MARTINA BALEVA

THE HEROIC LENS: PORTRAIT PHOTOGRAPHY OF OTTOMAN INSURGENTS IN THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY BALKANS—TYPES AND USES

"In front of the lens, I am at the same time: the one I think I am,
the one I want others to think I am." (Roland Barthes)

In his essay on the constitutive role of photography in the construction of collective identities in nineteenth-century Romania, the photohistorian Adrian-Silvan Ionescu identifies a genre of photographic portraits as representations of "Bulgarian national heroes."[1] Unfortunately, Ionescu leaves open the question of what exactly he means by this term, and he does not give a visual example of this photographic genre. Indeed, a large number of portrait photographs of Ottoman Bulgarians posed in a "heroic" manner exist, all made in the second half of the nineteenth century in Romanian photography studios. Many of them are today an integral part of the Bulgarian historical tradition, and they have become deeply imprinted onto the visual memories of generations as a testimony to and documentation of the Bulgarian national movement against Ottoman rule (c. 1396–1878). Not a single history book has failed to reproduce them, and they hang in every school and public building. Even the uniforms of the National Guard today are influenced by this photographic genre, which Ionescu would later accurately sum up as the "Bulgarian national hero."

It is obvious that Ionescu did not derive the term from this particular "heroic" pictorial tradition but from another kind of photographic genre: "Oriental-type" photography. More exactly, Ionescu has very likely borrowed it from the title of a photograph taken by the famous Viennese photographer Ludwig Angerer (1827–1879) during the Crimean War (1853–1856), probably in Bucharest (fig. 1).[2] Designating a male portrait with the title "A Bulgarian national hero? Or a Turkish Bimbashi?" is both ambiguous and literally questionable. It seems that while creating his term, Ionescu did not know that the two ethnic attributions "Bulgarian" and "Turkish" could not be more disparate from a contemporary perspective. The essentialist historical narrative of the Ottoman era portrays the "Turk" as the ultimate enemy of the "Bulgarian" and the "Bulgarian national hero" as fighting against 500 years of oppression by the "Turkish Bimbashi."[3] Seen from today's national perspective, the interchangeability

___ 1: Ludwig Angerer, A Bulgarian national hero? Or a Turkish
Bimbashi?, Bucharest (?), c. 1855, salt print, size unknown,
Picture Archives of the Austrian National Library.

of two completely opposing, constituted national identities within the Ottoman
Empire (1299–1923), as suggested in the caption of the portrait, can potentially pro-
voke a knee jerk reaction or even be taken as an insult. At the same time, however, the
title raises fundamental issues concerning an indigenous lens in the Ottoman
Balkans: the possibilities of and limits to photographic categorization of the Ottoman
imperial subject; the historical and cultural relocation as a result of terminological
discrepancies between national attributions in photographic imagery; and most
importantly, the self-defined and externally-determined visualization of identity
through photography.

These issues mark the starting point of my reflections on local forms and social
uses of portrait photography within insurgent circles in the nineteenth-century
Ottoman Balkans. In contrast to the established field of research on photography in

the Ottoman Empire or on the official Ottoman imperial gaze, my reflections address a still relatively new area of research with a growing focus on the self-fashioning of identity in photography of the Ottoman world at large. When the issue of Ottoman identity is raised in photography, it normally involves the externally-defined constructions of "archetypes," as were produced in photographs for European and foreign audiences[4] or served as an apparatus of imperial rule. These "scenes and types" photographs show the individual as a passive object, serving solely as a vehicle for and bearer of particular ethnic, religious, or professional symbols. Featuring supposed or explicitly identifiable characteristics, type photographs from the Ottoman Empire were in particularly high demand as souvenir pictures for European tourists or collectors. Yet "type" photographs of ethnic tribes, in particular from the Middle East, or professional groups, such as bureaucrats, students, and military cadets, also served to consolidate imperial power, as evidenced in the large-scale photographic projects initiated by Sultan Abdülhamid II (r. 1876–1909) to survey the modern Ottoman subject completely within his habitat.[5] As Wolf-Dieter Lemke writes, for Sultan Abdülhamid II photography was not only an indicator of modernization but also a technology for "long-distance control," enabling the center to reach through images to the uncontrolled peripheries.[6] "Consequently," as Stephen Sheehi writes, the official Ottoman lens "acted in its disciplinary capacity."[7]

Subsequent research on the history of photography in the Ottoman and post-Ottoman world has contained little information about the private uses of this visual technology and individual photographic practices. Both Nancy Micklewright and Michelle L. Woodward were the first to approach this topic of visual self-representation and the subject's own molding of his or her identity in Ottoman-era photography. They have examined the private practices involved in the individual development and active employment of photography in the Ottoman capital of Istanbul.[8] Meanwhile, the widespread and intensive production of photographs for individual ends outside Istanbul, especially within several insurgent movements in the empire's European provinces, remains relatively underexposed.[9] This situation is in large part due to the fact that research on the history of photography in post-Ottoman successor states tends to be based on their respective national perspectives. Consequently, the common Ottoman origin of early photography in what is now Southeastern Europe or the Balkans has fallen out of focus. The national appropriation of photographic artifacts from the Ottoman era ultimately has prevented a comprehensive overview of the closely interwoven array of private photographic production across the region at that time.

This analysis attempts to provide at least a basic appraisal of what is still a minimally researched field. I have examined portrait photography of Greek, Albanian, Serbian, Romanian, and Bulgarian origin from the second half of nineteenth century in an attempt to explore the entangled and dynamic processes, in which

these former Ottoman subjects achieved a self-defined visualisation and group identity through photography. Here I will discuss some specific aspects that I consider symptomatic of the Ottoman context and that in historical terms can indeed be located in the dynamic, multiethnic field between the "Bulgarian national hero" and the "Turkish Bimbashi."

TYPES

Bulgarian national hero? Or a Turkish Bimbashi? It is unlikely that the ethnic identity of the man in the photograph taken by Angerer will ever be determined. While he might have been Bulgarian or indeed Turkish, what is certain is that the man was neither a "Bulgarian national hero" nor a "Turkish bimbashi." His "profession" can be identified, however, as the picture is very probably a "typical" representation of an irregular soldier, a *bashi-bazouk*.[10] The clothing reform of 1829 required Ottoman "bimbashis" to wear western European-style uniforms that remained relatively unchanged up to the end of the Ottoman Empire. "Bulgarian national heroes," however, went through several phases of sartorial development before they, likewise, adopted a western European military uniform in the 1870s.

The timing of the dress code reform of Mahmud II (r. 1808–1839) was no accident. It came during the final phase of the decade-long Greek War of Independence (1821–1832). Donald Quataert notes: "More specifically, [the sultan's] action came at the very moment when the success of the rebel Greeks was so gravely challenging his hold on non-Muslim Ottomans. At this crucial moment, he [Mahmud II] renegotiated Ottoman identity, stripping it of its religious component."[11] Ottoman reform efforts did not prevent the Greeks' struggle for nationhood, which resulted in the creation of an independent kingdom in 1832; rather, it became a model for other independence movements in the empire. Furthermore, it was the dress code of the Greek rebels that would inspire many imitators among the members of diverse ethnic groups in the Balkans.

The "Bulgarian national hero" experienced a rapid and simultaneously complex development from the Greek national costume to the military uniform. Within the course of just one decade, the appearance of Bulgarian insurgents underwent a remarkable transformation that produced essentially three types of clothing styles or dress codes, reflecting the wide spectrum of ethnic clothing in the Ottoman Empire during the nineteenth century. I have called them the *Albanian-Greek* type, the *Turkish-Montenegrin* type, and the *Hungarian-Romanian* type. Each of these three types of dress was also associated with particular characteristics that could be expressed in a suitably ostentatious manner through clothing, most notably in the form of photographic portraits. This transformational process of clothing also sheds light on the ideological evolution of the Bulgarian national movement.

2: Oscar Kramer, Full-lenght portrait of Otto, King of Greece, Vienna, c. 1860, albumen carte-devisite, 8.8 × 5.4 cm, National Portrait Gallery, London. ___ **3**: Pjetër Marubi, Full-lenght portrait of Hamzë Kazazi, c. 1858, place of creation, size, technique and holding institution unknown.

THE ALBANIAN-GREEK TYPE

The roots of the Albanian-Greek type of "Bulgarian national hero" can be traced back to the early nineteenth century, or more specifically, to the beginning of the Greek independence movement in the early 1820s. The Greek rebels—*klephtes* and *armatoloi*—dressed like Albanian mercenaries, who enjoyed an excellent military reputation and were admired for their bravery. Probably the oldest surviving, self-defined portrait in Albanian-Greek attire is that of the rebel Panagiotis Naum. The daguerreotype was taken by the Greek photographer Filippos Margaritis (1810–1892) in 1847–1848. It shows the Macedonian-born Greek in an oval, three-quarter, knee-length portrait with a waistcoat, the *fermeli*, and the Greek-style cap with tassel, the *farion*. Less visible but clearly identifiable is the pleated white skirt, the fustanella, which

——— **4**: Anastas Stojanović, Full-lenght portrait of Petar Mishaykov, Belgrade, date of creation unknown, albumen carte-de-visite, c. 9 × 5.5 cm, Photo Archives of the National Library SS. Cyril and Methodius, Sofia.

would become a signature feature of the Greek independence movement and is today the central element of the uniform of the Greek Presidential Guard, the *Evzonoi*.

Margaritis also took a full-length portrait of the legendary independence war veteran Christodoulos Hatzipetros (1799–1869) in a fustanella, probably around 1855. The Greek declaration of independence led to Hatzipetros becoming the general and adjutant to the first monarch of Greece, Otto I (r. 1832–1862). As the second son of King Ludwig I of Bavaria (r. 1825–1848), who was known for his philhellenism, Otto I had his portrait taken in opulent Albanian dress with the fustanella even during his exile in Vienna (fig. 2). These later versions of the Albanian costume are, as John Stathos states, "of course, highly formalised versions of what the average klepht would have worn in the 1820s."[12]

Symbolizing male courage and national pride, the fustanella was especially popular among young men who were not themselves involved in the fight for independence, but who would gladly pose for the camera in a heroic manner. Many were in fact following the example of the first Greek monarch, Otto I, who had introduced the costume to his court shortly after his enthronement and had also made it the basis of the uniform for the Evzones.[13] The exaggerated deployment of the fustanella, which originally served as a visible symbol of masculinity and heroism, eventually reduced it to a mere cliché. British contemporary historian and Philhellene George Finlay remarked: "It became then not uncommon, in Greece and Macedonia, to see the children of the proudest Osmanlis dressed in the fustanella, or white kilt."[14]

The Albanian-Greek fustanella, however, enthralled men of all ethnic backgrounds across the empire. In 1858 Hamzë Kazazi (1799–1859), one of the first Albanian rebels and the instigator of an uprising in the Albanian city of Shkodër in 1835, had himself photographed by Pjetër Marubi (1834–1903) in the dress of Greek revolutionaries (fig. 3), although posthumous attempts to portray him as an fighter for independence border on the comical.[15] However, Bulgarian guerrillas were likewise eager to dress in the heroic attire of the Greeks. Two portraits of the legendary Bulgarian Hajduck Ilyo Voyvoda (1805–1898), taken by the Serbian court photographer Anastas Stojanović in Belgrade in 1867, show him in the pleated skirt. Other Bulgarian men also had their portraits taken at Stojanović's studio and likewise in the fustanella. While not necessarily fighters for independence, they would dedicate their portraits to a friend or mistress, as is the case in the full-body portrait of Petar Mishaykov (fig. 4).[16]

THE TURKISH-MONTENEGRIN TYPE

The Turkish-Montenegrin dress code of the "Bulgarian national hero" appears to have evolved parallel to the Greek-Albanian type. The equal standing enjoyed by both clothing styles and the mutual reinforcement of their ideological significance are illustrated by the double portrait of the two famous Bulgarian guerrillas (slav. *vojvodes*) Vidul Stranski (1840–1878) and Stefan Karadzha (1848–1868), which was taken by Stojanović in Belgrade, probably in 1867 (fig. 5). In addition to the fustanella and the Greek cap with tassel familiar from the photographic portraits of Greek rebels, however, Stranski is wearing not an "Albanian" but a Montenegrin jacket called the *toke*.[17] It can be identified by the ample decoration on the chest, which is richly adorned with metal plates. Instead of the pleated white skirt, Karadzha is wearing the richly adorned "Turkish" pantaloons combined with a Montenegrin jacket and a likewise Montenegrin fur cap with tassel.

The "Turkish" style of dress appears to have taken inspiration from the uniform of the bodyguard or *cavas* (even if, like the *bashi-bazouk*, they had no particular ethnic

___ **5**: Anastas Stojanović, Double portrait of Vidul Stranski and Stefan Karadzha, Belgrade, c. 1867, albumen carte-de-visite, c. 9 × 5.5 cm, Photo Archives of the National Library SS. Cyril and Methodius, Sofia.

origin). This uniform is seen repeatedly in photographic portraits of "typical" professional groups. Many photographic series of Ottoman ethnic types addressed to European tourists construed the *cavas* as a separate category of virile Turk. Most people in the profession were from the local population in Anatolia and the Middle East, although also in the capital, the latter case being recruited by European diplomats as bodyguards, escorts, or security guards. The dress code of the *cavas* symbolized the right to bear arms as exclusive to Muslims, which at the same time is likely to have been associated with power and authority.

There are manifold examples of photographs of Bulgarian men dressed up as Turkish guards. In Belgrade in 1867, Vassil Levski (1837–1873), the quintessential Bulgarian national hero, posed in Turkish attire for a photograph (fig. 6). The only detail that distinguished him as not being "Turkish" was the fur cap, the *kalpak*—today's national symbol of the Bulgarian rebel against Ottoman rule. Even for not so popular

___ 6: Anastas Stojanović, Full-lenght portrait of Vassil Levski, Belgrade, c. 1867, albumen carte-devisite, c. 9 × 5.5 cm, Photo Archives of the National Library SS. Cyril and Methodius, Sofia.

"Bulgarian national heroes," dressing up as a *cavas* was a very popular practice. Unlike the fustanella, the attire of the "Turkish" *cavas* was a sign of respect for the power and authority of the wearer.

The influence of Montenegrin dress, meanwhile, can be traced back to the Serbian uprisings against the Ottoman central government which had taken place from the beginning of the nineteenth century. In similar fashion as the Greek rebels in Albanian attire, an array of high-profile Serbian nationalist activists, intellectuals, and literati had their pictures taken in Montenegrin dress. Ever since Montenegrins played a strategic role in the Serbs' struggle against Ottoman sovereignty, their clothing stood for the freedom and independence of the supposedly indomitable inhabitants of the "Black Mountains."[18] Anastas Jovanović (1817–1899), the first Serbian photographer, produced a pantheon of portraits of Serbian national heroes all wearing Montenegrin clothing. Jovanović later worked with his Bulgarian colleague Stojanović

___ **7**: Anastas Jovanović, half-length Portrait of Lyubomir Nenadović,
Belgrade, c. 1855, calotype, size and holding institution unknown.

who documented the most "Bulgarian national heroes." The famous portrait of Petar
II Petrović-Njegoš (1813–1851), Prince-Bishop of Montenegro, national poet, and phil-
osopher, survives as a talbotype or calotype (taken in 1848 or 1851) and shows the
earnest-looking man with the Montenegrin waistcoat and cap as later worn by
Karadzha. Njegoš made the flat red cap fashionable in polite society and helped it to
become the Montenegrin national symbol. This series of portraits also includes that
of Serbian national poet Ljubomir Nenadović (1826–1895), heavily armed and posing
like an irregular mercenary with the Montenegrin toke (fig. 7). Nenadović has his
right hand on a hilt, with his left hand drawing attention to the Montenegrin cap.[19]
His portrait is remarkably reminiscent of the poses by Stranski and other Bulgarians
with the Montenegrin toke. Milorad Medaković (1824–1897), Serbian historian and

diplomat, biographer, and personal secretary to Njegoš, likewise had his portrait taken in Montenegrin dress. Instead of the flat, round Montenegrin cap, he wears the distinctive fur cap with tassel, as familiar from the portrait of Karadzha.

THE HUNGARIAN-ROMANIAN TYPE

The first appearance of the Hungarian-Romanian uniform style, the precursor to the uniforms worn by today's Bulgarian National Guard, can be found in photographic portraits of Bulgarian insurgents taken in the Romanian capital of Bucharest. To the best of my knowledge, the man credited with founding this clothing tradition which would inspire an unprecedented wave of imitation is the emblematic Bulgarian national hero Vasil Levski. After posing in Belgrade as a "Turkish" cavas, Levski had his photo-

—— **8**: Carol Pop de Szathmari, Full-body portrait of Vasil Levski, Bucharest, c. 1870, albumin cabinet card, size unknown, National State Archives, Sofia.

graph taken in Bucharest by the Romanian court photographer Carol Popp de Szath-mári (1812–1887), probably some years later around 1870. His uniform is a Hungarian-style imitation of the Imperial and Royal Hussars regimentals (fig. 8). The white uniform with dark attachments on the collar and sleeves, as well as the lacing on the chest, sleeves, and trousers, is complemented by leather boots, a hussar fur cap adorned with a feather resting on the balustrade, and the rifle leaning demonstratively against it.[20]

The same uniform as seen in Levski's photograph was also featured—albeit with varying attributes and backdrops, and less authentic looking—in portraits for other, lesser-known Bulgarians, such as Branislav Veleshki (1834–1919), also photographed by Szathmári.[21] Veleshki posed in the same hussar-style uniform, but as an infantry-man in full dress with a haversack, while donning the traditional peasant footwear in the Balkan region, the *opanci*, and standing in front of a painted out-of-place English style landscape as a backdrop and a balustrade.

USES

The decision of Levski, Veleshki, and many other Bulgarian emigrants to visit Szath-mári's photography studio does not appear to have been a coincidence. Romanian Prince Alexandru Ioan Cuza I (r. 1862–1866) had been there previously for a portrait, and he also dressed in a Hungarian hussar regimental costume (fig. 9). He appears to have been the model for many Bulgarian emigrants in Romania. Cuza I's likeness was most likely distributed among the population in the form of inexpensive carte de visite portraits, both to boost his popularity and political standing and to promote a developing Romanian national identity. Following the example of the French emperor Napoleon III (r. 1852–1870), who in 1859 was photographed in a civilian suit by the inventor of the carte de visite, André Adolphe-Eugène Disdéri (1819–1889), Cuza I also presented himself in a ceremonious fashion but nevertheless as a man of the people.

Cuza I came to power in 1862, following the merger of two Ottoman vassal princi-palities, Moldavia and Wallachia, to form the United Romanian Principalities. Romania remained under the nominal sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire during the reign of Cuza I and would remain semi-autonomous until the declaration of independence in 1878. Nevertheless, Bulgarian separatists saw the newly-created state as a model that not only embodied the ideal of the progressive, European nation state but also one with which they could relate due to its Ottoman background. With his assumed hus-sar-style, Cuza I stood for the ideal of the independent nation sate, the latter's enlightened citizens, and a disciplined army that would wage organized war in defense of the independent state.

The ideologue of the Bulgarian national movement, Levski, had evidently recog-nized the advantages of a European-style appearance among radical nationalists. The

——— **9**: Carol Pop de Szathmari, Prince Alexandru Ioan Cuza I, Bucharest, c. 1861, 6.3 × 10.4 cm, Photo Archives of the National Library of Romania, Bucharest.

idea was to replace the old-fashioned stance and appearance of rebels associated with what Edward Said deconstructed as the image of "Oriental"[22] backwardness and brute force as seen in Western Europe with a modern and enlightened image. It triggered a widespread fashion trend among Ottoman Bulgarian migrants in Romania and later in Serbia, as witnessed by countless portraits featuring hussar-style dress. The result was a range of uniformed photographic portraits created in the 1870s which provided the basis for the uniform of the Bulgarian National Guard. These portrait series offer insights into the preferences and the self-conceptions, ambitions, and agendas of an entire social group. If one thinks of Pierre Bourdieu's thesis regarding the social uses of photography, then the series of photographs of "Bulgarian national heroes" garbed in uniforms constitutes a veritable "sociogram"[23] of an entire milieu, together with the visual culture that created it.

CARTES DE VISITE

The photographs of "Bulgarian national heroes" are all carte de visite portraits. The original images have the same modest dimensions, on average 9 × 5.5 centimeters, and are mounted on cardboard that measure 10 × 6.5 centimeters. Disdéri, who patented the carte de visite in Paris in 1854, found a way of creating eight images on a single plate, thereby drastically reducing the cost of purchasing more than one photograph. This photographic technique is to thank for the rise in the visibility of the common man and the common woman.

This invention, referred to either pejoratively as a "proletarian form of portraiture"[24] or more positively as a symbol of democracy,[25] triggered a momentous mass phenomenon known as "cardomania,"[26] across Europe, then North America, and globally. The influence of cardomania crossed social, cultural, and linguistic borders. Napoleon III, African-American slaves in the United States, and insurgents in the Ottoman Balkans all sooner or later found their way into the ateliers of photographers and thereby became part of the massive and entirely new business of photographing human subjects.[27] This historically novel method of seeing oneself in photographs had far-reaching consequences for culture and a decisive influence on our concept of historical images.[28]

The standardized format of the carte de visite photograph made the rationalized and optimized production of portraits possible, and the standardized poses and accouterments of the photographic portrait had a homogenizing effect on the social circles in which they circulated. The innumerable portraits articulated a unified formula of depiction that was rapidly becoming institutionalized, regardless of place. This is why carte de visite photographs from all over the world are so strikingly similar that they can be easily confused. Apart from minor dissimilarities in national motifs, clothing, or symbols, carte de visite portraits from even the most far-flung regions of the world hardly differ from one another. It is not by chance that the invention of the carte de visite photograph and its rapid spread coincided with the rise of national movements. Deborah Poole has drawn parallels between the market for carte de visite portraits as a part of visual capitalism and the role of "print capitalism" as referred to by Benedict Anderson, who characterizes print media as the motor of national ideology.[29] According to Poole, the market in carte de visite images strengthened a sense of community among the middle classes and their identity of "sameness" all over the world, from the bourgeoisie of large urban centers to the ambitious merchants of the provinces and the upper and middle classes of the colonies.[30] She writes, "The worldwide rush to purchase carte-de-visite photographs … reflects the extent to which these small, circulating images of self answered the shared desires and sentiments of what was rapidly emerging as a global class."[31]

FUNCTIONS

We do know, however, that carte de visite portraits should be understood as pictorial expressions and indeed assertions of a certain social prestige that the person depicted had achieved, or at least, so the portrayal would suggest. The most visible sign of this prestige in the petty bourgeois circles of the cities in the European territories of the Ottoman Empire was the uniform. Especially "foreign" uniforms gave the Ottoman subjects an air of importance, and they ensured that the people wearing them would be admired, attracting the gaze of the viewer with their shimmer. Zahari Stoyanov (1850–1889), the first chronicler of the Bulgarian uprisings, offers a lovely description of the enchanting charm of even the simplest school uniform: "The heroes of the day were the people who returned from the School of Medicine in Bucharest or Constantinople, or the School of Commerce in Vienna, or any kind of school that had a uniform, two or three gold buttons, a cap with flourishes."[32] A uniform was a clear sign of success and social advancement. The uniform filled the person who wore it with pride, affiliating him with the state and winning him the respect of others. It was a symbol of power and a forward-looking attitude, a sign of a "new era [and a new] time, in which even a Bulgarian carries a saber."[33] The photographic portrait was the perfect representational form for the vision of a subject of the Ottoman Empire who sought to portray himself as a modern man. It provided a visual delineation of this masculine fantasy, and because of the apparent reliability of the photograph as a documentary image, invested it with authenticity.

FACEBOOK INSURGENCY

Carte de visite portraits represented an important implement in modern communication and social networking. The relatively inexpensive photographs were referred to as cartes de visite for a reason. They served as useful tools when people sought to present themselves and to establish their places in various social contexts and hierarchies. In addition to this practical use, they also had what could be referred to as exchange value. Fitting easily into someone's pocket, carte de visite portraits were predestined to be exchanged, and they thereby acquired an important social function and an equally important role in the expression and communication of status.

These portraits circulated through a wide array of channels. They were sent by mail, exchanged personally, given as gifts, and even collected. People used them to introduce themselves, to court a beloved, or to dedicate to friends. The circulation of portraits guaranteed recognition and membership in certain social circles and groups. The carte de visite rapidly became a meaningful social medium, without which one

could hardly hope to participate in the social life of the time. It was a precursor to the social networking tool of our time, the Facebook of the nineteenth century.

In addition to their function as representations of uniformed masculinity, the portraits of the "Bulgarian national heroes" possess significance as a medium of communication that should not be underestimated. This fact is indicated by the dedications on the backs of the portraits. Like many of his contemporaries, Toma Kardzhiev (1850–1887), a teacher and organizer of a local revolutionary committee, wrote a dedication on his portrait (fig. 10) to Dimitar Gorov, a Bulgarian entrepreneur in Romania and a patron of radical Bulgarian national circles: "To my friend D. Gorov as a sign of *truthfulness* [emphasis mine]" (fig. 11). From the perspective of elegance and imagination, Kardzhiev's portrait could have hardly been outdone. He is garbed in a hussar's uniform with a saber and gun, standing on a checkered rug in front of a neutral background. The dedication is dated May 14, 1876, just days after the bloody suppression of the April Uprising, in which Kardzhiev participated only indirectly, supplying the armed units with money, weapons, and so forth.

The function of the portraits of "Bulgarian national heroes" was certainly by no means limited to their role as a medium of access to the social network of radical nationalistic circles or as a tool in the maintenance of ties to those who shared their ideals. The portraits were clearly central components in the logistics of insurgency. The circulation of the portraits went far beyond the private sphere or the narrow social network. As Poole observes, "As a form of social currency [...] the carte-de-visite circulated through channels much broader than the immediate network of friends and acquaintances."[34]

The photographs of "Bulgarian national heroes" were intended to saturate all layers of society with the ideology that they embodied in a manner that was entirely new at the time. Levski, who had considerable experience in the art of self-invention through photography, recognized the potential of the carte de visite portrait, which could be easily and inexpensively reproduced, to kindle agitation. He used the carte de visite portrait to attract and to recruit comrades in arms. In his letters, he instructed his fellows to have portraits of him wearing a "legionnaire" uniform circulated among the people.[35] Clearly he assumed that the depictions of "Bulgarian national heroes" could convince the everyday "man on the street" to join the armed uprising. Finally, the carte de visite enabled the national revolutionaries to widen their spheres of influence and to extend the revolutionary network beyond cultural, social, and linguistic borders.

Once set in motion, the circulation of the portraits of the "Bulgarian national heroes" did not necessarily prompt the observer to take action, but it did prompt many observers to follow suit. This explains the striking rise in the number of photographic portraits that were taken in the widest array of military uniforms, photographs that are stored by the hundreds in Bulgarian archives. Paraphrasing Roland

_____ **10**: Babet Engels, Full-length portrait of Toma Kardzhiev, Bucharest, 1876 (?), albumen carte-devisite, 10.5 × 6.5 cm, Photo Archives of the National Library SS. Cyril and Methodius, Sofia.____ **11**: Back side of Figure 10.

Barthes, the photograph invests the subject depicted in a military uniform with at least a metaphorical existence as a "Bulgarian national hero."[36] And it was the uniform that allowed the historical portraits to become part of historiography, and through historiography, they became part of culture, immortalized one more time in photograph albums, but this time as "genuine" heroes.[37] In the end, the iconographic and aesthetic similarities of the portraits—the ubiquitous poses and uniforms—created a welcomed occasion for historiography to craft a homogenous collective image that today creates the impression of a self-contained, unified military movement for national liberation.

NOTES

1 Ionescu, "Fotografie und Folklore," 47.

2 The portrait belongs to a series of different ethnicities and/or professional types taken by Angerer in what is today Romania during the Crimean War. The entire series is kept in the Picture Archives of the Austrian National Library and is available digitized at: http://www.bildarchivaustria.at/Pages/Search/Result.aspx?p_ItemID=2 (last accessed: February 6, 2017). See Holzer, "Im Schatten," on how the photographic series was created. Unfortunately, Holzer does not address this photograph or its title.

3 "Bimbaşı" means Ottoman Turkish *binbaşı* (colonel), i.e., literally "head (baş)" of "thousand (bin)."

4 The majority of studies on photography in the Ottoman era have concentrated on representations of the "Other" produced by either non-indigenous photographers or by local ones who satisfied the demand of the western European gaze. See, for example, Behdad/Gartlan, *Photography's Orientalism*; Micklewright, "Orientalism and Photography;" and Özendes, *Orientalism.*

5 A special selection of photographs from this imperial photograph archive project for western European audiences is known as the "Abdülhamid II Collection," which is held in the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., and in the British Library, London. Entirely digitized, the albums of the Library of Congress can be found under http://www.loc.gov/pictures/collection/ahii/ (last accessed: January 8, 2017). A first overview was edited by Gavin (ed.), *Imperial Self Portrait.* For an aesthetic analysis, see Shaw, "Ottoman Photography;" and Micklewright, "In the Service." On particular aspects of the collection as the representation of "students," see Harper, "School Portraits."

6 Lemke, "Ottoman Photography," 238.

7 Sheehi, "Social History," 177.

8 Micklewright, "Late Ottoman Photography;" Micklewright, "Photographs and Consumption;" and Woodward, "Photographic Practice."

9 The history of indigenous photography in Anatolia has also remained little investigated. On the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire, see Sheehi, *Arab Imago*, and Sheehi, "Portrait Paths."

10 In response to my e-mail to Peter Prokop, head of the Picture Archives of the Austrian National Library, asking whether the title was created by Angerer himself or had been added later, I was informed that "the so-called title was penciled in beneath the photograph by somebody or other; I would say it is clearly a later interpretation. It would be interesting to know who the subject really is." Peter Prokop, e-mail correspondence with the author, December 5, 2013. At this point I would like to thank Peter Prokop for his valuable insights and other help.

11 Quataert, "Clothing Laws," 413.

12 Stathatos, "Frock Coat."

13 Ibid. The female equivalent of this "Greek" national costume was invented by the wife of the prince, Amalia (1818–1875), hence the name "Amalia" dress. It was based on the male version, including the tasseled hat (gr. *kalpaki*) and jacket covered in gold embroidery.

14 Finlay, *History of Greece*, VI, 39.

15 Greeks and Albanians still argue bitterly over heritage claims to the fustanella. See, for example, the discussion platform: http://arbenia.forumotion.com/t18-fustanella (last accessed: March 5, 2017).

16 On the back of his portrait, Petar Mishaykov wrote: "As a souvenir for Miss Magdalena Stanković from Petar Mishaykov."

17 *Toke* are large silver plates, which may be attached to the front of the *jelek* (jacket). These plates were very expensive, so only clan chiefs and other important individuals were able to wear them.

18 On the pictorial creation of the Montenegrin archetype in the nineteenth century, see Baleva, *Bulgarien im Bild*.

19 Ljubomir Nenadović (1826–1895) also posed later for the camera in the *toke* with cap in hand and heavily armed. Photographer, location and date are unknown. A digitized image can be found at: http://www.montenegrina.net/pages/pages1/istorija/cg_u_xix_vijeku/sazdanje_crnogorske_nacionalne_drzave6_b_pavicevic.htm (last accessed: March 5, 2017).

20 Both among historians and in the popular imagination, Levski's uniform is seen as that of the Bulgarian Legion in Belgrade from 1862. Krumka Sharova, one of the most renowned scholars on the biography of Levski, designated the picture as "Vassil Levski in the *so-called* uniform of the First Bulgarian Legion, Bucharest, 1868–1869" (my italics). In a footnote on the picture's title, she nevertheless added: "As such the uniform is of Hungarian design and probably a prop from Szathmari's studio." See Sharova et al. (eds.), *Vassil Levski*, I, 658, document number 250.

21 Carol Pop de Szathmári: Full-length portrait of Branislav Veleshki, Bucharest, undated, albumen carte de visite (10.5 × 6 cm), Photograph Archives of the National Library SS. Cyril and Methodius, Sofia, Signature НБКМ-БИА С 14. The dating of the photograph to 1862, as specified in the Photograph Archives of the National Library, is more than dubious.

22 See Said, *Orientalism*.

23 Bourdieu, "Culte," 43. The term goes back to Jacob L. Moreno and describes the visual representation of "the position of each individual within his group as well as the inter-relations of all other individuals as these are affected by attractions and repulsions" (Moreno, *Who Shall Survive?*, 26). In other words, a sociogram shows the structure of interpersonal relations in a social group.

24 McCauley, *Disdéri*, 30.

25 Freund, *Photographie*.

26 Gernsheim, *Geschichte*, ch. 24: "Das Visitenkartenporträt," 355–368. Gernsheim writes of a "carte-de-visite fever" and a "carte-mania," 358, 360.

27 In larger photograph ateliers of European cities, the average number of cartes de visite produced over the course of six months added up to half a million. See the statistical data, ibid., 361.

28 Barthes, *Camera Lucida*, 12. According to Barthes, inexpensive portrait photography led to a disturbance of civilization.

29 Poole, *Vision*, 112; Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, see ch. 2 on "Cultural Roots."

30 Poole, *Vision*, 112.

31 Ibid.

32 Stoyanov, *Botyov*, 8.

33 Ibid., 9.

34 Poole, *Vision*, 112.

35 According to the founder of the digital photograph archives "Lostbulgaria" (http://www.lostbulgaria.com/); Kolev, "Mustacite."

36 Barthes, *Camera Lucida*, 11.

37 Compare ibid., 16. Barthes regards any picture that has been included in illustrated books or magazines as having passed through the filter of culture.

COPYRIGHT/ILLUSTRATION CREDITS

 1: Picture Archives of the Austrian National Library, Pk 4400, 12.

 2: Photographs Collection, NPG x74416, © National Portrait Gallery, London.

 3: www. archivio.internazionale.it/all'ombra-di-ghisoland (last accened: February 2, 2015).

 4: Photo Archives of the National Library SS. Cyril and Methodius, Sofia, НБКМ-БИА С 565.

 5: Photo Archives of the National Library SS. Cyril and Methodius, Sofia, НБКМ-БИА С 2090.

 6: Photo Archives of the National Library SS. Cyril and Methodius, Sofia, НБКМ-БИА С 653.

 7: Debeljković, *Stara srpska fotografija / Old Serbian Photography*.

 8: National State Archives, Sofia, III 291. Photo from the original by Hristo Yonkov.

 9: Photo Archives of the National Library of Romania, Bucharest, 934.

10, 11: Photo Archives of the National Library SS. Cyril and Methodius, Sofia, НБКМ-БИА С 99.