**LITERATURE REVIEW AND BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**Uttara Parekh**

## Literature Review

Research on landscape representation has long emphasized that depictions of nature are never neutral, but are culturally and historically produced. Foundational work by **W. J. T. Mitchell (1994)** argues that landscapes function as "cultural media," encoding ideological relationships between people, land, and power. Similarly, **Simon Schama (1995)** shows how historical identities and environmental memory shape the visual construction of wilderness, suggesting that what appears "natural" is often deeply bound to political and social histories. Together, these studies frame landscape imagery as a lens through which changing environmental values can be read.

Art historians studying the 19th and early 20th centuries—particularly the rise of industrial modernity—have documented a shift from sublime, unspoiled wilderness toward scenes of railways, factories, ports, and expanding cities. Scholarship on **industrial-era painting and photography** (e.g., Tim Barringer, John Barrell) highlights how new technologies altered aesthetic possibilities and reshaped the cultural imagination of nature. The emergence of photography further transformed visual culture: as **John Tagg (1988)** and **Allan Sekula (1986)** argue, photographic technologies made urbanization more visible, reproducible, and central to documenting modern life. This provides historical grounding for my finding that Photography and Digital/Media works heavily skew toward urban themes.

Environmental humanities research underscores how representations of nature change alongside broader ecological and technological regimes. Scholars such as **Kate Soper**, **Ursula Heise**, and **Timothy Morton** describe how modernity produces shifting categories of "wild," "managed," and "constructed" environments. These frameworks align closely with my ecological phases—Steam & Coal, Oil & Empire, Motor & Machine Vision, Plastic & Suburban Nature, and Carbon & Crisis—which reflect transitions in energy systems, environmental consciousness, and cultural attitudes toward nature.

Museum studies research further supports the idea that collections act as repositories of environmental imagination rather than neutral archives. **Carol Duncan**, **Tony Bennett**, and **Sharon Macdonald** show how museums selectively frame cultural narratives through acquisition patterns, curatorial choices, and institutional histories. This background helps explain my regression finding that the Met and Tate differ systematically in their likelihood of exhibiting urban imagery, even after controlling for year and medium.

Finally, computational and data-driven methods are increasingly used in art history. Recent work in **digital humanities** and **cultural analytics** (Lev Manovich; Drucker; Da et al.) demonstrates

how large-scale datasets can quantify long-term visual trends that would be difficult to observe qualitatively. My use of keyword classification, statistical modeling, and ecological phase analysis builds on this methodological shift, offering a quantitative perspective on long-standing art historical questions about landscape, technology, and shifting environmental imaginaries.

In sum, the literature demonstrates three consistent themes:

1. **Landscape is culturally constructed**, not a neutral record of the natural world.
2. **Technological and ecological change shapes how nature is represented**, especially through new media.
3. **Museums structure environmental narratives** through collection practices that reflect broader cultural values.

My empirical findings—showing measurable shifts from wild to urban depictions over time, strong medium-based differences, and institutional variation—extend these theoretical insights through systematic statistical evidence drawn from nearly two centuries of museum collections.

## Bibliography


**Barringer, Tim.** *Men at Work: Art and Labour in Victorian Britain.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

**Barrell, John.** *The Dark Side of the Landscape: The Rural Poor in English Painting, 1730–1840.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

**Bennett, Tony.** *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics.* London: Routledge, 1995.

**Da, Nan Z., Susan Rubin Suleiman, and Peter Decherney, eds.** *The Routledge Companion to the Digital Humanities.* New York: Routledge, 2022.

**Drucker, Johanna.** *Graphesis: Visual Forms of Knowledge Production.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

**Duncan, Carol.** *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums.* London: Routledge, 1995.

**Heise, Ursula K.** *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet: The Environmental Imagination of the Global.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

**Manovich, Lev.** *Cultural Analytics.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2020.

**Mitchell, W. J. T.** *Landscape and Power.* 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994/2002.

**Morton, Timothy.** *Ecology without Nature: Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.

**Schama, Simon.** *Landscape and Memory.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995.

**Sekula, Allan.** "The Body and the Archive." *October* 39 (1986): 3–64.

**Soper, Kate.** *What Is Nature? Culture, Politics and the Non-Human.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.

**Tagg, John.** *The Burden of Representation: Essays on Photographies and Histories.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

**Macdonald, Sharon.** *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today.* London: Routledge, 2013.