

**Everett A. Scholfield and 19th Century Regional Photography:
William Parker at the Rhode Island School of Design, April 27, 1977.**

Parker comments made during quotations from texts are set in ().
Transcribed by Bob Martin, 2023.

It is good to be here. I do have a surprise, I think this is sort of atypical relative to what most of my friends expect me to speak of because they are not terribly aware of what I have been doing for the past three years. I have become very interested in regional photography, particularly nineteenth century regional photographs, primarily because of the fact that, it has occurred to many people, I think I was first prompted toward this thing by Richard Rudisill, and now the Santa Fe Art Museum, that one of the problems we have in understanding 19th century photography is that we have really not looked at enough of it. In fact, what we know of as the history of photography is but a very miniscule portion of the entire development of photography as we should know it. What many of you may not be aware of is that the photography that occurred in regional areas, whether in Providence, which was regional in its own period, or in rural areas of New Mexico, or whether we are speaking of Connecticut, and that will be the concern today, with one photographer, Everett A. Scholfield, who was born in 1843 and began his practice in the late 1850s. We have to reckon with the fact that the majority of photography of this period developed around an interest of individuals who have no prior academy, school, training program whatsoever to go through. In other words, they developed their photography and their photographic interests virtually as primitives. And we don't use that in a pejorative sense, we mean that they were *ingenuinists*, they were plain and simple frank folk usually trained in some area of activity such as smithing work, or perhaps as a baker, a barber or whatever it may be. And then gradually evolved their interest in photography in the Daguerrean era, in the late 40s and early 50s, particularly when it becomes active in regional areas. The photographer that I am going to speak of today, Everett A. Scholfield, was actually born in rural Massachusetts, as I said in 1843, and he learned photography from his father, who was a textile worker, who had developed an interest in photography during the latter part of his years as a textile worker in Lowell, Massachusetts, and then gradually evolved a major interest in it and became a studio photographer in the late 1850s in Westerly, Rhode Island. And thus we have Everett Scholfield serving as his apprentice, starting about the age of 12 and continuing with photography for the rest of his life until he died in 1930. I might add that Scholfield discontinued his practice around 1913 or 1915 thereabouts, at least that is as far as we can trace the final activity of his work. And he lived in retirement and inactivity for the latter part of his life. Now I mention this because Scholfield is typical of what photography was in the 19th century, particularly in America. And I would say that it is rather typical of what photography was in Europe as well. When we speak of

European photographers like D. O. Hill and Robert Adamson, or if we think of photographers in the mid-19th century in America, like O'Sullivan, or Jackson, or others, we are not thinking of the typical photographer: we are thinking of people who might have been recognized even in their own time, and developed a certain type of activity which was not typical of the mainstream of photographic practice during the 19th century. Scholfield is one of countless numbers of photographers who conceived of themselves as artists. They spoke of themselves as photographic artists, not as technicians, practitioners, or otherwise. They thought of their work in portraiture or landscape photography as indeed a form of art. They thought of themselves as in cooperation with Helios. They saw themselves as dependent upon the basic magical dimensions of properties of sunlight and as a result had to become a particularly sensitive artist in order to be able to accommodate this. Scholfield is the type of photographer who handcrafted most of his own cameras, whether those were earlier box in box sliding types made out of mahogany, or later bellows types with a Waterhouse stopped lens, or whether he worked in his latter years with a gigantic Skogul portrait camera which would virtually fill the entire frontal part of this particular area. They were photographers: Scholfield and others like him, were photographers who definitely allowed their work to be influenced by public taste. Admittedly as artists, they thought they were primarily interpreters of not their own individual aims but basically what the public wanted. Now this is disturbing to many people, because most people want to retain their individuality, but I think we discover that in regional photographers of the 19th century, their individuality is hard strained and yet it does become apparent. If we look carefully, or comparatively I should say, at the differences in the way portraits were approached, or the landscape, we will definitely find individual attitudes emerging. I thought as a prelude to showing you some of the slides, because my main thesis is to show you a sort of selected group of photographs by Scholfield, his early work to late, and then to show you how a sort of irony about how many photographers today, are postulating in the development of their work *as art*, you see, on the basis of images that are well established in vernacular photography of the 19th century, so that again we have that postulate that there is nothing new in the world, only a return to earlier paradigms. Scholfield, there is a little catalog and I am sorry, I can't provide everyone with a copy, but I thought for those interested in history I have got about fifteen or twenty copies here, so if you really feel like you urgently need one of these I will be happy to give you one. And if you want one even more urgently until they run out, I'll send you one. But this is a little bulletin we did to accompany an exhibition we did at the University of Connecticut of this artist's work. And the opening of the introduction, and I wrote this, it gives you two postulates to sort of direct our attention to what I consider to be the reason for offering this type of material. I don't propose Scholfield as any kind of master. In fact I would simply just say he is typical, to repeat my use of the term. I don't say that there is anything inherent in the photographs that we

should *want* to look at. I think the thing is that we should want to look at it simply because it was typical, it represented what the majority of human beings saw in the 19th century. Robert Taft wrote in 1938, “ I venture to say that an organized effort on a larger scale could assemble, given sufficient time, a duplication of the past in photographs that would leave little to be desired. The wealth of such material lying unused and uncared for in attics, all over the country, must in toto, must be truly astounding. In my judgment the effort would be well worthwhile but it must be undertaken before many years pass.” And Taft was primarily speaking, not of, auspiciously recognized already in 1938, identified figures, he wrote about a number of things we didn’t know of until his *Photography and the American Scene*. But on the other hand he was talking primarily about the regional photographer. And then Beaumont Newhall as recently as 1975 states this about the history of photography as a discipline, “I also think that one of the easiest ways to start getting the grand history of photography going is to encourage people in small towns and cities to do the histories of their particular locality. That way it becomes a task that can be contained. Whereas the old history of photography is beyond the grasp of any one person now.” And that is a little bid for missionary work for those who wish to get involved in the regional photography of Providence or other locales. In this bulletin, it includes a chronology, and I think it might interest some of you that when you start with, as we did, with a group of found glass plate negatives. And then you start trying to know who the photographer was because there was no name or identification on the material, so we were trying to trace things in relation to period and locales and so on, it becomes an arduous task. And as I said we spent three years, a colleague and myself. A colleague found the material and then I researched it over the successive period before the exhibition. And this requires one going through period newspapers, and trying to find letters and correspondences from surviving relatives and to be able to look through business records and journals of the period and so on. And it becomes a sort of fascinating search and one can be completely absorbed in it almost to the neglect of other activities. I am not going to read you a great deal but I want to read you a few things concerning some correspondence, most of it to Scholfield, that is introduced in this little bulletin. Because intermittent with the chronology I chose examples that indicated how people felt about photographs during the period, how they indicated their interest. Here is a letter to E. A. Scholfield from a former girlfriend, Mattie E. Clark, and it was written in 1862, and Everett is stationed right outside of Washington DC with the Ninth Regiment of the Rhode Island Volunteers. They still exist by the way, their organization. She says, “Friend Everett,” and you can imagine my, as a Southerner, you know a displaced Southerner, how I feel about a couple of the lines in here: “Friend Everett, I presume you have some very gay times out where you are stationed. I suppose you will not have many weeks longer to guard the old fort, but you must take good care of it and not let any of those rebels get within gunshot of you” (laughter). And she talks about, “think how glad you’ll be to get home when your three

months is up," after all he went in when there were three month enlistments as opposed to multiple year enlistments. And then she says this: "Mother will be pleased to see you home. Mother was up to Westery last week. She called at your house and also at the shop. Your father had not quite forgotten how to tease anyone for a picture. Mother sat for a picture and was fortunate enough to get a very good one, the best she had ever taken, according to my opinion." Now this, that she was fortunate enough to get a good one, this has implications: many of you who are students of the history of photography have read a number of documents or quotes from the Daguerreian period in which individuals thought of photography as a magical instrument, and the idea of getting your picture, or being fortunate enough to have your picture taken is also a kind of accolade within the photographer himself or in this case, herself, because there were women photographers in the period. Just in this research alone I discovered in New London practicing from about 1870 through about 1910 there were no less than 42 women photographers. And then she says this later, "Friend Everett," and she is commenting on a drawing that he had sketched, "I think you are a very good artist, you have done nicely on drawing, if I could do one half as well I would be very much pleased." And then she says a strange thing, "Then you really have got Lizzie out there, have you? I don't know what she will say when she finds out that her picture is away down south. I expect my face is out in Manassas, if it has not changed its position recently." The idea of the photograph and the photographic portrait being basically THE face, THE person. That the locale changes, but the magical identity of the photograph virtually encapsulating, encompassing the identity of the person, and then comments being made upon it. In other words...about peripatetically by...photographs through... indicates their loving... breast. He also, and imagine this, a man writes about the Civil War, his cousin, Joseph, who later became a tinsmith when he returned from the Civil War, he states in one letter, "When we came out here we had 93 men, and now we ain't got but about 23, but where they have gone to is more than I can tell. We have it pretty hard here now for we have to go on picket every other day and we have to go over the worst road you ever see, but I think we will have it harder pretty soon for we have had 8 days rations dealt out to us and I think old Hooker is going to make a big strike in front of Fredericksburg, for he has got his pontoon bridges," many of you immediately think of the wonderful photographs of the pontoon bridges laid out over the water outside of Fredericksburg, "laid both above and below there. You must give my love to your father and mother, don't forget to keep a good share yourself and if it is convenient I would like for you to send me your picture." This idea of insisting upon sending a memento, of pictures being traded and so on. And he gets another letter from Joseph which goes on to indicate something rather peculiar. Imagine a man in the midst of battle, practically...written on location in Stafford, Virginia, is a rather unusual phrase to use, "It is with pleasure, cousin, that I seat myself to answer your welcome letter. " (laughs) A high degree of formalism out in the midst of the wilderness. He says, "Cuz, if you never was in battle you can't form no

idea of it for I tell you it is a bad sight to see your comrades falling all around you, and you expecting to go yourself every minute,” and then he just quickly changes, “I would not wonder but Westerly is a dull place now,” and then again he says, “I suppose you say you want me to send you my picture, but it is impossible for the gallery that we have with us has left us now,”-- and it definitely would have been one of Brady’s galleries, one of his bands-- “but it is impossible because the gallery that we usually have with us has left us now and there is no chance for me to get it taken. I will send you a piece taken out of a fellow’s leg that was wounded in Fredericksburg.” But again this reference to the idea of, I will send you my face, my picture, as soon as it is possible, and its identification in various forms. Well, you can read this for yourself without me reading it to you, but I think there are a few things that are rather interesting about the nature of a photographer setting up business. There are two accounts of this, one is when Scholfield has learned from his father, and with a friend, he leaves for Wakefield, Rhode Island in order to establish his first opportunity as a photographer. And of course at that time which was typical for the period, he vies for a form of prize photography, or, what do you call it when you get prizes, well I can’t think of the term. At any rate, he says, to every member paying us in advance, he gets a newspaper to agree to this, a bonus sort of approach, “We will give *gratis* a photograph of the late General Isaac Rodman” particularly figures who were killed in the Civil War and who were from people’s locales became prized merchandise. “Or to those who prefer it, an order for their own likeness, in ambrotype, on Scholfield and Nash, artists.” Notice, constantly being referred to as artists. “To any person getting up a club of four new subscribers paying in advance we will give an order for six cartes-de-visite.” Well, Everett has gone off to make his fortune and his father gets a little disturbed because he doesn’t feel like he has returned, I wish I could have made an X-rated catalog, we don’t have much of an indication, but we know he was quite involved with a number of ladies at the moment. And his father said, “Dear son Everett, I should think from appearances that you are going to do well, no doubt, you will, if you put the best foot forward and do good work thereby making a permanent business and a paying one too if your work suits. Write often, keep strict accounts of your work.” And then he says that he has arranged to get some cards made up with his name on the back and then he says there is a bill for 16 dollars for making and trimming your pants and vest, and he says trimming costs high and your suit will cost you 25 dollars. Well at that time that is comparable to buying one of the most expensive suits imaginable, but you have to look good. And then finally he says, “Dear son,” this is written several months later, “It seems to me that you ought to get more work. I hope you are making business your main object. I am making from 12 to 15 dollars worth every other day and I average about 40 dollars a week. I would send and get you some lithograph cards,” meaning some card mounts, “if you were doing more but as it is the object is trifling. However I will hope for the best. I am not disposed to find fault with you as I don’t know that you are at fault. I don’t know but you are doing

the best you can do.” You can see the wagging finger of the father telling the son to pay his mind to his business. Then he finally tells him he really needs to adjust his light a bit in the making of portraits. Throughout this chronology, as I stated, that we tried to indicate attitudes toward picture-taking, and the kind of thing a photographer was involved in on a day-to-day basis. Scholfield, during the 70s, went to the Virgin Islands, because there was a considerable depression during the 70s in America and as a result, he decided he would try his efforts on basically territorial shores. And here is an entry from a diary, and he sort of expands or extrapolates some of these attitudes, you can see that he had a love of nature, that he also liked to hunt, and that he was interested in various social gatherings. “January 2, 1871: “Customers began to come in” (is the only entry for that day). “January 3: Took in three fifty, found a centipede on me. Fourth: The *Governor* came” (a sailing vessel). “The *Nellie* sailed home for home,” (that is the boat that carried him to St. Croix). “Feel lonesome to see her go. Fifth: Went out taking views. Ninth: Got my gun from Custom House. Tenth: Went out shooting pistol with Baker, shot at land crabs, killed one. Eleventh: The mail left for home. Twelfth: Went out duck shooting, I killed three birds, went over and dined with Mr. Curtain and spent the evening. Thirteenth: Commenced storming about noon and lasted through the day and night.” And daily, he talks about walking on the beach, “Went in bathing in the morning, went out making views, went out to a fire about half past 12 in the morning.” And then, you will see this photograph, on the 24th, the great event was, Baker brought in a live iguana which I secured in view,” and we will see that image. But this is the kind of response, this daily activity of being associated with the landscape and with the earth, and also you can also see the sort of ease with which his portrait studio activity in St. Croix and the Virgin Islands was not necessarily a day-to-day activity but a very intermittent activity there. He was also a very strong advisor, I think this is sort of an amusing letter. Some photographers weren’t quite as stable as Scholfield, and here is a young man, we now know more about him, he writes to his friend Everett and says, “I received your letter this week and was happy to hear from you for I have been looking for this for the last few weeks but I suppose the cares of a family”(by now Scholfield is married and has children) ”weigh heavy on your mind, you being so inexperienced in that station so I will have to excuse you. Now what that damned cuss says about her I believe to be a lie. I should sooner have believed him if he said nothing about it, or denied it, for that is human nature. You know I don’t like to hear such things reported about her, but at the same time if I believed they are the best things that could be said on my behalf. Oh by the way, you say she still thinks that I will return and do the square thing by her? Now Schof, if she waits for me to come back and fulfill those engagements that I made when under the influence of what shall I say, you know how it is yourself, she will be too old to ever be brought her milk again.” (laughter) The itinerant photographer traveled about and obviously created quite a bit of trouble and then walked away. There are interesting advisements concerning studio activity in the

development of Scholfield's work, He develops a process in the 1872 period that was patented by a man named Carl Meinerth from Newburyport, Massachusetts, and it involved laying a small sheet of transparent vellum between the negative, at this point obviously the glass plate negative, and the albumen paper to give a slightly blurred effect or ovalescent effect. And Mr. Meinerth writes him and says to him that "the faces of ladies you kindly sent me look sulky or pouty. Can't you mesmerize their brains a little during the sitting so as to call out an agreeable expression? I know there are some cold potatoes out of which you can't get no-how of an expression. But on the average I can squeeze out whatever there is inside by indirect talk before and during the sitting." Now, throughout this material, we find Scholfield confronting not only difficult times but a wide variety of attitudes concerning advisements. There is one I want to read you a very beautiful statement I think would still apply to anyone interested in photography today in terms of the development of an attitude: is it your technical skill or is it basically the emotive or personal identity being brought to bear. Scholfield entered a picture in the centennial exhibition of 1876. Unfortunately, the negatives arrived too late to be included. Later, he was published in *The Philadelphia Photographer* which we recently discovered. And he receives a letter from Benerman and Wilson, *Wilson's Photographics*, and it says this: "Dear Sir, Yours of the 24th at hand, and the pictures also received. We are sorry you were not in time to get your negatives in for competition. They are much better than some we have, and are very creditable indeed. With so slow a light as you mention we are quite surprised that you should have been so successful. A good light, good appliances, and good tools of any kind are a great help in producing good work, but we have long since found that these are only secondary. The main-spring of all excellence is in the photographer himself, and many do fine work in spite of numerous difficulties which surround him. This is a good school and often prepares a man to meet and overcome many troubles as they arise when it comes to be more favorably located. " Obviously the postulate certainly gathering, that the photographer's ability is within the photographer and not within the instrumentation. There are a series of things. I keep saying that I would not read more but there is one I can't resist, it has to do with how a photographer of the 19th century would apprentice and how they would discover their life's work. Remember Scholfield apprenticed to his father who was more than likely a late Daguerrean, and he later, and throughout his career had apprentices, and he would train them and then they would become his partner. And there was an auspiciously identified photographer who was actually quite well known, say around 1895 to about 1910, was in every major international salon, He was also recognized throughout a number of publications. And this was a fellow named George Tingley. There will be an exhibition of his work in the coming year. Here is Tingley writing in his little memoirs that we found written on yellow, lined paper: "Selecting my life's work" (Laughs), if you're wondering what you've done in selecting your life's work, listen to this: "The inevitable recurring topic would bob up as to what

line or vocation, trade or business I would prefer to follow as a means of earning enough to enjoy the necessities as well as some of the pleasures of life. (laughter) Father was profoundly interested and anxious, so much so as to now and then suggest or question me on the subject. I did not know the answer. Evidently he had investigated many avenues of approach, in search of the right profession. He came home with his first selection and out of a clear blue sky asked, 'how would you like to become a boat builder?' It was a nice clean trade that paid three dollars per day,' the largest sum attainable at that time for ten hours labor. Quite true, but not for me, who had nothing mechanical in my make-up. A week later, he proposed the vocation of a locomotive engineer, as another high salaried position. Again I said no, telling him it was altogether out of the question, due to my inability to shovel seven tons of coal in a 65 mile run. (laughter) This labor was required of a fireman while studying to become an engineer. Again, it was an apprenticeship to learn the trade of a machinist. I said, 'Why dad, I cannot even sharpen a jack-knife correctly.' Finally, he came home bringing a half dozen photographs which had been copied from an old daguerreotype of one of our relatives by the local photographer' (who happened to be Scholfied who was doing copies of earlier work) 'I have had quite a long talk with the man who made these copies' (And I might add this is certainly not an honor to George Tingley because to become a photographer, even in the 1880s, was considered to be somewhat low on the totem pole, so finally in exasperation his father said, maybe this will work) 'I have had quite a long talk with the man who made these copies. Inquiring if he was willing to take you as an apprentice, and teach you the business, he said, yes, but under certain stipulations. What do you say? How do you feel about it, son? Slapping my hands together in joyous approval, I said, 'That is just exactly what I wish to be!' His probings had finally hit the nail so squarely on the head as to cause me to exclaim, 'Eureka! Selah! I have found it'" (laughs, laughter) Did you choose photography with such enthusiasm? (Laughs) The first conditions of the contract deal with the dates of duration: "My services were to begin (and here is the disappointing part, the punchline) "my services were to begin January 1, 1884 and continue for the term of a year. The reason: January was the dullerest month of the year. December was the busiest. The intervening months would give time for me to become more proficient and therefore of more assistance to him during the Holiday season, at which time it was most difficult to keep up with the Christmas rush. Second and final condition: I was to receive no pay for my services. My education must be considered as ample compensation. Did that scare me? Not on your life! I said, 'Ok, dad, if you can board and clothe me during that year.' It cost him, my board, lodging and 30 dollars worth of clothing to start me on my successful life work of 55 years at the same location, in my home village." And then he says, "The new year found me promptly on hand and anxious to assume such duties as were to be expected of one aspiring to become a photographer. I was shown a bucket of water and a mop (laughter) also carefully instructed in their use, in cleaning both the floor and the

windows. Though this menial task did not check up with my pleasant dreams of service, the boss commended my work and said he thought my chances of becoming an artist were excellent.” (laughter) Cleaning up the collodion and other residues, gelatin residues. Well, let’s look at some slides now because I’ve probably read too much already. I am going to go through these, I am not going to dwell on a great number of things, but just indicate some of the issues. I want to show you a series of portraits first and then develop a number of images from that point on. Now in this first photograph, this was taken...right at the turn of the century, around 1900, and here is our photographer, Everett A. Scholfield on the left, this is his brother Addison who also worked in partnership with him. This is the elder gentleman, the father. All of them had the name either Edwin, or Everett or Edgar and it becomes maddening so I’ll just simply say father rather than going through their actual identities. He began his practice as I said as a textile worker, he worked in a linen mill, and a cotton mill, and then gradually developed an interest in photography and taught his sons. This is Dell, who also became a partner but was not terribly capable at business enterprises. Next slide please. This is E. A. Scholfield in masonic regalia, this is a photograph which is an 8 x 10 portrait, it is a self-portrait, obviously, and it was taken in the 1860s period. And I think it is interesting to notice, I am sorry, this one is from the 1870s, there are a number earlier, but the idea that the masonic order was extremely important to a number of photographers, certainly in the east. And you will find on the roles, quite often those roles that identify professions, that photographers figure quite prominently. And he later became a grand master of the charity and relief lodge in Mystic, Connecticut. But this introduces something to us that is a typical sort of hallmark of earlier photography, that is showing an individual either in particular organizational regalia or out holding an instrument of occupation. Now most of you are familiar with this from the daguerreotypes of the earlier period, where occupational images figure as a very important aspect of self-identification. Also the importance of the figure being seen not candidly in natural terms but presented very much within the *en face*, or face to face view. The idea of direct confrontation. We might speak of, and I think that you would discover in the chronological entries here, that people tend to think of the photograph as confronting them as opposed to their confronting the photograph. And this is very consistent within most of the work of the period. Next please. Here are the three brothers in a stereoview and you can see Addison on the left, and Dell in the center, and E.A. in younger years, on the left. This is an image taken in the 1870s. Next please. The earliest work of Scholfield that we find, he obviously did daguerreotypes, we have correspondences, references and so on. But I don’t think this was much more than to indicate that these were daguerreotype copies of daguerreotypes, which was a business itself during the period. This is a portrait of his Aunt Martha... and you have something which is rather typical of the period, there is nothing astounding about the nature of the pose or the quality of the image. But it does establish this important issue

that I've already hinted at in terms of the masonic pose, this idea of direct confrontation, the frontal pose, an interest in the figure confronting us as though she were actually present to us, in fact. Here is E.A. just before he went to the Civil War, a handsome devil (laughter) I've always felt somewhat ashamed to think of moving these (?) because there is all the qualities and all the affects of the...But at any rate, this is a 16th plate ambrotype, and there are any number of these plates in which he records himself, I am sorry I don't have them with me today, where he shows his real enjoyment of natural life and so on. For example he has one with the flying squirrel falling on the shoulder of his coat and others with a cat in his lap, and so on. He has a strong interest not only in domestic creatures but also when he is in St. Croix with other animal life. Next please. Again, unusual, this by the way was terribly damaged when it was found because the collodion had not been shellacked or varnished, and as a result, when it was taken for cleaning it just powdered away on...It is very unusual, a rare photograph. And for those of you who are not aware of the attitudes that might be cultivated here, here a man working with a box-in-box camera, and there is definite documentation to confirm that this is a portrait of his mother that was developed in the 1862-63 period, at least we know basically in that period, he refers to it, and she is preparing cartes-de-visite, and you can see one right on the front of the table. She has the glue pot. The burnishing unit is tucked down beneath there, you can't see it, and she is putting the glue on and mounting the cartes-de-visite for her husband, E.A.'s father, and this is an unusual view, to take the action taking place, obviously posed, from over the shoulder as opposed to the idea of confronting her directly or having her hold the instruments or what have you. And he is prone to do this, it is a very radical departure from the typical convention of the portrait. And there are a number of images of this nature where he tries to find a view as we will see forthcoming in a number of them, that are quite unusual for the period of the 60s. Next please. The salt prints that he developed. And most of you know this is based in the Calotype process. The salt prints were quite popular during the late 50s and certainly into the 60s. These two happen to be made sometime between 1865 and 67. These images are definitely marked and signed by him and I would suggest to you that you could in this case, this is an interesting thing, we could use the phrase, could compete with Sedgewicks of New York, or other major portrait photographers of this particular period. However there is no problem of competition, I say again and this is typical, and much of what we have given accolades to is only because of its rarity in terms of what we are familiar with. We find out that a great deal of the work of Nadar, for example, and I hope this doesn't disturb some of you, but I think you should look again in a comparative sense, that a great deal of photography that is occurring in exactly the same period you will find that there is an extreme similarity. Next please. Some of the attitudes or the expressions, particularly in the portraits, with a strong sense of interest in the whole presentation of the fabric or the totally unembellished backgrounds. That you really do have a strong sense of the presence of a figure being articulated. Next

please. Here is a Scholfield with his sort of Mutt and Geoff, one of his earliest partners, C.D Holmes. Holmes looks like a tough hombre. But at any rate, they are shown posing together because this was used as one of the announcements for their own studio in Mystic, Connecticut when they were in partnership. Next please. We find a strain of experimentalism beginning to develop. Now again, this attitude, the idea of the anecdotal gesture beginning to introduce the narrative aspect, pointing to something, this was typical for Scholfield. I don't know of any other photographer who used this quite as deliberately as Scholfield other than the photographs of Hill and Adamson, in which they direct attention off the plane. And we might speak of this work as field oriented, and a great deal of his work has that same flavor...At the same time, next please, there was a strain of experimentalism: E. A. Scholfield means E. A. Scholfield. The idea of the composite occurring. And these images, most of these are taking place between the 1863 period and 1868 period. But you can see where the measure of blending has occurred throughout...into the center, and this idea of, it is a restrained attitude. It is not the composite in high art manner of European photography and I doubt if Scholfield would have even been aware of the high art photography that was occurring, particularly in Great Britain. Next please. Or that he would take this radical view, which I think predates people like Lee Friedlander and others who have used this as a definite way of viewing a face, the idea of looking over the shoulder and allowing this portrait to appear in the mirror, a very unusual attitude for a photographer working again in the 1860s. I would be welcome to discover...among hundreds of thousands of carte-de-visite images that too include this particular viewpoint. It occurs constantly in the painting of the period, I might add. Next please. Again the idea of, a slightly comic image, a man plays a juice-harp, a Civil War hat upon his head, and something that gives us the quality of a casual snapshot approach. Obviously posed, and it is formal, but it tends to state, in the 60s to the 70s period, and a number of his portraits this rather comical attitude. Let's see the next one, and I think it is just one example of ...but on the other hand, quite often they appear formally posed. Remember his masonic portrait of the same period. Here we have, next please, the kind of thing that the polychroming effect was introduced to enhance the photograph with color, often a single color. And you are certainly familiar with this not only in daguerreotypes but certainly ferrotypes and cartes-de-visite, a tinting to bring into viability or life, faces as well as gowns and so on. Or this again I would suggest to you the holding of the handkerchief is to represent something more casual, something that we start sensing the idea of, instead of the typically stiff-posed image, where one thing is pressed against the table and the holding of the handkerchief is more diaphanous against a more rigid pose and introducing something more casual in the work itself. Next please. (laughter) We have now found others of this particular genre with this idea of (laughter)...You like that one? I love this one. At first we thought this might be a bit of sarcasm about this man's identity but on the other hand we came to find out he was a very good friend of his. The idea of the

comic portrait was quite constant during the 60s and 70s. And again it shows this interest in the photograph as having the potential to be something that composes or brings together or synthesizes various realms of reality and to discover the possibilities of amalgamation that were not available in any other art, certainly not in the regional sense within our culture. In ferrotypes it becomes virtually classic. Now at this point in the 1870s, it happens that this one was taken in the late 1860s, we know primarily by costume and things like that. It could be taken anywhere between 1865 and 1872, but that he approaches a photography that begins to reflect influences of publications, whether we are speaking of *Wilson's Photographics* or *The St. Louis Photographer*, or what have you, we have recommendations that introduce the idea of triangulation, or circular posing, or of works that tend to establish schemas that underlie the arrangement of chairs or figures or other environmental forms. Scholfield never seems to take his lessons seriously, because he always does something, that even though he gets this extended, this triangulated structure, he tends to play with the flow of the costumes and you would have to see, and I am not exaggerating, the hundreds of examples to recognize how consistent this is, where he almost plays a pattern analysis that is already apparent within the clothes themselves or the chair backs or what have you. But tends to turn the figure away and have the face look back as opposed to having them completely in profile which was rather typical for this type of pose, the woman behind the chair, which is a convention of the period. Next please. Or the vignette portrait which had been common even from the Daguerreian period. He tends to use it...the isolated head...generally the vignetting is much more harsh where things move off more diaphanously, or smokily, it creates a kind of atmosphere out of which the figure emerges as opposed to having it vignetted in a harsh manner against the form. That is a ferrotype by the way, or a tintype as it was popularly called. Notice this next one, the typical pose, the woman is seated on the floor, and she is...by the chair, and he tends to project the furniture off the plane, again... he does this quite often, the chair being within the plane or even three-quarters within the plane, but having the forms spread laterally across the plane. Next please. In his travels to the Virgin Islands and other areas not only in New England, he begins to establish certain impulses that are typified by the anecdotal strain, for example, this is a picnic tableau, and I won't start uncovering, but there is an iconography that could be referred to, but it is a celebration of spring, and you find that he is trying to make at any rate what he *has* seen in publications, and that is the idea of the tableau vivant, or the high art presentation of figures. Next please. It is much better when he trusts his own instincts. This was taken, by the way his studio no longer exists, but this was taken from the original studio, the view looking down Gravel Street. And again, if not for the fact that he has innumerable photographs that show this unusual viewpoint and this kind of intersecting of planes, and a deliberate, almost not caring about the fact that the subject, which is Gravel Street, down here, is given any dramatic identification. There are a number of

examples, in his more casual photographs, those which he took for his own delight, in which he becomes virtually interested in abstraction and even makes intimations of it in his correspondences that we have. Next please. Here is a Civil War monument. I think this is interesting because accompanying this in the original stereo card, this was made for the Antietam burial ground in Maryland and it is made by Rhode Island Brass Works in Westerly, Rhode Island. And the sculpture is 26 feet high and is cut from a 60 ton block of stone. It is quite a commemoration. And this idea of recording and defining in the stereo image not only the artist at work and that is indeed the artist but also the attendant figures, and you will notice...leaning behind this support work in the background the figures in the background, but he chose to show everything as a portrait. Just to refer to in news or press reports that they are sitting for their portrait. Human beings are, the sculpture is, everything is conceived to be somewhat detached, or psychically detached from the idea of interpretation. Schofield is less interested in transformation than he is in what things look like. And obviously what the public wants to see. And particularly this idea of the factual record of things. Next please. He was quite a fisherman. And so as a result of a number of occasions of the hunt or fishing or what have you, he presents objects as if they had an innate value just by their presentation in stereo view. These were not the kinds of views he would typically mount and sell, but were the mementos of his own experience, and a great number of contemporary photographers have become interested in this idea of the presentation of objects that do not necessarily become inherently interesting, but simply presented objects placed on a table or what have you. Next please. Here is the iguana we heard about in the diary, you see again we are more interested in the presentation of the creature than in the idea of trying to use it for any other purpose than for that. Next please. A number of the images he did while in the Virgin Islands have an interest in this kind of corridor view, a strong perspectival view, whether in the landscape or within an architectural structure, and rather typifying the quality of images that we associate with the art of the 1870s, where you get this strong silhouetting identity against a raking perspective or landscape view. Next please. I think you see this sort of attitude where we see this grand rainforest and finally we discover the figure placed within the context of this marvelous bounty of nature. This was rather consistent within the development of his work, the figures are usually minuscule, very much not in what we might say in the grand manner of presentation of the portrait, but the landscape is far more powerful. Next please. And he was also interested in, again, in documenting certain events. Now you might not realize how really shocking this image is, but for women to be playing cards with men, and those wearing the hats and cigarettes to be displayed, and I love that dog in the foreground that wouldn't cooperate in holding still. But in this image that is known as the Raymond Group, again in the 1870s, we have a certain degree of a return to anecdotalism with his photography. But most of the work, next please, had to do with the use of, as you know, the different shaded lens on a larger format camera, let's say

like a 4 x 5 for an 8 x 10, and created this tondo effect that we see so consistently present in a number of photographers today. And a rather unusual (laughter) a masonic group: they are taken out on an ice flow in the Mystic River and he has presented them there because he wants the presentation of their uniforms and so on in a silhouetting effect... This sort of side by side, very subtle kind of identity. Next please. This is called... to your delight and attention, the mezzotinto process which included that slipping of the vellum between the negative and the albumen paper, and, next please, and we can see the effect, this is by the way, you might not think of it incredibly detailed, but you see the print itself looks burnished and has a slightly porcelain-ized effect and it is simply because of ...a lack of differentiation and focus. Next please. Here is the presentation of what becomes constantly present in *all* regional photography in the 19th century, particularly portrait photography. In the late 1860s, and I should say from the mid 1860s and certainly apparent right through the 70s, and then it becomes an insistent demand on the part of the public in the 80s and 90s, it is the retouched image. And Scholfield would offer his customers either/or: as you can see this lovely lady on the right, our right in this case, has been transformed into becoming even more ethereal and eternally beautiful on the left.

Side two:

...in the collodion or dry plate gelatin emulsion, and then of course this recalls that the light would basically scatter and refract and create this rather delicate effect. The interesting thing is that people were insistent upon this retouching method on the face, very seldom were the hands, you notice many are exactly the same, so this is somewhat of a dichotomy between the face and the hands themselves. Next please. It is a form of idealism. And yet, Scholfield tends to return to earlier prototypes, and some of these images that begin to occur in the 1880s are rather astounding in the sense that they are atypical of the period. He will use the painted backdrop which became present during the carte-de-visite period of the 1860's and extended right through the 70s and the 80s. But he generally suppresses it. The figures sit well out in front of it, they don't combine with it. He is more interested in the presentation of the figures, consistently documentary in the attitude of the work itself. Next please. Whether he is photographing three men... because by this point in the 1880s there was sufficient speed to be able to encompass this image, but a sign of the comradeship with the hand on the shoulder and all sorts of body gestures, from father to son, or for married couples, or what have you. But these figures, we know other things, we find out because in their lapels they have strings, that they are out of work. And obviously they had enough money to get their portrait taken and at this point it would cost them about 35 cents a piece to have this portrait made. And they might have used it in terms of trying to gain employment, because the string itself in the lapel suggests their need for employment. Next please.

Another standard thing, the apparent image of the nude male baby, which is, the nude male is quite unapparent in American photography I might add until the late 1890s, and certainly became an obsession during the 20s and 30s, particularly children. Or even with animals, children accompanied by their favorite toy, you see everything sits for a portrait of equal value. This is Mr. James Pugg and this was done somewhere around 1895. Next please. Or these two young men. There is a marvelous essay concerning early photography, it was written by...Rogers in Hartford, Connecticut, who talks about how gentlemen used to come in dressed in their best and insisted that their pictures be tops, and you will notice that, here they are as dressed in their best, a kind of leaning gesture, a sign of comradeship, There is even a...brace, you can see behind this it has nothing to do with an inability to be able to take the image, because of the slowness of the emulsion. It has to do with the slowness of the people and the feel of the people in having their image taken. And dutch braces and so on were part of the peripatetic instruments that people expected to be involved with during the development of their portrait and as a result he often used it. But you will notice their shoes are covered with dust, so that they are obviously workers who wanted to be elegant, and they are apparent against that rather simple background for most of the cabinet photographs of the period. Next please. This is an astounding image because there are a number of images of, now we almost want to say haha, progenitor for a precursor for a Diane Arbus. It is not the case at all. People were not embarrassed about by even their blindness or their disfigurements, or their missing fingers, or arms, or what have you. There are a number of images in which Schofield photographs again, with equal value, any number of figures either with handicaps or not. But again, young adults generally appear within a more dramatic landscape setting, such as the paper mache rock and other forms that were introduced into the landscape itself. However, (laughter) again we have this pointing effect, this happens to be Mr. Maynard, with revolver and girl pointing. This one we have the title...but again, I want you to think it terms, here is a work done in 1896. That is very late, obviously. However, most of the cabinet images occurring in the 1890s, most were influenced by pictorialist interests. There is a tendency not to be emphatic, not to define the person in the image with clarity. And Schofield seems to still try to get the participants involved and defining somewhat the photographs suggesting not just the image of the persons contained within that frame, but they are involved in a world, a milieu in which they are partaking part in. As you point to a bird, he shoots, or a false lover, or whatever it may be. Next please. James..leads the sound...of Old Lyme, Connecticut, and postulates on a certain passage of the stock market, although that is the reverse side of that paper...it is not clear enough to read the page, but we can read the headlines. And this was done in 1894. And again, pointing and suggesting that he is giving information to an audience as it were. Next please. An acrobat stands before us in a completely anonymous environment. But again, this is rather typical of the period. The formal setting, the formal interior as opposed to the landscape backdrop. And when

this was introduced to the cabinet period, it was the expectation of people to pose in that setting, whether it had anything to do with their identity or not. Here we have the occupational image because of the acrobat's costume, and we have the typical public interest in the formal interior setting. Next please. Here is Florence Fengar. It is interesting to find that certain people have influences from their progeny. Florence Fengar was photographed multiple times in her fancy dress. It is a dress for costume presentation. She was a dancer, but it was typical of ladies at parties and so on during the 80s and 90s, this happened to be done in the mid-90s, 1895, to wear such dresses to major social events. And she is having herself presented with a fan. And we find some ten years later, a photograph with her daughter in a dress very similar and a similar pose, and we find her occurring ten years later with another daughter. There is a repetition of type that appears throughout time. The pugilist, again, looking somewhat absurd against that backdrop, but again I suggest to you...the prints from the original glass plate negative, so as a result these would have originally been masked off, you wouldn't get the backdrop exposed above and below the...but the important thing is that it is the choice of the pugilist to choose that backdrop. It still tends to pull the figure forward. Next please. Again it is to me, as in this sailor in the early 1900s, or the next one, a family portrait, where he tends to start, I particularly like this because this child is refusing to take seriously the solemnity of his portrait as you can see by making that face, and Scholfield tends to, and we find in a number of portraits where instead of avoiding this, he would save such images, there would be duplicates, the one that the family obviously wished which we know from the record books what the family purchased, and those in his own collection because he was delighted by the idea of the person not obeying what we might call the objectivity of the moment. Or this, where figures with utter solemnity, then out of the midst of this wonderful group of smiles and faces...a strange moment, and yet we find in a number of images he values this kind of attitude, these people are behaving in a way expected to behave in a late 1880s portrait. And the other one is indeed enjoying the delight of having her picture taken and seems to indicate that by this wonderful smile. Next please....strange images of early immigrant groups, and street cleaners, and wine makers, and they pose in inexplicable gestures, you would really have to know what is going on and I would be delighted to know, obviously they are musicians and one holds a bottle to be tapped or what have you...again in the studio and the formal portrait showing figures with their occupational regalia or is some kind of celebrational or ritual kind of identity. Next please. He also photographed a number of very interesting people from the period. This is called *Mrs. Muck and Friend*. And there are two other negatives in which she is referred to as Mrs. Muck and the second figure as you obviously would recognize as a male, and he has a beard by the way because we have the full face image, and it is called *Mrs. Muck and the Other One*. And whether or not it is an example of transvestism it makes no difference. It became valued and respected simply by the fact that people wanted their

portrait. And he tends to do this portrait in the grand manner which became rather typical in the late 1890s with frames. And then of course this would be printed down to the edge so that you would get it almost as a portrait within a portrait. Next please. The great portraits...return to the effects that occurred in the salt prints of the 60s and 70s. In the late 90s Scholfield tends to dismiss the backdrop, and we also note that this was extremely unpopular with his clientele...the confirmation is not in correspondence in this case, but certainly in terms of the evidence of his work. He is at this time working in New London. He had ample money. He had ample facilities to include the backdrop but he refuses to and presents us with these remarkable images of children or of other adults...with unadorned backgrounds. Next please.

Question from the audience: What type of lighting was used?

Basically skylighting. Even in the New London studio, he never used gaslight or any other kind of artificial illumination. He worked in a skylit studio even through 1913. And still used, even in the Scoville camera, he never used an automatic lens or shutter, he still had it capped. But he kept the simplest procedures throughout the entire development of this work. Here for example in this portrait of E. C. Peck, done in the 1900s: a very elegant, remarkable return to an example of portraiture, a return to the same paradigms we saw in the salt prints of the 60s. Next please. Or Mrs. Wiggins. We forget, most people rifle through cabinet photographs and don't realize they are not looking at the richness, the wonderful chocolate color of an albumen print, and they tend to dismiss the realization that many of these portraits are truly magnificent to compete in terms of portraiture, with any other major photographs that you have seen that are more auspiciously recognized. Next please. A whole host of Orientals and ethnic types...A.D. Birch... the idea of the articulation of the gloves, or occasionally there is a kind of poignancy to the way he approaches their image, again the large Scoville camera, he tends to come close to the forms, he tends to, and by the way I might add that in most of these there is some retouching but it is less amplified than we saw in that comparative portrait of the woman and in all those portraits I've shown you up to these the retouching is quite severe. There is a much more reflective sense in the person present to us and the original identity of that person. Next please. Isn't this a marvelous little...It is interesting in this photograph, if many of you like this I'd like to know your response, because this is one that was purchased by the Museum of Modern Art and also by Rudolph Arnheim and a host of people keep responding to this image. Every time they see this in the exhibition, I keep wondering why. I enjoy it myself, but he begins to use a pose with throw rugs and so on where the figure again projects forward and leans against it. So that the face is brought out in terms of the progressional scale, the face becomes quite large and the body recedes from it. He even does this in adult portraits as well. Next please. A lovely young lady, but again the whole point I am trying

to get across, he dismisses the idea of the embellishment of a background or of accompanying articles. Even the chair itself is usually a simple stool...and in fact it actually is a part of the opposing chair, but he doesn't allow the accouterments or the studio furnishings to interfere in these grand portraits of the late 1880s and through the 1890s. Next please. In his landscape work, and I want to go through these rather rapidly. This was done in Putnam, Connecticut. Scholfield was a peripatetic photographer, that is he had to move wherever the money was. And if a mill town developed, as did Putnam in the 1870s, he too moved there because indeed people would have money and would want their pictures taken. And we have in a number of images a record of events... which is one of the more rewarding aspects in discovering what happens to environments and so on. I know that my wife and I would be able to discover, we would walk all through this area virtually a hundred years later and finding the remnants of this form that was originally there in Putnam, Connecticut, and I had been looking for where possibly this church was located for years, and then of course we discovered where it is, and when you know that this was the site...it is thrilling. This is St. Mary's Church in Putnam, Connecticut. And it was consecrated November 24, 1870, and this was done in the 1872/73 period...and this was one of the most elegant churches in the entire state of Connecticut for its time. Most of the interior work was works, paintings, and other types of metalwork and sculptures that were brought in from Europe. And it was quite noted in this period. Next please. But it burned on February 6, 1875, as you can see it only lasted for five years and here is the burned ruin itself and then it shows, in the background here, another wooden church that was constructed to replace it temporarily while the new structure that now stands on the site was developed. But in these large scale 8 by 10 or even larger collodion plate negatives, we have again a confirmation with an interest in the detached view. It is as though the burned church sits for its portrait. It is not so, it was not a commission, it wasn't a record for journalistic files or what have you. I think again it was his interest in an environment and recording the changes that occurred in that environment. Next please. Here again there is a definite anecdotal quality, here, in the cathedral school that was associated with the church, you can see the wooden struts in the background, the later Greek later than the church itself, here you see the burning of the church over here, and he is indicating the convent or the convent school, St. Mary's School. And here we have two nuns, I mean a nun here and two here, and this one is going to apply to enter the convent standing to the right where she is waiting to be admitted...and here is the Father Legion, as he was known, standing here to receive the new novitiate. Then of course we have...standing, and behind the folds in the background. The whole series of these images are really quite wonderful...these photographs, and it is typical, you would associate these certainly with the photographs of the 60s, 70s, and 80s, landscape photographs, with the American exploration of the west, the geographical explorations and so on. And yet in the east, most of the landscapes were cabinet scale, and we are

talking about anywhere like 5 x 7 inches or 4 by 6 inches or what have you. This happens to be 3 and $\frac{7}{8}$ inches by 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ inches and it is a typical record of a sermon at a shipyard in Mystic, Connecticut. And at the noon hour they would break and they would have their lunch and then of course they were forced into (laughs) an insistent prayer group activity by the owner of the shipyard itself, who happens to be Deacon Palmer standing...right here...This is a type of event within the landscape, which is typical of the period. Next please. Or views of disasters. This is in Pawtucket, Rhode Island, and you have a view of a flood that took place in the 85/86 period. Next please. Another view of the same thing. And we have this kind of attitude: in other words, there is very little...work in the American west that tends to be quite as interested in documenting specific events in regional areas. They were more based in wilderness images because that was the purpose of the exploration itself. But here the daily event, the daily disasters, the daily activities, were constantly recorded and sold as views of: Pawtucket and vicinity, Mystic and vicinity...A virtual record of the periods in which we are involved. Next please. One of the most remarkable examples of, again, this return to the tondo effect is in portraits of new persons in town or new figures or new developments that occurred. Let me read you just one entry from a newspaper and you can see the kind of interest that people had in photographs: this accompanies this photograph... this was taken in 1868, this photograph, and this is a notice that we found in the Mystic Pioneer, a publication and newspaper of 1868: "We see that William S. Grant of the Mystic Bakery has come out this week with a handsome new wagon, built expressly for a new firm in New London. It is of a... style of those usually seen but much more convenient and certainly more ornamental. On one half side a sheaf of wheat and the other half is taken up with the name, William S. Grant, Mystic Bakery. Believing that thing worth doing at all should be done well, Mr. Grant has dressed his horse with an elegant silver-mounted harness. The workmanship, which is admired by all who examine it, manufactured by E.H. Paine of this place who by the way has made several splendid sets of harness lately both double and single. Altogether, the turnout is a fine one and is a credit to both the makers and the owner." This interest in the factual evidence of a new person, a new event, a new artistry, a new wagon, whatever it may be. This veritable record of the day to day events that were taking place in a community which Scholfield appreciates and defines, and this was not used or purchased by Mr. Grant, it was simply because he was interested in the silver harnessing and the...style itself. Next please. Stone and rock pulling equipment...You might have wondered often how all these stones were removed out of Connecticut and Rhode Island, Appalachian fault residue, but basically this is how they were removed, by these gigantic pulleys, and they talk about them having ten-ton power, which is basically oxen, and they could basically lift a rock that was eight feet in diameter and they were developed by a man name V. W. Packer, and once again a photograph taken of earth moving equipment in the 1870s. His architectural forms tend to define... and it is not an interest in the figures who are

standing in front of the building but a documentation that would occur with greater consistency, let's say the impulse that moved Atget also moved regional photographers to record every aspect of the architecture in their environment. Here in the 1865/66 period he photographs the Exchange Building in Washington, Connecticut and he also documents the meeting hall of Washington Hall that appears on the second floor. Or next...the Hoxie House Hotel, a major center of the commercial district in Mystic, Connecticut. Or next, the Merchant's Building. He not only gets the old wooden floor bridge which allowed them to cross the Mystic to the Stonington side, he photographs the Academy School and the Merchant's Building here. Next please. In most of these works that appear in the period...this one is rather remarkable (laughter)... this is an example, and Scholfield began to work with this camera less on a higher tripod, and began to work on a small bench...that he would move around, it had rollers on it, or wheels like on a cart, and that is where you get some of these unusual views. They are less at a distance and they are less either above or below but just sort of right on eye level. And we have some of the early commercial buildings, the opera house and other commercial buildings, and the newer Fennel bridge in this particular image. And the liberty pole that was erected in the 1860s to fly the standards of the community as well as New England. This is the Nathan G. Fish and Company Chandlery, or supply store, and you have Bark Caleb Haley...taken in the 60s again...this was taken in 1866, and the ship almost a year later off the coast of Mexico. It is a rather dramatic image of him recording the event and the activities of the period, not just, it is not commissioned work, although some were from the fishermen to record his own shipbuilding precincts but also the vessels that he served. But predominantly because Scholfield simply enjoyed the life and activities of his own environment. Here again is, I mentioned this before, his move toward abstraction: we have now discovered other material to confirm this. It was an intuition before but now I can say it safely. These were found wrapped in newspaper that was dated 1883. And then we found further evidence of a definite statement by Scholfield about how much he was interested in photographing slow views, and that I enjoy the idea of not only working with more or less panoramic...and don't think about the panoramic camera but grand space views, and then moving close into the forms. Here are three that were found together as a sequence: we move from a stereo view rather terribly damaged... Next please. Then he moves closer and starts becoming almost interested in the sculptural configurations until finally in the third one, which is an extraordinary image, he becomes interested virtually in what I'll call for want of a term, a Weston-ian identity of configurations, or if you want to refer to someone even later. But there are a number of images we found very recently that have this very close view and where they are... abstract: they tend to simplify the world down to pattern configuration. It was again, instinctual. Which might suggest more about the fact that one doesn't need to be tutored to recognize such interests, but that they can obviously delight any eye if one is sensitive enough to be able to see them. Next please. The typical cabinet

photograph was...on a small scale size...and yet there was certainly a grandeur to be achieved in the landscape and normally in more intimate views: fishing spots, watering holes, and they have a more bucolic sense, none of the grandeur of the Western views of large mammoth plate views. Next please. You will see this, even with the isolable forms. How they are reminiscent of someone even like Henry Wessel, when we think of the idea of photographing something that is not pre-organized or predetermined with such strong emphasis upon compositional integrity or relationships of pattern or organization of planes, but simply allows us to view two trees and a rock-filled landscape. Next please. Generally this is the case, with most of his grander views of landscapes. This happens to be a large-scale work, mammoth for Scholfield would have been 8 x 10 or around 12 x 14 glass plates, but in grand views of the countryside surrounding Mystic or other areas where he was located. Generally the introduction in many of these works...a single figure to give us a sense of scale, harking back again, you remember our figure standing in the rainforest, at the edge of the rainforest, to give a sense of scale to the grandeur of this Pequot Avenue. It is the road to New London from Mystic image, or again...the figure standing in the environment here, the sheep, and the dog running across the yard there. This interest in various stages...you could block this off the top of this off and you could have a virtual Fred Sommer in terms of the tapestry effect, in the interest of layer upon layer, of stratification or a screen against the foreground and then events taking place within the structure of the plane itself. So in that case they have a grandeur, but it is still more intimate. It is someone's farm or place, someone's world that can be named and identified. Next please. Or again his brother Addison standing on the old town road of New London, shows us a sense of scale and you have the idea of the figure somewhat isolated in the world that is defined. Next please. There is a typical image that many of us associate with Michael Lesy's Wisconsin Death Trip, and Scholfield also had his commercial trade in posthumous portraits of children and adults as well as photographs of things like funeral flowers. Stands of commemorative, whether celebrating events like a graduation or the death of someone. But this idea of bringing the units into the studio and photographing them as a memorial to the life that was no longer present with the community. Next please. Or the trial run of a new sandbagger sloop developed in this tondo portrait is a rather, they are exquisite to us but we have to keep in mind in regional photography, they are primarily a kind of celebration of the world that was around one, on its own terms, without anyone trying to rise and transform it. Next please...I think it is interesting, it is almost ironic, when we think about much of the development of photography today, we forget, and I think a typical example in the recently discovered Mike Disfarmer...Arkansas portraits, in which an individual working in isolation without the influence of developments in photography and the grander national scene, can still work with a direct frontality using certain conventions that extend really from the turn of the century right into the later 20th century. He was working between 1939 and 1946. Next please. Disfarmer, as

eccentric as he may have been, was satisfied simply with this striped taped wall and the figure standing directly in front of it. Many of you have seen Julia Scully's celebration of this regional photographer's work. Proving again, and obviously, that there are countless thousands of other photographers who were working in this naive and ingenuous, plain and simple manner. Next please. In our own time...here is another example of one of Scholfield's dramatic, anecdotal images; he passes occasionally in the 1900s this kind of presentation. In our time, he does it again though, almost as a conceit, a personal interest, a delight, without trying to gloss it off as a commercial attitude or what have you. Next please. In our own time, interesting composite portraits or composite images, think of Jerry Uelsmann: you can go through these, Keith, at your own rhythm and I'll keep up with you. (laughs) I talk very fast... Where units which seem to have no apparent relationship are brought into relationship in the interest of perhaps finding out, for after all, underneath it is the idea of poly-synthesizing, bringing together disparate aspects of the world to delight our eye. In the work of Diane Arbus. We have a return to this frontal presentational New York teenage couple. Next please. Or the twins, which impress themselves upon us, it is astounding, as a kind of radical posture, in reality they are following one of the most established conventions within the entire history of photography: the en face presentation. Or Elaine Mays, the Haight-Ashbury portraits, I've just selected a few of these to give the drift of the idea. But again where nothing is over embellished. The figures stand against... they appear centrally within the plane. There is no attempt to psychologically interpret their identities and yet we tend to project upon them all sorts of psychology. When in reality they are standing before us as presentational figures. Next please. Obviously, or Nathan Lyons. A great deal of the imagery in Notations in Passing as well as the ones of the earlier period appear to present unusual architecture without embellishment in a plain, frank, and simple direct manner. Next please. Emmet Gowin. I think these are less like snapshots and I am a very close friend of his and we have discussed this on many occasions and I thought it was obscene to have his work included in the snapshot issue of Aperture because there may be a casualness that we associate with the snapshot but what is more important there is a sort of grand manner of direct presentation. Here the gentleman of the icehouse who sculpts, basically, tinted Santa Clauses, that is the ice tinted with Kool-aid or other dyes. Or sailing vessels on the capital letter C. This marvelous sense of figures being associated with some object or some form of their identity and presented in a very plain and direct manner. They don't tend to overdevelop the issues. Next please. Edith pregnant. Next please. The three sisters. Next please. The presentation of the child. Next please. The tondo image of the slaughter area for the pig with the bleeding area. Or the back of the house, again presented with the interest in the innate appearance of the basketball or the other elements within the, or the windows or the television antennae or what have you. Next please. Or the interior of the compound home in Virginia. Or Edith as Santa Claus at Christmas time with the dogs in the foreground. Or

Les Krims, in presenting obviously with the absurd intent and with something that would arrest our eyes being rather preposterous, so this woman spraying this organic poison against her yard (laughs) there are a few things funny...but it tends to look like a state of decay (laughter) But again, surprisingly enough...Les, by his own admission, has been terribly influenced by the tableau images of the 1870s, and cartes-de-visite images of the 60s and the 70s. Those that set up scenes, and again he is following an impulse that is rather typical of regional photography in the 19th century. Next please. Figures in their various occupations. He knows exactly what he is doing historically. It is surprising how people are disturbed by the deerslayers or by the littlest people in America. He is really dealing with no more than the idea of confirming, as does Neil Slavin, the identities that people make with their own life or occupation or personal urgencies. Or Murray Riss. Who tends, like in the portrait of the iguana or Scholfield's many images, stereoview of a seashell on the table, or a flower on a table, or a simple fern in a vase: objects that are presented because we should be attentive to their identity. Murray for example often plays a marvelous, I think, it is a wonderful, recapitulative presentation, which shows you that the leaf is recapitulated in their presentation on the grass. But again it is a very simple form of organization. It doesn't have to depend upon radical transformation in order to sponsor visual interest. Next please. Or having figures stand again in a straight line or a curved line or what have you. In this case, Murray is making a comment on the typical, standard, 19th century portrait by having the figures move their heads. And it is as though humans can now get away with what dogs could in an earlier period. (laughter) Next please. Again, this very disarming, neutral, detached, non-cycligizing (?) non-forced presentation of fact. Next please. Tom Barrow in his *Pink Stuff* series, very early. Whether you can follow this through, his pastiches on Henry Fox Talbot, the library images, and things of that nature. But, even the box stereo view. And again what to me is most important about these is not only the fact that they are in essence suggestive of the coloring of the photograph from an earlier period, but they show an historian's eye for the interest in inconsequential subject matter. Subject matter that does not have within its own structure any innate interest or is not forced to become interesting by virtue of its silhouette features, or the planes, or its tactility, but simply the idea of grass or trees against a rather conventional suburban home. Next please. Or particularly what we find in this mis-term, New Topographics. But this detached and neutral view of the landscape and of the world which many people find shocking today. I think what you are really finding shocking is that the world is there after all and that it need not be transformed. But that it is basically offering up its information as in the work of individuals such as Robert Adams, as you see here in this subdivision street in California done in 1973. It is very similar to that same attitude Scholfield developed, looking directly down a perspectival view, seeing the architecture, not trying to comment upon it, not offering it as a social document, but basically respecting the fact that it is there, and then finding an inherent interest in that fact. You see it in Joe Deal's work...

He and John McWilliams to me seem to be the supreme (laughs) masters at neutral detachment and yet we would never expect it. McWilliams seems to be interested in romanticism and Deal interested in...an almost real estate view, a realtor's view, but in reality there is a kind of grandeur that appear in both works that simply states a sense of detachment, a sense of removal from involvement within the image as in this work from Albuquerque in 1974. Next please. Or Frank Gohlke. As you could say of a number of color photographers, whether you take your choice of Eggleston or whether you want to deal with Stephen Shore's work, or Larry Miller's, but again this interest in things as they are presented innately as opposed to the way the camera or the photographer's vantage point transforms them. Next please. John Schott of the series of Route 66 motels, 1973. Again this idea of the presentation of form without embellishment, without alteration or transformation. Next please. And finally, Henry Wessel's images of the 70s where you get this...sense of...the object for its own sake, the presentation of materials, that for the photographer is innately interesting. Despite the fact that we find it very difficult to suggest that there is any pictorial schema, or any pictorial identity that measures the psychology even of the photographer or tries to transform, if you will accept this in quotes, the psychology of the world. Things are seen as they are, they are valued for what they are, and this is indeed what the regional photographers of the 19th century, and I would say virtually, collectively was concerned with keeping things kit as they are seen. Thank you. (applause)