And even I can remember

A day when the historians left blanks in their writings,

I mean for things they didn’t know.

—Ezra Pound, Cantos XII
ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a material culture analysis of vernacular photographic artifacts that were incorporated into the devotional culture of nineteenth-century religious Americans. Rather than focusing exclusively on the visual content of early photographs to determine whether or not they constituted a “religious” archive, I am attentive to the practices of preservation and display that contributed to circumstances of encounter. In several instances it is a study of religion in photography, but my interests are ultimately much broader than the compositional frame of any given photograph. Theological, devotional, liturgical, and skeptical discourses thus emerge less as compositional directives than as interpretive contexts. Likewise, as a category of analysis rather than a category of collectible, in this dissertation the terminology of the vernacular refers to the photographic artifacts that Americans most commonly encountered through the course of their daily affairs, specifically studio portraiture, memorial photographs, halftone reproductions, stereographs, and, at the end of the century, consumer generated snapshots arranged into albums and scuttled through the mail.

This art historical interest in the vernacular is considered alongside recent historiographic interest in the quotidian among historians of American religion, a field which, not incidentally, has also become increasingly committed to material culture analysis. By identifying a historiographic association between lived religion, everyday practices, and material artifacts, this dissertation works to interrogate notions of indexicality freighted in historical analysis. American religionists’ converging interest in the quotidian and in material culture, not surprisingly, echoed similar movements in other disciplines, including sociology, history, art history, literature, and area studies. In many respects located at the crossroads of these disciplinary concerns, my
dissertation contributes to this broad scholarly interest by providing an attentive consideration of the relationships that historians, especially, posit between material culture, on the one hand, and, on the other, the accessibility of human experiences via the artifacts that inhabited their subjects’ tactile worlds. During the nineteenth century, arguably no other cultural medium in the United States was more charged than photography, and no other arena of human life more contested—or more fervently defended—than religion. By placing these two areas of inquiry in deliberate conversation through cultural historical analysis, my dissertation works to provide one place wherein scholars of any number of specializations can begin to think critically about the relationships between material artifacts, photographic representation, and religious experiences.
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OF ATTICS AND ARCHIVES

METHOD AND SCOPE IN THE STUDY OF VERNACULAR ARTIFACTS
AND AMERICAN RELIGION

In the sizzle of late August 1862, twenty-two year old Walter Jones enlisted in Company C of the 8th New York Calvary—known among locals as the Rochester regiment—in Smithville, New York. As he put his affairs in order and packed the few belongings that he would take with him—a book or two, perhaps, some writing paper, and maybe a small likeness of his wife, Lola—his stepmother gave him a small New Testament to carry with him throughout his service. He also sat for a photographer. Although he could not have known it then, the Testament and the likeness would together become defining elements in narrating his life story some forty years later.

The year before Jones was born, news from Europe had arrived that detailed advances made in the decades-long quest to secure “images from life.” Although the technique attributed to Louis Jacque Mande Daguerre was hardly the only method of securing such images, it quickly became the most commercially viable in the United States. Daguerre’s method utilized a careful alchemy of chemical solutions to fix single-exposure, inverted negative images on burnished plates of silvered copper and resulted in highly reflective images that were so sensitive to touch that they had to be preserved in a protective casing. It was into this newly mirrored world that Walter Jones, like so many of his fellow recruits, drew his first breath. By the beginning of the
1860s, the daguerreotype had been succeeded by other techniques, including ambrotypes (negatives on glass), tintypes (negatives on thin sheets of iron), and albumen prints (positives on paper). Jones’s framed half-length portrait appears to be a tintype—the most common form of portraiture in the field because of its durability and relative simplicity—although it may have been an ambrotype, which, when fitted against a dark felt matting threw the image into view.¹

In his enlistment portrait, Jones sits in front of a painted background of the Union standard waving above his left shoulder, legs crossed, clasping his left fist around the hilt of his saber and resting his right hand on his right knee. His comportment in this portrait was most likely informed as much by the lengthy exposure times of the tintype method, which could be up to thirty seconds in imperfect lighting (still quite instantaneous by previous standards), as any calculated message of authority or studied resolve.² In many respects, Jones’s portrait is not unlike thousands of others produced of Union and Confederate soldiers in the early years of the American Civil War. What is remarkable about his portrait is the mode in which it was both displayed and preserved. In September 1899, thirty-five years after he was mustered out of the Union army, Jones secured a copyright of his likeness, now an albumen print of the original framed photograph and entitled “A Testament” by depositing two copies with the Library of Congress.³
Making photographs of photographs was not unheard of in the nineteenth century; in fact, it was quite commonplace for portrait sitters to hold and to wear likenesses of departed or otherwise displaced loved ones. In the print of Jones’s portrait, however, the earlier image was not held by another sitter but was used to stand in for Jones himself, whose uniformed likeness was now surrounded by a tattered New Testament and two discharged bullets. In 1899 Jones was still living, but the decision to have his photographic likeness stand in for himself reflected contemporary understandings of photographs as corporeal surrogates of the departed and material disclosures of the intangible. In a sense, then, as much as it was an authenticating measure of his presence and participation in the hellish war, the likeness was also a memorial of Jones’s former self, a tactile proxy of now-discarnate flesh. The accompanying caption, printed below the assembled artifacts, told of how Jones “carried this little Testament in my blouse pocket” during the war and how “in two battles” it “saved my live from bullets,” once at Cedar Creek, Virginia, in 1864, the other at Appomattox in 1865. Although we know little of the circumstances surrounding the assembly and circulation of this undated print—was it commissioned? were there additional copies?—what is clear is that Jones’s portrait, the disfigured scriptures, and the mangled bullets all worked together to authenticate the soldier’s narrative of divine intervention through the marvel of print photography. In short, the photograph had become Jones’s new testament.

As both icon and relic—that is, as a coded image that underscored and invited recognition of its materiality—Jones’s portrait gestures to the wider archive of vernacular photography that this dissertation examines. Vernacular photographs evade precise definition, as I will discuss momentarily, but in general they were the kinds of photographs most likely to be encountered during the daily course of events rather than in museums or specialized exhibits. In
this dissertation three of the four chapters are materially related to bibles. Such moorings are certainly not requisite for the study of vernacular photography in American religious history. But after a good deal of resisting my sources, I eventually released the reigns. Nevertheless, throughout the chapters I have taken care not to write a history of photography in bibles (in which the former is subordinated to the analytical compass of the latter) but rather a history of photography and bibles as cultural artifacts that just so happen to have had very meaningful intersections during the nineteenth century. For instance, High Private Jones’s gospel, much like that within the tattered pages of the volume gifted by his stepmother decades earlier, testified
both to presence and absence, to events transpired and to anticipated futures—to borrow a
different idiom, it was both genealogy and prophecy. As the chapters in this dissertation
demonstrate, inherent in the medium of photography for much of the nineteenth century was an
expectation of continued presence, despite the vagaries, limitations, and corruptions of flesh.
Simultaneously here and there, past and present and future, photography provided a particularly
adept metaphor for nineteenth-century Christianity, which was also accustomed to slipping
between seemingly fixed points in time—indeed, for many religious Americans, the biblical past
had a habit of shaping their present.

But photographs were more than metaphors of Americans’ tendency to finagle time and
space. As tactile artifacts embedded in circuitous systems of production, circulation, acquisition,
beholding, preservation, and display, photographs constituted a vast material archive that has yet
to be considered by historians of American religion as objects of inquiry. The flood of pictures
produced by cameras, chemicals, metals, and papers—not to mention countless human hands—
did not, of course, replace or even challenge the place of the bible for most Protestant and
Catholic Americans. Yet just as importantly neither did they threaten sacred truths or prompt
considerable angst about the state of religion in the modern world. Rather, photography was by
and large embraced by religious Americans throughout the nineteenth century. To be sure, there
were doubtless naysayers who shuddered at the theological implications of the new technology.
But what is remarkable is that, in a country with such a strikingly religious character—“the
religious atmosphere of the country,” recalled Alexis de Tocqueville in 1833, “was the first thing
that struck me on arrival in the United States”—such opposition was such a minority that it is
difficult to find in surviving sources.5 In his influential study of the daguerreotype in the United
States, Richard Rudisil recounts a scathing article published in the Leipziger Anzeiger shortly
after news of Daguerre’s invention reached the German province. “Wanting to hold fast to transitory mirror-pictures is not only an impossibility,” the article scoffed, “but even the wish to do so is blasphemy. Man is created in the image of God, and God’s image cannot be captured by any man-made machine.” Given the immense popularity of daguerreian portraiture in the United States, however, it seems that Americans were far more ready to reconcile any similar qualms with the marvel of nature’s pencil and the security of their own visages.

As a material culture investigation of vernacular photography and nineteenth-century American religion, this dissertation works to unpack these entangled narratives of technological marvel and religious devotion. By taking seriously the photographs that graced peoples’ tabletops and walls, adorned their bodies, illuminated darkened auditoriums, and stared back from albums, in other words, I also throw into relief the error of historical narratives that see in the advance of technology the retreat of religion. Fortunately, in this respect, I am in good company with many historians of religion who have challenged such narrative arcs in a variety of historical and cultural contexts. But studying photography, and especially the visual habits of beholders, also demands critical assessment of the motifs of presence and absence that are commonly folded into analytics of the quotidian and the material.

Scholars of religion have recently begun to reevaluate historical models that mounted their analysis within a modernist interpretive framework that had itself been defined as a clear-headed corrective to so many “presences”—visual, aural, and otherwise. Defining modernity in cahoots with religious “invisibility,” to use Sally Promey’s term, chokes out interpretive space for nineteenth-century religious Americans, in particular, who were simultaneously self-consciously modern and unquestionably devout—albeit the measure of devotion was hardly a standard yard. Photography was just one of the ways in which modern people using modern
technologies used them to substantiate (and, just as often, create anew) ancient truths. Another way of approaching the matter is to recognize with Leigh Schmidt that “modernity has turned out to be not so modern after all.”\textsuperscript{8} The analytical focus of this dissertation on photographs as material artifacts embedded within familiar networks of production, circulation, and display, however, raises additional questions about the relationships between presence and absence in American religious history. “A book is not an exhibit,” writes historian Laurel Thatcher Ulrich. Words cannot display texture or heft nor can they “replace the subtle measurements our bodies make as we look up or down upon things.” Even tactile records pose significant limitations for historians. But this does not mean that objects are weak historical documents: “a book about objects might move through the cluttered rooms of nineteenth-century memory and the ordered galleries of twentieth-century scholarship into that dimly seen and never fully realized space we call history, giving us blood and greed as well as beauty, exhibiting things that did not get saved.”\textsuperscript{9} In addition to affirming that the drumbeat of American progress (of which the photograph was a primary synecdoche) did not silence religious devotion—it is this sense of presence that is most clearly engaged in the chapters that follow—in this introduction I also want to consider what the criteria of presence and absence are for scholars of religion who have embraced material culture and lived religion, in particular, as more reliable avenues to the lived worlds of nineteenth-century American religion.

My focus on visual habits refers, in a broad sense, to the range of expectations informed by prior experiences as well as the more subtle structured relationships between artifacts and beholders.\textsuperscript{10} In this sense, it is related to scholarly discussions of “technologies,” a rather dense analytical field cogently defined by Judith Weisenfeld as the “legitimating mechanisms that help structure our lives in public and material ways as well as in more subtle and veiled ways of
which we are sometimes hardly aware.” In this sense, photographic techniques were certainly technologies in both the mechanistic and culturally-attuned valences. A primary focus on technologies, however, can deflect attention from the people engaged in acts of beholding. The language of visual habits, pedestrian though it may be, is intended to straddle the dual emphasis on technologies of perception—religious, racial, and otherwise—and circumstances of beholding. Moreover, rather than parceling “religious” artifacts in a separate inventory, in which this a priori categorization influences subsequent analysis, I am attentive to the ways in which visual habits traversed, undercut, and intersected numerous fields of knowledge, reflection, and practice. What did people see when they held up a daguerreotype likeness, rocking it back and forth until the image surfaced on the mirrored plate? What did they see when they pressed their forehead into the wooden frame of a stereoscope, gripped the handle in one hand, and relaxed their vision until, miraculously, Jerusalem emerged before their eyes in seemingly three-dimensional relief? Did a photograph recall a single moment or an entire life, or perhaps the sum of many? Were portraits about remembrance only, or were they also about expectation? A Communion of Shadows takes these questions and more as starting points for a reevaluation of the relationship between everyday practices—seeing, for instance, but more specifically beholding—and material culture in historical analysis, each of which has become increasingly central to the study of religion over the course of the last two decades.

My story begins ostensibly in 1839 when, after making a sixteen-day voyage across a temperamental sea, the steamer bearing news of Daguerre’s method of fixing the camera obscura’s field of vision weighed anchor in the quarantine ground of a New York harbor and the daguerreotype became the country’s first commercially viable photographic method. But in truth it begins earlier, not at a specific moment in time but in the caverns of collective memory
and visual sensibilities informed by an inheritance of visual devices and modes of representation and remembrance. Many histories of photography identify the daguerreotype as the culmination of decades of experimental work, or at least the heir of advancements made in the fields of optics, chemistry, and even anatomy and philosophy that made pictures from life not only possible but desirable. But what is often not addressed in standard histories of photography is the simple fact that nineteenth-century Americans were collectors who lived with the past as much as the present through the accumulation of material artifacts—furnishings, trinkets, ornaments, silver, needlework and other handicrafts, commonplace books, written correspondence, and, of course, optical marvels such as vues d’optique, magic lanterns, and thaumatrope amid countless other curiosities. Because my story begins in a world already populated by ocular devices that informed visual habits, therefore, rather than isolating the technology and influence of photographic methods, I take a broader inventory of both innovative optical marvels—daguerreotypes, stereoscopes, photographic prints—and inherited visual traditions—painted miniatures, panoramas, magic lanterns—that contributed to the vast kaleidoscope of artifacts, to use a metaphor quite familiar to folks in the early nineteenth century, in which photographs were but one vibration in a spectacular “ocular harpsichord.”

But the relationship between photography and previous technologies is hardly a simple narrative of technological improvement. As historian Jonathan Crary has convincingly argued, the first decades of the nineteenth century generated new viewing subjectivities in stride with reevaluations of the physical senses and technological advancements. In his work on “hearing loss” and the American Enlightenment, Leigh Schmidt summed up this point more succinctly: “the Enlightenment changed the senses.” Crary’s assessment directly critiques older historical models that narrated a kind of technological determinism, a teleology that bound ancient
experiments with light and shadow with a driving pursuit for accuracy in representation that culminated in motion pictures. He counters by demonstrating how the philosophical and anatomical pursuits of the early nineteenth century generated a new kind of “observer” that was not continuous with early modern formulations. Moreover, Crary demonstrates how the act of seeing was caught up in productions and manipulations of power that were closely aligned with the bodies of observing subjects. “Problems of vision then, as now,” he asserts, “were fundamentally questions about the body and the operation of social power.”

As influential as his model and analysis may be, however, by arguing in favor of a “systemic rupture” in the economy of perception, Crary’s work deflects attention from the lived circumstances of nineteenth-century beholders whose visual landscapes were populated not only by optical marvels but by visual devices inherited from previous generations. To be sure, elements of Crary’s thesis may hold in the final analysis—despite the continued bequest and manufacture of these older devices, their relationship with the bodies of later beholders, and thus the particular patterns of perception that they conditioned, changed alongside the production of new subjectivities: “Vision and its effects are always inseparable from the possibilities of an observing subject who is both the historical product and the site of certain practices, techniques, institutions, and procedures of subjectification.” Nevertheless, it is difficult to parse the emergence of new subjectivities from visual habits informed by previous models of perception, especially when the vehicles of these previous models continued to populate the material landscape of many Americans. How can we say with certainty that a child playing with a thaumatrope in 1850 was seeing differently than her parent had decades earlier? The evidence is thin and certitude is elusive. The sensorial landscape was indeed changing, and with it the modes of perception that influenced experience and interpretation. Photography was central to
this change. And yet these new technologies did not wipe the slate clean; their influence was profound, but incomplete; they changed the cadence of time, but their march was at times slow, at times rapid, and at times stalled. Thus without dismissing Crary’s insight, in this dissertation I am attentive to these older technologies, prior modes of visual instruction, and the clutter of past generations and argue that they contributed to the formation of visual habits that would later assimilate photographic modes of representation into a world already populated by forms of embodied visual knowledge.

“SECURE THE SHADOW”

Throughout the century, a common advertising jingle counseled Americans to “Secure the shadow, ere the substance fade.” Nurturing an association between form incarnate and its photographic representation, the jingle was used to promote a demand for likenesses that could be handed down through the generations as testament to one’s existence and a conduit for one’s remembrance. The metaphor of “shadow” was also used more generally throughout nineteenth-century parlance to denote photographic representation, as when in the 1860s Sojourner Truth captioned her cartes de visite with the tag, “I sell the shadow to support the substance.” By the turn of the twentieth century, the association between shadow and substance was a little less certain, a shift that was illustrated in J. M. Barrie’s endearing play Peter Pan, based on a “record of the Terrible Adventures of Three Brothers in the summer of 1901.” In the script from the play’s run at the Duke of York’s Theatre in London during 1904, upon awakening to Peter Pan sniffling at his inability to get his “shadow to stick on” with soap, Wendy scoffed that “It must be sewn on.” According to the published stage directions, Peter “tests the combination” after Wendy mends the fragments and sulks that “it isn’t quite itself yet.” But after Wendy concedes
that “Perhaps I should have ironed it,” the shadow “awakes and is as glad to be back with [Peter] as he to have it.” While Barrie may or may not have had photographs in mind when he wrote this scene, the vignette nevertheless gestures to the fraught relationships between photographic likenesses and physical bodies that were becoming increasingly acute in a world newly saturated with images produced by amateur consumers rather than studio professionals. This change over time between mid-century certainties and turn of the century caution with regard to the identification between likenesses and flesh, representation and selfhood, is one of the narrative arcs that this dissertation works, often subtly, to address.

In addition to heightening attention to the unstable—but, as we will see, stubbornly persistent—conflation of photograph and referent, in this dissertation I am also attentive to the embodied experiences of photographic beholding. Indeed, the term quoted earlier from a rhapsodic review of Sir David Brewster’s new invention, the kaleidoscope, in 1819—recall the “ocular harpsichord”—gestures to the messy compartmentalization of the senses among early nineteenth-century Americans. Rather than becoming increasingly occularcentric over the course of the century, nineteenth-century Americans leveled their gaze in a distinctly sensorial whirl. Schmidt has argued that “the crucial counterpoint to the growing visualization of knowledge among Enlightenment natural philosophers [in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries] was the inductive concern with the senses as a whole.” What was true for the educated elite was mirrored in the millions who not merely saw but touched, felt, and even tasted photographs in hushed solitude, humming households, rowdy lecture halls, and to the low sway of familiar hymns. Reviving this sensorial world is no easy task and material culture only gets us to the tips of our fingers. And yet even if historians are never quite able to awaken the shadows of the past, there is surely something to be learned from testing the combination.
Throughout the nineteenth century, photographs of persons were not understood as discarnate likenesses so much as mediums intended to invoke the body of those they represented—despite the jingle, in other words, substance and shadow were not so clearly distinct. One of the most common practices of reinforcing the correspondence between likenesses and bodies was to accompany photographs with relics of the body, most commonly human hair. When Mary Elizabeth Baker wrote to her mother, Elizabeth Stuart, after her sister died in October 1853, she commiserated over “the time of our deep affliction” that had clouded over the family that autumn, taking not only Kate but two other members of the Stuart family as well. At the time that she wrote in March 1854, there was new concern for her nephew, “dear dear little Bobby,” who she feared “that even now his days on earth are ended.” Concluding the letter, Mary asked a favor of her mother: “Is there no good likeness of Kate, do not send me a bad one, but I do so much want something that looks like her, but send me by express the likeness of the boys & one more recent of John [who had also died], one of yourself, & a piece of Kate's hair.”

Mary’s letter raises a number of questions that will be addressed in Chapter Two, but her letter also underscores the relational context of photographic beholding, the fact, in other words, that beholding was not merely a function of the organ of sight. Kate’s family, especially her mother and sister, would still be within the formal mourning period—although, six months after her death, her husband would probably not have been. Mary wanted a “good likeness” of Kate, not just a visual document of her sister’s existence—whether it was taken in life or after Kate died is not made certain. She also wants pictures of “the boys,” one of whom is gravely ill—he would die in April—and a “more recent” likeness of her brother John, who had died less than a month after Kate. Mary also knew that her mother would have saved locks of Kate’s hair and
knew that she was entitled to such a relic. If she did receive a daguerreotype of Kate, Mary most likely displayed the hair in the case with the likeness. All of this meaning, all of this signification, occurred outside the image.

“COMMUNION WITH EACH OTHER”

As impossible as it may ultimately be, in order to understand the profundity of photography for nineteenth-century Americans, especially in the earliest days of the 1840s, we must place ourselves in a world where mirrors were scarce, where the measure of a moment was not calculated in seconds and milliseconds but, at best, in minutes and more often in hours and days. In stark contrast to the atrocities of enslavement, the sedimentation of the economy that produced entire populations of impoverished workers, widows, and orphans, societal norms that restricted women from that celebrated American virtue of self-reliance, and an imperialist ethos that misshaped the perception of alterities, American public discourse was mulishly optimistic. In one of the first histories of photography in the United States, published in 1864, Marcus Aurelius Root captured this sense of momentous promise—with all of its refracted implications—just as surely as his camera had captured the visages of Philadelphia’s affluent citizens:

The tradition of a millennium, to occur at some stage of the Christian History, has, for nearly nineteen centuries, been floating through Christendom... I presume, most of my readers are also aware that, during the last century, a spiritual construction has been put upon the term millennium, whereby it is held to signify a rapid and vast improvement in the universal condition of our race—its exaltation to a plane of intelligence, virtue, and happiness, unparalleled before. And, what is somewhat singular, these recent constructionists have agreed in placing the dawn of this new era at or near the present time.
Root was aware of the hyperbole that such a mood could inculcate in his contemporaries, and his examples happen to be religious flourishes on impending doom, such as Swedenborg’s “New Jerusalem,” which was an “event to become distinctly manifest . . . between the years 1850 and 1880” and “Father Miller” who labored under “an aspect too absurd for any but a disturbed brain to accredit.” But regardless of how one ciphered “the multiform improvements going on in man’s condition”—as the first stinging breath of new life or the last gusty exhale—Root considered them “manifestly due to various scientific and practical discoveries,” including the application of steam power, the magnetic telegraph, and “heliography [an early synonym for photography] in its multitudinous forms.” What bound these developments in common purpose, he concluded, was that they “serve to bring the individuals of our race, however widely dissevered by material distances, into more or less close proximity and communion with each other.”

Root’s observation that the “scientific and practical discoveries” of his day worked to bridge disparate communities into “communion with each other” voiced contemporary sentiment about the social effects of the new technologies. It also frames later historical analysis of material culture. In short, historiographic interest in material culture often assumes that material artifacts facilitate immediate connections to “widely dissevered” historical communities. Artifacts frequently do withstand the passage of time that conquers human flesh, and in this way they invite a romanticized tethering of bodies past and present. No doubt it is sometimes difficult to acknowledge an artifact’s intervening history and to recognize the historical circumstances in which sense perceptions are formulated and gain meaning. Moreover, influenced by social historical approaches, the vast majority of artifacts studied by material culture historians have been from quotidian environments, a trend set thirty years ago by premier material culture
historians Thomas J. Schlereth, Kenneth L. Ames, and Jules David Prown.\textsuperscript{28} This quality of familiarity—of ordinariness and banality—also often contributes to an under-recognition of the historical circumstances of both artifacts and faculties of perception. My interests in material culture, visual habits, and religious experience, however, prompt interrogation of both the historiographic and epistemological confluence of these categories. Does material culture in fact bring us closer to the people we study? Is it a reliable index of experience? What, ultimately, does material culture study provide for studies of religion?

Holding a locket, photography historian Geoffrey Batchen observed that the article, “whatever its intended meaning, . . . now functions as a representative of a genre rather than as a portrait of a known individual.”\textsuperscript{29} To an extent, this generalizing approach is necessary for the study of vernaculars, in particular, of which the archive available for historians is fragmentary at best. At the same time, Martha Sandweiss counsels against the kind of inductive analysis that this generalizing approach can facilitate when she writes that historians must “guard against” the temptation “to let unidentified images stand for the experiences of particular individuals.”\textsuperscript{30} Batchen and Sandweiss are looking at different sides of the same coin. On the one side, the lack of identifying information beckons analysis of types or genres, represented by the unknown individual. On the other side, such unidentifiable images can never speak directly to the actual experiences of historical beholders. The inability to identify with much certainty the fragmentary visual record of bible galleries or memorial portraiture, in other words, should not preclude close analysis but neither should we allow the shards here examined to stand in as historically defined surrogates for the actual experiences of generations of producers, compilers, and beholders of these likenesses. Beholding a likeness of someone dear to heart, in particular, evades historical calculus, no matter how sensitive historians might be to the range of conditions that informed
such moments of encounter. When in March 1852 Harriet Newell Vance wrote to her “beloved Zebulon” that she had “received your letter some days ago & with it your Daguerro-type Likeness,” she asked her husband “to imagine the joy of my heart, when I opened it & found that it was the image of him that I love.” The intimacy of this exchange, indeed, the intimacy of Harriet’s continued relationship with her husband’s burnished reflection—“I gaze often with delight upon [the daguerreotype] & hailed its arrival with infinite pleasure”—makes the attempt to confine the role of photographic portraiture to a delimited range of influences and responses seem untenable, even absurd. But, however imperfect—there are indeed many blanks in my writing—the study of vernacular photography is imperative if we are to continue the effort to understand the many worlds of nineteenth-century American religion.

While in the chapters that follow I take a less theory-driven approach, this dissertation nevertheless offers a space to consider the associations between material culture, quotidian practices, and religious experiences that have been freighted largely under the radar since lived religion transitioned from a critique of the field in the late twentieth century to an interpretive rubric in the twenty-first. In other words, this dissertation’s stated interest in vernacular photography not only invites reflection on the descriptive arena from which interpretation and analysis extend but on the very constitution of the quotidian. Specifically, when the object of one’s study is the particular, but the interpretive apparatus is contingent on the abstract—a problematic that the very notion of “the everyday” embodies—one must make explicit the different ways in which the concept operates in one’s analysis. In addition to functioning as a descriptive and interpretive arena, then, the category of the “everyday” needs to be understood as a constructed theoretical space for investigating the social processes—including seemingly natural processes of perception and recognition—that mediate individual and collective
identities. In the sections that follow I unpack a great deal of the theoretical and historiographic terrain that has influenced analysis throughout the dissertation. In particular, I work to sketch a silhouette of *vernacular* as an analytic category and to situate it within a broader literature of material and visual culture studies.

VERNACULAR PHOTOGRAPHY: FROM INDEX TO VISUAL HABITS

The terminology of the vernacular, as used in this dissertation, is intended to straddle two disciplinary usages. As an art historical concept, the coordinates of the vernacular have been most convincingly summarized by photographic historian Geoffrey Batchen. As a category of analysis in religion, the term has been explicitly theorized by Leonard Primiano and shares a good deal of analytical terrain with the more broadly used vocabulary of the quotidian bandied in studies influenced by lived religion. Writing in the mid-1990s, Batchen used the term to prod his field towards greater consideration, in his words, of the “popular face of photography” that had been “largely ignored by the critical gaze of respectable history”—a critical orientation that will be familiar to scholars of religion versed in the history and analytical sensibilities of lived religion. Given the superabundance of these photographic artifacts in American culture and history—from “elaborately cased daguerreotypes” and “ambrotype jewelry embellished with twists of human hair” to snapshot albums, “formal portraits of the family dog,” and panoramas of church groups—Batchen’s befuddlement with the analytic lacuna is easy to understand.

To be sure, he was hardly the first to recognize the social life of the medium. As early as 1938 the University of Kansas chemist Robert Taft wrote the first social history of photography in the United States, and Batchen himself identifies several scholars who had “begun th[e] process” of “seeing vernaculars.” But a social history of photography is not the same as a
critical orientation that places vernaculars, in Batchen’s terms, as “the organizing principle of photography’s history in general.” Rather than supplanting conventional master narratives with new material, “vernaculars insist that there are many photographies, not just one, indicating a need for an equally variegated array of historical methods and rhetorics.” In other words, for Batchen the recognition of certain artifacts demanded a critical reevaluation of the field of photographic history. In this dissertation I take Batchen’s assessment and push it one step further by defining *vernacular* according to visual habits rather than specific artifacts.  

This step is critical given the reconfiguration of viewing habits that photography enabled. Although he explicitly argued against the idea of vernaculars as a “category of collectible”—that is, a prefigured arena of artifacts that could be classified as “vernacular”—the photographs that Batchen identifies in his work are delimited by in large by their spatial location. For instance, he introduces the concept of vernaculars by describing them as “the photographs that preoccupy the home and the heart but rarely the museum or the academy” and proceeds to limit his analysis primarily within the bounds of domestic space. In this dissertation space remains an important consideration but I am primarily interested in the range of cultural spaces wherein visual artifacts were created, beheld, inspected, censored, and celebrated by their many publics—homes, to be sure, but also churches, classrooms, lecture halls, public rotundas, photographic studios, and government offices. Indeed, one of the biggest contributions that photography provided was a disruption of space. Not only were artifacts that were previously restricted to particular locations—architecture, landscapes, artworks—now made accessible by photographic reproduction, which simultaneously unhinged both the referent and the beholder from their previously fixed location, but, just as importantly, the spaces in which images were encountered contributed to their reception, interpretation, application—in a word, to their beholding.
This argument is picked up most directly in Chapter Four where I explore the viewing habits that informed the reception of stereographs, magic lantern demonstrations, and painted panoramas. Later critics have pointed to the period examined in the chapter to theorize photography’s reconfiguration of artwork’s relation to physical location. Walter Benjamin offered a particularly succinct indictment on this score. Photography, especially after 1860 when glass negatives enabled limitless production of positive exposures, in Benjamin’s estimation, stymied claims to artwork’s “historical testimony”—which was directly tied to location—and thereby its authenticity by supplanting the previous “cult value” of artwork with a newly configured “exhibition value.” While he places these values in successive opposition—they are “polar types” that fall onto a linear arc of progress, even, it seems, when they coexist in a single historical moment—their tension is nevertheless instructive for interrogating both space and authenticity in practices of beholding.35

Briefly, Benjamin tied the cult value of an artifact to the circumscribed conditions in which it could be encountered, its limited mobility as well as the strict regulation of access—“what mattered was their existence, not their being on view.” The advent of technologies of graphic reproduction, first lithography and then, especially, photography, “emancipated” works of art from these “ritual” environments even as they augmented “opportunities for . . . exhibition.” Moreover, for Benjamin, these emancipated works were flushed of authenticity in the act of obviating their “historical testimony.” In short, when an artifact—such as a chapel or a sculpture or a painting—was reproduced photographically it undermined the criteria for authenticity previously conferred by the regulated limitations of encounter. In Benjamin’s critical assessment, the “aura” of artwork was replaced by an aesthetic of consumption that thrived in the marketplace of graphic reproduction. In the terms of this dissertation, for Benjamin, photography
undermined art’s previous claims to authentic presence. But what was true for the twentieth century critic was not true for millions of Americans who reveled in the opportunity to experience the Holy Land or witness great works of art from the comfort of their homes and in the company of their townsfolk. Indeed, rather than “emancipating” artifacts from their hold on authenticity, far more Americans agreed with the Methodist minister Jesse Lyman Hurlbut when he asserted that stereograph series of the Holy Land provided just as “real” of an experience as any maritime pilgrimage. Spaces of encounter between artifacts and beholders continued to be important—spaces do shape experiences—but photographs were understood to proliferate rather than to obviate these opportunities.

Even if Benjamin’s historical theory falls short of addressing how the majority of Americans experienced photographs—in all fairness, he was primarily interested in chronicling a crisis in the definition of art that technologies of reproduction introduced—he did identify an exception to the rule. “But the cult value does not give way without resistance,” he wrote, “it retires into an ultimate retrenchment: the human countenance.” As a signature mode of vernacular photography, Benjamin’s nod to portraiture is instructive. “It is no accident that the portrait was the focal point of early photography. The cult of remembrance of loved ones, absent or dead, offers a last refuge for the cult value of the picture. For the last time the aura emanates from the early photographs in the fleeting expression of the human face.” If mechanical reproduction of a Michelangelo or a Vermeer challenged its claims to historical testimony, he suggested, the same technique imbued the likeness with authenticating presence. Benjamin’s assessment was especially acute for single exposure techniques, such as daguerreotypes, ambrotypes, and tintypes, wherein the exhibition value remained limited, at least until other processes enabled reproduction. In marking this exception, however, he presents the portrait as a
vestige of antiquated perceptual habits, wherein authenticity was couched in the fact of existence and the security of ritualized encounter; in this schema, photographic portraiture was a grotesque, an uncanny disruption of neat historical order. And yet the photograph’s testimony of presence need not be relegated to the sensibilities of a fading past.

Nineteenth-century Americans busy with the tasks of sitting for, assembling, looking at, and preserving photographs surely understood their likenesses, in particular, in multiple terms. They were as struck by the novelty and marvel of the many photographic techniques as they were invested in the artifact’s historical testimony. In short, rather than constituting competing paradigms, in the case of vernacular photography, at least, authenticity was limned in the representation—indeed the two were unanimous in the act of beholding. This is not to say, as later theorists have, that photographs were indexes of their referents. Philosophical ruminations concerning the indexicality of photographic images take on different modes of significance when the referent is not understood to be Barthes’s “certificate of presence” captured by a camera lens but a second order removal, a hieroglyph encoded by the camera’s lens. In N.D. Thompson’s 1894 publication of *Earthly Footsteps of the Man of Galilee*, a bound “art-folio” of several hundred halftone prints visually chronicling for modern Americans the “Holy Land” of the bible, Southern Methodist minister James Wideman Lee provided commentary for a photograph of “Mat Weavers at their Looms” taken by his companion Robert E. M. Bain (figure 3). “There is no beauty in the faces and the forms of the women whom we see, and no remarkable ingenuity in their handiwork, but the moment we think it possible that over this soil and under the shadow of these mountains passed Saul of Tarsus bound for Damascus, with his splendid career . . . before him, the entire picture becomes invested with new significance.”
As I discuss in Chapters Three and Four, this practice of narratively eliding the photographic present in order to “illustrate” the New Testament and to “see” the biblical past trained beholders of Bain’s photographs, whether in artfolios or in photographic editions of the bible, in the imperialistic ethos of late nineteenth-century America. Through Bain’s photographs, the lived circumstances of contemporary inhabitants of Egypt, Palestine, and other corners of “the Holy Land” were appropriated as ciphers of American Christian biblical heritage. More than that, they were rendered invisible through narrative dismissal, even as their eyes trained on the camera, perhaps the most powerful—if most stealthy—instrument of American imperialism. The visual habits of bible books and Holy Land stereograph series were rooted in previous
modes of visual representation, most especially the painted panorama and the magic lantern. But photography brought with it a discourse of immediacy that heightened the tension between the photographic contemporary and the imagined biblical past. Influenced by cultural politics of imperialism as well as the visual habits of the biblical imaginary, most Americans at the end of the nineteenth century did not see contemporary Palestine when they flipped through books on the order of *Footsteps of the Man of Galilee*—there were many similar volumes—or when they nestled their brows against the cool aluminum frame of the stereoscope and relaxed their eyes into focus. They saw the Holy Land of the bible. Similarly, in the context of postmortem and memorial portraiture, which are the subject of Chapter Two, the perceived referent was not the decaying carcass but the liberated soul. In this way, vernacular photographs did exhibit a kind of iconicity—the power and purpose to point beyond themselves to the true subject. And yet, importantly, icons were not indexes, in which the primary operation was to authenticate the historical existence of what had passed before the camera’s lens, which in the case of Bain’s photograph would have been the contemporary “women whom we see” rather than the biblical tableaux their unbeautiful visages invoked.

If icons and indexes were distinct ways of beholding photographs, they were nevertheless not mutually exclusive. Both are related to the central motif of presence in this dissertation. For most nineteenth-century Americans, photographs were understood to be directly tied to the persons and vistas they represented, or, according to Karl Barthes, that they authenticated. Batchen elaborates on Barthes distinction between authentication and representation in his work on the “doubled indexicality” of hair and photographs when he writes that in the process of “adding a lock of hair to the subject’s photograph, the indexical presence of that subject is reiterated and reinforced. The studium of mere resemblance . . . is transformed into the punctum
of the subject-as-ghost (a figure simultaneously absent and present, alive and dead).” In making this move, however, Batchen is no longer talking about indexicality. Indeed, while the idea of photographs as indexes has remained powerful, it makes too fast a correlation between what had been photographed and what is beheld. In other words, despite their mutual operation in the visual habits of nineteenth-century beholders, historians need beware of the tendency to slip between a photograph’s stated indexicality and its interpretive iconicity. An interpretive paradigm sensitive to the measure of presence for beholders need not advance the normative assumptions of photographs as direct emanations of their referents.

Even in the supposedly empirical applications of photographic techniques—daguerrotypes of slaves intended to prove the racial inferiority of Africans, for instance, or mug shots of criminals used to classify gradations of deviancy—seeing demanded imagination. In her study of the daguerrotypes of South Carolina slaves commissioned by Harvard ethnologist Louis Agassiz, historian Molly Rogers argues that, despite contemporary understandings to the contrary, photography “is not an objective medium, particularly when it comes to the interpretive moment, the moment we look at the image and make sense of it. . . . [T]he photographic image comes to have meaning only when it is viewed, and viewing is an act of imagination.” This imaginative process was, to be sure, still attuned to a corporeal register. In the case of stereographs of the Holy Land, for instance, beholding the biblical imaginary—the actual places that Jesus lived and breathed and moved—was accomplished by denying the photographic contemporary of Ottoman Palestine as well as consciously subordinating the “sense horizon” to the transformative powers of vision. Juggling seemingly contradictory understandings of photographs as “an exact transcript” from life, to use a contemporary phrase, and encryptions of
imperceptible realities, photographic beholding was anything but a simple calculus of perception.43

Rogers’s apt assessment of the role of imagination not only gestures to the visual habits of presence but to absences, whether accidental or intentional, as well. As Martha Sandweiss perceptively notes in her study of photography in the American West, an important part of the photographic history of the nineteenth century are the artifacts that have not survived—which in this study stretch from the thousands of discarded daguerreotypes, used as references for mid-nineteenth century canvases and then swallowed by time, to the millions of photographic snapshots that are safely tucked away in forgotten corners of our homes. Sandweiss writes of her own work that, “if I could not . . . always find missing pictures I might at least try to explain why they were missing.”44 In his Cantos, Ezra Pound remembered “a day when the historians left blanks in their writings, / I mean for things they didn’t know.” This reflective injunction is a profoundly appropriate epigraph to this dissertation because the fragmented and frayed historical record demands many holes in my writing. The haphazard preservation practices of many photographs account for many missing pictures—photographs that were discarded, forgotten, or destroyed—but often enough in the study of vernaculars, the photographs still exist but are simply not available for historians to consult. Erotic pictures constitute one such archive. After all, finding a stash of nudes in grandpa’s closet does not always spark the most benevolent of gestures for preservation.45

But another class of photographs more explicitly highlights the discrepancy between the indexicality of photographs and imaginative practices of beholding, the absences freighted under the guise of presence. In taking studio portraits of children during the nineteenth century, and especially during the 1840s and 1850s when exposure times were still at least several seconds, if
not minutes, it was common for mothers to hold their children. It was also common to cover these women with blankets. As the full-plate tintype in figure 4 demonstrates, however, the woman’s form was often still quite evident in the resulting image. Other techniques for disguising maternal restraints included not developing the mother’s face and the far more invasive practice of scratching her likeness off of the developed image. Perhaps even more common, however, was the practice of merely obscuring mothers (or, less commonly, fathers) from view in display mounts. This ninth-plate tintype—about two inches wide by two and half inches tall—clearly depicts the residue from decades of strategic revision of the camera’s field of vision (figure 4). Why was this mother hidden from view? Any answer would be speculative. Her arm would still have been visible, as would part of her veil. Beholders would have known that someone else’s likeness—however fragmented—was on the plate. This comparatively benign approach to elision may echo Benjamin’s definition of the cult
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**Figure 4:** Full plate (8 ½ by 6 ½ inches) and ninth-plate (2 by 2 ½ inches) tintypes, ca. 1865. From the collection of Merry Gordon. Used with permission.
value of photographs—“what mattered was their existence, not their being on view.” And indeed he understood these vernacular visages to be the exemption to the historical rule. But display did matter in the constitution of beholding subjects. And what were vernaculars without their beholders?

In demonstrating the obstructions commonly embedded in presences, this is also an appropriate place to note the gendered implications in historical uses of the terminology of the vernacular. John Kouwenhoven is largely credited for inaugurating the study of “vernaculars” in American history with the publication of his seminal work, *Made in America*, shortly after the Second World War. In this study, he makes the case for an American aesthetic that was borne of the “unself-conscious efforts of common people” who “found themselves living under democratic institutions in an expanding machine economy.” For Kouwenhoven, the “purest form of this vernacular” was “represented by technological design”—firearms, tools, watercraft, steam engines. After initially agreeing with Kouwenhoven’s assessment of the development of a uniquely democratic aesthetic, Michael Aaron Rockland rightly contends that Kouwenhoven’s formulation of vernacular “has chauvinistic aspects—sexual as well as cultural—for the vernacular is not gender neutral.” Rockland advances a narrow definition of gender in which the parameters of masculinity are coterminous with a kind of brawny machismo, but he is nevertheless correct to identify the gendered dynamics of what has been designated as *vernacular*.

Both men and women posed in photographic studios, ornamented their bodies with likenesses, and beheld photographs in a variety of circumstances. There were of course variations. For instance, following trends set with miniature portraits, men were more likely to wear articles of photographic jewelry closer to their bodies, on watch fobs and in secreted
medallions, whereas women were more likely to wear them in broader view of the public, on necklace chains, brooches, and hairpins. Women were also the focus of advertising campaigns at the end of the century—the Kodak Girl modeled the New Woman even as Kodak and other firms built their campaigns on the domestic sentimentalism of previous generations. Cultural historian Shawn Michelle Smith has similarly argued how “the photographic industry situated white middle-class women at the cornerstone of [the] technological process.” But far from being merely the pawns of a determining market, that is, rather than collapsing all kinds of beholders into a single subjectivity, viewing habits embraced a range of motivations and registers of signification. What all of this points to is the fact that, despite associations of cameras with a masculinist, imperialistic gaze, such a vantage did not eclipse the eye of the beholder.

“THE THINGNESS OF THE VISUAL”: FROM ICON TO RELIC

Embedded in the visual practices of nineteenth-century beholders was an understanding that photographs were objects. It was not until the 1890s that photomechanical processes, such as halftone and photogravure, began to disrupt the tactility of photographs by printing them in books and newspapers in manners that deflected attention from the fact that they were still artifacts, albeit now often subordinated to, and at the very least evaluated in relation to, the interpretive guides of surrounding text. At the same time, however, photographs were proliferating outside of published texts as snapshots and real photo post cards began to accumulate in larger and larger quantities, largely displacing but never erasing professional prints. Unfortunately, analyses of photography, especially by scholars of religion, have tended to privilege the indexicality and iconicity of photographs to the neglect of their thingness. While material culture approaches are in need of interrogation, the tendency of historians to treat
photographs as texts rather than physical artifacts is related both to turn of the twentieth century photomechanical techniques and to scholarly traditions arising in the same period that subordinated objects in a schema of hierarchical evaluations of religion.

While much good work has recently addressed the historical devaluation of materiality in studies of religion, the terminology of the vernacular among scholars of religion has yet to account for these developments and, at the same time, analogous vocabularies of the quotidian have yet to interrogate the epistemic relations between material culture and “the everyday.” An early advocate for the terminology of vernacular in studies of American religion was advanced in 1995, two years before David Hall’s edited volume *Lived Religion* was published, when folklorist Leonard Primiano argued to replace the scholarly category of “folk religion,” in which he correctly identified historiographical and sociological biases, with that of “vernacular religion,” a concept that he defined as “religion as it is lived: as human beings encounter, understand, interpret, and practice it.” Turning attention away from conceptual models that sought to explain religion from the vantage of comparative corporate typologies, he argued instead that individuals were constantly engaging in “various negotiations of belief and practice,” and thus that the methodological concerns of vernacular religion are located in “the experiential component of people’s religious lives.”

If Hall’s “lived religion” was directed toward articulating a “history of practice,” Primiano’s attention to the “experiential” components of religious interpretation was calibrated to the coordinates of belief: “Vernacular religious theory,” he wrote, “involves . . . special attention to the process of religious belief, the verbal, behavioral, and material expressions of religious belief, and the ultimate object of religious belief.” Although his nod to “material expressions” might appear to articulate a space for the study of material artifacts, he quickly
avers that “by the object of religious belief, I do not mean to imply the objectification of faith or religious understanding through material culture.” To be sure, Primiano’s methodological approach does not preclude the analytic possibilities of, in his words, “permanent and ephemeral objects within domestic and public environments” as part of the study of vernacular religion. And yet, at this early point in his thinking, at least, the category of the vernacular was principally concerned with the interpretive dynamics of religious beliefs: “Vernacular religion as an approach to understanding religion as it has been lived in the past and is lived today,” he concluded, “emphasizes the study of the belief systems of religious people.”

Somewhat surprisingly, Primiano’s association of the interpretive potential of material culture with an animating system or negotiation of belief is echoed by historians and theorists of material culture. In an essay plumbing “the truth of material culture,” Jules David Prown, for instance, wrote that the “objective of a cultural investigation is mind—belief.” Elsewhere he has argued that the “underlying premise” of material culture analysis “is that objects made or modified by man reflect, consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly, the beliefs of the individuals who made, commissioned, purchased, or used them and, by extension, the beliefs of the larger society to which they belonged.” Similarly, Thomas Schlereth described material culture study as “the study through artifacts (and other pertinent historical evidence) of the belief systems—the values, ideas, attitudes, and assumptions—of a particular community or society, usually across time.” Colleen McDannell and David Morgan have been more directly influential in material culture studies of American religion. In his study of the shifting emphasis from the didactic to the devotional in nineteenth-century Protestant visual practices, Morgan defines the mass-produced images he examines as evidence of a “visual culture of belief” and in his more widely read Visual Piety he defines that term as “the visual formation and practice of
religious belief.” In *Material Christianity*, McDannell was more interested in mapping the debate onto the coordinates of sacred and profane than belief and matter, although she indicates that the lack of sustained material inquiry for much of the history of religious studies was related to an association between the profane and the material, on the one hand, and the sacred and belief, on the other, with the latter dyad constituting the analytical focus of the field. More recently, in an introductory essay to a collection on religion and material culture, Morgan explicitly argues for a “more capacious account” of belief, albeit “one that looks to the embodied, material features of lived religion.”

While I agree with Morgan that the allergy to vocabularies of belief in recent decades needs to be corrected, the move to conceptualize the contributions of material culture study as merely another, more tactile, road to belief, demands further interrogation. Does, in short, the study of religion, spiral out though it may to culture, artifacts, embodiment, and other modes of knowledge and practice, necessarily return to the role of belief in constituting identities of self and other? Must material objects always be evaluated, in the final analysis, on their capacities to point beyond themselves to something else, be it culture, belief, or some other prevailing intangible? This folding of material and visual culture into ciphers of belief betrays a Geertzian approach to the architectonics of culture. Clifford Geertz has a long shadow in the study of religion and yet, as has been critiqued most convincingly by Talal Asad, his definition of religion as a system of beliefs reinscribes the Protestant bias his ethnography sought to displace. Focusing on nineteenth-century America, wherein Christianities in all of their multitudinous forms and permutations influenced public discourses and cultural representations of religion more than any other group—of which there were many, to be sure—belief was surely a part of
the visual vocabulary of many photographic beholders and I am in no way interested in wringing the study of belief entirely from American religious history.

But neither do I approach material culture, and photographs in particular, as a backdoor to belief. With anthropologist Webb Keane, I am convinced that materiality “can never be reduced only to the status of evidence for something else, such as beliefs or other cognitive phenomena.” Such a claim exposes the seam joining two sides of my interpretive approach: empathy towards nineteenth-century beholders’ who saw “something else” in their photographs and my own conviction that the study of material cultures of American religions should not be immediately reduced to a cipher of belief. But rather than hide this suture, for my purposes it is better to leave it be; not as an unsightly scar but as a visual marker of the historian’s craft—I remain in the picture, even if at times I am hiding under a blanket. As much as visual habits of many Americans may have been informed by—and, over the course of the century, worked to shape—beliefs, creeds, traditions, injunctions, and excoriations, the morphologies of photographic artifacts studied in this dissertation cannot be entirely examined as evidence for the imperceptible. Indeed, if anything, the embodied practices of photographic beholding worked to constitute the subjectivities necessary for the formation and recognition of ideas and beliefs. It is for these reasons that, despite the precedent of the term in the field of American religion, my use of the terminology of the vernacular departs from Primiano’s. Rather than discarding vernacular in favor of the more commonly used terminology of the “everyday,” however, this term works to emphasize the interdisciplinary dialogue that the dissertation works to facilitate and, in the process, may raise into relief interpretive assumptions within the field.

In particular, if we agree that what beholders saw in photographs was not coterminous with the camera’s field of vision, what can we say about the relationship between material
artifacts and the human experiences that we use them to access? Photographs, of course, are artifacts.\textsuperscript{59} This “thingness of the visual,” to use Geoffrey Batchen’s apt turn of phrase, is a critical step often not taken by scholars of religion.\textsuperscript{60} Indeed, despite the immense contributions of scholars to the study of visual and material cultures of religion, the prevailing attitude is one of transparency—one, we might say, of indexicality. By and large, we use photographs to demonstrate what a person or an object looked like, how a sanctuary or city or landscape was arranged, who our subjects interacted with and where they lived and breathed and moved. To provide an analogy, photographs are commonly used as if one were to mine a diary or memoir for biographical material and disregard the larger interpretive context of writing patterns, cultural milieu, and authorship. And yet, taking the portrait of Private Walter Jones in our hands, we are asked not only to look but to behold—not only to mine the image for visual information but to feel its weight, the tooth of its grain, to place it in an economy of production, circulation, and display. In short, recognizing the materiality of what is often referred to as visual exchanges a primarily ocular relationship for a sensibility to the entire sensory and contextual experience of the photograph at different points in the artifact’s history—the studio, the parlor, a stepmother’s hands, a dusty cabinet, the Library of Congress.

It is in this sense that photographs were relics as much as they were icons. In a very different historical context, Carolyn Walker Bynum has noted how “the goal” of medieval devotional objects was “not so much conjuring up or gesturing toward the unseen as manifesting power in the matter of the object.” In her analysis, moreover, the “stuff” of which images were made “was not incidental to their form or simply functional, nor indeed was it only an iconography to be decoded.” Although there are significant historical discrepancies to take account of, what was true in the case of devotional objects created of vellum and ink, wood and
paint, was also true for objects created from glass and iron, paper and albumen, thermoplastic casings and leather bindings. Such objects “speak or act their physicality in particularly intense ways that call attention to their per se ‘stuffness’ and ‘thingness.’” By recognizing that photographic objects “disclose, not merely signify, a power that lies beyond,” we are better equipped to understand why portraits were placed in family bibles, how pictures of dead babies could become testaments of their eternal life in glory, and the ability of stereographs to reproduce the Holy Land.\(^5\)

As artifacts that constantly call attention to their materiality and their historical legacies, moreover, relics also disclose a relation to the bodies of those who hold, see, smell, and hear them. And yet relics mean different things for historians than they do for practitioners. While pushing us to consider more attentively the experience of photography for nineteenth-century Americans, material culture approaches also raise questions about the indexicality of artifacts. In short, despite an object’s morphological persistence—its preservation across generations—does the historian’s ability to touch it, to smell it, in short, to behold it, really bring us any closer to the people of generations past who felt its heft, whose fingers moved along its grain, whose hearts swelled with grief upon its sight? Does running a finger over the tooth of a photograph’s grain, feeling the weight of an encased daguerreotype, or flipping past the Testaments to a new dispensation recorded by “the honest eye of the camera” really get us closer to experiential realities of generations past or present? In short, is the relationship between material culture and religious experience that the category of the relic discloses indexical?

The assumed indexicality of material artifacts runs deep in both art historical and American religious studies. In an early definitional essay on material culture, Prown defended his scholarly intervention by claiming that his proposed methodology was “based on the
proposition that artifacts are primary data for the study of material culture, and, therefore, that they can be used actively as evidence rather than passively as illustrations.” I am in complete agreement with Prown’s critique of historians’ uses of material culture as “primary data” rather than as mere illustrations to themes and arguments derived from textual documents. Commenting on the limits of art history’s conventional canons, however, that is, reaching into the commonplace, he asserts that “in some ways artifacts that express culture unconsciously are more useful as objective cultural indexes.” Are stereographs of the Holy Land, sold by subscription and viewed in Sunday Schools, more “objective cultural indexes” than, say, the “large collection of superior photographs” of the Holy Land by the French photographer Felix Bonfils that were on display at Wiswell’s gallery in Cincinnati in July 1873? Does thumbing through a 1903 photograph album get us closer to the experiences of turn of the twentieth century America than a Stieglitz print?

The possibility that material culture somehow brings us closer to “religion” by introducing us to a still-tactile legacy of generations past is powerful. But it also warrants a closer interrogation of the relationship between objects and experiences, tactility and belief, both among contemporary beholders and among later historians (certainly a similar ordering of this dynamic applies to sociologists and ethnographers who, despite contemporaneity, frequently apply different practices of perception and recognition than the people they study). Prown assumes that the senses are a more reliable portal to the past than the mind; that “by undertaking cultural interpretation through artifacts, we can engage the other culture in the first instance not with our minds, the seat of our cultural biases, but with our senses.” Surely our senses, too, deceive. Several of the articles examined in this dissertation were procured from antique malls,
flea markets, and online auctions. While researching the bibles I discuss in Chapter One, I came across an eBay merchant who had posted this disclaimer about their materials:

Our Bibles have in many cases lingered in different homes and surroundings, the odor of tobacco, dampness, dogs, cats, birds and human odors maybe present. Please do not bid on these old antiques if you have an allergy, sinus problem, or repugnance to the smell of OLD. We are sorry but many antique books are not pristine and nearly all of them have some type of odor.65

While historians generally have an affinity rather than an aversion “to the smell of OLD,” this seller’s proviso underscores the counsel of cultural historian Lawrence Levine: “We must . . . prepare ourselves for the possibility that these people whose lives we are sharing for the moment are not necessarily earlier versions of ourselves whom we can know just by knowing ourselves. It is much safer to approach the people who inhabit these pages as different from ourselves, as people whose lives and thoughts we have to strive to understand in however flawed a manner.”66 In other words, if scholars recognize that our own bodies are implicated in the historical process, that our senses are just as mediated as our imaginations, the pretense to immediacy evaporates.

In this introduction I have referred both to material and visual culture as interpretive fields that I engage, with noted caution, in this dissertation. But a more accurate description of my interpretive approach has been recently theorized by historian of religion Sally Promey as “sensory culture.” Promey and her co-author Shira Brisman define sensory culture as a “working method that seeks to hold the sensory and material together in nonhierarchical relation, encouraging consideration of the whole human sensorium (including vision), and reconfiguring the ‘material’ term to include, rather than the compression of ‘the other’ senses, close attention to specific materialities themselves, and the ways that sensations and sensory properties . . . situate human material bodies in connection to other material bodies (animate and inanimate).” This approach is critical because it posits an “interrelational enterprise with respect to people and
things.” Rather than replacing study of objects and images, the authors emphasize, “the scholar of sensory culture . . . attend[s] to practices and artifacts and their producers and processes and contexts of production and reception in relation to the sensory and material embeddedness of each one.” Moreover, while the authors do not directly address this application, a sensory culture approach is also better equipped to place historians’ own sense horizons within the analytical field.67

Importantly, sensory culture also participates in recent scholarly efforts to shake off the interpretive shackles of a field borne out of an attempt to “progress from fetishistic engagement to abstract thought, from material involvements and practices to ‘belief.’”68 No longer bound to interpretive approaches that are defined primarily as analytical counterpoints to this disciplinary heritage—the kind of language that marked early forays into material and visual studies of religion—sensory culture exposes the errors of a historical model built on the assumption of absence. Robert Orsi’s recent advocacy of an enduring supernatural “presence” as an analytical corrective to modernist vocabularies built on an assumption of religious absence provides some interpretive guidance.69 More to the point, Leigh Schmidt asserts that “understanding only goes halfway until the presences of the religious imagination are faced.”70 A study of nineteenth-century American Protestants and Catholics who were firm in their self-identification as both irrefutably modern and unquestionably Christian, in other words, need not fret over how these self-descriptions could coexist. Rather than replicating Benjamin’s suggestion that photographic portraiture necessarily replicated vestigial viewing habits, moreover, this critical approach locates vernacular visual habits within the same interpretive paradigm that refuses to parse religion and modernity into analytical categories of presence and absence.
The concept of presence, moreover, has art historical precedence that further strengthens its applicability in material culture studies, particularly in the work of Hans Belting. But where Orsi and Belting are principally concerned with conventional objects that freight the sacred—relics, holy cards, statues, icons—this dissertation starts from a different corner of materiality. This starting point raises an important question: What happens when commonplace objects assume the commemorative and iconographic function of “sacred” artifacts? Does maintaining the distinction between sacred and profane, religious and cultural, thus become an act of interpretive convention rather than historical observation? The important work of material and visual culture scholars has moved us towards greater consideration of the commonplace as vehicles of religious negotiation and practice. And yet it is precisely this relationship that this dissertation throws into question. Studying the intersections of vernacular photography and American religion provides one space in which frame the seemingly indexical relationship between stuff and the sacred, between the humdrum and the holy—but it is by no means the only place in which such interrogations can take place.

1 The portrait could also be a paper print, which had become increasingly popular after 1857, although the framing and proportions make this possibility unlikely. In short, because the portrait only survives through later photographic documentation, it is difficult to be certain about the medium. Much depends on when the portrait was made: if before Jones left for camp, then it was likely an ambrotype or paper print, if after, then a ferrotype. See, Robert Taft, Photography and the American Scene: A Social History, 1839-1889 (New York: Dover, 1964 [1938]), 123-37, 153-66.


4 Although various methods for securing “images from life” had been discovered in the 1830s and had begun to be practiced in the United States in 1839, paper prints were a later development and were not popularized extensively until the introduction of cartes de visite in 1860. See, for instance, Robert Taft, Photography and the American Scene. Although among the earliest studies of photographic history in the United States, Taft’s breadth and historical detail have preserved his enormous contribution for subsequent generations of scholars. For a more recent, definitive account of the origins of CDV photography, see Elizabeth Anne McCauley, A.A.E. Disderi and the Carte de Visite Portrait Photograph (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985). For two somewhat dated collectors guides, see: William Culp Darrah, Cartes de Visite in Nineteenth [sic] Century Photography (Gettysburg, Pa.: W.C. Darrah, 1981) and Lou W. McCulloch, Card Photographs: A Guide to Their History and Value (Exton, Pa.: Schiffer Pub., 1981).


6 Richard Rudisil, Mirror Image: The Influence of the Daguerreotype on American Society (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1971), 50. While certainly the exception to the rule, Prophet Cherry’s Church of God, an African American congregation of “Black Jews” begun in 1886—according to an ethnography conducted by Arthur Fauset in the early 1940s—considered photographs taboo because “these will harm you, and besides the Bible says you must not make any graven image.” Indeed, Nora L. Rubel has suggested that this proscription against photographic portraiture among its membership was consistent with the centrality of the Ten Commandments in Church of God theology (though it is interesting that contemporary groups who also privileged the Decalogue, such as Father Divine’s Peace Mission Movement, conversely celebrated photography as a means of eliminating racial distinction and of sacrilizing members’ homes through the divine presence of Father Divine’s beatific visage). In addition to its theological implications, however, Prophet Cherry’s proscription was most likely also informed by a desire to create an archive of racial representation that was not rooted in the medium’s ugly history with “race science.” Moreover, if Rubel is correct when she claims that the group not only proscribed members from taking their own photographic likenesses, but that “members did not possess pictures of people,” then the taboo can also be seen as a statement against pervasive practices in American commerce and recreation at the turn of the twentieth century, practices (such as taking pictures, album making, home displays, and so forth) in which historians have discovered deep affinities with discourses of whiteness and eugenics. See, Fauset, Black Gods of the Metropolis: Negro Religious Cults of the Urban North (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001 [1944]), 33, 74; Rubel, “‘Chased Out of Palestine’: Prophet Cherry’s Church of God and Early Black Judaisms in the United States,” New Black Gods: Arthur Huff Fauset and the Study of African American Religions, ed. Edward E. Curtis, IV and Danielle Brune Sigler (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2009), 95-96.
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The thaumatrope was a disc with complementary images on either side that, when wound with string and released, produced the effect of a single image.


James Matthew Barrie, *Peter Pan or The Boy Who Would not Grow Up* (London, ca. 1904). Full text online through Project Gutenberg Australia. [www.gutenberg.net.au/ebooks03/0300081h.html](http://www.gutenberg.net.au/ebooks03/0300081h.html), accessed January 26, 2012. A copy of Barrie’s play with a sixteen-page manuscript dedication to “the five,” dated May 9, 1928, is in the J.M. Barrie Collection, part of the General Collection, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
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This understanding of the teleportational promise of stuff is by no means limited to academe, either. Even if the dominating narrative of television series featuring auction houses, pawn shops, “pickers,” and appraisal services is the potential pecuniary profits of clutter, a prevailing motif is also the “connection” that these found treasures facilitate with “the past.”
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In his history of pornography in Britain, H. Montgomery Hyde writes that in the latter half of the nineteenth century, “erotic realism was artistically exploited” through the new medium of the camera. “The discovery and development of photography facilitated the
manufacture and distribution of erotic and indecent photographs on an enormous scale,” he continues, “thereby laying the foundations of the business in ‘feelthy pictures’ and postcards” that continued to “flourish” into the middle of the next century. Although there is abundant evidence for a robust American market for these “feelthy pictures,” at least one historian claims never to have “seen a pornographic stereograph manufactured in the United States prior to 1905.” Though certainly erotic photographs took a variety of mediums—from daguerreotypes to cabinet cards—this assessment of stereography suggests that the market for erotica was under the sheets—“sold on the streets, not in the shops”—making retrieval of surviving artifacts somewhat more difficult. Hyde, A History of Pornography (London: Henemann, 1964), 110-11. See also, William Durrah, The World of Stereographs (Gettysburg, Penn.: W. C. Durrah, 1977), 158-59; Mary Warner Marien, Photography: A Cultural History, 65-66, 168-69.
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The possibility for the existence of subjectivities existing apart from material practices that constitute ideological apparatus is addressed most directly by Louis Althusser. While I do not go so far as to endorse his theory for this dissertation, it does bring to the front of analysis the interconnectedness of practices, bodies, the quotidian, and the ideological formation of recognition, all of which are of direct concern to the present study. See Althusser, “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation),” *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, trans. Ben Brewster, (New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1971), 127-86.

Sandweiss, *Print the Legend*, 7.

Batchen, *Each Wild Idea*, 59, 61. Promey and Brisman’s call for “sensory culture” does register an interpretive space for this kind of analysis to ensue.
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Chapter One

“WHEN I AWAKE WITH THY LIKENESS”:
PHOTOGRAPHIC PORTRAITURE IN FAMILY BIBLES

As it is, the Bible is a vast picture gallery, where every face may find its likeness, and every character its counterpart.

Le Roy J. Halsey, 1860

Sometime after James Nash and Mary Sheldon were married at Minersville, Pennsylvania, on July 4, 1868, they purchased a full-gilt New Illustrated Devotional and Practical Polyglot Family Bible in luxurious Turkey morocco binding. By the time they bought their bible, most likely from a canvassing book agent who would have assured them that the binding was the only option for “Persons who want a magnificent Bible,” the Nashes had moved seventy miles north from Schuylkill County to Lackawanna Township and had welcomed the birth of their first daughter, Annie. Like most other men in the largely immigrant neighborhood, James was working in the coal mines and Mary was at home with Annie, and likely already expecting the arrival of their second child, Elizabeth, who was born in February 1872. ¹ Whatever the precise date of purchase, the event marked not only an investment in a sacred text but also a material declaration of the Nash family—the bible, in other words, was intended not only as scripture but as a lasting testament of James and Mary’s legacy.

For a family of three or more on a miner’s paycheck, the bible’s purchase price of between $9.00 and $13.00 well exceeded the cost of other options—for instance, the similarly
sized (10 ½ x 13) roan-bound “Pica Bible,” with references, published by the American Bible Society and sold for three dollars—and thus established the investment as a desire for something more than a copy of the scriptures. In addition to whatever value the Nashes attached to the sacred text concealed beneath the heavy raised panels of the leather binding, the bible was a cultural space that not only signified devotional practice, but that established through specific gestures—purchase, display, transcription, accumulation—historical presence, a presence that was signaled before one even opened the cover of the enormous leather-bound compendium of sacred knowledge, elegantly embossed with gilt decorative work and James’s initials, and that lasted long after the family’s corporeal demise. This family was here. And here is their story.

Signaling historical fortitude and inviting those who would finger the enormous volume to reflect not only on its scriptural content but also on the family whose story it told, the Nashes’ bible was not unlike other family bibles popularized after the American Civil War. In addition to the biblical text, for instance, its contents featured “A history of the religious denominations of the world,” many “valuable treatises,” including a “History of the Translation of the Bible,” and a host of “Chronological and Other Useful Tables, Designed to Promote and Facilitate the study of the Sacred Scriptures.” Among the latter was “A Table of Kindred and Affinity: Forbidden to Marry Together,” buried in the back pages and evidently included to clarify appropriate nineteenth-century familial relations. Along with the written material, moreover, the bible included a number of maps of the Holy Land and was “Embellished with Over 200 Fine Scripture Illustrations.” In pages strategically positioned between the Testaments, continuing the practice of generations of Americans before them, moreover, the Nashes dutifully recorded their matrimony and the births of their ten children over the next two decades, as well as the deaths of four, in the printed registries provided by the publisher—thus positioning their own family
history within a biblical chronology. Unlike previous generations of recording practices, however, the Nashes’ bible also included a “Photographic Album for Sixteen Portraits.”

Figure 5: Nash Family Bible, front cover, *The New Illustrated Devotional and Practical Polyglot Family Bible* (Philadelphia, 1870). Reproduced courtesy of the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
Figure 6: Nash "Family Portraits" album page, *New Illustrated Devotional and Practical Polyglot Family Bible* (Philadelphia, 1870). Reproduced courtesy of the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
Introduced in the early 1860s, when card-sized carte de visite prints became an immensely popular social currency, family photograph albums within family bibles typically consisted of two leaves with four apertures on each facing page. Among the “Family Portraits” preserved in the Nashes’ sanctified album were twelve such mounted calling card-sized prints, as well as four tintypes taken by J.Y. Barry, “Artist.” Although placed at the end of the volume rather between the Testaments, these visual genealogies shared with their textual counterparts the simultaneous effect of not only recording the ordinary course of the Nash family’s lives but of positioning their lineage within a sacred chronology that was guided less by the accidents of history than by the masterful plan of the album’s Creator.

Although historians of American religion have not overlooked the family bible as an important archive of material and visual cultural practices, the practice of including studio photographs alongside written genealogies, textual commentary, and published lithographs has merited little more than passing reference. In her 1929 memoir, the “ordinary woman” Anne Ellis recalled that her childhood “big family Bible . . . . had designs all around the leaves, places for photographs, also places for births, deaths and marriages.” Although she conjectured that “it must have been made to sell, certainly not . . . to be read,” Ellis nevertheless remembers specific episodes in her girlhood associated with the massive book—her Mama and the biblical Rachel “weeping for [their] children,” her brother Frank hiding a nickel between the leaves and then cutting them out with a knife in his effort to rescue the coin, finding flowers from “Mama’s old home” and “from a dead baby’s coffin” tucked between its leaves, the latter twined with a lock of hair. Absent from these vivid memories of the bible, however, is any indication of whether her mother placed photographs in the designated pages. It seems that, much like Anne, cultural memory has forgotten about the photographs.
But throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century, bibles and photographic portraiture were commonly associated in material form and in display practices that worked to link individual likenesses with broader narratives of family, race, and sacred history—each of which were, not incidentally, threads of a common tapestry. More than that, the inclusion of albums within bibles transformed the ubiquitous family record, dutifully transcribed, into a deliberately orchestrated, mixed-media narrative of the human predicament and the promise of salvation. Historians have identified photographic portraiture’s participation in constructions of race and nation, but no one has yet explored how these ideological threads, when placed within the pages of the bible, were accompanied by an equally significant visual reckoning of the soul. When asked by his precocious nephew, Tom, about the origins of “the art of photography” in 1879, an essayist in the British youth magazine The Little Gleaner responded with a tidy history of the medium’s nineteenth-century “discovery” and development. When he concluded that its success was evident in the fact that “there is scarcely a house in the kingdom, from the royal palace to the humblest cottage, but possesses some specimen of photography,” Tom mused in wonderment at the possibility of gathering “all those photographs together”: “what a monstrous album would be required for them!” Evidently an eager pedagogue, Tom’s uncle responded with the observation that “it occurs to me I have seen such an [sic] one as you suggest.” To his nephew’s mirthful skepticism, the essayist continued: “Nay, lad, I am serious. Do you not think most people possess a Bible? and is it not comparable to an album? for it contains portraits drawn by God, who is essential light; and, as proof of its magnitude, there is not a person in the world but what, if they had the seeing eye, might discover themselves in it.” More than a record of ancient lives, the bible, through God’s “essential light,” was continuously augmented with the likenesses of the generations: “by carefully looking over the blessed book we have been talking
of, discover your portrait, for it abounds with precious likenesses which will shine like jewels in your eyes if you can but get a proper light thrown upon them by the Holy Spirit being your Guide."

If Tom’s uncle was using the common portrait album as an allegory for the volume of “precious likenesses” of the ancients, he was nevertheless writing at a time when portrait albums had been part of the physical arrangement of family bibles for nearly two decades in both Britain and America. Hardly an isolated association, moreover, his lesson echoed a then-familiar mode of identification between albums and bibles, but one that scholars of both photography and of religion have yet to consider in any significant depth. Robert Taft’s earliest social history of photography in America, published in 1938, recounts pioneer reminiscences of a flour barrel, domesticated by a white lace coverlet, “whereupon reposed the family Bible and photograph album,” but Taft uses this anecdotal evidence to elevate the status of the common enough family album to a level on par with that of the equally ubiquitous family bible. Additionally, cultural historian Martha Langford has observed that, “if the album tore a page from the family Bible, it was the ‘family record.’” While her observation registers a degree of collaboration between visual and transcribed records, Langford nevertheless positions albums as biblical replacements rather than as contemporary counterarchives. When placed in collaboration rather than in succession, in other words, photograph albums and family bibles shared a number of characteristics that reveal shared ideological legacies—the racialized construction of family heritage, for instance—no less than formal characteristics. In this sense, then, it is no surprise that bibles came to include photograph albums. Rather than merely hosting a broader cultural association between photographic portraiture, racial construction, and family history, however,
likenesses within family bibles further entangled these ideational chords with a biblical narrative that purposefully dismissed the pesky constraints of historical time.⁹

If historians of photography have made interpretive correlations between albums and bibles in order to augment albums’ cultural authority or to launch analytic distinctions of narrative strategy, historians of religion have similarly understudied the intertwined history of family bibles and photograph albums. Among scholars of American religion, references to the inclusion of albums within family bibles have been little more than passing glances, as in the fleeting image of a daguerreotype, and cited as but one example of “so much paraphernalia” introduced into family bibles during the course of the nineteenth century. In his otherwise exemplary study of the “packaging” practices of nineteenth-century Protestant bibles, for instance, Paul Gutjahr utters but one sentence in reference to portrait albums, although he does include a full-page graphic of “a family portrait gallery included in post-Civil War bible editions.”¹⁰ Similarly, in her groundbreaking work on family bibles in Victorian homes, Colleen McDannell only peripherally refers to the incorporation of photographic practices—primarily engravings based on photographs—in these encyclopedic tomes, although she does mention “pages for families to include photographs” among a litany of other records bible publishers included by the late nineteenth century.¹¹

Despite a scholarly inattention to family portraits in bibles, this chapter nevertheless builds on the important work that Gutjahr and McDannell, in particular, have provided in order to chart an interpretive history of family bible portrait albums, a practice which began shortly after 1860 and continued through the end of the century. Between 1860 and 1900 at least twenty-five bible publishers with locations in more than fifteen cities—primarily in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, long established hubs of bible publication in the United States—
provided family bibles that included pages for “family portraits” or “family galleries.” Placed almost uniformly at the end of the binding, these galleries appeared in bibles of both Authorized and Douay-Rheims translations, and, after 1881, in “combination” editions that provided parallel columns of both Authorized and Revised translation. Despite the augmentation of materials included in family bibles over this period, and in particular the heightened use of chromolithography and “illuminated” engravings of biblical events and figures based on the works of popular contemporaries Gustav Doré and Heinrich Hoffman, moreover, the photographic leaves remained remarkably consistent over the course of four decades. Variations of page ornamentation on photograph leaves occurred, which is not to be dismissed as insignificant, but by in large publishers included space for between thirteen and seventeen portraits in roughly the same format—four rectangular die-cut openings per side of two leaves of heavy stock or, after 1866 when the larger “cabinet card” portrait was introduced, a space for this larger photograph at the beginning of the album section followed by three or four pages of the smaller apertures.

Both morphological affinities with albums and visual habits informed by portraiture convention conditioned the interpretive possibilities of bible portraiture. Photographic historians have established a number of conventions for dividing portrait photographs into various classifications that supposedly evoked differing visual strategies. Anna Pegler-Gordon, for instance, has identified one such binary as “the honorific self-presentation of bourgeois subjects” and the “repressive representation of prisoners, patients, and the poor.” Shawn Michelle Smith makes a similar distinction between “scientific and criminological mug shots,” on the one hand, and “middle-class portraits,” on the other. Barbara McCandless has taken a different approach, identifying the two modes in which to categorize early photographic portraiture as the
“democratic” appeal of making affordable likenesses of family and friends and the “morally instructive” practice of beholding “images of society’s leaders.” While helpful to map the visual culture of photographic portraiture, that is, the different ways in which portraits were approached and interpreted, these distinctions also risk obscuring the ways in which affordable likenesses of family and friends, made according to established conventions of representation, could be at the same time morally instructive, racially informed, and ideologically charged in ways that did not necessarily map onto the intentions of photographers, scientists, or state officials. In other words, such interpretive compartmentalizations of photographic portraiture privilege the intent of an authorized gaze according to aesthetic convention rather than the tangle of visual habits that could prompt any number of interpretations of a particular likeness.

Moreover, these existing classifications typically assume that photographic portraits were always made to document the present. As historian Martha Sandweiss instructively notes in her study of photography in the American West, however, from an early period, photographs “were invested with the power of myth and cloaked in the gauzy haze of nostalgia; they evoked a longing for the past rather than an understanding of the present.” Sandweiss is here considering the ironic use of staged cowboy photographs as “straightforward reportage” in subsequent histories of the American West, but her attention to the ambiguous temporal positioning of photographic portraiture speaks to the unstable—indeed, the mischievous—operation of time in photograph albums as well. More than a document of a particular moment, photographic portraits brokered an imagined past with an anticipated future through a selective present. It was in this unstable encounter between beholder and likeness, between an embodied present, an imagined past, and an anticipated future, that bible portrait galleries were firmly positioned within the charged chronography of sacred time.
Photograph albums were ordinary objects where beholders were instructed and inspired by the likenesses of friends and family no less than those of greater fame. Even outside of the charged archival context of the family bible, the physical arrangement of albums was believed to inspire personal reform in anticipation of celestial reunion, as demonstrated in a placard inserted into an early album of card portraits that waxed in verse how communion with these familiar shadows prompted beholders towards “the home . . . beyond the sky”:

This book contains much choicer gems
Than any casket on the earth,
It holds the Portraits of our friends,—
Some who have known us from our birth;

Memory of such we’d always have,
But, haply, some who’re here portrayed,
Have left the changing scenes of time,
To dwell among a holier throng,
To labor in a happier clime.

The thoughts of those thus brought to mind
Shall raise our aspirations high,—
Shall help us on to seek the home,
That they have found beyond the sky.19

The relationship among visual habits of the present, memories of the past, and aspirations towards the future that this poem articulates, in short, can be mapped onto contemporary photographic discourse in a way that emphasizes the ideological and indeed theological roles of photographic portraiture without assuming a causal relationship between aesthetic convention and a photograph’s meaning for its beholders. And whether the card was tucked into a photograph album or a bible gallery, its sentiment underlined a viewing habit common to both archives, namely that beholding the likenesses of friends and family carried the same instructional potential as the shadows of more famous folk.
In order to understand the practice of including studio portraits in family bibles, in this chapter I unravel the aesthetic, scientific, and theological idioms of “likeness” at work in the first several decades of photographic portraiture. In most cases these differing idioms agreed on a fundamental correspondence between interior states—whether figured as one’s character or one’s soul or one’s natural dispositions—and externalized counterparts available to sensory perception. Despite this accord, however, the aim of the chapter is not a plucky narrative of discursive synchrony. Rather, by training our gaze on the constellation of visual and discursive contexts that informed the manufacture of bible albums in the latter half of the nineteenth century, it is a story of how the knotted threads of race and nation were smuggled into sacred history—unwittingly, perhaps—under the guise of family pictures.

“WHAT AN ARRAY THERE IS OF HEADS!”: PORTRAITURE AND BIBLES

Soon after news of Daguerre’s method for securing images from life arrived on the British Queen in September 1839 Americans rushed to purchase the necessary furnishings—chemicals and plates—and to jury-rig their cameras from household objects—Joseph Saxton of Philadelphia made his from a magnifying glass and cigar box.20 By the end of the week, Samuel F.B. Morse, who had met with Daguerre earlier in the year while touting his Electro-Magnetic Telegraph in Paris, boasted a view of the Unitarian Church taken from the third story staircase of the gothic revival University of the City of New York on Washington Square, where he was currently installed as professor of literature of the arts of design.21 Although these earliest experiments were in keeping with Daguerre’s own preference for inanimate subjects—“rural scenery, buildings, &c.”—Morse, a portrait painter by training, and his fellow compatriots were eager not only to capture their environments on silver, but also their own reflections. In fact,
Daguerre’s skepticism “in regard to the practicability of taking portraits of *living persons*” did little to deter Morse and others from just such pursuits, the lengthy exposure times—“fifteen to twenty minutes” in strong outdoor light in those earliest days—notwithstanding. Within a month Morse claimed to have taken full-length portraits of his daughter and her friends, “out-of-doors, on the roof of a building, in the full sun-light,” and given the exposure time of “ten to twenty minutes,” with “the eyes closed.” To the great fortune of these early experimenters, by the following spring, having adjusted the lens and focal length of the camera and “dusted the sitter’s face with flour,” Morse’s colleague at the University, John Draper, was able to reduce the exposure time to just over one minute.\(^{22}\)

Despite such a rough start, by the following spring John Johnson and Alexander S. Wolcott had opened “the first daguerreotype gallery for portraits” in New York and Robert Cornelius had established a portrait gallery in Philadelphia. Although daguerreotype portraits had in fact been made in France by the end of 1839—one Parisian satirical magazine instructed in August, for instance, that to make “a portrait of your wife. . . . you fit her head in an iron collar to give the required immobility, thus holding the world still for the time being”—Americans were quick to assert the technical improvements and market savvy that made their work stand apart. As one career daguerreotypist later reflected on these early years, “the daguerreotypes made in Europe did not compare with the *Yankee work*.”\(^{23}\)

As early as 1840 the Philadelphia daguerreotypist Robert Cornelius used portraits of his city’s elite citizenry to draw clients into his studio, and the same strategy was used by John Plumbe, Jr., to promote his franchise in studios across the northeast.\(^{24}\) In 1843 Edward Anthony, a mogul of photographic supplies and prints for much of the mid-nineteenth century, along with his partners at the time, Jonas Edwards and J.R. Clark, had assembled The National
Daguerreotype Miniature Gallery at the New York address of 247 Broadway. Although originally an architectural term relating to covered promenades, since at least the early seventeenth century the term “gallery” had been associated with spaces specifically designed or appropriated to display works of art—and there is little doubt the ever-enterprising Anthony was aware of this latter association when he named his collection of portraits. Indeed, “consisting entirely of likenesses of distinguished persons,” wrote the editor of the Democratic Review in 1845, the gallery was deemed “one of the most valuable and interesting objects connected with art.” “What an array there is of heads!” the Knickerbocker concurred a year later, “poets, painters, statesmen and heroes; the evidence of truth stamped upon each likeness.” The collection was especially noted for its “counterfeit presentments” of Congress, which were “regularly transmitted to New York . . . with the autographs of each person” for display. Unlike other studio galleries that were designed to attract passersby not only as beholders but as clients, at Anthony’s miniature gallery “for seeing them there is no charge, as the gallery is free to all.”
Around forty years later, at his studio in Oconomowoc, Wisconsin, using photographic techniques that produced negatives on plates of glass that could then be used to make countless prints on paper, Douglas Munger peered through his camera at the trio comported and composed in front of him. Whatever other uses the camera had been put to in the decades since the introduction of Daguerre’s process—and there were many—the making of likenesses had become the signature operation of photography for most Americans, and this was especially so after the popularization of card photographs in the 1860s. In this newly mirrored world, however, likeness was a versatile category—one could say prismatic—that reflected not only the lineaments of one’s flesh but the state of one’s soul, the integrity of one’s lineage, and the virtue of one’s character. Frequently the perception of these less apparent qualities was effected through visual cues, and among the most charged props were books: described by the Broadway photographer Abram Bogardus at the end of his career as “just the thing” to communicate “an attitude of importance.” We know nothing of Munger’s religious affiliation or that of the family who now sat before him. What we do know is that someone thought it important—whether aesthetically, culturally, or piously—to place a large family bible in the middle of the composition, and, just as importantly, that the other people involved in the portrait agreed.

The photograph is presumably a family of three: mother, father, daughter. The two older figures sit in elegant parlor chairs, hands on their laps, shoulders and hips pointing toward the opposite edge of the frame. The woman, sitting on the left side of the composition, looks directly into the camera, the dimple on her right cheek betraying the slightest grin. The man, sporting a full beard, holds a rolled newspaper in his left hand and stares obliquely across the frame. Between these two figures stands a young woman, gazing to the right of the frame, seemingly over the camera’s lens—no doubt at Munger’s insistence—her long light-colored hair draped
over her left shoulder, her hands resting on an enormous book whose spine clearly reads “Family Bible.” The bible itself sits on an elegantly carved table adorned with a delicate chain. The entire scene is set before what appears to be an enormous mantle and ornamented wall, but that is almost certainly a painted backdrop, as evidenced by competing perspectives and uniform focus along the walls’ supposedly receding planes. As with other portraits that feature bibles, or any prop for that matter, it is ultimately unclear just what the bible is doing for the composition and, just as importantly, how the artifact figures in relationship to the people being photographed. Was this a studio prop or a family treasure? Was it part of their daily lives? How so? Does it mean anything that, within this particular portrait, the bible is depicted in closest proximity to the girl, rather than her father or mother? Why does the man hold a newspaper and look away from the bible? Are we, as accidental beholders, to detect a message within the frame?

In her work on American material religion, Colleen McDannell has examined the nineteenth-century Protestant iconography of family bible reading as evidence of a transition from paternal to maternal instruction, which was itself part of a broader domesticization of the bible among Victorian Protestants. Photography certainly was part of this iconographic tradition, as McDannell indicates in a reproduction of an 1860s stereograph that, in her words, “reflects popular engravings of the time” that were themselves modeled after Jean-Baptiste Greuze’s eighteenth-century painting, *Père de famille expliquant la Bible à ses enfants* (1755). More common than this genre-style photography, in which the composition was intended to narrate a story, however, was the practice of posing for a portrait, perhaps with one or two others, while simply holding the bible on one’s lap or, as in Munger’s photograph, resting it on a nearby table. Soon after Daguerre’s invention was adopted by American photographers, props became a regular feature of daguerreotype portraits, and books were among the most frequently utilized,
particularly in portraits of women and children. But whereas books in portraits have frequently been remembered as bibles, it is often difficult to determine the veracity of such claims, as in the tintype of “Gr. Grandpa Dikeman” or the card photograph of a middle-aged woman taken by a photographer (“Raymond”) in Brooklyn (figure 8). Other times, closer inspection proves such claims to be incorrect, as in the otherwise emblematic real photo postcard of an elderly woman posing in front of a corner cabinet decked with family photographs, holding Scott’s *Life of Napoleon* (figure 9). Despite the challenges of cataloguing or quantifying the prevalence of bibles in early vernacular portraiture, however, there is sufficient evidence that the practice was common enough to nurture such assumptions. McDannell’s discussion of the cultural significance of bibles in the late nineteenth century—it was, as she says, a revered object” no less than a “text telling of salvation”—provides some rationale for later acts of inventive remembrance. See, for instance, the real photo postcard of “Grandma and Grandpa Wood” (figure 10) from around 1907, in which Grandma seems clearly not only to be holding open an indexed bible, but also to be pointing to a particular page—as one of their grandchildren later inscribed on the correspondence side of the card, “how nice of them.”

Despite the instructive promise of iconographical analysis of these photographs, in short, there are problems with investing too much signifying agency in any particular prop. In 1864 a Broadway photographer instructed the “fraternity” in some “hints” to produce “ease and grace in a portrait”: “The hands of a lady may rest easily upon the lap, and should be presented edgewise, neither too high nor too low, which will give them a small, delicate appearance. Or one hand may be laid upon a table, while the other hand may hold a book or some other object, if the sitter so choose. For myself, however, I think a pretty hand is much the prettiest when empty.” In an undated carte de visite taken by “Miss R.M. Thorp” of Geneva, Ohio, the aging
Figure 8: Undated tintype (ca. 1865) and undated carte de visite (ca. 1875) of sitters holding books that appear to be bibles. Author’s collection.

Figure 9: Real photo postcard of woman holding *Life of Napoleon*. Ca. 1910. Author's collection.
Figure 10: Real Photo Postcard of "Grandma and Grandpa Wood," ca. 1907. Author’s collection.

Figure 11: Carte de visite, "Lucian Williams Mother," ca. 1860-1870.
sitter, one Mrs. Williams, seems to have struck a compromise with these hints, her hands “resting easily” upon a massive family bible. Clasping her hands on the edge of the closed volume, the ancient Williams purses her lips and looks intently into the camera. On the back of the card, someone, at some time, wrote “Lucian Williams / Mother” above the photographer’s stamp and “she never weighed 100 pounds” below it.

Paying attention to archival practices does not quiet these concerns entirely, but it does map a broader sweep of the circumstances of encounter that informed visual habits of beholding. Prior to the turn of the century, studio portraits were the variety of photograph most commonly included in family bibles. Many of the same interpretive problems associated with studio portraits of sitters holding family bibles carry over into studio portraits tucked into bible albums. Who were they? What did this visual association with a bible mean? Who were their anticipated beholders? How have the practices of their descendents shaped later interpretations of their likenesses? Before turning to the bibles themselves, however, it is first important to outline the conceptual coordinates of “likeness” within nineteenth-century religious and photographic discourse. As an idiomatic category, it is important not to overburden the term with definitive precision and yet it is also important to point to nodes of congruence in the term’s broad web of signification.

“AS EVEN THINE”: THE BODY AND SOUL OF LIKENESS

In early December, 1841, Mary Van Lennep retreated to her room, “which I have long wished for.” The wife of Henry Van Lennep, a missionary in Turkey, Mary had long waited for “a day in which to look over my future course, and endeavor to adopt those principles upon which I can safely act in after life.” Trembling at the weightiness of her meditations, she wrote
that “God has placed me in this world to glorify him, by preparing my own soul for his kingdom, and by doing all I can to lead others to do so. He is sparing me in this world, that my character may be formed into a likeness to his own perfect character, that I may continually increase in holiness, and receive those blessings for which the Saviour died.” For Mary Van Lennep, to grow in likeness to God was a process of conforming to his character, of preparing her soul for the rewards to come, and, through these actions, leading others to adopt her course.

Although the phrase “awake in Thy likeness” is taken from the Psalms, the concept of a likeness to God or to Jesus was one that nineteenth-century Christians found from Genesis through the Gospels. And while ministers and lay persons who invoked the concept in their sermons, diaries, and memoirs certainly did not agree on all points, its consistent invocation certainly suggests its ubiquity as a theological concept that, in turn, we can map onto the visual habits of photography’s earliest beholders. William Ellery Channing’s 1828 sermon “Likeness to God” at the ordination of Frederick Augustus Farley in Providence, Rhode Island, first published in January 1829 and in print throughout the century, provides one contemporary meditation on “the importance of this assimilation to our Creator” among nineteenth-century Americans. Though the Unitarian Channing perhaps pushed further than his “orthodox” contemporaries on the issue of humanity’s “kindred nature with God,” his sermon is nevertheless an important touchstone in the effort to map the overlapping terrains of theological and photographic conceptions of likeness.

In his sermon, Channing noted that “likeness” did not correspond to God’s “figurative resemblance to man,” but rather a recognition of “kindred mind, which interprets the universe by itself” and thus sets humans apart from other beasts in God’s creation. For Channing, “to grow in the likeness of God, we need not cease to be men. This likeness does not consist in extraordinary
or miraculous gifts, in supernatural additions to the soul, or in any thing foreign to our original constitution. . . . I repeat it, to resemble our Maker we need not quarrel with our nature or our lot.” Neither beast nor saint nor angel, human beings in their very constitution were made to “resemble [their] Maker.” Channing hinges his evidence of such kindred nature with the New Testament notion of God as Father, “and a brighter feature of that book cannot be named.” Religion, then, for Channing “is not the adoration of a God with whom we have no common properties . . . but of an all-communicating Parent. It recognizes and adores God, as a being . . . who has made man in his own image, who is the perfection of our own spiritual nature, who has sympathies with us as kindred beings, . . . who looks on us with parental interest, and whose great design it is to communicate to us for ever, and in freer and fuller streams, his own power, goodness, and joy.” Thus for Channing, likeness to God was a temporal aspiration that was to be effected through cultivation of God-given faculties of mind and soul, in whatever lot one was given. It was, nevertheless, a hereditary nature, passed from parent to child, a paradigm that would become increasingly important in the growing culture of vernacular photographic portraiture.35

However much Channing’s theology bristled against the grain of the period’s emerging evangelicalism, as a public figure of great repute there is no doubt. As the only minister to be featured in Mathew Brady’s Gallery of Illustrious Americans (1850), the first bound volume of lithographs based on daguerreotype portraits of “representative” Americans, moreover, he marks an important intersection in this history of likenesses.36 Nevertheless, the theological idiom of likeness was hardly limited to the Unitarian pulpit. While serving as Rector of St. Peter’s Episcopal Church in Westchester, New York—a post which he held from 1848 to 1871—Charles D. Jackson also sermonized on “The Divine Likeness.” While for Jackson one’s “awakening”
was delayed until “the morning of the Resurrection Day,” after all had “laid down their precious dust in the sweet repose of death,” he nevertheless enjoined his parishioners that “we are not fashioned into this likeness of Christ by a single abrupt act of omnipotent power first exerted at the resurrection, but it is a likeness into which we grow.” If for Channing one’s likeness to God was inherent to humanity, for Jackson the “immortal beauty of body and soul”—in short, one’s likeness to the resurrected Christ—was similarly “but the ultimate development of vital forces now planted and working in our nature,—a life hid with Christ in God.”

Echoing Jackson’s exegesis of a soul awakened as the site of divine likeness, the Presbyterian missionary William Jessup Armstrong wrote that “the likeness of which the psalmist speaks is a conformity of the soul to God,” and that it “will consist in a similarity between the qualities of [persons’] souls and the attributes of the Divine nature. . . . when they awake from this dream of life.” Despite important theological differences from Channing, the Congregationalist Jackson and the Presbyterian Armstrong nevertheless acknowledged that, however “partial in the present life,” traces of this future likeness were perceptible, in Armstrong’s words, within the “gross material body.” Armstrong, to be sure, was more suspicious of the powers of perception, writing that “enveloped in the mists of sense, and covered with the darkness of sin, we see objects very superficially, and often they do not appear to us as they really are,” and his sermon was accordingly a stronger exhortation on “the future likeness of the saints to God” than either Jackson or Channing. Armstrong’s suspicions of human perception, however, better reflect the philosophical moorings of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries than the visual habits of the nineteenth, when confidence was increasingly placed in sciences of observation and measurable correspondences between referents and beholders.
As a ubiquitous if theologically slippery concept, nineteenth-century Protestant notions of divine likeness are also to be found in the records of the saints. On Ash Wednesday, 1850, Susan Allibone pleaded in her diary, “Oh! my Savior, take me to thyself whenever it shall seem good to Thee. I shall be satisfied when I awake with Thy likeness.” Whether Allibone’s modification of the psalmist’s preposition (the scriptural “to” becomes “with”) constitutes a deliberate theological move—and one that transforms the penitent from being in the audience of the divine to being in communion with him—we cannot know, but it is clear that the prayer was often on the tip of her pen, and, we might imagine, her tongue as well. Even as she was “cut off from the enjoyments of health, and confined to the couch of languishing,” wrote Episcopal Bishop Alfred Lee, who first published her diary and letters in 1855 (they were still in print a decade later), “the grace of God which was in her could not be hid.” Allibone’s utterance of the prayer to “awake with Thy likeness” seems, less like Channing and more like Jackson and Armstrong, to anticipate a future, celestial awakening rather than an earthly aspiration of similitude to a kindred nature with God. And yet by publishing her memoirs “to present to the disciples of Christ such an exhibition of profound and living piety,” Bishop Lee presented Allibone’s own life as one to emulate while still enrobed in fleshy garb.41

Three weeks before her sixtieth birthday in the “seventh month” of 1857, Sarah Hunt of the Society of Friends reflected on her recent journey to the Genesee Yearly Meeting in

---

Figure 12: Frontispiece to Journal of the Life and Religious Labors of Sarah Hunt (Philadelphia: Friends' Book Association, 1892).
Farmington, New York. Although her “exercises were very great,” for “the duties of home seemed pressing,” her decision to attend the meeting was rewarded by a “Master [who] was good to me, and on various occasions unsealed the spring of Life, that I could speak of His goodness in the great congregations.” After describing various meetings and the “blessings showered down,” Hunt closed her entry with a prayer for her “companions in life,” particularly those “who think life is given for amusement and to trifle away,” for an “abundance of Thy goodness . . . ; and embracing its unfoldings be transformed into Thy likeness, and beautified with salvation.”

While still operating on a spiritual register rather than one of “figurative resemblance,” for Hunt the transformation into a likeness of Christ was one that manifested itself through perceptible traits. Although her memoir was published posthumously in 1892, the frontispiece supports the notion of a link between one’s recordable visage and one’s spiritual state, particularly through the medium of portraiture. No doubt based on a photograph, below the partial profile engraving of Hunt is what appears to be her manuscript valediction, “as even thine / Sarah Hunt.” Whatever meaning these words invited in the context of written communication, their proximity to Hunt’s portrait in the journal suggests a constructed correspondence between one’s physical likeness and one’s likeness to Christ, “beautified with salvation.”

While maintaining a conceptual distinction between spiritual and corporeal likeness, theological invocations of the idiom, particularly among the laity, introduce a healthy measure of ambiguity, as when Deborah Cushing Porter prayed in 1839, “Oh, draw the outlines of thy likeness in my heart, and never leave the work, until all its lineaments are filled up, and every feature is fashioned and finished in thy likeness, and made to supplant all the image of the earthly.” Though her similitude to Christ was supposedly manifest “in my heart” and not in the flesh, her language, like that of many of her contemporaries, suggests that this primary
signification of an inward cultivation was understood to influence one’s outward appearances as well. Indeed, as the century progressed, greater confidence was placed in the correspondence between physical and spiritual constitutions, particularly among those Protestant reformers who identified Jesus as a model of physical perfection no less than spiritual aspiration. By shaping the visual habits of religious Americans, portrait photography no doubt played an important role in this theological transition.44

At a time when likeness was becoming increasingly associated with physiognomy, on the one hand, and with a calculable correspondence between “form” and the inner-workings of one’s soul, on the other, these preacherly pronouncements and saintly scribbles echo conversations in other quarters concerning the linkage between present, past, and future in lineages facilitated through perceptible comportment. The ability to discern through outward registers the state of one’s soul has been well-documented in histories of American religion, but what has not been addressed in this literature is how during the mid-nineteenth century discourses surrounding the new medium of photographic portraiture also emphasized a mutual correspondence between what the camera recorded and what the beholder perceived beneath, as it were, the surface.45

“By the early 1850s,” writes photographic historian Barbara McCandless, “the standard for a truly accurate likeness had become not merely to reproduce the subject’s physical characteristics but to express the inner character as well.” She goes on to describe such nineteenth-century sensibilities as a “naïve belief that outer physical features could be clues to inner character,” citing as her example a transformation in the period’s professional literature from “aesthetic treatises into a series of formulas” designed to produce the right effect in the sitter’s likeness.46 Even if her assessment of these logics of correspondence as “naïve belief” undermines the intellectual, theological, and aesthetic discourses that supported their currency
throughout the century, and her reference to shifts in professional literature overlooks the ways in which studio manuals borrowed from aesthetic treatises, McCandless is nevertheless correct to identify an uncertain terrain between similitude and likeness that was navigated, in part, by the compass of “expression.”

In order to counter accusations from established art traditions—primarily portraiture painting and its more popular cousin, miniature portraits—that daguerreotypists were merely “operators” and not “artists,” studio proprietors who catered to affluent clients clambered for aesthetic excellence even as they articulated the challenges of securing a “true likeness” in but a moment’s time. It was a hard sell. “Thus a portrait is satisfactory in so far as the painter has sympathy with his subject,” the American painter Rembrandt Peale quoted one Mrs. Jamieson in 1857, “This may be the reason why a daguerreotype, however beautiful and accurate, is seldom satisfactory or agreeable; and that while we acknowledge its truth as a fact, it always leaves something for the sympathies to desire.” While Peale took care to position himself as an expert on the subject, unlike the “amateur” Mrs. Jamieson, he nevertheless agreed that the daguerreotypist’s “pictures may be true, as regards the proportions of the features; . . . but sometimes they are more true in recording the strong marks of age and some fixed expression, than is agreeable to the person represented.” Thus he predicted that portraitists in his medium would now have to make their works “not only as true, but expressively more true than the daguerreotypes, with which but few, at present, are content.”

Peale was writing at what would only later become known as the end of the daguerreian period. Over the next few years, using techniques that had been around since around 1850 but that had not yet become commercially viable in the United States, studio photographers would begin selling more likenesses on paper than on metal, especially after 1860 when the card-sized
“carte de visite” came into vogue. And yet the articulated disjuncture between “truth” and “representation”—indeed, the excessive truthiness of the camera as a representational failing—in photographic portraiture was noted by later photographers as well. In his 1864 historical account of “the heliographic art,” Marcus Aurelius Root, who consistently distinguished between “artists” and “mere mechanics,” wrote that the aim of photographers was “not merely to get an exact outline of his sitter’s face” that could then be tinted and colored so that “it shall be true to the original.” However “essential to a perfect portrait,” such accuracies of light and shadow “are insufficient, in the absence of that expression which reveals the soul within,—that individuality which distinguishes this from all human beings beside.” So sure was he that expression trumped “outline” that he declared, “If the artist cannot detect and seize this, he makes no portrait.” Thus even if Root could identify “verity of likeness” as the “first point of excellence” in a studio portrait, he could with equal gusto proclaim that such a portrait was “worse than worthless if the pictured face does not show the soul of the original,—that individuality or selfhood which differentiates him from all beings, past, present, or future.” Root likened the process to that of the “Supreme Proto-Artist,” who, in creating Adam, “formed the man of the dust of the ground”—that is, established his corporeal frame—and only then “breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.” Writing to an audience of professional photographers, Root explained that in order to succeed, his readers “must copy, throughout, the process of this Divine Exemplar.”

Peale’s appeal to the sympathetic eye of the artist as a superlative rubric of likeness and Root’s adoption of religious language to explain the heliographer’s art suggests common ground between theological and aesthetic understandings of likeness at work in nineteenth-century American culture. What is further important to note, however, is how both portraiture and
religion drew upon emerging racial discourses that sought to baptize this correspondence between character and comportment in the cool springs of scientific observation. McCandless notes, for instance, that the contemporary notion that portraits could “express the essence of the subject—the sitter’s true moral character” was profoundly influenced by popular understandings of physiognomy and phrenology, although we might also add to this the collaborative sciences of anthropology, craniology, and anatomy. As Molly Rogers has argued convincingly, these eighteenth-century disciplines “were used to get beyond the awkward surface of race—the color of skin—and attempt to construct racial difference more objectively.” If it is too much conjecture to argue that all beholders of photographic likenesses consciously wove these racialized disciplines into the interpretive moment—which it is—it is not off mark to argue that they nevertheless profoundly influenced viewing habits, particularly as likenesses became increasingly salient registers of hereditary lineage, which is discussed in the following section. What is more, American Protestants were caught up in the heat of these fiery agnotologies.

In his heliographic essay, Marcus Aurelius Root drew upon the popular sciences of phrenology and, especially, physiognomy, to instruct his readers in the art of delimiting not only the sitter’s likeness but, more importantly, her soul: “The human face . . . is the most perfect of all mediums of expression; the medium, too, for expressing that intelligence and affection whereon rests man’s claim to be ‘made in the image of God.’” Beginning with the premise that “the face is . . . the index of the soul,” Root clarifies “that in a considerable degree, the face is an index both to the intellectual and moral character, is beyond dispute. Indeed, we are all physiognomists in practice, if not in theory.” Rogers notes along these lines that daguerreotype portraits were sometimes called “physiognomies,” which indicates that long after Johann Caspar Lavater had recognized the infinite complexity of facial expression, and thus the impossibility of
securing a stable system of physiognomic classification, the idea remained firmly entrenched in the imagination of many Americans—the same place, not incidentally, where photographs were imbued with meaning through the act of beholding.\textsuperscript{53}

In her study of fluctuating ideologies of embodiment in American Christianity, R. Marie Griffith identifies within nineteenth-century discourses of phrenology “notions of corporeal and spiritual equivalence” that continued to have “a conspicuous impact on American body culture” well into the twentieth century. Griffith identifies the physiognomic theologies of the eighteenth-century Swiss Protestant theologian Johann Caspar Lavater, who, in her summation, “believed that the soul carried somatic evidences,” as an important influence among nineteenth-century Protestants who “seized upon the theory of body-soul correspondences known as phrenology: a system that supposedly proved that the character of any individual could be read in the anatomical details of the skull.” Although phrenology was first introduced to the United States in the 1820s, during the 1830s it became much more popular among literary elite, in no small part due to Johann Gaspar Spurzheim’s ill-fated visit to America in 1832 (Spurzheim was phrenology-founder Franz Joseph Gall’s student and died while on his American tour). Even as phrenology came to be at home in popular entertainments no less the halls of respectability, Griffith argues that the “emphatically corruptible” science nevertheless “promised to satisfy Christian hopes for authenticity and transparency, teaching that physical traits . . . perfectly disclosed the inner worlds of their bearers.”\textsuperscript{54}

The gradual cooptation of likenesses into narratives of descent drew upon visual habits conditioned in the first decades of photographic portraiture, which were themselves informed by broader cultural concerns with surface and depth, as evidenced in theological, aesthetic, and racialized discourses. In the physical artifact of family bibles, all of these converged.
A decade after James and Mary Nash bought their hefty family bible, their family of three had grown to one of seven. Eleven-year-old Annie was now at school and Mary was at home with daughters Elizabeth, age eight, and Mary, age three, and her infant son, George. Also living with them in 1880 was Mary’s father, George Sheldon, no doubt the namesake for the Nashes’ only surviving son. As was all too common during the nineteenth century, James and Mary had also suffered loss in the intervening years. In December 1875 their two-year old daughter Mary, for whom her sister was later named, died the week before Christmas, and a year later they buried their infant son James.

In addition to tucking studio portraits into the designated pages at the end of the bible, over the years the family had placed other mementoes within its pages. A clump of short, fine, light colored hair rests in the Gospel of Mark, perhaps snipped from baby James’s fevered head or his sister’s ailing brow. A newsclipping tucked in the Wisdom of Solomon bears witness to the elder Mary Nash’s “final tribute.” A calling card from Grace Weiser Davis of Jersey City in the fold of Maccabees proclaims, “Under all circumstances, Look to Jesus!,” and in the New Testament book of I Corinthians, between chapters 14 and 15, there is a stemmed yellow flower. Though the presence of the flower does not alone indicate a deliberate association with the text, it is at least suggestive that I Corinthians 15 concludes with the promise of victory over death through Christ: “O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory,” poignantly symbolized in the flower that hath not fadeth.

The registries, photographs, and mementos preserved in the Nash family bible all contributed to a form of memory work that was linked, by its material association with the scriptures, with sacred history no less than with the rather inglorious human predicament of birth,
procreation, and death. But what is less apparent in the Nash bible is what role the photographs, in particular, played in constructing these narratives. Importantly, contemporary amateur genealogical projects that facilitated racialized discourses under the aegis of “ancestry” model ways in which lineage was plotted on sacred no less than racial or cultural arcs. In particular, photographic technology enabled ethnologists, law enforcement agencies, and ordinary studio photographers to manufacture visual records of belonging—according to classifications of race, criminality, and social standing—that were woven into narratives of destiny and progress under the authorizing discourse of technological empiricism. This use of technology to construct visual archives of descent—whether to the benefit or detriment of those represented—profoundly influenced the popularity of photograph albums in the 1860s. The prospective implications of genealogical narratives, moreover, was also evident in albums that assembled “Portraits of our friends” in order that beholders “raise our aspirations high.” Family bible portrait albums, with their physical proximity to the written family records and to the pearls tucked between the pages, as well as the morphological similarities between albums and bibles, made bible galleries important archives of these intersecting modes of representation.

As early as 1862 the Saturday Evening Post made reference to a family bible that “has been published in which adjacent to the pages usually bound in the book for the registration of births, deaths, etc., are arranged in sheets any convenient number of card cases, such as contain the ordinary photographic albums, in which may be inserted the photographs of the different members of the family.” Although its details are scant—who published the bible? where was it sold? how much did it cost?—this notice already shifts our understanding of the practice of including portrait pages in family bibles from a post-Civil War phenomenon, as Gutjahr has suggested, to one that was more closely linked with the rise of portrait albums in the United
States around 1860, once card-sized paper prints had become commercially viable. In December 1864, L. Clark and Company of Baltimore listed among their “Christmas goods” for the holiday season “a splendid assortment of PHOTOGRAPH BIBLES at very low prices.” While the language of this advertisement does not point directly to the types of photographs their bibles included, a year later the Baltimore publishers and booksellers at Murphy and Company, located two doors down from Clark, described their photograph bibles as “QUARTO BIBLES arranged to contain in connection with the Family Record Photographic Portraits of the Family.” Arranged for sixteen “family portraits,” this “entirely new and attractive feature” was to be found in a selection of bibles “bound in the most beautiful and superb styles” and sold “at very low prices.”

Although both merchants advertised photograph bibles, they nevertheless seem to have catered to different clientele, if the accompanying goods are any indication. Clark and Company, for instance, noted their “splendid stock” of photograph albums, their plated-ware, including tea sets, ice pitchers, coffee urns, wine stands, and butter dishes, among other sundries, as well as watches, jewelry, and a stock of “fancy goods” from “china vases of all kinds” to mahogany writing desks and “a splendid assortment of fine French perfumery.” In contrast to the stock at Clark, Murphy & Company specialized in books and religious goods. In addition to their selection of photograph albums and “juvenile books etc.,” for instance, they also supplied prayer and devotional books “in every variety of CARVED IVORY VELVET TURKEY MOROCCO CALF and other superb bindings,” a stock of Catholic prayer books “of their own publication,” ranging in price from twenty cents to forty dollars per volume, in bindings “upward of ONE HUNDRED different styles,” and “a very large stock of FINE ROSARIES . . . SILVER and GOLD MEDALS FINE CRUCIFIXES STATUETTES &c.”

An advertisement from June 1864
further clarifies what the later print subtly suggests. Under the boldfaced caption, “Something New and Appropriate. Photograph Bibles,” Murphy and Company invited “such as may want a good Cheap Family Douay Bible . . . to call and examine prices, &c, at the Cheap Up-Stairs Bookstore” on their premises at 182 Baltimore Street.⁶¹

More common than bookstores, however, most households in the nineteenth century were introduced to family bibles through publishers’ agents. Often nameless to posterity, or at best remembered as unscrupulous catchpennies peddling the Word of God, bible agents in fact mediated the world of publishers with that of consumers. Armed with specimen copies of the scriptures that were bedecked with three or four binding styles and that dazzled prospective buyers with vibrant chromolithographs and ornamental presentation plates, the agents’ impossible task was to mediate a timeless truth with the discriminating taste of middle-class Americans. Seldom are historians invited into this exchange. What was the course of conversation, for instance, that persuaded Andrew Roberts and Mrs. John Muzgy of Saranac, New York, to order the New Devotional and Practical Pictorial Family Bible in American Morocco, or W.W. Knight, E.J. Onusbee, and F.E. Prickeauau to buy it in the finer grade of Turkey? How did agents pitch the merits of each feature? How did the domestic context influence the conversation? Were selections determined by the depth of one’s pocketbook alone, or were other considerations of equal or greater influence? A number of publishers in the latter decades of the nineteenth century included photograph albums in their canvassing bibles, including P.W. Ziegler, the Hubbard Brothers, Bradley, Garreston & Co., W.A. Burnham, and Ziegler & McCurdy, in territories than stretched from Philadelphia to Houston, Texas, to San Francisco. Most of these agents left the album pages blank, perhaps inviting their customers to fill them with their mind’s eye. At least one agent, however, decided not to leave such matters to
the imagination alone. With no other identifying information in the volume, this enterprising salesman placed nine cartes de visite and one gem tintype portraits in the specimen “Family Portraits” pages (figure 13). Whether or not this move yielded greater results cannot be determined from the canvassing book alone, as it lacks subscription information in the designated pages as well as other markers of interaction with subscribers. Regardless, the inclusion of portraits in the canvassing book corresponds with uses of studio photography in family bible galleries. Moreover, that both Protestant and Catholic bible publishers came to offer photograph galleries in their products, and that these “new and appropriate” options were sold in a variety of commercial venues, suggests that the introduction of bible portrait albums was a wider cultural phenomenon than has been previously noted by historians of religion or photography.

Indeed, despite such evidence, previous scholarship has assumed—or at the very least intimated—that including portrait galleries in family bibles was predominantly a Protestant trend. Catholic publishers, however, such as John Kelly and John E. Potter of Philadelphia and D. & J. Sadlier of New York, also produced a number of Douay and Rheims editions that designated spaces for family photographs. John and Mary Droney of Brooklyn owned an 1884 Douay & Rheims translation, complete with Haydock’s “Notes and References” published by the Lovell Manufacturing Company of Erie, Pennsylvania, and copyrighted by the National Publishing Company. In addition to the section for “Family Portraits,” the bible also included selections from Gustav Dore’s Gallery of Scripture Illustrations, graphic content that was frequently included in Protestant translations as well. While Catholic and Protestant publishers may have approached the conventions of portraiture to different effects within family bibles as a whole—for instance, Catholic publishers may have been the first to include lithographic portrait
studies of divine figures and ecclesial authorities in the 1880s—the particular usages of family photograph albums nevertheless seems not to have differed significantly along sectarian axes.62

The Droneys’ bible, in fact, better demonstrates shared archival practices than theological differences. The enormous bible was copyrighted in 1884 but bears no records before the Droney’s marriage in July 1892. The “Family Portraits” included apertures for two cabinet photographs and eight card photographs. The photographs that were preserved in the bible include tintypes and paper prints, studio portraits and snapshots, men and women, and photographs of both individuals and groups of two or more. Judging by dress, furthermore, they appear to represent a period of time ranging from the 1890s through the 1910s or even the early 1920s. The abundance of visual information is juxtaposed to a dearth of written records. Other than the brilliantly colored marriage certificate documenting the union of John Droney and Mary McKee in July 1892, the birth records for Mary and her daughter, and the date of Mary’s death, there is no indication of who the photographs are of. In fact, Mary died within three years of their matrimony, leaving her husband a twenty-seven year old widower with a not-quite two-year old daughter. In June 1900 John and his daughter, who was also named Mary and was now six, were boarding with his in-laws, who had immigrated decades earlier. By 1910 John had married Annie, and the three of them were living on their own in Brooklyn. Despite the presence of photographs taken after Mary’s death in 1895, the recorded dates are those of her birth, marriage, childbirth, and death. While on the one hand the absence of later written records—such as John’s marriage to Annie—might suggest an integrity of descent that the bible was deemed to preserve, the inclusion of photographs indicates that the photographs did not merely confirm what had been transcribed in the pages of records but that they worked to create their own narratives. In this case, the photographs charted a visual family history that disregarded the temporal bookends
Figure 13: "Family Portraits" page from canvassing *New Illustrated Devotional and Practical Polyglot Family Bible*, ca. 1875. Michael Zinman Collection of Canvassing Books, University of Pennsylvania Rare Book and Manuscript Library Collections, Print Collection 17, Folio 127. Used with Permission.
of the registers. It was a narrative, in short, that defied the finality of death by refusing to subordinate a “living hagiology” to the dictates of recorded time.⁶³

That family bibles were used not only to document but to construct the family through the collaboration of narrative strategies was more clearly demonstrated in a bible belonging to the family of Enoch Look Hemenway and Clara Davis. As the lingering war continued its threat to sever the Union, Enoch and Clara were married in Framingham, Massachusetts, on April 22, 1863. Less than four years later, Clara had given birth to two sons, Seth Carleton and Harry Windsor. If they had any more children during the next decade, these births were not recorded. In September 1876, more than eleven years after Harry was born, Clara gave birth to her only surviving daughter, Bertha, around which time the Hemenways purchased the “Latest Illustrated Family Bible.” Published by Henry S. Goodspeed & Co. of New York and Cincinnati in 1877, and stamped with the Holman device of 1874, the Hemenways’ bible included “nearly two-thousand illustrative engravings on steel, wood, and in colors”—ten-fold the illustrations in the Nashes’ bible less than a decade earlier. In the Family Portraits at the end of the binding, six photographs of Clara, Seth, Harry, and Bertha remain.⁶⁴

In addition to the album photographs, however, other material points to how the bible was used as an archive of familial descent—that is, a narrative device, not unlike photograph albums, that shaped the ways in which the family’s lineage would be remembered by triangulating the relationship between the moment of encounter, the imagined past, and the projected memory. What this bible demonstrates most clearly, however, are the racialized implications at work in these materialized memories. Alongside other material stuffed inside the front cover, including a landscape photograph of Chester, Massachusetts, with ball-point markings identifying two ancestral residences, for instance, was a membership certificate
certifying Bertha’s inclusion in the “Detroit Colony” of the National Society of New England Women and a two-page “Ancestral Chart for Six Generations,” recording the lineage of Bertha and her daughter, Doris. Conferred by “virtue of her New England Ancestry,” for an “active” membership Bertha would have been pressed to demonstrate to the Colony—one of thirteen such bodies in the nation, “prophetic of great results to follow in building up a staunch and imperishable fraternity”—either her own New England nativity or that of her husband or parents.65

Although Bertha’s membership was not conferred until 1928, the National Society of New England Women had been established in 1895 “when citizens from foreign countries are becoming nationalized in such large numbers,” E. Marguerite Lindley explained, that “we of the old New England stock need to band together in a common fraternity . . . in order to preserve those grand old days of which we are so justly proud.”66 With the stated purpose “to perpetuate the memory of our glorious ancestry,” the Society of New England Women shared with other hereditary societies formed in the late nineteenth century an interest in genealogical pursuits aimed at securing America’s racial “stock” through a careful inventory of ancestral characteristics.67 In an essay on “The Value of Genealogy” published in the same volume as Lindley’s essay on the Society of New England Women, G.W. Dial identified a “moral value seldom recognized” in genealogical research that was ciphered through the racialized discourse of “miscegenation.” Dial argued that “dominating characteristics, noble and generous as well as groveling, may be transmitted not only to immediate offspring but to later generations.” He went on to demonstrate his case with the occasional “arrival, in a white family, of a baby with wooly hair, thick lips, and a flat nose” that “reveals a carefully concealed case of miscegenation.” “It is then too late,” Dial laments, “to regret that the family tree was not traced previous to marriage.”
By coding race as “morality” in a way that situates visual cues as imperfect signifiers of racial “belonging,” Dial’s essay underscores the often covert conceptual calculus at work in genealogical projects whose explicit vocabulary of “ancestry” or “descent” or even “family records” freighted racialized ideologies through the “glowing eye” of filial interest. Photographs, and photograph albums especially, were no less a part of this genealogical project than transcribed records, even if, as Dial warned, visual cues alone were not always transparent. As collective archives of family records, photographs, and realia, family bibles, such as that inherited by Bertha Hemenway, wove the racially-charged practice of constructing family lineage into the biblical pageantry of redemption.

Morphological similarities between family bibles and photograph albums supported their association, with a little nudge from advertisements, in nineteenth-century viewing habits and narrative sensibilities. A number of booksellers in the 1860s and 1870s, for instance, linked bibles and albums through their placement in advertising, including H. H. Moore of San Francisco who, in 1870, listed in succession the stock of “Bibles and Prayer Books, in ornamental binding; Photographic Albums, with patent flexible backs, of all sizes, and of the most elegant styles” available at his newly-opened store off of Merchant Street. At the end of the specimen book for James P. Boyd’s *Wonders of the Heavens, Earth, and Oceans*, copyrighted in 1887, were facing ads for albums, “of matchless elegance and superlative excellence,” and bibles that included “a Family Album holding 2 Cabinet and 8 Card Photographs.” Either through circumstances of mercantile display or marketing strategy—and probably some of both—albums and bibles were commonly juxtaposed in contemporary classifieds and advertisements. Some firms, however, made the association explicit. The earliest evidence of such deliberate association comes from none other than D. Appleton & Company of
New York, long presumed to be the first American agency to merchandise photograph albums. Advertising their “complete and extensive assortment, including several new styles” of albums “for the Carte de Visite” in December 1861, Appleton noted that the newly popularized albums presented “at once a mild form of hero-worship and an illustrated book of genealogy,” and speculated that “it does duty for a living hagiology, and it will supersede the first leaf of the family Bible.” Portrait albums did not in fact replace the “first leaf of the family Bible,” and, moreover, whereas bible albums eventually fell out of vogue after the turn of the century, not incidentally once commercially available hand-cameras introduced a new era of “albumania,” one could still find pages to record life events well into the twentieth century. And yet while Appleton’s predictions closely resemble later historians’ supersessionist accounts of the album’s triumph over family registries, they nevertheless poignantly convey important sensibilities gaining currency in the second half of the nineteenth century: the camera was the new pen and provided a “living hagiology”—wherein likenesses were animated surrogates rather than chemical traces—in place of lifeless scribbles.

A dearth of textual information in photograph albums, despite printed “Index” pages in many early specimens, supports the idea that sun-pictures were slowly but surely replacing written records as the authoritative mode of genealogical preservation. Rather than eclipsing the role of the family bible, however, photograph albums shared with bibles the charge of resurrecting the past through inherited fragments. Throughout the nineteenth century, bibles were important commonplace archives, designated spaces for reflection and remembrance, of which often only traces remain in the fragmented records—a birth, a lock of hair, a photograph. From these fragments, both albums and bibles were charged with constructing doubtless narratives of ancestry that would instruct the present—through the beholder—and shape the future. Not
merely a fiction of advertising or historical imagination, the tactility, indeed the obviousness, of the association was evident in the morphology of the two articles. The Done Family photograph album from around 1860, for instance, is a leather-bound, gilt-edged volume that was once secured by a metal clasp (figure 14). The portraits, moreover, are placed in apertures that are nearly identical to those in family bibles, although the leaves in the Done Family album contain only one portrait per side (figure 15). An album published by F. Heppenheimer in New York later in the decade also resembles a bible, with its embossed leather cover and brass clasps, though the spine is this time marked “Album.” Following current trends, this album of twenty-five leaves, with four openings per page, includes the likenesses of many famous figures—Lincoln, Henry Ward Beecher, Ulysses S. Grant, Jefferson Davis, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, among others—alongside those of friends and family. Invoking the premise of

Figure 14: Cover, Done Family Album. Reproduced courtesy of the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
moral suasion in Mathew Brady’s Gallery of Illustrious Americans, card portraits of famous figures were deemed to inspire beholders toward personal excellence. The self-reflexive gaze supposed to have been occasioned by likenesses of society’s leaders, however, was instead conditioned by the archival context of the portrait album and was thus extended to photographs of more familiar figures.

Also in the pages of the Heppenheimer album are three fundraising photographs of children posed on the Union standard, from which the “nett proceeds . . . will be devoted to the education of colored people in the department of the Gulf, now under the command of Maj. Gen. Banks” (figure 16). The inclusion of these fundraising card photographs demonstrates both the racialized sensibilities of photograph albums and the instructive capacity of familiar shadows,
both of which played out in the context of family bible galleries as well. Recently freed from enslavement by Union forces in New Orleans, the children in these card photographs—Charles Taylor, Rebecca Huger, and Rosina Downs—were on a tour of northern photographic studios coordinated by the American Missionary Association and the National Freedman’s Relief Organization during the winter of 1863-1864 to raise money for the fragile freedman’s schools through abolitionist support. Kathleen Collins has argued that despite the tour’s main purpose of raising funds for recently freed slaves’ education, the promoters, including C.C. Leigh of the Freedman’s Relief Organization, accommodated northern racial prejudices “by selecting for a Northern photographic tour children with white features.” 73 In an 1864 letter published in *Harper’s Weekly*, Leigh described Rebecca as an eleven-year old who, “to all appearances . . . is perfectly white. Her complexion, hair, and features show not the slightest trace of negro blood” and concluded of eight-year old Charley that “three out of five boys in any school in New York are darker than he.” 74 As Nicholas Mirzoeff has argued, “the selling point and scandal” of the series “was precisely the fact that all the children, by virtue of their status as former slaves, were African American. The very whiteness of the children’s skin was the sign that they had no place in slavery.” In short, the message to Union sympathizers buying these photographs and placing them in albums alongside likenesses of Beecher, Lincoln, and unnamed kinfolk and acquaintances, was that “slavery was to be abolished . . . not only because it was violent and inherently immoral, but because the ‘wrong’ kind of people were being enslaved.” That the creators of this album chose to include the photographs of Charley and Rebecca—children who are marked as visibly white and contextually black—speaks to the album’s tacit reinforcement of racialized sensibilities that prioritized “rampant miscegenation by the Southern planters” as the rallying moral infraction, even as it raised support for the emancipation of the minds and bodies
of former slaves. If they were encountered three decades later, moreover, the photographs may also have reinforced G.W. Dial’s insistence on thorough “genealogical searches” and his not so subtle suspicion of visual cues alone. Photograph albums were thus cultural sites primed to negotiate narratives of race and nation no less than those of individual families. Or rather, within the archival context of photograph albums, family pictures were inevitably wrapped up in narratives of race and nation. Furthermore, the common practice of positioning “society’s leaders” alongside more familiar likenesses as well as those designed to animate the beholder’s moral or patriotic sensibilities—both of which freighted racialized connotations—indeed, of binding them within the same visual narrative, makes it difficult to compartmentalize the portraits into “morally instructive” and “memorial” categories, as scholars have frequently asked us to do.

The practice of collecting likenesses of the famous and the familiar in a single volume was sure to ruffle a few feathers, a fact that further clarifies the ambiguities of visual habits. The same year that the Saturday Evening Post noted the recent publication of a family bible that included “any convenient number of card cases” for photographic likenesses, a humorist for Vanity Fair published a scathing critique on the recent surge of “Photographalbumanie” among Americans, writing that “of all the forms of insanity . . . we know of none . . . more deplorable in its effects upon the social constitution than the prevailing mania for carte-de-visite likenesses and a gilt-edged album to stick them in.” Evidently unaware of things afoot in bible publishing, the author goes on to consider the effect of these new social nuisances upon “the serious man, the man of truly religious principle,” for whom he conjectures “a shock administered by the photographic album that may well be described as extremely distressing.” To illustrate the paroxysmal effects of the album upon those with heightened religious sensibilities, as well as
Figure 16: Fundraising card photographs, Heppenheimer album. Reproduced courtesy of the Department of Rare Books and Special Collection, Princeton University Library.
the unmistakable similarities between bibles and albums, he fancies a scenario in which his killjoy Calvinist “sees before him what he supposes to be a family bible out for a holiday, and, reverently unclasping it, is shattered into epilepsy by beholding himself sandwiched between—well, suppose we say between the Esquimaux Woman and GEORGE FRANCIS TRAIN. What can be more dreadful than this?”

The horror of seeing oneself within the same visual narrative as an indigenous woman and a railroad magnate demonstrated through farce the haphazard racialized ordering that photograph albums could construct by combining the contents of a cabinet of curiosity, a commonplace book, and a family record in a single artifact. Each common enough within the home, and hardly hermetically sealed from one another, the author of “Photographalbumanie” seems to have exaggerated for dramatic appeal the difficulty of recognizing each of the photographs’ place within the visual ordering of race. But if he was tongue in cheek in this regard and wrong about religious Americans’ responses to the introduction of photograph albums—or at least wrong in his representation of “the man of truly religious principle” as the paradigmatic opponent of their staggering popularity (indeed, he went so far as to introduce a sort of sectarian conflict by designating albums as the “new religion of the carte-de-visite”)—he was nevertheless correct to note the morphological similarities between bibles and albums as well as the interpretive fecundity of the archival context. In other words, while portrait albums and bible galleries shared certain attributes—leather binding, metal clasps, album leaves, photographic media, conventions of portraiture, ideologies of representation—the archival context of the family bible differed from that of the family album in important ways. Bible portrait galleries, to put it bluntly, were not just albums inside bibles. One important variation is that, from the beginning, the only likenesses preserved and displayed in family bibles were those
of the family, thus avoiding the “extremely distressing” scenario imagined by the *Vanity Fair* columnist. Just as importantly, if obviously, bible galleries were positioned *within* the family bible—alongside its copious illustrations, essays, family records, temperance pledges, not to mention the scriptures themselves—and thus prompted different modes of interaction. If, for instance, bibles and albums competed for the title of the family archive, and drew upon common strategies in making such claims, the genealogies that they recorded did not always map onto the same narrative aims. Recognizing the distinction does not, of course, demand that we dismiss the morphological similarities and narrative sensibilities between the two contexts as peripheral. Rather, it reinforces the need to situate counterarchives within their historical contexts if we are to get any closer to understanding how photography was not only absorbed into religious practices or artifacts but how it shaped the contour and direction of American religion.

That photography was considered at least a complement to conventional familial records is evinced by new photographic methods of recording family lineages, such as the lithographic

*Figure 17: “The Family Photograph Tree,” Currier & Ives, 1871. Library of Congress Prints and Photographs.*
“Family Photograph Tree” published by Currier & Ives in 1871 (figure 17). Set against a bucolic vista of a wooded village, the foreground tree features two openvignettes at the roots and twelve additional spaces in the branches—hardly a scientific chart of descent, but one highly suggestive of the narrative inventiveness of family histories. A meetinghouse in the distant background could perhaps lend credence to interpretations that privilege the displacement of religious authority in the face of scientific advances, but it is equally likely that the lithograph, which also included a schoolhouse and a farm, was making a visual claim to the institutions that nurtured a verdant lineage: church, school, and home. In any case, what is remarkable about the lithograph within the history of photographic bible albums is that it marks one way in which a vernacular artifact designed to display the likenesses of one’s own flesh became the basis for constructing a “living hagiology” that, by definition, interwove biological descent with grander narratives of race, nation, and (sacred) progress.

In her account of the growing popularity of “baby’s picture” at the end of the nineteenth century, Shawn Michelle Smith has argued that from the earliest daguerreian period “the photographic image has been conceptualized as a means of preserving family history and of documenting family genealogy.” Indeed, as Hans Belting argued with regard to medieval iconography, photographic likenesses from the beginning had both retrospective and prospective “character”—they were made to record the present for persons in the future to enter the past, however obliquely their admittance. For Smith, this mirrored process of memory had especially racialized implications. The “early function of the photograph as heirloom,” she writes, “connects the photograph, through inheritance, both materially to the circulation of goods and the preservation of likenesses, and ideologically to the continuation of the family blood line.” As the century progressed, she argues, the portrait that “was first circulated as a family heirloom . . .
was later exchanged as a document that recorded an ancestral heirloom,” namely “inherited character.” 76

Smith locates such a shift in the growing popularity of Francis Galton’s definition of heredity, which provided a foundation for the racial theory of eugenics that shaped public discourse—including hereditary societies’ interest in genealogy—in the United States for the first several decades of the twentieth century, affecting legal actions and legislation no less than popular sentiment. Smith argues that while Galton published his study *Hereditary Genius* in 1869, it was not until the volume was reprinted in the 1890s that eugenics—a term that he first defined in 1883 as “a brief word to express the science of improving stock”—became a dominant racial discourse in the United States. 77 His notion of heredity, however, resonated with theories circulating earlier in the century, particularly among portrait photographers. Noticing during the course of his ethnological researches “into the mental peculiarities of different races” that certain “characteristics cling to families,” Galton determined to investigate “the kindred of about four hundred illustrious men of all periods of history” in order “to establish the theory that genius was hereditary.” This objective did not prevent him, however, at the conclusion of his study, from writing on the “comparative worth of different races,” using the data gleaned from his statistical inquiries as a rubric for comparison. Even if his work was not widely known in the United States for several decades after its initial publication, his association of mental faculties with individual lineages that could then be extrapolated onto races and nations—differentiated on a basis of corporeal difference guised as geographical or national variance—mirrors contemporary photographic discourses of likeness. “In fact,” wrote the Philadelphia photographer Marcus Aurelius Root in 1864, “the keen-eyed physiognomist may find in every
nation a cast of countenance peculiar to itself; and, still further, may discover in particular
districts and even families faces or single features distinctively marking them.”

If, as Smith argues, photographic portraits were early “posed as a signifier of both
national and racial identity,” both of these were ciphered not in isolated portraits but through
economies of exchange and the compilation of visual narratives. Galton’s *Life History Album*,
first published in 1883, for instance, was “designed to contain the Chart of your Life, and to be a
record of your own Biological experience,” not only for one’s own amusement or benefit, but
also because such a document “will further be of great value to your family and descendents.” In
addition to a genealogical record, descriptions of the infant at birth, medical history, and
anthropometric observations at regular intervals, among other intended data, there were “two
pages . . . left in the portion of the album devoted to each successive five years to receive
photographs of the owner that have been taken during the period.”

What is striking about Galton’s album is how closely it resembled practices that had been at work in bible galleries for
nearly two decades. Although not systematically executed in the way that Galton advised—he
went so far as to provide specific dimensional instructions regarding reductions “of the original
face” and the distances between the pupils of the eyes—family bible portrait albums frequently
included multiple photographs of its members at various stages in life. In the Nash bible, for
instance, one page features two card portraits of a middle-aged woman and man positioned over
two tintypes of what appear to be younger versions of the same couple, most likely James and
Mary Nash (figure 18). Similarly, the Hemenway bible includes several photographs of Bertha
from infancy through girlhood, effectively collapsing Galton’s “record of . . . Biological
experience” into a biblical frame.
Figure 18: “Family Portraits,” *The New Illustrated Devotional and Practical Polyglot Family Bible* (Philadelphia, 1870). Reproduced courtesy of the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
Contemporary discourses of likeness, theories of descent, and practices of genealogy point to ways in which we can imagine the interpretive context of family bible photograph albums. We can also look to the pages themselves for an indication of how they were understood within the context of the bible. Oftentimes the only script on these elaborately engraved pages was “Family Portraits” or “Family Portrait Gallery,” although occasionally these leaves would have more extended textual material. See, for instance, the National Comprehensive Family Bible, an Authorized translation published in Manchester, England, in 1870, but circulated in the United States (figure 19). Centered between the open frames at the top of each page of the “Family Portrait Gallery” was the phrase “Thine own friend and father’s friend forsake not” and between the two open frames at the bottom of each page was the phrase “Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.” The inscriptions were positioned on open scrolls, seemingly fastened to the page with stylized tacks. Their placement on engravings of parchment works to order the visual plane into photographic and scriptural demarcations, as both phrases were direct quotations of scripture—the first from Proverbs 27, the second from Psalm 133. Because this is one of the only instances of scripture having been explicitly associated with the album section, it provides some indication of how publishers worked to regulate the relationship between photographic portraiture and biblical verse, on the one hand, and fleshly and sacred lineage, on the other.

First, the verses are positioned as interpretive prompts for the inclusion of portraits—do not forget these people, the Proverb commands, while the Psalm sets up the page as a gallery of “brethren . . . dwell[ing] together in unity,” a model for subsequent beholders to esteem and to emulate. This ordering of interpretive authority, moreover, was replicated through the iconography of the engravings on the page. The portraits were to be placed within rectangular
frames whose ornamentation mimicked daguerreotype casings of an earlier era, whereas the scriptural references were seemingly inscribed on parchment, and yet the frame surrounding the entire page indicated that the photographs and the verses were to be considered in relation to one another. Nevertheless, it is the way in which this relationship was visually structured that is most instructive.

During the 1880s, John Potter & Co. of Philadelphia, who produced a number of Douay-Rheims editions throughout the decade, placed a medallion in the upper-left corner of their “Family Portraits” section, with the phrase “The LORD THINE EVERLASTING LIGHT” encircling an opened flower. Taken from the Prophecy of Isaias, the phrase portends a coming glory for those whose likenesses are therein revealed:

“Thy sun shall go down no more, and thy moon shall not decrease: for the Lord shall be unto thee for an everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended.”

In this gallery, at least, the portraits were intended to be memorials to the deceased. This form of photographic memorialization was repeated in other contexts as well, including Jane Stebbins’s popular consolation book, *Our Departed Friends*, first published in 1867. Examined more closely in the
following chapter, like family bibles, subscribers of *Our Departed Friends* had the option of including photograph leaves at the end of the binding. Like the Potter bible, moreover, these leaves were captioned with scriptural excerpts intended to guide the beholders’ interaction with the portraits. The National Comprehensive Bible and the Potter bible are exceptional for their explicit association and ordering of biblical text and photographic likeness, and yet they only state clearly what other bible portrait albums suggest more obliquely. Bible portrait galleries were spaces where individual likenesses became touchstones for ancestral legacies which were in turn woven into narratives of biblical lineage that disrupted the constraints of time and positioned every soul within that “monstrous album” of celestial design fancied by young Tom. Conditioned by emerging photographic technology and visual habits informed by racialized theories of representation, bible galleries at once reflected the construction and influence of photograph albums and at the same time set their focal point on a yonder horizon. That likenesses were more impervious to the ravages of time than their fleshly referents seems an obvious enough point, but it was one that spurred much interest in the latter decades of the nineteenth century. Over the course of the century, photographic operations were frequently understood as memories etched in glass or silver, translated onto paper, and available to the senses no less than to the mind. Whether this memory work necessarily translated into theological work is tricky to determine, and yet it seems especially significant that the bible’s arc of history, linking a hopeful past to a redemptive promise, was so clearly mirrored in the likenesses of the saints.

Many thanks to participants in the Religion and Culture Workshop at the Center for the Study of Religion for providing very insightful critique on an earlier draft of this chapter. Its many shortcomings, of course, remain solely my own.
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Many thanks to Joe Azure for graciously loaning the Droney’s bible to the University during the course of this research.

I don’t want to read too much into Enoch’s absence, as there is no way of knowing for certain whether, at some point, his portrait was also included in the gallery.


*American Publishers’ Circular and Literary Gazette*, Dec. 5, 1861. APSO.
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Isaias 60:20 (D-R)
Chapter Two

“HERE IS MY NAME WHEN I AM DEAD”:
BODIES OF MOURNING AND THE PRESENCE OF DEATH

In the autumn of 1862 Molly Stilwell waited anxiously for news—any news—from her husband. Twenty-two year old William had enlisted in the 53rd Georgia Infantry in May and as news rolled in of the carnage that had taken place near Antietam Creek in mid September, Molly’s thoughts drifted to darker and darker prospects for herself and two-year-old John Thomas, whom William playfully called Tommy. Would she ever know his fate? What would become of the farm? No doubt she knew of women who had received the dreaded news second hand, who would never see their soldier’s mortal remains, would never know for sure how he died—was he brave? was he frightened? was his soul assured? Finally, her letter arrived. “Great God, what awful things I have to chronicle this morning!” William wrote. For two days, while he stood guard at the field headquarters of Confederate Brigadier-General Paul Jones Semmes in Harper’s Ferry, Virginia, his brigade “fought and fought like men” in one of the bloodiest battles of the American Civil War. “Molly, I have not heard who was killed and wounded in my company,” he wrote from the troubled uncertainty of the front, “though I learn that the regiment was almost cut to pieces. . . . I have no doubt but some of my friends is lying cold on the ground now.” The blood-stained ground at Antietam Creek would prompt many Americans to consider the toll of the war as well as what such carnage ought to purchase—preservation of the Union
was no longer singularly motive enough. But before the great battle would become politically sanguine, it prompted innumerable personal confrontations with death, both for soldiers surveying the field of battle and for their beloved confined to the lonely corners of their imaginations.¹

In William’s letter to his wife, mortality is the dominant motif. Although his experiences of battle were certainly not representative of all soldiers engaged in the war, the intimacy of his letter does gesture to the frightening realities that soldiers on both sides endured as well as to the theological work that their situations prompted. It also points to ways that soldiers devised to bridge the caress of affection across time and space through material artifacts. William knew that there were few assurances of his prospects—“I don’t know now that I will ever get to send this [letter] off, but will have it ready”—but rather than wallowing in terror he understood what the theological demands of his condition required, even amidst the unforgiving haste of war. “I know that you are uneasy about me,” he consoled Molly, “but you know that it will do no good to grieve. It is best to be cheerful as you can, for we ought to be willing to say the will of God be done. If it is His will that your best friend should die away from home, let us submit to it.”

Despite discouraging Molly from grieving over his corpse and reminding her of the inscrutability of the “will of God,” William nevertheless confessed to his wife what he hoped for should he, like the ranks falling all around him, die in battle. “I think of you while the cannon roar and the muskets flash,” he scribbled in his stolen moments of solitude. “Never have I been so much excited yet but what I could compose myself enough to think of you, and I have often thought that if I have to die on the battlefield, if some friend would just lay my Bible under my head and your likeness on my breast with the golden curls of hair in it, that it would be enough. Molly, I shall have to close, for my eyes is bathed in tears, ’till I can’t write.”²
In describing his improvised deathbed scene, William’s letter to Molly—would it be his last?—demonstrates ambivalence about the relationship between tokens of remembrance and a culture of mourning largely defined by theologies of redemption. Stilwell’s struggle to “submit” to God’s will, though it cost him his life, and also to throttle Molly’s grief echo motifs from consolation literature earlier in the century that positioned mourning not only as a matter of social decorum or even a matter of personal sorrow but as a matter of religious discipline. The Civil War changed the ways that nineteenth-century Americans experienced death, corpses, and mourning. But the developments that war accelerated were rooted in traditions of mourning, including representations of the deceased, that preceded the cannon fire on Fort Sumter. The ostensibly public experiences of war, moreover, were frequently undermined by moments of intimacy facilitated through material artifacts tucked into uniforms—letters, lockets, likenesses—or stowed alongside necessary provisions. William’s letter, in short, summarizes a shifting memorial culture that was rooted in historical modes of representation and theologies of redemption even as present circumstances—war, in particular, but also recent developments in photography and social practice that the war would accelerate—promoted a revision of their application to experiences of grief, mourning, and remembrance.

As material artifacts, photographs were related to an archive of mourning whose theological moorings had been debated for centuries. Rings, tombstones, portraits, printed sermons, and consolation books had long been exchanged and commissioned as memento mori—literally objects intended to remind the living of their mortality and their own quick succession to the grave. The danger that ministers and other consolationists feared was that these articles, which were designed to encourage introspection among the bereaved, were in fact nurturing injurious allegiances to mortal conditions. Grief was of course to be expected of the bereaved.
British consolationist Richard Cecil, whose *A Friendly Visit to the House of Mourning* was reprinted in the United States through the 1840s, acknowledged in 1793 that “Our heavenly Father, who knows our frame, and remembers that we are but dust allows us to mourn when he afflicts us; he often, in his providence, calls us to it, and charges us to weep with them that weep.” Indeed “there is something sacred in grief,” he wrote, when it draws mourners into awareness of the “unerring Providence [that] presided over the whole, yea, actually conducted every part on reasons as right as inscrutable.” And yet there were dire consequences for failing to submit to this unerring Providence, even in the midst of personal anguish, even, as William no doubt understood, in the midst of war: “all allowed repugnance to the determinations of his [God’s] government, (however made known to us) is sin.”

Even though there is no way of knowing whether or not William had read Cecil’s treatise, his seemingly impossible instruction to Molly not to grieve—“it is best to be as cheerful as you can”—betrayed a long-rooted gendering of grief in which material objects nurtured effeminized grief to a point of soul-damning doubt. Cecil’s models of properly submissive mourning were biblical patriarchs—Aaron, Eli, David, Job—and his vocabulary evinces a gendered understanding of unregulated, indeed sinful, grief: “[T]here is such a thing as nursing and cherishing our grief; employing a ‘busy meddling memory to muster up past endearments,’ and personate a vast variety of tender and heart rending circumstances.” Fathers, husbands, and brothers grieved as well, of course, but their sorrow, when “nursed,” “cherished,” or “meddlesome,” signaled a decidedly effeminate lack of discipline. As late as 1855, in fact, no less a cultural authority than Horace Greeley summarized gendered dimensions of unholy grief familiar to his contemporaries when he declared that “it often seems to me that the bitterness of our anguish by the death-bed and the open tomb, is exaggerated and un-Christian” and
admonished his readers to “stop this unmanly howling, evince some fitting trust in God, and exhibit a deportment becoming our faith.” But whereas William encouraged his wife to receive unerring Providence with due humility, his own deathbed reverie betrayed a more complicated relationship with material tokens of transcendence than declarative theologies could possibly encompass. What is important for this chapter, then, are the ways in which material objects—most especially photographs—became contested sites of religious discipline. On the one hand, as *memento mori*, they were relics that prompted meditation on the “divine life” through the cipher of the past—“death at hand . . . should be death in view, and lead us to consider next / our PROSPECTS from this House of Sorrow, as inhabitants of a present and future world”—and, on the other, shackles that bound the bereaved to recurrent bouts of sinful woe. “There is a tearing open the wound afresh by images and remembrances,” Cecil warned, “and thereby multiplying those pangs which constitute the very [b]itterness of death itself.” The consequence of submitting oneself to such “voluntary torture” was dire, for it “unfits the mourner for the pressing duties of his station, [and] leads to that *sorrow of the world which worketh death* to his body, soul, and Christian character.”

By the middle of the nineteenth century, photography was as wrapped up in this internal struggle over the theological utility of material artifacts of mourning as were printed sermons, mortuary portraits, painted miniatures, gift books, hairwork, and innumerable other tokens treasured by the bereaved. But whereas these previous articles had been used to invoke recollections of the now-absent body, photographs became increasingly identified with the body of the deceased itself. Whether or not Stilwell was familiar with Cecil’s text, which was printed as late as 1848 by the American Tract Society, we can almost see his face twisted in deep
contemplation, struggling to reconcile his own desire for one more touch, one more look, with God’s inscrutable demand for resignation to his will.

If sermons, consolation literature, and commemorative verse worked to subordinate or even impugn material archives of remembrance in favor of the perfect will and righteousness of God’s inscrutable timing, these same sentiments were often facilitated through material artifacts. Consolation literature, for instance, was frequently structured around material references, from John Flavel’s *A Token for Mourners* (1674) and John Dunton’s *The Mourning Ring* (1692) in the seventeenth century to nineteenth-century volumes bearing such titles as *The Cypress Wreath* (1844), *Agnes and the Key of her Little Coffin* (1857), and *The Empty Crib* (1868). By reproducing lithographic representations of the deceased, these latter volumes and others silently testified to the portrait photograph’s increasing prominence as memorial iconography even if they fail to comment directly on the particulars of its ascendancy. What is more, even as photographs of the dead invited reflection on the temporal existence of the now-absent, thereby encouraging conditions of protracted sorrow, postmortem and memorial photographs were nevertheless deliberately positioned to prompt meditation on the vanities of corporeality and assurances of immortality, frequently by attaching photographs to snippets of scripture and promises of future reunion. In short, at a time when prevailing sentiments nurtured filial affections amidst high mortality rates, the tension between cultivating fondness for one’s relations—most especially one’s children—and, as one mid-century consolation book put it, “view[ing] the FATHER’S dispensations with resignation” produced a culture of mourning that both lamented and celebrated death even as it cherished and scorned material tokens of remembrance.
At the center of this ambivalent memorial culture was the body of the deceased. As we saw in the introduction, limners and heliographers in the nineteenth century both employed a vocabulary of shadow and substance to define the relationship between corporeal representation and fleshly incarnation: “secure the shadow e’re the substance fade.” And yet whereas the whole business of photographing likenesses was to one degree or another concerned with immortalizing human form, nowhere was the association between substance and shadow more acute than in the vast archive of memorial photography. Postmortem portraits, pictures taken in life and repurposed for memorialization upon decease, and even spirit photographs each worked in different ways and to different effects to refine the transcendence of the representation. As material tokens that not only represented but verily mediated the presence of the dead and dying, in other words, photographs were fraught with the potentially dangerous capacity of protracting devotion to the “emptie carcasse” even as they began to displace conventional figurative representations of death. In short, as photography began to supplant previous iconographies of death and mourning, corporeal representation became increasingly theologically significant among communities of the bereaved.

Previous modes of representation—most notably hairwork—had long before invoked the body of the deceased and the mouldering body had been a common trope in funeral sermons since the seventeenth century. But whereas photography in a large sense collaborated with these previous modes of representation, it also invited new forms of scrutiny, both corporeal and theological. For instance, around mid century, “recognition” became a fast concern among Christians interested in heavenly reunion—will we recognize relations and others in heaven? Will they appear the same as the faces in the daguerreotypes or as the strangely familiar likenesses in the family bible? In some ways more fundamental than notions of photography’s
representational exactitude, however, was the widespread conviction that photographs mediated presence in spite of corporeal absence. It was surely this underlying belief that prompted William Stilwell’s desire for his wife’s likeness in the moment of his demise. Whereas hair had previously accompanied portraiture to authenticate the presence of the deceased, with photographic portraiture it came to signify the commemorative operation of the photograph itself. In other words, hairwork silently instructed beholders in how not only to see the photograph as a representation but to identify in the likeness the very body of their beloved.

Over the course of the first two decades of photographic portraiture, bodies of the deceased were commonly represented in death, a practice that invoked a tradition of posthumous mortuary portraiture. In this sense, postmortem photography was an attempt to preserve the literal face of death for spiritual reflection via physiognomic inspection, a practice common to generations before the introduction of the daguerreotype. “I closed her dying eyes, and we sat for a moment in solemn Silence,” Deborah Logan wrote of her cousin, Hannah Griffitts’s, death in 1817, “each, I believe, contemplating the joyful landing of her Soul upon the celestial Shore, a sweet evidence of her happiness resting with us.” Locating “sweet evidence” of the soul’s triumph in the form now “resting with us,” Logan points to a longstanding tradition of corporeal inspection that postmortem photography would invoke among later generations. Postmortem photographs were certainly complex cultural documents, hardly explained by any single motivation or precedent. And yet whatever else they were, photographs of dead people, whether taken posthumously or from life, were associated with practices of inspection that promised both the corruption of the flesh and the triumph of the soul.

Even as the conveyance and disposal of the dead became increasingly regulated by municipal authorities and a rising funeral industry, and postmortem photographs in turn became
less frequent, they remained common into the twentieth century. Far more ubiquitous, however, were photographs taken in life and repurposed as tokens of remembrance after death. By the end of the daguerreian period and into the early years of albumen paper prints, photographic methods began to claim status not only as representation but as identity itself. Catharine Christ of Berks County, Pennsylvania, summarized this sentiment well when she slipped a verse beneath her daguerreotype likeness in 1859, concluding with the statement “Here is my name when I am dead.” Three years later, in October 1862, a correspondent for the New York Times fancied that pedestrians “would jostle less carelessly down the great thoroughfare, saunter less at their ease, were a few dripping bodies, fresh from the battlefield, laid along the pavement.” While survivors of fallen soldiers were increasingly bringing bodies home for burial, when such a course was possible, this correspondent was not referring to embalmed corpses but to the recent installment of photographs at Brady’s gallery. “If he has not brought bodies and laid them in our door-yards and along the streets, he has done something very like it” by exhibiting for the public “views of that fearful battle-field, taken immediately after the action.” The photographs of slain Confederate soldiers taken by Alexander Gardner and exhibited in Brady’s gallery may have been artfully arranged, as later scholarship has determined, but they still carried a patina of carnage for their pedestrian beholders. Still, few Americans would have had the opportunity to view this series in Brady’s gallery. Many thousands more witnessed the carnage in three dimensional relief through the circulation of Gardner’s stereographs, however, such as this one of crumpled Confederate bodies, bloated from exposure to the balmy September climate (figure 20). Pairing crumpled Rebel bodies with a crumpled Union standard was no doubt Gardner’s deliberate compositional maneuver, but whatever the ideological motive, like Christ’s
instructions to beholders of her likeness, the view’s effectiveness was related to the assumption that the image was tied viscerally to the referent.

Of course, even if beholders were conditioned to perceive photographs as immediate references to the body, they were nevertheless mediated representations. The association that William Stilwell made between the Bible, photographic portraiture, and hair in his intimate reverie demonstrated how each of these artifacts could be used to mediate haptic experiences beyond corporeal measure. William survived the war. He suffered a foot injury in the battle of Cedar Creek, Virginia, in 1864, “which necessitated an amputation, leaving only the ankle and heel,” according to a pension application filed later in the century, but was able at long last to return home to his wife and son. All too many were not so fortunate. In the weeks and months after Gettysburg, a “feeling of tender sympathy and interest” swept over northern citizens as efforts were made to identify “the unknown soldier who died in the field . . . clapping in his

Figure 20: Gardner, View on Battle-Field at Antietam, “Brady’s Album Gallery, No. 566.” From the collection of Jeffrey Kraus. Used with permission.
hand the picture of his three little children.” By late November it was confirmed that the soldier was Amos Humiston of New York and that the treasured ambrotype had been sent to him by his wife shortly after he enlisted in the Union army in July 1862. The soldiers’ desire to hold these likenesses in the moments of their own death mirrors, through the looking glass as it were, the more common use of photographs as tokens of reflective promise—a kind of future oriented memory—among the living. If Molly could not be with William to cradle his broken body during his final earthly moments, then her likeness would suffice to ease his soul through the transformative power of imagined reciprocal touch as he fingered her golden curls—her likeness and her hair, in other words, mediated her presence in spite of her corporeal absence. More than any other media, in fact, as the century progressed, hair and photographs were used to evoke the mouldering body in nineteenth-century memorial culture. But rather than signaling a morbid obsession with putrefaction and decay, they promised the triumph of immortality that awaited the souls of the faithful.

Nineteenth-century Americans who listened to funeral orations and perused any number of consolation books knew that material tokens—fragments of belongings, photographic or painterly representations, and even corporeal relics—could nurse morbid myopia of grander schemes, a shortsightedness unable to see through the present pale of sorrow to the tableaux of redemption. Worse, they could bind feeble or susceptible—in a word, effeminate—mourners to a perpetual or recurring state of melancholy that stunted the spiritual fortitude that such affliction, many believed, was intended to produce. But they were equally convinced that these same articles could procure healthful meditation on the human predicament and on assurances of corporeal frailty that led to submission to the providences of God and induced personal reforms necessary for favorable judgment at the moment of their own reckoning. Striding alongside the
theological ambivalence of mourning’s material culture was the development of a photographic culture of remembrance that positioned the bodies of the deceased at the center of a new iconography of mourning and memory.

“A STORY TOO DEEP FOR TEARS”: A MATERIAL CULTURE OF MOURNING

A printed poem entitled “Wilbraham is in Mourning,” believed to have been printed between 1830 and 1840, gestured to a material culture of mourning that was familiar to many Americans in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Opening with a scene of mourning that enveloped the town of Wilbraham, Massachusetts, “Girded in sackcloth, and the cries ascending,” after the watery deaths of six young inhabitants, the verse moves back to a moment of youthful bliss—“Just now, all active, little thinking danger”—and then rushes forward to the unthinkable turn of events—“Now hastening, judgment from the Great Eternal / Not to be altered.” After pausing for a moment on the “mournful shores [where] the corps are lying” to “see tender mothers wipe the drowned faces,” the author turns from verse elegiac to a prayer of resolve:

Wisdom has mingled this our cup of trembling,
May we not murmur, but in silence drink it;
Parent of heaven, while we wade the billows,
   Hold us from sinking.

Just are thy dealings, thy decrees eternal;
May sinful mortals never question wisdom,
Nor wish to turn a leaf of heaven’s secrets,
   Waiting contented.

This turn from trembling grief to contented resignation echoed theological modulations of purposeful sorrow from generations past. Marking the developing theological interest in reunion,
moreover, the final stanzas move readers through the funeral proceedings and interment of the six drowned youths in their “silent mansions . . . Borne up by bearers” to a lugubrious farewell limned with a mournful promise of future embrace:

Farewell, our children, till the great Archangel
Shakes the creation with the trump of heaven,
Then hope to meet you joined with Saints and Angels;
    Hail the Redeemer.  

The verse itself points somewhat obliquely to the material culture of Christian mourning of the early nineteenth century. “Sackcloth” signaled the mourning garb draping persons while “tidings spreading clothed the streets in mourning” suggested the town itself was draped in heavy somber fabrics, most of which would have been woven in the homes of the bereaved. “From the desk a solemn warning given” referred to the pulpit from which the funeral oration was delivered and “silent mansions” of course intimated the “string of coffins” that preceded the “trail of mourners.” But what is less apparent is how the poem itself was part of a memorial culture that was facilitated in large measure through material artifacts. And completely absent is any sense of the context of the actual event.

Indeed, the elegy did not refer to a recent event but to an accident that had transpired decades earlier. Gordon Bliss, his brother Leonard, their unnamed sister, “a daughter of Dr. Merrick,” Catherine Warrener, and Guy Johnson, drowned in a pond outside of Wilbraham in the late spring of 1799. They were “visiting at a house near the Pond,” the Connecticut Courant reported in May, when “ten set out, in haste” to a small boat. The “three young Gentleman and three young Ladies” who succeeded in securing passage were “but few rods from the shore, when a sudden gust of wind upset the boat,” resulting in their death. Thirty years later, their
tragic demise was still used to negotiate theologies of mourning through the circulation of a commemorative poem. Rather than signaling a contradiction—do we mourn or do we submit to the inscrutable will of God?—the poem, like consolation books and memorial photographs, succeeded in demonstrating the theological complexities of a culture that was deeply committed both to soteriologies of redemption and to remembering the past, largely through the accumulation of material artifacts.

In the mid-nineteenth century, death was a far more regular feature of Americans’ daily lives than it would be among later generations. Mortality rates, particularly of children, were staggering by modern comparison and the rituals of death and mourning transpired in private homes rather than in hospitals and businesses dedicated to the care of the deceased. Harriet Beecher Stowe’s vignette of little Eva’s deathbed in *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* was but a paradigm of countless other such scenes that transpired in American homes during the 1850s. In fact, Stowe’s iconic scene, in which the prevailing temperament is confident resignation rather than anxious disquietude, may have been influenced by her father’s recollection of his wife’s reaction to the death of their infant daughter, also named Harriet, half a century earlier in March 1809. The babe, who was “seized . . . with the hooping-cough,” died while her mother slept. Stowe’s father, Lyman Beecher, later recalled that when his wife, Roxana, awoke to find that her month-old daughter had succumbed during her slumber, “there was no such thing as agitation. She was so resigned that she seemed almost happy. I never saw such resignation to God; it was her habitual and only frame of mind; and even when she suffered most deeply, she showed . . . an entire acquiescence in the Divine will.” And yet using such authoritative reminiscences as emotional bellwethers is a tricky undertaking. Indeed, even if the frequency of death allowed a certain level of expectation and even if the trope of the “good death” in popular literature provided a model
for Christian response, this proximity to death hardly soothed its bitter sting for many Americans. Kneel, for a moment, with the minister in the darkened bedchamber as he read “heavenly messages of consolation” to the recently bereaved as they “rocked and trembled under the tempest of their agony.” Stand with a father in the doorway of the empty nursery, tears coursing down his cheek as he examines the child’s playthings. No matter the promise of celestial reunion, for many Protestants and Catholics throughout the nineteenth century, death was still a cross to bear, a burden of seemingly impossible magnitude that demanded spiritual resolve and manly fortitude.

Material artifacts straddled this seeming gulf between celestial promise and terrestrial grief. On the one hand, they were emotive tethers to the “vapours” of fleshly existence. “In almost every home,” wrote one consolationist shortly after the Civil War, “there are stored away, among its most cherished treasures, a little photograph, or a box of toys, a torn kite, a halfworn cap, or a pair of tiny shoes. They all tell a story too deep for tears.” On the other hand, they were the very brick and mortar through which spiritual discipline was effected—clothing, jewelry, repasts, coffins, tombstones, and portraits were all ways of prompting spiritual reform even as they threatened to nurture soul-threatening doubt. And while the social form of mourning shifted over the course of the nineteenth century, mourning continued to connote a particularly tenuous period of time that demanded close regulation of ardent passions that threatened to disrupt both theological and social fabrics. In the late seventeenth century, for instance, British minister Richard Allestree instructed in his Whole Duty of Mourning on “How to comfort our selves with Spiritual Remedies against immoderate Grief for the Loss of Relations and Friends.” As Richard Cecil would do a century later, Allestree subordinated grief to spiritual promise: “Let not, I beseech you, immoderate Grief too much overwhelm you; but when you
have shed your solemn Tears, and paid your due Sighs to the memory of your Friends, then wipe your Eyes with Comfort of Hope, and change your Grief into Charitable Joy.” Such an exchange was not only a matter of calming mental tempest, it was the essence of Christian confidence: “excessive and immoderate Sorrow, implieth a diffidence or distrust we have of our Soul’s immortality, Resurrection, and Glorification.”

In explaining scriptural injunctions to “moderate the mourning of Christians for the Death of Others,” John Dunton explained to his readers in 1692 that because death “is the end of all men, it is that that is the common condition of all men, it should not be too grievous, nor too doleful to any man.”

Twenty years earlier John Flavel’s enormously popular *A Token For Mourners*, which was reprinted as late as 1818 in Andover, Massachusetts, was a sermon to “a distressed Mother” upon the death of her son “wherein, the Boundaries of Sorrow are duly fixed, Excesses restrained, the Common Pleas Answered, and divers Rules for the support of Gods afflicted ones prescribed.”

And yet, somewhat ironically, in addition to their intended task of moderating grief as spiritual discipline, these tracts also constituted a material archive of mourning that was in danger of participating in the very dolor it intended to circumscribe. Allestree deemed that his tract was “Necessary to be given at all Funerals” while Dunton was more reserved, claiming his treatise was “Recommended as proper to be given at Funerals.” Dunton, in fact explicitly associated his work with tokens more commonly associated with funerals, such as gloves and rings sent as invitations and distributed as memorials.

Having been asked “Whether Books are not more proper to be given at Funerals, than Bisquets, Gloves, Rings, &c.,” he confidently retorted that “undoubtedly a Book would be a far more convenient, more durable, and more valuable a Present, than what are generally given, as much exceeding them, as the Soul does the Body.” Addressing “the Sorrowful” in 1709, Cotton Mather evinced a similar orientation to
printed texts as appropriate mourning articles in his published sermon, *The Cure of Sorrow*: “If this *Book* in thy closet help thee, in those Methods of Piety, which will afford Rest unto thy Mind, under any uneasy Occurrences, the End of it will be happily answered.” These printed texts were supplemented by an even vaster archive of letters, diaries, and memoirs that, according to one historian, “often substitute[d] as the only *memento mori* possible,” especially in the years prior to photography’s invention. Even as they worked to moderate grief and sorrow, then, by training mourners’ eyes on grander dramas of redemption than present predicaments could possibly comprehend, these texts drew upon material vocabularies—tokens, rings, and the like—that muddied the very distinctions they were trying to maintain. It was against this historical backdrop of mourning as a catalyst of spiritual regeneration, rooted in material sensibilities and gendered ideas of grief that nineteenth century mourners worked to reconcile theological aspirations with circumstances of impossible personal anguish.

For Nehemiah Adams, a Congregational minister in Boston, the material link with his daughter, Agnes, who died just before her first birthday, was the “key to her little coffin.” His tormented relationship with the key in many ways unearths an entombed historical silence surrounding memorial culture more broadly considered, including photography—the vast archives of material culture, in other words, seldom speak directly to what they meant for the people who held them. Finding it in his trouser pocket the night after the burial, the diminutive token that had “supplant[ed] the remorseless screw and screw-driver” nevertheless prompted great anguish: “I could neither keep it nor part with it. I abhorred it, and idolized it. I wished to be rid of it, and I clung to it. There was a fearful spell about it; and yet it was a charm, a precious treasure, and at the same time a symbol of my agony.” As the months went by, however, though still a tangible link to “her little form . . . mouldering back to clay,” the key began to unlock
many a door to heaven through Adams’s ministrations to the dying and bereaved, opening, as his wife put it, “a way for us to sorrowing hearts.”

Despite an expansive archive of memorial tokens, perhaps the most publicly (and historically) visible mode of mourning during the nineteenth century was attire. Richard Allestree had advised in 1695 that “our Garments [are] being Badges of Mortality, and Cognizances of Death, so as we look upon them, we are called of God to remember Death.” By the nineteenth century, Allestree’s point that all clothing should be a reminder of “when by our Sin we came first into the world to the state of Death” was more explicitly rendered through the corpse’s winding sheet and the mourner’s mourning dress. Despite passage of sumptuary laws in many colonies during the colonial period that prohibited the wearing of mourning attire—it was, after all, an undeniable signal of wealth and status—by the nineteenth century mourning garb was a central component of mourning ritual across a broad swath of Americans, middling and otherwise. In the 1820s Charles Winslow of Boston had “Mourning articles constantly on hand” among his store of “English, French, and Canton GOODS.” Around the same time, Mrs. M.D. Chapin, also of Boston, advertised her “fashionable millinery and mourning bonnets, of all kinds, ready made.” Among the “spring importations” of mourning articles available at Besson & Son of Philadelphia in 1851 were twenty-four varieties of black fabrics—chaly, silks, grenadines, bombazines, “Mousseline de Laines,” and crapes—intended for a variety of different articles, including gloves, shawls, “mode or love veils,” and, of course, dresses and petticoats. Also for sale were a number of fabrics and articles specifically designated as “mourning”: siciliennes, poplins, lawns, gingham, chintzes, “collars and cuffs,” and “bordered hdkfs, &c.”
In contrast to widowers, who officially mourned for six months, the regulated duration for widows was two and a half to three years, although many women, following the lead of Victoria, mourned in perpetuity. Significantly, although widows in first mourning, whose resources permitted, were to restrict their presence in public, many took time to have their likeness made in photographic studios. This card photograph (figure 21) of a young woman by the Kimball Brothers of Lowell, Massachusetts, not only demonstrates the mourning garb all too frequently worn by her generation—the presence of the black mourning cap and draped veil indicating that she was in full mourning—but also something about her desire to be remembered in her state of mourning.

Another widow from the same period who distributed her likeness in full mourning attire signed the back, “Your friend in distress, Sue.” In addition to the fact that the ostensibly secluded mourning period was frequently documented through photographic means, that these studio portraits of widows were also circulated—and not merely stored for posterity—simultaneously announced a recent loss (and perhaps a patriotic sacrifice) and worked to maintain ties among the living through established channels of social exchange.

A similar desire to document grief was at work in postmortem portraits wherein bereaved parents held the remains of their children. The latter convention has been explained in part as an urgent acquisition of a family picture. And yet these photographs were not just records of existence or markers of status. Not unlike the winding sheets and coffins among previous
generations, photographs of the dead and of the bereaved demonstrated what Susan Stabile has identified in another context as “the shared identity between corpse and mourner as death’s remains.” Rather than being completely concerned with remembering the deceased, photographs of the widow sitting in her weeds and the mother holding her dead child signaled an identification between the mourning body and the corpse as parallel testaments to what death had transpired. In her study of an eighteenth-century coterie of Philadelphia women, Stabile demonstrates how these women “created a specifically material aesthetic of mourning that preserved their corporeal connection to the dead” by “embodying grief in tangible artifacts that represent the absent body.” Although coffin keys, empty cribs, mourning garb, and “indiarubber rings, with prints of small teeth in them” were common articles of commemoration in the nineteenth century, likenesses and hair were staples in the material archives of mourning. Frequently worn close to the body in the form of pendants, lockets, and pins, moreover, photographs and hair were more deeply entrenched in practices of display that reinforced the association between the body of the deceased and the body of the bereaved.

Mourning jewelry had been popular well before the mid nineteenth century when photographic technologies began to re-center memorial iconographies on visual representations of the deceased. In 1693, a gold band manufactured by the Boston jeweler Jeremiah Dunner became the first article of mourning jewelry made by someone born in the colonies. A century later in Philadelphia, Joseph Anthony, a prominent “goldsmith and jeweller,” advertised “Miniature Pictures set . . . in Hair” and “mourning rings & lockets Made on the shortest Notice” among his “General assortment of Gold, Silver, Plated Wares, & Jewellery of the newest Fashion and most elegant taste.” Like daguerreotypes, ambrotypes, and card photographs among later generations, the portrait miniatures that were popular among affluent classes between the mid
eighteenth and mid nineteenth centuries posed important considerations of the dynamic between corporeality and commemoration. Frequently, however, these earlier “Miniature Pictures” were not likenesses of individuals but anthropomorphic representations of death and mourning. A common motif was a figure bent over a fresh grave with an urn in the background documenting the date of death and willow branches hanging over the scene.

While photography did not entirely displace these figurative representations, by the end of the nineteenth century memorial iconography centered on photographic likenesses of the deceased. The availability of photographic modes of representation did not, of course, unilaterally induce this broad shift in memorial iconography nor, more broadly speaking, was photography alone in elevating ideologies of individualism during the nineteenth century. Firmly ensconced in Jacksonian political sensibilities, disestablishment, the philosophical sensibilities of Scottish common sense realism, revivalism, rising mercantilism, and rapid advances in printing technologies, steam power, and telegraphy—each of which elevated individual experience and agency, even within corporate contexts—the years preceding the daguerreotype’s introduction to Americans were undergoing rapid transformations that were continually refiguring epistemologies of individualism across political, social, and theological spheres. And yet even if photography did not solely determine the ontological contours of personhood (which it did not) the medium certainly worked to entrench as well as to negotiate abstract ideologies into material, indeed iconographic, form.

“HE SHUTS HIS EYES TO SEE”: REMEMBERING THE BODY OF THE DEPARTED

After the death of his wife in 1848, A. J. MacDonald of Albany, New York, reflected on the “custom of this age” for dealings with corpses. “She died, and was . . . enclosed in a coffin,
and buried in the earth, in a place called a grave-yard, where there was a great display of tombstones and monuments.” It was not the promise of the putrefaction of his wife’s remains in the “bosom” of earth that troubled MacDonald. Rather, it was “the custom to place a tomb-stone or monument over the grave . . . which agitated my mind for a long period.” When he decided not to place a marker over her grave, friends predictably asked why—did he not respect his wife? Such queries, MacDonald replied, missed the point. Of course he respected his wife, whom he called “the partner of my home.” But costly monuments and grave-markers would hardly benefit her and they were equally incapable of comforting him as they gave “no consolation for my loss.” “To me it looks like heathenism and idolatry!,” was the widower’s unguarded judgment on the subject.42

But then MacDonald considered what monuments were intended to do for communities of the bereaved—namely, to prompt recollections of the deceased in order to quicken sinners to mend their ways. A consolation book printed a couple of decades later was insufferably optimistic in this regard: “the grave should be a place to inspire high and holy purposes, to beget pure and benevolent desire, and to inspire rapid preparation for the fulfillment of our mission which remains on this side.”43 In addition to individual graves as sites of contemplation and reform, the bucolic landscapes and grand architecture of rural cemeteries that had become fashionable in America after the opening of Mount Auburn outside of Boston in 1831 were also intended to invoke the sublime.44 Frequently restricted to the wealthy and refined citizens, even this guarded access provided an instructive allegory of things to come. Reflecting on the Greenwood Cemetery outside of Hartford in the 1860s, Jane Stebbins described a “magnificent gateway, or entrance, at which stands a porter mindful of those who seek admittance there,” and then proceeded to ask “who can enter and not think of another porter and another gate?”45
To such sensibilities regarding the inspirational capacities of remembrance, MacDonald had a measure of sympathy, but nevertheless he deemed their association with graves misguided folly of reason. “Fancy a man alone on the earth, whose wife is buried in a wood,” and who, because his memory fails him, marks her grave so that he can distinguish it from the surrounding foliage. “But is it because he loves the loathsome, putrifying flesh and decaying bones, that he wishes to remember the spot where they lay? Would he not be horror-struck to have them come in contact with him? How can he love that which is so unlovely, and which we really look upon as being so horrible? No! he cannot.” In truth, then, MacDonald reasoned, the object of remembrance was not synonymous with fleshly form, which is subject to decay: “It is the image, the form which that dreadful mass of corrupt matter once presented, that he loves; that being whose bright eye, in reality, shines no more—that gentle smile which always gave him joy, but which now he shuts his eyes to see . . . yes! he loathes the putrid carcase, but the dearly loved image remains to be loved still.” For MacDonald, it was not that the body itself was to be categorically derided or that the motives behind monuments and memorials were unsound. Rather, physical form was an important hieroglyph of the soul so long as it was properly portrayed. “Create whate’er you please,” MacDonald wrote, “there is no memorial like a portrait, for in it I see the nearest image of herself; her smile is there, her deep dark eyes, and the sweet bloom upon her cheeks; her lips, they even now would seem to speak, and almost whisper comfort to a grief-torn heart.” Grave markers, in short, were poor monuments to the memory of the departed because they associated acts of remembrance with the site of putrefaction and decay—inevitable natural processes that, when dwelled upon, interfered with maintaining memories of form “once presented.” A truer monument, an artifact that more closely associated the object of remembrance with a material token, was a portrait.46
Unlike “likeness,” which, by the middle decades of the century was increasingly understood as a pictorial convention that vaulted corporeal similitude, portraiture had historically been less interested in fidelity to fleshly form than to the portrayal of imperceptible—at least to the untrained eye—traits. Even Charles Bell’s enormously popular 1809 treatise Essays on the Anatomy of Expression in Painting, which lauded anatomy as the “grammar” necessary for those who would “show the working of human passion, and give the most striking and lively indications of intellectual power and energy,” nevertheless scorned those artists, so-called, who possessed only “the merit of accurate imitation” and who were “satisfied merely to copy and represent what he sees.” The issue also haunted early champions of the new art. Recall Marcus Aurelius Root’s defense of heliography as a god-like art rather than a mere mechanical trade in his early history of American photography. Fearful of the daguerreotype’s precarious social pedigree, moreover, charter members of the state’s photographic association at a New York daguerreian convention in July 1851 wrung their hands over the “mere catchpennies who hold themselves up in the world as artists, when they are not.” While still considered “more faithful to nature than any other style of portraits,” the reputation of the daguerreotype as art was in jeopardy, the gentlemen fretted, by so “many imposters” flooding the cities with “caricatures” rather than true portraits, likenesses that conveyed inner form as well as outer lineament. As for MacDonald, the issue in all of this was not imitation (the “putrid carcass”) but representation (form “once presented”). By the 1840s when MacDonald mourned his dead wife, portraits had long been used as memento mori. Painted miniatures and portraits commissioned in life with one’s progeny in mind as well as postmortem portraits that improved upon death’s inevitable somatic alterations in order to “preserve these bodies in that high perfection of form,” in the words of celebrated portraitist Charles Wilson Peale, had comprised an archive of memorial
portraiture since the eighteenth century. Yet it was not until photographic methods increased in popularity beginning in the early 1840s that memorial iconography increasingly exchanged figurative representations of death for representations of the deceased either in post-mortem photographs or, more commonly, in likenesses taken in life and repurposed for commemoration upon decease.

As early as 1844 the Langenheim brothers of Philadelphia were quite candid with this latter application. “SOME time or other we all have to leave this world,” they declared, “anyone whose parent, whose wife, whose husband, whose friend, whose child has died, what would he not give to possess a likeness of them as they appeared in full life and bloom.” Indeed, “NOTHING can be more affecting or exciting to the feelings of our hearts,” they proclaimed in another advertisement from 1844, “than to take to hand an excellent Daguerreotype portrait of a parent, a brother or sister, a child, a friend or anyone else we love, after they are ‘far away’ or dead.” While Marcus Aurelius Root would defend heliography in a language familiar to pictorial conventions of portraiture in his early history of photography, early proponents such as the Langenheims ballyhooed the daguerreotype’s greater exactitude of representation than any other medium, especially painted miniatures. “No limner’s brush, no engraver’s steel, no lithographer’s ink is able to produce a likeness so striking-pleasing and lifelike as the Daguerreotype, which is not done by the hand of the artist but by the Pencil of Nature.” In this context, then, as photographic modes of representation came to displace painted portraits as signature tokens of affection and regard, the discourse of exactitude espoused by champions of the new art nevertheless confused the distinction between likeness and portrait, between imitation and representation. Indeed, as with the defenders of the artistic merits of portraiture, rather than merely becoming a transcription of fleshly form for future generations to inspect,
memorial likenesses sutured relics of the past with a discourse of celestial reunion, wherein the body of the deceased, represented through relic and shadow, became a mirror into the beholder’s soul.\textsuperscript{51}

It is unclear whether MacDonald had a painted miniature of his wife or a tinted daguerreotype, or, for that matter, whether he describes an actual likeness or the one he saw when he closed his eyes. In the late 1840s he could easily have secured his wife’s likeness on either ivory or silver, and in many respects either article would have performed a similar commemorative function, although they would have signaled different relationships to the market and social status. What is most important here is that regardless of the compositional or formal similarities between painted miniatures and photographic likenesses, MacDonald identified an important shift in the memorial culture of the mid nineteenth century: a move away from meditations on the decaying corpse and toward a culture of memory that prompted self-reflection through the mediated presence of expired associates. And yet, ironically, the body of the deceased remained central to this changing memorial culture.

MacDonald’s evaluation of portraiture and gravesites as artifacts engaged in the common pursuit of memorial, although sponsoring different associations with the body of the deceased, was also evinced in a common bit of doggerel inscribed, stitched, and scribbled on other “monuments” during the period. Tracing iterations of a verse in the context of differing material presentations demonstrates fluctuating relationships between corpses, memory, and presence. In October 1859, Catherine Christ scripted a verse in her own hand before carefully entombing it behind her daguerreian effigy:

\begin{verbatim}
Fetherolfsville [Pennsylvania] October 29 AD 1859
This is the likeness of
Catharine Christ
When I am dead and in
\end{verbatim}
my grave And when my bones 
are rotten Remember me 
When this you see or I 
shall be forgotten. The grass 
is green The rose is red here 
is my name when I am dead. 52

In the sixth-plate daguerreotype (figure 22), which fits comfortably in the palm, a middle-aged Christ—very much alive—sits in a rather plain chair, hands crossed over her lap, and looks to the left of the compositional frame. For Christ, whose explanatory note, sequestered in its sarcophagic casement, was removed from view of all but the most inquisitive beholders, her portrait became her name, her identity, in her absence. In this context, then, the verse indicated the photograph’s increasing surrogacy for corporeal presence by positing that, through her likeness, her presence continued beyond her bones’ decay. The verse is also significant for what it omits.

Figure 22: Sixth-plate daguerreotype of Catharine Christ, Berks County, Pennsylvania, ca. 1859. From the collection of Geoffrey Batchen. Used with permission.
This verse was not unique to photography. As early as 1797 twelve-year-old Martha Taylor stitched the chime into her girlhood sampler: “Martha Taylor is my name Lancaster is my Habitation Octorara is my dwelling place & christ is my Salvation the rose is red the leaves are Green the days are past [that] I have seen when Im dead & in my Grave & all my bones are rotten when this you see remember me Adieu.”

Eighty years later, in a recurring “Gazette Museum” segment featuring “curious facts, fancies and figures . . . for inquisitive readers,” the National Police Gazette described the “lonely grave” of one Margaret Hurley in Gratton Township, Michigan, whose epitaph read: “Margaret Hurley is my name, / Ireland is my nation; / Vergennes my residing place, / Heaven my expectation. / The grass is green, the rose is red, / This tells my name when I am dead / When I am dead and in my grave, / And all my bones are rotten, / This little stone will tell my name / When I am quite forgotten.”

Photography historian Geoffrey Batchen has found two more iterations of the verse inscribed in North American bibles, one English and one German, in 1877 and 1882, respectively.

Whereas Christ’s portrait signaled presence, these other artifacts, both contemporary and ancient, signaled absence. In 1870 Margaret was an eleven year-old girl in a large family of Irish emigrants to western Michigan. What made her grave a curiosity a decade later could not have been the verse’s novelty but rather its incorporation of somber mirth into the familiar scene of woe. More to the point, whereas Christ was still very much alive when she penned the verse and tucked it into the daguerreotype case, the same singsong verse on Hurley’s grave operated less as lilt to remembrance than as a marker of identification. But, unlike MacDonald’s anguished meditation on his wife’s grave, the verse had the peculiar effect of dissociating Hurley from the residing place of her rotten bones. The verse, in short, did not refer to Hurley’s presence but to her absence. Associated with neither her corporeal form nor her grave, in the case of Martha
Taylor the token of remembrance is the product of her labor, which unlike later commodities, still referred back to the hands of the one who crafted it.

The fact that Christ’s daguerreotype lyric lacks reference to her “salvation” or her celestial “expectation” may be attributable to the limited space provided by the diminutive likeness. Or it may have been intentionally omitted. Regardless of Christ’s intentions, it is likely that the verse’s celestial chimes would have rung in her ear if not those who dared to lift her likeness out of its thermoplastic case. Yet even if Christ’s daguerreotype—which, as an artifact, necessarily included the case and the note—omitted common theological references, it nevertheless gestured to the theological significance of presence in nineteenth-century memorial culture. Oftentimes, when treated at all, the notion of continued presence is relegated to the curio cabinets of historical inquiry—apparitions, ghosts, spirit photography are all well and good, but hardly the stuff of, well, material history. But presence was not a curiosity for nineteenth-century Americans. Thus, whereas the inscriptions on Taylor’s sampler and Hurley’s grave gestured to the now-familiar theological significance of absence—saying, as it were from beyond the grave, that I was as you are and you will be as I am—Christ’s portrait suggests that presence was no less significant.

Photographs in particular communicated the importance of continued presence by providing a vehicle for the deceased to interact in the daily affairs of the bereaved. But, as discussed in the introduction, presence was also a familiar aspect of piety. Landscapes and babies were christened with biblical names—Enoch and Zipporah alongside John and Rebecca—and even if there was disagreement on the degree to which human sensoria facilitated divine presence, most agreed that God and his emissaries, whether incarnate or discarnate, commingled daily in human affairs. Indeed, presence was something of a prism, reflecting both biblical past
and celestial future through the embodied present. Naming newborns after biblical figures and newly discovered territories and new municipalities after biblical terrain—Jordan, Bethlehem, Shiloh, Mount Sinai, Jericho—was not merely to commemorate the past but to shape the future. Likewise, photographs of the now-dead were not intended only to memorialize but to prompt regeneration. Christ’s daguerreian likeness, taken in life, eulogized in her own hand, and intended to facilitate her transformative presence after death, parallels the temporal slipperiness of presence that was familiar to many nineteenth-century religious Americans. Photographic and religious notions of presence were not exact analogues, of course, but they each gestured to the ways in which both beholding and believing were capable of seeing beyond sensorial referents.

In its capacity to evoke not only the image of form once seen but also the whisper of a voice once heard, a touch once felt, a scent once breathed, likenesses of the deceased depended on some fidelity to somatic representation in their commemorative operations. But in addition to depending on the corporeality of the deceased in acts of remembrance, portraits also anticipated the corporeality of the beholder. Declaring that “a portrait is without doubt the greatest of monuments,” MacDonald continued to meditate on its unique ability to facilitate continued interaction between the two bodies. “You can hide it in your chamber, or mayhap in your bosom; you can gaze upon it with love; you can press it to your lips, and in imagination, you can find in it, one who watches your actions, and keeps you ever humble in your path.” Most important for our concerns, by endowing his dead wife with a form of agency that was animated through her visual representation, MacDonald touched on the theological and social work that photographic jewelry, among other modes of memorial photographs, performed as articles of personal adornment. I consider the corporeality of the beholder more closely in a later chapter, but the corporeal relationship between the mourning body and the absent body was also articulated in
other modes of mourning-work. A quick look at how these two bodies were associated in the broader sweep of nineteenth-century mourning culture sheds light on the visual habits of photographic memorial portraiture.

A year before he published his treatise on monuments, MacDonald edited a gift-book comprised of poetry and short stories by authors representing nineteen states, including an original poem by Mrs. Frances H.W. Greene of Rhode Island. Although death was a prevailing motif throughout the volume, Greene’s poem, entitled “My Still-Born Babe,” offers the most intimate experience of grief in the collection. Written as a meditation on the body of her lifeless daughter whom she has enfolded in “these bereave-ed arms,” Greene begins with a cry of helpless disbelief: “Unfolded Bud of Life, oh can it be / This lovely form is all there is of thee?” Her soul-heavy response is that the limp form is not—could not be—all that remains of her child and consoles herself with the promise of a future embrace denied “when Birth and Death were gathered face to face”: “The sweet maternal office yet is mine— / The human all engrossed in the divine; . . . Through all the Courts of Heaven my ear shall greet / The bounding music of thy little feet.” Though the promise of heavenly reunion that limns Greene’s verse may at first reading suggest a devaluation of corporeal form, it is in fact her mournful scrutiny of the tiny features that enables her to imagine their expression in the Courts of Heaven:

These mute lips ne’er shall utter baby moans;
. . . Love shall teach
To thee the music of an angel’s speech—
When from this curving mouth sweet words shall part
With deep a blessing for thy mother’s heart.

Rich “Gems of Life” to crown thy flaxen hair;
And all the beauty of these soft blue eyes,
That woke not here, shall brighten Paradise—
Till in their peerless depths my Soul shall see
A picture of our love’s eternity.
Once more in these bereave-ed arms I hold thee—
Once more to this lone bosom I enfold thee—
My First-Born, and my Precious! for I know
The time has come when even this must go;—
Yet tell me not my clinging hope is in vain!—
Dear little Mary, we shall meet again!

I am denied one living, warm caress;
Yet these cold lineaments have power to bless,

But for a season I release thy hand,
I will not keep thee from the Spirit-Land. 59

As she examines the limp frame of her baby, who was so recently a part of her own living body, Greene’s elegy poignantly summarizes the corporeal identification between death and mourning that shaped experiences of grief. The image her poem elicits, of a mother cradling her dead child, also recalls innumerable postmortem daguerreotypes of small children being held by their grieving parents. During the daguerrian period, parents of deceased children often posed with the corpse in a manner that invoked the pieta. Although Protestants esteemed Mary differently from their Catholic counterparts, the mother of Jesus nevertheless provided a model of mourning for the grief-stricken as well as a way to identify their personal sorrows with the pageantry of salvation. Reflecting on the recent death of her daughter, Ruby, Mildred Mifflin wrote in her journal how “this mourning for my first-born child brings me into nearer sympathy with that unexampled grief which must have rent the heart of Mary, the mother of Jesus, as she beheld him, in whom was the hope of her race, dying the ignominious death of the cross!” Although Mifflin’s liberal strand of Christianity may not reflect the theological sensibilities of many of her companions in mourning, she saw in Mary’s trials an “experience which must ever sanctify the mother-love and dignify the mother-grief” of all women who shared in her lot of despair. 60 In
this sense, then, postmortem likenesses performed a kind of theological work by sacralizing sorrow as a religious experience.

Lastly, Greene’s poem also makes explicit the necessary relationship between form and memory that underlies MacDonald’s critique of contemporary memorial practices, while at the same time pitching the function of memory less to records of the past and present than to future glories limned in her babe’s “cold lineaments” and visible to the soul if not to the organ of sight. In this sense, her meditation closely resembles earlier practices of visually inspecting corpses for signs of heavenly rapture. In other words, while full of sorrow, Greene is also full of hope—gazing into “these soft blue eyes” Greene sees not an unforgiving grave but “a picture of our love’s eternity.” The prevailing language of mourning culture in the mid nineteenth century was one that celebrated a future, heavenly reunion. In this context, the human form, represented in portraiture, became increasingly important throughout the century. But the portrait was an abundant referent, signaling not only the realness of what had passed before the camera’s lens, but the continued presence of the departed as well as promises of glories to come.

“PREPARED TO MEET YOU THERE”:
THEOLOGIES OF RECOGNITION IN MEMORIAL PORTRAITURE

The relationship between the body corruptible and body glorified prompted a great deal of soul searching during a century when one’s physical likeness became increasingly associated with one’s soul and when corporeal decay was increasingly stayed by advancements in mortuary practices. A number of consolation books commented on the prospects of “recognition” in heaven. In 1855, Presbyterian minister James Madison MacDonald defended the position that “the Scriptures plainly teach that the redeemed are to possess bodies so far resembling the bodies they had on earth, and which were ‘sewn’ in the grave,” that loved ones would have no trouble
recognizing those who had gone before. Evidence of this was in the bible, he argued, as a necessary requisite for communing with the ancients and rejoicing in the bounty that each individual prepared for glory. It was also, of course, superlatively “soothing . . . to the Christian, mourning for those who ‘sleep in Jesus.”’

Books of consolation had been popular since the late sixteenth century, and volumes like John Flavel’s *A Token For Mourners*, first published in 1674, were in print well into the nineteenth century, including an abridged version for the New England Tract Society in 1818. While many motifs remained constant over the years, such as, in Flavel’s words, the desire that “these searching afflictions may make the most satisfying discoveries,” the idea that heaven was a place of reunion made possible by the continuance of social ties was influenced by the eighteenth-century theologian Emmanuel Swedenborg. By the middle of the nineteenth century, recognition of relations, especially children, in heaven had become a subject of much theological interest in both England and the United States and a popular topic in books of bereavement. Books under titles such as *The Recognition of Friends in Heaven* and *The Recognition of Friends in Another World* were in print from the 1830s through much of the rest of the century, and chapters on the subject were included in books by Spiritualists and Universalists as well as Presbyterians and Baptists. In *Agnes and the Key to her Little Coffin*, Nehemiah Adams mused on “what scenes there must be in heaven, every day, in the meetings of parents and children, and relatives and friends.” The certainty of Frances Green’s reunion with her stillborn daughter—“Dear little Mary, we shall meet again!”—was predicated on the knowledge that she would recognize the child whose eyes were to “brighten in Paradise.”

The relationship between a developing theological interest in recognition and the popularization of photographic portraiture was neither causal nor consistent. But by accelerating
the portrait’s surrogacy for corporeal presence, and thus personal identification, photography certainly had a hand in these developments. In her 1867 consolation book, *Our Departed Friends*, Jane Stebbins described memories of friends and, especially, children as “daguerreotypes” provisioned by God. However, for Stebbins such “daguerreotypes” did not refer to a material likeness but rather to a divine impression, “chiselling the features in substance more enduring than marble, and dwelling upon and preserving every look, tone, and word with careful exactness, thus creating a likeness that in after years is recognized as the one that was once a reality to us.”

This figurative use of the daguerreotype as a synonym for memory was, by the late 1860s, a somewhat dated usage of the term. During the 1840s and 1850s “daguerreotype” was bandied to denote precision rather than impression, as in the Boston magazine, *The Daguerreotype*, which published foreign news rather than developments in the field of photography. That Stebbins used a photographic metaphor to describe divine impressions upon the mind worked to associate the operations of memory with the daguerreotype’s marvelous detail and tonal depth—even if she failed to account for its well-known fragility and mercurial image. In any case, relying on the “daguerreotype” impression of mortal associations, Stebbins assured her readers that “surely we may count upon the joyful recognition of friends, upon meeting the loving ones in the streets of the New Jerusalem, and walking with them ‘in white’ on the holy errands on which our Lord may send us.”

Although there was hardly consensus on the nature of the glorified body, memorial culture throughout the century commonly assured the bereaved that heavenly reunion awaited them after a brief separation. Funeral cards, such as those provided by the company of H.F. Wendell of Leipsic, Ohio, at the turn of the century, often paired verse with images—a common motif was the name of the deceased inscribed on a bible—in addition to the details of birth and
death that reminded the bereaved that their separation was temporary. The family and friends of Catherine Mumma, who died in 1901, were reminded that though “we must lay thee / In the peaceful grave’s embrace” Catherine’s “memory will be cherished / ‘Till we see thy heavenly face.” And when seventy year-old Ivory Jones died in 1890, her mourners were heartened by the promise that “One by one our hopes grow brighter, / As we near the shining shore, / For we know across the river, / Wait the loved ones gone before.” Most of these cards employed text and memorial iconography to comment on the soul’s safe journey to heaven—a common visual motif was a dove, conventional symbol of both the soul and the Holy Spirit. But by the end of the century, several suppliers provided spaces for photographs of the deceased as well, such as this one (figure 23) for Jonathan W. Osborn using a card from the Ideal Memorial Card Company of Bluffton, Ohio, to which a salt print medallion was affixed.

If the association between likeness and the soul’s sweet embrace was sometimes rendered visually explicit, other memorial photographs used more
cryptic visual cues to identify the depicted individual as deceased. Black borders around the portrait, for instance, designated the image as a memorial photograph, as demonstrated in a card photograph from an album compiled from the 1860s through the turn of the twentieth century (figure 24). By the end of the century, the most common method of rendering a portrait as a memorial was the application of studio retouching. Since the 1860s when collodion negatives had all but replaced daguerreotypes and ambrotypes as the dominant commercial method of

Figure 24: Memorial photograph of unidentified infant, ca. 1890. Author's collection.
photographic portraiture, studios had been storing negatives so that patrons could order additional prints—a practice that earlier photographic techniques simply did not allow. One of the more common circumstances for additional runs was after a person had died. In such cases, the studio would make prints from the stored negative with added iconographic embellishments that signaled a portrait’s memorial status. Wreaths and flowers were common such embellishments. The most frequently used device, however, was to place the deceased’s likeness on a scroll, either through retouching or by positioning the portrait on commercially designed memorial mounts, as in the cabinet photographs of young men from Middletown, New York, and Milwaukee, each likely from the 1880s or 1890s (figures 25 and 26).68 Thirty years earlier a similar, though more rudimentary, practice of signaling the death of the pictured individual involved trimming a portrait to fit vignettes on commercial mounts that had been embellished with visual cues. During

Figure 25: Unidentified memorial portrait, Middletown, NY, ca. 1890. Author’s collection.
the card photograph era of the 1860s, a common such mount featured a vignette frame bedecked with tassels (figure 27). Absent any textual cues, these modes of memorialization required a sort of visual literacy, especially when placed into albums or other contexts that limited the beholder’s ability to handle the photograph.

Figure 26: Unidentified memorial portrait, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, ca. 1890. Author's collection.
Indeed, after receiving memorial portraits at funerals or wakes or upon visiting the house of mourning, the photographs were subsequently archived in bibles, albums, or other designated contexts. Figures 24 and 26, for instance, both come from a common album compiled in Wisconsin. Though we do not have a record of names (other than a photographer named Wollensak, whose name appears on a number of portraits) or other identifying markers, the album, which also includes a number of wedding and first communion portraits, does paint a jagged arc of life cycle events. Like other forms of vernacular photography, the relationship between a memorial photograph and a beholder was largely conditioned by the circumstances of
encounter. Specifically, by considering where memorial portraits were secured we are better positioned to identify the intersections of theologies of recognition and conventions of memorial portraiture.

When seventeen year old Charles Hall died in 1867, his bereaved parents placed a recent photograph of the young man on commercial memorial cards to distribute at his funeral and as friends and acquaintances called upon the house of mourning over the coming weeks and months. Like the unidentified man in figure 27, who was memorialized on a similar format, the cards were of ordinary carte de visite dimensions and featured an elaborately tasseled frame in gold ink, suspended from a point near the top center of the card. Charles’s youthful likeness was trimmed to fit the blank oval in the center of the frame. Beneath his portrait someone wrote with mournful promise Charles’s final admonition to the land of the living: “I am gone to the better land / Prepared to meet you there.”

Drawing on a discourse of heavenly recognition, Charles Hall’s memorial photograph demonstrated how portrait photographs were used to bridge body and soul, heaven and earth, susceptible flesh and incorruptible spirit in the changing memorial culture of mid-nineteenth-century America. If in life one’s likeness was perceived as an index of character, in death it became a cipher of the spirit, not merely a record of “a form
once presented” but a promise of what was to come in “the better land.” But Charles’s photograph was not simply distributed, it was archived. At some point, probably shortly after receiving it, the likeness was placed within a popular consolation book in pages specifically designed for cartes de visite.

In 1867 Jane Eliza Stebbins, a temperance woman from Hartford, Connecticut, published her “proofs of the great doctrine of immortality.” Sold by “agents, ladies, and Clergymen” from Hartford to Cincinnati, Our Departed Friends, or Glory of the Immortal Life was a consolation book that was commended by ministers from across the Union—ranging from glowing reviews, as when H.D. Kitchell, the President of Middlebury College, deemed it “worthy to lie by the side of the Bible as a family book,” to weak endorsements, such as that of Rev. S.D. Willard who “read some portions of [the] new work” and thought “well of the subject and spirit of the book.” Kitchell’s association of Stebbins’s book with the bible was echoed both in its structural similarity to recent bibles that also included photograph albums as well as in an advertisement in the Christian Advocate, which described the volume as “a religious work of the highest type, is in harmony with the Bible, not sectarian.” If the book was “not sectarian” in religious terms—which it was, as its Protestant bias betrays—it was more clearly tilted in its sectional prejudice. Before readers even opened the book to see that she had dedicated it “To the Friends of the 341,670 (Official Report) Deceased Soldiers, who volunteered in Defence of the Union . . . sacrificing their lives in the prime of their manhood, for the good of their country,” they would recognize in the Union-blue binding and embossed gold decorations the Federal uniforms that paraded through the streets and littered the battlefields of recent memory.

First published by her uncle, Lucius Stebbins of Hartford, Stebbins’s book was reprinted as late as 1880 under different titles, including Glory of the Immortal Life (1871) and Earthly
Trials and Glory of the Immortal Life (1879). Although it was an unapologetically verbose examination of immortality, Stebbins saw her consolation book as a work of art. “With the hope that it will . . . give glad conceptions to all who look upon this picture of the glories of the immortal life,” Stebbins positioned her excursus in the pictorial tradition, adding modestly that her success was only “inasmuch as its brightest and only worthy tints have been borrowed from the sketches of divinist models—*the sacred artists.*” Although women had long been the subject, or perhaps more accurately, the ire, of memorial sermons and consolation literature, few women—or men, for that matter—had endeavored to author so exhaustive an account of “the great doctrine of immortality.” Thus by subordinating her own toils and deliberations to an act of simply mirroring “sketches of divinist models,” she was preemptively deflecting critics who would accuse her of transgressing established roles of religious authority in American Protestantism. But her application of the pictorial motif was not only to establish a deflective maneuver. It also spoke to the visual vocabulary her book commanded.

From cover to cover, *Our Departed Friends* demonstrated how photography was transforming the iconography of mourning during its years of publication. Not all copies would have included photograph leaves at the end of the binding. Indeed, much like bibles during the period, Stebbins’s book was sold by subscription and purchasers would have had the option to include albums for a premium charge. If a cursory examination of extant copies is any indication of buying trends—it would be crude one at best—little more than a quarter of subscribers purchased album leaves and only a fraction of these remaining copies still include photographs. Despite a paucity of surviving archival evidence, however, Charles was hardly the only one whose likeness was displayed within the pages of the consolation book. The difficulty of identifying precise subscription records and the impossibility of cataloging every instance of
photographic display hardly diminishes the fact that the very availability of album pages marks an important development in iconographies of mourning that were increasingly attentive to theologies of recognition, evident in the process of displacing figurative symbols with likenesses of the deceased.

The front cover and frontispiece of *Our Departed Friends* feature conventional funereal iconography. On the blue cloth cover, an embossed angel with outstretched hand is surrounded by four stems of lily, one in each of the four corners. Both were traditional funerary icons. Angels were depicted as messengers between heaven and earth, and the outstretched hand figuratively reaching toward heaven also pointed to the embossed gilt circle bearing the phrase “Glory of the Immortal Life,” effectively highlighting the triumphant rewards awaiting the souls of those dearly departed. Similarly, the lily was the traditional symbol of the resurrection of Christ and the promise of the restoration of the souls of the faithful. More densely iconographic than the cover, an engraving of a cemetery scene on the frontispiece (figure 29) continues to invoke conventional tableaux of grief and mourning. Two women kneel beside a freshly covered grave while a man in uniform stands behind the simple internment. A bouquet of flowers, symbolizing the brevity of life, has been set upon the heap of earth and a willow tree, symbolizing both body-bent grief and resurrection—the willow will regenerate from a cutting—embraces the three figures. Again, an angel, mediating one’s passage between heaven and earth, watches over the whole scene. Simple grave markers, urns, an obelisk, and a monument comprise the background, each of which was associated with conventional funerary iconography.

Illustrations throughout the text also rely on memorial iconographies. In an engraving entitled “Raising of Jarius Daughter” in her chapter on “The Resurrection”—in the copy I now hold, someone has folded in this page a single flower, now crumbled—the empty shoes signified
death. The same motif was reiterated several chapters later in a print of a modern deathbed scene. Here, the good death is modeled by prayerful resignation. The dying man’s ailing body is bent in prayer as the cleric administers his last rites and the executor, still blinded by mortal concerns, reaches into his breast pocket for a pen to sign the mess of papers spilled on the bed. The finality of the moment is signaled both by the empty shoes and by the abandoned spectacles. “What glorious appearances will greet the organ of vision in the world of light!,” Stebbins declared on the preceding page, “Something of this power seems to be given to the dying, as they gather up their feet at the close of their mortal journey” (figure 30).
On the other end of Stebbins’s ambitious account of “the prophecies and proofs of the great doctrine of immortality” optional die-cut decorated album inserts paired photographic likenesses with scripture (figure 31). Unlike the book’s previous invocations of mourning iconography, the photographs warranted deliberate scriptural framing. This captioning of the die-cut album frames was, in part, because the photographs referred to specific individuals—whose present circumstances could be witnessed through scripture—rather than to grand literary or painterly motifs. Turning to the end of the volume in which Charles’s picture was preserved, the two album leaves, with spaces for a total of eight card photographs, include four likenesses. Below a studio portrait of a young man with a full beard, perhaps a soldier, is a line from the Revelation

![Figure 30: “Then Shall the Righteous Shine Forth as the Sun,” engraving, Our Departed Friends, opposite 521. Author's collection.](image_url)
of John, “And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes,” a verse that speaks both to the promises of heaven and to the community of the bereaved. The words of the prophet Daniel, “The wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament,” was paired with a carte de visite of a Union infantryman and a photograph of a baby girl—her gender indicated by her hair’s center part—was coupled to a verse from Paul’s epistle to the Galatians with apparent deliberation: “An heir of God through Christ.” Beneath Charles’s youthful visage is the heartening promise from the Gospel of Mathew: “Of such is the kingdom of heaven.” None of the portraits are identified in their setting by name, only by their likenesses. Only by removing the likenesses from their ensconced position—an action that risks compromising the integrity of the album—do we learn the identity of those whose names have been recorded. Even the inscription below Charles’s likeness is obscured when it is in the album, a fact that gestures to the photograph’s other display contexts. Not unlike Stebbins’s figurative “daguerreotypes,” the studio photographs placed at the end of the book also facilitated this divine impression of redemptive promise through material form. By invoking the body in ways that the conventional iconography in her book’s frontispiece and illustrations could not, moreover, the likenesses prompted more urgent reflection on the temporality of mortal life. Indeed these “daguerreotypes” were also designed to remind the living that their names were on the roll call, too. By opening with figurative representations of death and concluding with photographic representations of the deceased, Stebbins demonstrated a moment when likenesses were in the process of displacing figurative iconographies in becoming dominant modes of remembrance.
Figure 31: Photograph album, *Our Departed Friends* (Hartford, 1867). Used with permission of Andover-Harvard Theological Library, Harvard Divinity School.
“A RELIC WHICH BECOMES YOU WELL”: HAIRWORK AND PHOTOGRAPHIC JEWELRY

“On many a shelf at home,” wrote the Massachusetts Baptist minister Daniel Clarke Eddy in his 1857 gift book, The Young Woman’s Friend, “is the silver plate snatched as a memento from the coffin ere it was lowered into the ground; the miniature form taken just before the loved one died, or while it was in its little shroud; full many a relic which becomes you well, is worn in memory.” Notwithstanding Eddy’s religious affiliation or political orientation—in 1854 he was elected by the Know Nothing party to the Massachusetts legislature—his description suggests the ubiquity of postmortem and memorial daguerreotypes of children in mid nineteenth-century American homes. He also hints at a changing understanding of relics among American Protestants. A quarter of a century earlier in the first edition of his American Dictionary, Noah Webster defined the term as “that which is left after the loss or decay of the rest” and, more specifically, as “the body of a deceased person; a corpse.” In this definition, a relic by large signified absence—it was what remained when, according to another period definition, the “the body [was] deserted by the soul.” And yet even though Webster did not alter his definition in the 1857 edition of his dictionary (published the same year as Eddy’s book) Eddy’s use of the term nevertheless suggests an interest in presence—“full many a relic which becomes you well, is worn in memory.” Eddy’s prose is characteristically purple and it is difficult to discern whether he is identifying the “silver plates” and “miniature forms” as relics or if he is referring to an altogether different category of memorial token. Sixth-plate daguerreotypes could easily be “worn” in vestments, tucked into folds or pockets. Far more likely, however, Eddy was referring to articles intended for ornamental wear—mourning vestments, perhaps, but also memorial jewelry. And if the nativist Baptist minister may have scoffed at the idea that these likenesses mirrored the devotional habits of Catholic immigrants, the notion of a relic nevertheless
resonated for many of his contemporaries as an article “which is kept in memory of another with a kind of religious veneration.”

Without manufacturing a “gotcha!” scenario in which the material archives reveal inherent contradictions in stated theologies and social practices, it is nevertheless important to consider how photographs operated as a kind of relic of presence for many American Protestants, even during the heated decades of nineteenth century immigration and social reform when such terminology smacked of Romish influence for a number of Americans (it is also easy to overstate anti-Catholic sentiment, which in many cases was a useful political heuristic even as it was an evacuated social principle). In particular, photographic jewelry, which was commonly associated with hairwork, provides a conveniently knotted tangle of the issues raised in this chapter regarding bodies, memory, recognition, and the demarcation of religion through material artifacts. In short, if hairwork and photographs were not considered relics in the sacramental sense familiar to Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy, they were nevertheless highly charged articles that traversed similar theological and social registers.

Not all articles of photographic jewelry were worn in mourning. Collectors Larry West and Patricia Abbot have identified no fewer than fifteen categories of nineteenth-century photographic jewelry, from bracelets and buttons to stickpins and watch fobs—of which they have classified one as mourning pins and badges—although they also recognize that any article could have become “commemorative.” Photographic jewelry could be worn for a variety of reasons—to commemorate a birth or christening, a marriage, an anniversary, or holiday, to announce political or social allegiance, or simply as novelty ornamentation. And yet, when articles depicted someone who had died, they seemed to become all the more precious. Imagine the sense of urgency and renewed loss that would envelop a grieving widow, parent, or sibling if
the very object designed to provide a tangible link with their beloved was suddenly gone. In late April 1853, William Catchcart of Baltimore lost “a GOLD LOCKET, with a male Daguerreotype likeness and plait of hair in the back.” We can imagine the hair belonging to a son lost in the Mexican-American War or a brother who headed West in search of gold and adventure, never to return. Perhaps the man in the daguerreotype was felled by something more mundane—a fever or an accident. Whoever it was, the cost of its absence far outweighed the article’s market value—the locket, Catchcart pleaded, “is of little value to anyone but the owner, by whom it is highly prized as a memento.” Newspapers commonly ran ads for these lost relics throughout the middle decades of the century. In October 1856 a citizen of Baltimore offered a “liberal reward” to anyone who would return “a HAIR BRACELET, with Gold Locket,” that had slipped off her wrist earlier in the week. Two years later in New York, a thief lifted “one Gold-Linked Chain, with cross and large locket attached, containing a lady’s likeness, marked M.A.P.” and “a lady’s mourning pin, containing hair” among several other articles. In addition to demonstrating the precious nature of these articles, worn close to the body, intended not merely for display but for communion, these classifieds also point to the association of hair and likenesses, especially in memorial photography. If over the course of the nineteenth century photographs became increasingly identified with absent bodies, nowhere was this more evident than in the common association of hairwork and photographic likenesses.

In the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, hairwork—a variety of fancywork created from human hair worked into jewelry or ornamental display—was popularly used to materialize bonds of affection and to memorialize those who had died through a relic of the very body that had once commingled with those now bereaved. Far from becoming obsolete after the introduction of photography, hairwork in fact became even more popular as a parlor
entertainment and hair jewelry a common form of adornment. Throughout the 1860s, *Godey’s Lady’s Book and Magazine* published notices of recently sent articles that women could expect in their mail over the coming days and weeks. Out of twenty-six such notices in September 1863 were five hair rings, one cross, one hair pin, one hair chain, and one unspecified “hair-work.” The two “braiding patterns” that were mailed were most likely for women who endeavored to create their own hair-work at home. “Hitherto almost exclusively confined to professed manufacturers of hair trinkets,” *Godey’s* had written in 1850, “this work has now become a drawing-room occupation, as elegant and as free from all the annoyances and objections of litter, dirt, or unpleasant smells, as the much-practiced knitting, netting, and crochet can be.” Although surely excusing themselves from such deceptions, this earlier piece enjoined its readers that by “manufactur[ing] the hair of beloved friends and relatives into bracelets, chains, rings, ear-rings, and devices” at home, they would “insure that they do actually wear the memento they prize, and not a fabric substituted for it, as we fear has sometimes been the case.” Hair bracelets had been a popular mourning accessory since at least the seventeenth century and during the eighteenth century girls’ academies instructed pupils in the arts of palette-worked hair, which consisted of either finely chopped or dissolved hair that was painted into memorial tableaux.

By the 1850s loupe work had become fashionable, which was made by curling the hair on a hot iron and then arranging it into feather-like plumes, such as the one demonstrated in a “catalogue of artistic hair work for mementoes and souvenirs” published by the National Artistic Hair-Work Company in 1886 (figure 32). This catalogue was composed of a variety of patterns for memorial hair-work, including several for pins, pendants, and rings. The majority of these patterns featured conventional memorial iconography—urns, anchors, willow trees, angels,
crowns, wreaths, crosses. Two of the patterns in the 1886 catalogue, however, incorporated photographic likenesses into the design (figure 33).

In the first, a photograph of a young man is encircled by a wreath of willow and blossoms. The “negative” for this pattern, as the catalogue termed their designs, was mounted on an 8 x 10 inch plate of glass, which would have been suitable for a large wall frame. The second design features a young girl, surrounded by an open wreath, although the negative for this pattern was on a much smaller 4 x 6 inch plate. Despite the variation in size, the photographs in both patterns would likely have been card sized portraits, as indicated by the proportion of the likeness in relation to the hair-work. Significantly, in the second pattern, the girl is wearing a locket. Although these were merely patterns that would be modified by consumers, the inclusion of a portrait in which the depicted individual is wearing a locket—which could have held a likeness or a lock of hair, or both—demonstrated the deep entanglement of photography and hair

Figure 32: Hair work sample from the Catalogue of Artistic Hair Work for Mementoes and Souvenirs, National Artistic Hair Work Company (New York and Chicago, 1886). Library of Congress.
Figure 33: Hair-art patterns incorporating photographs. *Catalogue of Artistic Hair Work for Mementoes and Souvenirs*, Library of Congress.
in memorial culture toward the end of the century. In fact, if the catalogue only gestures to probable associations between likenesses and hairwork, another artifact more surely demonstrates their representational collaboration. Notice, for instance, how in this album of card photographs (figure 34) the hairwork is situated in sequence with other likenesses without any further remark than the identifying inscriptions: “Mother, Died Dec. 16 1867, aged 56 years” / “Father, Died May 31 1872 aged 64 years.” Flipping through the album, it is as if the worked hair was reiterating if not replacing the albumen prints (absent any further written commentary, later beholders do not know if Mother and Father are found elsewhere in the album). And if the hair prompts revulsion in a way that photographs do not, their common association in nineteenth-century artifacts suggests that this responsive discrepancy was not shared by their crafters or earliest beholders.

---

Figure 34: Carte de visite album, ca. 1865-1875. Author’s collection.
Despite the album’s tantalizing orchestration of relics, it is difficult to quantify the prevalence of such albums where the worked hair is positioned as a compositional analogue to surrounding photographs. Far more readily available for researchers are articles of jewelry that feature both hair and likenesses.\(^{85}\) Significantly, however, in both forms of display, hair and photographs were presented as compositional analogues. The visual habits of photographic beholding were of course caught up in modes of representation and recognition that were distinct from the legacy of hairwork. Nevertheless, the relics’ ubiquitous association demands they be treated as, in the terminology of Geoffrey Batchen, “hybrid” artifacts rather than competing modes of representation.\(^{86}\) As early as 1844 daguerreotypists were advertising their ability to set daguerreotype portraits “in a breast-pin, bracelet, locket or finger ring.”\(^{87}\) When Millard Fillmore sat for the Boston daguerreotypist John A. Whipple in 1851, Whipple made duplicates for the president’s wife and daughter, the latter of whom received a “beautiful little miniature of the same in a locket” and was “greatly delighted with it.”\(^{88}\) Around the same time a jeweler in Providence, Rhode Island, named Cornelius Cunliff began manufacturing swivel box pins, which, according to an 1892 retrospective on the jewelry industry, placed a “regulation” box pin on a pivot in order “to contain hair in one side and a miniature in the other.” A brooch containing a tintype of a Union soldier (figure 35) exemplifies this common type of photo-jewelry. Notice how the ring for a chain, or perhaps a black ribbon, as was common during periods of mourning, was positioned

\[\text{Figure 35: Swivel brooch of unidentified Union soldier. Oval sixteenth-plate tintype, 4.6} \times 3.4 \text{ cm (case), ca. 1861-1865. Library of Congress.}\]
below the likeness, demonstrating that the intended beholder was the wearer rather than the public. Standard box pins were also intended to contain “mementoes in the shape of hair, picture, or the like,” and patrons often tucked a lock of hair beneath a likeness when an article could not easily display both. According to the same retrospective, the intended “purpose” of lockets attached to long chains, popular among women in the mid nineteenth century, “was to contain hair or a miniature.”89

Worked hair and photographic likenesses may not have carried the theological weight of relics of Jesus, the apostles, or the saints, but for many American Protestants during the nineteenth century, struggling to reconcile the untimely demise of their beloved with a desire to fulfill the expectation to resign to God’s inscrutable will, these articles each allowed a continued mode of presence and communion with the absent body. The practice of working hair preceded the theological emphasis on recognition that developed during the middle decades of the nineteenth century, and yet as a cultural practice, it continued into the early twentieth century when changing attitudes and aesthetics contributed to its decline. As a pre-photographic mode of authorizing the historical presence of individuals depicted in portrait miniatures or memorialized in iconographic tableaux, the continued association with commemorative and memorial artifacts after the introduction of photography suggests that hairwork silently instructed the visual habits of memorial photography. In other words, as a conventional signifier of presence, hairwork contributed to the photograph’s cooption of that function for later generations. Moreover, as a somatic survival of the deceased’s body, hair succeeded in the task of immortalization that photography could only pretend to accomplish. Whatever the precise nature of the relationship between photography and hairwork—I have only begun to identify possible avenues for further analysis—these entangled relics were certainly significant components of a memorial culture that
was increasingly concerned with the body of the deceased as something more than *memento mori* for the bereaved.

**CONCLUSION**

In his lively study of northern Protestant notions and experiences of death, Gary Laderman has argued that nineteenth-century evangelicals “did not grieve the corpse—it simply began to serve a new purpose of functioning as an instrument for healing the pain of survivors.” This assessment can surely be arrived at by attending to theological instructions and popular literature that modeled both good death and proper resignation to God’s own time. But perhaps the issue is not that Protestants did not grieve, but that the rituals and rhythms of grief changed during the course of the century. For Laderman, the corpse was a “symbolic object,” abundant with potential meanings for different situations and persons. “In spite of the rather uniform ritual structure that managed the elimination of the dead from living society,” he writes, “there was no fixed meaning for the remains.” Nor, we might add, following Stabile, were the “remains” of death limited to the corpse. By attending to the continued association of the absent body with communities of the bereaved, either through mourning practices, memorial artifacts, or anticipations of heavenly reunion, I have attempted to identify how vernacular photography participated in reconfiguring nineteenth-century memorial practices and theologies. Photography extended the reach of earlier memorial customs even as it transformed inherited mourning practices by making visual representations of the deceased—rather than traditional iconographies of death—a central feature of their memory. While portraits did become the increasingly dominant mode of commemoration, the rising popularity of photographic memorials neither displaced traditional iconographies entirely nor signaled movement away from religious motifs.
or sensibilities. The next chapter continues to unpack the relationship between embodied modes of beholding and the negotiation of religious identities that vernacular photography provided by turning to the marvel of stereographs. Whereas this chapter has been primarily interested in the body of the beheld, however, stereographs elicit greater attention to the corporeality of the beholder.
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In October 1893 sixteen-year-old Ivy Ledbetter Lee stood among the crowd gathered on the elevated rail platform in Chicago. The weather was mild for mid-October—the morning Tribune had forecast a comfortable sixty degrees—but Ivy still had a chill run down his spine as he thought about what the day had in store. Four days earlier he had left Atlanta with fifty dollars in his pocket and a brown cloth memorandum pad. To pass time on the rail passage through Chattanooga, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, and Lafayette, Ivy had come up with a list of “terms of interest in Chicago.” Throngs of tourists had taken similar routes to the “phenomenal city—so gigantic, so young, so rich, strong and powerful” earlier in the summer to witness the World’s Columbian Exposition.¹ And while the sweltering summer crowds had dissipated, there was still much to behold as autumn’s long shadows crept into the city. Ivy’s father, a Methodist minister, had been in Chicago a few weeks earlier when he delivered a paper at the World’s Parliament of Religions, an auxiliary congress to the Exposition that testified both to the triumphalist sensibilities of Protestant ministers like James Lee and to the cosmopolitan aspirations of many other participants. But Ivy made no mention of his father other than the $45.00 “Rec’d from Papa” on October 13. He had other things to think about. Miss Pearl Mozley, a family friend, had insisted that Ivy see the “Special Pictures in [the] Art Gallery,” so he made a list of sculptures
and oil paintings by nationality—the United States, France, Germany, Belgium, Denmark, England, Norway, Russia, Spain, and Italy. Julian Hawthorne had directed him to the “portrait of Lady Macbeth”—a study of the British stage actress Ellen Terry by the American artist John Singer Sargent—gushing that it was “first picture in the Exposition.” He also scribbled that he must “see Tiffany Diamon[d] Exhibit and Stain Glass in M. & L. A. Fine”—the Manufactures and Liberal Arts Building located on the Grand Basin, America’s leviathan answer to the piece de resistance of the Paris Exposition four years earlier.²

In addition to these exhibits of fine arts from Europe and the United States, the Exposition had other attractions that would have drawn the attention of a teenage boy striking out on his own for the first time. Having purchased his guidebook (twenty-five cents) and Fair admission (a dime), Ivy quaffed a glass of orange cider and ambled his way over to the “Anthropological—Ethnological” attractions on the Midway Plaisance. He flipped open the memo book. “Go: Streets of Cairo.” A wedding procession complete with “gaily caparisoned camels” and a “half-stripped Egyptian who danced with his shoulders, after the Asiatic, African, and Muscovite manner” was a “typical scene in Cairo Street” according to one souvenir book of the Fair.³ Within earshot of the “tom-tom beaters” he may also have seen bangle-clad performers of the Danse du Ventre at the Egyptian Theatre, an attraction that had stirred up quite the media sensation over the summer.⁴ From Cairo Street, Ivy cocked his head up to gauge the towering Ferris Wheel but “did not go on.” He also went to the Javanese and South Sea Islanders Villages and Old Vienna. He witnessed the “mon-poy” at the Chinese Theatre but missed the Moorish Palace. At the Algerian Village he bought a coin for a nickel, one of several purchases he made that afternoon: a wooden waiter inlaid with pearl for Mrs. Mozley, a glass souvenir, a Japanese coin, two spoons, and an unspecified assortment of “Souvenirs (aluminum).” Ivy spent a week in
the Dream City of the West, the enthusiastic moniker bestowed upon Chicago, and spent a good
deal of time exploring the city beyond the Fair. But the Columbian Exposition’s cacophonous
orchestration of fine art and ethnographic spectacle anticipated the visual habits of willful elision
that Ivy Lee’s father would help facilitate for Americans over the course of the next decade by
bringing them to the pages of the bible. In the same way that patrons beheld gyrating Egyptians
and joss-houses and Japanese coins but saw them to signal something else—heathenry, greed,
frivolity—so did the living and photographic presence of the Holy Land cloak underlying
hermeneutics of elision that denied the contemporary circumstances of Ottoman subjects.⁵

Simultaneously conditioning aesthetic contemplation and wide-eyed wonderment, the
Chicago World’s Fair modeled in microcosm the visual habits of an era of increased colonial
engagement and immigration, both of which sorted out a multitude of anxieties and aspirations
through visual strategies of representation that frequently obscured far more than they revealed.
In a word, these visual habits of elision are the flipside of the signifying presence of the icon.
Hundreds of thousands of visitors ambled their way through the Fair’s labyrinth of exhibits and
spectacles. For those who could not attend, dailies and weeklies provided countless sketches of
interest for the curious and the intrigued. Using a newly popular technique to print photographs
in situ with published text, James Wilson Pierce authored a “profusely illustrated” Photographic
History of the World’s Fair that included “a minute account of the GREAT EXPOSITION”
alongside scores of photographic “illustrations.”⁶ Pierce was not alone. One historian has noted
at least 600 souvenir photographic albums available to visitors to the fair and patrons of sundry
publications.⁷ In April of 1894, for instance, new subscribers to The Southern Cultivator received
“50 photographic views of the World’s Fair” as a free gift, “$25.00 Worth of Instantaneous
Photographic Views.”⁸ Similarly, the Religious Herald of Hartford, Connecticut, issued a
“profusely illustrated” number entitled *Picturesque Chicago* that included a guide to the Fair and the *Chicago Times* serialized halftone photographs of “Midway types” by the Canadian portrait photographer James J. Gibson.⁹ While Gibson’s portraits have been credited for resisting contemporary caricaturizations of the national groups found along the Midway, his portrayals were the exception to the rule when it came to the cultural legacies of photographic representations of the performers and artisans along the Plaisance.¹⁰

Fatimah Tobing Rony has defined the late-nineteenth-century hunger for images of natives as “fascinating cannibalism,” by which she means to draw attention to “the consumers of the images of the bodies—as well as actual bodies on display—of native peoples offered up by popular media and science.”¹¹ The category of the ethnographic was implicated in the construction of racialized categories it portended merely to demonstrate through empirical technologies. Rony’s assessment of ethnographic cinema as insatiable spectacle provides a helpful framework for understanding the category of the ethnographic in visual technologies at the turn of the century. But the concept of spectacle leaves little room for the sense of manifest presence that photographs of the Holy Land were intended to convey even as they participated in the “pervasive form of objectification of indigenous peoples” that Rony labels “Ethnographic.”¹²

This chapter explores how the racially-charged visual politics of photographic representations of the Chicago World’s Fair were echoed in photographic representations of the Holy Land. In addition to modeling the visual habits of an imperialist gaze that Ivy Lee’s father would bring to the pages of the bible, in other words, the method of illustration that brought the Fair to kitchen tables across the nation also brought the Holy Land to life for countless Americans. These associations are more than speculative.
The publishing firm of N. D. Thompson of St. Louis was directly involved in publishing photographic records of both the Fair and the Holy Land. And Ivy Lee’s father was instrumental in making the connections explicit. In 1893, Thompson published *The Dream City: A Portfolio of Photographic Views of the World’s Columbian Exposition* and a few months later *Oriental and Occidental, Northern and Southern: Portrait Types of the Midway Plaisance*, a collection of eighty halftones of “all the queer people you gazed at ‘down on the Midway’” comprised in large part from the negatives of the Chicago photographers Place and Coover.13 In March of that year, as installments of *Portrait Types* were coming to press, Thompson asked James Lee if he would be “disposed to make the trip outlined on the map of Palestine showing the journeys of Christ and the Apostles, with a photographer which you say can be procured in that country or in Egypt, and procure five hundred photographs.” As a gesture of his “sincere regard” for Lee, Thompson enclosed in his correspondence a “Worlds Fair Series of Views.”14

By the time the United States hosted the international exposition in St. Louis a decade later, the connections between the imperialist gaze and Holy Land topographies would be manifest in the orchestration of the fair itself. The wildly popular Jerusalem Exhibit at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in 1904 was, as historian Burke O. Long has noted, situated strategically between the magnificent Fine Arts building and the hubbub of the Pike, St. Louis’s boisterous echo of Chicago’s Midway Plaisance. James Lee both advised its construction and authored the exhibit’s official guidebook.15 Long suggests that such a position demonstrated ambivalence about the cultural location of Jerusalem. By 1904, however, there was little that was ambivalent about the Holy Land for Protestant and Catholic Americans. For more than a decade they had been policing the boundary between the sublime and the subjected through photographic artifacts that teetered between visual habits of emulation and elision. To be sure,
many things happened between 1893 and 1904 that circumscribed a range of visual habits that linked American colonialist endeavors with biblical imaginaries through strategies of elision. The Spanish-American War, for instance, bore a graphic legacy that far outlasted the few months of armed conflict in 1898, and wave upon wave of immigration had inspired catalogues of caricatures for decades. As contemporary inhabitants of “the Orient,” the peoples of Palestine and Egypt, especially, were subjected to a dismissive colonialist gaze. At the same time, however, when rendered as types—icons—rather than individuals, these same figures were understood to disclose the hidden truths of the bible. Inhabitants of the Holy Land were simultaneously configured as ethnographic icon and biblical relic. It was not a matter of ambiguity but of duality. It was a messy affair, to be sure, but there was little confusion, little ambivalence, about the place that Jerusalem and its attendant Holy Land locales occupied in the religious imagination of turn of the twentieth century America.

This chapter does not posit a causal sequence between the Midway Plaisance, photographs of the Holy Land, and the Jerusalem Exhibit. But these spectacular events do help to place the photographs within a cultural milieu that was electrified with practices of representation that influenced the visual habits at work in beholding the Holy Land. James Lee had at least a cameo appearance in all three acts. But as much as this is a story about the visual habits of an imperialist gaze that linked the racialized renditions of the Midway with representations of colonized subjects and both with a biblical imaginary, it is also, and more directly, a story of migrating photographs. The book project that Thompson pitched to Lee was for a tour of the Holy Land in which Lee would lead with “the pencil” alongside a photographer who wielded a camera. In the end, Lee agreed to Thompson’s terms. But the photographer who accompanied him through the Holy Land—a designation derived, according to Lee, “from the
fact that God’s chosen people lived in it”—was not an operator hired in Egypt but rather the American landscape artist, Robert Edward Mather Bain. And despite Thompson’s earliest inclinations, Bain’s photographs would have a longer shadow on biblical interpretation than Lee’s learned commentary.¹⁷

Eight months after his visit to Chicago, Ivy recorded in his diary that “Papa had cabled that he sailed Wednesday and of course that pleased me.”¹⁸ Lee and Bain were in the Holy Land for a few months. But Bain’s plates would generate a reevaluation of the relationship between text and image in American Protestantism, even to the point of making the bible a “new book.” Photographs of the Holy Land had been popularized early in the medium’s history and had reached a level of artistic import through the works of the English Quaker Francis Firth and the Belgian Felix Bonfils in the 1850s and 1860s. More commonly, however, early photographs reached wider publics not through plates and prints but through the intercessory arts of the engraver and, in the case of canvas panoramas—popular entertainments throughout much of the century—the painter. Although fine art photographs and painted panoramas remained influential throughout the century, during the 1880s technical advances in the field of photo-mechanical reproduction enabled publishers to print photographs directly into manuscripts, processes known familiarly as “photogravure,” a misnomer that confused commercial halftone techniques with the highly involved process of transferring negatives to copper plates. Photogravure was used by Edward Curtis, for instance, in his folios of Native Americans, as well as other artists who desired to maintain as much fidelity to the tonal quality of the original negative as possible.¹⁹ Nevertheless, even if the resulting print was grainier and yielded a lesser spectrum of light and shadow, halftone techniques profoundly influenced the visual habits of Americans in the last decade of the nineteenth century by bringing photographic representations of racially- and
religiously-coded populations to the fingerprints of millions of Americans—Midway “others” in *Portrait Types* (1894), urban tenement dwellers in Jacob Riis’s *How the Other Half Lives* (1890), Filipinos in periodicals during and after the Spanish-American War, and inhabitants of the Holy Land in a host of publications. This chapter follows Bain’s photographs through a series of display contexts—a photographic exhibit in 1894, a folio book and an illustrated New Testament in 1895, and multivolume bibles in 1896—and considers them within a culture increasingly comfortable with visual politics of imperialism, a politics saddled with narratives of elision that worked to erase the existence of photographic contemporaries even as they asserted the power of photographs to disclose the presence of national and, in this case biblical, imaginaries.

**EARTHLY FOOTSTEPS: THE MAN OF GALILEE AND THE “WORLDLY ST. LOUISAN”**

In January 1894, three months before Lee and Bain would set sail, *The Freeman* of Indianapolis, a weekly “national illustrated colored newspaper,” printed “coupons” redeemable for the first installment of *The Holy Land Photographed*, “a photographic panorama of sacred history” published in “seven royal parts.” Designed in part by the weekly’s editor George L. Knox to boost sales by coupling the one-dollar price-tag with a six month subscription to *The Freeman*, each part of the “elegant and tastefully bound” series included “sixteen photographs printed on heavy ivory [...] paper,” totaling 112 photographs of “everything of any special interest in the Holy Land.” Knox’s ballyhoo that the volume represented “the first effort ever made to hold before the eyes of the reader the very spot where Jesus and his disciples walked and lived” was, by 1894, entirely wrong. As is discussed in the next chapter, stereographs of the Holy Land had been in circulation for decades by the 1890s, and a number of photographers had been exhibiting prints since the daguerreian period. The discourse of Holy Land presence—and
vicarious access—in other words, was nearly as old as the medium of photography. But the seven issue series was nevertheless important for, in Knox’s words, placing the “photographic panorama of sacred history” into the “hands of every man, woman and child of the race.” This “indispensable [sic] companion of the Christian home,” Knox further boasted, was to “delineate graphically the scenes portrayed, and to connect them with the familiar and important events of Bible history.” The editor spared no words in his endorsement of the volume: “it makes the Bible a new book.”

The Freeman’s “elegantly and tastefully bound” volumes were likely similar to (if not the same as) those advertised the same week, at discount, in the Methodist book-concern Zion’s Herald as “Neil’s Photographs of the Holy Land,” a series of 112 views “of the exact scenes of the great events of the Bible and a panoramic view of Jerusalem on the day of the crucifixion.” Indeed, while his confidence in the transforming power of the photographs was no doubt in part a calculated effort by the successful editor to boost his paper’s sales, The Holy Land Photographed was one of many series of photographs of the Holy Land sold by subscription at the end of the century. In addition to the entrepreneurial aspect of the photographs, for nineteenth-century Americans, such pictures not only illustrated religious narratives but actually shaped how such narratives were interpreted among contemporary audiences. During this last decade of the nineteenth century, claims would increasingly be made that photographs had a unique ability among the visual arts to “make the Bible real,” an ability that was located in a presumed collaboration between photographs and texts, most notably, between photographs of the Holy Land and the pages of the Bible. Although this collaboration was particularly poignant in stereographs, with their prominent captions, biblical references, and flipside descriptive-analyses, similar conventions were also utilized in a number of techniques that conditioned the
mutual significance of photographs and texts in matters of biblical interpretation. In other words, despite claims—both implicit and direct—that photographs, particularly within the pages of bibles, were interpretive supplements, they often enough yielded interpretive cues beyond those of the surrounding scriptural context.

Three months after *The Freeman* advertised its series of *The Holy Land Photographed*, James Lee and Robert Bain set out from St. Louis on their way, via New York, to Egypt, freighted with nine boxes of glass plates from the Cramer Dry Plate Company of St. Louis, an impressive cargo of more than six-hundred pounds. Dry plates were a relatively recent development that freed photographers from carrying cumbersome sensitizing equipment into the field—a young banker from Rochester named George Eastman was instrumental in popularizing dry-plates in the United States. Whereas just a decade earlier Bain would have had to carry a veritable cabinet of chemicals with him, sensitize each plate with a wet emulsion, and make an exposure before the emulsion dried, the Cramer Plates came pre-sensitized. This not only reduced their cargo load—six-hundred pounds was still no feather to bear—but also enabled Bain more latitude in selecting his camera positions, and thus, it was presumed, greater accuracy in treading the footsteps of the Man of Galilee.

The pairing of Lee and Bain was itself something of a comic episode according to contemporary accounts. “Nobody would ever suspect the young, fat, good-natured and very worldly St. Louisan, Mr. Robert E. M. Bain, of having traveled all over Palestine in company with a distinguished Methodist minister,” chortled the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* a year after their return, “But that is precisely what he did.”²³ Lee was now pastor of St. John’s Methodist Episcopal Church in St. Louis and Bain, on his passport application filed March 19, had claimed for his occupation “European Steamship Agent.”²⁴ Although Thompson and later publishers
would defer to Bain’s expertise as a photographer in their promotional materials, throughout the
decade Bain identified as an “amateur,” which explains his occupational status on official
documentation. Nevertheless, “by amateur photographer,” he explained in an article published in
the trade journal *Photographic Times and American Photographer* in 1891, “I mean one with a
complete outfit—tripod, camera, focusing cloth, and all. The fiend with the alleged detective
camera is at best a base imitation.”25 Pocketing their “letters of introduction” to foreign
dignitaries—this was indeed a great commission—Lee “carried the pencil” and Bain
“manipulated the camera” from April through late June as the men roughed the sacred terrain
with a caravan of “four tents, five mules, four horses and eight men, including dragoman, cook
and waiter.”26

Following a route familiar to many Americans, whether from their own travels or those
facilitated by book or brush, from New York the minister and the photographer had crossed the
Atlantic to Egypt, where they visited the Heliopolis, Memphis, Cairo, and Alexandria, jotting
down descriptions of each place “with pen and camera” while making sure to relate each place to
its biblical significance. Even recently unearthed mummies were poised to illuminate the pages
of scripture. Describing Bain’s photograph of Ramses II, John Heyl Vincent—who collaborated
with Lee in writing commentaries for Bain’s photographs, although he did not travel with the
pair in the spring of 1894—reminded his readers how the pharaoh had reigned during the time
that the Israelites were exiled in Egypt. “Rameses II. was . . . great, but egotistical and vain. . . .
He vaunted himself as a god. He introduced polygamy into Egypt. He was brave, but boasted
excessively of his bravery. With it all he was a selfish tyrant. Look at him.”27

From Egypt Bain and Lee sailed north to Palestine, where they arrived at the port of
Joppa on Sunday morning, April 22, 1894. From the port city, they traveled through the country
and into Turkey, Greece, Italy, and “the Archipelago Islands”—in short, “all Biblical points of interest”—for two months, their precious cargo of brittle glass plates miraculously surviving the harrowing journey “over the road traveled by our Savior and his Apostles” as well as “the footsteps of St. Paul in his missionary journeys” and into “the city of Plato and Aristotle and the home of the Caesars.” Especially telling of the plates’ divine protection was that their journey was often not in the careful stewardship of Lee and Bain’s personal entourage. “From place to place by railway cars, by express wagons, by carriages, by steamboats, by row-boats, by porters,” the plates exchanged many hands but never escaped God’s watchful eye before arriving back in St. Louis in early July “without the loss of a single box.”

Beginning in December 1894, six months after their return to St. Louis, a selection of the negatives—the Post-Dispatch cited at least 1,500 in Bain’s collection, although Thompson had originally commissioned only a third of that sum—were serialized in twenty-four Parts, each consisting of sixteen photographs, and sold by subscription under the uniform title, Earthly Footsteps of the Man of Galilee. The Congregationalist of Boston advised against having “the Series . . . permanently bound,” since, in their loose form, the photographs “are convenient for reference, can be easily handled, carried into the Sunday School class, or kept at one’s elbow for use at a moment’s notice.” Five months later, the same periodical had changed its tune, at least enough to cater to subscribers’ who “would prefer to have their Footsteps in a more solid form.” In any case, the complete set included the original twenty-four parts as well as “an extra number” that was “issued in obedience to the call for a general alphabetical index and also to round out the work in other important particulars.” Each part, including the extra number, was ten cents. For those who “wish[ed] them bound,” the price of a full-cloth binding, embossed in gold, was
$1.50 for subscribers who made arrangements through the *Congregationalist* office, and the far more elegant Half Morocco was $2.00.\(^{30}\)

Not everyone opted to bind their *Footsteps*. In July 1895, the *Southern Cultivator* gave special notice to their readers that “A *Handsome and Durable Portfolio Holder* in rich English cloth stamped in gold will be given to EVERY ONE completing the entire series of 24 parts.”\(^{31}\)
The *Congregationalist* similarly pledged that a “Portfolio to hold the 25 Parts will be furnished free to all who have paid for the entire series, if delivered at our office.”\(^{32}\) To the *Congregationalist*’s credit, the bound volume was particularly cumbersome, making it less likely to be handled frequently or carted to Sunday School, which no doubt contributed to different modes of interaction with and assessment of Bain’s photographs. Thus while I focus here on the bound editions of Bain’s photographs, there are doubtless other histories to be plumbed as well.

The bound “art-folio” was an impressive volume of full-plate halftone prints, a feat of technological no less than devotional importance, made possible by the patented “chemigraph process” utilized by Cramer Dry Plate Works.\(^{33}\) Throughout the century a variety of photographic technologies had made halting, inconsistent, yet vociferous claims to representational authority based on discourses of empirical exactitude, claims that were echoed in *Footsteps of the Man of Galilee*. Although by the 1890s photography was understood as an artistic no less than a scientific or commercial endeavor, these domains were hardly exclusive. In fact, the incorporation of photographic mediums and methods into the rising fields of biblical history relied on both artistic and scientific claims to authority in their “exact” reproductions of “picturesque” Palestine—and tethered both to consumer demand. The folio of “delightful pictures, so handsomely taken,” promised the *Post-Dispatch*, “give one the impression that he is there and gazing upon the reality.”\(^{34}\) Lee affirmed the assessment when he described how they
had “stood amid the scenes of [Jesus’s] prayers, tears, sermons and wonderful works, and transferred them, with the blush and bloom of Palestine, to the delicate, sensitive surface of our glass plates.”

Promotional material often noted Bain’s recognition as an award-winning “landscape artist” in order to bolster his authority as a photographer and thus the integrity of the photographs deemed not merely to represent but to reproduce the Holy Land for American beholders. An advertisement in the Atlanta Constitution, for instance, quoted James Lee in an “Explanatory” intended to bolster public confidence in the pictures. “We simply secured the best pictures that ever came from the East,” the minister boasted. Such a claim, moreover, came “without any seeming surplus of overconfidence, for the National Photographers’ Convention, held this year in St. Louis, awarded Mr. Bain a medal on all the twelve views he entered—being the first he developed.” In the same way that Marcus Aurelius Root had praised heliographers as “artists” who were gifted with the ability to manifest subtle, even imperceptible, qualities in portraits, Lee credited his companion with manifesting something greater than technical skill: “to the function of the photographer he unites the genius of the artist.” By combining the technical aptitude of the medium with the technique of the artist, Lee promised subscribers that “an opportunity is here given of making a delightful tour of Palestine and the countries adjacent to it without leaving home.” Pilgrims who followed in Lee and Bain’s footsteps could rest assured that the photographs were not merely adequate representations but rather, by all standards, good pictures.

But Bain himself had not always been a part of the picture. Robert Bain’s changing role in the retellings of the initial journey demonstrates changing attitudes to the role of photographs in American Protestant biblical interpretation. Although photographic techniques had long been used to illustrate Holy Land topographies in an effort to “make the bible real,” placing these
images within the bible itself required both the development of appropriate methods of photomechanical reproduction and theological wiggle room. In short, one had to be certain that what readers saw in the photographs was not contemporary Palestine or Egypt or Greece but flesh and blood—and brick and mortar—representatives of the “ancient orient.” In his introduction to *Earthly Footsteps*, Bishop John Heyl Vincent of the Methodist Episcopal Church underscored this mindset, which will be plumbed in greater depth later in the chapter: “The manners and customs of this Eastern country have not been changed. People dress and eat and sleep and live and labor as they did two thousand years ago. *The scenes of the Bible are reproduced with startling fidelity to the old record*. . . . The old customs and costumes remain.” Such a rendering of Ottoman culture is easy to critique. But such claims to continuity were necessary for the relevance of photographic representations of the Holy Land.

Recall from Thompson’s original correspondence to James Lee that he expected a photographer would be “procured in that country [Palestine] or Egypt.” In this initial pitch, the photographer was incidental to the project; it was the narrative of the journey and the commentary that carried the project’s instructional promise. By the time Thompson published the *New Testament Illustrated and Explained* in 1895, however, it was Bain’s “direction” of “a corps of assistants, interpreters and guides” that yielded the “novel but forceful and instructive plan of illustration” provided in the edition. Indeed, in the “Map of Bible Lands” that unfolded from inside the front cover of this edition—maps were included in all published iterations of the journey—James Lee is all but erased from the story. “Showing in red line the journeys of Christ and the Apostles while on earth,” the map also shows “the journey of Photographic Artist Robert E. M. Bain, in the year 1894.” The map formalized the footsteps of Jesus such that they could be followed by a photographer who, it was implied, stood in for all beholders. It was this
conflation, combined with the presumptive timelessness of the region, that made the halftone prints of contemporary Palestine, Egypt, Greece, and Italy relevant to biblical interpretation. The publishers’ confidence in the edition’s “acceptability, desirability and absolute helpfulness” in biblical instruction, in other words, extended from their conviction that the “superb engravings” they selected from Bain’s portfolio “represent[ed] authentically the places made famous in those earthly journeys.” In both the map and the explanatory material, the eye of the beholder was synchronized with the eye of the photographer. Such an interpretation, however, masks variations in seeing that contributed to the many different circumstances of beholding. In particular, while editors and commentators worked to situate Bain’s photographs first as a journey through the Holy Land and subsequently as biblical illustration, the pictures simultaneously bled beyond such interpretive frameworks.

A year after Thompson published *The New Testament Illustrated and Explained* and *Earthly Footsteps of the Man of Galilee*, Bain’s photographs and Lee’s commentary were published by R.S. Peal—Thompson’s former associate—and J.A. Hill in the *Self-Interpreting Bible*. Sold in four folio volumes, the *Self-Interpreting Bible* was an Authorized translation that included detailed references, explanatory notes, tabulated statistics, geographical, historical, and explanatory illustrations, expository notes, dissertations, side lights, reflections—in short, “all the helps, tables, commentaries, dictionaries, illustrations and side lights necessary to enable any one to understand it”—and, not the least among this impressive catalogue, were halftone prints from the photographs by R.E.M. Bain. Chief editor of the project was James Lee, and, notably, his Introduction to the volumes was largely drafted as a defense of the use of photographs within its pages. Whereas Thompson had staunchly claimed that his “illustrated edition of the New Testament . . . is in no sense experimental,” Lee chose to capitalize on the novelty of the mode of
illustration in the Peale and Hill edition. “The Publishers of the Photographic Edition of the Holy Bible,” Lee erroneously reported, were the “first to carry out the unique idea of specifically showing by means of PHOTOGRAPHY the actual places mentioned in the Bible, thus securing pictorial results of the very highest order.” Previous bibles’ use of “sacred pictures of a general nature, such as portraits, copies of well-known paintings, representing scenes and incidents of more or less importance,” he explained, were not only imperfect but actually detrimental to the tasks of spiritual growth and historical knowledge because they were, “in the main wholly imaginary and hence untrue.” The present edition, however, “by means of the absolutely perfect record of the camera, and also in immediate connection with the text” was to be, Lee anticipated, “stimulating and satisfying to Christians everywhere” for giving them the “privilege of beholding, through the medium of a wonderful art, those sacred places which they have heretofore been able to see in imagination only.”

In a guidebook for a stereographic tour of the Holy Land a few years later, Lee’s fellow Methodist minister Jesse Lyman Hurlbut would praise photographs’ “power to give us a vivid realization of actuality in the Bible narrative” by stimulating the imagination. For Lee, however, the intended effect of “the absolutely perfect record of the camera” was to control such fancies, although he later concluded that “the imagination, as informed by the eye, is helped to interpret [biblical events], and we believe that with these helps the Bible itself will become a more tangible and interesting book than ever before.” In both cases, however, the truth claim of the photograph was not in its compositional referent but in the imaginative act of beholding. Thus however they approached the tricky topic of imagination, both volumes considered photographs of the Holy Land indispensable to the task of biblical interpretation, largely through strategic positioning of image and text. This kind of spiritual sight required a good deal of
overlooking what the camera had recorded—a hermeneutics of elision—and, by the same token, ciphering what had passed before its lens.

Bain’s prints did not, of course, displace scripture. Rather, all three publications featuring Bain’s photographs cultivated a sense of direct correspondence—“immediate connection,” in Lee’s words—between the prints and accompanying text. In *Earthly Footsteps of the Man of Galilee*, the collaboration between the perfect record of the camera in Bain’s photographs and the perfect truth of the Holy Writ was given graphic representation in the frontispiece to the volume. Below the vignettes of “Our Tourists”—which included the celebrated Methodist Bishop John Heyl Vincent, although he did not accompany Lee and Bain in 1894—is a medallion of an ancient stone dwelling flanked by books and quill on the right and camera on the left (figure 36). Both *The New Testament Illustrated and Explained* and *the Self-Interpreting Bible* identified the prints as “illustrations,” a designation that signals how the photographs were intended to illuminate the text rather than supplement or augment scriptural interpretation. In both editions of the bible, moreover, scriptural references were explicitly aligned with each print in the accompanying commentary and in *Earthly Footsteps*, the “descriptions” centered primarily on biblical figures.

And yet, claims to the perfect collaboration of image and text were challenged by the fact there was not a direct correspondence between the photographs and the scriptures they were intended to “illustrate.” Among the most glaring evidence of this in the *Self-Interpreting Bible* is the frequent use of New Testament events to explain Old Testament prophecies, an interpretive approach common enough to many nineteenth-century American Christians, but one that also points to the often unacknowledged interpretive work of visual material. The Photographic Bible underscores how photographs were used to accomplish this familiar biblical typology by
Figure 36: Frontispiece and detail, *Earthly Footsteps of the Man of Galilee* (New York and St. Louis: N.B. Thompson, 1894).
freighting a discourse of empiricism—the “honest eye” of the camera—that collaborated with biblical hermeneutics. When Bain’s photograph of the Via Dolorosa—a ritual site developed in early Christianity that is nowhere specifically mentioned in the Gospels—was placed opposite Psalms 35:7, the “gloomy street” became a visual reference for David’s lament of the “pit, which without cause they have digged for my soul.” In this case, David prefigures Christ and a view of contemporary Jerusalem depicts the anguish of both. In fact, many of the photographs in the Old Testament volumes of the *Self-Interpreting Bible* were used to position Jesus firmly in the pages of the prophets. For instance, opposite Deuteronomy 6:4-10 (a passage that was cited in the commentary below the print), a view of “Mosque El-Akso, With Basin,” depicted “Where Our Savior Held the Conversation with the Lawyer.” According to the commentary, “Upon one occasion Christ was approached by a lawyer tempting him and enquiring of him concerning the law. . . . We give a picture of the Mosque el-Aksa which stands upon part of the grounds once occupied by the temple, and is doubtless near the spot where our Savior stood when he held the conversation with the lawyer.” Using a Muslim mosque to mark the space where “our Savior stood” in order to exegete a passage from the Pentateuch, photographs such as this one facilitated a great deal of theological work within the pages of the *Self-Interpreting Bible*.

Using visual cues to inscribe Jesus literally into the pages of the Old Testament was one of the ways in which photographs influenced biblical interpretation. But in addition to this hermeneutics of presence, the photographs also required beholders to overlook the faces who on occasion stared back. The rest of this chapter focuses on the hermeneutics of absence and its relation to ideologies of imperialism that so often characterized popular representations of “foreign” peoples both beyond the nation’s borders and, just as commonly, within their own. Palestine and other regions of the Holy Land were never American colonies but they were
certainly wrapped up in the colonialist ideologies of appropriation, representation, and domination. Unlike other modes of contemporary American imperialism in the 1890s, Americans had little interest in changing the peoples, practices, or landscapes of the Holy Land. Whereas in other contexts “the savage became a signifier of an earlier period,” writes David Brody in his recent study of the representational practices of Filipinos during the United States’ military occupation at the turn of the twentieth century, and it was “the responsibility of colonialism to rescue the [native] artist from his modern-day anachronistic life,” Galilee and Matariyeh were more useful as anachronisms than as evidence of American progressive intervention.51 Just as surely as minarets, bicycles, and parasols were evident in Bain’s photographs, they were seldom acknowledged as evidence of cultural change.52 Indeed, a constant refrain throughout Earthly Footsteps and the commentaries on Bain’s photographs in bibles is the glacial passage of time in Palestine and Egypt, especially. People still practice “very ancient” methods of agriculture and other industry and descriptions slip easily between travels in 1894 and 1863 and “Joseph’s day.” Matthew Frye Jacobson has noted how “timelessness” was a “staple of travel reportage” at the turn of the century and how ethnographic icons facilitated “a timeless present tense.”54 This colonialist operation of timelessness was surely at work in Bain’s photographs and other contemporary views of the Holy Land beheld by Americans. But the perpetual present tense also had theological implications.

Describing Bain’s photograph of the “Jewish Wailing Place,” taken in the spring of 1894, John Heyl Vincent told readers how “On Friday afternoon, March 13, 1863, the writer visited this sacred spot” and “found between one and two hundred Jews of both sexes and of all ages, standing or sitting, and bowing as they read, chanted and recited, moving themselves backward and forward, the tears rolling down many a face.”55 By overlooking the significant changes in the
political, religious, and social landscape of Jerusalem that came with an influx of Jewish
migrants and refugees in the 1880s, Vincent presents Jews as ethnographic subjects that were, at
best, not affected by such changes, and at worst, inured to changes. In fact, throughout the
various iterations of Bain’s photographs, this print was positioned as evidence of Jewish
resistance to change. “All the years of change and war and bloodshed and fire and persecution,”
read the caption to Bain’s photograph of the “Jewish Wailing Place” in the Self-Interpreting
Bible (figure 37), “have not been able to destroy the affection which this ancient people of God
have for their Holy City.”56 For Christians who analyzed the photograph alongside the scripture
it was designated to illustrate—Luke 13: 35—the image was not one of laudable perseverance
but rather condemnable obstinacy: “Behold, your house is left unto you desolate: and verily I say
unto you, Ye shall not see me, until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh
in the name of the Lord.” If there was any doubt of the intended interpretation that the
juxtaposition between the verse and the photograph suggested, the “Reflections” on the
chapter—authored by the eighteenth-century British theologian John Brown—put it to rest:

With great care should we guard against uncharitable censures of those whom God hath
sorely afflicted, remembering that his strokes on them are warnings to us, and that
nothing short of evangelical repentance can prevent our eternal ruin. . . . The most
unfruitful sinners may be renewed and turned to God by the gospel; but the obstinate
abuse of this will at last issue in men’s just and inexpressible ruin. Cries for mercy will
then become vain, hopes and pleas from external privileges will be defeated, and there
will be none to intercede for the sinner.57

There is nothing in the chapter or in Brown’s reflection that directly identifies Jesus’s injunction
with a specific population. But by the end of the nineteenth century, the American Protestant
icon of recalcitrance to the gospel was the wailing Jew.

In addition to this interpretive operation of rendering the people in Bain’s photographs as
ahistorical icons of theological mandates, the theologically-inflected present tense also enabled
beholders of his photographs to position themselves within the biblical narratives. “The Son of Man is on his way to Jerusalem,” begins Lee in his commentary for a photograph entitled “Ahab’s Well in Jezreel.” Compositionally speaking, the photograph was nothing to boast of. A group of six stand around what we are told is a well. One person looks at the camera, quizzically. But it plopped viewers onto the road that Jesus trod on his “final departure from Galilee” some nineteen centuries earlier just the same. This ability to transcend the passage of time through embodied visual practices was especially important at the end of the nineteenth century. During the last half of the century, practices of biblical interpretation had spurned a number of new translations which in turn popularized theretofore academic debates about the presumed timelessness of scripture. Although Bain’s photographs were never designated with the authority

Figure 37: Bain, “Jewish Wailing Place,” Self-Interpreting Bible (1896), 4:183.
of scripture, when they were positioned within editions of the bible they were charged, according to Thompson, with the purpose of “throwing light on Scriptural facts, and fixing more indelibly in the mind scriptural incident.” The accompanying commentary did not always keep the grammatical present tense, but both Lee and Vincent consistently associated Bain’s photographs with specific biblical events, a representational strategy that bolstered the claim that the views exceeded illustration in their reproduction of the Holy Land. They were, in short, relics to behold just as surely as they were icons to interpret. Whereas the scriptures were becoming increasingly challenged by evidence of canonical debates and scribal traditions, Bain’s photographs provided direct evidence of the “very footsteps” of Jesus.

COLONIZING THE HOLY LAND

In his introduction to *Earthly Footsteps of the Man of Galilee*, James Lee framed the pious project in the rhetoric of a military objective. It would be several years before tensions between the United States and Spain erupted in a flash of armed conflict, but the cultural ethos of nation-building, couched in the language of civilization and Christianity, was already in the air, as the events on the Midway and in the World’s Parliament of Religions had made abundantly clear. Describing the book’s conception, Lee related how Thompson and Peale had “proposed to capture the countries about the Mediterranean Sea and transport them to America without destroying their cities or disturbing their people.” The instruments of this ostensibly benevolent enterprise were Bain’s camera and Lee’s pencil. “No bombardment was to be inaugurated, except such as passed through the lens of the camera, and no missile was to be projected deadlier than the thought that passed through a pencil to the pages of a note-book.” Despite his qualifications of the vocabulary, Lee’s use of militaristic language fit within the prevailing
colonialist ethos of late nineteenth-century America. As David Brody has argued in his study of American popular representations of Filipinos in the context and aftermath of the Spanish-American War, colonialism was a duplicitous enterprise that promised freedom yet delivered violent appropriations of land and charged racializations of native peoples through “exaggerated imagery.” In Brody’s telling, both supporters of and antagonists to American presence in the Philippines resorted to “racially loaded representations in the expanding popular press” to shore up their ideological stance and, just as importantly, “sell more newsprint.” While there are important distinctions between official colonialist projects, such as the Philippines, and unofficial cultural appropriations of regions of the Ottoman empire, Bain’s photographs of the Holy Land nevertheless participated in practices of ethnographic iconographies that both denied the individuality of persons depicted—a visual habit at odds with contemporary domestic portraiture—and relied on racially-charged “exaggerated imagery” to regulate the cultural distance between Anglo-Protestant American beholders (a crafted subjectivity in its own rights) and modern-day embodiments of the biblical past. Indeed, the inclusion of Bain’s photographs in illustrated editions of the Bible demonstrates how bibles were complex cultural artifacts that archived both individual likenesses and imperialist stereotypes.

The Chemigraph halftone technique used in *Earthly Footsteps* allowed less room for the stylized racial stereotypes common in lithographs and newsprint drawings. Or rather, photography required different approaches to visual coding of race. The front cover of *Earthly Footsteps* features an embossed engraving of the group “as we journeyed from Jerusalem to Damascus” (figure 38). Three figures are on horses—presumably Lee and Bain, and possibly their dragoman. Four additional figures ride mules. One figure, however, stands in the center of the composition and, unlike the rest of the group, stares directly out at the reader. It is unclear
who the shrouded figure was intended to represent and no corresponding photograph was included in the book. The racial codes, however, are unquestionable. The most obvious signs of racial difference are on the face, which is represented with a broad nose, full lips, and deeper hatching to indicate dark skin. Juxtaposed to the two mustachioed Americans in modern dress—including dapper riding caps—the figure’s sartorial cues were also intended to signify difference. The androgyny of the figure is also telling. Bain and Lee, sitting perfectly erect astride well-groomed horses, are represented as paragons of American manhood and thus a stark contrast to an effeminized native masculinity. But the figure’s androgyny also invokes common ethnographic icon of the “savage beauty” who, according to Jacobson, was made “to stand for an entire people and their land.” Whatever insurgency the native figure may signal through his or her stare, it was effectively subdued through the visual habits of an imperialist gaze.
The concept of an imperialist gaze by no means adequately describes the range of visual habits that were brought to bear upon or that were facilitated through Bain’s photographs. Recall, for instance, that similar series were issued through black periodicals during the 1890s and that Bain’s series was issued through both Northern and Southern offices. Variations across region and race no doubt influenced the valences of racial representations for beholders of Holy Land prints. And yet it is difficult to assess the juxtaposition of text and image in these photographs without accounting for a cultivated sense of superiority that straddled national, racial, and religious discourses without ever settling firmly into any one category.

A view printed early in *Earthly Footsteps of the Man of Galilee* established a number of the viewing strategies expected of beholders. As Bain and Lee were making their way across the “Plains of Jezreel” in central Palestine on May 4, 1894, they came across a group of men plowing their fields with teams of oxen. Because the plains evoked so many biblical events—Deborah and Barak conquering Jabin’s army, Josiah’s defeat by Pharaoh Necho, the battle between Gideon and the Midianites, the travels of Mary and Joseph, the Philistines encampment during their conflict with Saul—the outfit decided to stop for a picture. “Our dragoman asked the people . . . if they would stop long enough for us to take a photograph,” Lee related in his commentary in *Earthly Footsteps*. “For the usual ‘Baksheesh’ they granted his request.”62 First, the print works to establish Bain and Lee as self-guided pilgrims and to circumvent the thorny issue of Ottoman control, which required a native escort, by obscuring the identity of their translator and guide. Although the “dragoman” is mentioned frequently in the volume and appears in a number of photographs, he is never named. An article in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* identified the guide as Abraham Lyons, “a native of Jerusalem, but a Hungarian by descent” and
“a member of the English church” who had guided tourists through the Holy Land for three decades.63

Secondly, the photograph indicates that the Americans were not above staging their views. Many of the photographs in Earthly Footsteps include people who appear to have been positioned—if not hired—by Bain or Lee. In terms of compositional content, the prints in the published volume can be divided roughly into four categories: landscapes that did not include people; long shots that circumstantially included people; shots of varying length that included people for compositional directives, such as scale; and focused views that appear to have been deliberately composed around specific figures, even if the commentary neglected to mention them. A print entitled “The King’s Chamber” demonstrates the last category (figure 39). The focal point of this interior view of “the pyramid of Cheops—the great pyramid” at Giza is a man crouched against a wall near the center of the print. He is accompanied by another man who stands behind him, back also against the wall. Despite the prominent position of both men in the print, the closest that Lee came to acknowledging them was when he wrote that “the ascent [into the chamber] is difficult and requires the assistance of two or three Arabs who pull and push and prop as the exigencies of the ascent demand.”64 As was noted in Chapter One, the fact that a photograph was staged did not undermine its authenticity or integrity. Thus, in Bain’s views, the probability that the views were staged did not challenge their authenticity so much as the lack of acknowledgment of the people who populated them spoke to the cultivation of a hermeneutics of elision.
Another prominent example of this willful elision is in Bain’s photograph of the tomb of Lazarus (figure 40). The print in *Earthly Footsteps* is one of only a handful that were positioned in portrait orientation, which required the viewer to turn the heavy volume lengthwise in order to see the image and read the commentary comfortably. The print features four figures standing around the opening to an ancient stone structure. In his commentary, Lee used the view to challenge the site’s biblical accuracy—“it is, of course, nothing but a tradition”—but then to speculate that the real sepulchre was surely “within the sound of our voices” and to recount the story of Lazarus’s miraculous resurrection. Not once does Lee mention the figures who so deliberately look back at the viewer. Not once does he acknowledge the woman nursing her child. Breastfeeding on its own merits ought not signal the pornographic. Indeed, in this view, the suckling babe and the exposed breast are gratuitous compositional flourishes that signal “the
Figure 40: Robert E.M. Bain, "Tomb of Lazarus," *Earthly Footsteps of the Man of Galilee*, 229.

native” more than the erotic. Nevertheless, as Jacobson has observed, there was a tendency in American relations with “colonies or potential colonies”—his example is Fiji—to cast “the encounter with various peoples as a story of sexual desire and conquest.” In other words, the
heteroerotic colonialist framework worked to transform the maternal bond into an eroticized signal of cultural inferiority by positioning it alongside a muted commentary.

As much as these seemingly deliberate photographs of people invite the assumption of compositional staging, Lee and Bain were also quick to emphasize the spontaneity—which, for them, operated as a kind of authenticating device—of some of the views. In a print entitled “A Woman of Samaria,” for instance, Lee recounted how Bain was “taking pictures in Shechem” when a woman and a little boy “appeared upon the scene, and showed much anxiety to know exactly what we were about” (figure 41). His condescending tone suggests that the woman and child were unfamiliar with the contraptions and culture of photography—“wherever we stopped [the natives] gathered about us, and it was sometimes very difficult to keep them from standing

Figure 41: Robert E.M. Bain, “A Woman of Samaria,” *Earthly Footsteps*, 164.
directly in front of the lens”—when, in truth, it would have been difficult to find anyone in the region without some familiarity with camera-toting Westerners. In any case, as Lee continued in his narration, he demonstrated just what he meant by the camera’s “bombardment” of the Holy Land. “The artist, having taken a picture of the city, quietly turned his camera upon the tripod and took a photograph of this woman before she knew what he was doing.” Such blatant acknowledgment of the photographer’s stealth worked in favor of Lee’s larger point. For him, the woman represented “the naïve and unsophisticated manners” of a people—“her people”—who had “forgotten the moral and spiritual teaching of the Lord who lived and taught among them.” In short, in spite of the technological savvy of contemporary inhabitants of Palestine, for Lee, the woman in the picture did not represent nineteenth-century Samarians but rather her biblical antecedent: “There is still among these natives the same work to do—the work of reproof and conviction, instruction and salvation which Christ performed when He was here.”

The likelihood that Bain’s photograph of “A Woman of Samaria” transpired as spontaneously as Lee recounted is debatable. Even given the latest equipment, the operation would have taken long enough—at least a minute or so—and the figures are relatively in focus (although the woman appears to have been retouched). The narrative device of spontaneity, however, provided a kind of authenticating measure for Lee, whether he needed it or not. But more than the circumstances in which they were positioned, the mere presence of the woman and the young boy did the work that Lee needed. To raise the issue as a question, if Lee and Vincent seldom made mention of the people who so frequently, seemingly deliberately, populated Bain’s photographs, why were they there? The answer, in short, is that the people demonstrated the continuity with biblical times necessary to underwrite the theological utility of photographs. If the medium of photography worked to disclose the Holy Land to middling Americans,
contemporary inhabitants of the region—whether Jews, Muslims, or Christians—provided the evidence the camera needed to stake its claim. Bain’s photograph entitled “Traveling in Galilee” was printed in both *Earthly Footsteps* and *The New Testament Illustrated and Explained*. Under the title “Traveling in Galilee [Mark, iii:7-8]” in *The New Testament*, the commentary collapses scriptural incident within contemporary practice: “Jesus Christ was brought up in Galilee and often traveled through it. This scene is common to the country. Every day one is likely to meet families traveling just as is here shown. Things never change in Palestine. As they travel today, they have always traveled.”67 Never mind the parasol (figure 42).

Figure 42: Robert E.M. Bain, “Traveling in Galilee,” *The New Testament Illustrated and Explained* (St. Louis: Thompson, 1895), 115.
When James M. Buckley described a recent visit to the Jerusalem Exhibit at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in an editorial for The Christian Advocate in November 1904, he related that, “so far as its external scenery is concerned,” the organizers had accomplished an “accurate reproduction” of the historically significant city. Sitting on eleven acres, Jerusalem “displayed 22 streets; 700 people, including Mohammedans, Jews, and Christians, reside in it, and there are more than 200 houses.” There were also some unfortunately “divers incongruities” with the real thing. Camel rides were evidently not allowed in Jerusalem, although they were freely available at the Exhibit, and the Arabian wedding “performed by a sheik . . . in the square of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre” would never have transpired beyond the perimeters of the Pike. “But the scenery well repays the visit,” Buckley insisted. James Lee had authored a “pamphlet history” of the city that served “as a handbook which those who have not mastered the history of that wonderful people will do well to carry with them” as they ambled up “the steep, narrow streets” and “visited chapels, temples, the tower of David, and the wailing-place of the Jews.” “The Walled City of Jerusalem—in St. Louis,” as John Brisben Walker jested in his 1904 guide, could be as deceptive as it was illustrative. Chatting with one of the “native attendants” in the exhibit, Walker soon learned that despite an initial claim to have hailed from Palestine, he actually had “a push-cart in New York, and live[d] in Hoboken.”

Not far from Jerusalem in St. Louis was the Philippine Reservation. “Savages of many tribes I have seen,” Buckley assured his readers, “for I have penetrated to their native regions; but when I saw the Igorrote village everything was new.” Fortunately, he found a helpful guide in “the little books that are sold there under the imprint of the Philippine Photograph Company of the World’s Fair.” The souvenir consisted of ten prints, including views of “the Igorate village,”
the jail, “the portrait of the head-hunter chief,” views of tribal members “preparing a dog for a feast . . . and at last an Igorrote woman.”69 In St. Louis, Palestine and the Philippines were made physically proximate in a way that materialized the imaginative proximities of the previous decade. If there was a lingering tendency to portray Filipinos as savages, it was a strategy of representation that was losing urgency now that the archipelago was more firmly under American control.70 But even if both Palestine and the Philippines had their share of curiosities—camel rides and dog-feasts—Jerusalem was approached as a relic more than a fossil. The model, however, was imperfect. A New York street vendor could pass as a native. At the end of the nineteenth century, photography became a far more reliable method for manifesting the Holy Land to Americans. And the revived photographic technique of the stereograph not only brought the Holy Land to life for beholders, but enabled them to place themselves in the shadow of Zion.
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Rather, the sentiment—broadly shared by late-nineteenth-century Americans (as I discuss later in the chapter)—demonstrates how biblical interpretation was enmeshed with the cultural politics of colonial power, in both its explicit and subtle manifestations.

Travel narratives remained an important interpretive context for photographic tours of the Holy Land. In Chapter Four I am especially attentive to the trope of the travelogue in stereographic tours of the Holy Land and series of the Life of Christ.
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Chapter Four

“BEYOND THE SENSE HORIZON”: HOLY LAND NARRATIVES OF CORPOREAL DISPLACEMENT

*I pass, in a moment, from the banks of the Charles to the ford of the Jordan, and leave my outward frame in the arm-chair at my table, while in spirit I am looking down upon Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives.*

—Oliver Wendell Holmes, 1859

On Easter Sunday 1896, wearied from months of travel, the American entrepreneur Elmer Underwood sat down at the desk in his room of the Alexander Howard Hotel in Jerusalem to write a note to his wife. “My Dear Jennie,” he wrote on the single sheet of hotel stationary, “Bert and I are having a grand and interesting time here. I arrived on Good Friday morning and have been seeing and photographing the grand parades and ceremonies.” Six months earlier Elmer had applied at the United States Embassy in London for a passport for himself, his wife Jennie, their infant daughter Ruth, and their “maid servant” Elin Ericsson, “a subject of Sweden,” for the purposes of “travelling on the continent” and with the expressed intent of returning to the United States within two years. Jennie, it seems, along with their six-month old daughter and maid servant Elin, had stayed in Europe while Elmer and his younger brother Bert traveled further east.¹
Upon arriving in Jerusalem, the mustachioed thirty-six year old Elmer—blue eyes, high forehead, ordinary nose, according to government clerk David Dwight Wells—wrote to his wife that he and Bert had witnessed a spectacle of “Catholic Franciscan pilgrims follow[ing] the Via Dolorosa” and the “great sight” of the Holy Sepulchre. “The Christians (Roman Catholic), the Armenians, the Greeks, and various pilgrim churches took their turn in the ceremonies,” he wrote, “which mostly were anything but sacred. Pomp and form was the order of the evening, and thousands upon thousands of Christian Pilgrims from all Europe were there and crowding for standing room or any kind of room.” Although a certain amount of cosmopolitan disdain was to be expected of someone of Elmer Underwood’s stature, his gentlemanly restraint in describing these “grand and interesting” scenes buckled when he reported to Jennie the “blasphemous ceremony” at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre—“where the priest ridden and ignorant of all nations gather for worse than heathen worship”—and the solemn practice of “passing by and kissing the great stone slab which is claimed to be the stone upon which the Lord’s body was anointed, and doing honor to the numerous places and objects which traditionally were connected with Jesus.” “Much of all this,” he wrote with an almost audible huff, “is the grossest humbug, of course.” But one site quieted Elmer’s sardonic criticisms of the city and its Holy Week observances. “There is a sacred spot outside of the city which I have faith in as the identical place (or at least probable place where Christ was Crucified and buried).” “I really believe that we have looked into the very tomb where Christ’s body was laid, the new and unfinished tomb of Joseph of Arimathea,” Elmer gushed. “We shall photograph it.”

By intimating that his photograph of the “empty tomb” would gain Jennie access to the sacred site without physical travel, like many of his contemporaries, Elmer Underwood evinced a confidence in the power of photography not merely to represent but to reproduce the experiential
conditions of the real Holy Land—the sites and scenes of the biblical narrative absent later accretions of “pomp and form” (which, for the Baptist pilgrim, was a not-so-subtle dig at the region’s very apparent Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox traditions). As we began to see in the previous chapter, from its earliest years photography had a complicated relationship with biblical illustration and scriptural interpretation. From the authenticating mechanisms of photographic vistas of the Holy Land, whether translated into lithographs and woodcuts or printed as halftones, to the biblical scenes that adorned thermoplastic daguerreotype casings, multiple photographic techniques directly and obliquely shaped the biblical imaginary of
religious Americans. Unlike Bain’s award-winning prints, however, the photographs that Elmer and Bert took that April of 1896 were not destined for the pages of the Holy Writ. Rather, their photographs were positioned outside of the “immediate connection” of the bible that James Lee had used to elevate the interpretive relevance of Bain’s pictures and thus worked to displace conventional orderings of image and text in Protestant reading practices. More so than any previous technique, the Underwoods’ photographs were calculated to transport their beholders to the Holy Land as a necessary help to modern scriptural interpretation.

Elmer’s account of the brothers’ visit to “the Jews’ wailing place” offers a different vantage from which to map their photographs on the increasingly expansive terrain of nineteenth-century photography. In describing to Jennie the “interesting spot” where the city’s Jews “congregate on Fridays especially, and where they face the wall with their Hebrew Old Testament and weep and wail,” Elmer boasted that he and his brother had “splendid photographs” of the sight but lamented in the next breath that their pictures “lack the wailing.” Touching upon one of photography’s most glaring obstacles to representational exactitude—the other being the absence of color—Elmer’s pause at the percussive void between Holy Land pilgrimage and its photographic representation was nevertheless largely overlooked by contemporary audiences who, in the vein of a Sunday School lesson commentary, gushed that looking at the Underwoods’ photographs “is almost the same as if we were actually traveling in the Holy Land.” Indeed Elmer and Bert themselves would later write that with their photographs, the beholder “may feel that he is actually visiting the places” before her eyes. Such discourse was based in part on the growing field of biblical geography. Jesse Lyman Hurlbut, a New Jersey Methodist minister who edited the widely used Manual of Biblical Geography in 1884—“Containing Maps, Plans, Review Charts, Colored Diagrams and Illustrated with
Accurate Views of the Principal Cities and Localities Known to Bible History”—later published a guide to the Underwoods’ Holy Land photographs, grounding their instructional authority in their ability to facilitate “experiences of standing in the very presence of Palestine.”

Because thousands of years have passed since these records were made, and the lands in which the events were recorded are said to have occurred are thousands of miles away,” Hurlbut wrote, “consequently . . . we find it very difficult to think ourselves into those far-away lands, back to those distant times, to make that history real to us.”

“Hurlbut’s corrective to this lapse of cognition? “We must see that the land is real,” for “such experiences . . . are magical in their power to give us a vivid realization of actuality in the Bible narrative.”

Emphasis on the photographs as a conduit of sorts for biblical geography, with its own claims to representational authority, however, was, as with Bain’s prints, a discourse that masked an orchestrated correspondence between the photographic contemporary and the biblical imaginary. In this sense, by using contemporary inhabitants of Palestine to demonstrate biblical figures, Bert and Elmer relied on existing Protestant conventions of photographic representation. In the photograph of the “Tomb of Our Lord,” for instance, the brothers arranged “two young Syrian girls from the English Protestant school,” “dressed in the costumes of their people” to demonstrate how the resurrection scene might have appeared, with “one [angel] at the head and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain.” Such staging was not to deceive viewers, a later commentator explained, but was better to illuminate the biblical account, to correct beholders’ fanciful imaginings of biblical pageantry through the honest eye of the camera. This same principle was at work elsewhere in the Easter morning letter when Elmer recalled that at the house in Jaffa “claimed to be” that of Simon the Tanner, where heaven opened to the apostle Peter, that “of course we took the picture, and we went up on top to see the place where Peter’s
vision was, and tried to imagine a great deal.” Standing on the rooftop at Jaffa and “imagining a great deal,” on the one hand, and positioning contemporary inhabitants of Ottoman Palestine within the compositional frame of their prints, on the other, were different ways of accomplishing the same interpretive feat, namely, conscripting the present into the biblical past through the authorizing mechanisms of technology.⁹

Unlike the majority of camera-toting Holy Land pilgrims at the turn of the century—and despite recent improvements in exposure speeds and camera construction, personal ownership was still a luxury in the 1890s—Elmer and Bert Underwood had gone to Jerusalem specifically to photograph. Nearly two decades earlier, when they were scarcely twenty-years old, the brothers had begun peddling stereographs supplied from three east coast firms—Charles Bierstadt of Niagara Falls, New York, J. F. Jarvis of Washington, D.C., and the Littleton View Company of Littleton, New Hampshire—door to door, in Kansas and Missouri.¹⁰ Unlike standard photographs that collapsed the field of vision into a single plane, stereographs worked on the principle of binocular vision by fusing two similar, but not singular, images through prismatic lenses. When viewed through a specially-designed device dubbed a stereoscope, the two images became one seemingly three-dimensional view, giving the beholder a sense of depth, perspective, and proportion that other photographs elide. Look again inside the tomb. Below, the photograph (figure 44) is reproduced as a stereograph. When seen through a stereoscope—as the view would have been by the Underwoods’ contemporaries—the shadows become cavernous, the tomb appears to plummet to an unknown depth, the kneeling figure descends backward, and, as Elmer later wrote, the Holy Land appears “to you in a more life-like aspect than it has ever before been reproduced.”¹¹
Figure 44: “Tomb of Our Lord,” stereograph. Author’s collection.

But reproducing the views in their original stereoscopic format is important for reasons beyond the visual interest that the dimensional effect produces. Although easier for publication and common in scholarship utilizing stereographs, looking at a single frame better approximates the visual experience of other photographic formats, such as published photographic tours of the Holy Land on the order of James Lee and Robert E.M. Bain’s *Earthly Footsteps of the Man of Galilee* or magic lantern slides, rather than the experiences of stereoscopic viewing. Certainly there is much to learn from the visual content of individual stereographic frames, and such content analysis should not be discredited as a worthwhile and important academic pursuit. In this chapter, however, as in the dissertation more generally, I am as much concerned with the visual habits that photographic media facilitated as with their manifest images. Thus, without privileging one above the other, this chapter examines stereographs in the context of contemporary photographic media—photographic “landscapes” and magic lantern slides—in
order to map the similar but ultimately distinct ways of both imaging and imagining the Holy Land, specifically, and American religion more generally.

In their coordination of the senses of sight and touch, as well as their ability fray the constraints of time and space, stereographs were similar to other types of vernacular photographs popular among nineteenth-century Americans. And yet whereas portraits and memorial photographs, for instance, promised a kind of continued presence despite corporeal absence, stereography offered beholders an embodied technology of corporeal displacement, a device specially configured, according to contemporaries, to unhinge the senses from their corporeal frame. This thoroughly tactile experience of temporal and spatial transport was regulated viewing through specific, body-centered instructions and yet promised, in the language of Jennie D. Pullen, an instructor in geography at the Cleveland Normal School, to wing students “far beyond the sense horizon that shuts them in.”¹² Writing decades earlier, Oliver Wendell Holmes nevertheless voiced a similar understanding when he wrote in far more oneiric prose that stereographs “produce[d] a dream-like exaltation of the faculties, a kind of clairvoyance, in which we seem to leave the body behind us and sail away into one strange scene after another, like disembodied spirits.”¹³ While kindred image content shared to varying degrees in this discourse of displacement, particularly through the narrative strategies of the travelogue that bound different photographic media into complementary interpretive paradigms, the immediate circumstances of beholding were particular to landscapes, stereographs, and magic lantern slides, respectively, and thus generated different viewing subjects. Thus even if Elmer and Bert Underwood borrowed existing conventions of representing the Holy Land for American Protestants and Catholics, the stereographic format changed the experience of beholding by magnifying the beholder’s sense of bodily absence, even though the practice of stereographic
viewing itself augmented the physicality of perception. Pressing one’s face into a well-fitted stereoscope and adjusting the position of the card while training one’s eyes on a distant point until the ancient port of Joppa sprung into life beyond the bow of the vessel, for instance, was a very different entrance to the Holy Land than sitting in a darkened room as the gas-light of the lantern slowly focused onto the suspended sheet, bringing the city into view, or thumbing through Bain’s photographs in *Earthly Footsteps* and, later, *The Self-Interpreting Bible*.

Among any number of relevant visual archives that contributed to the visual habits of stereography—including painterly traditions, staged tableaux, woodcuts, elaborate canvas panoramas of biblical events, or earlier photographic plates and prints—magic lantern demonstrations most closely approximated its technological, instructional, and devotional discourses. Lantern slides and stereoscopic views, moreover, frequently came from a common stock of negatives, a half stereo being issued as a lantern slide. Although Bain’s landscapes, stereographs, and magic lantern slides in many ways shared visual archives and worked to weave text and image into a single artifact of mutual significance, the entangled history of stereoscopic and magic lantern slides requires that we look beyond the artifact itself to its mode of encounter in order truly to grasp its meaning among contemporary beholders.

STEREOGRAFPHY IN AMERICA

By the time Elmer Underwood boarded the steamship *Majestic* in September 1895 to ferry his young family from New York to Liverpool, the stereograph had become a national passion on the brink of obsession.¹⁴ Stereographs were first introduced to the American market in 1850 by the Philadelphia establishment of Frederick and William Langenheim upon Frederick’s return from studying with Daguerre in Paris. Four years later the brothers were
producing their own views on glass plates, the first to be made in the United States. Although the
physics of binocular vision had been probed since antiquity, it was not until 1838—a matter of
months before Daguerre would announce his discovery to the Académie des sciences—that a
modern apparatus for replicating the appearance of solidity in two-dimensional format was
announced by the English physicist Sir Charles Wheatstone.\textsuperscript{15} Within a decade another English
physicist, Sir David Brewster, who had invented the kaleidoscope in 1815, had improved upon
Wheatstone’s earlier design to enable better viewing of the highly reflective daguerreotype plates
by enclosing the plates and the lenses in order to regulate the amount of light filtering onto the
view.\textsuperscript{16}

Despite such improvements, however, the expense and experience of daguerreotype and
glass-plate slides were not optimal for mass production. In 1859, Oliver Wendell Holmes, who
Elmer Underwood later described as “an enthusiastic prophet as to the development of the
stereoscope as a means of visual instruction,” waxed that “there is a brilliancy in a glass picture,
with a flood of light pouring through it, which no paper one . . . can approach,” but then quickly
added that “twenty-five glass slides, well inspected in a strong light, are \textit{good} for one
headache.”\textsuperscript{17} Indeed these early apparatuses were often bulky, heavy, and very costly, although
that hardly deterred fascination among the well-heeled and those with access to respected
photographic firms that provided full-plate stereoscopic entertainment to draw patrons into their
salons. Southworth and Hawes of Boston, for instance, installed an elaborate, piano-sized “grand
parlor stereoscope” that revolved plates by the turn of a crank in their Daguerrean gallery for the
benefit of their patrons, at a cost of twenty-five cents per visit, or a “season ticket” for half a
dollar.\textsuperscript{18} Not all early stereoscopes were as grandiose as the grand parlor. In 1855 J. F. Mascher
of Philadelphia advertised a “stereoscopic medallion” in \textit{Humphrey’s Journal}, “the first
photographic journal in the world.” “The article, when closed, looks so like the ordinary locket, that no one can distinguish one from the other, when worn,” the journal assured, and “the difference in expense is more than counterbalanced by the beauty of the results.” The promise to make the visage of one’s dearest evermore present in absence would certainly have drawn potential clients, but it seems that the medallion was never put into production. Americans’ fascination with photographic jewelry, it seems, was hardly limited by the technological possibilities of the day.

In terms of broadest cultural influence, in fact, the stereoscope with that honor was designed by none other than Oliver Wendell Holmes. Holmes’s handheld prototype was designed for views on paper, rather than glass, was made of wood, and featured multiple slots for viewers to adjust the position of the card. Holmes referred to his “very convenient” viewer in an 1861 Atlantic Monthly article, but did not advertise it until after the Civil War. Significantly, the convenience and relative affordability of what came to be known as the “Holmes Scope” was an important development in shaping the stereograph market in the last decades of the nineteenth century, a market so pervasive that it is as difficult to underestimate its cultural influence then as it is to grasp how it has gone under the radar of religious historians for so long. As Elmer Underwood wrote to historian Robert Taft in the late 1920s, by the turn of the century his firm alone—one of a handful of operations with comparable output—was printing “25000 stereoscopic photographs per day, or 7,500,000 per year” along with the “approximately 250,000 to 300,000” stereoscopes they manufactured each year. Moreover, historians and collectors have estimated that between three and four million stereoscopic negatives were produced in the United States between 1854 and 1920. Allowing that the average negative was reproduced as few as one hundred times (often many times that later in the century), it is difficult to
overestimate the degree to which stereographs tickled the imaginations of turn of the twentieth century Americans. Even if only a fraction of these views featured religious subjects or were marketed to religious populations, it is nevertheless difficult to deny their importance to the study of American religious history.

While definite sales figures of religious stereographs during the nineteenth century are difficult to nail down, their sale was lucrative enough for swindle. In the late winter of 1876, advertisements ran in several religious newspapers for “100 different views of the Holy Land” from the firm of J.C. Henry and Company of Glen Falls, New York. The same advertisement was later signed by the firm of C.W. Whitney and Company of Chester and placed in *The Sunday-school Times* of Philadelphia and the *Methodist, Episcopal Journal* of New York. By April, Clarence W. Miller of Saratoga County was before United States Commissioner Aubrey H. Smith, charged with the crime of “using the mails for the purpose of fraud.” The “great scope of his operations” ranged from Maine to Virginia and west to Indiana and had spanned several years. At the time of his arrest, Miller was found with “some 300 letters and postcards addressed to the bogus firm” along with evidence of payments received, although he testified to Special Agent C.B. Barrett of the Post Office that he “had no photographs, and gave no return for the money sent to him.” With so many of the “religiously inclined” having been “mulcted” by Miller’s duplicity, there is evidence that trade in sacred subjects was robust.

We have more affirmative evidence as well. Take, for example, the abundant catalogue of stereoscopic views available for the “religiously inclined” consumer. In addition to Holy Land tours—of which there were several—one could purchase serials of the Life of Christ, innumerable views of church and cathedral interiors and exteriors from around the world, reproductions of master paintings—which, according to one historian, “had absolutely no
dimensional effect”—views of Shakers, Mormons, and camp meetings, bibles, ministers, magnificent organs, memorials of religious figures, priests, bible verses in elaborate typographical displays, bishops, a “pilgrimage to see the Holy Father,” monks praying in the catacombs of Rome, and penitent Hindu devotees. The production of these views, however—and many more that feature religious subjects, whether in sincerity or in levity—does not demonstrate how they were used. William Culp Darrah, for instance, a leading historian and collector of stereoscopic views, has argued that despite their immense popularity, views of the Holy Land—as well as Rome and Egypt—“are properly to be considered as travel, archaeology, or history, rather than religious.” This would seem to be the case for early views of Mormons, as well, which were frequently sold as views from the railcar of the Union Pacific, “West from Omaha,” or other familiar rail routes. Moreover, based on contemporary catalogue descriptions, at least, Darrah is correct to note the genre of travelogue in which Holy Land tours were typically placed. An 1865 catalogue for E. & H.T. Anthony and Company’s Emporium of American and Foreign Stereoscopic Views, for instance, one of the leading manufacturers of stereographs in the 1850s and 1860s, listed their views of “Egypt and the Holy Land” in the section on foreign tours, and the Philadelphia firm of Benerman and Wilson explicitly catalogued their views of Palestine as “New Travels in the Holy Land.” But the fact that these views of the Holy Land were typically catalogued as “travel, archaeology, [and] history” did not preclude them from also being religious. In fact, it was the narrative mechanism of the travelogue that legitimized views of the Holy Land for Protestant beholders, in particular, as collaborators of scriptural interpretation rather than potentially disruptive icons.

Stereographs of “sacred subjects” in general drew on a variety of different viewing practices and narrative genres—travelogue, biblical iconography, devotional imagery, comic
series, landscapes, and so forth—none of which necessarily denied religious interpretation or
significance. For instance, several landscape views from the Holy Land series, such as one
entitled “A Barley Harvest, near Bethlehem of Judea, Palestine” copyrighted in 1899, invoked
not only the agrarian subsistence intended to suggest an immediate link to “bible times” but also
the popular genre of stereographs of Negro sharecropping in the American South, depicted in the
view (figure 45) “Cotton Field,” a “characteristic Southern scene” by the South Carolina
photographer J.A. Palmer, likely from the late 1860s or early 1870s as indicated by the square
corners and yellow mount. Indeed, whether or not the subject matter of a stereograph was
explicitly “religious” did not determine how the artifact was viewed, nor was the category of
“sacred subjects” unaffected by the immense quantity of multivalent views available to
beholders. Just exactly what the relevant interpretive visual archive for any particular view was
for specific beholders is next to impossible to identify. Nevertheless, despite the paucity of
personal accounts of the use of stereoscopic views in the domestic and devotional lives of
religious Americans, close readings of the sources do provide occasional glimpses, however
oblique of the visual habits at work in stereographic beholding.

As with the firms of Anthony and Benerman and Wilson before them, the “photographs”
that Bert and Elmer made in the April 1896 became part of their firm’s first stereoscopic “tour”
of the Holy Land, issued in 1897 as Journeys in the Holy Land through the Perfecscope, a boxed-
set of “seventy-two original stereoscopic photographs” to be viewed through the firm’s patented
scope. Although the popularity of this first boxed-set of Holy Land views paled in comparison
with the clamor surrounding their set of 100 views, Traveling in the Holy Land through the
Stereoscope, first issued three years later, the perfecscope series was among the first tours the
firm had issued from their own negatives, having to this point exclusively distributed views
Figure 45: “Characteristic Southern Scenes. Cotton Field.” J.A. Palmer, Aiken, South Carolina. ca. 1870. Black History Collection of the Springfield-Greene County Historical Society, Springfield, Missouri. Used with permission.
created from the negatives of other photographic establishments, including Jarvis, Bierstadt, and
the Littleton View Company, as well Messrs. Strohmeyer & Wyman of New York City. The
companion text to *Journeys in the Holy Land*, moreover, was written by the brothers themselves
and drew largely from their travel diaries scribbled in moonlight along the “rocky trails” and
“rugged ravines” of their own Holy Land pilgrimage. The enormously popular *Traveling in the
Holy Land* volume, which underwent three editions between 1900 and 1909 before changing the
name to *Traveling in Palestine*, conversely, was authored by a Methodist minister, Jesse Lyman
Hurlbut.

Hurlbut also narrated a tour of Jerusalem, “taken bodily” from the Underwood tours of
Palestine, while Underwood and Underwood series on *Travel Lessons on the Life of Christ* and
*Travel Lessons on the Old Testament* were authored by Presbyterian minister William Byron
Forbush. All of these tours could be purchased “in neat Volume cases” resembling bound books
or, for a prettier penny, in “Underwood Extension Cabinets,” which would hold up to “2,000
stereographed places, or more” and was recommended “when two or more of the ‘100’ tours are
wanted.” The firm’s decision to market their travel series in “volume cases” reflects a deeper
ambivalence about the role that their stereographs played in relation to conventional instruction,
namely, through books, and raises even more interesting questions when considered within the
context of biblical subjects. Although Forbush was quick to concede that “seeing Bible lands
[through the stereoscope] does not take the place of the Bible,” the discourse of authenticity
draping the marketing and use of the views, the meticulous system of biblical references on both
the cards and in the guidebooks, as well as the deliberate bibliophilia of the packaging, indicates
a more complicated culture of image/text correspondence than vocabularies of mere
“illustration” can possibly articulate.
In addition to being available for purchase through catalogue subscription, these tours could also be purchased by way of the company’s “Bible Study Department,” a correspondence department at the firm’s New York office, “to which any teacher may freely apply in any perplexity.” Evidence abounds that many teachers took heed of the merits stereographs offered to Sunday school instruction. As early as 1875 “photographs of the Holy Land, with the stereoscope,” were “recommended in the line of apparatus” befitting a “well appointed Sunday-school” by Lyman Abbot’s Christian Union. Twenty-five years later, stereoscopic entertainments punctuated the “strain of solid study in midsummer” for Methodists at Ocean Grove—a group who later in the week “witnessed the marvelous powers of the vitagraph,” Thomas Edison’s recently patented motion picture projector and augur of the technological displacement of stereographs by the middle of the century. A 1903 review in the Congregationalist and Christian World indicated something more of the devotional use of stereoscopic images of the Holy Land in the course of biblical study: the “value [of a stereograph] is not exhausted in a single view, but it becomes more helpful with frequent reference. When the life of our Lord or the history of Israel is being studied these pictures will illuminate every lesson.” To this effect, Reverend J.W. Raine of Riverhead, New York, “conducted a class in mission study, also a Sunday school class, using Forbush’s Life of Christ, with stereoscopes” and Mrs. J. Woodridge Barnes demonstrated “manual methods in Sunday school work, including the use of sand tables, notebooks, stereoscopic pictures, map drawing and coloring” at the Broadway Tabernacle in New York.

If Underwood and Underwood had invited teachers “in any perplexity” to send for materials and advice, their stereographs were also an important part of home instruction. In 1908 Mrs. W. W. Stark of Jackson County, Georgia, wrote to Underwood, extolling that “I don’t see
how any parents with children could afford to be without Traveling in the Holy Land through the Stereoscope.” “We are perfectly delighted with it,” she continued, adding that “I expect to know more Bible history than in all my life before I bought the stereographs.”

Taken together, this record demonstrates how stereographs were an important component of biblical instruction among American Protestants at the turn of the twentieth century, both in the home and in the church. Such testimony, moreover, demonstrates how the popularity of stereographs was as much rooted in its ability to entertain as in its capacity to instruct. Drawing on contemporary theories (rifled with ambiguity, to be sure) of race and progress, utilizing the narrative genre of travelogue, and sincerely seeking to root biblical interpretation in an empirical record, the Underwoods and their patrons envisioned within a flawed photographic contemporary a biblical past that could be experienced from anywhere, simply by leaving their “outward frames” and letting their “spirits” soar.

FROM ICON TO EXPERIENCE

Before moving into a focused analysis of stereographs, it will be helpful to pause for a moment and reflect on the shared modes of representation used by Robert Bain and publishers of stereograph series of the Holy Land. In particular, because they used methods similar to stereographs in their collaboration between photographic images and biblical texts, as well as invoking a similar claim to the authenticating perspective yielded through the honest eye of the camera, Bain’s prints provided important visual cues for beholders of Holy Land tours through the stereoscope. But the different series did not condition identical interpretive habits. For James Lee, as with many of his contemporaries, the principle benefit of the camera was its capacity to make readers “see the events and histories and battles which are recorded in [the Bible] placed
side by side with the very scenes where they took place. In this way the land is made to explain and interpret the book.” It is not surprising that Lee here sounds a lot like Jesse Lyman Hurlbut, both of whom were Methodist ministers affiliated with Chautauqua and who had working associations, if not personal endearments, with Bishop Vincent. What is more difficult to suss about both ministers, however, were their claims that, in Lee’s words, through “the aid of these representations of the lands of the Bible,” the Old and New Testaments “become real books.” Hurlbut would later write that the Underwoods’ stereographs, through their ability to bring Palestine into close proximity to Americans, work “to make the Bible real to us.”39 Even if photographs did not displace the authority of the Bible, the ministers’ agreement that the prints and stereographs were effective means of “making the Bible real to us” certainly elevated their influence beyond that of “illustration” to a more profound level of scriptural interpretation. Because of their archival placement, Bain’s photographs in the Self-Interpreting Bible, present different questions about the relationship between photographic images and biblical text than the stereographs in the Underwood tour. In his guidebook, for instance, Hurlbut identified the stereographs as “the real text” of the book, rather than “merely as an embellishment or supplement,” a configuration that inverted Lee’s stated subordination of image to text.40 Thus while both series of Holy Land photographs claimed that their views were important contributions to biblical interpretation, they ultimately mounted different defenses of the common claim.

At first blush it might be argued that what the ministers really meant was that the land—which Hurlbut called the “Fifth Gospel”—was the authenticating mechanism in question and photography was just a convenient medium for its transmission. Such analysis, however, overlooks both the physical properties of the photograph itself as well as the ways in which
photography was deemed capable of reproducing not only the physical likeness of a geographical terrain but the experience of standing in its “very presence.” And here is where the two modes of presentation are most clearly differentiated. While both Lee and Hurlbut claimed that the photographic prints in their tours facilitated an experience of Holy Land pilgrimage, Hurlbut was convinced that stereographs were much more effective in this regard than an “ordinary single photograph,” and used the word “real” or a variant (“realities,” “realistic,” “reality”) more than twenty times in ten pages to drive his point home.41 That stereographs facilitated a more “real” experience of the Holy Land than “ordinary” photographs, he argued, “could not be possible except for several reasons.” First, the stereographs “are infinitely accurate in detail and proportion, and therefore marvelously realistic.” Secondly—“and it is an absolutely indispensible condition,” he assured, one that differentiated the medium from other photographies—the stereographs “are not looked at in the hand, but with the eyes within the hood of the stereoscope, our immediate surroundings being entirely shut out.” His language here invokes that of Jennie Pullen, the instructor at Cleveland Normal School, in her claim that stereographs were uniquely equipped to take her geography students “beyond the sense horizon that shuts them in,” a rhetorical parallel that points to an underlying dynamic of embodiment among turn of the century beholders of stereographic images.42

Writing the “instructions” for the tour in 1900, Hurlbut first oriented his fellow travelers to the “specially devised maps” folded into the binding at the back of the guidebook. “Constant reference should be made to the maps,” he insisted, “first to the general map at the end of this book, and then to the detail maps of special sections when given.” Each of the 100 positions were marked on the general map with red ink and the vantage point indicated by two intersecting red lines, wherein the “apex . . . indicates the place from which the view was taken” and the
“branching lines . . . the limits of the stereographed scene, viz., the limits of our vision on the right and left when looking at the stereograph.” This initial attempt to situate beholders in a physical environment—a practice that was also at work in editions of Bain’s photographs—was followed by five additional instructions detailing correct use of the stereographs themselves. “Move the slide or carrier . . . to the point on the shaft of the stereoscope where the view can be seen most distinctly” and “see that the best light available falls on the face of the photograph,” he advised. Then, “hold the stereoscope firmly against the forehead, excluding all surrounding light from the eyes.” These instructions were important not only for shedding light, so to speak, on the physical conditions that beholders of stereographs were expected to manipulate in order to see correctly, but also for suggesting how other forms of photographic viewing were assumed not to need instruction. Lee and Bain, for instance, never instructed their readers how to look at their prints. At the very least, then, through his instructions Hurlbut acknowledged that the stereographs were a very different viewing experience from “ordinary” photographs.43

Before disembarking at the “compact, solid-looking town” of Joffa—“the Joppa of the Bible!”—Hurlbut made one last defense of the use of stereographs, this time explicitly positing that “your experiences of being in the presence of the land” was of more instructional value than “the material Palestine,” which “you do not . . . bring away with you on your return.” In this way, Hurlbut argued, even if one were to fund the tremendous expense of travel to Palestine, ultimately “the places, buildings, people” one would encounter were “only means of giving us [the] experiences” of reality that would be freighted home. “So now, coming back to the stereoscope, . . . there is indeed an infinite difference between the picture and the place itself as objective realities,” the goodly minister concluded, “but there need be no essential difference between the ideas and emotions which the picture and the place can produce within us. We are
dealing with realities in the stereoscope, but they are real *experiences* of seeing Palestine, not the material earth and water and air of Palestine."\(^{44}\) Ostensibly this “subjective experience” could be acquired through other means, such as the scaled replicas of the Holy Land popularized throughout the century, a cultural phenomenon in which American Methodists played a particularly active role.\(^{45}\) For Hurlbut, however, who was active in Chautauqua for nearly half a century, not even these replicas approached the level of “experience” that stereographs facilitated: “One hundred life-size models of stone and dirt of these same parts of Palestine, so rich in historical memories,” Hurlbut penned in 1900, “could not be more definite and solid to the eyes—moreover, they would be vastly less accurate and not at all serviceable for use.”\(^{46}\) Just as photographic portraits drew on previous traditions of representation and commemoration—painted miniatures and hairwork, for instance—and yet generated novel experiences of presence, so too were stereographs able to facilitate “*real* experiences” despite corporeal remove.

Stereographs of the Holy Land replicated in large measure the visual habits of an imperialist gaze that rendered contemporary inhabitants of Palestine, Samaria, and Egypt, especially, as icons of a biblical imaginary. But the culture of stereography was also particularly attentive to the corporeality of the beholder, whether in terms of strategic denials of the senses that enabled a kind of telegraphing of the body through the pulsations of the eyes, or in instructional material that explicitly addressed the beholder’s embodied relation to the views. It was this attentiveness to the beholder that facilitated an interpretive transition from icon to experience. For Hurlbut, photography was the medium best suited for facilitating experiences of the Holy Land—even better than physical travel to the Orient—experiences that were vital to comprehension of biblical events. And yet, not all photographs were created equal. The
stereograph, with its seemingly miraculous duplication of physical space, was, in Hurlbut’s estimation, the best vehicle for transmitting the “realities” of sacred terrain.

“GIFTED WITH THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY MAN”: BEHOLDING PANORamas AND BIBLICAL PAGEANTRY

Whereas tours of the Holy Land may have been among the more popular devotional views, they were by no means the only instances of “religious” stereographs that created a visual record of devotional narrative. Popular series of biblical tableaux from the New Testament gospels, especially the events leading up to and following Jesus’s crucifixion, were distributed in various visual formats—stereographs, panoramas, and magic lantern slides—throughout the century. Besides the narrative scope of the series, what differentiated the so-called “Life of Christ” series from Holy Land tours was that the latter were seldom if ever photographs of live actors but of figurines and paintings. It should not be surprising that makers and distributors of stereographs in the late-nineteenth century were hesitant to use live actors in their series on the life of Christ. As Kristin Schwain has noted in her study of F. Holland Day’s The Seven Last Words of Christ, a series of photographs of Jesus (played by Day) on the cross, there was “extensive debate” at the turn of the century about the theological implications of representing Christ in human form, a debate that was not limited to the visual arts. Day’s series, taken in rural Massachusetts during the summer of 1898, however, was not in fact the first American photographic work to use a live actor to represent Christ—in 1880 John Lawson Stoddard popularized photographs of Joseph Maier playing the part of Christ at Oberammergau through his magic lantern lectures, a point which will be returned to later in the chapter. Although Day’s theological and aesthetic motives differed considerably from that of Hurlbut and the Underwood
stereographs, both series drew on “iconographic traditions and protocols of spectatorship,” in Schwain’s words, in order to condition the viewing experiences of beholders. By presenting in visual form the familiar narrative of the life of Christ—a truncated selection of events in the gospels—stereographs in this vein drew on both interpretive and representational strategies of the Christian drama of redemption, strategies which included the visual traditions of panorama and magic lanterns. Moreover, while still “photography” in the sense that they were albumen prints made from collodion negatives, these views of biblical pageantry departed from those of Holy Land series in that their claim to representational authority was grounded less in the discourse of immediacy—the ability to pluck beholder’s from their armchairs and drop them into biblical Israel—than in established devotional practices such as the Stations of the Cross.

A popular series of twenty-four views reproduced under numerous imprimaturs throughout much of the latter half of the century featured what appear to be stylized wax miniatures arranged into biblical tableaux against painted backgrounds. Beginning with the adoration of the Shepherds and the Wise Men at the Nativity, the first six views are of Jesus’s birth and boyhood, the Wedding at Cana, and the Sermon on the Mount. In the seventh view, Jesus is shown entering Jerusalem astride a colt as the crowd prepares his way with branches and garments, as the accompanying biblical reference to the gospel of Mark explains. This view commences the trajectory of Jesus’s final hours and the remainder of the series carries the beholder from Judas’s betrayal in the Garden of Gethsemane (view 8) through the remaining Stations of the Cross (views 9-22) on to the Resurrection (view 23) and the Ascension (view 24). In the 1890s, Underwood and Underwood distributed the entire twenty-four view series, complete with corresponding biblical verse, explanatory commentary, and caption in six languages (English, French, German, Spanish, Swedish, Russian). Although this series bears the
telling marks of the Underwood stereograph format, the photographs themselves are identical to the series published by Strohmeyer & Wyman of New York and distributed by Underwood and Underwood years earlier. Given that Underwood and Underwood bought out the New York establishment in the early 1890s, it is perhaps not surprising that they would reissue the series under their own imprimatur. But the borrowing does not end there. The paucity of identifying information on large numbers of views in circulation during the late nineteenth century makes precise dating, distribution, and circulation seemingly impossible in many instances. Nevertheless, the same negatives used by Underwood and Underwood (or new negatives acquired surreptitiously from previously published stereographs) were used by the International Stereoscopic View Company of New York to produce much poorer quality views at the turn of the century. Two more views from the same series printed earlier in the century, however, bear markings of French origins.

Although the Philadelphia establishment of William and Frederick Langenheim had been the first to produce stereoscopic plates in the United States in the mid 1850s, many views in circulation through the 1870s were still imported from Europe, particularly England and France. In 1875, for instance, Benerman and Wilson of Philadelphia profited handsomely by issuing in English a catalogue of “transparencies for the stereoscope” manufactured by J. Levy and Company of Paris, of which were included 92 views from their “New Travels in the Holy Land” tour. Thus the Passion views are less interesting for the fact that they had probably been imported than for the fact that the American publishers seemed merely to have made exposures of the original stereograph and proceeded to make single, seven-and-a-half inch prints consisting of both views as well as the decorative divider bisecting the original mount. In the first, published as “French, Stereo, Publisher” out of Lawrence, Kansas, as one of the “Scenes in the
Figure 46: “La Nativite. Adoration des Bergers.” *Scenes in the Life of Christ*, French, Stereo, Publisher, ca. 1880. Author’s collection.

Figure 47: No. 10, “Jesus Bearing the Cross,” *Scenes in the Life of Christ, Views for the Stereoscope*, ca. 1875. Author's collection.
Life of Christ,” not only is there clear evidence of borrowing in the faint markings along the interior space between the two views, but the title on the face of the card, within the photographic print, is in French, “La Nativité. Adoration des Bergers,” whereas all other markings on the view were in English. A similar view, apparently taken from the same original series and published by the same Kansas firm—they have the same series title in the same typeface—has been mounted on to the tell-tale bright orange card of the 1870s.

In this view, moreover, the medallion at the top of the print is clearly labeled “Paris,” although any other identifying information was lost in the reproduction. In all other respects—sequence, title, verse, caption—the view is the same as that printed by Underwood and Underwood in the 1890s (figures 46 and 47). Although the series’ focus on the Passion narrative might initially suggest, in the words of one recent historian, “a dominantly Catholic clientele,” during the nineteenth century the Passion was a familiar sequence to a broad swath of American Christians, Protestant no less than Catholic, in part due to the immense popularity of Passion plays and the even greater popularity of biblical cycloramas. Between 1885 and 1892 cities from New York to Los Angeles, Boston to Milwaukee, St. Louis, and Chicago boasted cycloramas (also known as panoramas) of the Holy Land, elaborate paintings which revolved around patrons as narrators explained the scenes that unfolded before their eyes, complete with visual effects. A frequent focal point in these Holy Land excursions was an elaborate vignette of the crucifixion, as in the long-awaited “Jerusalem the Day of the Crucifixion” that opened for admission at the rotunda on Chicago’s Wabash Avenue in September 1887. As a contemporary newspaper recounted, the “central feature” of the painting was “the sixth hour,” from the Via Dolorosa to the reed of hyssop at the foot of the cross. The next summer a “just completed” panorama of “Jerusalem and the Crucifixion” opened at a theater “made cool artificially” on
Madison Avenue and 59th Street in New York, thus enabling patrons to attend at their leisure “day and night.”

In fact, although travel narratives of pilgrims’ journeys had been popular since the seventeenth century, and had become standardized in the new genre of the non-fictional travelogue in the eighteenth century, it was the moving painted panorama of the early nineteenth century that most immediately prepared stereographic beholders for their vicarious voyages. Dating to late eighteenth-century Edinburgh, the term “panorama” was coined by the Irish-born artist Robert Baker to describe an enormous painting exhibited in a custom-built rotunda to provide a seemingly exhaustive eye-level sweep of a view from a specific vantage point. By the 1840s when a so-called “panoramania” swept across Europe and the United States, providing picture-viewing publics with an array of cosmoramas, cycloramas, georamas, and pantascopes of cities, river routes, and overland trails, the custom-built rotunda had in many cases been exchanged for a stage, which enabled the ticket-holder to remain stationary while the narrated scenes were unfurled before her eyes. In addition to lively narration—which could take the travelers in either direction along the Mississippi or across the West, depending on which side of the stage the previous journey had left the painting—the long journey across the painted canvas (in some cases it would take three hours to unfurl the entire journey) was often accompanied by live music, while more enterprising stagers included elaborate special effects—beholders of the Bombardment of Vera Cruz in New York, for instance, were awed by thundering fireworks while steam and smoke wafted about travelers on Leon Pomarede’s canvas of the Mississippi River.

While, according to historian Martha Sandweiss, panoramas of cities, rivers, and Westward migration were most popular among mid-century American audiences, there were also several early moving canvases of the Holy Land as well. In 1846, just before introducing his
immensely popular panorama of the Mississippi River at Amory Hall in Boston, John Banvard advertised his “Great Panorama of the Holy Land” at the Lower Music Hall on Winter Street. Set to “Music suited to the scenes represented” upon the organ harmonium and the piano forte, the “very original, interesting, and instructive” painting, which was “explained” every evening at eight as well on Wednesday and Saturday afternoons at three, featured “hundreds of figures, of life size” arranged in narrative sequence to “illustrate the manners, customs, and religious ceremonies of the inhabitants, who are Christians, Mohammadans and Jews,” as well as “all the important” topographical features “mentioned in the Bible, or in the History of the Crusades.” By far the most exciting part of the demonstration, however, was the “great mechanical picture” of the destruction of Jerusalem, in which Banvard “has so combined painting, music and acoustic effects, as to produce a striking and life-like representation of this most terrific and memorable siege.” Unlike the moving panorama, the “mechanical picture” of the siege of Jerusalem was a diorama, a stationary image that manipulated light to give the illusion of movement. In “The Destruction,” the scene was “represented under the shades of night, the better to produce the striking effect of the terrible conflagration.” Beholders would stand in wonderment as the moon struggled through “intervals of smoke and flame,” its pale face conspicuous against the “lurid glare of the burning city.”

Panoramas of the Holy Land provided an important context in the history of photographic biblical narration, in both landscape series like *Earthly Footsteps* and in stereographic tours. In fact, as Sandweiss argues, the first photographic expeditions across the American West were valued *more* for their assistance to panoramic paintings, which could follow conventional narrative lines, than as works of intrinsic value in their own right, an attitude reflected by the disappearance of daguerreotype plates from these journeys within years of their manufacture.
Similarly, the American biblical archaeologist James Barclay was among the first from his country to show biblical images in panorama, although the plates he made from his excursions in the early 1850s also disappeared shortly after his return.\textsuperscript{58} Even after photographs took hold as narrative devices in their own rights, however, panoramas continued to provide important visual strategies whereby familiar events were placed into meaningful sequence. As the \textit{Daily Tribune} reported at the opening of the Jerusalem panorama in Chicago in 1887, “that wonderful country, that wonderful people, that wonderful atmosphere, that mystic semi-darkness of a great past . . . are not only reproduced, but revived, brought face to face with the beholder, who may now pursue the study and investigation of the greatest event in human history with almost the same advantages as he would have enjoyed had he been an eye-witness, gifted with the knowledge of the nineteenth-century man.”\textsuperscript{59} Panoramas of the Holy Land and biblical narratives had thus made the sacred routes conventionally associated with specific devotional practices familiar to various audiences by the time stereographs entered the visual marketplace in substantial numbers.

There were also more direct associations between panoramas and stereographs. Whereas it does not take one long to recognize that the French series was not comprised of live actors, the views photographed and published by the American stereographer Benjamin West Kilburn are at first more difficult to ascertain. Kilburn had started his “work of the camera” in 1855 while working with his father as a machinist and founder in Littleton, New Hampshire. Two decades later Benjamin was running a stereoscopic firm with his brother Edward. The Kilburn Brothers made a number of significant views with Benjamin as chief photographer and developer until the partnership dissolved in 1875. After purchasing Edward’s share of the company, Benjamin struck out on his own until hiring his son-in-law, D.C. Remich, at which time the White Mountains photographer grew to international repute. Using a camera “specially constructed . . .
by The American Optical Co.” for his tripod work and a Henry Clay stereoscopic camera for
hand work, in 1893 Kilburn was selected from a prestigious battery of photographers—including
Underwood and Underwood—to be the official stereoscopic photographer at the World’s
Columbian Exposition in Chicago where he created such enduring scenes from the fair as the
“Surging Sea of Humanity,” an iconic view that was visually quoted in the Underwoods’ “Easter
Procession of the Greek Patriarch,” the twenty-second view in their 1900 tour of the Holy
Land. 60

Two years before he and his General Agent, James M. Davis, made the “Surging Sea” an
icon of the Columbian Exposition, Kilburn issued a series of stereographs
depicting biblical tableaux. Unlike Underwood and Underwood’s meticulously labeled and
captioned views, however, there is little record of Kilburn’s series. The third view, reproduced
below (figure 48), is entitled “Father into thy hands I commend my Spirit” and has the viewer
looking across a deep gorge to the cliffs of Golgotha, upon which three crosses are erected.
Unlike the Underwood travel series, this view was sold individually (see the catalogue number to
the left of the caption, “6483”) but was also part of an intended series, as the sequencing on the
back of the card indicates (“No. 3.”). The view, distributed by Davis, has the viewer looking
across a gorge onto Jesus’s “last moments of earthly torture,” as the narration on the back of the
card indicates. Although this view clearly consists of two separate prints mounted onto pale
orange stock, the two prints are identical, thus diminishing the effect of solidity the technique
was intended to provide.

While there are some variations, the view bears remarkable similarities to a
chromolithograph entitled “Jerusalem on the Day of the Crucifixion” (figure 49) in Thomas
DeWitt Talmage’s 1890 smash From Manger to Throne. As the celebrated Brooklyn preacher
explained in his description of the “panoramic view of the world’s greatest tragedy,” the “Grand Panorama” in From Manger to Throne was “a perfect reproduction of the famous cyclorama of Munich.”61 It was not perfect—its color spectrum was limited and but as lithographs went, it was pretty impressive. Responding to the predominance of military scenes in the reviving panorama industry of the 1880s, Bruno Piglhein, Karl Hubert Frosch, and Josef Krieger had opened their cyclorama to the watchful eye of criticism in 1886. It was a hit. The run in Munich lasted until the spring of 1889 and spurned at least seventeen panoramas of Jerusalem with the Crucifixion in its wake over the next decade.62 Both Kilburn and Talmage likely missed Piglhein’s original in Munich. Talmage was in Europe and “the Christ-Land” in 1889 to research his book, but he did not arrive until October. Kilburn traveled frequently to Europe, although his most recent venture had him returning to Boston from England, via Ireland, in July 1890 (his
passport was issued in April of that year). Either Talmage or Kilburn could also have visited the panorama of “Jerusalem and the Crucifixion” on Madison and 59th in New York or “Jerusalem the Day of the Crucifixion” on Wabash in Chicago—each of which was likely an imitation of the Munich marvel. Determining the precise chain of influence may never be ascertained with absolute certainty. Nevertheless, while the lithograph in From Manger to Throne takes a wider view, it seems probable that both Kilburn’s stereograph and Talmage’s lithograph were visually quoting the Munich panorama.

Panoramas were thus a tradition of graphic representation that influenced the visual habits of stereographic beholding. In particular, the narrative convention of the “Life of Christ” provided a visual vocabulary familiar to American Protestants and Catholics. Moreover, the sensorial experience of panoramas—with their blending of aural and visual content in crowded room in busy cities—underscored the embodied experience of visual perception that stereographic beholding simultaneously conditioned and subordinated to the telegraphic powers of sight. In other words, although stereographs provided a distinct mode of embodied viewing, no visual media during the nineteenth century was encountered by transparent eyeballs. If panoramas not only influenced the interpretive field of stereographs but also shared visual content, another contemporary mode of representation was more transparently entangled with the production and beholding of stereographs.

MAGIC LANTERNS AND THE VISUAL ARCHIVES OF TRAVELOGUE

In 1872 Presbyterian minister Robert Patton of the Jefferson Park Presbyterian Church in Chicago gave a public lecture “illustrated by stereoscopic views” of the Holy Land. Despite the Daily Tribune’s copy, the lecture was likely not illustrated by stereoscopes and stereographs but rather by a “magic lantern,” which was a device used to project views onto a white sheet at the front of the room by means of a gas lamp. Magic lanterns preceded stereoscopes by more than a century but it was not until the latter half of the nineteenth century that they were embraced by religious Americans as a popular mode of entertainment and instruction. Among earlier generations, magic lanterns were associated primarily with scientific and philosophical instruction, on the one hand, and bewitching devilry, on the other. Simultaneously earning a reputation as a “wonderful aid to pretenders” and an “optical and philosophical instrument,” until
the middle of the nineteenth century magic lanterns used painted lantern slides in all manner of exhibitions.  

Significantly, the first technique to enable photographic lantern slides was developed at around the same time that magic lanterns began to gain a foothold as a mode of religious instruction. Among the earliest evidence of an emerging market of magic lantern views for religious instruction was in an advertisement in the *Episcopal Recorder* in October 1850 for McAllister and Company of Philadelphia. “Prepared to furnish Sabbath Schools and public Lecturers with MAGIC LANTERNS,” McAllister listed “Scripture subjects in sets packed in neat boxes” as well as in “separate views” and “Views of the Holy Land, Palestine, etc.” among a catalogue of other subjects, from temperance to natural history to “Comic Slides in almost an endless variety.” McAllister was an agent of William and Frederick Langenheim, who just that year had devised a method of securing “views . . . taken from Nature on glass, by the Camera Obscura”—they called it a Hyalotype—by modifying William Henry Fox Talbot’s calotype to produce a positive image on glass. The process made it possible, for the first time, to produce photographic magic lantern slides.

During the latter half of the nineteenth century there was considerable exchange of visual content between magic lantern slides and stereographs. Most often the exchange was made by using one-half of a stereoscopic plate to make a lantern slide. Where magic lanterns had the advantage of corporate viewing, which was better suited for public lectures, whether religious, civic, or academic, the projected view nevertheless conditioned a quite different viewing experience for its beholders in terms not only of collectivity but in removing the depth that was yielded through the scope. Importantly, however, stereograph manufacturers frequently used the same negatives for both magic lantern slides and stereoscopic prints. In the 1850s, for instance,
the Langenheim’s of Philadelphia used half-stereos in their lantern work and a decade later, advertising their extensive selection of “pictures on glass,” E. & H.T. Anthony made them available “for either the LANTERN or the STEREOSCOPE.” Thus beholders’ experiences of photographs were not limited to the positive image itself—whether a paper print mounted on a piece of stock or a glass negative that produced a positive image when projected onto a white sheet—but to the conditions in which such images were encountered.

Jesse Lyman Hurlbut, who narrated the Underwood and Underwood Holy Land tour in 1900, had been giving popular illuminated sermons since at least 1893. His earlier lectures featured “slides” of well-known paintings—those of Felix-Joseph Barrias, Louis-Edouard Dubufe, Leonardo Da Vinci, Heinrich Hoffman, and others—arranged into narratives such as “The Last Week” (his Easter sermon) and “The Holy Child” (his Christmas sermon) and interspersed with selected hymns from the Methodist hymnal. For instance, notes for his “Illustrated Bible Reading and Song Service” on the “Holy Child,” given at least eighteen times between 1892 and 1916, mostly in New Jersey and New York, enumerate thirty-five slides, illuminating the young messiah’s life from “The Sistine Madonna” to the “The Boy Jesus with the Commandments,” and five songs peppered throughout the lesson—such as when the Methodist anthem “How Firm a Foundation” was sung between slides of Raphael’s *Madonna of the Chair* (1514) and William Charles Thomas Dobson’s rendition of the return of the Holy Family to Nazareth (1857).

Hurlbut was not alone. In the 1890s the Riley Brothers of England, whose American headquarters were in New York, fashioned what was perhaps the most lucrative trade in religious slides, and embarked a campaign to win the churches’ approval. A partial list of their “general lectures” on “Bible Lands and Bible Themes” for the magic lantern included series on
“Wanderings in Bible Lands” (54 slides); Stories of Ruth, David, Solomon, Esther, and Moses, among others, ranging from a handful of slides to a couple dozen; “Manners and Customs of the East in the Times of Christ” (50 slides); “How We Got Our Bible,” parts I, II, and III; “Women of the Bible” (18 slides); and a number of lectures centered on the life of Christ and the Crucifixion, including “Ben-Hur” (72 slides), “The Life of Christ” (50 slides), “The Passion of Christ and the Acts of the Apostles” (44 slides), “The Passion of Our Lord” (34 slides), “The Stations of the Cross” (14 views), and “Christ on Calvary” (12 slides). Riley also provided slides of “words and pictures” for scores of “Illustrated Hymns,” which consisted of three to ten slides per hymn. Large type hymns and Roman Catholic Hymns could be “hired separately.”

The Riley Brothers were by no means exclusive dealers in sacred subjects. Their catalogue listed hundreds of other series, from tours of Asia and Europe, to illustrated songs and stories, to “Educational, Historical, Scientific Lives, Etc.,” to comic slides and “war sets.” But in 1895 the firm issued a sixty-five page booklet entitled, Solved; or, the Sunday Evening Problem, which included nearly a dozen glowing essays by Protestant ministers across the country—Congregationalist, Methodist, Lutheran, Baptist, and Presbyterian—who had begun to incorporate lantern lectures into their Sunday evening services, as well as “specimen Sunday evening lantern services” complete with illustrated hymns and sermons “illustrated by . . . magnificent hand paints.” The hire list distributed a few years later indicated that subscribers could rent not only the slides and elaborate equipment, but also operators and, if circumstance demanded, an “experienced lecturer.” In church work, however, it seems that the latter was foregone in favor of the expertise of ministers and pastors who drew, as did Hurlbut in his Christmas sermon, upon the authority of verses cut-and-pasted from the pages of the New Testament into his notes to explain and interpret the slides.
Well before the 1890s, however, magic lanterns had been used in religious instruction, as Patton’s 1872 lecture and McAllister’s 1850 advertisement indicate. In addition to the shared visual content of stereographs and magic lanterns, a matter to which I will return shortly, there are important epistemic relations between the two forms of visual media. In short, each was sanctioned through the narrative convention of travel. As media historian Charles Musser has argued, in the late nineteenth century, Passion Plays, particularly that of Oberammergau, were accepted as public demonstrations primarily through the genre of travelogue. At a time when stage performances of sacred drama were under intense scrutiny and public censure—a correlative to the representational dilemmas we saw in stereographs of Jesus—popular lecturers like John Lawson Stoddard were able to present photographic lantern slides of live actors with great public support, including the adulation of the very clergy who so vociferously opposed the slides’ theatrical counterparts, at least as long as the performances were firmly established as medieval survivals, in Stoddard’s estimation, akin to “the last sacred fire kindled on a neglected shrine by the ardent breath of simple piety.”

In December 1880, within a week of having successfully prevented the New York premiere of Salmi Morse’s The Passion—a “miracle play in 10 acts” that had enjoyed a brief run in San Francisco before it too succumbed to public outrage and the lead actor, James O’Neill, was charged with a heavy fine “for personating Christ”—“a fair-sized and very select audience” ambled over to Chickering Hall to hear Stoddard’s account of the Bavarian miracle play, “still performed with all the simplicity and reverence of ancient days,” and “abundantly illustrated” by fifty lantern slides “delineating the principle scenes of the drama.” Unlike the wares advertised by Riley, these slides were photographic. Although the actors were Catholic, including Joseph Maier, who played the part of Christ for several of the decennial performances in the late
nineteenth century, Stoddard was careful to situate the performance as a historical legacy that preceded the Protestant Reformation in order to quell the fervency of contemporary anti-Catholic sentiments. Anticipating the discomfiture of his largely Protestant readers, for instance, in his written account Stoddard prefaced this episode, in a remarkably ecumenical tenor, by writing that “if our souls are responsive to all that is divinely great and pure in every form of faith, we can easily find ourselves in sympathy with those who see in this sacred drama a form of their religion, cherished through generations as a precious privilege, and hallowed by centuries of historical associations.” In addition to amplifying the play’s historical connotations, Stoddard was also careful to distance the festivities at Oberammergau from the New York stage, writing that Morse’s “so-called ‘Passion Play’ . . . has nothing whatever to do with this Play at Ober-Ammergau. That was a purely modern drama written by Mr. Salmi Morse, and possessing neither the music nor the text of the Bavarian play, nor even the arrangement of its parts, while it was of course wholly lacking in its remarkable religious traditions and historical association.”

If the Passion Play at Oberammergau was legitimized in part by its “remarkable religious traditions and historical associations,” Stoddard’s lantern exhibition was legitimized by his mode of presentation, namely, photographs and travelogue.

Beginning the lecture from the railway station in Munich, Stoddard took his audience by rail and carriage to the Bavarian hamlet of Oberammergau and then proceeded to give a tour of the “little village itself” before arriving at the play proper nearly a third of the way through the hour and a half demonstration. The travelogue genre was invoked in other ways as well. A month after his lectures in New York, Stoddard announced “a series of his illustrated souvenirs of foreign travel” at Central Music Hall in Chicago. “His plan . . . to make European tourists for the evening of his audiences” during the week-long series began in southern France, and continued
on to northern Italy, Oberammergau, and “various interesting places in the German Fatherland.” before jaunting to “the Orient” on Friday and Spain on Saturday. Positioning the events at Oberammergau within a narrative of European and world travel was also at work in published editions of Stoddard’s lectures. In his 1883 illustrated book Red-Letter Days Abroad, for instance, his account of the 1880 play, from which his earlier lectures were also drawn, comes between “Travels in Sunny Spain” and “The Cities of the Czar.” By approaching the play as part of a longer travel experience rather than a self-contained moment, Stoddard was able to circumvent some of the charges leveled against stage performances even as he was able to draw on the cultural authority of photographic representation of live actors dramatizing the gospel narrative. In this way, even if Stoddard’s use of photographs of Oberammergau was not quite the same as the Underwoods’ stereographs of the Holy Land, both explicitly drew on the narrative convention of travelogue to introduce their audiences to their photographs, rendering them participants in rather than voyeurs of sacred drama and sacred space.

Stoddard’s lectures were also significant in that they were the first time photographs of actors representing Jesus were accepted by the American public. As Charles Musser writes, Stoddard’s “bold step in showing a photographic representation of a man playing Christ” constituted “a notable and potentially hazardous departure from earlier lantern shows of the Passion that relied on paintings.” But his success was limited, as the brouhaha around F. Holland Day’s photographs twenty years later amply demonstrates. For Musser, it was the genre of travelogue, wherein Stoddard became not an author of the drama, as Morse had been for his ill-fated play, but an observer “that allowed him to claim objectivity” and thus secure public approval rather than opprobrium. Of course, Stoddard’s lectures were in fact crafted, and his status as an “observer” was just as charged as that of an “author.” Musser is nevertheless correct
in pointing out that the lantern exhibit, with its cultural ties to education and religious instruction, combined with the narrative convention of the travelogue, could present the sacred drama “as a documentary account of this single sacred performance” at Oberammergau. With the lecture’s narrative driven by photographic slides carefully interpreted by Stoddard’s lively commentary, moreover, the charges leveled against stage performances, namely that of scriptural embellishment, were greatly circumscribed, despite the fact that it was still a commercial enterprise performed in a reputedly profaned public space. In short, the narrative and visual conventions of Stoddard’s lantern exhibition animated a particular mode of viewing habits that legitimized his lecture and the photographs despite precedent to the contrary.

The connection between Stoddard’s magic lantern exhibit and stereograph tours that cover similar terrain was further evinced by Stoddard’s contemporary, Edward L. Wilson, editor of the *Philadelphia Photographer*. Also in 1880, the year that Stoddard published his lantern lectures, Wilson published the sixth edition of his three-volume *Wilson’s Lantern Journeys*, “a series of descriptions of journeys at home and abroad . . . for use with views in the magic lantern or stereoscope.” The impetus behind his collection of “descriptions” sprung from a conviction that “the magic lantern and the stereoscope would be much more enjoyable and instructive in their way if, when we are looking upon the lovely pictures which blessed photography produces for such instruments, we could also have at hand some little bits of information concerning the places and things we are viewing.” Anticipating Hurlbut’s conviction regarding the comparable useful experiences of stereographs to physical travel, moreover, Wilson confessed to having jotted down his commentaries during “the many long hours waiting for trains, and for . . . dinners at restaurants, and for servants to come after [he rang] the bell, and for things to move generally”—inconveniences of physical travel that could now be avoided through the “lovely
pictures which blessed photography produces.” Thanks to these lovely pictures, Palestine was toured in thirty slides, numbers 19-49 in Journey E, between Egypt and Constantinople.\textsuperscript{79}

Wilson’s strategy of complementing his photographs with instructive and situational commentary was repeated in stereographic tours, such as those authored by the Underwoods and by Jesse Lyman Hurlbut, and reached a new level of collaboration between images and texts when Underwood and Underwood began to print excerpts from their commentaries on the reverse side of the stereographic cards in the early twentieth century. Beyond this practice of commentary, moreover, Wilson’s lantern tour evinced important visual strategies of touring the Holy Land that were based on conventional overland routes and that were repeated in later, more popular stereographic series. Even if Wilson’s views were made for both “instruments”—the stereoscope and the magic lantern—it is important here to underscore that the later stereographic tours were based on established visual conventions of the Holy Land no less than customary travel routes. Not all travelogues of the period followed the same route from the port at Jaffa in the south to Baalbec with its colossal ruins at the northern border—Mark Twain’s journey in \textit{The Innocents Abroad}, for instance, followed a reverse route from Baalbec to the port city where his party of “strong, healthy men, accustomed somewhat to fatigue and rough life in the open air” were reunited with their less robust, seafaring companions.\textsuperscript{80} And yet, the route from Jaffa through Jerusalem, Bethany, Bethlehem, and Nazareth, on north to Baalbec, was familiar enough, either in practice or in pictures, to become the dominant visual passage through the Holy Land in both lantern slides and stereographs. Take, for example, some of the numerous shared views, at least in name if not in vantage, between Wilson’s lantern slides and later Underwood tours: Jaffa, “the Joppa of Bible Times,” Lydda, the Garden of Gethsemane and its grove of olive trees, the Mosque of Omar, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, “The Wall of Solomon, or The
Thus auditors of Hurlbut’s lantern lectures on the life of Christ and the holy city of Jerusalem were likely to have had a sense of the established visual conventions of travel routes through the Holy Land, as well as the narrative convention of travelogue, each of which had been part of religious instruction for decades.

Although we do not have a contemporary’s description of one of Hurlbut’s magic lantern lectures, an *Independent* correspondent in 1899 left his eyewitness account of the “Georgian Oberammergau” he witnessed in October of that year at the “negro settlement” in Ocalita, Georgia. Unlike Stoddard’s lectures, which used photographs of the famous play, the lantern lecture described in the *Independent* used the Bavarian drama as a metaphorical referent to the passion narrative more generally. Written in a jocular tone from the vantage of a curious, nearly dismissive, northern white male onlooker, Edward Irenaeus Prime-Stevenson’s plucky description nevertheless offers a fascinating account of how magic lantern demonstrations weaved aural and ocular, sacred and profane, reverent and comical, within a singular space and moment in time. 

That the slides in this particular exhibition were not all photographs should not obstruct from view the ways in which magic lantern demonstrations conditioned distinct modes of viewing and beholding that were nevertheless related to the visual practices at work in stereographs.

“Goliath Whistle’s ‘Celebrated Unique Biblical Perspective’” was held at St. Philip’s AME Church, crowded and dim, with the light of a dozen oil-lamps casting long shadows on the walls and the “familiar strong smell of lamp and soot” lingering in the close air. When the
program began, Goliath Whistle’s “deep voice boomed out of the darkness” and invited the audience to sing the national anthem. As they sang the lights dimmed further until the only light in the room was the “round white disk on the screen” before them. And then the Perspective began. The first pictures—most likely photographic slides—were of President McKinley “and his amiable wife”—who, incidentally, was also the subject of more than one Underwood and Underwood series. Next followed more “portraits of our Chief Executives” from Washington through Lincoln, the “martyr President.” Then came a series of “mechanical slides,” which gave the illusion of movement through deft maneuvering of successive plates, a method similar to the “great mechanical picture” of the destruction of Jerusalem in Banvard’s panorama half a century earlier. “And now the show grows biblical apace.”

From Adam and Eve in the garden to the drowning of Pharaoh in the Red Sea to Daniel and Jonah, David and Saul, each of the thirty or more pictures of, in Stephenson’s words, “the Old Testament’s great actors and figures,” were accompanied by “the familiar lyric of the plantations.” As with panoramas, photobooks, and stereographs, Goliath Whistle’s Celebrated Unique Biblical Perspective arranged visual cues to narrate biblical interpretation, using a familiar enough story to naturalize its sequence, all of which was performed to what are assumed to be variations of black spirituals in the highly sensorial theater of the darkened sanctuary. After an hour or more of this viewing and singing, Mr. Whistle intoned from behind the screen that “the last hour of our Biblical Perspective will be devoted to the blessed story of the life and death of Jesus Christ, our Divine Redeemer.” When the pictures for this dispensation began, Prime-Stevenson noticed something different about the slides: “instead of the crude or commonplace representations by unskilled mechanics” exhibited earlier in the program, one was now seeing “faithful” reproductions “from the masterpieces of classic and modern religious art.” “The effect
was complete and profound,” Prime-Stevenson wrote. “Sighs and sobs began to rise all over the dark building when Da Vinci’s Cenacola and August Geiger’s ‘Betrayal,’ and Munkaesy’s spectacular ‘Christ Before Pilate’ appeared. There were low moans of ‘O dear Lord!’ ‘O, the Precious Blood!’ ‘The Blessed Jesus!’ as the Flagellation, by Sedoma, the Crucifixion according to Van Dyk’s appalling work, and the Descent from the Cross, after Rubens, each appeared.” “From first to last,” Stephenson concluded, the Perspective’s “religious power over that humble audience . . . and ourselves was sustained. It was plain that wherever it might go, it would be a kind of Oberammergau . . . with influences of grace and beautiful import.”

Comparing Goliath Whistle’s magic lantern entertainment to the most famous passion play in the nineteenth century, if hyperbole, nevertheless demonstrated the narrative power that such visual spectacles could wield in their beholder’s devotional practices. Hurlbut’s illustrated lectures most likely resembled the scene described by Prime-Stevenson in some key regards, although it is also important to keep in mind the difference in mood that the selections of images, hymns, and commentaries would condition. In other words, even if it was common to weave various modes of participation, there was hardly a template by which all public demonstrations independently manufactured uniform response. Where it is likely that Hurlbut interspersed photographic views into earlier lectures, his later sermon on “Jerusalem, the Holy City” so closely resembles the text and sequence of Traveling in the Holy Land through the Stereoscope that it was almost certainly exclusively comprised of Underwood views. By the time of this lecture, Hurlbut’s Underwood text had gone through three editions (1900, 1905, and 1909), and his notes closely correspond with the published volume. In his notes, however, we get a feel for how his lectures were adapted for different audiences over the next decade. Changes in sequence, for instance, are indicated by arrows and the instruction to “omit” in different shades of ink. In
his notes, Hurlbut does not specify how he illustrated his sermons, but we can assume that he utilized the magic lantern instead of acquiring scopes for his entire audience, perhaps assuming that they were already familiar with the stereographs or jokingly instructing them to go purchase the views after his lecture.85

Beholders of stereographs and magic lantern slides both experienced images as artifacts in particular circumstances of encounter that elicited different meanings and conditioned different relationships to biblical texts and scriptural knowledge. But the fact that each medium could be produced from common negatives points to the social biography of images, to the multiple terrains a single image could navigate across the cultural landscape of the turn of the twentieth century. And yet, the written word of the commentary and caption, the spoken word of the sermon, and the sung word of hymns each elicited different dynamics of image and text that informed the experiences of photographic encounters—which could vary from pew to pew as much as from church to church or parlor to parlor. In the final section of this chapter, I return to a closer examination of the interaction between images and texts in stereographs, keeping in mind that both the visual and the narrative content were informed by traditions of representation and interpretation.

VISUAL ARCHIVES OF “THE WORD”

If the idea of the Holy Land was conditioned by a complex matrix of archaeological, historical, devotional, and theological imaginings, so too was the visual practice of stereography. Beholders of stereographs were, as historian Shirley Wajda has argued, equipped with a host of “situational cues” that “provide[d] . . . the stereograph viewer with evidence to reconstruct the story line—the totality of assumptions and actions of the actors—encapsulated within one
stereographic frame.” Although it is difficult to parse the “totality of assumptions and actions of the actors” in sacred series that deliberately aimed to displace the photographic contemporary in an effort to visualize a sacred history that was, in the words of Jesse Lyman Hurlbut, “unreal to us,” stereographs of sacred series were nevertheless presented as complex artifacts containing sufficient evidence of their intended interpretation. The most apparent “situational cues” on the cards, even before extended commentary was printed on the reverse at the turn of the century, were the inclusion of biblical references, often printed on both the front and back of the stereograph. Even as it was common to print scriptural references on the stereographs themselves, the extensive use of cross-reference seen in Hurlbut’s tour and Forbush’s travel lessons was not evinced in the Underwoods’ earliest Holy Land guide book. In the introduction to the perfecscope series, the Underwoods had written that “Bible references are freely given in [the] descriptions,” but there was no uniformity in the citations and many views were absent any specific biblical reference.

By the time *Travel Lessons on the Life of Christ* was published, however, both Hurlbut and Forbush had asked their would-be-tourists to first identify and familiarize themselves with the corresponding biblical reference either printed on the face of the stereograph, on the back of the stereograph, in the guide book, or in a specified bible lesson. “A most important point,” Forbush declared, was “never [to] show a stereographed scene, seldom even distribute copies of it, until after you have told what it is.” His reason was both pedagogical and theological. In the first instance, premature circulation of the cards ran the risk that “the scholar will get so interested in its details that he will forget what it is about.” But the effect of this “special hint” was indeed theological in at least two interrelated ways. First, related to Forbush’s pedagogy, proper interpretation of the stereographs required that the visual field first be delimited by a
scriptural proof. To be sure, the details of the composition were important for maximizing the visual effect of relief and solidity, but they were often considered by the guides (and, it seems, Sunday school teachers and bible professors) to be incidental to the theological work the views were intended to perform. In other words, the pedagogical underpinning of Forbush’s statement was linked to its theological potential—the views were indeed marvelous, but they required a studied gaze in order to be truly instructive. Secondly, and tantamount to the first, Forbush’s caution against the lure of details suggests an interest in the Bible Department at Underwood and Underwood in establishing a veneer of perfect correspondence between photograph and biblical text in which the latter always explained the former and neatly circumscribed its interpretive possibility. The stereographs themselves, however, like Bain’s photographs, often tell a different story. First, biblical references, perhaps to the consternation of churchly schoolmarm and ministers, did not determine interpretation even if they did work to situate the view within a beholder’s theological paradigm. Secondly, in addition to this explicit verbal situational cue, there were more subtle interactions between the biblical text and the photographic image, wherein the latter was not merely a visual translation of the former but a constitutive component of its very substance.

Even as he wrote of being “very sad and solemn” as they stood in the footprints of Adam sunk into the red clay of “the Cave at Hebron where Adam and Eve hid themselves”—and mused that they “didn’t see any rib laying round anywhere to represent Eve”—Elmer Underwood also indicated that the holiness of the Holy Land was to be created through the photographs themselves and not just something to be recorded through the lens, that the photographic contemporary was readily manipulated in order to more accurately “represent” the biblical truth. “We photographed Lazarus coming out of his tomb at Bethany,” Elmer wrote of one of the
“more impressive scenes” the brothers had taken during their month in Palestine. “Martha and Mary were there” and “we took Mary’s baby away from her in order to have her pose in the picture.” “Martha was not a very shapely woman,” he continued, “but it won’t show in the photograph.” Writing three years after Bain and Lee returned from their travels, Elmer may have been making a subtle jab at the suckling baby in Bain’s photograph of Lazarus’s tomb (figure 40).

Despite the veiled critique, looking through the stereoscope was an imaginative process that posited an immediate link with the Holy Land—itself an indefinite place in an imaginative space—even as it obscured the range of visual, conceptual, and theological habits that invested the view with meaning. Certainly it is important to recognize the correspondence between image and text that these views assumed through such situational cues as biblical references and extended commentary. And yet there was nevertheless a superabundance of visual information—often in the form of “Arab” figures—that suggests a more complicated form of visual piety than direct correspondence between photographic image and biblical text. Stereographs of the Holy Land indexed a convergence of photographic realism, scriptural authority, and biblical geography in the 7-inch by 3-inch card, a matrix of signification that eludes simple parsing or causal analysis. Thus, it is not at all helpful to place the images and the texts of stereographs into causal sequences of meaning—to ask how the text determined the meaning of the image, for instance, or vice versa. Indeed, the interdependence of words and images began before the view was ever placed in the scope.

In the view entitled “Unclean! Unclean!”—taken by Elmer and Bert in April 1896 and included as part of their tours for more than two decades—we see this negotiation between photographic images and biblical text at work in the lifting of “wretched people” from their
present circumstance into a devotional context that resignified them as indices of the beholders' piety (figure 50). The view would call to the mind’s eye of some beholders Bain’s photograph of the “Dervish Beggars” that came a little more than halfway through *Earthly Footsteps* and which was used to illustrate I Chronicles 28:9 in *The Self-Interpreting Bible*. In the first text, the photograph was used specifically to mount a critique of the “Mohammedans” who “have reduced begging to a science.” In his caption, Lee wrote that the “two sad-looking creatures . . . represent a large class of Moslems who account it a thing of merit to renounce earthly comfort,” adding that “it is an easy thing to lose the first impulses and convictions which the truth inspires, and to allow selfishness and avarice to use the outward signs of the good for the accomplishment of evil.”92 In the Photographic Bible, the image, now titled “Dervish Beggars—Such as Stand and Beg in the Holy City Where Solomon Lived and Reigned,” the critique is more cautionary than

![Figure 50: "Unclean! Unclean!" Wretched Lepers outside Jerusalem, Palestine. (St. Matt. viii: 2-4) Copyright 1897 by Underwood & Underwood. Author’s collection.](image-url)
indicting. “We give a view of Dervish beggars such as are found to-day in Jerusalem,” the caption reads, “and they serve to illustrate what comes to people when they violate the laws of God. The most wretched and inhuman looking creatures we have ever seen are found among the beggars of Palestine. They are diseased, degraded, and as miserable as humanity with the dregs of generations of sin can make them.” Although there was some recognition that their “degradation . . . is perhaps due in some respect to the tyrannical, remorseless and outrageous Turkish civilization under which they live,” the unfortunate state of the Dervish Beggars was less a matter of accident than Providence.93

The Underwood counterpart to Bain’s beggars was published in at least three series between 1897 and 1914. In the view, three figures, two young and one old, sit on rocky earth against a stone wall, their knees bent up toward their chests and their hands out with palms facing upwards. In the perfecscope view of the “wretched lepers outside Jerusalem,” the Underwoods described with a disdainful curiosity the “deformed and decaying creatures . . . suffering the torture of an untold hopeless misery which is finally to be relieved only by the merciful hand of death.” After describing the biblical significance of the disease in the laws of Moses as well as the prognosis of those afflicted, they conclude that it is “incurable except by the divine hand” and, moreover, that it “is verily typical of the sin of the world.” They then pointed their readers to the seventeenth chapter of Luke for scriptural corroboration.94 The view was subsequently also issued as part of the Holy Land tour conducted by Jesse Lyman Hurlbut and in William Byron Forbush’s Travel Lessons on the Life of Christ, a bible study system designed by Forbush “to enable the student to get close to Jesus, to see Him” through stereographic helps.95

In the case of “Unclean! Unclean!,” the situational cue of the biblical reference, which by the reed of St. Matthew told of a leper who was healed by his faith and instructed to “tell no
man; but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest . . . for a testimony unto them,” was accompanied by further interpretive work in the commentary. In *Traveling in the Holy Land*, Hurlbut jumped from a command to “Look at the stumps of hands from which the fingers have dropped off! See those twisted and deformed feet!” to an analysis of leprosy substantiated by further biblical reference. Why had lepers been “shut out of the cities” and why do they “live by themselves in loathsome communities”? Look at II Kings. Echoing both James Lee and the Underwoods in his appropriation of the afflicted Mohammedan bodies as salves for Catholic and Protestant souls, he announced that “There is no more cure now than there was in Naaman’s day,” although he reassured that the infected “never attempt to touch the passer,” in effect soothing the anxieties of potential pilgrims through a buffer of physical distance.

In Forbush’s commentary, we learn that these lepers are actually sitting outside the wall at Gethsemane, physically in close proximity and yet metaphorically—through their somatic condition—at great distance from the pageantry of redemption enacted within the wall. As with his predecessors, Forbush too instructs his pupils that “we need this horrible sight to make plain to us the awfulness of misery and sin to which Jesus ministered.” But Forbush complicated the matter further when he added that “the disobedience and ingratitude of the leper mark his disfigurement as one of soul as well as of body,” a statement which raises doubts about whom the figures in the view are made to represent. Are they metaphors, visible signs, of the beholder’s own sin? Do they refer to the “heathen” occupying the Holy Land, disfigured in body and soul by their disbelief and banned beyond the wall of redemption? Can they refer to both? Indeed, as Wajda argues, despite the deceptive clarity of situational cues, “the message . . . may be multivalent.” For all of the biblical commentary, moreover, the trope of leprosy participated in what Warwick Anderson has identified as the “colonial pathologies” of the turn of the twentieth
century representations of native peoples. In demonstrating the effects of this rendering in the Philippines, David Brody recounts the sensationalist story of William Lapeer, a soldier who was reputedly injected with a “leper’s blood” as he lay unconscious. The story ran in an 1899 issue of the *World* entitled “The Revenge of the Filipino” and Brody uses it to address nationalist anxieties that pivoted on threats of blood contamination, an issue that was evidently on the front of Hurlbut’s mind as well when he allayed readers’ fears of the lepers’ touch. Thus whereas vernacular photographs such as stereographs often evince a collaboration between image and text that hints at direct correspondence, historians who embrace these artifacts within their corpus should be attentive to the elisions—both visual and verbal—that such a correspondence demands.

Whereas Holy Land tours and stereographic bible study lessons offered one context for situating the issue of correspondence between biblical text and photographic image, another genre of stereograph first published in the late 1860s constituted what was perhaps a more explicit framework. Whereas stereographs shared representational strategies and narrative conventions of panoramas, volumes of photomechanical prints, and magic lantern slides, none of these other techniques made the physical artifact of the Bible itself the compositional subject of their views. After the Civil War, as northern Americans began to reinvent a national heritage through regional histories, W. S. Robbins of Plymouth, Massachusetts, began issuing an irregular series of *Plymouth Views* consisting predominately of seventeenth-century Separatist artifacts, including a “Pot and Platter which belonged to Miles Standish” and “the gun-barrel with which King Phillip was killed,” as well as gravesites of early New England magistrates and ministers. Among the views for purchase was one featuring a “Mug and Wallet which belonged to Thos. Clarke and a Bible brought over in the Mayflower” (figure 51). Another stereograph in the series
identifies Clarke himself as a “mate of the Mayflower,” which would indicate that the Bible, too, belonged to Clarke. But at the time the stereograph was produced, there was considerable debate about the “mate of the Mayflower’s” passage on that blessed vessel.\textsuperscript{98}

The earliest known record of Thomas Clarke in Plymouth is July 1623—three years after the \textit{Mayflower} weighed anchor—when the twenty-four year old arrived onboard the \textit{Anne}. Clarke’s impressive lifespan, an impossible ninety-eight years at a time when most never saw the hither side of sixty, no doubt encouraged his association with the \textit{Mayflower} amidst the political, mercantile, and religious tumults of the turn of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{99} The stereograph produced nearly two centuries after Clarke’s death, however, raises different questions about the claims to historical narratives and cultural truths that material artifacts and their visual reproductions could make. In an 1869 genealogy, Thomas’s descendent Samuel C. Clarke noted that “in the collection of relics at Forefathers’ Hall, Plymouth, is a china mug and leather wallet bearing the name of Thomas Clarke.”\textsuperscript{100} That Robbins added to these “relics” a Bible that purportedly crossed the Atlantic with the early Separatist community enabled him to affirm Clarke’s legacy as a “mate of the \textit{Mayflower}” even as it spoke to a larger cultural effort to generate new regional identities grounded in the imaginative spaces of “Old New England” at a time when immigration, urbanization, and industrialization changed the cultural, religious, and political landscapes of the post-Civil War decades. Indeed, without uttering a word, rather than subordinating the view to textual illustration, Robbins used the stereographed Bible as a proof-text to Yankee legacy.\textsuperscript{101}

Although Robbins’s stereograph of the \textit{Mayflower} bible was used to make historical claims about New England piety and culture, most views of opened bibles—I have yet to come across one that is closed—are presented as timeless artifacts, carefully adorned, perhaps, but
absent any specified historical identity. A number of views from the 1860s and 1870s feature ornamented bibles opened to the Psalms or the New Testament Gospels. In one view from the prominent New York establishment of Edward and Henry T. Anthony entitled “Open Bible,” the Holy Writ became an object of deliberate inspection and display (figure 52). An 1865 catalogue of Anthony views lists “Open Bible” as “Miscellaneous” view No. 1470, between “The Suspension Bridge, on the Ohio, at Wilmington” (No. 1415) and “The Good Friends” (No. 1526), neither of which appear to be categorically related, thus indicating that the view was not part of a narrative sequence. The stereograph below bears the same title and label, but is sequenced as No. 7023, which indicates a later circulation than the catalogue listing, although it is possible that the later view came from the same negative. A pair of spectacles drapes over the
verso page—a prop used in a number of Bible views—which has been opened to Psalms 144 through 146. A decorated placard with the phrase “Search the Scriptures” (a silent nod to the gospel of John) ensconced in a scroll loosely encircling the vertical arm of a cruciform covers the recto page of the opened bible, effectively obscuring the biblical text. Two candles, with flames flickering from their wicks sit in their holders in the foreground of the view, one in front of each page of the opened text. The entire assemblage sits on a two-tone floral spread and patterned fabric hangs behind. When placed in the stereoscope, the relief between the curtain in back, the upright Bible, the candles, and the front edge of the table, becomes distinctly discernible. By using textured patterns, contrastive tones, and multiple vertical planes, this view utilizes several of the tactics used by producers of stereographs to enhance the optical effects of depth and solidity.
But why a Bible? Since the 1850s, E. & H.T. Anthony had been a premier photographic establishment in the United States and had thousands of stereographic views bearing their label. Even in the scope the text is not legible, and besides, it is doubtful that Anthony intended beholding the view to be an equal substitute of bible study. At first blush, it seems as though the view could be a visual affirmation of the cultural role bibles played in fomenting middle-class identities for mid-to-late nineteenth-century Americans. At least one historian of American photography early noticed the parallel cultural space—if not final significance—that bibles and stereoscopes played in American domestic spheres.\textsuperscript{104} But such a functionalist interpretation does not explain the obvious instruction to “search the Scriptures,” an injunction that points less to middle-class aesthetics than to personal piety.

A view published by L.E. Walker of Warsaw, New York, entitled “The Bible Lesson” affirms the instructive impetus of stereographed bibles. As part of their series of \textit{Pleasing Studies for Our Young Folks}, the Bible in this view stands vertically on a Moresque tablecloth, propped against a horizontal text with a cross wreathed in ivy rising from behind. As with the Anthony view, the pages are opened to a specific page, the cloth page-marker draping the left margin of the verso page suggests a deliberate selection of Luke chapter 11, the first four verses of which are the Lord’s Prayer. Curiously, the prayer itself, which is recited by Jesus in Luke and in Matthew in response to a disciple’s request to “teach us to pray,” was also the compositional subject of stereographs in the 1870s, such as the Kilburn Brothers’ view No. 222 “The Lord’s Prayer” (figure 53). In this rather uninteresting view, the longer prayer from the gospel of Matthew has been printed onto a plain white placard and propped against a bed of White Mountain snow. The visual relief is apparent, but the subtlety of the monochromatic composition warrants consideration of the view not for its visual effects but for its textual content. Thus it
would seem, in this instance at least, that the stereograph of the Word—taken verbatim from the pages of Matthew—is directed toward a particular viewing practice rather than the dimensional effects of stereoscopy. In other words, stereographs of bibles and their words were used to different effects by different publishers, but each instance nevertheless seems more calculated to the visual habits that stereographic viewing conditioned than to facilitating a correspondence between photographic image and biblical text through the visual content of the views themselves.

The Kilburn Brothers’ “Lord’s Prayer” is contrasted sharply with another view of the same verse, this one highly ornamented, anonymous, and untitled (figure 54). Unlike the plain text of the Kilburn view, in this stereograph one is immediately drawn to the rich catalogue of symbols that structure the composition no less than the words of the prayer. While utilizing the same text as the Anthony, Walker, and Kilburn views, each of which suggested Christian interpretive sensibilities, this stereo is rich with Masonic symbols that conscript the prayer into an alternative system of meaning. Like Kilburn’s stereograph, this view also offered nominal variation in depth, thus, again, prompting questions about the place of stereoscopic entertainments among late-nineteenth-century Americans. What was the attraction of views that offered little, if any, perception of depth and that, as verbatim scripture passages, offered minimal interpretive guidance? Whereas Holy Land tours were claimed to assist biblical reading practices, so as to “make the bible a new book” in their abilities to transport beholders to the space and time of biblical pageantry, this was clearly not the case in stereographed images of bible pages and printed verses. Rather, these views underscore how the stereoscope and its views conditioned a particular mode of viewing charged with cultural significance. The dimensional effect was certainly a significant component of the practice’s allure, but the popularity of views that lacked such effect—a striking number of which feature religious subjects—indicates that
there was more than meets the eye in stereographic representations of American religion.

Stereographs of bibles and bible verses, in short, gesture to vernacular photography’s simultaneous status as icon and relic. As discussed in the introduction, far too often in the study of religion visual culture and especially photography is approached as so many icons gesturing beyond their own material forms to something else. Such an approach contributes to the analytical and phenomenological neglect of such artifacts’ simultaneous ability to freight that something else, to not only represent but to replicate, if only *pars pro toto*. For many beholders, as the Masonic Lord’s Prayer stereograph suggests, part of the significance of two-dimensional views was their encrypted reference to the views’ latent messages. One example is the Kilburn Brothers’ view “One Hundred and Thirty-third Psalm,” from the 1870s. In this view the bible is surrounded by ice—one of Benjamin Kilburn’s favorite optical effects—and seems to be held
open by a square and compasses (figure 55). When viewed through the scope, however, it
becomes clear that the square and compasses are in fact suspended in front of the opened Bible.
The stereograph is a photographic quotation of Masonic “hieroglyphs” printed in earlier Masonic
Charts—it is, in short, a catalogue of icons. The three objects—bible, square, and compasses—
constituted the “Great Lights by which a [Freemason] must walk and work,” according to the
Morals and Dogma, first published by Grand Commander Albert Pike in 1871. As with “so
many oath-bound men” at the turn of the century, Benjamin Kilburn had in fact joined more than
one fraternal society: in addition to being a member of the Ancient Free and Accepted Masons,
he was also a member of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows and of Post No. 48 of the Grand
Army of the Republic, a society established for Union veterans of the American Civil War that,
like its contemporary organizations, departed from earlier and later veterans’ societies in its
emphasis on ritual, including “elaborate successions of initiatory degrees.” In both Oddfellowship and Masonry, the Holy Bible played an important ritual role. “No Lodge can transact its business,” wrote J.F. Newton for the Masonic Service Association in 1924, “much less initiate candidates into its mysteries, unless the Book of the Holy Law lies open upon its altar.” Although Newton was ambiguous about the origins of the bible in Masonry, he wrote that “students have traced about seventy-five references to the Bible in the Ritual of the Craft” and noted that, more important than the “direct references,” was “the fact that the spirit of the Bible, its faith, its attitude toward life, pervades Masonry.”

Newton was writing well into the twentieth century, after great changes to the demographics and theologies of Masonry had been effected throughout the nineteenth century, but the “direct references” to which he referred are evident much earlier. In the “improved stereotyped edition” of *The True Masonic Chart, or Hieroglyphic Monitor*, published by A.S.
Barnes and Company in 1854, a line drawing under the “Section Third” of the Entered Apprentice Degree depicts an opened text with an inverted square intersecting opened compasses. Along the uppermost margin of the book is “Psalm CXXXIII.” Flipping past the hieroglyphics to the text, Right Worthy Jeremy Cross explained that “the third section” of the Entered Apprentice Degree of the American Rite “explains the nature and principles of our Constitution” and departs “instructions relative to the form, supports, covering, furniture, ornaments, lights, and jewels of the Lodge.” Agreeing with Pike’s account of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, the order in which Kilburn had been initiated, Cross wrote that “every well-governed Lodge is furnished with the Holy Bible, the Square, and the Compasses” and further explained that “the Holy Bible is dedicated to God; the Square, to the Master; and the Compasses, to the Craft.”

Nothing in Cross’s “lecture,” however, or in the “CHARGE at Initiation into the First Degree,” mentioned the significance of Psalm 133. On one level, the association is obvious. The first verse of this “Song of degrees of David” reads “Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!” and appears to have been used in sermons directed toward fraternal audiences, as when Edward Abraham Foggo, rector of Christ Church in Philadelphia, chose the verse in his sermon on “the value of organization, and the true method to preserve it in perfection,” which he delivered to the “members and officers” of the Right Worthy Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of the Odd Fellows on September 17, 1876. But as all brethren would have known, the true meaning of the verse was hidden from view—Foggo was not an Oddfellow—and to assume such a transparent interpretation was mere folly. While not all views of open bibles fell into the same analytic paradigms as the fraternal orders, the practices of deliberate selection of a scriptural passage and adornment are found in a number of views that
have no obvious connection to Masonry or Oddfellowship. As an image that referred to something beyond itself, for photographers such as Benjamin West Kilburn and Edward and Henry Anthony, stereographs of bibles encapsulated a sort of iconicity in the visual landscape of nineteenth-century America.

But these stereographs also beckon us to look beyond what they are of and pay attention to what they were. In a word, these stereographs were not only pictures of bibles. They were bibles. Stereographs of bibles lacked the twists of human hair, pressed flowers, mourning badges, and other mementos that were folded into their three-dimensional counterparts. But these artifacts nevertheless prompted meditations on materiality and presence in such a way that reinforced the materiality of bibles and photographs. The stereographs were not meant to be read but to be seen and touched. They were not to be studied as scripture but inspected as objects. Through their physical encounter, beholders were confronted with the sensorial experiences of perception even as they calibrated these experiences to registers of corporeal transcendence. In other words, they invited meditation on the artifact’s position in time and space, as a fragment of something thought to be absent, despite competing interpretive cues that rendered the photograph as a transparent void. As Carolyn Walker Bynum has convincingly demonstrated in her work on materiality in late medieval Christianity, the images she consulted “call attention to the material through which they achieve their effects rather than merely using it to create the illusion of something else. . . . they disclose, not merely signify, a power that lies beyond.”11 As discussed in the introduction to the dissertation, this recognition of images as relics points to the fact that icons and relics are rarely easy to distinguish and have often coexisted in a single artifact. When they are recognized as relics no less than icons of religious practice, stereographs of bibles become less curious and more emblematic of the complexity of vernacular photography.
Bynum’s attention to the “disclosures” that images facilitated in her study underscores the visual habits of stereographic beholding for nineteenth-century Americans who, to be sure, maneuvered in a quite different visual landscape than that of medieval Europe. But contemporary celebration of photography, and especially stereography, as a medium charged with making the bible real reveals a culture of disclosure that rendered physical objects, available to the senses, as fragments of a biblical imaginary that had been, according to Jesse Lyman Hurlbut, critically displaced both temporally and geographically. The visual archives of “the Word” refers to the strategies of narrativization that incorporated visual and verbal into a single, if multivalent and unstable, artifact, and can be seen in different modes in stereographs of the Holy Land, the Life of Christ, and the bible as a physical artifact. The circumstances of beholding and claims to interpretive authority varied from medium to medium—stereographs, magic lanterns, and panoramas each boasted different stakes—that were in no small part related to the corporeal experiences of spectatorship. And yet each evinced a relationship to words, and to the Word in particular, that bound them into a common archive. Far from being auxiliary to bibliocentric reading practices, the ways Americans saw the Holy Land had profound effects on theological and devotional sensibilities.
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most authoritative source of visual meaning for American Protestants without exploring in depth
the range of visual cues at work in any particular encounter between artifact and beholder. It is
possible, however, to recognize the significant influences of traditional, text-based modes of
interpretation without conscripting the entire field of visual information to a model of textual
engagement defined by acts of “reading.” Indeed, understanding the profound influence of
biblical “pretexts,” as Morgan calls them, at work in the engagement between beholders and
Holy Land stereographs is vital to determining their devotional import in Protestant religious
instruction. But it cannot stand alone.

To this end, I take cues from historian Jonathan Crary who has argued that “relations
between the body on one hand and forms of institutional and discursive power on the other
redefined the status of an observing subject” in the nineteenth century, and from Kenneth Ames
who wrote that “my argument is not that material culture is superior to other ways of knowing,
but that it is different” and that “goods and words are both culturally constructed artifacts.” Such
an approach is supported by previous scholars of the material culture of American religion, most
notably Colleen McDannell, who has argued that material culture “in itself has no intrinsic
meaning of its own” and that “objects become meaningful within specific patterns of
relationships.”

Jonathan Crary has argued in his work on the production of “a new kind of observer” in
the early nineteenth century, the subjectivity of the beholder—Crary’s “observer”— was
facilitated by optical devices that situate habits of viewing firmly in the slippery exchange
between corporeal experience and “a much larger assemblage of events and powers.” See
Morgan, Visual Piety: A History and Theory of Popular Religious Images (Berkeley and
McDannell, Material Christianity, 3-4.
92 Lee, Earthly Footsteps, 239.
93 Self-Interpreting Bible, 2:841.
94 Underwood, Journeys in the Holy Land, 41-42. See also Luke 17: 11-19 for a gospel
account of Jesus’s encounter with lepers.
95 Forbush, Travel Lessons on the Life of Christ, 7.
96 Wajda, “A Room with a Viewer,” 122.
97 See Warwick Anderson, Colonial Pathologies: American Tropical Medicine, Race,
and Hygiene in the Philippines (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006); David Brody,
Visualizing American Empire: Orientalism and Imperialism in the Philippines (Chicago and
January 22, 1899.


Samuel C. Clarke, Records of Some of the Descendants of Thomas Clarke, Plymouth, 1623-1697 (Boston, 1869), 7.


John 5:39 reads: “Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me.” (KJV)

Taft, Photography and the American Scene, 138.


Epilogue

HOW MR. EASTMAN CHANGED THE FACE OF AMERICAN RELIGION

On Tuesday, March 20, 1900, the Los Angeles Times ran an inconspicuous advertisement on a crowded page for S. G. Marshutz, an optician and supplier of photographic materials on Spring Street. “We Place on Sale Today a New Eastman Kodak, ‘The Brownie,’ at $1.00 Each.”¹ It had been more than a decade since George Eastman, the tinkering banker from Rochester, New York, had “perfected” the “little rollholder breast camera” that substituted paper negative film for glass plates and paved the way for a generation of picture takers by distinguishing them from picture makers.² By providing a product that enabled consumers to take pictures and then mail the exposed film to Rochester for development, Eastman effectively bifurcated the production of photographs into ostensibly distinct processes to great commercial success. Despite meteoric success and the launch of an international distribution market, however, Kodak sales during the first decade were largely limited to an affluent clientele. The Brownie changed that. “So simple they can be operated by any school boy or girl,” as a widely-printed advertisement promised, the Brownie was also very affordable. Earlier Kodaks had been loaded with film for 100 exposures, which, when completed, were sent back to Rochester, camera and all, for development, printing, and reloading. These were the “detective cameras” that Robert E. M. Bain had deplored as “base imitation” ten years earlier.³ The Brownie was loaded for six 2 ¼ x 2 ¼ exposures—for an additional fifteen cents—and marketers were quick to clarify that,
despite its diminutive size and simple operation, the camera “takes perfect pictures . . . and is no toy.”

The history of vernacular photography in the nineteenth-century is not a prehistory to the Kodak, but the introduction of a simple-to-operate, affordably-priced camera did profoundly influence the cultural practices of photography in the United States. As a new face of vernacular photography, Kodak culture continued in a long tradition of visual habits and circumstances of beholding. But it was also a turning point in the history of photography that warrants a new page. By 1900, at the same time that Americans were touring Palestine through the stereoscope, flipping through new editions of photographically illustrated family bibles, pinning memorial photos to their lapels, and posing for studio photographers, they were also keeping records of missionary ventures in snapshot albums, mailing pictures of little boys in first communion attire on postcards, and affixing photographic evidence of divine intervention to the

**Figure 56: First Communion real photo postcard of Dominick and Willie, ca. 1918. Author's collection.**
The communion postcard here of Dominick and Willie is from around 1918 and was never mailed, although others just like it were likely sent to family and friends (figure 56). Even though Americans had been actively compiling and creating photographic artifacts for decades, the advent of the personal camera ripened the conditions for a new perspective on religious practices within a nation that was racing forward as earnestly as it was grasping the past. This brief epilogue works to identify continuities and innovations that the new technologies advanced in an effort to summarize the analytical concerns of this dissertation.

The commercial success of Kodak marks a moment when, for the first time, the ability to take pictures was attainable for a wide range of socioeconomic, regional, and ethnic populations. Curators and scholars have been tempted to associate this technological development with unprecedented documentation of Americans’ quotidian experiences. The association between the snapshot, spontaneity, and the instantaneous record of American life was articulated as early as 1944 by Willard D. Morgan, then Director of Photography at the Museum of Modern Art, in the catalogue for a “folk art” exhibit on “The American Snapshot”:

> For some fifty years now the hand-held camera, with its instantaneous shutter, has been recording the American scene in infinite, spontaneous detail—the new baby, the family group, the home, friends, small and large adventures, discoveries. . . . Today it is possible for everyone to know what it means to see, to enjoy, and to capture for re-enjoyment the outward essence of a moment.  

Morgan’s effort to reevaluate snapshots as folk art anticipated by several decades later curatorial and scholarly efforts to bridge the presumed spontaneity of snapshots with their “highly significant form of self expression.” But positing connections between spontaneity, transparency, and authenticity, both exaggerates the probability of spontaneity—the briefest encounter with turn of the twentieth century snapshots demonstrates a keen awareness of the camera’s presence—and reinforces the interpretive assumption of indexicality that obscures the
thingness of photographic artifacts. Even as snapshots have been carefully exhibited in museum displays, their material existence has often been subordinated to the images they convey—“a bridal couple dashing through a rain of rice” and “an English bulldog giving the Bronx cheer from the doorway.”

For Americans at the turn of the twentieth century, the possibility that their whimsical kodaks would ever be displayed in a New York museum likely crossed few minds. While snapshots could be archived in any variety of artifacts, from serving trays to wine cabinets, the snapshot album became the most ubiquitous place to encounter amateur photographs in the years leading up to the Great War. Photograph albums had of course been around since the early 1860s. Albums, moreover, were modeled after commonplace books, souvenir albums, and even quilting and other varieties of domestic handicraft that had been around since the mid-thirteenth century. What changed was the degree to which photographs were now archived as narrative cues. Still thoroughly tactile, sensorial artifacts, snapshots nevertheless became more closely identified with what David Morgan has defined as the “token” operation of material culture. “A token . . . occludes, shapes, or highlights memories that the owner of the token wants to remember,” he explains, and as such, the token “constructs any number of visual fields—occlusive, aversive, or devotional—depending on what story the owner wishes to tell.” The language of the token in relation to that of the relic and the icon used throughout this dissertation could certainly be parsed. All modes of photography, for instance, promoted narratives, from ancestral pedigree to the human predicament to the drama of redemption. But the physical arrangement of snapshot albums, in particular, made this operation far more explicit. A loose page from an early-twentieth-century album demonstrates the distinction (figure 57). Four snapshots are on the black paper page and someone has captioned the images in white crayon.
Figure 57: Loose page from unidentified album, ca. 1921. Katherine G. Lederer Ozarks African American History Collection, Missouri State University. Used with permission.
The arrangement of photographs and script tells the story of a trip to Leavenworth, Kansas, around 1921. The narrative is integral to the arrangement rather than imputed through conditioned acts of beholding.

Ironically, at the same moment that the premiere authorizing mechanism in American culture shifted from the autograph to the photograph—consider, for instance, how Anthony’s National Daguerreotype Gallery had required signatures to authenticate the “counterfeit presentments” of Congress in the early 1840s against the increasingly common practice of using photographs to authenticate identification in the 1890s—Americans were ever more conscious of the orchestrated semiotics of identity at work in photographic likenesses. In other words, even as photographs came to authorize identity, they were simultaneously recognized for their ability to confuse identity. The bottom right photograph on the above album page demonstrates the ambiguity that the reputedly spontaneous and transparent snapshot often nurtured. Below the photograph of a person in a black suit and hat holding a shotgun, the compiler scribbled a question: “Can you guess he or she?”

The tension also surfaced in the contemporaneous popularization of documentary and pictorial photography in the early 1900s. On the one hand, photographs of people, in particular, were increasingly identified as authenticating mechanisms of truth, an interpretive dynamic that had been coursing through the medium for decades. On the other, photographic techniques were becoming recognized and celebrated as artistic processes that disrupted the empirical calculus of observation and reportage. Amateur photography thrived at this mercurial impasse. Kodaks reported and orchestrated. They documented and they devised. They were both heirs of generations of vernacular photographic viewing habits and rebellious offspring who held aspirations unimaginable to their forebears. Amateur photography created the conditions
necessary for quotidian circumstances to become common subject material. Yet the truly banal was rarely photographed unless it was framed to suggest something beyond itself. Eating a meal signified conviviality rather than daily sustenance; baby pictures spoke to the fecundity of one’s lineage or the nostalgia of youth rather than to the daily toils of childrearing. Whereas the quotidian in earlier photographic modes was largely defined by circumstances of encounter, after 1900 the quotidian itself was often on display—and defined through these compositional frames—in ways that previously orchestrated domestic scenes anticipated but never accomplished on the scale that snapshots enabled.

In this dissertation I have worked to identify a place in the historiography of American religious history to approach nineteenth-century vernacular photographs as historical artifacts that not only signified but that also worked to disclose. In short, I have asked historians to approach photographs in the way that nineteenth-century Americans did—as complicated and often contradictory material artifacts that navigated between imagined pasts and anticipated futures, that simultaneously affirmed the sensorial conditions of perception and subordinated the senses to truths coded in photographic referents, that traversed contexts of display and encounter as deftly as they conditioned sophisticated habits of beholding. But even as I have advocated for scholars to recognize photographs as relics no less than icons, this dissertation has also interrogated the relationship between material culture, analytics of the quotidian, and religious experience. In this regard, recognizing the materiality of photographs is not only necessary for scholars interested in photography, technology, or visual cultures of American religion. If we are going to continue to use photographs and other modes of material culture as registers of religious experience, we desperately need to be sensitive to the epistemological assumptions trafficked through these approaches. If definitive answers remain elusive—which they do—this dissertation
has nevertheless succeeded on the primary level of articulating the problem in a way that resonates beyond the particular narrative it weaves.

1 Display ad, Los Angeles Times, March 20, 1900.
4 Advertisement, The Youth’s Companion, April 26, 1900; Advertisement, Scientific American, April 14, 1900; Display ad, Los Angeles Times, March 20, 1900.
5 The Internet Mission Photography Archive provides an immense database of digitized missionary photographs from the early twentieth century and is part of the digital collections at the University of Southern California. See, http://digitallibrary.usc.edu/impa/controller/index.htm, accessed April 13, 2012. On the development of real photo postcards, which were amateur photographs developed in darkrooms rather than lithographically printed, see, most recently, Luc Sante, Folk Photography: The American Real-Photo Postcard, 1905-1930 (Portland, OR: Verse Chorus Press, 2009). The history of photographic ex-votos is, to my knowledge, as yet unwritten. Even though these articles are often drawn, painted, or sculpted, I have a hunch that the use of photographs started in earnest after hand-held cameras became widely used at the turn of the twentieth century. Of course further research needs to be done to confirm or revise this conjecture.
“Snapshots Exhibited at Museum of Modern Art.”


David Morgan, The Embodied Eye: Religious Visual Culture and the Social Life of Feeling (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 87. Morgan discusses the token as one of two “common mediums of religious exchange”—the other being the amulet—that he uses to “frame consideration of the icon,” which he defines as “the portrait image of a sacred person” that “create[s] a sense of presence” through a “reciprocal gaze.” While his comparative analysis is helpful for parsing the various operations that material culture can facilitate in religious contexts, I am using his language here merely to chart an important distinction between the organization of photographs in CDV and cabinet card albums of the 1860s through the 1880s and early snapshot albums in the 1890s to 1920s.

Katherine G. Lederer Ozarks African-American History Collection, unprocessed, Box 10, Special Collections and Archives, Missouri State University.
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