In June 1924, Elias Goldensky (1867-1943) traveled from his Philadelphia studio to demonstrate his portrait photography technique at the Convention of the Ontario Society of Photographers in Toronto. To encourage attendance, the Society printed a publicity card with Goldensky's portrait. The text on the back reflects the esteem with which Goldensky was held by his professional colleagues:

Mr. Elias Goldensky, the Wizard of Photography, is coming from Philadelphia to demonstrate at our convention.... He has demonstrated at Conventions perhaps more than any other living photographer. He is a most interesting lecturer and has the great gift of being a natural teacher; he can, and will, solve your many lighting problems. He will show how to so balance a lighting that he can light four subjects at opposite corners at one time, clever as this may be in its practical way; he will also demonstrate how to make pictorial work. He is an acknowledged artist, in addition to his practical craftsmanship. Three Big Performances from the brain of this marvelous workman. You owe it to yourself to see and hear him....

The wizard did not disappoint his audience. As reported by the Toronto Star Weekly on June 28 under the headline, “King of the Camera Works Like Greased Lightning,” Goldensky, described as “one of the six best in the country,” took 400 portraits in 55 minutes while keeping up an amusing running commentary:

“Good morning, madam,” he began, “in the matter of portraits we have two sizes, one at six photos for twenty dollars, one at six for forty. You are now sitting in the twenty dollar position.” The sitter moves automatically and a bit uneasily. “Thank you,” he remarks immediately, “that is much better. You are now sitting in the forty dollar position,” and he gestures towards his conferees as much as to say, “See how simple it is.”
Figure 1: J.C. Strauss. Elias Goldensky with cigar. Platinum print, ca. 1910. Many pictures of Goldensky as an adult include a cigar. This picture was later used as the basis for a caricature by "Vet" Anderson, published in the Chat magazine, January 1918. George Eastman House 77:116:1123
Who was this wizard and how did he achieve this pinnacle of his profession?

To place Goldensky's career in context, a brief overview of the development of photography in nineteenth century Philadelphia may be helpful.

Photography in Philadelphia

During the first fifty years after Daguerre, Talbot, and Bayard publicly introduced photography in England and France in 1839, Philadelphia was the second largest city in the United States and was an important center for art, science and manufacturing. Moreover, as Terence Pitts has written, "From 1839 until the 1890's, Philadelphia... staked a good claim to being the country's photographic center, and was preeminent in optics, medical and astronomical applications, publishing, and more." It was justifiably renowned for its photographic portrait studios; Robert Cornelius opened one of the first daguerreotype establishments in the world in 1840. Others prominent in photography included the Langenheim brothers, who introduced stereographic transparencies; Isaac Rehn, the first commercial ambrotypist; Casper W. Briggs, the leading manufacturer of lantern slides; John Carbutt, the first U.S. manufacturer of gelatin dry plate negatives; and Frederick Gutekunst, who led a growing cohort of Philadelphia portrait photographers.

There were more than 130 portrait studios in Philadelphia when Goldensky opened for business in 1895. He was one of the first photographers from Russia to work in the city. At that time, no other Philadelphia photography studio had an Eastern European Jewish name, so he may have held a small temporary advantage for the expanding immigrant market.

In addition to his work as a professional portrait photographer, Goldensky also produced photography as an art form. Nineteenth-century Philadelphia was an important center for photography as a medium for personal expression. The first organization in the United States devoted to amateur art photography, the Amateur Photographic Exchange Club, was formed in Philadelphia in 1861 and included Oliver Wendell Holmes among its members. Philadelphia gained widespread attention for major photographic exhibitions, such as at the Centennial Exposition of 1876 and the International Exhibition of Photography in 1886, the latter organized by the Photographic Society of Philadelphia (founded 1862) at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts. The 1886 exhibition led to a series of annual salons that rotated among Philadelphia, New York, and Boston; they were a key factor in the flowering of American art photography in the 1890s. Goldensky probably saw the sixth exhibition, held in Philadelphia in 1893; Alfred Stieglitz characterized it as "without doubt, the finest exhibition of photographs ever held in the United States."
Despite the growing presence of amateur art photographers, few studio photographers in Philadelphia or elsewhere had much concern for aesthetics. Veteran field and portrait photographer William Bell warned his fellow professionals in 1885 that, with the introduction of the convenient gelatin dry plate, amateur artists represented a potential threat to their preeminence in portraiture. Earlier, most amateurs had found the wet-plate, collodion process too cumbersome. Now some were turning to photography and making professionals wish that their work had, as Bell put it, "more of the artistic element."

By 1900, the high end of the market was ripe for an artist/photographer like Goldensky who could combine the technical quality of the professional with the aesthetic trends in photography developing among the most advanced amateurs, known as the pictorialists, who exhibited in the salons of the 1890s. In portraiture, the pictorialists, in part influenced by the studies of women by James Whistler, incorporated into their compositions home interiors, plain backgrounds modulated with light, or outdoor natural settings, instead of studio props such as columns, drapes, and painted backdrops. Rather than placing the subject squarely in the center of the picture, the "new school" photographers often placed the head near the edge of the frame. Instead of printing sharply focused images on glossy and high contrast albumen, collodion, or gelatin papers, art photographers like Goldensky often used softer lenses and made hand-prepared platinum prints on Jacobi Tissue or other fine papers to obtain a delicate matte surface and fine gradation of mid-tones. Some also made individually prepared gum bichromate prints, which they could produce in different colors, albeit usually in monochrome, and which afforded the printmaker an exceptional degree of control.

The influence of the pictorialists on the professionals was quite evident after 1900. The professional Photographers Society of America, at its annual conventions in the early 1900s, adopted the salon system of juried entries for the convention exhibits, mounted loan exhibitions of amateur pictorialist work, and in other ways "began emphasizing creative accomplishment." As professional German photographer Rudolph Dührkoop (1848-1918) stated, "The amateur has taught us that it is by no means impossible to take portraits in living rooms, or in the open, with natural and individual surroundings, without artificial background, without head support, and without the unnatural way of retouching the face."

Goldensky himself acknowledged that the advanced amateurs had demonstrated to the professionals that it was possible to go beyond a "mere likeness" in portraiture and achieve a unique interpretation of character. He urged other photographers:
Parlow was a Canadian child prodigy and the first North American to study at Imperial Conservatory in St. Petersburg. She later formed the Parlow String Quartet and made numerous tours. George Eastman House 77:116:810
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... individualize your work, because individuality is the keynote to the artistic. It means that the picture should have some purpose and that purpose should not be conflicting; that your intentions should be expressed in the most simplified form, whether it is a type, character or intellect, beauty of line and form. . . .

A good example of what Goldensky advocated may be seen in his portrait of violinist Kathleen Parlow, reproduced here. Parlow is seen in profile. Her right hand, nearest the viewer, holds her bow; this hand is very delicately placed, with the index finger slightly extended, showing that Parlow had long fingers, of great advantage to one in her profession. Parlow's left hand holds her violin upright, diagonally across her body. The violin, with its sculpted form so reminiscent of the female torso, is also posed in profile, formally creating a parallel and implicitly close relationship between the musician and her instrument.

Goldensky used very careful and effective focusing for this image. The figure is clear from the hand nearest the viewer, resting on the right thigh, to the plane of the face. This selective focus was essential. If the out-of-focus top of the violin resting on the left shoulder and seen just under the chin were in clear focus, it would have distracted from the face.

On top of Parlow's temples, there is a bright spot of light, implying inspirational genius, and delicate edge lighting caresses and curves around her nose, chin, and hands, enhancing Parlow's feminine qualities. Elsewhere, there is adequate reflected or ambient light so that her face is well illuminated in the mid-range of the tonal scale. Good separation of details in the mid-range has also been achieved through Goldensky's choice of the platinum print process, which sacrifices depth (i.e. deep blacks) in exchange for exceptional tonal mid-range detail. Finally, note that Goldensky used a plain background with modulated tones; there are no lines in the background to distract from the figure.

In describing his working method at a photographers' convention in 1911, Goldensky stated since there was "not any set rule for taking pictures of everybody, first you must understand your subject" by studying the character and face. As he explained, "A woman is brought into my studio and I am polite by nature, and I say to myself she is a good woman and she has a heart and I look for her beauty and grace. . . ." "I see her as a graceful, beautiful woman whom someone loves, and look for that grace and beauty which we see in the woman we love. . . then I make what I see in her." "When a boy comes in I try to think of him as my boy, and get the expression his father sees in him." He also noted that "in making a photograph of your customer the first thing to observe is yourself, and that constitutes you as a photographer." On another occasion, he said, "I do not make a sitting for money alone, but for the best that is in me in my love for art and for what I can do. I do not make a picture of you. . . . I make a picture which is my idea of you."
Although Goldensky varied his compositional strategies with each sitter, many of his portraits include some of the same stylistic elements, such as the hand secondary only in importance to the face, edge lighting, plain backgrounds, and printing with processes usually associated with fine art rather than commercial photography. But what is most characteristic of his exhibition-quality work is that each of the portraits is ultimately different and composed to best portray the individual qualities of the sitter as Goldensky interpreted them. C.H. Claudy wrote, “Take any ten photographers at random in any large city and nine of them will do approximately the same grade of work. . . The tenth man—Goldensky, Garo, Strauss—will get something else in his picture. . .”

Portraiture may have been Goldensky’s business, but it was also his art. Frank Chambers, who knew him well, wrote in 1907 that “he is so wrapped up in his art he seeks to obtain the acme in each sitting” and that he would send sitters away if he felt “a little ‘off’ on that particular day, or the sitters look a little tired and dragged.” For this attitude, he was considered somewhat irrational by some, but it enhanced his reputation as an artist and attracted wealthy customers. As Goldensky explained to Chambers:

I want individuality and I want my subjects to feel that. If I cannot put my whole soul into the picture that I am about to make, I will not spoil my reputation nor will I disappoint my sitter by giving him something that anybody can make. I must have results and only the best, I don’t care if I do not make a penny out of the sitting. They are after one of my creations, and that’s what they pay for and that is what they get.

By the early 1900s, Goldensky had become the leading practitioner in Philadelphia of the new style. Ulrich Keller has explained that the market for such artistic portraits developed among the upper middle class in reaction to the growth of industry and the cheap commodities of dubious aesthetic merit, including stereotypical portraits, that flooded middle class Victorian homes. One manifestation of this reaction was the Arts and Crafts Movement led by the Englishman, William Morris; in the 1890s, it spread to America through the efforts of Elbert Hubbard and others. Arts and Crafts periodicals encouraged those who could afford it to cultivate aesthetic sensibilities through creating and collecting exquisite objects, writing poetry, playing music, and making pictures, including by photography, in a manner unconstrained by “the economic necessities of rapid production” affecting professional photographers.

Leaders of Arts and Crafts, like the furniture specialist Gustav Stickley, glorified “good work” as the “keynote of life.” “Art,” explained Stickley, “is
Figure 3: Benjamin Goldensky Studio, Kremenchug, Ukraine. Elias Goldensky, ca. 1876, in school uniform with bookbag. Carte-de-visite, albumen paper, buttons hand-colored in original. Uniform and hair style indicate Russification (nontraditional Jewish lifestyle). George Eastman House 77:116:1235.
the flower of which the strong and living root is work, and upon the honesty of that work depends all that is worthy and lasting in art and in life.” Stickley urged readers of his magazine, *The Craftsman*, to further “the growth of a noble and simple architecture and household art that shall make absurd the age of senseless display” and to develop “an interest in handicrafts that shall awaken the old pride and joy in good work for its own sake.”

Goldensky, F. Holland Day, and Rudolf Eickemeyer, Jr., were among those photographers whose work flourished in the Arts and Crafts milieu because they produced hand-crafted prints in a distinctive individual style.

When he opened his studio in 1895, it was among the growing class who could afford and appreciate craftsmanship that Goldensky sought a market for what he offered as “Modern Photography” or “Modern High-Class Photography” in 1899 and 1900 advertisements in *The Jewish Exponent*, a Philadelphia newspaper published in English. At this time, Goldensky was the only photographer advertising in *The Jewish Exponent*; his ads took their place next to those for “Mando” (hair removing lotion), “Celnart” (bust enlargement cream), gas ranges, rubber cement, dark beer, jewelry, clothing, furniture, water purifiers, banks, stockbrokers, caterers, undertakers, and Atlantic City resorts.

**Russia**

Elias Goldensky, born on September 9, 1867, in Radomysl, a small town west of Kiev in the Ukraine, was one of more than two million Jews who left Russia during his lifetime. In 1891, at the age of 23, he emigrated to Philadelphia, along with his two younger brothers, Henry and Abraham, his father Benjamin, and his grandmother, Rieve. Although little specific information is available about his youth, the dramatic events experienced by the Russian Jews in the nineteenth century surely had an impact on him.

Russia had expelled most of its Jews in 1742, but reacquired millions of them through the four partitions of Poland from 1772 to 1815. Unlike most of the ethnic Poles and Russians in this era, the Jews were literate and many were property managers, artisans, or small businessmen. Also unlike the others, they were restricted to live in an area called the Pale of Settlement in the Western part of the Russian empire, where they comprised about 15% of the population, but about half the population in towns and villages.

Although Russian Jewish men prayed in Hebrew, the vast majority of Jewish men and women in the Pale spoke only in Yiddish in the first half of the 19th century. They practiced a distinctive way of life based on strict adherence to the *Shulhan Aruk* (a sixteenth century code of conduct based on the Talmud) and their only education was in religious schools. Traditional Jews were usually led by saintly, self-denying, poor rabbis who advocated daily reading of the Talmud, charity, sobriety, and righteousness.
In 1827, repelled by the Jews' distinctive appearance, customs, and Yiddish language, Tsar Nicholas I ordered the conscription of all Jewish males over eighteen into the army for 25 years and selective conscription of boys as young as twelve, who, if they survived, would serve for 31 years. Other harsh policies included expulsions from selected places like Kiev and Courland (now Latvia), measures which tended to concentrate the Jews in urban ghettos. For the Jews, this was a very bleak period.

Elias' father, Benjamin, was born about 1846 during the reign of Tsar Nicholas I. Fortunately for Benjamin, Alexander II became tsar in 1856 and repealed the conscription laws. Alexander II subsequently introduced modest reforms that gave hope to the Jews that they would achieve civic, and eventually, social equality. Jewish professionals, wealthy merchants, artisans, mechanics, distillers, and prostitutes were permitted to live outside the Pale by 1865.

The early reign of Alexander II was like a breath of fresh air in Russia and brought a flowering of literature and the arts; among the few Jewish intelligentsia, there came "a wild rush for spiritual regeneration." The positive steps taken by Alexander II prompted the spread of the Haskalah (enlightenment) movement from Germany to Russia, beginning in Odessa, the Jewish intellectual center of the Ukraine, where some Jews began to act and look like Gentiles when they were not at home or in the synagogue. These enlighteners advocated Russification—Russian manners, culture, dress, and a reformed Judaism.

This is the period during which Benjamin Goldensky experienced adolescence, marriage (no information about his wife other than her pleasant appearance in pictures has been found), and fatherhood. By the 1870s, when Elias was a child, "Russification ... had begun to sweep over the upper layers of Jewry." Increasing numbers of Jews, including Elias, began to attend Russian schools instead of Jewish religious schools and a few thousand gained admittance to the universities, where they usually abandoned Judaism and became socialists. For this new young intelligentsia, "the fundamental article of faith ... was cosmopolitanism." The cosmopolitans dreamed of a new world without nations and viewed Judaism as a "relic of the past."

As also can be seen by their modern dress and hair styles in photographs taken in the 1870s and 1880s, Benjamin and Elias belonged to this Russified group. In childhood photographs, Elias lacks the traditional side curls and wears a Russian school uniform. Elias may or may not have attended a university, but, like many of the best educated, politically idealistic Russian Jews who came to America, he did become a socialist. Moreover, at least in America if not earlier, he did not practice Judaism, although he joined Keneseth Israel, a Reform congregation in Philadelphia. Mrs. Eleanor Schlank, the daughter of Elias' poker buddy, Max Sladkin, recalled that in the 1930s, Elias would shock her mother with his atheistic remarks.
Although Elias was born in Radomsyl, he most likely grew up in Kremenchug, a large commercial center since the middle of the seventeenth century. His father, an oculist by profession, opened a photography studio there in the 1870s. As with Benjamin's appearance in photographs taken in this era, his operation of a studio in the 1870s suggests that he was a non-traditional Jew.

Benjamin's non-traditional views must have had a profound impact on Elias, although they had their philosophical differences. Unlike Elias, Benjamin was both a believer in spiritualism, which began in America in 1848, and a follower of the Theosophist Society, the international occult group started in New York by the controversial and bizarre Ukrainian medium, Madame Blavatsky, in 1875. Benjamin also practiced hypnotism with Elias. These facts alone suggest that Benjamin and Elias were members of the Jewish intelligentsia, very different from the masses of Russian Jewry, and may explain the unusual circumstance that they knew English before they emigrated, although Elias never lost his Russian accent.

The relatively rosy period for the Jews came to an abrupt and violent end with the assassination of Alexander II in 1881, when Elias was about thirteen. A wave of two hundred pogroms flashed through the Pale. In Kiev, crowds as large as 4,000 looted and destroyed entire Jewish neighborhoods. At the Balta pogrom, in which 5,000 peasants from the countryside were invited to participate, 15,000 Jews lost their homes, forty were killed or seriously wounded, and more than twenty women were raped. The violence was the worst against the Jews since the seventeenth century. It is not hard to imagine the reaction of the Goldenskys to these horrifying events.

During the pogrom outbreak, thirty to forty thousand Jews crossed the border and, in Philadelphia, the first shipload of 360 refugees arrived on the Illinois in February 1882. Philadelphia was to become a major destination for Ukrainian Jews for the next thirty years. In fact, due to the effects of chain migration, most of the more than 100,000 Russian Jews who came to Philadelphia by 1920 originated in the Kiev area.

The pogroms were followed by discriminatory legislation; at least 650 anti-Semitic laws were introduced by 1888. Tens of thousands of Jews became impoverished in this decade and an unprecedented wave of 90,000 Russian Jews arrived in the United States in the years 1887, 1888, and 1889. By 1889, for reasons unknown, Benjamin moved his studio to, or back to, Radomsyl, where his economic prospects must have been limited.

About this time, Elias became an actor in a local theater company, but curiously, turned down parts with one in Moscow. He also, no doubt, had learned some photography from his father and perhaps other Russian photographers. Before his departure in 1891, he sat for portraits in the Poltava studio of I. Ts. Chrelevski, whose style was influenced by the Russian mas-
ter, Andrei Osipovich Karelin, known for his indoor group portraits using home furniture instead of studio props.64

Although the Goldenskys' specific reasons for emigrating are unknown, a cataclysmic event in 1891 certainly provided sufficient cause. Seven hundred thousand Jews living east of the Pale were driven into it, including 20,000 from Moscow, where the expulsion ukase was issued on March 29, the first day of Passover. Only wealthy merchants who could afford an exorbitant residence permit could stay. Jewish artisans, tradesmen, clerks, teachers, and others quickly had to sell or give away most of their property and belongings. Those who remained beyond the deadline were thrown in jail like common criminals.65

The expulsions caused a surge in emigration in 1891. The Goldenskys were among the 51,398 Jews who came to the United States that year,66 of whom 4,984 arrived in Philadelphia.67 Only about 1% of the male adult Jewish immigrants could be considered "professional class."68 Although Benjamin Goldensky did not have full medical training, he was an oculist specializing in eye diseases, as well as a photographer, and could be considered a member of this elite group.

Far more Jews followed the Goldenskys than preceded them. Between 1880 and 1914, more than two million Russian Jews came to United States, 200,000 went to Great Britain, and 60,000 to Palestine. The peak year was 1906, when 153,748 arrived in the United States.69 Although New York was much more affected by the stream of immigrants, in Philadelphia, the population swelled from one million in 1890 to 1.8 million in 1920, with Russian Jews accounting for much of the increase. Consequently, after Elias established his portrait studio in November 1895, he had a steadily growing clientele among his Jewish brethren.70

Goldensky's Early Years in Philadelphia

Like most of the recent Russian immigrants to Philadelphia, the Goldenskys settled near the Delaware River in South Philadelphia. They found lodgings at 218 Christian Street, which at that time was the southern boundary of what soon became the largest Jewish neighborhood.71 In the 1892 city directory, Benjamin and Elias are listed as photographers and Elias' younger brother Abraham as a "segarmaker."

Drawing on "preliminary art training" obtained in Russia,72 Elias found work as a retoucher in the photographic portrait studio of William J. Kuebler, Jr., in the 1200 block of Chestnut Street, along which some of the most prestigious photographers in the city had been located since the 1840s. After ten months, he found employment with Frederick Gutekunst as a retoucher and occasional printer, and stayed with him for about four years.73
Frederick Gutekunst (1831-1917), whose name means “good art” in
German, was then the dean of Philadelphia portrait photographers and widely
known for his many portraits of celebrities, such as Ulysses S. Grant and Walt
Whitman. He had opened his studio at 706 Arch Street in 1856 and his
success was such that he employed as many as thirty-five people there.74

The Goldenskys do not reappear in the city directory until 1895. Benjamins three sons are listed at 1504 N. 11th Street in North Philadelphia,
a few blocks from then-new Temple University, and far from any Jewish neigh-
borhood. Elias is listed as an artist, Henry as a student,75 and Abraham (now
called Abel), was still making cigars.76

In all probability, Elias moved to North Philadelphia to work at
Gutekunst's large new branch studio at 1700 N. Broad Street, which Gutekunst
opened in 1893 to follow the outward growth of the population from the
center of Philadelphia.77 The introduction of the electric street trolley in 189278
facilitated commutation to jobs downtown and thereby helped stimulate such
changes in the city's residence patterns.

During these early years, Goldensky continued with his acting and
founded a Russian dramatic society, the first in Philadelphia, that gave perform-
ances at least until 1905.79 He may have had visions of a theatrical career,
but conflicts regarding career options were apparently resolved by November
1895, when he rented an equipped photography studio on the second floor of
the Captain James Abercrombie House at 270 S. 2nd Street in the Society Hill
district.80 It had been used for photography studios since 1862.81

With four and one-half stories, the Abercrombie House, built in 1759,
was one of the finest and tallest dwellings in Colonial Philadelphia, only a few
blocks from Independence Hall.82 But by 1895, Society Hill was becoming a
run-down neighborhood, filled with Ukrainian Jews, that has been described
as “one of the most dilapidated and unsanitary areas of Philadelphia.”83 More-
over, Goldenskys studio was just a few blocks north of South Street, below
which, according to historian Maxwell Whiteman, “the districts were notori-
ous for their high crime rate, disease, and poverty. . . . No one who cherished
his life would venture into the neighborhood unprotected.”84

Goldensky chose this location well, considering the resources he had
available at that time. He was in an imposing building long associated with
photographic portraiture, outside the most dangerous area, but still close
enough to attract both residents there as well as the better-off Jewish newcom-
ers and the established Gentiles remaining in Society Hill. Setting down
roots, he obtained citizenship in 1896, and, on his thirtieth birthday on Sep-
tember 9, 1897, he married Nettie Goldberg (d. 1944), a woman of Hungar-
ian Jewish descent. They made their first home at 331 Pine Street,85 quite
near the studio, and would have two children, Milton in 1900 and Helene in
1907.
Figure 4: Captain James Abercrombie House (1759), 270 S. 2nd St. Philadelphia. One of the tallest buildings in Colonial Philadelphia, it was built facing the Delaware River so that the original owner could see his ship from the upper floors. Site of Elias Goldensky's first studio, 1895-1908, family residence, ca. 1902-1908, and pharmacy operated by Elias and his brother, Henry, 1902. Photo by Gary Saretzky, 1994.
Goldensky's success depended in part on a forceful personality, excellent manners, and an often amusing style. One contemporary remarked, "When Mr. Goldensky gets much interest in a subject of any sort he can be very impressive! When he waggles his forefinger at you in making a point, and expresses as much with his pose and gesture as he does with his words, you can not help but believe that what is being said is so." No doubt, his interests in art and politics, and his poise enhanced by his acting experience, helped in his dealings with people. His training as a hypnotist may even have been useful, since he said that, in part, the length of his exposures depended on his "mental control" over his subjects to get them to sit still.

Although it has been stated (erroneously?) that he never exposed a plate before opening his studio, after a few years Goldensky's business endeavors were quite successful and warrant closer examination.

Advertising and Celebrity Portraits

Goldensky's early ads in The Jewish Exponent are informative concerning how he positioned himself in the marketplace. In the "Modern Photography" ad, which first ran on April 21, 1899, he listed nine awards he had received in the United States since 1898 and offered twenty-five different portraits of Israel Zangwill. Zangwill, an English playwright who, a few years later, would write "The Melting Pot," was then "the bright star of the Anglo-American literary scene." From May to November, the "Modern Photography" ad remained much the same, except that autographed portraits of the Baroness de Hirsch are mentioned instead of Zangwill's and another prize is listed beginning in July.

Baron Maurice de Hirsch (1831-1896) was also an extremely familiar name to readers of The Jewish Exponent. A German-Jewish multimillionaire, Hirsch made an offer to the Russian government in 1891 to settle 3,250,000 Russian Jews in Argentina over twenty-five years. Although this scheme collapsed—only 10,000 eventually went to Argentina by 1900—Hirsch poured money into educational and other programs for the immigrants in America, including land settlement, English instruction, and agricultural education in Woodbine, New Jersey.

Goldensky's success in capturing Zangwill and the Baroness must have greatly enhanced his reputation in the Jewish community. As did many portrait photographers before and after, beginning with Mathew Brady's Gallery of Illustrious Americans in 1850, Goldensky early in his career sought to increase trade through celebrity portraits. Among the many other well-known contemporaries he photographed subsequently were Franklin Delano Roosevelt; Pennsylvania Governor and noted forester Gifford Pinchot; entertainers and musicians Jules Falk, Al Jolson, Kathleen Parlow, Otis Skinner, and Leopold Stokowski; artist Albert Rosenthal; Reform rabbis Joseph
Figure 5: Elias Goldensky. Woman with rose, 1916. Ives color process print from Tripack film (three negatives) made with Hi-Cro Camera (Hess-Ives Company), made at request of the inventor of the process, Frederic Ives. In 1928, Goldensky’s portrait of Ives was published opposite the title page in the latter’s autobiography. George Eastman House 77:459:171.
Figure 6: Elias Goldensky. Naphtali Herz Imber (1856-1909). Gum on tissue over gelatin silver printing-out-paper (double printed), ca. 1900. Imber was the Austrian-born Hebrew poet whose “Hatikvah” (The Hope) was later set to music as the official Zionist anthem in 1933 and became the national anthem of Israel in 1948. George Eastman House 77:116:86. [Variant at Library Company of Philadelphia.]
Figure 7: Elias Goldensky. Maxim Gorky (1868-1936), Russian revolutionary, and Elias’ son, Milton Goldensky. Gelatin silver. July 1906. Gorky came to Philadelphia at this time to attend an Esperanto convention organized by Goldensky’s brother, Dr. Henry Golden. Esperanto was being advocated by socialists as a universal language. As the “Golden Brothers,” Elias and Henry operated a pharmacy in the early 1900s. George Eastman House 77:116:679.
Krauskopf and William H. Fineshriber; Orthodox rabbi Bernard Levinthal; writer and revolutionary Maxim Gorky; poet Naphtali Herz Imber; Felix Adler, the founder of the Ethical Culture Movement; and color photography pioneer Frederick Ives. His clients also included a group of friends—prosperous Jewish businessmen and professionals, who called themselves “The Bunch” and, together with their wives, met monthly for dinner. Among these men were Dr. Maurice Belber, Morris Rosenszweig, Max M. Sladkin, Charles Schwartz, and Samuel Schless.

Exhibitions and Critical Acclaim

The awards listed in Goldensky’s ads reveal that he had begun to exhibit intensively by 1898 and was having considerable success. Most of the awards or acceptances were from exhibitions held at conventions of the professional photographers’ associations of Michigan, New England, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Wisconsin. Ryland W. Phillips, who became the president of the Photographers Association of America, stated in 1910 that Goldensky was the only photographer he knew who was “the direct product of conventions” and that he had been an annual contributor since the beginning of the century. Phillips commented:

Goldensky holds the theory that making prints for conventions, and the opportunities offered there for comparison with other men’s work, has been the great factor in his success as a photographer. But there is one thing about him which stands out prominently—he is not a copyist. In fact I have known him to refuse to exhibit very beautiful prints just because they were not characteristic of himself.

In addition to the opportunity conventions afforded for obtaining praise and criticism, they provided an important networking function for Goldensky, who greatly enjoyed social interaction with other photographers. The Goldensky photograph collections at the George Eastman House and the Library Company of Philadelphia contain numerous images depicting “Goldy” (as he was known to his friends) with groups of photographers, as well as individual portraits of him by his peers, including William Shewell Ellis, Gertrude Käsebier, and Ryland W. Phillips. Goldensky also photographed many photographer friends; examples abound at the George Eastman House. He became known as “the photographers’ photographer.”

Goldensky joined a number of these groups, including the Commercial Photographers of Philadelphia, the Camera Club of New York, the Pennsylvania Photographers Association, the Photographers Society of America, the Photographic Society of Philadelphia, and the Salon Club of America, and
Figure 9: Elias Goldensky. "Italian Type." Carbon print, 1898? Goldensky’s first well known photograph, selected by Alfred Stieglitz and other judges for the 1898 International Photographic Salon at Philadelphia. Frequently published, it first appeared in Photo-Era, 1:4 (August-September 1898), 85, with a quotation, “The year grows rich as it groweth old, and life’s latest sands are its sands of gold! — Dorr.” In a gelatin silver variant, the man faces to the right. George Eastman House 77:116:325
continued to be active in them until the 1930s.0 However, unlike some of his close friends, such as E.B. ("Pop") Core, Benjamin Falk, Pirie MacDonald, and Ryland Phillips, he did not hold important offices in national or regional associations of professional photographers and participated less frequently as a speaker or demonstrator at conventions after 1913.0

In the 1899 ads, Goldensky also mentioned recognition at two art photography exhibitions: the American Institute's exhibition at the National Academy of Design in New York, held from September 26 to October 8, 1898, and the Philadelphia Salon held at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts from October 24 to November 17, 1898. At the former, he exhibited two genre pictures with dark backgrounds of old men, "An Italian Type" and "Forlorn." At the latter, "An Italian Type" was shown, along with another untitled portrait of an elderly gentleman.0

"An Italian Type," an extreme close-up and detailed profile of an elderly man's face, is consistent with some Symbolist tendencies then developing in American pictorialist photography. Like the Arts and Crafts movement, Symbolism was an expression of opposition to growing materialism. As characterized by Colleen Denney, Symbolist artists "wanted to escape the increasing intrusions of industrialization by retreating to an inner world ruled by the imagination and intellect, a world beyond reality." The Symbolists often emphasized the head, sometimes isolating it from the body to suggest the intellectual qualities and "interior imaginings" of the sitter.0 Goldensky may have been attracted to Symbolism for its links to some strains of socialism, for example, in its romantic portrayal of women as preindustrial guardians of the ideals of beauty, love, and harmony.0

To a significant extent, these exhibitions were even more important to Goldensky's growing reputation than his convention appearances, for his work attracted the attention of influential figures in the nascent art photography movement, especially Sadakichi Hartmann. Hartmann was the first writer who, in his own words, "treated photographic pictorialists as artistic individualities and criticized an exhibition of prints in very much the same way as I would an exhibition of paints."0 An extremely prolific writer on art photography,0 Hartmann gave his first public praise of Goldensky0 in his review of the 1898 National Academy of Design exhibition, published in Camera Notes, the sumptuous journal of the Camera Club of New York edited by Alfred Stieglitz. He characterized the five hundred prints, of which one-third were contributed by professional photographers, as mostly mediocre, with the exception of excellent work by F. Holland Day, Elias Goldensky, and Alfred Stieglitz.0 This was heady company for Goldensky, as Day and Stieglitz were the two leading amateur photographers in America in the late 18900s.0 Hartmann would subsequently write three major articles about Goldensky in 1904, 1905, and 1912.
The second of the two, mostly amateur, photography exhibitions in 1898 which Goldensky exhibited his work was probably more significant for the subsequent history of photography than it was for him. Yet his acceptance in it must be viewed as an important milestone in his career. As noted earlier, the Photographic Society of Philadelphia had initiated a series of exhibitions in the 1880s, rotated among Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, that had wide influence on the development and acceptance of photography as an art form. After the seventh annual exhibition in New York in 1894, the series came to an end. Responding to an invitation in 1895 from the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts for an exhibition of “artistic” pictures, John G. Bullock and Robert S. Redfield of the Society planned the International Photographic Salon at Philadelphia, later known as the first Philadelphia Photographic Salon, which, according to William Innes Homer, constituted the “first exhibition of photography in America that took place with the active sponsorship of a recognized fine arts institution.” Unlike earlier exhibits that accepted photographs in categories like genre, architecture, landscape, and scientific, pictures at the Philadelphia Salon were chosen for artistic merit only, in accordance with the “European plan advocated by Stieglitz,” one of the jurors.

From more than 1,500 entries, the jurors selected 259 prints, including Goldensky’s “An Italian Type.” One reviewer, E. Lee Ferguson, writing in *The Photographic Times*, stated:

> “An Italian Type” is a strong head by Elias Goldensky. . . . There are many to whom beauty only appeals, and to those such a strong thing is uninteresting and even repulsive. But the merely pretty cloys while such work as this continually appeals to the art lover.

Another reviewer was Joseph Keiley, an attorney and amateur photographer who was soon to become Stieglitz’ “closest photographic colleague.” In his review of the Philadelphia Salon in *Camera Notes*, Keiley singled out twenty-six photographers. He first described at length the work of Alfred Stieglitz, F. Holland Day, Clarence White, Gertrude Käsebier, and Horsley Hinton. Keiley then continued with a briefer discussion of twenty-one other photographers, including Goldensky. Of his work, Keiley wrote:

> Goldensky’s type studies were unsurpassed in their line, but reproduced in a way that was not a credit to their author’s artistic taste or judgment. The technical treatment of the “Italian Type,” a well-known Philadelphia model, being aggressively hard [i.e., sharply focused with high tonal contrast].
Keiley's criticism is not surprising, since much of his own work of this period was soft focus. Despite Keiley's mixed reaction, Goldensky's participation in this important exhibition, his second mention in *Camera Notes* within a few months, and the positive reviews in other journals established him as a recognizable name in the pictorialist movement.

The Salons, which continued for three more years, placed Philadelphia in the limelight of American pictorialist photography. Unfortunately for Goldensky, the locus of influence soon shifted to New York. "Old School" photographers in the Photographic Society of Philadelphia (those who preferred more traditional exhibitions that were not limited to photography as an art form) were elected to the Society's leadership in 1901 and the pictorialist leaders Bullock and Redfield resigned the following year. Alfred Stieglitz, who at the same time was feuding with similarly conservative elements in the Camera Club of New York, soon invited Bullock and Redfield to join his new, loosely organized group, the Photo-Secession, and their photographs were eventually published in the Secession's influential journal, *Camera Work*.

Goldensky did not become a member of the Photo-Secession, which came to include other professional portrait photographers such as Zaida Ben-Yusuf, Alice Boughton, Frances Benjamin Johnston, Gertrude Käsebier, Baron Adolf De Meyer, and Edward Steichen. He never published in *Camera Work*. Goldensky had great admiration for Stieglitz, yet it is probable that Stieglitz disdained Goldensky's position as art director of the Photographic Society of Philadelphia, which Stieglitz came to despise. Stieglitz also would have found both Goldensky's need for commercial success and, as Peter C. Bunnell has suggested, his proletarian sympathies, distasteful. Moreover, Goldensky associated with photographers like Curtis Bell and Julius C. Strauss who, in the early 1900s, resented Stieglitz' efforts to control the movement to gain acceptance of photography as a fine art.

Curtis Bell, a Midwesterner who opened a portrait studio in New York, became president of the Salon Club of America in 1904. By the end of 1904, there were about two dozen "Active Members," including Goldensky and Rudolf Eickemeyer, Jr. The original purpose of the Salon Club, founded in December 1903 as an alternative for photographers excluded from the Photo-Secession, was to circulate portfolios of the members' prints among themselves for written critiques. However, under Bell's leadership, the Salon Club joined and then dominated a new organization, the American Federation of Photographic Societies, which, also led by Bell, organized the first major international exhibition of photography to be held in New York, known as the First American Photographic Salon. Although Stieglitz and the Photo-Secession boycotted the show, which opened in December 1904, 10,000 photographs were submitted to the judges by hundreds of photographers and tens of thousands attended the exhibit. Goldensky was listed in the catalog as a
Salon member, but his work was not on view. Whether he submitted or not is unknown.122

For the above or as yet undiscovered reasons, despite Goldensky's excellent and widespread reputation among photographers and the public during his career, his absence from the Stieglitz circle explains why he was later omitted from the well-known histories of photography by Beaumont Newhall and others.

The Coterie

Although Goldensky did not join the Photo-Secession, he no doubt drew great satisfaction from his own peer group. According to Louis Walton Sipley, founder of the American Museum of Photography, Goldensky was the "acknowledged leader" of the "Coterie, a small band of the top portraitists in America" that included Pirie MacDonald (whose slogan was "Photographer of Men"), E.B. "Pop" Core, B. J. Falk, H.H. Pearce, Simon L. Stein, 'Commodore' Steffens, Frank Rinehart, and Julius C. Strauss. Unfortunately, Sipley did not state when the Coterie was formed, but it probably came into existence before 1910.123 In a series published in 1912, Strauss featured Goldensky, MacDonald, Stein, and Pearce, as well as Curtis Bell, Gustav Cramer, Edward S. Curtis, and F. Dundas Todd, in his "Old Masters" series, in which he portrayed leading photographers of the era in the styles of Del Sarto, Dürer, Holbein, Raphael, and Van Dyck. A hooded Goldensky played "Dante," photographed in 1905.124

Strauss' elegant St. Louis gallery, which looked like an Alpine chalet, had a rathskeller in the basement called the "Growlery," where prominent locals, as well as visiting Coterie members, would gather for steaks and beer.125 But he is also remembered by photographic historians for leading the campaign to move the proposed site of the photography exhibition at the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition in St. Louis from the Liberal Arts Building to the Fine Arts Building. (This was no trifling matter to photographers, as the Exposition was attended by nearly twenty million people.) In this worthwhile endeavor, Strauss was peevishly criticized by Alfred Stieglitz, who objected not to his aims, but to his qualifications for representing other photographers. Stieglitz did not permit the Photo-Secession to participate in the exhibit, at which Goldensky won a gold medal.126 Strauss went on to collaborate with William Bell and other photographers who shared similar goals as Stieglitz, but wished to do so in their own new organization, the American Federation of Photographic Societies, which held annual exhibitions from 1904 to 1913.127

Strauss's affection and admiration for Goldensky is obvious in his portrait of his friend, ca. 1910. By incorporating elements of Goldensky's own style, with its emphasis on "individuality," it could be mistaken for a self-
Elias Goldensky

portrait. Strauss emphasized Goldensky's ever-present cigar, the mark of a successful businessman in this era and, by using an extreme upward camera angle, made him seem like a towering presence, when in fact he was more or less of medium height. Goldensky is presented as a man of confidence, power, and prestige.

Quite possibly, the portrait was made in Goldensky's own studio with electric lighting, and no doubt was posed with Goldensky's collaboration. It is stylistically consistent in several respects with many of Goldensky's own portraits of others in his mature period. Quite characteristic is the masterful use of strong side lighting, with adequate reflected light ("fill") on the darker side of the face to illuminate it. Goldensky often used side-lighting to create a strongly lit edge, which adds drama to the portrait.

This portrait also is probably more representative of Goldensky's work than Strauss' in at least two other respects. First, Goldensky was noted for the attention he paid to the rendering of hands in his portraits. In this case, the hand is presented to the viewer almost like a fist, adding to the suggestion of strength that he wished to convey.

Also, the penetrating gaze of the subject into the lens can also be found in many of Goldensky's portraits, particularly of men. Portraits in the first decades of photography, roughly from 1840 to 1880, typically featured a frontal pose. But toward the end of the century, photographers increasingly had their subjects look off camera; frontal poses became associated with photographers untrained in art. While Goldensky often photographed subjects in profile or in a three-quarter view, he also employed very successfully the direct gaze as well.

Goldensky's New York Exhibition

Although the Louisiana Purchase Exposition did provide Goldensky additional recognition, his one-man show from February 10 to 27, 1904, at the prestigious Camera Club of New York generated far more publicity. According to the catalog, he exhibited fifty prints, of which thirty-three were platinum variations and fifteen were pigmented gelatin (either carbon or Ozotypes). Some were portraits of named individuals, including Arctic explorer Admiral George Wallace Melville and Daniel Guggenheim. Others included, "My Grandmother," "Lady with Medallion," and "Profile of a Lady." Several were simply entitled "Study."

Sadakichi Hartmann's review of this exhibit was the first of his three major articles on Goldensky. The article likely had quite an impact on its subject, for much of it was critical. Hartmann began by praising Goldensky for being one of a small number of photographers breaking away from the stereotyped portrait and producing "work of a superior order." He then launched into an analysis of the merits and shortcomings of the exhibit, stat-
ing that the quality of the fifty prints was very uneven. "While some were artistic in intention and delightfully unconventional in effect," he wrote, "others were so unsatisfactory in conception and treatment that the exhibition as a whole would have been greatly improved if the latter had been kept out of sight. I particularly refer to the big Ozotypes of 'Admiral Melville' and 'Adolph Grant.'"

Hartmann also objected to Goldensky's framing, asseverating, "I am surely no advocate of the elaborate mounting as practiced by certain pictorialists, but neither am I an admirer of lumber exhibits. The majority of the larger frames were entirely too heavy for a photographic print, no matter what dimensions." Indeed, the reproductions of the two Ozotypes published with Hartmann's review indicate that they were presented in unusually wide wooden frames, each of different design. The idea that frames (and mats) should be individually crafted to suit a picture was inherent in the Arts and Crafts philosophy. Some leading pictorialist photographers, notably F. Holland Day, promoted the practice, although narrow, simple wooden frames were preferred by most.130

Hartmann went on to praise Goldensky highly for his avoidance of studio props, his special methods of lighting that concentrated the main interest on the face, his skillfully handled compositions and natural poses, and his effort to achieve a distinct style. He also especially found favor in Goldensky's expressive rendering of hands. Hartmann then continued with an analysis of several pictures. He liked most of them, including "Italian Type" and a profile of Zangwill, but he characterized as "irritating" a dramatically lit portrait of actor Otis Skinner in "Francesca de Rimini."

Despite the mixed review, Hartmann clearly placed Goldensky among the top portrait photographers of his era. A few months later, in a perceptive article about whether portrait photography could be considered art, he stated that anyone would want to be photographed by one of the following nine photographers: Edward Steichen, Gertrude Käsebier, Clarence White, Frank Eugene, Mathilde Weil, Rudolf Eickemeyer, F. Holland Day, Elias Goldensky, and Alvin Langdon Coburn. Curiously, all except Goldensky, Eickemeyer, and Weil were highlighted by Newhall in the several editions of his History of Photography (1949-1982), and all except Goldensky were mentioned in Naomi Rosenblum's more comprehensive text, A World History of Photography (1997). Roger Hull has explained that "it is the reseeing of photographs in an ongoing context of prestige that valorizes them and elevates them to the level of classic examples." Photographers included in Camera Work, in which selected photographs were carefully reproduced in gravure and mounted on special papers, were 'emplaced' where they would be found by future scholars, while the work of Goldensky, Eickemeyer, and others, crudely reproduced in halftone on magazine pages where they competed with text for attention, was 'displaced' and forgotten.131
The Chestnut Street Studio

If 1904 was a big year for Goldensky, by 1908 he was at the top of his profession. That March, the Bulletin of Photography, a weekly magazine for professional photographers, issued a “Special Goldensky Number,” an honor it accorded no other photographer. Calling him “a natural born artist,” the accompanying article read in part:

Some ten years ago, down in the “slums” of Philadelphia, Elias Goldensky placed his sign of “photographer.” But few thought that this modest Russian would achieve the success in photographic art that he has done in this short time, but when one understands his indefatigable method of working and the pluck and energy he puts into his work, he richly deserves the success that has come his way. At first he had a hard struggle to conquer the natural prejudice that a lover of art would feel in going into such a district for artistic work. . . . His remarkable work has attracted a clientele of the best people, not only from Philadelphia, but from all of the larger cities.132

This article and others developed a mythology about Goldensky, implying that he rose from humble origins through his artistic gifts. A later author described him in this period as a “great artist living among humble folk” in “his little studio.”133

In fact, Goldensky’s clients did not have to go to the slums much after 1903. In September 1903, he had opened a second location in the Center City section of Philadelphia at 1227 Walnut Street, but only maintained it until 1904. In 1907 or early 1908, he leased, but may not have occupied, a studio at 1519 Walnut. But then, finally closing the Second Street location, he established a stunning studio, where he would remain for the next twenty years. As Ryland Phillips put it, “after having succeeded to some extent in the environment in which he was then placed, Mr. Goldensky decided to force the issue and went up among the photographers on a street where it was supposed they were paying the highest rents and were receiving the patronage of the most wealthy classes. . . . immediately upon his establishment in that studio, his success was assured.”134

On June 29, 1908, Goldensky leased (for ten years) the upper two floors of a three-story building at 1705 Chestnut Street, in the heart of the business district containing other fashionable studios, for $2,500 per year.135 Extensive renovations were designed by architect Walter L. Price,136 with considerable input from Goldensky. Price’s design looked much like an Arts and Crafts interior that had appeared in the magazine, The Craftsman, in 1902.137 Characterized as “the most original studio in the world,”138 it featured exposed
that were reproduced in this book. George Eastman House R.B.1.680.P.55.

Figure 10. Eliza Colleney or Palood W. Phillips, Eliza Colleney studio, showing ephemeris, model and portrait camera, 1705 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia. Plate II.

Courtesy of George Eastman House.
wooden beams in the ceiling, chestnut woodwork, maple floors, and stained glass windows. One of four skylights illuminated both the second and third floors through an opening in the third. A carved Roycroft panel from Elbert Hubbard's workshop hid three cameras used to take candid portraits. Persian and Turkish rugs and a quietly tinkling fountain with a large distinctive sculpture by Giuseppe Donato enhanced the decor.

The use of hidden cameras had been suggested to Goldensky by one of his customers, engineer Charles Henry Davis, not long before Goldensky opened his new studio. Although it is not known if Goldensky had the idea earlier, other recommendations by Davis were remarkably consistent with Goldensky's new studio and working methods there. As recounted by mutual friend C.H. Claudy, in an article published a few months before Goldensky moved into his studio, Davis told Goldensky:

If I were a photographer. . . I should have a studio that you couldn't tell was a studio if you looked at it with a microscope. There wouldn't be any camera in the room, in the first place. There wouldn't be any backgrounds that you could call backgrounds. . . . I would have a pretty room—large, light, airy and interesting. I would take my sitters in there, and I would worm my way inside them and find out what they liked, and I'd make them talk about it, and all the time I would be taking pictures of them, and they wouldn't know it. . . . There would be a whole battery of cameras outside the room. They would look into the room through holes in the wall. . . .

Although Goldensky said, "For years I have dreamed this, planned this, worked over this," it seems possible that Davis had given him the idea for the concealed cameras, although Goldensky did not, as Davis had suggested, limit himself to their use. No doubt, they were used mainly for amusement. Most of the time, Goldensky used an impressively large camera that took 8x10 inch negatives, placed quite near the customer.

Certainly, as Davis had recommended, the new studio in many respects resembled a comfortable home more than a business. (In fact, it was considerably more spacious than Goldensky's modest residence.) Goldensky had decided to see if it was possible to create a beautiful studio and do only high quality work. Taking considerable time with each customer, he charged high prices accordingly. One child he photographed, Eleanor Sladkin, later said that Goldensky spent what seemed like long minutes just to arrange her hands. He personally directed all the photography at his studio, unlike other photographers who employed "operators" for routine sittings. Five sittings was a busy day for him, with one to two dozen negatives per client.
Unfortunately, by 1912, he had determined that it was not financially feasible to limit himself in this way and was producing what Sadakichi Hartmann characterized as "cheaper 'shiftmake' work" in addition to his high quality portraits.4

Goldensky was extremely pleased with his dream studio. Not long after it opened on or about September 1, 1908, he said:

I come to this place in the morning—glad to come. I work here all day, with pleasure in my work. I leave at night lingeringly and reluctantly—sorry to separate myself from this, which is all beautiful and peaceful, for the busy and ugly city. I know I shall do better work here. . . .

Among his friends, the new studio obtained a very favorable reception. On November 7, his Philadelphia friends, the Bohemians (Frank V. Chambers, J. Mitchel Elliot, William Shewell Ellis, Alfred Holden, Louis Kubey, Albert E. Lipp, Ryland W. Phillips, and William H. Rau), organized a surprise party for "Goldy" at the studio, also attended by out-of-town photographers A.F. Bradley, Pirie MacDonald, B.J. Falk, and "Pop" Core of New York; G.W. Harris of Washington; and Meredith Janvier of Baltimore.4

After hours, a room in Goldensky's hospitable studio called the "Hall of the Bohemians" became the "Five O'clock Club," which "opened punctually every afternoon." As Goldensky explained, "I am bohemian; my friends, many of them, are also. We can meet here in an atmosphere which is never that of the dollar, always that of the ideal."4 One impressed visitor commented, "One likes to linger in the comfortable Rohlfs' furniture and while away an hour or two in animated conversation. It is difficult to get away for Goldensky is a most charming and insisting host."4

Charles Rohlfs (1853-1936) of Buffalo, who earlier had produced the outdoor showcase for Goldensky's 1227 Walnut Street Studio,48 represents an interesting Arts and Crafts parallel to Goldensky. Both men took a medium associated with repetitive production methods and sought to make it a vehicle for personal expression on a commercial basis. Like Goldensky, Rohlfs spent part of his early career as an actor, but then turned to wooden furniture design, particularly in the Spanish Mission style.49 In an article on Rohlfs in Wilson's Magazine in 1912, photographers were urged to dispose of heir old studio furniture and introduce "individual and artistic pieces, that will not only prove valuable as accessories, but give to the establishment an air of distinction and refinement."50 Clearly, in the design, furnishing, and decoration of his studios, Goldensky sought to make a statement consistent with his advocacy of "individuality,"51 and his studio was held up as a model for contemporary photographers to follow.
In addition to being attractive, the studio was highly functional. Ryland W. Phillips praised the spaciousness of Goldensky's operating room "with its diversified lights" that "enables him to allow his sitter to occupy almost any chair or stand in any corner and yet be in a photographable light without the use of either screens or reflectors." Phillips also noted "the simplicity of surroundings, the main source of light being a square hole in the ceiling. . . . the north and south ends of the room being well lighted, he gets a great deal of diffusion, which helps to soften the general effect." 5

Even those few visitors who did not like Goldensky were impressed with his work. In July 1909, Alfred Stieglitz received a detailed letter about Goldensky, "a big gun down here," from John Nilsen Laurvik, art critic and editor of the then new Philadelphia journal, Photographic Progress. Laurvik wrote that Goldensky's work on view in his studio was "far better than any I have seen by the fashionable professional photographer. Evidently he has an excellent printer in his employ for most of his work is distinguished by very good print quality and fairly interesting point of view." Laurvik, however, was apparently repulsed by "Goldie's" character, claiming, "His sleek, radiant countenance and soft, well-kept hands, that have long since forgotten what a developer feels like, simply radiate gold, gold, gold. . . . His whole place reflects his shining, lucrative personality. . . . [He was] obsequious and disgustingly pleasant, bringing out cigars, whiskey and seltzer [sic] and ginger ale."

Apparently keeping his antipathy for Goldensky well hidden while partaking of the photographer's hospitality for an extended visit and studio tour, Laurvik was shown Goldensky's "large, sumptuous reception salon fitted up with a touch of Oriental splendor as to rugs and fine furniture," his battery of hidden cameras for candid portraits, and his intense electric portrait lights, which left him practically blinded for ten minutes. Just about whatever Goldensky liked, Laurvik did not. 5

Laurvik's attitude was hardly shared by C.H. Claudy, who asserted:

Goldensky's main idea [was] to separate the appearance of commercialism as far as may be from a business which is less a business than an art. No one will deny, Mr. Goldensky least of all, that he works to live, and that he takes money—and a lot of it—for his work. But no one who knows Goldensky believes he works for money only, and no one will deny him credit for his desire to remove the appearance of a business office, and a money-getting organization, as much as possible from his place. He believes—and it is a pretty sound belief—that the artistic and the peaceful, the comfortable and the homelike, in surroundings react upon both sitter and operator. The less the typewriter and the ledger is in evidence, the more there is of simple beauty and comfort, the better the picture will be. 5
News of Goldensky's Chestnut Street studio spread. In addition to a feature article in the *Bulletin of Photography* on November 18, 1908, he received tremendous publicity from the activities of his friend, Ryland W. Phillips, another Philadelphia photographer whose father was veteran photographer Henry C. Phillips. Ryland Phillips' lecture, "Methods Under the Skylight," probably first delivered at the annual meeting of Professional Photographers' Society of Pennsylvania, May 4-6, 1909, included lantern slides of the interiors of leading photographers' studios, including those of Goldensky, Rudolph Dührkoop, Pirie MacDonald, John Garo, and others. For each photographer, Phillips projected sequences of a long shot of a model in the studio, a work print, and a finished framed print. This lecture, which was repeated to an overflow crowd of 1,200 photographers (400 had to stand) at the national convention of the Photographers' Association of America in Rochester in July 1909, and elsewhere, became the basis for Phillips' book, *With Other Photographers*, published by Eastman Kodak in 1910, with a chapter on Goldensky.

After hearing Phillips present his lecture at the Virginia and Carolinas Convention of professional photographers, C.O. Towles exhorted the audience to emulate Goldensky and the other leading photographers by developing an individual style.  

Goldensky now had a superb studio, but he also photographed upscale clients in their residences at a time when most professionals considered home portraiture to be the sole prerogative of amateurs. His portrait of two women entitled, "Home Portraiture," graced the cover of the October 23, 1907, *Bulletin of Photography*. C.H. Claudy wrote a few months later in the same magazine that Goldensky's home portraits were "entirely distinct in style and conception from the work of [Henry Havelock] Pierce [of Boston], but both dramatic and pictorial in the extreme. And Goldensky himself told me that his effects are secured first in life and on the ground glass, and never in the darkroom." The culmination of Goldensky's career in home portraiture were his photographs in the 1930s of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt at Hyde Park, now at the Library of Congress and the George Eastman House.

**Innovations in Artificial Light and Color Photography**

Although Goldensky's natural lighting at his new studio was much better than at Second Street, where he had neither skylights nor windows on the north side, Goldensky also installed an electric lighting system from Germany, the first American studio so equipped. Four years later, on April 19, 1912, he lectured to the Illuminating Engineering Society, encouraging its members to develop lighting applications for photography and, as he stated, "to engage the thought of the photographer to the wonderful field and benefit that he may derive by employing artificial illumination for his daily work. Only those photographers who have worked with artificial illumination can appreciate
the wonderful possibilities, the directness, the certainty and particularly the results which he obtains in his work."

At the same lecture, Goldensky demonstrated the making of Autochrome color transparencies, the first commercially available color process, by electric arc light. This experiment, he believed, was the first public demonstration of color photography by artificial light. (Goldensky was familiar with the Lumière brothers' Autochrome process from its inception in the United States, as he attended a special dinner for Antoine Lumière on December 17, 1907, when Lumière came to Philadelphia to introduce the Autochrome. In 1914, Goldensky would patent his own electric lighting device. Pressing the shutter release increased voltage to an array of about 30 tungsten bulbs from 110 volts to 220 volts, creating a brilliant light.

In 1916, in the still nascent field of color photography, Goldensky produced color paper prints using the Hi-Cro camera produced by the Hess-Ives company, at request of its inventor, Frederick Ives. The procedure was too difficult to be commercially successful, but that it could produce beautiful results is obvious from Goldensky's several color portraits of women preserved at the George Eastman House.

Gum Prints and Nude Studies

After 1908, Goldensky became widely known for his portraits printed in the gum bichromate process, a hand-crafted variant of carbon printing in which pigmented, bichromated gum arabic (or another colloid) becomes insoluble in water by exposure to light. Results could be controlled by degree of washing in local areas of the print, by use of a brush during washing, by choice of paper (textured or smooth, thickness varying from tissue to cardboard), and by multiple applications. Many different pigments were used to control color; Goldensky often utilized black and brown in one print. Sometimes he deliberately left the print untrimmed, so that one could see, outside the image area, the brush strokes that applied the different colors. He also combined gum printing with silver gelatin and platinum processes. In accordance with his aesthetic intentions, Goldensky mounted his gum prints carefully on a colored paper somewhat larger than the print; this paper was mounted on a thicker colored board. The colors of the mounting materials were chosen carefully to complement the tones of the print.

When successful, a gum printer could achieve very painterly results; when it went awry, according to the Bulletin of Photography in 1908, "the results are [the] most woebegone imaginable. To those who fail it seems the most mussy, dirty, disgusting process ever devised by a crazy photographer."

The catalog for Goldensky's 1904 Camera Club of New York show reveals that he did not include any gum prints in this exhibition, although he probably began making them several years earlier. In Hartmann's second
Figure 12: Elias Goldensky. Man with rolled up sleeves and long stemmed pipe. Gum bichromate. Published as "Gum Print," in Wilson's Photographic Magazine, December 1905, in Sadakichi Hartmann's article on Goldensky, "In the Proletarian Interest." Note modulation of light on face, a characteristic of the new style of portraiture that emerged in the early 1900s, in contrast to the flat lighting previously common in commercial portraits. George Eastman House 77.252.38
Figure 13: Elias Goldensky. Unidentified young woman. Gum (brown and black, showing brush strokes on edges), ca. 1910. Goldenksky’s monogram signed in the brush strokes, indicating that they were part of the final presentation. George Eastman House 77:116.722.
article on Goldensky published in December 1905, a gum print is reproduced,\(^{167}\) so it is possible that he began printing more in gum in 1904 or 1905, possibly in reaction to Hartmann's critique of his ozotypes, which somewhat resemble gum prints. Another factor in this shift may have been the rise in the price of platinum.\(^{168}\) Whatever the reason, the degree of commitment and desire for artistic achievement required to produce a large number of works in gum was considerable. As Paul Anderson explained:

> ... gum is no medium for the quantity production of prints; the bromide worker ... will stand aghast at the idea of producing one finished print as the result of a week or perhaps two weeks of effort. On the other hand, the true artist, who finds his satisfaction in a single really magnificent print rather than in a trunkful of mediocre ones, to whom exquisite gradation, rich shadows, and a beautiful range of tones are qualities to be sought for and cherished—such a one will welcome the process.\(^{169}\)

Goldensky, who clearly liked to experiment with different processes, was up to the challenge of gum bichromate. During his long career, he printed with other controlled processes favored by pictorialists, such as bromoil transfer,\(^{170}\) and used a variety of commercial papers as well, but the majority of his extant pictorial work, consisting of hundreds of prints, is in gum bichromate. In 1912, in his third article on Goldensky, Hartmann wrote:

Goldensky is an ardent adherent of the gum print. It is the ideal medium for him. It allows a wider range of individualized expression than any other process. Goldensky's 'pictorialism' implies an unwillingness to be impressed by actuality and character alone. He aims first at effect, at effects light and delicate or beautiful, powerful and extreme. It is with him less exact portrayal and careful presentation of fact than a partial interpretation, guided by a particular attitude of judgment. And in the gum process this analysis results in the conveyance of a juster truth.\(^{171}\)

Although gum bichromate began to be popular among amateurs in the middle 1890s, largely through the efforts of the French pictorialist, Robert Demachy, and was used by Steichen and other Americans in the early 1900s, Goldensky was one of the first studio photographers to offer high-priced gum prints to his clients. There were many variations in his gum printing techniques. For example, sometimes he combined gum with gelatin or platinum and the number of coatings and colors varied, although brown and black predominated. He also printed on tissue, smooth or textured paper, or a stiff cardboard.
Figure 14: Elias Goldensky. Mrs. Albert Rosenthal with dog (greyhound?). Gum bichromate. Published in Wilson's Photographic Magazine, June 1912. Albert Rosenthal (1863-1939), whom Goldensky also photographed, was widely known as an etcher and painter of portraits of famous Americans. His father Max (1833-1918), an immigrant from Russian Poland in 1849, was also a well-known artist. George Eastman House 77:116:518.
William Crooke, a Scottish photographer who toured the United States in 1911, stated that Goldensky, “the bi-gum man,” was the only photographer he met who did “all his work in gum, no other process; if his gum does not please you, then you must go elsewhere. Of course, his clientele is distinctly a better class one, and he gets good prices for his work.” However, if Goldensky did limit himself to gum in 1911, by 1912 he was also exhibiting photographs printed on Cyko, a commercially prepared printing paper sold by Ansco, at the national convention of the Professional Photographers of America. The publicity for that convention, held in Philadelphia, July 22-29, 1912, stated:

Ever since Elias Goldensky, searching for a better means to express the individuality of his work and style, showed the wonderful gum-prints that have been so much written about . . . there has been a quiet but growing desire on the part of more thoughtful photographers to learn both the process of gum-printing and the more recent evolution, oil and bromoil printing. The 1912 National Convention is planned along helpful lines in its every department.

In addition to broadening his printing repertoire, Goldensky also expanded his subject matter to include nudes. Among Goldensky’s earliest nude studies preserved at the George Eastman House is an extended undated series of swimmer Annette Kellerman, “The Diving Venus,” who was chosen to personify the Pan-American Exposition in 1901. Like Kellerman, most of his models, but not all, were females. No nudes can be identified from the list of his fifty pictures at the 1904 Camera Club show, but he was known for figure studies by 1912.

Goldensky’s nudes, which afforded ample opportunity to explore lighting and compositional innovations, are in some ways consistent with his portraiture. Males are often portrayed as strong and self-confident; females as beautiful, but often, with the exception of the muscular Kellerman, ethereal or weak. Goldensky effectively used soft natural lighting for many female nudes; the highlighted skin seems to glow in the gum and platinum prints.

Goldensky expressed his ideas on beauty in a newspaper interview in the 1920s. He stated that, in both personal and commercial work, he sought physical perfection, but hoped he wouldn’t find it:

A photographer, in judging the beauty of a woman must ask himself, is that a good face or is it not a good face. Is it balanced or distorted? For my part I do not prefer this so-called perfection. If I found it I would be disappointed because then I would be forced to stop looking for it and I don’t want to do that. It is the little
Figure 15: Elias Goldensky. Nude, Platinum, ca. 1910. George Eastman House 77.1161079.
irregularities and shortcomings of the woman's face that make them beautiful to me. Woman today is the idol of civilization because she is painted as the acme of perfection. We worship her really, and as soon as we start to do that we idealize her. When a woman becomes an ideal she will be beautiful to her admirer until the end of time. The mistake is, though, that youth and not the woman is beautiful.  

Later Years

Goldensky seems not to have produced many gum prints after World War I, although he experimented with other printing techniques until the end of his career. Very probably, the demand for gum declined as the dominant style in portrait photography shifted toward colder-toned, silver gelatin black-and-white prints. An example of later work from the early 1920s is his portrait of Leopold Stokowski. Like an “Italian Type,” executed about twenty-five years earlier, Stokowski’s head is isolated against a dark background. But unlike the earlier portrayal of a passively quiet man in his last years, illuminated by what seems to be a setting sun, Stokowski is presented as a dynamic figure thrusting himself beyond the surface of the picture toward the viewer. The drama is heightened not only by high contrast, but also by very strong double side lighting produced by artificial illumination. The overall effect has far more in common with the glamour photography associated with Hollywood portraiture like George Hurrell’s than with Goldensky’s own prewar work. Stokowski was quite pleased with the results.

The decade between the opening of Goldensky’s new studio and the end of World War I was probably his most successful period in terms of art, fame, and income. References in photographic journals of this era suggest that, among contemporary professionals, he was one of the primary exemplars of a highly esteemed practitioner: the art-motivated studio portraitist. One colleague praised him as “the inimitable exponent of originality.” However, for reasons unknown, his work was not published as frequently in photographic journals as that of a number of other photographers.

During this period, Goldensky had a number of one-man shows and won gold or silver medals at international exhibitions at Dresden (1909), Budapest (1910), Riga (1910), and Paris (1912). At the huge Dresden exhibition, he participated in both the amateur and professional divisions. Commenting on the latter, one critic wrote, “The Americans, like Eugene, Hutchinson, Goldensky, Käsebier, Dooner, sent a few specimens of perhaps finer and more artistic value, but the Germans showed the best average.” Closer to home, in Philadelphia, he had a special exhibit in March 1911 at Wanamaker’s department store that coincided with both an amateur exhibition of 1,600 photographs judged by Alfred Stieglitz and others, and an ex-
hibit of photographs from Germany, including work of the respected portrait photographer Rudolph Dührkoop.\(^{181}\)

While the best portraits by Goldensky did not suffer in the company of Dührkoop's, the latter received much more national publicity a few years earlier when, on his first visit to Chicago, he said that Chicago photographers were inept in posing American women, who, although the most beautiful in the world, did not know how to pose. According to an editorial in *American Photography*, "newspapers throughout the United States rose en masse to the defence of the injured dignity of American womanhood. . . . No photographer has ever received so much free advertising from the American press, and Mr. Dührkoop can return to Germany conscious of the fact that his name, under a hundred different spellings, has become familiar to millions of people in the United States."\(^{182}\)

By comparison, most of the publicity Goldensky received was within the photographic community. For example, in 1911, 1912, and 1913, his photographs were published in the *American Annual of Photography*\(^{183}\) and he was regularly mentioned in American photography magazines. After 1913, he was mentioned and published less frequently in photographic publications. No obvious explanation for this change has been found. It is possible that, after 1913, Goldensky, who a few years earlier was described as "the man who would rather make good pictures than own a bank,"\(^{184}\) may have become preoccupied with paying the rent, rather than extending his already widespread reputation within the professional photographic community.

In May 1914, McClure Publications announced a major promotion to mark the thirtieth anniversary of its magazine, *The Ladies' World*, in November 1916. It proposed to obtain 30,000 portraits of women subscribers and put them all in a "monster album" as a sixtieth birthday present for its editor, Stuart H. Moore. The "Album of Gold" was to be bound in gold cloth and set with expensive jewels. About twenty-five photographers were sought to do the portraits, of whom Goldensky was among the first chosen. He was assigned the Philadelphia region, from "the edge of the Pittsburgh territory, north almost to New York, and in neighboring territory to the south" and his name was used prominently in the letter sent to recruit other photographers for the project. The portraits for the album were free to the sitter (if her subscription was paid until November 1916) and the photographers were asked to participate with the hope that they would be able to sell prints or additional sittings to the women. The *Bulletin of Photography*, published in Philadelphia, characterized the plan as a "scheme to trade on the conceit and gullibility of . . . women readers by selling their names as a sort of 'suckers list' to photographers around the country."\(^{185}\) Possibly, this editorial by Frank V. Chambers, who previously had praised Goldensky many times in print, may explain why Goldensky virtually disappears from the pages of the *Bulletin*.
Another indicator of Goldensky's work, if not his aspirations, in this period was his extensive coverage in the pages of *Chat*, an up-scale Philadelphia society journal, in January 1918. In addition to photographs of celebrities, genre studies such as “The Offering,” and local “Smart Society” women in various sections of the magazine (a total of eleven images), the issue included an enthusiastic article about the photographer with a caricature by “Vet” Anderson based on Strauss' aforementioned portrait of Goldensky with a cigar.

After World War I, the portrait photography business gradually declined until it was decimated by the Great Depression. But Goldensky continued to be active: in business, in photographic societies, as an occasional lecturer at conventions, and as an exhibitor, although he moved to gradually smaller studios after 1927. He also established connections in Atlantic City and became a judge for beauty contests in the 1920s. On June 17, 1925, he photographed Miss America, Ruth A. Malcomson, and sent a print to the Copyright Office at the Library of Congress. His 1930 advertisement in the Haverford College yearbook (he was the “Official Photographer” of the Class of 1930) indicates his continued commitment to “interpretive photography”:

Interpretive photography differs from other photography in the motive by which it is inspired. Employing the same tools, it uses the camera as an instrument of artistic expression to reveal the sitter’s true personality.

Toward the end of his career, Goldensky received richly deserved honors from his colleagues, including a testimonial dinner given by the Professional Photographers Association of Pennsylvania in October 1935. In the summer of 1937, he taught at the “Goldensky School of Photography,” directed by his son, Milton, at the Cottage Studio in Dunmuvin-Churchville, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Although he did less professional work in the 1930s and early 1940s, he did a considerable amount of informal personal photography. Max Sladkin's daughter recalled that “Mr. G.” always brought a hand camera along on his weekly weekend visits and made lots of snapshots. He also took pictures at picnics and on fishing expeditions, some of which are in the collection of the Library Company in Philadelphia.

In 1940, Louis Walton Sipley founded the American Museum of Photography in Philadelphia and Goldensky, whom Sipley called “the dean of American portrait photographers during the great portrait years from 1900 to 1917,” was one of the senior photographers invited to serve on its first board of directors. The museum opened on December 12, 1940, with an exhibit of sixty-four Goldensky portraits and figure studies in the main gallery for changing exhibitions. Included were prints in carbon, platinum, gum-
Figure 17: Elias Goldensky. “The Offering.” Platinum or gum on tissue, with smoke added by hand in the negative, 1917. Published in Chat magazine, January 1918, along with another Classical fantasy of a woman with grapes and four pictures of the Morgan Dancers in Classical garb, of which his model might be one. George Eastman House 77:116:851.
bichromate, and “three color prints.”193 Another Goldensky exhibit elsewhere in the Museum consisted of twenty-two figure studies and more of his work was on view elsewhere in the building, including “An Italian Type” and Ives process color prints.194

Goldensky appears to have taken great pleasure in the Museum’s activities and Sipley’s recognition of his eminence in the first decades of the century. One Museum event Goldensky attended and no doubt enjoyed was a dinner held on March 31, 1941, in honor of two veteran photographers who had never previously met, 99-year-old William Henry Jackson and 95-year-old Caspar W. Briggs.195 Unfortunately, Goldensky would not attain such longevity. When the Wizard of Photography died of complications from asthma on March 10, 1943, he left the American Museum of Photography his personal photographic archive.196 After Sipley’s death, Mrs. Sipley sold the museum’s holdings to the 3M Company, which in 1972 donated the collection to the George Eastman House.197 There are about 1,500 prints and 1,620 negatives and transparencies in this primary Goldensky archive.

Goldensky’s Place in Photographic History

Despite Goldensky’s wide renown, his name seldom appeared in print for thirty years after his death. As previously mentioned, Beaumont Newhall did not include him in his landmark work, *The History of Photography*, nor did subsequent historians. Newhall’s reliance on his interviews of Stieglitz and *Camera Work* as sources for early twentieth century pictorialists is assuredly one reason for his omission of Goldensky. He also had no interest in those who continued working in the pictorialist mode after about 1908, believing that the creators of the movement, such as Stieglitz, Steichen, and Alvin Langdon Coburn, had gone on to a more modernist aesthetic, while the followers just kept “repeating the formula.”198 Even so, it seems surprising that Newhall, who met Goldensky199 and was friends with Sipley200 excluded him, considering the stature Goldensky held as artist, professional, and teacher.

One reason for Goldensky’s current relative obscurity was the contradiction inherent in his divided loyalties between art and professional photography. In 1912, Sadakichi Hartmann perceptively summarized what he called Goldensky’s “thorny path” as follows:

Whenever the names of the foremost photographers, the so-called “top-notchers,” are mentioned, Goldensky is sure to be among them. Nevertheless, he occupies a most peculiar, vacillating position. He stands alien, homeless, between advanced pictorialism and the regular profession. He realizes this himself, and has told me more than once, “I am neither one thing nor another” . . . yet nobody can deny that art dominates in the method that Goldensky
follows. . . . I, for my part, wish Goldensky . . . would devote himself entirely to gum prints and artistic interpretations, and double his price. Apparently he has not the courage to follow the example of Clarence H. White or Gertrude Käsebier. He says it cannot be done in Philadelphia. . . . It is the cheaper work which butters his bread, while just the opposite should be the case.  

Hartmann, who often lived on the edge of poverty, hardly qualified as a financial advisor. While Goldensky valued his art above the dollar, he needed income to pay the rent on his beautiful studio. Goldensky also probably had deeply embedded insecurities that arose during his youth in troubled Russia. Like many other immigrants of his generation, he had a deeply felt need for material success and stability, as well as for acceptance and recognition from others. He had taken a big risk by moving his operation to Chestnut Street; it is hard to imagine him taking a chance on losing it when he was at the height of his fame.

When feasible, drawing on a finely tuned understanding of character and lighting obtained through his acting and portraiture experience, Goldensky showed an extraordinary commitment to produce a finished print that best expressed not only the sitter’s but his own “individuality.” His work, especially when seen in superbly crafted original prints as were on view in “Shades of Beauty: Controlled Process Prints from the Studio of Elias Goldensky,” held at the George Eastman House in Rochester, New York, in the winter of 1993-1994, continues to provide visual delight. In addition to being of interest for what he did, Goldensky, as a prominent representative of his generation of photographers and as an immigrant who “made it,” is fascinating for whom he was. With respect to both his art and his life, Goldensky provides useful insights into the American experience and the history of photography.
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58. Tabak, 60. Although the pace of emigration slowed temporarily from 1883 until 1887, the pogroms resulted in a vision of a mass exodus that gripped the Pale for several years. Emigration societies were organized, including in Kremenchug and in Kiev, where Professor Mandelstamm, a famous oculist whom Benjamin Goldensky may have known, founded such a group. Dubnow, 298, 373; Frankel, 49.

59. In 1882, 500,000 Jews living in rural areas within the Pale were forced to move into shetrots. A few years later, ruinous fines were imposed on families whose sons evaded the draft through emigration; this one law alone prompted many families with draft age sons to leave the country. Presumably Elias avoided the draft, but his two younger brothers could have been at risk. The Goldenskys’ decision to leave may have been influenced by the prospect of military service and by increasingly restrictive university quotas, as Elias’ brother Henry may have already decided that he wanted to become a physician. Dubnow, 364, 373.

60. Bodnar, 297-298; Dubnow, 373.

61. An 1888 law forced Jews to move back to villages in which they had formerly lived. This might explain why Elias could have been born in Radomysl, moved to Kremenchug with his family, and then moved back to Radomysl. Bernard Pares, A History of Russia (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951), 412.

62. Obituary, Philadelphia Inquirer (March [?], 1943), [page unknown, clipping, Goldensky file, Library Company of Philadelphia]. Elias Goldensky’s daughter, Helene Sauber, believes that her father was in a theater company associated in some way with the tsar, with a name something like “Royal Art Theater.” (Telephone communication, January 1994.) See also Louis Walton Sipley, [funeral oration?] for Goldensky, 1943, Goldensky file, IMP/GEH Library.

63. IMP/GEH, two cartes-de visite, 77:116:1098, 1239.

64. Morozov, 335, 337. Morozov identifies Chrelevski as a member of a “Karelin School,” not an organization but a consistent style. Chrelevski’s name is misspelled in Morozov’s article.

65. S.M. Dubnow, 401-406; Gilbert, 19.


68. Golab, 56.

69. The decision of the Jews to leave the Ukraine was justified by future events. Tens of thousands were killed in pogroms between 1900 and 1920. During World War II, the Nazis killed nearly 134,000 Jews in Kiev and nearby Babi Yar and about 2.5 million Jews throughout the Pale. Between 1897 and 1945, the number of Jews in the Pale declined from about five million to 150,000. Gilbert, 27, 47.

70. Examples of Goldensky’s early family portraiture are in the Philadelphia Jewish Archives Center at the Balch Institute for Ethnic Studies in the Domsky-Podolsky, Green, Stoka, and possibly other collections. One is reproduced in Stern, 76. My thanks to Gail Stern for sharing with me her catalog, which includes reproductions of Goldensky’s work and Elizabeth Holland’s short biography, which is generally accurate except that the address of Goldensky’s first studio was 270 S. 2nd Street, not 370, an error which appeared earlier in some of Goldensky’s obituaries.

71. “Below Christian the groupings are less distinct.” Bernheimer, 52.


73. Biographical notes, Goldensky file, IMP/GEH Library. These notes appear to be either by Goldensky or based on an interview
Elias Goldensky

with him, although the handwriting is not Louis Walton Sipley's, from whose files the notes derive.

74. Brey and Brey, n.p. Due to renumbering of street addresses in 1858, Gutekunst's original studio had a different address in 1856 and 1857.

75. Elias' family maintains that Elias provided financial support to Henry, who attended the University of Pennsylvania and began his practice as a physician at 527 Pine Street in 1901. Helene Sauber and Charlotte Golden, telephone communications, January 1994; Gopsill's Philadelphia City Directory, 1901.

76. Gopsill's Philadelphia City Directory, 1892, 1895. Although about half of the Jewish immigrants in Philadelphia were in the needle trades, tobacco occupations were also a major source for their employment. While most Russian immigrant men smoked cigarettes, the cigar was the mark of a prosperous businessman and, in numerous portraits of Goldensky at IMP/GEH, he is almost never without one.

77. Brey and Brey, n.p. In 1917, Frank V. Chambers inaccurately stated that the branch studio at the intersection of Broad and Columbia was set up "about fifteen years ago." He also wrote that "an energetic photographer (Mr. William Braucher)" was the first manager. I could not verify this statement. Chambers, "An Appreciation of the late Frederick Gutekunst," Bulletin of Photography, 20:509 (May 9, 1917), 441.


79. Tierkel, 15, 18. Tierkel states that Goldensky organized the first "Russian dramatic club" in 1891. [Translation, Maxwell Whiteman.] A portrait of Goldensky is included with the caption in English, "Founder of the First Dramatic Society in Philadelphia." However, The American Hebrew (39:1 [May 10, 1889], 9), to which Harry Boonin kindly drew my attention, makes reference to the first performance of "The Russian Dramatic Club," in October 1888. The relationship, if any, of the Club and Society is unknown. Tierkel also reproduces an 1894 program in English, Russian, and Yiddish of a play by Gogol in which Goldensky's name appears. Playbills involving Goldensky as an actor or stage manager from as late as 1905 for the "Russian Dramatic Circle" are in the possession of Ellen Golden. Self-portraits and portraits by Gutekunst of Goldensky as an actor ca. 1895-1900 are at IMP/GEH.

80. Lease, Goldensky file, IMP/GEH Library. Goldensky also rented an attic room on the fifth floor. In 1898, for another $38 per month, he expanded to all of the third floor and another room on the fourth floor.

81. Previous studios at this address: Jesse J. Groom, 1862-1874; Henry M. Clifford (Principal, Philadelphia College of Photography), 1875-1885; Piper & Marcus, 1886-1889; and Samuel Piper, 1890-1895. In part, Brey and Brey, n.p. Gutekunst's original lease suggests that he took over Piper's equipment, having little or none of his own.

82. Richard J. Webster, Philadelphia Preserved (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976), 4-5. According to Webster, it features a gable roof capped by a balustrade and is a self-conscious expression of Georgian architecture complete with a Doric frontispiece and mutule cornice. Fairly recently, it housed the Perelman Antique Toy Museum (closed 1988). In 1989, it was offered for sale at $1.75 million and described as "one of Philadelphia's most famous dwellings," which, if it garnered the asking price, would have made it the second costliest home in the city. Linda S. Wallace, "Home with a view of the river and history," Philadelphia Inquirer (March 8, 1989), 1-E.

83. Society Hill also contained significant numbers of African Americans and Italians. While all the Jewish neighborhoods of this time (Society Hill, Northern Liberties, South Philadelphia, and Port Richmond) were predominantly of Ukrainian origin, Polish and
Lithuanian Jews were more concentrated in the Northern Liberties. Tabak, 31-32.


85. In 1905, Charles Bernheimer wrote that the Russian Jews had “swarmed into Pine and Spruce Streets, formerly occupied by old Philadelphia families... Some of the well-to-do Jews are in the northern part of the section on Spruce and Pine Streets.” Bernheimer, 52.

According to Philadelphia city directories, Goldensky lived at 331 Pine Street in 1897, but no home address is listed for him again until 1902. In that year, he was living at 270 S. 2nd, where his studio was located; possibly, he had rented the rest of the Abercrombie House. Also that year, he and his brother Henry, as the “Golden Brothers,” were operating a pharmacy at the same address; Henry lived nearby at 527 Pine, where he is listed as a physician. Their father, Benjamin, also is listed as living at 270 S. 2nd in 1902, 1904, and 1905, and is described as an optician. In 1903, the pharmacy moved to 430 S. 5th, but is not listed subsequently. In 1908, Elias is listed as living at a modest two-story row house in the middle of the block at 2321 Tioga. He remained there until the 1930s. In 1938, under reduced circumstances brought on by the Depression, he and Nettie, together with his son Milton and his wife Charlotte, lived above his studio at 238 S. 13th, a brownstone on the property of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. At the time of his death in 1943, Elias resided at 1910 Pine Street. Philadelphia city directories; Goldensky file, IMP/GEH Library; Charlotte Golden, telephone communication, January 1994.


87. Goldensky stated, “[Exposure] depends on your mental control over your subject. If you can’t hold your subject for five seconds, don’t try to hold him for twenty. You’ll probably have to begin with a short period and gradually work up your mental control until you are safe.” “An Interview at Detroit,” *The Camera*, 12:08 (September 1908), 356. The very large pupil size in the eyes of the woman with roses taken at the 270 S. 2nd Street studio (IMP/GEH 77:116:921) indicates low light level and long exposure.

88. Chambers, 322.

89. IMP/GEH has both platinum prints of Zangwill by Goldensky and postcard-sized numbered half-tones from this series.

90. Maxwell Whiteman, “The Philadelphia Group,” in Friedman, 168. Whiteman notes that Zangwill was promoted by Mayer Sulzberger, who was involved in all the Jewish educational and philanthropic groups in Philadelphia and was a trustee of the Baron de Hirsch Fund.

91. In the second series of ads, under the banner, “E. Goldensky, Specialist in Modern High-Class Photography,” he replaced the list of awards and the notice concerning Baroness de Hirsch with the claim that, “pastels, miniatures and works of fine quality skillfully executed” and promised that particular attention was given to attractive framing.

92. The news of the Baron’s offer was another reason for the rush to the Russian frontier in 1891. Dubnow, 414, 421. Woodbine, founded by the Baron de Hirsch Fund in 1892, “became the first all-Jewish municipality in the United States” in 1903. American Jewish Historical Society web page.

93. Goldensky also exhibited portraits of other Jewish celebrities such as Naphtali Herz Imber, the poet who wrote “Hatikvah” (later set to music and now the Israeli national anthem), but it is not known if he advertised them. The Imber portrait has been published a number of times, for example, in Sidney Allan [Sadakichi Hartmann], “In the Proletarian Interest,” *Wilson’s Photographic Magazine*, 42 (December 1905), reprinted in *Valiant Knights of Daguerre*, 219; Kenneth Finkel, *Nineteenth Century Photography in Philadelphia* (New York: Dover, 1980), 14; and in Stern, 74.

94. On this occasion in Hyde Park, Elias was assisted by his son Milton. They also photographed the President’s mother, Sarah Delano.
Goldensky's daughter, Helene Aubur, recalled that Mrs. Roosevelt was very impressed with Elias' impeccable manners and asked if he was French; he replied that he was a Russian Jew. Telephone communication, December 1994.

95. Falk was a child prodigy who joined the Philadelphia Orchestra, directed by Stokowski, at age 17. Rosenthal, a well known painter, was described (in jest?) as the man who picks the mayors of Philadelphia. (Falk's and Rosenthal's pictures were reproduced in Chat, January 1918, 14.) Parlow, a Canadian, was another child prodigy who became the first North American to study at the Imperial Conservatory in St. Petersburg. Krauskopf, Finershriber, and Levinthal were nationally known Jewish leaders. Krauskopf, the Reform rabbi of the Kneseth Israel congregation to which Goldensky belonged, was known for his lectures on social justice. Finershriber became the rabbi for Kneseth Israel in 1924 and served the congregation for about forty years (from 1949 as emeritus). Levinthal helped establish the Union of Orthodox Rabbis in 1902. (See Tabak, op. cit. and Maxwell Whiteman, "Western Impact on East European Jews: A Philadelphia Fragment," in Randall M. Miller and Thomas D. Marzik, eds., Immigrants and Religion in Urban America (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1977), 120-121.) Goldensky photographed Gorky in July 1906 when Gorky came to Philadelphia for an Esperanto Society convention; Elias' brother Henry was head of the local chapter. At the time of his portrait, Gorky had captured the attention of the media by being ejected from a New York City hotel for living with his girl friend. Adler must have interested Goldensky since Goldensky's son, Milton, was educated at the Ethical Culture School in Philadelphia. In part, Charlotte Golden, telephone communication, January 1994; Henri Troyat, Gorky (New York: Crown Publishers, 1989), 104.

96. A photograph of The Bunch is in the collection of Eleanor Sladkin Schlank, Lansdale, PA.

97. With Other Photographers (Rochester: Eastman Kodak Company, 1910), n.p. Phillips later wrote, "Mr. Goldensky spent most of his money in the early days making pictures to exhibit at conventions. Now, that is a very broad statement, but I mean it in relation to the advancement in his work." Phillips, "Photographers Who Have Succeeded," Photo-Era, 43:6 (December 1919), 296, an expanded version of Phillips' presidential address at the Annual Convention of the Photographers Association of America. The other four photographers who "succeeded" were Frank Scott Clark, Eugene Hutchinson, Dudley Hoyt, and Pirie MacDonald.

98. IMP/GEH.


100. Obituaries, March 1943, Goldensky file, Library Company of Philadelphia. A published account of a 1935 meeting, which Goldensky probably attended with his son Milton, of the Commercial Photographers of Philadelphia, is suggestive of both the educational and recreational benefits of his participation. Milton conducted a question and answer session for the 52 attendees, which was followed by a lighting demonstration by Joseph Palladino, "using pulchritudinous feminine models. 'Tis whispered there were several of 'those ubiquitous mosquito cameras' being used to get candid shots from the odd angles; including the 'worm's eye' as well as the 'bird's eye.'" [Charles P. Mills], "Commercial Society of Philadelphia," The Camera, 51 (July-December 1935), 356. Milton Goldensky (1900-1965), who changed his name to Golden in 1944, was an electrical engineer who worked with his father for a few years in the 1930s.

101. The Bulletin of Photography published numerous references in the period 1908-1913 to Goldensky's participation in photographic societies. Goldensky declined the nomination of vice-president, Professional Photographers' Society of Philadelphia, at the annual meeting on May 20, 1908. (H.A. Krips, "Philadelphia Photographers," Bulletin of Photography, 2:45 (June 17, 1908), 461.) However, he
did speak during business meetings, demonstrate his techniques, and contribute in other ways. For example, at a convention in New York, he "gave an amusing description of his hand and foot power cutting machine," which allowed the operator to have both hands free while cutting paper or board. (Frank V. Chambers [att.], "Professional Photographers' Society of New York; Proceedings of the Convention in New York; April 1 to 3," Bulletin of Photography, 2:35 (April 8, 1908), 295-297.) At the Philadelphia group's meeting on October 21, 1908, he described his print varnishing method. (Frank V. Chambers [att.], "Philadelphia Section," Bulletin of Photography, 3:64 (October 28, 1908), 286-287.) For a 1909 convention, he made his studio available for two afternoons of demonstrations by A.F. Bradley, Dudley Hoyt, and Pirie MacDonald, for which he was thanked in a resolution and given a gift. (Frank V. Chambers [att.], "Professional Photographers' Society of Pennsylvania," Bulletin of Photography, 4:90 (April 28, 1909), 268, and "Professional Photographers' Society of Pennsylvania; Summary of the Pennsylvania Convention of May 4, 5, and 6," Bulletin of Photography, 4:92 (May 12, 1909), 307.) Bulletin of Photography, 209 (August 9, 1911), 81-90, concerns his involvement in planning meetings of the Pennsylvania Photographers Association. Also in 1911, he was appointed to serve on a committee to explore the creation of a home for aged photographers by John Garo, then President of the Photographers' Association of New England. (Frank V. Chambers [att.], "A Most Worthy Project," Bulletin of Photography, 9:216 (September 27, 1911), 207.) For a later reference, see "Hocus Focus Club Is 75 Years Old," Philadelphia Record, Second Section, April 27, 1937, 1, about the Photographic Society of Philadelphia, in which Goldensky, one of only two professional members at the time the article was written, served as the art director.

102. Goldensky's contributions to the National Academy of Design show are listed in [unattributed], "The American Institute Exhibition," Wilson's Photographic Magazine (November 1898), 498. This article also reproduces "Forlorn." A letter to Goldensky from the editor of Photo-Era, August 5, 1898 (Goldensky file, IMP/GEH Library), implies that "Italian Type" had won the second prize at a recent exhibition of the Photographers Club of New England. Goldensky's acceptance certificate for "Italian Type" only, signed by Stieglitz and four other judges, is in the Goldensky file, IMP/GEH Library, which also holds an album for the show, including the catalog and installation photographs. "Italian Type" was reproduced in Photo-Era, 1:4 (August-September 1898), 85, with a quotation, "The year grows rich as it growtheth old, and life's latest sands are its sands of gold! — Dorr." Later reproductions include American Amateur Photographer (April 1904), 155, under the title, "Character Study"; without title in Wilson's Photographic Magazine, 42 (December 1905), [article on pages 541-544], reprinted in Valiant Knights of Daguerre, 217 (lower right); Arts and Sciences, Volume 5 (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Arts and Sciences Society, 1941), 53; and in Editors of Popular Photography, Photography Annual 1968 (New York: Ziff-Davis, 1967), 33. The George Eastman House has two versions of "Italian Type" (77:255:64 and 77:116:325); in one he faces left, in the other, to the right, as well as a three-quarter view of the same model, on tissue, probably gum bichromate (77:116:324). 103. Colleen Denney, "The Role of Subject and Symbol in American Pictorialism," History of Photography, 13:2 (April-June 1989), 111, 116.


106. Hartmann contributed more articles to Alfred Stieglitz' journal, Camera Work, than any other writer; he also wrote for numerous other periodicals. For biography and bibliography, see Valiant Knights of Daguerre and Jane
Elias Goldensky


107. No earlier reference has been found, but it is possible that Hartmann reviewed one or more of the aforementioned earlier exhibitions at professional photographers' conventions. 108. Sadakichi Hartmann, "A Walk Through the Exhibition of the Photographic Section of the American Institute," Camera Notes, 2 (January 1899), 86-89. Source for "five hundred pictures" and "one-third" is the "American Institute Exhibition," cited above. 109. Estelle Jussim, Slave to Beauty: The Eccentric and Controversial Career of F. Holland Day... (Boston: David Godine, 1981), 4. Earlier in the decade, a case for one of the "top two American amateurs" could also be made for Eickemeyer, who with Stieglitz was one of the first two U.S. photographers elected to membership in the "Linked Ring," the elite club of pictorialist photographers based in England. Day's leadership in both his art and organizational activities emerged in the late 1890s, at a time when Eickemeyer became more involved in professional photography. 110. Beck, 47-49.

111. Homer, Pictorial Photography in Philadelphia: The Pennsylvania Academy's Salons, 1898-1901 (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, 1984), 12. The other judges were William Merritt Chase, Robert S. Redfield, Robert W. Vonnob, and Alice Barber Stephens; painters Chase and Vonnob did not attend the judging, although they did sign Goldensky's certificate. This publication is the catalog for a 1984 exhibition of fin-de-siècle Philadelphia Salon photographers; two pictures by Goldensky were included, although neither was "Italian Type" and neither is reproduced. Goldensky did not exhibit at the second, third, or fourth Philadelphia Salons. 112. E. Lee Ferguson, "Philadelphia Photographic Salon," The Photographic Times, 31:1 (January 1899), 6. Other positive mentions appeared in Wilson's Photographic Magazine, 35:504 (December 1898), 530; and Evening Telegraph (October 22, 1898), [page unknown, clipping in 1898 Salon album, IMPE/GEH Library]. 113. Weston Naef, The Collection of Alfred Stieglitz (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art/Viking, 1978), 78; Richard Whelan, Alfred Stieglitz: A Biography (New York: Little Brown, 1995), 146.


116. Goldensky and Kasebier were compared in the photographic press by C.H. Claudy, who wrote, "If you are a patron of Goldensky or Mrs. Kasebier, you don't have to look at their showcases to see what they do. . . . Mrs. K and Goldy . . make sure-enough pictures with a camera which deserve the name of art products, with no special letters or quotation marks either. . . ." Bulletin of Photography, 180 (January 18, 1911), 43.


118. Hartmann wrote of Goldensky, "I wonder if he himself has any admirer (present company excluded) who is as loyal as he is in his worship of the generalissimo of the Secession?" Sidney Allan [Sadakichi Hartmann], "Elias Goldensky, Maker of Gum Prints," Wilson's
In 1909, Goldensky placed a copy of Stieglitz’ journal, *Camera Work*, in the hands of Clayton Stone Harris, a visiting photographer, before taking his portrait. Letter, John Nilsen Laurvik to Alfred Stieglitz, July 17, 1909, Stieglitz Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University (used by permission). Sandra Markham very kindly informed me of the existence this letter, to which a reply has not been located.

119. Memorial brochure, Photographic Society of Philadelphia, 1943, Goldensky file, IMP/GEH Library. The text states that Goldensky held the position of art director for nearly fifty years.

120. Stieglitz characterized it as “those stupid . . . people doing everything in their power to disgust all the genuine talent.” Stieglitz, *Photo-Secessionism: Five Letters* (New York: privately printed, 1910), cited in Keller, 262.


123. Sipley stated that the Coterie included Henry Havelock Pearce (b. 1875) of Boston (a.k.a. Pierce); MacDonald (1867-1942), E.B. “Pop” Core (d. 1931), and B.I. Falk (1853-1925) of New York; Strauss (1857-1924) of St. Louis; Simon L. Stein (1854-1922) of Milwaukee; Steffens of Chicago; Frank Rinehart (1861-1928) of Omaha; and Goldensky (1868-1943) and that “other members of ‘The Coterie’ acknowledged Goldensky as their leader.” *A Half Century of Color* (New York: Macmillan, 1951), viii.

124. Dr. Malcolm Dean Miller, “Old Masters by Strauss,” *American Photography*, 6:6 (June 1912), 310-327 passim. This series bears a remarkable resemblance to recent work by Cindy Sherman.


126. Notes, Goldensky file, IMP/GEH Library.


128. The breakdown was twenty-four platinum, including “Forlorn” and a portrait of Zangwill; nine carbon; eight platinum on tissue; six Ozotypes (pigmented gelatin prints); one platinum and Ozotype (double printing); one brush developed platinum; and one silver print, “Italian Head” (a.k.a. “Italian Type”). At least thirty of the same prints had been in his exhibit of fifty works at the Photographic Society of Philadelphia in October 1903. Melville (1841-1912), was an Arctic explorer who became engineer-in-chief of the U.S. Navy. Catalogs in Goldensky file, IMP/GEH Library. “My Grandmother” is currently in the collection of Goldensky’s granddaughter, Ellen Golden. Goldensky had another exhibit at the Camera Club, consisting entirely of gum prints, March 12-April 9, 1912. Entrance pass,
Goldensky file, IMP/GEH Library.


135. Lease, IMP/GEH Library. The studio was scheduled to open on September 1. In 1920, the lease was extended for two years at $3,000 per year. The 1705 Chestnut studio actually was Goldensky's third or fourth in Philadelphia. In 1903-1904, he operated a second studio at 1227 Walnut, but retained the Second Street studio until 1908. In 1907 or 1908, he leased but may not have opened a studio at 1519 Walnut. In the 1920s, Goldensky and William Rau sold their studios to Charles B. Brown and A. Weintraub, publishers of the Boardwalk Illustrated News (Atlantic City), which featured an article on Goldensky on March 1, 1926. Goldensky stayed on at 1705 Chestnut as director and artistic head, so it is likely that the sale was made before the date of the article, which promoted the studio. At some point, he and Richard T. Dooner were partners at 1705 Chestnut. He was still at 1705 Chestnut in 1927, but by 1928 moved to 1626 Chestnut. From 1929 until at least 1932, he was at 1516 Chestnut, where his son Milton engaged in advertising photography. No later than 1935, Goldensky moved to 1524 Chestnut and, on July 15, 1938, he opened his last studio at 236 S. 13th. In 1941, after his retirement, Goldensky was available for sittings by appointment at his former studio at 1705 Chestnut, at that time operated by Herman Feldman and Harry Hollander. Hollander had trained under Goldensky early in his career, probably before World War I. "News and Notes," Bulletin of Photography, 3:47 (July 1, 1908), 11; Philadelphia city directories; Goldensky file, IMP/GEH Library; and Louis Walton Sipley, ed., Arts and Sciences 5 (1941), 95.

136. Drawings for renovations, Walter E Price Collection, Athenaeum of Philadelphia, PRI/149/010; related correspondence in Goldensky file, IMP/GEH Library. Price's work for Goldensky also included May 1908 plans for alterations to Goldensky's other studio (see previous note) on the third and fourth floors of 1519 Walnut Street, but it is possible that Goldensky moved to Chestnut Street rather than implement these plans. Price also planned alterations for Goldensky for residences at 714 Walnut and 2321 Tioga in 1912. Price is best known for his buildings at Haverford College.

137. Reproduced in Peterson, 204.

138. [Frank V. Chambers], Editorial, Bulletin of Photography, 3:67 (November 18, 1908), 322.


140. C.H. Claudy, "A Thousand Dollars a Portrait," Bulletin of Photography, 2:36 (April 15, 1908), 304, 309-310. Davis also told Goldensky that if he were a photographer, he would choose the best negative from a sitting, make one beautiful print, charge the astonishing sum of $1,000 for it, and break the
negative.


142. Interview, Eleanor Sladkin Schlank, Lansdale, Pennsylvania, July 21, 1996. Goldensky took numerous studio portraits of the Sladkin family, as well as snapshots taken during weekly visits to their homes in Philadelphia and Atlantic City, ca. 1900-1940. Elias and Nettie Goldensky and bicycle and motorcycle manufacturer Max M. Schlank and his wife Jennie were members of a social group of immigrant couples who had succeeded in America called "The Bunch," that, with varying membership, met monthly for dinner beginning in the early 1900s. Other members included Julia and Dr. M.Y. Belber, dentist; Dasha and Bernard Harris, lawyer; Stella and Morris Rozensweig, tailor; Julia and Samuel Schless, jeweler; et al. The Bunch appears in "Farewell Portrait, Thanksgiving, November 25, 1909," P8930.11, Library Company, Philadelphia, and printed brochure, Goldensky file, Philadelphia Jewish Archives Center, Balch Institute for Ethnic Studies, Philadelphia.


144. Sidney Allan [Sadakichi Hartmann], "Elias Goldensky, Maker of Gum Prints," Wilson's Photographic Magazine (June 1912), 265.


Goldensky's desire to create a non-commercial atmosphere in his studio is to some degree comparable to Stieglitz' at the PhotoSecession gallery at 291 Fifth Avenue in New York.

147. The other Philadelphia photographers' hangout mentioned in this article was William Rau's rathskeller known as the "Coal Bin." Editorial, Daily Photographic News (July 25, 1912), clipping in Goldensky file, IMP/GEH Library.


152. Phillips, With Other Photographers, 26ff.

153. John Nilsen Laurvik to Alfred Stieglitz, July 17, 1909, Stieglitz Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University (used by permission). This letter may have terminated any interest Stieglitz might have had in inviting Goldensky to join the PhotoSecession.


156. "Making Portraits at Home," Bulletin of Photography, 2:24 (January 22, 1908), 65. In this article, Claudy presents Goldensky and Pierce as atypical professionals in their practice of home portraiture. Unlike Goldensky, Mathilde Weil, another Philadelphia photographer not mentioned by Claudy here, limited her practice to home portraiture. After 1914, the Bulletin featured numerous home portraits by the Gerhard Sisters of St. Louis. See also Rudolph Dührkoop, "Lecture by Rudolph Dührkoop [sic] to the Photographers' Association of America, at St. Paul, Minnesota, July 27th, 1911," Bulletin of Photography, 9:23 (September 6, 1911), 153-159, who stated that German photographers more often went to private residences than their .
American counterparts who "seem to have a dislike for such sittings."


160. Sipley (1951), 36, 37, 44. A photograph of the dinner, showing both Lumière and Goldensky, is reproduced on page 37. See also Bulletin of Photography, 1:20 (December 25, 1907), 389-390, for an account of the dinner, including an impressive menu. Goldensky's fellow Coterie member B.J. Falk was the first photographer in the United States to use the Autochrome process. John Wood, The Art of the Autochrome. The Birth of Color Photography (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1933), 10.


162. Unattributed. "Report of the Meeting of the Professional Photographers' Club of New York," Bulletin of Photography, 12:287 (February 5, 1913), 173. This is apparently a report of the first public demonstration of the invention on January 21, 1913. As previously noted, on this occasion Goldensky used bulbs varying from 40 to 150 watts each.

163. Ives was awarded a patent in 1911 for a "tripychromatic camera and sensitive plate pack comprising members pivotally connected, to be used with a single plate holder and handled as a unit until after development" and for "tenuous photographic relief prints in bichromated gelatine by incorporating non-actinic dyes to limit penetration of light in printing, followed by dye coloring." As described by Sipley, a plate holder holding a "Tri-Pak" or "Hi-Pak" of three plates was inserted into the camera, after which the front plate was lowered 90 degrees and a filtering mirror, which passed some of the light and reflected the rest onto the lowered plate, was placed at a 45-degree angle between the lowered plate and the other two plates. After exposure, the plates were brought back together inside the camera. The result was three separation negatives, from which "one print was made on paper (this was the blue print) and two on transparent gelatin, the red and yellow. The dyed gelatin prints were superimposed and cemented to the blue print." Sipley (1951), 53. The 1916 date is given in Sipley, "The First Museum of Photography," Arts and Sciences 5 (1941), 59. See also Ives, op. cit. and Hess-Ives folder, IMP/GEH Technical Information File.

164. IMP/GEH 77:459:187, reproduced in Sipley (1951), 46 opp. The George Eastman House also has the camera Goldensky used; both the prints and the camera were formerly on exhibit at Sipley's American Museum of Photography in Philadelphia. Another masterful user of the Hi-Cro was Karl Struss; see American Photography (August 1917) for color reproductions.

165. In several examples at the George Eastman House, he signed his monogram over the brush strokes that extend outside the image area to make a very painterly presentation. Unattributed. "Gum Bichromate," Bulletin of Photography, 2:41 (May 20, 1908), 394.

166. 1903 to 1905 were the peak years of production for Platinotype Paper by the Platinotype Company. In 1905 the price of


170. In the bromoil process, a silver gelatin print is bleached and then the gelatin is hardened in proportion to the density of silver in various parts of the image. The print is then inked, with the ink adhering more to the unhardened areas of the gelatin. To create a bromoil transfer, the bromoil print is pressed against another piece of paper while the ink is still damp.
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