

Public (1896) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 999

DATED 12-9-96

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording explanation of the
Supt. Archaeological Survey,
re: the defects found in
the photographs forwarded
with his report for 1895-96-

T1579

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
3512/96							

OLOGICAL SURVEY, (MADRAS.)

From

THE SUPERINTENDENT,

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY,

(Madras,)

To

THE Chief Secretary
to the Government of
Madras.

Dated

Despd.

Recd.

7th August. 1896.
8th August. 1896.
24/10/8/96

CHIEF SECRETARY
8 AUG. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

ENCLOSURE *chil*

No. 135.

Sub.cct.

Reports on the photographic
prints accompanying the
annual report for 1895-96.

Pub 40757-9024-7-96 orig
2006-1-96
813029-10-94
729-4008-9-93
684024-8-93
119013-2-93.

CS.
This was written before
Mr Rea had recd. the
detailed criticisms.
Shall it be recorded or
Mr Rea asked whether
he is going to reply to
your d/o of the 7th Augt.
Apparently nothing more
is necessary.

JSB
10/9/96

JSB
11/9/96

Go No 999. 912th Sept 1896

Recorded

JSB

for CS

12/9/96

*meysu (are) nishat
as per...
phray the lens should*

Bangalore,

7th August 1896.

No. 135.

From

A. REA, ESQUIRE,

SUPERINTENDENT, ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY,

(MADRAS,)

To

The Chief Secretary
to the Government of Madras.

SIR,

With reference to paragraph 3 of G.O.
No. 757, Public, dated 21st July 1896, I
have the honour to report that defects had
been observed in some of the photographs
taken previous to those mentioned in
the report under note: but it was only
after some of these latter had been taken,
that the cause was discovered to be a
defect in the camera. After examina-
tion, I found one of the screws, which
fixed the focussing slide, to be loose,
so that if the camera happened to be
shaken by the wind or otherwise, durin
exposure, a clear image would no
result.

(the) left (are) most
aspects. And
-phrag the lens should

due to the changing state of the weather
on they were taken. These negatives have
not been "touched up" in any way: they
would as usual be so, before being used
for illustrated reports. Bromide of silver
paper can be used for the prints accom-
-panying the annual report.

I have the honour to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

A. W.
Superintendent.

towards top instead of being par-
because "string-back" of camera was not
used as should have been.

(3) Mostly out of focus especially at sides.
Smaller diaphragm should have been
used.

(3) Effect of glare both sides bad.
These sides should have been ~~double~~
printed longer by shading rest of
negative, or locally "reduced".

(4) Second copy of this is hopeless.
Over printed.

284. Should have been taken on
cloudy day. Hard shadows on left
most unartistic, & much of Carniq
on car quite invisible because in
deepest shadows. Sun was apparently
by almost perpendicularly above car
when photo'd. First principle is never
to photo in such a light.

285. Upper part quite out of focus.
Either lens is bad & won't cover
whole plate or "stop" used was
too small large.

286. Out of focus almost all over.
"Over exposed" & consequently in-
st. "Halation" round

288. f

299.

been Co. to
the most
the lens should

roughly on ~~the~~ ^{the} surface of part out of focus in places.
28. Same two faults. Also for so bright a light. This not only gives a "chalk & charcoal" effect which is unpleasant but much of detail is obscured by deep shadows in 284. super.

29. Perhaps the count got. All out of focus. Pimple popping over. Taken at one time of day when side of nple next camera was in deep shadow.

30. "Halation" dreadful. Should have been avoided by backing the plate, changing point of view, hanging muslin between filters & sun-light or exposing less time. Fails almost entirely as a picture of architectural detail as the detail doesn't appear.

31. Better. Softer light (morning sun) & a cloud or two printed in from another negative would have improved it.

32. Light too hard again.

33. Uncorrected halation. Pop

(She took the 1

Public School

With a baby on her hip, golly the girl was with only a gentle face towards the camera & have been for more picturesque photos of architecture taken for scientific record may not want the additional attraction of figures but if the figures are put in the might at least be less unpleasant in appearance & in artistic arrangement than this one.

294. Glare again. Ungainly baby again. One print very much overprinted.

295. Out of focus all over again. Perpendiculars converging again.

296. Technically better. The detail here shows that it is not the lens but the operator who is at fault in earlier instances. Artistically, terrible. That conch-like, for instance!

297. Edges out of focus. Light rather hard.

298. Overexposed & so "dence" & detail is clogged up. Eg. the round jewel in the centre is little more than a white patch.

299. Detail in plate. Perhaps on the lens should

aged.
no ditto
taken in, too bright light. One
overprinted.

302. Lower half insufficiently
exposed. Other vice very good &
other instance of what the lens
can do. Detail in places is excellent.

303. Glare across floor might
have been corrected in printing
otherwise excellent.

304. Over exposed. They consequently
very dark. Pose of the gentlemen
in the centre arch way scarcely ar-
tistic!

305. Out of focus at top. Should
have been focused with a strong
side light to throw up the inscriptions
detail of the coins.

This suggested that in future it should
be insisted that all these photos should
be printed on bromide of silver paper. These
bromide prints are almost certain to fade or
discolor, especially in the climate, unless they
are washed after being for hours in running
water, or var of something that
dissolves the prints.

Records of this kind are as
permanent, & bromide prints are as
useless as dirt impressions. Platinotype is
a more trouble some process
but printing is infinitely
more

Memo

N° 283

1. ~~The~~ particulars
in the building are missing
towards the top instead of
being parallel, because of
"swing-back" of camera
was not used, ~~which~~
have been

2. ~~The~~ is mostly out of focus
especially at sides. ~~The~~
smaller diaphragm should
have been used.

3. ~~The~~ Effect of glare
on both sides ~~is~~ bad.
The sides should have
been printed longer by
shading the rest of the
negative, or locally
"reduced".

4. ~~The~~ second copy
is ¹⁰/₁₀ overprinted.

N° 284

(This) should have been
taken on a cloudy day
(The) hard shadows
(the) left (are) most in-
artistic. ~~The~~ ¹⁰/₁₀ ~~is~~ ¹⁰/₁₀ ~~is~~
diaphragm on the lens should

Is it possible?

because in deep shadow.
The sun was apparently
in deep shadow almost
perpendicularly above
the car when photographs
were taken.

(The first principle in
photography) is never
to photo in such a
light?

N^o 285

The upper part is
quite out of focus. Either
the lens was back and
would not cover the whole
plate or the "stop" used
was too large.

N^o 286

This is out of focus
almost all over and was "over
exposed"; and consequently
there is insufficient
contrast. The "halation"
round the sky line should
have been corrected by
using a "backed" plate
or in the printing by
shading.

N^o 287

The artistic
arrangement.

"Daybreak". The top part
is out of focus in places.
N^o 288

The same two faults
(are noted) - Also (the image)
far too bright a light.
This not only gives a "chalky
and charcoal" effect which
is unpleasant, but much of
the detail is obscured by
deep shadow as in 284.
Lenses

N^o 289. This is perhaps
worse than any of the others
(and is all out of focus).
The temple seems to be
over. The photograph was
taken at the wrong time of
day when the side of the
temple (the) camera was in
deep shadow.

N^o 290. The "Halation"
is very bad and should
have been avoided by backing
the plate, changing the
point of view, hanging much
closer to the hill or
the whole matter is
wanting!

A photo. The smallest detail
in the lens should

as a picture of architectural
detail as the detail does
not appear. ^{light is just as}
N° 291 - ~~Better~~ (lighter
(lighter surrounding being) &
a shadow or two printed
from another negative
would have improved it.
N° 292 - (The light too
hard again.
N° 293 - (The detail is
uncorrected. The top
of the figure is in a most
conceivable attitude. A
woman with a baby on her
hip, going into the gateway
with a quarter face
towards the camera
would have been far
more picturesque. If
figures are for any reason
kept in photographs
of architecture taken
for scientific record
they should be pleasant
in appearance and
artistic in arrange-
ment.

Public Dept

glass and the remarks
regarding the un-
figure referred to above.
The print is very nice
overprinted.

N° 295 - This again is
at focus all over and
the perpendicular is correct.

N° 296. This is technically
better. The detail is better

that it is not the lens that was
at fault but as might have
been in the earlier instance.

Artistically the picture
is bad especially the intro-
duction of the constable.

N° 297. (Here the) edges are
out of focus (and the light
rather hard.

N° 298. This has been over-
exposed and is "dense". The
detail is clogged up e.g. the
round jewel in the centre is little
more than a white patch.

N° 299 (The detail is in places
defective and the detail
is the whole matter in the
photo. The smallest detail
in the lens should

same time employed

N° 300 - ditto

N° 301 (the photograph is)

taken in too bright light.

One copy (is) over printed.

N° 302. The lower half is in-

sufficiently lighted. Other

wise this is very good

and is another instance?

of what the lens can do.

The detail here is in

places excellent.

N° 304. This has been over

exposed and the sky

is consequently very

dark. The face of the person

in the center archway?

scarcely artistic.

N° 305 - (The picture is)

out of focus at the top

and should have been

photographed in the in?

strong ^{side} light (so as to

throw up the inscriptions

& detail of the corns.

It is understood
that bromide printing

NOTE FOR THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

If the C.S. will pass
para 3 of the draft the
separate commⁿ will be
drafted afterwards
so as not to delay the
report.

350
[Signature]

7-10-13
[Signature]

HC

The fair of this
has gone to C. S. for
sq. together with
the copy of the
Co. for Mr. Rea.
There should be
looked direct to
him soon please

RB
6/10

Mc.

all

When you send
up the h.o. on the report
of the Arch. Surveyor
send up by the fair
copies of this d/o and
enclosure - Have them
typed on half foolscap
size paper - quarto
post I think it is
called. Send to me
please.

J.B.

3/8/6 P. 70.

C.A.

The L.O. had been printed
& signed but not stamped. It
was now taken care away to all
addresses, viz but I enclose the
signed for Mr. Rice. I have
however dispatched his spare copies.
The B.O. & names have been
typed as directed on 45
post.

Ch

5/8/96

Public Dept

C. N. 2136

Do to accommo
7" August 1896

D.O. to the Supdt,
Arch. Survey

My dear Mr. Res,

In continuation

Off. O. N. 757 Pubd/21 July 1906

I am directed to send you

the accompanying memo

random of detailed

criticisms ^{of the} ~~and in~~

~~statements regarding the~~

photographs in question.

Albumen prints, such

as these, are, it has

been pointed out, almost

certain to fade and

become spotty unless

they have been washed

after "toning" in running

water for hours. It

is ^{essential} ~~highly necessary~~

that these prints should

be permanent, the use

of bromide of silver

paper has been sug-

-gested to you in the

Off. O.

It is understood

that bromide printing

^{Notes} A copy of the memo with certain alterations is put up. Perhaps the original had better stand is with ref. to the ellipses?

is a far less troublesome process than the platinotype one and that the results are more artistic as well as more permanent.

I am to add that in packing the photos it would be well if they ^{were} ~~were~~ placed alternately face to face and then pressed so as to take the bent out of the cardboard.

Yours sincerely

For request by Mr. J. A. ...

1/18/96

/from orders/

C.W.
21.7.96

To
A. Lea Esq.
Superintendent to
Archaeological Survey

Photographs

from orders

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

PAGES NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL

N.B. -

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied
F = Copy abstract only.