

# **Visualizing Urban Nature in Fairmount Park: Discipline, Economic Diversity, and Photography in Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia**

Nate Gabriel

Department of Geography, Rutgers University, Lucy Stone Hall  
54 Joyce Kilmer Avenue, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854-8045

## **Introduction**

The establishment of Fairmount Park occurred in fits and starts in the years that straddled the Civil War. While Philadelphians had for decades been seeking out and enjoying park-like spaces in the city from some time in graveyards, private pleasure grounds, as well as a few small public parks, Fairmount Park was the largest piece of property, about 3,000 acres, ever to be set aside for use by the public as a park in any city in the world. Philadelphia was not alone in its desire for such a park. In the mid-nineteenth century, numerous other cities in the United States established large parks of their own, including New York City (Central Park), Chicago (Lincoln Park), and San Francisco (Golden Gate Park). Often, the story that is told of these parks is that they were a response to popular unrest and demand for spaces of leisure and regeneration that accompanied the changing conditions of industrial cities. Indeed, even a cursory reading of popular writing in newspapers and magazines at the time bears out the connection between industrialization and park-building.

However, in this essay I argue that to draw such a conclusion is too easy an explanation. After all, the lands that would eventually become parks were in many cases already in use for a number a purposes. New York's Central Park, for example, was occupied by the shanty-towns of the poor (Gandy 2002). In Philadelphia, when public sentiment was sufficient to authorize the purchase or seizure of 3,000 acres for use as a public park in 1868, the city was only beginning

to push out beyond the Schuylkill River (though there were already numerous nearby settlements, like Germantown). At that time, the city's populace was still coming to grips with the notion of the industrial city; it had not yet entirely reoriented itself according to the demands of the manufacture of industrial goods. Like Central Park in New York City, the lands that eventually became Fairmount Park were in use for a variety of economic purposes, but these practices were largely ignored as those lands were reframed as a form of nature that, though proximate to the city, was defined by the absence of humans and as a counterweight to the raw economic space of the industrial city. Even as the establishment of Fairmount Park was framed as an effort to preserve, rather than to create, a large expanse of "wilderness" near at hand, it required the removal of numerous factories that dotted the banks of the Schuylkill River. Perhaps more interesting was the erasure as well of small-scale exploitation of forests, fields, and streams, a common practice prior to the establishment of the park. In order to recast the park and the city in these terms, a great deal of work had to be done. It was not always clear to would-be park users how the new park ought to be used. The public required a good deal of education in that regard before it could become a responsible, park-using society.

The Lemon Hill estate held and still holds special significance in narratives about the formation of urban parks in Philadelphia. Its significance derives in large part from the way it symbolized the juxtaposition of urban nature against the capitalist city. Throughout much of the mid-1800s, the Lemon Hill estate was highly valued by those seeking to establish a new park because of the views it offered of the city and of the Schuylkill River (Geffen 1982). According to one writer, 'It only requires a glance at the map or a visit to the ground to convince any one how important it is to secure this piece of land, to make Lemon Hill as it should be—a most

eligible and beautiful tract with boundaries free from objectionable features' (Anonymous 1854). In the 1850s, however, to the dismay of many, the German tenants of the Lemon Hill property operated a popular beer-garden on the site, a purpose that park enthusiasts saw as an affront to the grace and natural beauty of the site; many saw the operation of such an establishment as fundamentally in opposition to preservation of its natural character. One commentator notes that respectable citizens 'had for many years watched with great solicitude the destruction of...a spot incomparably well adapted to the purposes' of an urban park (Anonymous 1856). In describing the destruction, local historian Charles Keyser wrote that 'the tenants settled like incubi upon the spot...the shrubbery [was] destroyed...they erected great ice houses of stone and when these fell into ruin, they left the ruins and erected others in their places' (Keyser 1886: 7).

Such framings of the Lemon Hill beer-garden proved effective, and soon the sentiment prevailed – the city declined to renew the tenants' lease on the Lemon Hill property, expelled the proprietors of the beer-garden, and eventually incorporated the site into the first iteration of Fairmount Park. The tenants were evicted, and the land was declared public property, leading Keyser to triumphantly proclaim that, 'nature [was] restored....its verdure grows for the eyes of the little child ignorant of the means of [private] property, and for the old man who has long outlived the hope of acquiring it' (ibid.: 11). Thus, for Keyser and others, establishing a park at the Lemon Hill estate set it out of bounds for economic uses of any kind, producing a non-human – and non-economic – realm, while simultaneously maligning commerce in places of refuge. Though the struggle continued elsewhere during the first decades of the park's existence, for example where activity from taverns operating near park boundaries spilled onto park lands, the land occupied by the Lemon Hill estate became the keystone of the larger park that was

established in 1868 with the acquisition of thousands of acres, including lands previously occupied by factories and country estates along the Schuylkill River. It remains, not incidentally, central to the history of the park as it is told today, a reminder of the binary at the heart of the meaning of the park.

By 1868, the popular desire for a park was sufficient to authorize the Pennsylvania State Assembly to purchase or seize thousands of acres from wealthy suburban estates and industrial operators along the Schuylkill River (Geffen 1982). Newspaper commentary of the time clearly reflects the social and economic division between the park and the city. For example, it was in parks that Philadelphians could “get a breath of God's pure air, or enjoy the grateful shade and sweet aroma of woods...[where urban people] can be transported in a few minutes from the heat, and dust, and noise of a great city—its disagreeable sights, and smells, and sounds – into a rural scene of surprising loveliness, amid green fields, and purling brooks, and the waving forest, and flowering shrubbery...” (Anonymous 1859). For another writer, the need for a park was urgent: “[Philadelphia] must have some rest of business and labor...[Fairmount Park is] a place not surpassed anywhere for this object” (Anonymous 1875). While these sentiments were frequently communicated in daily and weekly newspapers and magazines through the mid-nineteenth century, they are silent about the specific, everyday acts that constituted the park. It still tells us little about how, that is by what means, this framing took hold and how it acted on urban people. Much of that work was done through the use of photography, spurred on by new technological improvements that allowed for the mass-production and wide dissemination of images.

## **Parks and Photography**

Much has been made of the power of photographs to fix meaning and to lend the illusion of objective truth and permanence of the subjects they depict (Rose 2007, Tagg 1988, 2009). This view goes at least back to Henry Fox Talbot, who was the first to invent a technique for photographic reproduction using negatives. In his book, the *Pencil of Nature*, Talbot celebrated the potential uses of photography for inventorying, since it allowed the photographer to make quick and reproducible record of items stored, for example, on a bookshelf. The photograph, he wrote, was advantageous 'both for completeness of detail and correctness of perspective' (Talbot 1844). But Talbot was also enamored of the ability of photographs to record nature's 'artistry', enabling the photographer to reproduce nature's wonders that he or she could only approximate by other means, like painting or drawing. For Talbot, the photographer was a documentarian, or perhaps a scientist, but never an artist.

Of course, the notion of objectivity on the part of the photographer ignores the decisions that photographers must make in doing their work. Such considerations include the positioning of the camera, the framing of the shot, the composition of scenes, and so on. In addition, both the photographer and the photograph itself are part of larger social assemblages, embedded in social webs, not working independently, but constrained (as well as enabled) in what they can do, and in what be said meaningfully (Tagg 2009). Thus, the photograph is not a simple medium for recording visual information any more than the photographer acts independently of social context. In this sense, photography is a political practice, and works to produce some forms of knowledge while destroying others. To the extent that photography is directed at depicting human activities in space, it is productive of particular kinds of subjects that are capable of some forms of behavior and incapable of others. In other words, 'Photography operates in disciplinary

discourses to arrest, isolate, and instantiate the body in relation to the axes of time and space; it enables the decipherment, delineation, and analysis of the body's surface' (Lalvani 1996: 33, citing Butler 1990).

This is especially significant for the present case since the era of large park construction coincided with an era of rapid era of innovation in photography. New developments in photographic technology occurred during the mid- to late-1800s, but perhaps the most significant, at least for the purposes of this essay, were improvements in the collodion process, which improved on Talbot's earlier success in reproducing images from paper negatives. While the concept of producing copies from negatives had been demonstrated some time before, it was the collodion process, which used glass slides rather than paper ones, that enabled photographers to produce durable negatives that could be stored and reused almost indefinitely, increasing the quality and thrift of photographic reproduction, and consequently the geographic reach of particular images or collections of images. These improvements gave photographers access to increasingly extensive circuits of communication compared to the daguerreotype, Talbot's calotype, and other techniques that could not be so easily reproduced.

A photographer named James Cremer, who lived in Philadelphia in the 1870s, took advantage of this new opportunity in publishing a set of photographs of Fairmount Park in the first years of its existence. In a sense, Cremer's images were an extension of trends established by earlier nature artists, most notably those of the Hudson River School, a nineteenth century group of landscape painters who, according to one historian, believed that, "nature had religious, therapeutic, and/or didactic values" (Driscoll 1981, p. 2; see also Kornhauser 2003, O'Toole 2005). Many of Cremer's photographs seem to borrow themes from the Hudson River School,

such as the juxtaposition of men and natural landscapes (compare Figure 1, a painting by Asher Durand, and Figure 2, an image from Cremer's collection), suggesting that Cremer's photographs were similarly intended to demonstrate the proper role of "man" in nature. While no direct evidence of Cremer's engagement with the Hudson School, the ideas expressed by Hudson River painters were also common among park advocates (c.f. Geffen 1982).

On the other hand, Cremer's work played a much different didactic role from that of the Hudson River School. While some of the landscapes depicted by Hudson River School painters were within reach of wealthier patrons, most of the people who enjoyed their work would never have had the opportunity to visit them (indeed, that fact was one of the strongest arguments in favor of large urban parks)(Novak 2007). Moreover, many Hudson School paintings, including the one included here (Figure 1) depict idealized scenes, cobbled together from multiple sites. By contrast, Cremer's work was meant for local consumption, and the scenes depicted were meant to be visited. Drawing visitors to the park was the central purpose of the collection. By drawing on the ideals established by the Romantic movement (of which the Hudson River School was a part), Cremer used photography, with all the properties ascribed to it by Talbot and others like him, in what seemed like an innocent effort to document the park shortly after its founding. Nevertheless, Cremer's work is better seen as a collection of political statements that helped to establish the park as an object of knowledge, and the people who used it as its subjects.

Cremer's images helped to produce the park as an object of knowledge by identifying, describing, and emphasizing particular characteristics of park lands over others. Cremer's photographs did so by placing the park within a teleological narrative of urban change, in which economic development rendered "pre-capitalist" modes of production obsolete as capitalist ones

came to dominate. Producing the park as a place that is outside of the space of work by setting it up as an oppositional space to the city, the photographs also asserted an ethical framing that circumscribed the bounds of behavior in and out of the park. In producing this set of statements about the identity of the park, Cremer provided a means of knowing the park to a populace that until then lacked a coherent framing until then. Cremer's work can be categorized into three types of images. The first category depicts a series of sites that are contained in the park. Predominant in these images are the forests, rivers, streams, and open fields that can be found there. Most are taken at some distance, sometimes featuring a lone individual (usually a man) off in the distance. Another category emphasizes people, alone or in groups, in quiet contemplation. These scenes also feature paths, benches, or bridges, the components of the park that facilitate the rest that humans were supposed to seek in the park. The third category features individuals (again, usually men) up close, usually engaged in active interaction with the natural features in the park.<sup>i</sup>

To a great extent, Cremer's photographs helped to reinforce an emerging understanding of urban space that took for granted the reorientation of economic activity toward industrial production and a shift away from a form of social organization in which rural economies were more closely integrated with their urban counterparts. It achieved that effect by focusing on 'rural' scenes. Not incidentally, this was a common trope employed elsewhere in the United States where other large parks were established (Young 1995, Olmsted and Sutton 1997). Cremer's work features many examples in which a solitary man is shown reclining against a wooden fence bordering a field or pasture (Figure 3). A short, three-paragraph essay affixed to the reverse side of all of his Fairmount Park photographs helps to illustrate the significance of such scenes. The essay includes a list of historical homes in the park, only recently vacated,

which were acquired at the park's founding, in which the homes and their surrounding grounds are not cast as viable dwellings or productive landscapes, but as links to past economic endeavors that were by then hopelessly out of reach, except through collective remembrance. These houses, in Cremer's view, were relics of a way of life that had disappeared, replaced by the encroaching city. Thus, for him, while the park couldn't bring back that past way of life, it could help Philadelphians to remember what was lost.

Another theme in Cremer's photographs was the tendency to depict human beings as visitors within the larger context of the park's natural landscape. That work was done by shifting the placement of the photographer himself. Many images are taken from a great distance away, often from a point high above the photographs' subjects, in order to take in the extent of the subjects' surroundings. In emphasizing the character of the landscape, the person within it becomes anonymous. Explicit reference to features in the park like the forest and the river place humans outside of the park even as they are within it. Again, the essay on the back of the photos helps in this interpretation. Cremer writes that "the city has purchased the ground of either side of the Schuylkill River...and have [sic] dedicated it as a Public Park and Pleasure Ground.... For natural beauty, it is unsurpassed, and has every variety of scenery - cascades, green wooded islands, meadows, uplands, lawns, rocky ravines, hill-summits and open fields." Together with the variety of scenes like that shown in Figure 2, the essay reveals the park as a space constituted by this collection of "natural" constituents, not by the people who visit them.

Cremer accomplishes this work as much by what he omits as by what he includes. When Cremer took his photographs, the park was very much a work in progress, and in many places its forests and pastures were interrupted up by roadways, mills, and manufacturing works well into

the turn of the century. While such sites were mainstays in the framing of Philadelphia's economic landscape only a decade before (as an emerging industrial city), they are given no place in Cremer's photographic description of the park. Bracketing out these sites, Cremer underscored a framing of the park as a preserve, as a space of exception set aside in the face of the expanding city. Omitting any reference to the importance of water-ways as power sources in industrial production, for example, obscured the decisions that led to the shift toward coal power and industrial production. To incorporate images of factories and mills would have required a different framing of the park than that of a pre-industrial space.

Finally, Cremer's photographs established a set of ethical guidelines for their intended audience that maintained this distance between the park and economic activity. They invited city dwellers into the park, encouraging them to sit, read, explore, and be inspired by the park's natural surroundings. Many of his photographs show people engaged in direct enjoyment of the park's natural surroundings, sitting for picnics (Figure 4), relaxing on benches, reading newspapers or books, or simply reclining on lawns. In short, Cremer's park was for leisure, not work. In that way, this group is also notable for its omissions: visitors to the park are never shown engaging in any kind of economic activity. As already discussed, factories found no place in Cremer's narrative, but neither did the kinds of forest-based economic activities that many people living in Philadelphia engaged in regularly, including the harvesting of fruits, nuts, firewood, river ice, or timber. With these activities in mind, I shift my discussion to the Fairmount Park Guard, an appendage of the park commission that was charged with maintaining civil order in the park. Specifically, I turn toward the Guard's record of criminal activity in the park, one of the few places where a record of the economic uses of park lands was maintained.

## **Erasing Economic Difference in the Park**

'The matter of clubbing trees [to obtain fruits and nuts] has become a serious one....Many of the best as well as the lowest class of citizens seem to be of the opinion that they have a right to club trees [in the park] and take any fruit they can obtain....There are many fruit trees in isolated places *that are of no benefit* and had better be cut down.' (Louis Chasteau, Annual Report of the Fairmount Park Guard, 1878, emphasis added)

When the Pennsylvania State Assembly passed the bill that authorized the formation of Fairmount Park, it also authorized the formation of the Fairmount Park Guard. Beginning in 1872, just four years after the official founding of the park, the captain of the guard, Louis Chasteau, began submitting annual reports of the Guard's activities to his superiors. Chasteau's reports span a twenty-seven year period and document, among other things, the Guard's efforts to shift park users' activity away from the practices oriented toward extractive uses of forest resources, and to replace them with a new set of activities oriented toward leisure. Chasteau and his officers faced a great deal of resistance in this regard, a fact that offers a different view on what has often been seen as a preexisting division between the park and the city. From these reports, it seems that the relationship is flipped: it was the policing practices of the park guard that brought the division into being.

That work was accomplished by the park guard in two general ways. First, like Cremer's photographs, it produced the park as an object of knowledge, as a thing that could be known through the use of statistics and detailed record-keeping for the surveillance of the park. Second, the park guard maintained the moral landscape of the park by punishing park visitors who

engaged in one set of practices, and encouraging another set.

The guard's surveillance of the park began by stationing guards at newly-constructed guard houses at regular intervals throughout the park. Guards were encouraged to move about the park within a prescribed territory, so that visitors became familiar with individual guards. In this way, the potential presence of a park officer served as a deterrent for criminal activity as well as for more minor violations of park rules. Among these rules was the designation of specific park entrances and trails where visitors could walk, ride, and drive. Chastreau's reports demonstrate that the role of the park guard was not simply to provide for the safety of visitors. It was also there to enforce adherence to the moral code that undergirded the set of rules instituted for humans' use of the park. The behavior of adults and the care of children, including the enforcement of gender roles and sexual norms, as well as the bounds of appropriate forms of recreation, fell within the purview of the park guard.

Among his duties, Chastreau was charged with the maintenance of "The Statistics", a report that communicated to park commissioners a series of data points related to the use and abuse of park lands. They included a list of "nuisances" confronted by park guards ("bands of gypsies", "dead dogs"), the number of picnics that took place in the park, the number and point of entry of park visitors, and a list of the rules that had been violated ("insulting women", "throwing stones", "females swimming"). It is important to note, however, that the purpose of Chastreau's reports does not seem to have been to document every offense that occurred in the park during the course of the year, since Chastreau's reports were often inconsistent. The categories of events reported (offenses, nuisances, etc) changed from year to year. This fact illustrates that their key function was not simply to record human activity in the park, but to

establish the park as a specific kind of space in which certain things were meant to happen and others were, to define the park's boundaries, to distinguish it from the city. By posting a list of rules at all entrances, and attempting to prevent entry into the park except at these spots, the guard achieved some success in that regard, producing an ethical landscape in the park that included a set of criteria that related directly to economic activity in the park. These guidelines included the following: "No person shall carry fire-arms or shoot birds in the Park...disturb the fish or water-fowl in the pool or pond, or birds in any part of the Park...cut, break, or in any wise injure or deface the trees, shrubs, plants, [or] turf...[or] take ice from the Schuylkill within the Park...." Such rules spoke directly to a set of activities that many park users would have otherwise desired to engage in. Indeed, despite the more-or-less clear designation of rules guidelines, many park users continued to pursue other ends.

For the purposes of this essay, key components of Chastean's reports are his narrative descriptions of violations in the park, which highlight a set of economic practices that continued to be performed in the park long after it was established and its guidelines enforced. The offenses Chastean documents run the gamut of "precapitalist" practices, including those related to subsistence, like the collection of fruits and nuts (to which the term "tree-clubbing" above refers), "shooting at game", and "killing rabbits"; it also included the cutting of ice from the river during the winter, fishing, felling trees, and collecting fallen limbs for firewood. Chastean's frequent remarks on such practices suggests that they were commonplace. The guard was kept busy trying to prevent the collection of ferns, leaves, and medicinal plants from the park. In an especially telling episode from a report in 1878, from which the epigraph at the beginning of this section is an excerpt, two boys were arrested for collecting nuts from trees found in the park. The

next day, the boys' father visited Chasteau's office, arguing that the boys had a right to collect nuts from public land. Indeed, he argued that he had moved with his boys to a house adjacent to the park so that they could 'have the advantages of all that might be obtained' from it. This and other events reported throughout the 1870s, 80s, and 90s suggest that the division between the leisure-space of the park and the work-space of the city imposed by the park guard and the Fairmount Park Commission more broadly was by no means universal. Because of these frustrations, Chasteau eventually submitted a request to the park commission to destroy all fruit trees in the park to prevent their use.

Simultaneously, the activities of the park guard seem in contradiction to a yearly event that was instituted in the first years of the park's existence. On "Nutting Day", school children were invited by the thousands to collect chestnuts, walnuts, and hazelnuts found in the park (Burley and Kidder 1876, p430). Three years after the park's founding, in 1871, it was estimated that one in six individuals living in Philadelphia participated in the event, many of whom were the adult guardians of the schoolchildren for whom the event ostensibly was created (Keyser 1872). It would seem, then, that the park commission's endorsement of the event was an embrace of the economic uses of parks to which Chasteau seemed so vehemently opposed. On the other hand, Nutting Day was meant for children, not for working adults. To that effect, one participant described Nutting Day as a time for remembering 'the old times when Fair-Mount was nothing more than a wildwood' (Calkins 1871: 585). Another explained about Nutting Day that: 'To the children, it was something which, in after years, would appear a big bright slice of their childhood. It was a new song in the dusty market-place which they would learn by heart and we fancy will never forget.... Contact with God's world outside of a town is as necessary for the

development of the soul of a boy as fresh air is for his body' (Keyser 1872: 116). Thus, in its own way, Nutting Day was like Cremer's reframing of the homes and estates encompassed by the park, a reflection of what many saw as the emerging hegemony of the capitalist city, a force that rendered other forms of economic practice obsolete, the domain of the past, more akin to the play of children than to the work of adults. Ultimately, Chasteau was unsuccessful in his campaign to remove fruit- and nut-bearing trees from the park (there are still plenty that remain). On the other hand, Nutting Day ended only a few years after it began, and deriving economic value remains illegal today (though it also remains a popular, if "invisible" pastime - see Gabriel 2006).

## **Conclusion**

The establishment of large urban parks in the mid-1800s was part of a broader effort to establish a set of economic relations oriented around industrial production. Parks like Fairmount Park served a discursive function to situate the space of the park within, but conceptually beyond, the economic space of the city. The establishment and maintenance of urban parks helped to do some of the discursive work required to render another set of practices unviable. Yet, the practices that would be erased by the imposition of this new discursive frame proved resistant - the narrowed vision of the industrial city proved inadequate for the desires of urban populations living near forested lands. The annual reports of the Fairmount Park Guard demonstrate that those living in cities did not always share this vision, and continued to pursue a different mode of urban living that could be found neither in the visual representation of the park found in Cremer's photographs, nor in the guidelines instituted and enforced by the Fairmount Park Guard.

And yet, the work that such techniques accomplish is never complete, however dominant a particular framing might become. Nature and the city, whatever qualities might be attributed to them, must be reproduced again and again. The illegalization of plant gathering in parks continues to be performed by urban environmental managers today, even as users of those environments continue to push at the boundaries of acceptable behavior. By becoming sensitive to these conflicts, we can begin to imagine what other worlds are possible and what practices are bracketed out of our understanding of the spaces we inhabit.

## References

- Anonymous. 1854. "Lemon Hill." *Daily Reporter*, Nov 16.
- Anonymous. 1856. "Public Parks." *Daily Times*, April 24.
- Anonymous. 1859. "Fairmount Park." *Philadelphia Evening Journal*, Aug 29.
- Anonymous. 1875. "Something Worth Seeing." *Trenton Daily Gazette*, May 25.
- Burley, Sylvester W. and Charles Holland Kidder. 1876. *American Enterprise*. Philadelphia: S. W. Burley, Publisher.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Calkins, Norman Allison. 1871. *The Student and Schoolmate: An Illustrated Monthly for Youth*, vols. XXVII-XXVIII. Boston: Joseph H. Allen, Publisher.
- Chasteau, Louis. 1878. *Annual Report of the Fairmount Park Guard*. Original housed in the Philadelphia City Archive.
- Driscoll, John Paul. 1981. *All That is Glorious Around Us: Paintings from the Hudson River School on Loan from a Friend of the Museum of Art*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University.
- Gabriel, Nathaniel. 2006. *Urban Non-Timber Products in Philadelphia*. Unpublished thesis, Philadelphia: Temple University.
- Gandy, Matthew. 2002. *Concrete and Clay: Reworking Nature in New York City*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Geffen, Elizabeth M. 1982. "Industrial Development and Social Crisis: 1841-1854." in *Philadelphia: a 300-Year History*, edited by Russel Frank Weigley, 307-362. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Keyser, Charles Shearer 1872. *Fairmount Park: Sketches of its Scenery, Waters, and History*. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, and Haffelfinger.
- Kesyer, Charles Shearer 1886. *Lemon Hill and Fairmount Park*. Philadelphia: Thomas Cochran, Horace J. Smith.
- Kornhauser, Elizabeth Mankin 2003. *Hudson River School: Masterworks from the Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art*. New Haven: Yale University Press in association with Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art.
- Lalvani, Suren. 1996. *Photography, Vision, and the Production of Modern Bodies*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Novak, Barbara. 2007. *Nature and Culture: American Landscape and Painting, 1825-1875*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Olmsted, Frederick Law and Silvia Barry Sutton. 1997. *Civilizing American Cities: Writing on City*. New York: Da Capo Press.
- O'Toole, Judith Hanson. 2005. *Different Views in Hudson River School Painting*. New York: Columbia University Press in association with Westmoreland Museum of American Art.

- Rose, Gillian. 2007. *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual Materials*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Tagg, John. 1988. *The Burden of Representational Essays on Photographies and Histories*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tagg, John. 2009. *The Disciplinary Frame: Photographic Truths and the Capture of Meaning*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Talbot, William Henry Fox. 1844. *Pencil of Nature*. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longman.
- Young, Terrence. 1995. "Modern Urban Parks," *Geographical Review* 85:544-560.
- 

i        A fourth category, which I do not discuss at length here, depicts groups of park visitors convened in fields or near buildings situated in the park (only a few examples exist of the latter). These images are left out of my discussion because they do not seem to be meant as a representation of park behavior. Instead, the individuals present are explicitly posing for the photograph.

