

Dane Poolaw offer illuminating family reminiscences. Cocurator and volume editor Nancy Mithlo discusses Poolaw's photographic work in terms of an indigeneous mode of cultural production. Cocurator Tom Jones contributes an essay on the work of documenting one's own community. A brief essay by Yuchi/Muscogee Creek photographer Richard Ray Whitman, a generation younger than Poolaw, speaks to Poolaw's example and influence. The scholarly contributions are not as thoroughly researched as other recent NMAI publications—for example, the career retrospective of Cherokee painter Kay Walking-Stick.¹ Nevertheless, *For a Love of His People* provides insights into the remarkable career of a singular and talented photographer. This volume is quite worthwhile for making accessible Poolaw's important images and is suitable for readers with an interest in Native American history and documentary photography. Readers interested in a more thorough view of Poolaw's life and career in historical and cultural context might wish to consult Laura E. Smith's excellent scholarly book on the artist, which makes an ideal companion to this catalog.²

BILL ANTHERS

Pitzer College, Claremont, California

Melody Davis. *Women's Views: The Narrative Stereograph in Nineteenth-Century America.* Lebanon: University of New Hampshire Press, 2015. xiii+247 pp.; 16 color and 139 black-and-white illustrations, notes, index. \$40.00.

Looking at a stereoview makes one powerfully aware of the embodied nature of vision. This is particularly true when one is looking at images of bodies themselves and their inhabitation of social spaces. In *Women's Views: The Narrative Stereograph in Nineteenth-Century America*, Melody Davis offers a rich and fascinating study of this domestic genre. It was domestic in a double sense. First, the stereoscope was a widely available optical device often used in the United States for visual entertainment, especially during the period 1870–1910. Second, the stereocards offered a means of commenting on, critiquing, and often laughing at a whole range of social as-

sumptions, especially concerning relations between the sexes. In all, over 6 million different stereograph titles were produced between the 1860s and the 1920s, and if many of these brought images of foreign places and customs into the parlor, or simply allowed people to explore their own country more intimately, a substantial number represented the home itself.

The idea of doubleness lies at the heart of Davis's book. In looking through a stereoscope—and one is included with the volume so that the reader can experience the author's many examples in full three-dimensionality—two images become as one. Body and brain are both involved in this operation. A duality of the material and the immaterial is found, too, in Davis's methodological approach. For this is a book informed both by well-grounded cultural history, especially nineteenth-century gender history, and by a deft command of recent theory concerning visuality and perception. She offers a particularly neat takedown of Jonathan Crary's ideas about the stereoscope, his misreading of Descartes, and his misguided thesis concerning the “rupture” between the camera obscura and this instrument.¹

Stereoscopy was often a self-conscious medium. Its views showed the stereoscope in the home or the itinerant salesman of stereoviews. Davis is especially strong on stereoscopy's dual relationship to a commodity world, in which images circulated alongside other popular visual forms and, in turn, manufactured and reinforced taste and stereotypes in the sense of generic scenes and figures. Makers of stereoviews enjoyed their visual puns—especially the idea of two becoming one through courtship and marriage—and Davis's treatment of comedy's role in all of this is outstanding. Comedy often depends, as Davis shows, on the confusion caused by inversion, role reversal, and transgression, and there is plenty of this topsy-turviness on display through frequently repeated tropes of the New Woman whose man is left holding the baby, or doing the washing, or discovered embracing the floury-handed cook, or canoodling with the typewriter—the female secretary, that is, not the machine. This is comedy that is both designed to appeal to women, the chief purchasers of the views, and that ultimately works to shore up assumptions about gender roles even as it acknowledges a changing social world.

For all the comprehensive detail that Davis provides about the circulation of these views and about

¹ Kathleen Ash-Milby and David W. Penney, eds., *Kay Walking-Stick: An American Artist* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Books, 2015).

² Laura E. Smith, *Horace Poolaw, Photographer of American Indian Modernity* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2016).

¹ See Jonathan Crary, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990).

the social contexts that they addressed, some questions remain. Chief among these, for me, are the implications of their staging. Just occasionally a figure is identified—Ben Kilburn’s self-portrait relaxing at the back of a barber’s shop; Fontanelle Weller, the daughter of stereographer F. G. Weller, learning to knit. But who constituted the large number of other participants? Were they professional actors? Were they friends who enjoyed amateur dramatics? The command that almost all of them display over gesture and expression, very often exaggerated for the camera, suggests practice and expertise, as well as a connection between stereoviews and theatricality that deserves further exploration.

What, too, of the locations—the proliferation of parlors and drawing rooms, bedrooms and kitchens, each carefully calibrated with decorative markers of class and taste? Davis convincingly makes the point that the average female consumer of this period was well schooled in the interpretation of detail, and wallpaper and knickknacks, mantel shelves and patterned rugs, identifiable engravings on the walls, drapes and china, and conservatory plants—let alone details of dress—are available for decoding and for instruction. But who put these interiors so carefully together? What was shot on location and what in the studio? These are not the bland, generic painted backcloths of nineteenth-century studio portraits but meticulously assembled sets, each calculated to make as realistic an impact as possible, to make the spectator feel as though she could inhabit that very room. Through admirable close readings, Davis brings out how carefully very many of these scenes were designed for this particular mode of viewing. This opening up of immersive possibility is, as she shows us, the ultimate triumph of the stereoscope. The detail pulls the hungry eye into the image and allows the viewer to speculate about imaginative space and action that both is, and is not, a version of her own domestic world.

KATE FLINT

University of Southern California

Jasmine Nichole Cobb. *Picture Freedom: Remaking Black Visual Culture in the Early Nineteenth Century*. New York: New York University Press, 2015. 288 pp.; 20 color illustrations and 51 halftones, notes, index. \$27.00 (paper).

Jasmine Nichole Cobb’s *Picture Freedom: Remaking Black Visual Culture in the Early Nineteenth Century* begins with an 1811 image, one of the earliest known

paintings of an African American woman. As Cobb explains, the portrait of Elizabeth “Mumbet” Freeman by Susan Anne Livingston Ridley Sedgwick shows us “a woman who achieved emancipation by confrontation”; this confrontation is not physical but is accomplished through Freeman’s “side-eyed stare” that meets the viewer in a calm and almost sophisticated self assurance (28). In her 1853 biography of the sitter, Catharine Maria Sedgwick (sister-in-law of Susan Anne Sedgwick; both were authors) recounted how Freeman intervened to save her sister from an abusive slave mistress. Freeman showed visitors the wound she received in the struggle to embarrass her mistress, thus using her body to undermine her mistress’s status (28). Freeman subsequently worked as a long-term domestic for the Sedgwick family, first as a free woman and later as a paid servant.

Freeman’s portrait is Cobb’s first example of the book’s main point, to demonstrate how African Americans seeking self-representation also sought to disrupt visual narratives about black inferiority. She finds this disruptive force in surprising places, including the parlor in the middle-class white American home. Cobb argues that the “transatlantic parlor” became a place that included African American freedom within its periphery, covertly making freedom more acceptable to the white middle class. She asserts that close analysis of “seemingly disconnected materials like racist caricatures, Black newspapers, and abolitionist material” (151) from the nineteenth century reveals how black and white viewers used print culture to address issues of black freedom.

As an example, by analyzing proslavery and abolitionist media together, Cobb is able to consider compounded concepts such as racial hypervisibility on a national scale. Her most innovative point is that photography functioned as a vehicle of struggle and negotiation for African Americans throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Cobb presents an interesting, if belabored, point about the “friendship albums” that educated African American women traded among themselves as an example of additional disruptive spaces. These albums allowed them to use sketches of flowers and excerpts of poetry or verse as creative ways to express their individuality. Cobb points readers to an important conclusion in the field of nineteenth-century African American women’s literature and culture when she writes, “different from historical analyses of the friendship album, this chapter considers theories of feminist spectatorship to treat the album as a media artifact and to think about private practices

Copyright of Winterthur Portfolio is the property of Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.