2 John Szarkowski, *The Photographer's Eye* and Stephen Shore, *The Nature of Photographs*

Both Szarkowski and Shore attempt to give what they feel are the defining characteristics of photographs. Szarkowski's book is based on the exhibition of the same title that he curated in 1966. Shore's book was published in 1998 and can be seen as being in the same tradition as Szarkowski's book. There is a sense in which whatever else a photograph is, it is first of all what they say it is, although some would argue that this approach is too limiting.

Both of these books are very well illustrated, and should be referred to in order to fully appreciate their authors' arguments. Note that the illustrations used in this book to illustrate the Szarkowski and Shore summaries are, for the most part, different from those used by the authors, and as such are interpretations of their points. Unfortunately, *The Photographer's Eye* is no longer in print.

THE PHOTOGRAPHER'S EYE

Szarkowski says his book is about '... what photographs look like, and why they look that way' (p. 6). Unlike paintings that are '*made*', based on traditional skills and theories, photographs were selected, i.e. '*taken*'. For early photographers, this raised a new issue of creativity as to how a mechanical process could make meaningful images that revealed a point of view. Since photography did not have the old artistic traditions, Szarkowski states that the answer to the question was not to be found in the photographic work of those who tried to follow those old traditions.

New ways to make the meaning clear were to be found, firstly in the work of those who consciously broke from the tradition and secondly from the multitude

of new photographers from many different backgrounds who never had any allegiances to, or were ignorant of the traditions of painting. By 1853 these photographers were producing millions of photographs a year. The degree of skill and knowledge behind these images varied but all were a '... part of a massive assault on our traditional habits of seeing' (p. 6). Once photography became easier with the advent of the dry plate process in the late nineteenth century, the impact became greater, as this led to the development of the hand-held camera and the snapshot. The new mass of amateur photographers photographed things because they looked nice. They had no time for such concepts such as composition and form. A vast variety of things were photographed in many different ways. Whereas an artist could show a dozen perspectives of a hand, the photographer could produce an infinite number. Although most of these images seemed accidental, some were coherent and had significance. These images broadened the way in which people looked at the world and in turn influenced the way other photographs were taken. The way photography 'described' a thing was new, as was the range of its subject matter. Unlike painting it was cheap, quick and was not precious. It recorded anything. 'By the end of the century, for the first time in history, even the poor man knew what his ancestors had looked like' (p. 7).

The photographer learnt from his own practical experience and from the multitude of other photographs being produced. Photographers of varying abilities with different aims took the photographs reproduced in Szarkowski's book. 'They have in fact little in common except for their success, and a shared vocabulary: These pictures are unmistakably photographs. The vision they share belongs to no school or aesthetic theory, but to photography itself' (p. 7). If this is the case then a history of photography can be made that refers to how photographers have become aware of, and have developed the particular characteristics of this unique medium. Szarkowski describes five characteristics that he argues are interdependent aspects of photography that he hopes '... may contribute to the formulation of a vocabulary and a critical perspective more fully responsive to the unique phenomena of photography' (p. 8). The characteristics are 'The Thing Itself', 'The Detail', 'The Frame', 'Time' and 'Vantage Point'.

The thing itself

Photography deals with the actual; the photographer had to accept and 'treasure' this or else is defeated by photography. The intelligent photographer realized that the world was itself an incomparably inventive artist and he was able to '... recognize ... anticipate ... clarify ...' and make permanent aspects of the world.

Despite being factual and convincing the photographs were also different from reality. Reality was filtered, reduced in size, rendered in monochrome, clarified and/or exaggerated. The photographer had to both see the reality and the photograph he had not yet taken and make his choices in terms of this unseen photograph.

This was an artistic rather than a scientific problem, yet people believed the camera could not lie. It was easier for the photographer to agree with this view or at least pretend to. As a result, it was credible to claim that the camera saw the truth and the eyes an illusion. In support of this, he quotes from Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables*. Holgrave, a fictional daguerreotypist in the story, says that no matter how hard he tried the camera always revealed the true character of his subject, in this case the very negative characteristics of the sitter when everyone else saw him as a good and pleasant person.

Szarkowski concludes by quoting William M. Evans, 'The nineteenth century began by believing that what was reasonable was true and would end up by believing that what it saw a photograph of was true' (p. 8).

The detail

Out of the studio the photographer could not 'pose' the truth. Rather, he found it fragmented in nature and from these fragmented facts he had to force the truth. These facts, 'suggestive clues,' could not be assembled into a narrative, a story, but by isolating and documenting fragments he gave them meaning and significance, which was more than description. Szarkowski describes the often trivial subjects of photography as having a 'compelling clarity' that suggested they were not trivial but had, prior to photography, unseen meaning. While photographs could not tell stories '... they could be read as symbols' (p. 9).

He finds it curious that the decline of narrative painting has been attributed largely to photography as he feels photography has failed as narrative. Of Robinson's and Rejlander's complex, posed montages he says that even the Victorians recognised them as 'pretentious failures' (p. 9). He dismisses early picture magazine story telling sequences as superficially coherent and lacking 'photographic discovery'. Even major documentary projects like that of Mathew Brady is dependent on text to explain the events photographed. Szarkowski feels that Robert Capa's quote 'If your pictures aren't good you're not close enough' express 'both the narrative poverty and the symbolic power of photography' (p. 9).

The frame

The photographer's subject is never self-contained because it is selected not conceived. The edges of the photograph surrounded what he saw as most important, but in reality the subject extended beyond the frame. By isolating the subject or subjects from their surroundings new relationships are formed. 'The central act of photography, the act of choosing and eliminating, forces a concentration on the picture edge–the line that separates in from out–and on the shapes that are created by it' (p. 9).

For practical reasons, early photographers could not enlarge their photographs, they contact printed the whole of their glass plate. If after taking the photograph they wanted to crop out part of the photograph they would have to reduce the size of their final print. Given the enormous practical problems in taking photographs, photographers made sure they filled the frame of the photograph. This usually resulted in parts of things intruding on the edge of the photograph. Although not part of the subject, these things, in a good photograph, added to the balance and correctness of the photograph. For the photographer, the world provided an infinite number of croppings. In the late nineteenth century, leading painters started to explore this aspect of photography (although some would argue that they were exploring an aspect of oriental art).

Time

Photographs are not instantaneous; they are either longer or shorter time exposures. The distinct piece of time they show is always the present, the period in which they are made, which is unlike other pictures. 'Photography alludes to the past... through its surviving relics, [and] the future through prophecy visible in the present' (p. 10).

Early photographs were taken with slow lenses and films showing a piece of time several seconds long. As a result, photographs accidentally but quite commonly showed blurred movement, ghostly people and other 'failures'. Szarkowski suspects that art historians compare the time-lapse painting of Balla and Duchamp to the photographs of Edgerton and Mili (who deliberately made time-lapse photographs later in the twentieth century), rather than compare Balla and Duchamp's work with the earlier photographs because the earlier photographs were just accidents.

With faster emulsions, lenses and shutters, photography increasingly explored moving objects. The inability of the eye to see parts of fast moving objects is illustrated by the depiction, by various cultures, over thousands of years of running horses. It took Muybridge's photographs of a galloping horse in 1878 to break the inaccurate convention of showing both front and back legs extended. While freezing time, the photographer '... discovered that there was a pleasure and a beauty in this fragmenting of time that had little to do with what was happening. It had rather to do with seeing the... patterning of lines and shapes... previously concealed...' (p. 10). Cartier-Bresson called his approach 'The decisive moment', a phrase Szarkowski feels has been misunderstood. Cartier-Bresson is not referring to a dramatic climax but a visual climax, a picture not a story.

Vantage point

While photography's clarity is recognised, there seems little awareness of its obscurity. Photography '... has shown us pictures that give the sense of the scene, while withholding its narrative meaning'. It uses unusual angles of view, the bird's, the worm's, views from the back of the stage, it distorts by foreshortening or not foreshortening, or using patterns of light, or by the ambiguity of things. Szarkowski quotes Ivins as pointing out how in the nineteenth century the public initially were very aware of photographic distortion, but how they soon began to see photographically. 'Just as nature had once imitated art, so now it began to imitate the picture made by the camera' (p. 11).

Photography continues to challenge our concepts of reality. Szarkowski quotes Alloway who comments on the influence of photography on the paintings of Francis Bacon, 'The evasive nature of his imagery, which is shocking but obscure... is arrived at by using photography's huge repertory of visual images... Bacon used... photography to subvert the clarity of pose of figures in traditional painting' (p. 11).

Photography has had a great influence on painters and writers, yet it is easy to forget its influence on photographers. Not only the influence of great photographers but the influence of the whole mass of photography on those photographers who have used photography as an art form. It '... has been teacher, library, and laboratory...' (p. 11). Much of these photographers' sense of reality and craft and structure '... are anonymous and untraceable gifts from photography itself' (p. 11).

The history of photography is not linear but centrifugal. 'Like an organism photography was born whole. It is in our progressive discovery of it that its history lies' (p. 11).

Szarkowski summarises each of these aspects of photography and follows each summary with a selection of images:

- 'The Thing Itself'. More than other types of images, photographs give a tangible sense of reality. In essence they have been used as a clearer more permanent version 'of the plain fact'. We see the photograph as true because the lens is impartial and we ignore the photographer's role. 'The photographer's vision convinces us to the degree that the photographer hides his hand' (p. 12) (see Figs 1, 2 and 3).
- 'The Detail'. Out of the studio the photographer, unlike the painter, could not bring together things that had been separated in time and space to tell a story. From reality he photographed what was relevant but too ordinary to paint, '... the significant detail. His work, incapable of narrative, turned toward symbol' (p. 42) (see Figs 4 and 5).
- 'The Frame'. 'To quote out of context is the essence of the photographer's craft' (p. 70). He has to decide what to include and what not to. The frame 'isolates unexpected juxtapositions', creates relationships between 'facts' that have been framed, cuts through familiar forms revealing unusual fragments and '... creates the shapes that surround objects' (p. 70). The frame '... is to the photograph as the cushion is to the billiard table' (p. 70) (see Figs 6 and 7).
- 'Time'. Photographs only describe the present. Exposures were so long in early photography they sometimes accidentally described a space–time dimension as the subject moved during exposure. Photographers went on to study isolated segments of time, from galloping horses to milk drops. Cartier-Bresson's 'decisive moment' was subtler. It was not decisive because of some particular event '... but because in that moment the flux of changing forms and patterns was sensed to have achieved balance and clarity and order – because the image became, for an instant, a *picture*' (p. 100) (see Fig. 12).
- 'Vantage Point'. To get a view, clear or otherwise of the subject, the photographer often had to reject the usual vantage point and shoot from above, below, the back, close up, changing orders of importance or obscuring the subject etc. This revealed a richer and more complex world. These images revealed both the clarity and obscurity of things '... and that these mysterious

and evasive images could also . . . seem ordered and meaningful' (p. 126) (see Fig. 12).

THE NATURE OF PHOTOGRAPHS

In the foreword to Shore's book James L. Enyeart says that the texts of P.H. Emerson, John Berger, Roland Barthes and John Szarkowski are the precursors to Shore's book.

Since the 1960s artists such as Robert Rauschenberg, Sigmar Polke, John Baldesari and Cindy Sherman have used '. . . photography for qualities other than its inherent aesthetics . . .' Shore, however, is not concerned with such artists who use photography for other ideas but with those '. . . who remain deeply impassioned by the creative apprehension of the photograph itself' (p. xiv). Shore begins by explaining what a photograph is both as an object and a work of art. By dealing with the photograph as an aesthetic object, not tool of trade, he provides a visual standard which can be applied to other forms of photography.

Enyeart points out that Berger, in *Ways of Seeing*, like Shore, sought to have harmony between '. . . seeing as an instrument of vision and seeing as a revelation of the vision of artists' (p. xiv). Berger expected his strictly visual essays and his written essays to have the same level of communication. However, Berger and Shore come to different conclusions. Berger doubts our ability '. . . to see anything outside our learned assumptions about art (beauty, truth, civilization)' (p. xv), and sees the medium as being allied to our materialist culture. While Shore argues '. . . that it is possible for visual language to inform and reform our learned assumptions . . . a photograph functions by providing a visual grammar . . .' (p. xv) that explains its meaning.

Roland Barthes also sees photography as having its own linguistic powers. However, like Berger he moves towards philosophy away from process, Berger being concerned with 'learned assumptions' about reality and Barthes, the moving but inadvertent aspects of reality he called 'punctum'. Enyeart feels that unlike their work, Shore's is not judgemental.

Enyeart states that Shore's approach is closest to Szarkowski's in that both divide photography into separate sections for critical analysis to the extent that they even have two sections, time and frame, that are the same. They differ in that Shore concentrates on the photograph and Szarkowski on the photographer. Shore's book is divided into four areas, two deal with the physical construction of

photographs and two with how we understand what we see. Enyeart feels it is important that Shore is an artist of international standing who has influenced, amongst others, Hilla and Bernd Becher. He sees the book as '... a primary tool for critical analysis ...' of photographs (p. xvii).

In the prologue to his book, Shore asks of a Robert Frank photograph how different from the actual scene it was and how '... much of this image is a product of lenses, shutters, and emulsions?' Shore says he wants to understand how '... all photographs made with a camera and printed directly from a negative ...' function. 'All photographic prints have qualities in common. These qualities determine how the world in front of the camera is transformed into a photograph; they also form the visual grammar that elucidates the photograph's meaning' (p. 3). Photographs can be viewed on three levels: a physical object; an image (which is an illusionary window onto the world revealing its content, for example a landscape); in this level is the third level which has visual signals that allow us to mentally interpret what is shown by the image. Shore does not want to look at the content of photographs but wants '... to describe the physical and formal attributes of a photographic print that form the tools a photographer uses to define and interpret that content' (p. 3).

The physical level

In most cases, a photographic print is a paper, or plastic or metal base coated, with a light sensitive emulsion of metallic salts or metallic salts coupled with dyes. It is flat (but not a true plane), has edges and does not move. With films and papers, the type of emulsion, developer and light source used will control both how many shades of grey there are and how the tones are compressed or separated. Shore reproduces a print by Richard Benson as an example of one displaying a large tonal range. On the physical level, the flatness determines the plane, the edges the 'boundedness', and the base the texture of the print. On the chemical level, the type of emulsion determines the tonal range and hue of monochrome prints and gives more descriptive information with colour prints.

A photograph is an independent object in the world; it can be stored and displayed in a range ways, bought or sold. The context the viewer sees the photograph in will affect '... the meanings a viewer draws form it' (p. 10).

The depictive level

The physical characteristics of the image are determined by '... physical, chemical, and optical factors' (p. 17) resulting in formal constraints on the way in which a

photograph depicts the world. When the world is photographed it is changed in four ways, in terms of flatness, frame, time and focus. 'They define the picture's depictive content and structure. They form the basis of a photograph's visual grammar' (p. 17). Photographers can express their perceptions and meanings by using them.

Flatness

Although the world is three-dimensional and a photograph is two-dimensional, a photograph can convey the illusion of space. Our perception of three dimensions is helped by our binocular vision. A photograph is the result of monocular vision and as a result it creates relationships between subjects in the foreground and subjects in the background that did not exist before. By changing the camera's vantage point the relationships change. These relationships are the result of photographic vision (see Fig. 13). Out of the studio the photographer is faced with a continuously changing set of relationships as he moves around. 'In bringing order to this situation, a photographer solves a picture more than composes one' (p. 23) (see Fig. 14).

Frame

Unlike the world a photograph has edges, by including something within the edges the photographer can change the photograph's meaning (see Fig. 15). The frame encloses the things that the photographer is interested in, it relates to them and makes the viewer look at them. Monocular vision creates relationships between shapes and lines. The edges of the photograph create visual relationships between these monocular relationships and the frame and also creates relationships of content. Shore gives the example of a Helen Levit photograph, *New York, ca. 1945*, in which a group of five people, only two of whom relate to each other, are brought into a 'jazzy cohesion' by the frame (see Fig. 16). A passive frame is simply one where the image ends. The photograph starts within the frame and works outwards, implying a world extending beyond the frame (see Fig. 17). With an active frame the structure of the photograph starts with the frame and extends inward. We know the world extends beyond the frame but the photograph is a self-contained world (see Fig. 8).

Time

Photographs, unlike the world, are static. They show a new, photographic meaning. In reality, a person saying 'cheese' may appear to be smiling, or if

saying 'crackers' may appear to sneer. Garry Winogrand's photograph *Texas State Fair, Dallas, 1964* shows a cattle handler leaning away from a bull as it sweeps its head around and licks the rim of his hat. The scene only existed for a fraction of a second from one viewpoint before disorder returned (see Figs 11 and 19).

The length of the exposure, in relation to the static film and print, affect photographic time. Szarkowski calls this 'a discrete parcel of time'. Frozen time is a very short exposure like one ten-thousandth of a second and produces a 'new moment' (see colour Figure C3). Extrusive time is longer allowing accumulated movement to register as a blur, e.g. two seconds (see Fig. 18). Still time could have very long exposures, say six minutes, but the subject is still, as is time (see Fig. 24).

Focus

The focus creates an order of importance in the depictive space by creating one plane of focus in the depictive space. This separates the subject of the photograph from its content. P.H. Emerson's photograph *During the Reed Harvest* has a little depth of focus, i.e. a shallow depth of field, which separates the reed harvesters in the foreground from the one in the background and the background itself (see Fig. 20).

Shore uses Robert Adams's photograph *Outdoor Theater Cheyenne Mountain* to show how although a photograph itself is only on one plane, when we look at its depictive space our eyes seem to us to change focus. Further, the way the eyes seem to focus can be opposite from reality, things that were further away in reality can seem to require closer focus when looking at the image (when looking at the clouds in the photograph for example) (see Fig. 21). He uses a Jan Groover photograph to illustrate how a view camera can turn the plane of focus from parallel to the film plane to perpendicular to it.

The only way to eliminate the order of importance caused by focus is to photograph a flat subject parallel to the film plane as in Brassaï's graffiti photographs (see cover photograph). In other cases, increasing the depth of field will minimise the effect of focus but there is always only one plane in focus and sharpness lessens both in front of and behind it.

The mental level

In real life we construct mental images from the light that enters our brain. People who have their eyesight restored after having been blind from birth initially only

see light. When we look at a photograph, the sensation we have of refocusing our eyes is on a mental level, not an optical one.

Although the mental and depictive pictures may coincide, they are not identical as, at the mental level, we rework the depictive level and construct a mental image of the photograph. In the depictive level, the vantage point, frame, time and focus are the formal decisions that influence the mental level. 'Focus is the bridge between the mental and depictive levels: focus of the lens, focus of the eye, focus of attention, focus of the mind' (p. 56).

Shore uses several photographs to show how what is on the depictive level may not transfer to the mental level, for example deep depictive space may not result in the eye seeming to change focus (see Fig. 22) while shallow depictive space may do so. The complex use of structure, lines, diagonals etc. that would suggest deep mental space may actually not do so (see Fig. 23), while a simple structure may (see Figs 24 and 26). Walker Evans' photograph *Gas Station, Reedsville, West Virginia, 1936* illustrates how when the photographer pays particular attention to parts of a photograph other parts appear to be collaged in (i.e. the sky), when in fact they are not (see Figs 40 and 25).

The photographer decides, either consciously, intuitively or automatically to arrange a photograph in terms of vantage point, frame, focus and time. If this is done effectively, it will have an effect on the viewer.

Mental modelling

Photographers base their photographs on mental models they have in their minds. These models can be very rigid, for example a photographer who only recognises sunsets as worthy of photographing. The other extreme would be an evolving model. In general, the model is unconscious but the photographer can control it, and the mental level, by making it conscious.

By way of illustrating the notion of a changing mental model, Shore suggests that the reader becomes aware of the space between the page and the reader, in doing so the reader's mental model changes. The reader can become aware of other things such as sounds, and while their mental model changes they still '...continue to read and to contemplate the nature of photographs' (p. 72).

Shore says of himself that when he makes photographs his perceptions are fed into his mental model that is then altered to accommodate them and this in turn alters his photographic decisions, all of which finally alter his perceptions. It is an ongoing self-modifying process.

'The print provides the physical framework for the visual parameters of the photographic image. The formal decisions, which themselves are a product of the nature of that image, are the tools the mental model uses to impress itself on the picture' (p. 78). Each level is the foundation for the next, which reflects back broadening the meaning of the earlier. 'The photographic image turns a piece of paper into a seductive illusion or a moment of truth and beauty' (p. 78).

ASSIGNMENTS/DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Unlike paintings that are '*made*', based on traditional skills and theories, photographs are selected i.e. '*taken*'. One way a photographer can 'make' a photograph is to arrange or set up a still life and photograph it. Take two photographs, one a set up still life in the studio and the other a found or 'taken' one which you have not arranged or created. Evaluate your results in terms of their success and if to any extent one approach felt more appropriate than the other.
2. Szarkowski points out that paintings are made and photographs taken. For early photographers this raised a new issue of creativity as to how a mechanical process could make meaningful images that revealed a point of view? Szarkowski argues that because photography did not have the old artistic traditions, the answer was not to be found in the work of those who tried to follow those old traditions. Some photographers however, notably Oscar Rejlander and Henry Peach Robinson did try to follow these traditions by making single photographs from different negatives. David Hockney also makes single images from different photographs. Compare a Hockney photograph to one by either of the Victorian photographers. In your response explain what you think the photographs show about the artists' attitude to photography and art in general, and why they have chosen photography as their medium for these images.
3. For Szarkowski, photography's accessibility, cheapness and ease of use allowed a vast number of people to record images. As many of these people had no allegiance to, or were ignorant of paintings traditions, a new way of seeing developed as a vast variety of things were photographed in many different ways. Could it be argued that Hockney's work combines this 'democratic' characteristic of photography with a more conventional notion of art?
4. Make a single image from several negatives or photographs using either the Victorian photographers' approach or Hockney's or both. Be aware that the

Victorian approach using traditional photography will be extremely time consuming, the use of digital photography will make it somewhat quicker.

5. Under the section 'The Thing Itself', Szarkowski says that despite being factual and convincing the photographs are also different from reality, and yet people believed the camera could not lie. It was easier for the photographer to agree with this view or at least pretend to. As a result it was credible to claim that the camera saw the truth and the eyes an illusion. Szarkowski quotes William M. Evans, 'The nineteenth century began by believing that what was reasonable was true and would end up by believing that what it saw a photograph of was true'. The social reformist photographer Lewis Hine wrote 'The average person believes implicitly that the photograph cannot falsify... while photographs may not lie, liars may photograph'. In what sense do we believe the camera never lies? Is the problem with using quotes like Evans' one and sayings like 'the camera never lies' that they are not meant to be taken literally? Evaluate these two quotes and the saying. Include in your evaluation to what extent our understanding of them has changed by the advent of digital photography.
6. Under the heading 'The Detail' Szarkowski describes the often trivial subjects of photography as having a 'compelling clarity' that suggested they were not trivial but had, prior to photography, unseen meaning. Take a series of photographs exploring this notion. (See the cover photograph for example.)
7. Szarkowski is dismissive of photography's attempts at narrative, be they Victorian montages, mid-twentieth century picture magazines or major documentary projects. However, in the book accompanying another exhibition that he curated, *Mirrors and Windows* (looking at the evolvement of the art of photography in America since 1960), he includes a narrative series of photographs by Duane Michals, *Chance Meeting*, 1969. This would suggest that he has changed his mind and that photography is capable of narrative. Look at examples of the type of work given above and evaluate the work in terms of its narrative success or otherwise. Produce a series of images using any of the approaches Michals uses.
8. There are two people on a street, one standing and the other moving. They are completely unrelated, they just happen, at that instant, to be next to each other. By taking a photograph of them in the same frame a relationship is created. Produce two or more images exploring this notion.
9. Early photographers could not enlarge their photographs; they contact printed the whole of their glass plate. This usually resulted in parts of things intruding

on the edge of the photograph. Szarkowski argues that although not part of the subject, these things, in a good photograph, added to the balance and correctness of the photograph. Produce at least two photographs exploring this notion.

10. Explore the notion of time in photography by producing a series of photographs. If you limit yourself to just one aspect of time then you should give a written explanation of other approaches. Aperture #158 *Photography and Time* would be a good reference.

11. Some photographers are particularly noted for their exploitation of vantage point, for example Alexander Rodchenko. Look at his work or that of other photographers that exploit vantage point and produce one or more photographs in the same vein.

12. Szarkowski gives as an example Francis Bacon as an artist whose work was influenced by photography. A contemporary artist whose work has been influenced by photography is Gerhard Richter. Look at the work of both artists and produce either a written evaluation of the way they have exploited photography or produce a practical response to their uses of photography.

13. The five characteristics of photography for Szarkowski are 'The Thing Itself', 'The Detail', 'The Frame', 'Time' and 'Vantage Point'. Take a series of at least five photographs that you feel emphasise each of these characteristics. Your research should include looking at the photographs in *The Photographer's Eye*.

14. In the section 'Flatness' Shore points out that the camera creates relationships between things that are photographed that did not exist before. Find a scene and photograph it from different viewpoints to create different relationships between the subjects.

15. Shore points out that there are two types of frames, 'active' and 'passive'. Take two or more photographs illustrating them.

16. 'Frozen', 'extrusive', and 'still time' are the three ways in which photography reveals time. Take a series of photographs that illustrate these three concepts of time.

17. The focus creates an order of importance in the depictive space by creating one plane of focus in the depictive space. This separates the subject of the photograph from its content. Produce a series of photographs that explore the notion of focus.