating. We don’t intend to make the blanket argument that knowledge production hinges on practices. Rather, we would encourage more introspection as to which specific everyday practices of Americanist scholarship have an actual epistemic function, in so far as they substantially enhance our research. For the sciences, such questions have propelled an entire field of Science Studies. While we may not need a fully-fledged companion program of “humanities studies,” we should still note how the current emergence of a “new discourse paradigm” as described by Liu thoroughly unsettles many of the processes, institutions, and practices that have served our field in the past. Steffen Martus has recently sketched the relevance of Hans-Jorg Rheinberger’s Science Studies scholarship for a praxeology of literary studies. Martus holds that within the humanities, Rheinberger’s influential notion of “epistemic things”—meaning the vague and uncertain entities that generate new knowledge—may be applied to more than just “primary texts.” Instead, the objects of humanistic knowledge appear inseparably entangled with the practices of writing that bring them into existence (Martus 46-49). From such a praxeological perspective, some questions that might otherwise appear trivial take on a new urgency: Do we need libraries and physical archives to produce knowledge? Is the single-authored monograph still the gold-standard of Americanist research? How do the various formats we write in (handbooks, textbooks, journal essays, encyclopedia entries) guide our way of thinking?

In *Planned Obsolescence* (2011), the most sustained account of digital publishing innovations in the humanities, Kathleen Fitzpatrick looks at how

emergent digital platforms and hybrid forms of scholarly criticism complement and often challenge “traditional” modes of dissemination. Aside from notions of authorship and peer review, Fitzpatrick discusses the formative period of the institution whose output still dominates the intellectual debates and the reputation economies within our field: the university press (175-178). The American ecosystem of scholarly publishing is a product of the media landscape around 1900, springing from newly established American research universities that attempted to reconcile “pure” research with a commitment to public service and institutional branding. Over the course of the twentieth century and into the present, specific discursive styles emerged from these scholarly institutions and media. Through the use of such “elements of academic style” (Hayot), a PMLA essay or a Harvard University Press book becomes a recognizable form of academic discourse. While experimenting with new modes of scholarly communication—from video essays to data visualizations and tweets—we should also challenge ourselves and our students to rediscover writing as a method, that is, as a medium of discovery. The quality of our writing, meaning not just the readability of scholarly texts, but more importantly their effectiveness in tracing connections and building worlds, determines whether our epistemic objects come alive or linger in obscurity. Stuck with the conundrum of studying media within and through media, we might as well reinterpret “media competency” to mean the capability of choosing forms of presentation purposefully, based on their capacity to generate ideas (rather than merely execute routines) and to shape them for dissemination and consumption (rather than for silent storage).

Works Cited

- Abel, Richard. “The Pleasures and Perils of Big Data in Digitized Newspapers.” *Film History* 25:1-2 (2013): 1-10. Print.
- Bennett, Jane. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2010. Print.
- Brasch, Ilka. *Operational Detection: Film Serials and the American Cinema, 1910-1940*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam UP, 2018, forthcoming.
- Drucker, Johanna. *Graphesis: Visual Forms of Knowledge Production*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2014. Print.
- Felski, Rita. *Uses of Literature*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008. Print.
- . “Latour and Literary Studies.” *PMLA* 130.3 (2015): 737-42. Print.
- Fitzpatrick, Kathleen. *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy*. New York: NYU P, 2011. Print.
- Fleck, Ludwik. *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*. 1935. Trans. Fred Bradley and Thaddeus J. Trenn. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1981. Print.
- Fluck, Winfried. “Inside and Outside: What Kind of Knowledge Do We Need? A Response to the Presidential Address.” *American Quarterly* 59.1 (2007): 23-32. Print.

- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage, 2012. Print.
- Gamper, Michael, and Ruth Mayer, eds. *Kurz & Knapp: Zur Mediengeschichte kleiner Formen vom 17. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2017. Print.
- Gitelman, Lisa. *Always Already New: Media, History, and the Data of Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 2006. Print.
- Goble, Mark. *Beautiful Circuits: Modernism and the Mediated Life*. New York: Columbia UP, 2010. Print.
- Hayot, Eric. *The Elements of Academic Style: Writing for the Humanities*. New York: Columbia UP, 2014. Print.
- Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: NYU P, 2006. Print.
- Kelleter, Frank. *Serial Agencies: The Wire and Its Readers*. Winchester: Zero, 2014. Print.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 4th ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2012. Print.
- Liu, Alan. "Transcendental Data: Toward a Cultural History and Aesthetics of the New Encoded Discourse." *Critical Inquiry* 31.1 (2004): 49-84. Print.
- Martus, Steffen. "Praxeologie der Literaturwissenschaft: Die Science Studies als Vorbild?" *Theorien, Methoden und Praktiken des Interpretierens*. Ed. Andrea Albrecht et al. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015. 23-51. Print.
- Mayer, Ruth. "Early Post-Cinema: The Short Form, 1900/2000." *Post-Cinema: Theorizing 21st-Century Film*. Ed. Shane Denson and Julia Leyda. Sussex: Reframe, 2016. Web.
- . "Running Late: The Silent Serial, the Cliffhanger, and the Exigencies of Time, 1914-1920." *Oxford Handbook of Silent Film*. Ed. Charlie Keil and Rob King. Oxford: Oxford UP, forthcoming 2018.
- Mittell, Jason. "Narrative Complexity in Contemporary American Television." *The Velvet Light Trap* 58 (2006): 29-40. Print.
- . *Complex TV: The Poetics of Contemporary Television Storytelling*. New York: NYU P, 2015. Print.
- Radway, Janice. "Research Universities, Periodical Publication, and the Circulation of Professional Expertise: On the Significance of Middlebrow Authority." *Critical Inquiry* 31.1 (2004): 203-28. Print.
- Rosa, Hartmut, and William E. Scheuermann, eds. *High-Speed Society: Social Acceleration, Power, and Modernity*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2009. Print.
- Rosa, Hartmut. *Social Acceleration: A New Theory of Modernity*. 2005. New York: Columbia UP, 2015.
- Singer, Ben. *Melodrama and Modernity: Early Sensational Cinema and Its Contexts*. New York: Columbia UP, 2001. Print.
- Starre, Alexander. "Professionelle Kondensierung: Die Annotation als Wissensformat im Catalog der American Library Association (1893-1926)." *Gamper and Mayer* 119-29.
- Winthrop-Young, Geoffrey. *Kittler and the Media*. Cambridge: Polity, 2011. Print.