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ABSTRACT

IN PURSUIT OF A LOST ARCHITECTURAL ARTEFACT: TRACING PHOTOGRAPHY STUDIOS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Coşkun, Esatcan
Doctor of Philosophy, Architecture
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. İnci Basa

September 2023, 338 pages

The glass daylight studios - referred with the moniker “glass house” at nineteenth century - began to appear on the rooftops of historic city setting, and quickly evolved to be a well-defined spatial element in photographic discourse. There are many diagrams, plans and perspectives with proper dimensions and brief explanations in the early written manuals on portrait photography. However, for architectural discourse, the daylight studios mostly remain as a footnote under the nineteenth century glass obsession. The glass daylight studios are also an underrated field of study as they are generally recognized as part of a transitional and experimental period through the transparency of modern architecture.

Guided by simple technical and scientific principles, the photographic “glasshouses” emerged as a manifestation of architectural space based purely on function and constructed by modern building materials of steel and plate glass. At the same time, their rapid and autonomous occurrence on the roof scape of the city as well as their growing popularity among the public underlines them as significant architectural and cultural elements of urban life. It is possible to assess that these “glass houses” as long lost urban artefacts that once had a substantial role in the collective memory of the city, which also contributed to the concept of remembrance by the photographic archives they produced from within.
This study argues that the crude glass constructions and alterations on rooftops quickly transformed into a hybrid architectural typology, beginning with the well-proportioned small glass extensions embedded in the rooftops of existing buildings to an entirely new design element for architects of nineteenth century. By focusing on the period between 1851 and 1910, when portrait photography was a cultural phenomenon, this study develops a research methodology to trace and map the long-lost photography studios of nineteenth century and to reveal the architecture of “glass house” studio as a neglected typology in architectural discourse.
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Basit teknik ve bilimsel ilkeler tarafından yönlendirilen fotografik “cam stüdyolar”, tamamen işleve dayalı, çelik ve cam levha yapısı malzemeleriyle inşa edilen “modern” bir mimari mekânın tezahürütüdür. Kentin çatı peyzajında hızlı ve kendiliğinden ortaya çıkımlarının yanında; halk arasında artan popülariteleri, bu stüdyoları kentsel yaşamın önemli bir mimarı ve kültürel unsuru olarak öne çıkarmaktadır. Bir zamanlar kentin kolektif hafızasında önemli bir yere sahip olan ve kendi içlerinde ürettiğleri fotoğraf arşivleriyle de kentsel hatıra kavramına

ÖZ

KAYIP BİR MİMARİ ESERİN PEŞİNDE:
ONDOKUZUNCU YÜZYIL FOTOĞRAF STÜDYOLARININ İZİNİ SÜRMEK
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The object of this research is a long-lost architectural artefact of the nineteenth century: the photography studio. This dissertation aims to unveil photography studios as a consistent, repetitive architectural pattern embedded in nineteenth century urban context and to assert their significance for urban memory by delving into the cultural implications they convey. Referred to with the monikers “glass house” and “daylight studio,” the photography studios started to appear, and then rapidly proliferated, on the rooftops of historic city setting by radically altering the roofscape of the nineteenth-century city with their transparency, multiplicity and ubiquity. Although there are several manuals and books on photography which include architectural drawings and diagrams to demonstrate the basic tips for constructing a glass studio, the photography studios escaped the attention of architectural discourse.

This study argues that the abundance of the photographic establishments as a popular cultural phenomenon in between the years 1851 and 1910s and the well-established spatial features of the studios shaped by the scientific standards define the photography studio as a unique architectural typology. Beginning as small glass extensions embedded in the rooftops of existing buildings, the photography studio soon evolved into a strong design element for architecture, which created a hybrid condition by superimposing modern materials and transparent surfaces onto the historic setting of the city. In other words, the transformation of the traditional space of the attic into a luminous and spacious photography studio constituted a hybridity between the roof level shaped with modern materials and standards, and the historically coded façade of the building. This study aims to demonstrate this particular architectural formation by tracing the long-lost photographic establishments in nineteenth century cities and to disclose visual data on the
architecture of the “glass house” studios to assess the photography studio as a hybrid architectural typology.

The enthusiasm towards portrait photography began immediately with the invention of the medium, despite the impossibility of capturing human subjects due to the long exposure times required. It took only two years to develop new methods that enable photographic portraiture, and the first photography studios began to emerge as early as the 1840s. Because the basic need for portrait photography is a well-illuminated enclosed space that can benefit from the natural sunlight as much as possible while providing shelter against weather conditions, the early rooftop ateliers of the photographers were formed as glass boxes that also give the photographer the opportunity to adjust the interior against the changing light conditions during the day.

With the experimentations and developments in both the optic technologies and chemical processes, portrait photography became more and more practical in the following eleven-year period. Together with the upgraded camera lenses, the introduction of the glass negatives and wet-collodion process in 1851 considerably decreased the time needed for both posing and printing. This is why the year 1851 can be assessed as a milestone that paved the way for the transformation of the photography studio into a widespread urban phenomenon.

The photography studios transformed into a frequented space for the bourgeois who wanted to be photographed in the luxurious settings of the studios. Especially after the introduction of the compact carte de visite format in 1854 by Eugene Disderi, portrait photography became available to a broader audience, with its economic prices while the photographs evolved into an item of exchange as a part of a social practice. Photography studios were visited by several famous figures whose carte de visite photographs were reproduced countless times and became a widespread object of collection for the public. An article titled “Photography” published by Charles Dickens in his popular weekly magazine Household Words in 1853, describes the increasing popularity of the medium:
We have been ringing artists’ bells. We have been haunting the dark chambers of photographers. We have found those gentlemen – our modern high priests of Apollo, the old sun god – very courteous, and not at all desirous to forbid to the world's curiosity a knowledge of their inmost mysteries. We rang a bell in Regent Street – which was not all a bell, for it responded to our pull not with a clatter; but with one magical stroke – and instantly, as though we had been sounding an enchanted horn, the bolts were drawn by unseen hands, and the door turned upon its hinges. Being well read in old romance, we knew how to go on with the adventure. There were stairs before us which we mounted; swords we had none to draw. In a few seconds we reached another open door, that led into a chamber, of which the walls and tables were in great part overlaid with metal curiously wrought. A thousand images of human creatures of each sex and of every age – such as no painter ever has produced – glanced at us from all sides, as if they would have spoken to us out of the hard silver. […] And the expert photographer – the magic of whose art is fostered by no worse feeling than vanity, or by a hundred purer sentiments – was followed very willingly upstairs. It was all wholesome latter-day magic that we went up to see practiced under a London skylight. […] we mounted to the door; through which we poured our forces into the room under the skylight, where we found several defenses thrown up in the shape of folding screens and faced an unusually heavy fire from a round tower of a stove.\(^1\)

This study acknowledges the emergence of photographic “glass houses” not just as an indicator of architectural and urban transformation but also a cultural one. The portrait studios presented a unique experience for the visitors who wanted to possess a “likeness” of their own. With the introduction of carte de visite and later cabinet formats, portrait photography transformed into an integral part of the cultural life of the nineteenth-century city.

The popularity of glass rooftop studios lasted until the 1910s. There are two factors which triggered their demise. The first is the advancement in artificial lighting which offers the photographer an easy control and practicality over the subject in comparison with the difficulties in controlling the daylight. Combined with other disadvantages of rooftop studios such as the accessibility for customers and the high construction and maintenance costs, the necessity to construct a glass atelier on the roof level became redundant. The well-illuminated and airy space of the rooftop

---

studio transformed into a more compact and plain dark space located on the ground level with easy access.

The second factor was the introduction of the roll film with the first personal compact camera model named *Kodak* by George Eastman’s Eastman Dry Plate and Film Company in 1888. The immediate popularity and commercial success of this camera amongst the public marked it as a symbol and even the company changed its name to Eastman Kodak Company in 1892. Between the years 1888 and 1908 while the camera became more compact, affordable, and easily accessible for everyone, the use of roll film also became more practical with the introduction of newer models. With this public enthusiasm towards amateur photography, the photography studios began to lose their former glory and popularity as a social phenomenon while transforming into more practical spaces of photographic reproduction. The architectural characteristics of the studios transformed entirely at the beginning of the twentieth century with these developments, while a few photographic establishments with glass studios could pace up with the evolution of the business. This is the reason why most of the buildings dedicated to portrait photography business were abandoned or transformed within the first half of the twentieth century, especially considering their locations near popular areas of the city. Therefore, this study focuses between the years 1851 and 1910 to trace the urban impact of the glass rooftop studios and to analyze their spatial and architectural characteristics, as well as demonstrating their possible influences in architectural discourse.

This sixty-year period bears witness to the increasing prevalence of photographic establishments throughout the nineteenth-century city, which can be distinguished within the historic city setting by the strong visual impact of the glass posing studios. The roofscape of the historic city setting began to be transfigured with the introduction of the photography studios. These photographic “glass houses”

---

proposed a luminous, airy, and sterile modern architectural space that fundamentally altered the traditional roofs by emancipating the residual space of the attic from its dim, cramped and dusty atmosphere.

The architecture of the studios is structured by scientific principles of optics, as can be observed in the early written manuals and treatises on portrait photography, in which several architectural drawings and diagrams can be found with brief explanations. The glass studio evolved into a well-defined spatial element for photographic discourse motivated by its function while representing a modern architectural language with the use of iron and glass as building materials. The studio was also a cultural symbol of newly emerging social practices clustered around the modern medium of photography in parallel with its popularity amongst nineteenth-century society. The autonomous and sudden emergence of the photography studios on the nineteenth-century city rooftops marked them as significant architectural and cultural components of urban life. This study assesses the photography studio as a vanished urban artifact that once played a significant part in the city’s collective memory and contributed to the idea of remembrance through the photographic archives that the studios produced from within.

Deriving from this ubiquitous yet neglected phenomenon of the nineteenth century architecture and urbanism, the research unfolds with following questions:

- Distancing from the “photography of architecture,” is it possible to define an “architecture of photography”?
- Are there any architectural types that emerge with the development of the photography industry, such as portrait studio, glasshouse atelier or the skylight studio?
- Is it possible to find the traces of photography studios in nineteenth century city? What can be the means of reflecting their multiplicity, density, variety and even their popularity?
- Is it possible to define photography studios as a typology neglected in architectural discourse?
Despite their straightforward architecture stimulated by the notion of function and structured with modern materials, the photography studios mostly remain as a footnote under the nineteenth-century glass obsession in architectural discourse. The glass daylight studios are also an underrated field of study, as they are generally recognized as part of a transitional and experimental period through the transparency of modern architecture.

The canonical books that seek the origins or sparks of the modern architecture amongst the nineteenth-century utilitarian iron structures, such as Alfred Gotthold Meyer’s *Eisenbauten*, Siegfried Giedion’s *Building in France* and later *Space, Time and Architecture*, and Henry Russel Hitchcock’s *Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, completely omit the photography studios while listing the grandeur iron architectures of nineteenth century such as warehouses, railway stations, market halls, conservatories, exhibition buildings or later department stores.\(^3\) Even Niklaus Pevsner’s book *A History of Building Types*, which embraces a typological classification of the buildings solely based on their use, does not include photography studios as a distinctive architectural typology.\(^4\)

It is possible to find the traces of the impact of photography in nineteenth-century everyday life and the significance of its architectural manifestations in the field of cultural studies in addition to architectural discourse. One example is a comprehensive book about nineteenth-century glass culture of Victorian England, *Victorian Glassworlds* by Isobel Armstrong.\(^5\) The book emphasizes how glass emerged as an integral part of photographic technologies right from the start and


\(^4\) Only shopfronts were mentioned briefly in chapter 16 titled “Shops, Stores and Department stores” which also includes the arcade as a precedent to the department store. Nikolaus Pevsner, *A History of Building Types* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976).

transformed into a revolutionary material later by the improvement of the camera lenses and the introduction of glass plates for fixing the image. With upgraded lenses, the glass negatives helped to diminish both the exposure times and proposed a better method for the printing and reproduction of photographs without losing the quality of the images.

Isobel Armstrong delves into how the photographic camera and the similar optical artefacts stimulated by the use of glass transformed the perception of the nineteenth-century individual, while also focusing on the production processes of glass and its practical uses especially in architecture. Although similar neglected architectural typologies such as the arcades and shopfronts become an integral part of the book along with the grandeur examples of train stations, conservatories, or bridges, the photography studios were not included as a part of nineteenth century glass culture. It is unfortunate that Armstrong’s book omitted photography studios despite its extensive concentration on architecture, yet it is possible to find other books about the Victorian period that carry the imprints of the significance of the photography studio for nineteenth century culture.6

Elizabeth Anne McCauley’s two books, *Industrial Madness: Commercial Photography in Paris, 1848-1871* published in 1994 and *A.A.E. Disderi and the Carte de Visite Portrait Photograph* published in 1985, are the primary sources for this study even though they are not directly related to architectural discourse and fall under the category of art history. The first book, *Industrial Madness* contributed

---

to this research not only with the index of Parisian photographers of nineteenth century but also by depicting how photography became a popular phenomenon amongst the nineteenth-century culture and transformed into an integral part of the urban environment. It is possible to find in the work rare exterior photographs of some studios that give clues about their architecture as well as several anecdotes, caricatures, and advertisements that are helpful to identify certain studios in Paris.

The second book, which is about the inventor of the carte de visite format, Eugene Disderi, emphasizes the substantial role of this special format as an object of exchange in the form of a social practice. Apart from the historical information about Disderi’s life and his career as a photographer (which also reflects the similar social conditions of other commercial photographers at the time), the book depicts the vital role of carte de visite photographs in the nineteenth-century material culture. The discussion of the materiality of the photographs in the book emerges as an influential impetus for this study.

Besides the literature on nineteenth-century culture, the books that aim to construct a historiography of photography are also examined to seek possible descriptions or depictions of the studios. Beaumont Newhall’s *The History of Photography from 1839 to the Present Day*, Helmut and Alison Gernsheim’s *The History of Photography: From the Camera Obscura to the Beginning of the Modern Era*, Michel Frizot’s *A New History of Photography*, and Quentin Bajac’s *The Invention of Photography: The First Fifty Years* can be listed as sources that briefly explain the significance of the genre of portrait photography for the history of the medium.7 Although these books contain valuable information which is beneficial to construct the historical framework of the study in Chapter Two; it is impossible to achieve a comprehensive analysis of the photography studios based on the data they provide because of the broader scope of study they embraced for establishing a

---

historiography of photography. Even though the photography studios were mentioned as a significant phenomenon of nineteenth century culture and exemplified with a selection of carte de visite or cabinet card photographs that were produced within, there is only a limited number of illustrations that demonstrates the spatial characteristics of the studio as an architectural entity. The illustrations are mostly in the form of caricatures and advertisements, while the photographs or drawings of the studios are difficult to find apart from some canonical examples.

Another significant source for this research is John Hannavy’s comprehensive indexical study on nineteenth-century photographers: *Encyclopedia of Nineteenth-Century Photography.* While presenting an exhaustive index of nineteenth-century photographers, the book includes several key figures who contributed to the development of photography along with a number of entries on photographic processes, techniques, equipment’s, artistic styles or movements, debates or the important books and journals on photography. Therefore, it emerges as a guidebook for this research not only by providing significant historical facts about the famous portrait photographers, which helps to identify or validate some of the photography studios, but also by presenting technical and conceptual knowledge about the photographic medium to consult during the construction of the historical framework of the study.

Amongst the vast archive of literature on photography, the earliest short histories, treatises, manuals as well as photography journals come forward as the most prolific sources for photography studios. The most prominent source amidst these nineteenth century references is Otto Buehler’s book *Atelier und Apparat des Photographen,* published in Berlin in 1869, which contains the most comprehensive compilation of photography studios presented with several

---

8 John Hannavy, *Encyclopedia of Nineteenth-Century Photography,* 2 volumes (London: Taylor & Francis: 2008). Many significant names for this study are also amongst the board of advisors for this book such as Geoffrey Batchen, Janice Hart, E. Anne McCauley and Michael Pritchard.

architectural drawings and diagrams. The book’s main concern is to represent the variation of the glass studio designs to achieve the best possible lighting conditions for the photographing process, as it also includes a variety of plan configurations that demonstrate the spatial relations between the subsidiary spaces such as dark room, printing facilities, reception, costume room, etc. It also includes the drawings and explanations of several apparatuses that were used for posing and printing as well as the furniture models for decorating the studio. These studios belong to the pioneers of portrait photography at the time which were later re-published as exemplary models or prototypes in several photographic journals. Although the book does not include the most complex examples installed on the rooftop of an already existing building, it still demonstrates a great deal of information about the spatial relations and architecture of the studios.

Amongst the books and photographic journals, which will also be mentioned in Chapter Five, Paul Eduard Liesegang’s *Illustrirtes Handbuch der Photographie* in 1864, Alphonse Liébert’s *La photographie en Amérique* in 1874, Josef Maria Eder’s *Das Atelier und Laboratorium des Photographen* in 1893, Thomas Bolas’s *The Photographic Studio* in 1895 and Franz Stolze’s *Handwerksbüch für Photographen* in 1898 are the significant sources that contain visual information about the photography studios. Although there are a considerable number of photographic journals, the *Photographische Korrespondenz* published in Vienna, *Das Atelier des Photographen* published in Halle and *Photographisches Archiv* published in Berlin are assessed as the most prominent sources, as they provide architectural drawings of certain studios.\(^\text{11}\)

---


The Photographic Studios of Europe by H. Baden Pritchard\textsuperscript{12} published in 1882 is the only comprehensive source regarding the practices of nineteenth century photographic establishments. The book was a compilation of Pritchard’s reports on photography studios he visited, which were published in the issues of the journal Photographic News between 1880 and 1883. Pritchard was the editor of the Photographic News between 1880 and 1884, while he also edited the Yearbook of Photography between 1881 and 1884. Although The Photographic Studios of Europe includes a selection of well-known studios of the time, the book is heavily structured upon the textual information based on Pritchard’s assessments of the facilities of the establishments and does not include visual representations of the studios apart from some crude sketches. However, the content of the book provides an initiator for this study to designate the scope of the research, as will be explained in detail in the fifth chapter.

The literature review on photography studios shows that even if it is possible to find information about the studios in various sources on nineteenth century European culture, there is not a comprehensive study that reveals the abundance and multiplicity of the studios together with a focus on their architectures. The findings on the architectural characteristics of the studio are relied on as the earliest source of nineteenth century photographic literature while the photography studio was entirely disregarded by the architectural discourse.

This study argues that the photography studios were an integral part of the nineteenth-century urban context not only as an architectural artefact but also as a cultural phenomenon. By focusing on the period between 1851 and 1910 when daylight studios and photographic establishments were at their peak, this study aims

\textsuperscript{12} H. Baden Pritchard, \textit{The Photographic Studios of Europe} (London: Piper and Carter, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed., 1883).
to trace both the prevalent urban existence of the studios and their spatial characteristics to define them as a neglected architectural typology.

The dissertation begins by introducing a brief historical framework of the development of photography and its relation to architecture. Although the literature on photography and architecture frequently discusses how these two discourses have developed in tandem, the emphasis is almost always on the visual impact of photography on architecture rather than debating whether there could ever be an architecture of photography.

The second chapter, “From Dormer Window to ‘Glass House’ Studio,” aims at structuring the historical context in which the photographic establishments began to flourish throughout the nineteenth-century city. As the proto-photographers were experimenting with space to benefit from the sunlight as much as possible, the rooftops and attics underwent a major transformation, which stimulated the expansion of dormer windows as well as skylights in size and resulted with the emergence of large glass surfaces on the rooftops of the city. The preliminary examples presented in this chapter depict the first sparks indicating the emergence of a new architecture regarding portrait photography. It also demonstrates how the architecture of the studios started to be articulated in time with the growing public interest, which later to be transformed into a hybrid architectural typology.

The third chapter, “Architecture of Photography,” outlines the functional, architectural, social and contextual underpinnings of the rapid and abundant emergence of photography studios on specific locations (cultural, economic, educational hubs/points such as squares, plazas, boulevards,) for a brief period in between 1850s and 1910s. With the transformative and generative power deriving from their multiplicity, density and simultaneity, these add-on photography studios became distinctive urban elements with a considerable visual and social impact on the morphology of the city and its collective memory. This study aims to expose the photography studio as a repetitive architectural pattern in nineteenth-century architecture. Instead of selecting innovative examples to speculate about their
underlying characteristics, it embraces a typological approach to trace the photography studios by capturing not only their tectonic qualities as architectural entities but also by acknowledging them as contextual formations with their deeper cultural and social associations embedded within the everyday of nineteenth century city.

To appraise photography studios with their architectural variety, urban multiplicity, and contextual popularity in the nineteenth century, the third chapter provides a discussion on the notion of typology in architecture concentrated upon three dominant paradigms of type-nature, type-machine and type-city. By embracing an understanding of architectural typology within a broader social and cultural context instead of simply a tool for formal analysis, this study attempts to evoke a reciprocal approach in-between these three paradigms to formulate the photography studio as a hybrid architectural typology.

The typological approach embraced by this research, therefore, seeks not only to acquire formal precepts of photography studios but also to demonstrate the diversity of its variations by highlighting the unique transformations to which each existing building was exposed with the introduction of the studio. Variety in this context refers to both the social/urban perception of the studios as cultural artifacts and their visual perception as architectural objects, in addition to the rational definition of a formal variation.

If the city is understood as an amalgamation of intertwined social, cultural, economic, political relations manifested through architectural forms, this study argues that the typological readings that will focus on utilitarian, transitory, and humble architectures rather than the grander examples can lead to new perspectives for architectural discourse. Then, typological studies cease to be merely a means of formal analysis or mathematical formulation for architecture and begin to shed light on the complex web of relations that led to the emergence of a new typology at first place. In this way, the symbolic and cultural dimensions of architecture can be discovered along with the formal aspects.
The fourth chapter, “The Glass House Studio and Architectures of the Utilitarian,” develops a theoretical framework to assess the “glass house” studio as a neglected architectural artefact based on the writings of two key figures: Siegfried Giedion and Walter Benjamin. Siegfried Giedion’s reading of the nineteenth-century utilitarian architectural forms as a precedent of modernism in his seminal book *Space, Time and Architecture*,\(^\text{13}\) provides a fundamental reference to distinguish the architectural significance of the photography studios. His preliminary work on the architecture of nineteenth-century architecture, *Building in France, Building in Iron, Building Ferro-Concrete*\(^\text{14}\) published in 1928 also had a great impact on the writings of another key figure, Walter Benjamin. The main notion that influenced Benjamin was Giedion’s methodology pinpointing the initial impulses of twentieth-century modern architecture among nineteenth-century structures. In parallel with Giedion, Benjamin thinks it is possible to understand today’s condition by deciphering the architectural remnants of the nineteenth-century city and tracing the web of relations that these buildings once manifested.

By focusing on the early utilitarian buildings of the nineteenth century, which are largely overlooked by traditional architectural histories, Giedion hopes to shed light on the “subconscious” role of “construction” as a revolutionary stimulus that eventually created the conditions for the emergence of truly modern architecture. While Walter Benjamin introduces the social dimension of architecture and its role as a catalyst towards a modern way of life, his conception of the “dialectical image” suggests a complex relationship between the past and the present in comparison with Giedion’s interpretation of nineteenth century as a period infused with a subconscious predetermination towards modernist architecture in a purely constructional means. Instead Benjamin embraces surrealism’s interest on the material remnants of the bourgeoisie and looks for the hidden aspects of nineteenth-


century culture that works in the level of the “subconscious” of the city. Benjamin’s enthusiasm of the arcades as a forgotten architectural typology imbued with the very materiality of nineteenth-century culture resonates with the aim of this research to assess the architectural significance of the photography studios not only through formal analysis but also based on their impact on everyday life in the second half of the nineteenth century.

The fifth chapter, “In Pursuit of a Lost Architectural Type: Tracing Photography Studio,” presents the body of this research. It elaborates the research tools and methodology developed in the research process to trace the photography studios throughout nineteenth-century cities and documents the research findings.

Through extensive research, not are only photography studios mapped to demonstrate their multiplicity, density and popularity but also their urban existence is illustrated through the vast archive of historical photographs. The artefacts – the broad collections of cabinet photographs – created by the studios were also scanned to match photographic establishments with the locations as well as obtaining the images of the studios that were used sometimes on the cover of the photographs. At the same time the photography and architectural journals of the time were studied to acquire the architectural drawings of the studios.

It is important to note that the primary goal of this research is not to gather historical information about the photographic establishments and their locations, but rather it is to trace the urban manifestation of this striking architectural typology. Due to the lack of a comprehensive architectural analysis of the studios and the disarray of information uncovered in the process, a system was required for searching through massive digital archives and identifying textual and visual data on the architecture of the photography studios.

The research methodology is based on an operation of cross-referencing of four significant sources of data to identify photography studios: “index,” “map,” “object,” and “image.” While maps aid in locating the studios in tandem with nineteenth-century indexes of photographic establishments, the image alludes to the
urban representation of the studios as they are portrayed in photographs, engravings, and architectural drawings. Lastly, the object encompasses the *cartes de visite* and cabinet format photographs created by the studios in addition to the books and journals on photography that are published and circulated within the community as a means of exchanging professional knowledge.

Rather than settling for haphazard sketches or photographs of the studios discovered during the research, this dissertation embraces the urban manifestation of the studios and their complex relationship to the cultural life of nineteenth-century cities as its primary motivation to define the photography studio as a hybrid architectural typology. Reestablishing the scope of the tracing operation by focusing on a set of primary cities – London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna – was necessary due to the difficulty of competing with the diverse urban contexts in which photography studios arose.

As mentioned before, *The Photographic Studios of Europe* by H. Baden Pritchard\(^{15}\) come forward as a significant source to confine the scope of the research by designating the cities to be studied. Amongst the abundance of studios scattered around Europe, four cities can be distinguished in Pritchard’s book: London, Paris, Berlin and Vienna. While London and Paris have already been an integral part of this research from the start in terms of their significance for the historiography of photography as the birthplaces of the medium (as will be outlined in Chapter Two), Berlin and Vienna were included in the study with the guidance of Pritchard’s book.

With the help of the quadripartite correlation established between the four different materials – map, index, image, and object – this study portrays photography studios as ubiquitous architectural phenomena by studying four capitals – London, Paris, Berlin, and Vienna – as model cities. The comprehensive study of these four cities by instrumentalization of four research tools fundamentally supports that the methodological framework developed for tracing photography studios can be

---

applied to other cities as well, the outcomes of which are provided in the Appendices.

Based on the research framework outlined above, Chapter Five (a) explains how the research methodology is adapted and applied for selected cities while tracing photography studios; (b) illustrates four types of materials and the changes in their priority as research tools in tracing process for different cities; (c) discusses the peculiarities and limitations of the study by unfolding the research process for each city; and (d) documents and maps the discovered photography studios for all four cities. In line with the objectives of the research to identify the multiplicity, density and simultaneity of photography studios so as to express its impact on urban scale by defining it as a hybrid architectural typology, the research findings are also presented in the form of catalogues for each city. Finally, several studios discovered in different cities during the research process are included in the Appendices.
CHAPTER 2

FROM DORMER WINDOW TO GLASS HOUSE STUDIO

2.1 On Photography

The year 1839 is accepted as the origin point for the historiography of photography. At the beginning of the year François Arago announced the success of Louis Daguerre and the invention of photography to the world with a speech to the French Academy of Sciences. Within a few months, the “daguerreotype” and its silvered copper plates spread around the globe and “infiltrated almost every conceivable genre of image making.” After the success of the daguerreotype, William Henry Fox Talbot also announced his “calotype” at the end of the year which uses an entirely different method to fix the image on paper achieved by a negative-positive method. In comparison to calotype, it is possible to capture more detail with the daguerreotype but it is a direct-positive process in which the final image is imprinted on a silvered copper metal sheet that requires a human intervention through lithography or engraving to produce copies from it. Therefore Talbot’s process, after some refinements and upgrades by other entrepreneurs within the following years, became the most convenient method because the images fixed by the negative-positive method can be easily reproduced and printed. With the development of glass technologies, better lenses became available for photographers to achieve sharper images. Finally, with the introduction of wet-collodion technique by Frederick Scott Archer in 1851 which uses glass plates as

---

negatives, Talbot’s calotype evolve into a more efficient photographic process that superseded the daguerreotype completely around 1860s.\textsuperscript{17}

For this reason, some historians have accepted Talbot as the true inventor of the photographing process, although Daguerre is the first one to announce his success. While the invention of the medium in 1839 is defined by the rivalry between these two important figures, a third one comes on the scene as the owner of the first surviving photograph, Nicéphore Niépce (Figure 1). Niépce is a significant figure for the history of photography (he called the process as heliography) who contributed to the invention of the medium with his experiments and especially with his partnership with Daguerre which started in 1829 until his death in 1833. Although Daguerre named his invention after himself without giving any credit to Niépce, the historical obsession for detecting the origins of photography brings forth Niépce’s “View from the Window at Le Gras” as the earliest surviving photograph dated back to 1826, which was actually tracked and rediscovered by photo historians Helmut and Allison Gernsheim in 1952 in a storage.\textsuperscript{18}

Figure 1. Nicéphore Niépce, View from the Window at Le Gras, 1826, the first photograph. On the left, the original plate discovered in 1952 by photo historians Helmut and Alison Gernsheim. On the right an enhanced version of the original plate by Helmut Gernsheim. Source: Helmut and Alison Gernsheim, \textit{The History of Photography}, 102.

\textsuperscript{17} For a brief history of photography see, Helmut and Alison Gernsheim, \textit{The History of Photography: From the Camera Obscura to the Beginning of the Modern Era} (London: Thames and Hudson, 1969).

\textsuperscript{18} Gernsheim, \textit{The History of Photography}, 59.
Similarly, the experiments of Schulze in 1726 or the photogram\textsuperscript{19} studies of Thomas Wedgewood and his associate Humphry Davy between 1790 and 1802 also suggest these figures as the possible first photographers, at least the first thinkers of a possible photographing process. The traditional histories of photography either pinpointed the year 1839 as the milestone for the medium’s invention or alternatively tried to designate an earlier point of origin by searching for other narratives based on individual accomplishments of important figures mentioned above; such as the first to experiment on light-sensitivity, Schulze in 1726; the first with the idea of capturing images in permanent form, Wedgewood and Davy between 1790-1802; the first who accomplished to capture a permanent image, Niépce in 1826; the first who perfected the process and announced his invention.

\textsuperscript{19} A photogram is a photographic image made without a camera by placing objects directly onto the surface of a light-sensitive material such as photographic paper and then exposing it to light.
officially, Daguerre in 1839 or the first who developed a more conventional method of reproduction, Talbot in 1839.20

For a critical reading of such a theory of origins and beginnings, Geoffrey Batchen’s *Burning with Desire* steps forward as a seminal source regarding the history of photography. In his book, Batchen mentions at least 20 people from 7 European countries who chased the idea of photography between 1790 and 1839.21 By embracing a Foucauldian perspective, the book aims to shift the focus from the successful invention photography to the onset of “a desire to photograph”22 which actually began to emerge around 1800s. In Batchen’s words;

Following Foucault, our investigation of photography’s timing will henceforth shift emphasis from the traditional economy of originality and priority to the appearance of a “regular” discursive practice for which photography seems to be the desired object. The invention of photography is thereby assumed to coincide as much with its conceptual and metaphoric as with its technological production. Accordingly, I will ask not just who invented photography but rather at what moment in history did the desire to photograph emerge and begin insistently to manifest itself? In other words, at what moment did photography shift from an occasional, isolated, individual fantasy to a demonstrably widespread, social imperative?23

---

20 Talbot actually achieved to produce his first successful low quality images in 1835, but he tried to develop his method further by knowing the experiments of Daguerre. Gernsheim, *The History of Photography*, 76.

21 The pre-1839 onset of a desire to photograph: Henry Brougham (England, 1794), Elizabeth Fulhame (England, 1794), Thomas Wedgwood (England, c.1800), Anthony Carlisle (England, c.1800), Humphry Davy (England, c.1801–1802), Thomas Young (England, 1803), Nicéphore and Claude Niépce (France, 1814), Samuel Morse (United States, 1821), Louis Daguerre (France, 1824), Eugène Hubert (France, c.1828), James Wattles (United States, 1832), Hercules Florence (France/Brazil, 1832), Richard Habersham (United States, 1832), Henry Talbot (England, 1833), Philipp Hoffmeister (Germany, 1834), Friedrich Gerber (Switzerland, 1836), John Draper (United States, 1836), Vernon Heath (England, 1837), Hippolyte Bayard (France, 1837), José Ramos Zapetti (Spain, 1837). Batchen, “Desiring Production,” 5-6.

22 The word “desire” (and the name of the book) is actually based on the letters between Niépce and Daguerre: Niépce writing in 1827 to Daguerre — “In order to respond to the desire which you have been good enough to express” (his emphasis) — and find Daguerre replying in the following year that “I cannot hide the fact that I am burning with desire to see your experiments from nature.” Geoffrey Batchen, *Burning with Desire: The Conception of Photography* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1997).

Among the two precursor components of photography, the camera obscura (with a lens) was available as an auxiliary apparatus for painting and drawing since the second half of the 16th century along with portable versions developed during 17th century, and the light-sensitive chemicals which would later be used for fixing the image captured by the camera obscura were already discovered with the experiments of Johann Heinrich Schulze in 1725. However, for the discovery of photography the world had to wait for another hundred years.24

This delay is the main indicator for Batchen that “the desire to photograph was a product of Western culture rather than of some isolate individual genius”25 and so, the momentum of the desire to photograph was evident among intelligentsia scattered especially throughout Europe in the 1830s. Therefore, rather than describing “the invention of photography as a technological struggle that should be traced to the chemists and physicists who studied light prior to the nineteenth century,”26 Batchen tries to interpret it as a discursive practice by examining the writings of these proto-photographers. The intensified search facilitated by different figures across Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century also demonstrated “a cultural need” for what was to become photography the meaning of which was not immediately clear at the time.27 Batchen claims that,

[...the desire to photograph only appears as a regular discourse at a particular time and place. One infers that it was only possible to think “photography” at this moment in history.]

24 “The camera obscura was known to the Arabian scholar Ibn Al-Haitham (Alhazen) before 1038; spectacle lenses are mentioned by Roger Bacon and seem to have been well known by the end of the thirteenth century; the darkening of nitrate of silver on exposure to sunlight was first recorded by Angelo Sala in 1614. But whereas the camera obscura served at first simply as a convenient means of observing solar eclipses, and, from the Renaissance on, as an aid to drawing, it was not until 1550 that a lens was fixed to the instrument by Girolamo Cardano, and the fact that the darkening of silver salts by light can be applied to the making of images was only discovered by Johann Heinrich Schulze in 1725. Considering that knowledge of the chemical as well as the optical principles of photography was fairly widespread following Schulze's experiment—which found its way not only into serious scientific treatises but also into popular books of amusing parlour tricks—the circumstance that photography was not invented earlier remains the greatest mystery in its history.” Gernsheim, The History of Photography, 13.

25 Batchen, Burning with Desire, 53.

26 Batchen, 53.

27 Batchen, 53.
specific historical conjuncture, that photography as a concept has as identifiable historical and cultural specificity. From a virtual dearth of signs of desire to photograph in the 18th century or earlier, the historical archive reveals the onset only in the late 18th and early 19th centuries of a rapidly growing, widely dispersed, and increasingly urgent need for that which was to become photography.28

While almost all proto-photographers spoke of wanting to devise a means by which nature represent itself automatically; “the word nature is ubiquitous within the discourses of all proto-photographers, its meanings and functions within that discourse remain surprisingly elusive and uncertain.”29 This is why a closer look at the language used by the proto-photographers and the ambiguity of the terms and phrases they preferred actually reveal the hidden stress between nature and culture.

Niépce used both the terms physaute, which means the nature herself and autphyse, which means copy by nature while describing his heliography process. The phrase Heliography by Niépce (from helio-sun and graph-something written) as well as calotype (from Greek word kalos-beautiful and type-impression) of Talbot also accentuates the dichotomy between nature and culture.30 Similarly, Daguerre also made a paradoxical description for the daguerreotype as a means to “draw nature while allowing her to draw herself.” Batchen’s main point is to show how the definition of this new medium also “posed a dilemma for its inventors that was as much philosophical and conceptual as scientific.”31

Instead of describing the invention by an evolutionary technological development scheme, photography should be acknowledged within a comprehensive framework of its conceptual, political and historical complexity. It is by this complexity that photography emerged as a cultural entity that has the power to shape and to

28 Batchen, 52.
29 Batchen, 52.
31 Batchen, Burning with Desire, 69.
contribute to the modern episteme instead of being just a new medium of representation developed upon scientific principles.

2.2 On Architectural Photography

The long exposure times required to capture an image during the early years of photography favored stationary objects as the proper subjects for the camera. Since the first subjects of the photographic images were buildings, the intertwined relationship between architecture and photography was pinpointed to the very origin of the medium’s invention. The first photograph, Niépce’s “View from the Window at Le Gras” (Figure 1) taken in 1826 is also accepted as the first architectural photograph by many writers.

There were two driving forces behind the increasing demand for the photographs of architecture in the nineteenth century: (1) the rising trend of “nationalism” throughout Europe that focused on excessive documentation projects of important architectural monuments and (2) the growing industry of “tourism,” that concentrated on the architecture of distant lands (especially Greece and Middle East) and eventually transformed into an early premise of publicity for European cities in the form of postcards.32

The zeitgeist was the keen interest in national identity, cultural heritage and historical sites associated with the Romanticism movement in arts and literature, and Historical Revivalism in architecture. Therefore, the depiction of historical ruins, medieval castles, exotic places as well as the historical monuments and religious buildings came forward as the main focus for many artists and researchers at the time. With the advance of tourism, many guidebooks and travel books started to be published which only demonstrated the public face of the cities. These travel

---

books provided tourist itineraries represented in highly conventionalized views of public buildings, palaces, parks and main thoroughfares.

The early architectural photographs were generally utilized around these two concepts of nationalist documentation and international tourism. The architectural photographs were mostly praised due to the reproduction power of photography which made the images of buildings accessible around the world including academic studies. It is important to keep in mind that during these early years, even for the immense documentation projects, the main focus was not just capturing the architecture in detail but also creating easily reproducible images of architecture to share with the public. As James Ackerman states, “modern history of architecture had its origins in Western Europe at about the time when photographs of buildings became available to scholars.”

Right from the beginning, the daguerreotype was superior to Talbot’s calotype in terms of its accuracy and detail. This was the reason why Viollet-le-Duc ordered the production of several daguerreotype images of Notre Dame de Paris for restoration even though calotypes were also in use for other documentation projects. While the documentation power of the medium was outlined as the dominant paradigm during this period by many writers regarding the representation of architecture, the daguerreotype which was more convenient for such a task eventually replaced by Talbot’s negative-positive technique in 1860s which was more effective for multiplication.

In parallel with the emphasized documentary power of the medium, the large documentation projects of the nineteenth-century city emerged as an origin point for a rather articulated understanding of an architectural photography. The nineteenth-century city was a field for constant change triggered by the economic and demographic shifts throughout the society. The dynamic and changing nature of cities were absent in the earlier examples of urban imagery produced in the 1840s

---

because the old pictorial traditions still dominated the production of these photographic representations. A significant year for the history of architectural photography was 1851 because Mission Héliographique, a major photographic project that aims to create an inventory of national monuments of France was launched at this year (Figure 3). In spite of being a disorganized and premature attempt for documenting architecture without an inherent systematic, Mission Héliographique is commonly accepted as an origin point and a stepping stone towards more successful documentation projects such as Charles Marville’s in Paris (1856-1871), Thomas Annan’s in Glasgow (1868-1871), James Burgoyne’s in Birmingham (1875), or George Koppman’s in Hamburg (1883-1888).

A linear historical narrative will tell us that after this documentary period, a modernist architecture came into the scene discovering the true potential of photography by using it as a constructive medium for inspiration and creation rather than just a tool for documentation. The architectural manifestations of the cultural transformation, which occurred in the nineteenth century after the invention of photography, were rarely examined in architectural discourse. While literature on photography and architecture always refers to the reciprocal development of these two discourses, the focus remains on the visual impact of photography on architecture instead of a spatial one.

34 Blau, “Patterns of Fact,” 36-57.
35 Blau, “Patterns of Fact,” 36-57. Five photographers; Hippolyte Bayard, Eduard Baldus, Henri Le Secq, Gustave Le Gray and O. Menstral were assigned for this project in 1851 by the Commission des Monuments Historiques, which was established in 1837.
36 Blau, “Patterns of Fact,” 36-57.
2.3 From Dormer Window to Photography Studio

After the official public announcement of the daguerreotype in 1839, a rapid interest towards photography emerged (Figure 6). Although the long exposure times of about 15 minutes made it impossible to capture the human subject during the early years of photography, many early photographers immediately began to search for alternative ways to achieve portrait photography.\(^{37}\) It took only two years to

\(^{37}\) “Despite Arago's opinion that 'one is little disposed to admit that the instrument will ever serve to make portraits,' there was a universal desire for portraits and attempts began almost immediately.
improve the light sensitivity of the plates, negatives and the lens technologies to reduce the posing time to a certain degree that with auxiliary apparatuses for people to hold still, the quality of the portrait photography began to improve. Because of the need for more sunlight, portrait photographers mostly worked outdoors, especially on rooftops to benefit from the sun as much as possible. With these improvements, new photographic establishments specialized on portrait photography began to emerge around the big cities.

Figure 6. Théodore Maurisset, La Daguerréotypomanie, December 1839. Source: Getty Museum Collection, accessed September 15, 2023. https://www.getty.edu/art/collection/object/104AFR

One of the first was taken by Susse in September, but owing to the long exposure in direct sunshine ‘the sitter had contracted features and a grimace expressing suffering’. In spite of the poor results, Lerebours and Susse’s edition of Daguerre’s Manual published in November 1839 contains probably the earliest instructions on portraiture.” Gernsheim, The History of Photography, 116.
Both Niépce’s (Figure 1) and Daguerre’s (Figure 7) surviving examples of earliest photographs were actually taken from an elevated viewpoint. While Daguerre experimented on the rooftop of his Diorama building in London (the Diorama building itself can be regarded as a proto-photographic example of an architecture that shaped by photographic principles), Niépce created his first attempts for fixing the image through the camera at the rooftop atelier of his house. Another acclaimed inventor Hippolyte Bayard, who created his own technique to fix the image on paper, also made his earlier experiments on the attic of his house (Figure 8) and prepared an exhibition even before the official announcement of the invention of daguerreotype.38

Figure 7. (left) Louis Daguerre, Boulevard du Temple, 1838.

Figure 8. (right) Hippolyte Bayard, in front of his house, 1842.

The frame for all these photographic experiments is actually a window of an atelier, which provides the view and the exposure as it keeps the photographer close to the chemical process to develop the final image.39 For this reason, photographers’

38 Batchen, Burning with Desire.
39 (Following Arago’s report to the Chamber) “A few hours later, opticians’ shops were besieged; there were not enough lenses, not enough camera obscuras to satisfy the zeal of so many eager amateurs. They watched with regretful eye the setting sun on the horizon, as it carried away the raw
houses began to be adjusted to include small laboratories and dark dooms with red-glazed windows while the demand for wider spaces with an influx of daylight increased in order to study in an enclosed and controlled environment.\textsuperscript{40}

To make the most of available sunlight, rooftops and attics became the proto-photographer’s experimenting space at first. Particularly for portrait photography, the dormer windows began to be expanded in size and big surfaces of glass began to appear on the roof-scape of the big cities instead of small skylights. Between 1841 and 1851, a small number of portrait photography studios were opened across the Western primary cities. But especially after 1851, with the invention of wet-collodion negative technology and use of glass plates which dramatically reduced the exposure times, the studios began to proliferate all around the world.

Most of the first commercial photography studios of 1840s established as an extension to an already existing business on a related field to photography, such as manufacturers of scientific instruments and metal plates (which is crucial for daguerreotype process) or optical supply vendors.\textsuperscript{41} Hence these commercial enterprises were already located on the ground floor, small architectural alterations were needed for the installation of a glass covered studio or a terrace on the rooftop of the building as well as the utilization of a staircase for easy and direct access from the shop to the studio. Therefore, it is possible to detect these initial tiny glass boxes as rather modest architectural interventions where photography related businesses were already located. Although they were few in number, some of them were visible amongst the very first photographs taken for documenting the old city

---

\textsuperscript{40} Ives Maes, “The architecture of photography,” (PhD diss., Belgium: Ghent University Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, 2018).

on the verge of major urban transformations; such as Lerebours’ studio which was accepted as the first studio of Paris in Charles Marville’s photographs (Figure 9 & Figure 10).

![Figure 9](image1.jpg) ![Figure 10](image2.jpg)

Figure 9. Charles Marville, Place du Pont-Neuf, 1855. Lerebours and Chevalier optic shops and the studios on the roof is visible. Source: McCaulley, Industrial Madness, 57.

Lerebours (13 place Pont Neuf) is accepted as the first portrait studio of Paris. (Based on the annuaries, McCauley map Lerebours as active in portrait business from 1844 and appears at the annuaries between 1848 and 1855 at this address. Similarly, Chevalier also (probably 65 Quai de Horloge) appears as active in 1845 according to commercial directories. The second glass box seen in the 1855 photo suggest that Chevalier is still active or at least the studio was still existed after 10 years.


Another illustration depicts the interior of Richard Beard’ studio (Figure 11), who was originally a coal merchant, a patent speculator and an entrepreneur fascinated by the commercial potential of daguerreotype process and later became one of the most influential figures in the promotion of photography in London. With the chemist John Frederick Goddard, who helped him to improve the sensitiveness of the daguerreotype plates, they managed to reach acceptable exposure times for portrait photography, and Beard opened the so-called first professional portrait


43 Hannavy, Encyclopedia of Nineteenth-century photography, 126-127.
studio of Europe by constructing a glasshouse on the roof of the Royal Polytechnic Institution in Regent Street. Although, the institution was a trendy place suitable for a commercial studio - where the latest inventions and ideas can also be observed by public - John Goddard’s connection to the institution as a science lecturer was probably an important reason of that choice because he was the one that operated the camera.


Beard’s studio was located in the roof of The Polytechnic Institution on Regent Street and it was accepted as the first professional photography studio throughout Europe. The circular glass skylight of the photography studio and the apparatuses used for subject to stand still were clearly visible in the illustration.

44 Hannavy, 126-127.
45 Hannavy, 126-127.
Another pioneer of English portrait photography, Antoine Claudet opened a studio in 1841 on the roof of Adelaide Gallery, which was similarly used like Polytechnic Institution as exhibition space and as an amusement hall for presenting latest scientific devices and innovations. For both Beard’s and Claudet’s chose of location demonstrates the engagement of photography with the institutions of science and education in these early years as a result of the endless efforts to perfect both the technology of the camera and the printing process.

On one hand, there was the nineteenth-century figure of the inventor-photographer who sought financial support among the bourgeois to establish a studio business while continuing to develop mechanical or chemical processes of photography. On the other, there were already established commercial enterprises – dealing with photography related optical and scientific equipments – that want to expand their business in terms of the growing popularity of portrait photography. It is important to note that, although there was an enthusiastic interest in the medium during the first decade of the photography, the number of photographic establishment (daguerreotype rooms) were relatively small. Although the initial glass boxes installed on rooftops by these establishments were visible through some of the earlier photographs between 1840 and 1850, it was not until 1851 that the studio transformed into an urban phenomenon with the discovery of Frederic Scott Archer’s wet collodion negative technology and the introduction of glass plates. This innovation reduced the exposure times so drastically that the studios proliferated throughout the urban fabric of the bigger cities of Europe (notably in London and Paris) and North America. Helmut and Allison Gernsheim accentuates this sudden boom in the photography trade after 1851 and the momentum of a related urban transformation:

In 1841 there were only three portrait establishments in London; in 1851 there were about a dozen; in 1855, 66; in 1857, 155; and in 1861 over 200, of which 35 were crowded into Regent Street (not to mention the legion of cheap traders

---

who had sprung up by then). In 1866 there were 284 studios in London. 'Glasshouses' were a new feature of the London skyline. With the flourishing of the photography business, the architecture of the studios began to be articulated through the growing public interest. In 1851, Antoine Claudet, who already had two different portrait studios in London, “consolidated his business at 107 Regent Street, opening a grandiose, custom-designed exhibition hall and studio he christened the Temple of Photography.” This multi-floor studio with a showroom is one of the first known examples which an architect was involved in the design process to create a luxurious and stylish interior to arouse public interest:

In 1851 he set up his “Temple to Photography” at 107 Regent Street. Inside, paintings illustrated the history of photography and the various photographic processes, and medallion portraits of men who promoted the science of photography and stereography surrounded the visitors in the waiting rooms and studios. By general consent, it was the most elegant and luxurious establishment of its kind in Britain […] Sir Charles Barry, architect of the new houses of parliament, reconstructed the existing building in Renaissance style, while the interior decoration was entrusted to Hervieu, a then well-known artist.”

The commercial boom of portrait photography was not only about the technological developments but it was also related to the growing public demand. Compared to the portrait painting which was a very expensive and laborsome process for both the painter and the subject, the portrait photography was distinguished as a quick process available to everyone especially after 1851. The appearance of “glasshouses” is not just an indicator of architectural and urban transformation but

---

47 They also add; “In Paris there were no fewer than 33,000 persons in 1861 who made their living from photography and allied trades.” Gernsheim, The History of Photography, 234. Similarly, Elizabeth Anne McCauley points the sudden boom of portrait business in Paris: “In 1848 thirteen photographic studios were listed in commercial directories for the city of Paris. By 1868 this number has expanded to approximately 365.’ Based on the information gathered from Bottin and Firmin-Didot annuaries.” McCauley, Industrial Madness, 1.


also a cultural one. The portrait studios also present a unique experience for the visitors who want to possess a “likeness” of their own.

Once portraiture photography was made commercially successful, it immediately resulted in the construction of specially built glasshouses in order to receive the best possible lighting situation. The belvederes of the highest buildings were very much wanted for professional photo studios, and specially constructed sheds with glass ceilings appeared on rooftops and in gardens […] This manifested itself to such an extent that people even complained that they had to climb too many stairs to have their photograph taken, and joked that photography was indeed a “high art.”

A caricature of Nadar, Gaspard-Félix Tournachon, who was one of the most famous photographers at the time, also refers to the rise of photography towards the level of art with the title, “Nadar Elevating Photography to the Height of Art” (Figure 12). The illustration created by Honoré Daumier in 1862 actually commemorates the fact that the first known aerial photograph was taken by Nadar from a hot air balloon in 1858. Alongside the photography, later which he became a professional of after working as a journalist and caricaturist, Nadar also experimented with hot-air ballons, which was speculated to be the source for inspiration for his close friend Jules Verne’s novel Five Weeks in a Balloon. Besides portraying the interesting and dynamic personality of Nadar, the abundance of “photographie” signs on the roof scape of Parisian urban fabric illustrates the sudden boost of the photography as a trending commercial practice and marks the cultural transformation embedded within it. Nadar’s own studio in 35 Boulevard des Capucines emerges as an icon that symbolizes this transformation through its architecture.

---

51 Jules Verne, Around the World in eigthy days & Five weeks in a balloon (Ware: Wordsworth Editions, 2002 [1863])
Figure 12. Nadar Elevating Photography to the Height of Art, Honoré Daumier, 1862.
https://collections.mfa.org/objects/168981
Figure 13. Nadar with His Wife, Ernestine, in a Balloon; taken in 1865, Nadar’s studio on 35 Boulevard des Capucines.
https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/286163
The first tenant of 35 Boulevard des Capucines was another famous photographer Gustave Le Gray, who actually invested a considerable amount of money to the construction with the financial support of prominent aristocrats of the time.52 While Le Gray’s studio located at the courtyard of the building, Bisson Brothers who were also important figures for Parisian photography, used the ground floor as a shop. However, it was Nadar who decided to transform the whole building for his studio in 1861 by adding two stories and remodeling the whole façade with red cast-iron frames and glass. The re-designing of the façade with the introduction of a conspicuous glass studio marks this building as one of the first architectural examples that was intentionally designed as a photographic establishment from top to bottom.53 The central studio does not seem like a later addition unlike the other contemporary examples, but an integral element of the architectural composition. The shop-front transparency, which was also one of the most transformative architectural (and cultural) phenomenon at that period, achieved at the ground level continues through the whole façade and ends with the wide arched glass surface of the studio that creates a strong visual effect when observed from the corner of the boulevard (Figure 17). Nadar himself also mentioned this view in his biography and described the architecture of 35 Boulevard des Capucines as a pure dedication to photography.54

Nadar was already a popular portrait photographer at the time, and Boulevard des Capucines were transforming into a more dynamic public space due to the construction of the Grand Hôtel and the new Opera House. After the renovation,

52 “In 1855, borne up the wave of prosperity at the start of the Second Empire, he opened, with the financial support of a family of Normand aristocrats, a luxurious studio at 35 boulevard des Capucines.” Sylvie Aubenas, “Boulevard des Capucines: The Glory of the Empire,” in Gustave Le Gray: 1820-1884 (Los Angeles: Getty Museum Publication, 2022).

53 “The vast central studio, mounted by a pediment and female allegorical busts by Emile Blaviet, recalled the new train station facades and the 1855 Palais de L’Industrie.” MacCauley, Industrial Madness, 68.

54 “Mais cette maison, qui n’est pas une maison et rapporte autrement mieux qu’une maison, cette baraque fatidique merite sa petite page d’histoire. Elle etait inexorablement vouee a la Photographie.” But this house, which is not a house and earns otherwise better than a house, this fateful shack deserves its little page of history. She was inexorably dedicated to Photography. Nadar, Quand j’étais photographe (Paris: Prés l’Odéon, 1900), 199-208.
Nadar’s photography atelier became one of the most trendy and energetic spaces along the boulevard with lots of visitors. The atelier was also manifested by the red illuminated sign of “Nadar” on the façade which was the first illuminated sign in Paris made by Antoine Lumiére (Figure 15 & Figure 15. Nadar’s atelier in 35 Boulevard des Capucines.

Figure 16). In addition, the first impressionist exhibition took place in Nadar’s studio in 1874 regarding both the popularity and the efficient natural light condition of the studio. Nadar’s 35 Boulevard des Capucines emerges not only as an architectural symbol for the discourse of photography but also as a cultural representation of the urban life of Paris, a crucial meeting point for the intelligentsia.


The inclined roof over the arched studio window seems to be constructed entirely with glass, as can be observed from both the caricature and the interior photographs. It is also mentioned in some sources that the rooftop studio has a simple ventilation system against overheating and also a water pipe system for the cleaning of the glass roof, which is an important problem at that time due to the air pollution originated form the close proximity to chimneys.
Figure 15. Nadar’s atelier in 35 Boulevard des Capucines.

Figure 16. A visualization of Nadar’s illuminated sign on the façade.

Figure 17. *Le Monde Illustré*, 22 Décembre 1866, 413. Nadar’s studio can be differentiated from the other buildings with its huge glass façade.

https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k6221664j/f13.item
CHAPTER 3

ARCHITECTURE OF PHOTOGRAPHY

The glass daylight studios - referred to with the moniker “glass house” at the time - began to appear on the rooftops of the historic city setting in the second half of nineteenth century, and quickly evolved to be a well-defined spatial element in photographic discourse. There are many diagrams, plans and perspectives with proper dimensions and brief explanations in the early written manuals on portrait photography (Figure 18 & Figure 19). However, for architectural discourse, the daylight studios mostly remain as a footnote under the nineteenth-century glass obsession. The glass daylight studios are also an underrated field of study as they are generally recognized as part of a transitional and experimental period through the transparency of modern architecture.

This study argues that the crude glass constructions and alterations on rooftops quickly transformed into a hybrid architectural typology, beginning with the well-proportioned small glass extensions embedded in the rooftops of existing buildings to an entirely new design element for architects at 1850s.

A photography studio consists not only of a “glass house” but also includes spatial elements such as darkrooms, re-touching ateliers, a customer lounge furnished with attractive historical objects and an anthology of photographs on the walls, dressing rooms and finally a shop on the street level for selling ready-made photographs or books. In some examples which were designed entirely as photographic establishments, the photographers’ own living space was also included to the architectural program. However, what is striking along all these program elements is the daylight studio itself, as a truly photographic space made of steel and glass manifesting the industrial spirit of the time with its austere architecture.
Figure 18. Drawings of photography ateliers by Alphonse Liébert in La photographie en Amérique : traité complet de photographie pratique (3rd edition), 1878: 48-52, plates 4-6.
https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k6383828w
Figure 19. Excerpts from Otto Buehler’s drawings of glass houses. 
In comparison with the grand architecture of train stations, greenhouses or bridges which also bears the same industrial spirit, the “glass houses” were modest architectural elements in terms of their scale. However, their independent occurrence on the rooftops of the city created a hybrid architectural condition within the existing urban fabric by the superimposition of the predominant visuality of the historical facades and completely functional use of modern materials. Even in the purposefully built architectural examples that include a designed daylight studio on the roof level, the tension between the large glass surfaces and the facade design is visible. The modest sizes and cheap constructions of daylight studios also resulted in a more “modern look” when compared to the highly ornamented cast iron skeletons of arcades, greenhouses or train stations.

Along with the glass arcades and storefronts which are later recognized as generative architectural typologies that transform cities, it is possible to claim that the daylight studios of photographers (and then painters and sculptors) created a short-term but powerful impact on the city image with their unique characteristics. As they introduced a modern architectural language, which was triggered by an urge towards transparency, to the roof-scape with their light-weight steel and plate glass constructions, they redefined the roof level as a new public ground and as a panoramic viewpoint by the vague of photography (Figure 20 & Figure 21).

Figure 20. Honoré Daumier, Croquis Parisiens, from Le Charivari, 1853.

Figure 21. Cuthbert Bede, Caricature of a daguerreotypist at work, 1855.
Guided by simple technical and scientific principles, the photographic “glasshouses” emerged as a manifestation of architectural space based purely on function and constructed by modern building materials of steel and plate glass. At the same time, their rapid and autonomous occurrence on the roofscape of the city as well as their growing popularity among the public underlines them as significant architectural and cultural elements of urban life. The crowded and popular zones of the city (Boulevard des Capucines in Paris or Regent Street in London etc.) were favored by photographers to establish their studios, which also strengthened their visibility and recognition in daily life (Figure 22). It is possible to assess that these “glass houses” are long lost urban artefacts that once had a substantial role in the collective memory of the city, which also contributed to the concept of remembrance by the photographic archives they produced from within.

This dissertation embraces a typological approach by tracing photography studios as a consistent repetitive architectural pattern in nineteenth century architecture instead of selecting innovative examples among these studios and speculate about their unique characteristics. This typological analysis also has contextual underpinnings that includes not only the tectonic characteristics of the studio as an architectural entity but also its deeper cultural and social connections to the everyday life of nineteenth century city. The multiple existences of these studios at important locations of the city through a brief period between 1850s and 1910s underlines them as significant urban elements with a considerable impact on the morphology of the city and its collective memory simultaneously.

For the conceptualization of the photography studio as a “hybrid typology,” the first part of this chapter will focus on the notion of “type” and “typology” in architectural discourse to outline the theoretical framework of the study. Three dominant paradigms – type-nature, type-machine and type-city\(^\text{55}\) - seem to emerge, all driven by an operation of classification and an impulse to find an overarching rational structure behind the creation of architectural forms. What differentiates them is their conceptualization of the origins of architecture and the source of architectural inspiration which triggers the process of creativity. All these three paradigms were imbued with the characteristics of the historical context that shaped them and therefore can be observed in a historiographical manner:

- **Type – Nature:**
  17\(^\text{th}\) & 18\(^\text{th}\) century Enlightenment thought – mostly associated with Neoclassicism; inspired by the quest for searching of the origins of human knowledge

- **Type – Machine:**
  End of 19\(^\text{th}\) century & first half of 20\(^\text{th}\) century – Modernism; inspired by the machine analogy – the notion of function and invention as its stimulant

\(^{55}\) This tripartite conceptualization is more or less evident in most of the literature on type and typology, but this study predicates it to Anthony Vidler’s text “The Third Typology.” Anthony Vidler, “The Third Typology,” *Oppositions*, issue 7 (winter 1977): 13-16. Also see, Adrian Forty, “Type,” in *Words and Buildings: A Vocabulary of Modern Architecture*, (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2000), 304-311.
• **Type – City:**

Second half of the 20th century – 1960s; inspired by the city and takes architecture itself as the source for creativity instead of seeking it elsewhere.

It is not a coincidence that the canonical debates on typology always arise in the moments of crisis; at historical junctures of paradigm shifts for architectural discourse. Therefore, by nature, they are holistic, and they propose grand schemas for both understanding and producing architecture in reference to the zeitgeist of the era. As the transition from one period to another - or one dominant architectural type or style to a new one - is not a sharp process, the in-between and hybrid architectural typologies or the intertwined modes of rational relations behind the creation of transitory forms tend to be disregarded.

Within the historical framework defined by these three type-paradigms, one can notice the exclusion of nineteenth-century architecture due to its acceptance as a transitional period without a distinctive architectural characteristic or a style. The historical revivalisms and eclectic architecture of that period is condemned because of its tendency to duplicate historic forms, proportions, or orders without developing a rational systematic foundation described by the notion of type. While new architectural forms of modernity underlined with the use of newly introduced materials like glass and wrought iron, the discipline of architecture tried to respond to these unprecedented needs and dynamics of the society by looking back to history. The typological method was abused during this search for the right historical combination that fits the current conditions of society to create a contemporary language for architecture. This attempt is mostly criticized according to the emphasis on the formal language which reduces architecture into a decorative overlay. This is why an entire century – in which the photography studio flourished as a new architectural program – was dominated by morphological or purely practical approaches to typology and was conceptualized as a prolonged stage of metamorphosis that results with the modernism.
The history of modernism opens up with the tradition of privileging utilitarian dimension of architecture as its fundamental basis and the rational determinant of the final form which leads to the pursuits of how the first sparks of modernist functionalism can be traced through the utilitarian architecture of the nineteenth century that promote the use of iron structural systems. The noteworthy spatial expressions of this utilitarian architecture could only be emerged at the end of the nineteenth century in the hands of certain grand figures such as Karl Friedrich Schinkel, H.P. Berlage, Henri Labrouste, Otto Wagner and others.

As a result of this conception, the in-between architectures of the nineteenth century were mostly disregarded by the holistic studies of typology (other than some practical uses like classification of architecture or architectural elements through form or utility). The selective approach embraced by the theorists of modernism to achieve a narrative of a linear historical evolution with modernism as its final and ultimate product resulted with the ignorance of the discontinuous “hybrid typologies” that reflect complex set of relations. Another important note here is that pre-modern architectural examples were represented as precedents to the degree of the impact of functional rationale behind their emergence and were not usually accepted as direct formal models.

The aim of this study is not to examine each and every one of these hybrid architectures that represented the sparks of an innovative architectural vocabulary of industrialism throughout the so-called transitory period of nineteenth century. By focusing on the nineteenth century photography studios, this study aims to show the potential of in-between or hybrid conditions to create consistent and repetitive architectural patterns that can become powerful in urban scale.

Introducing a Foucauldian approach to the concept of typology may reveal hidden imperatives and the discontinuities behind this linear historical understanding and also help to rediscover specific architectures in-between conceptual and contradictory paradigms of typology. “Rather than structure or systematicity,
Foucault discerned a discontinuous, incoherent disorder that became evident on the level of things said: discourse.”56

This study is rather an attempt at archeological research in a Foucauldian sense that seeks for a spark of a modern architectural language manifested through the daylight studio underneath the thick layers of the historical revivals that dominate the architecture of that era. Photography studios are not just assessed as a manifestation in the form of a material condition emphasized by modern components but also as a generative typology fused within urban life.

3.1 Typology in Architectural Discourse

The conceptualization of the notions of type and typology in architectural discourse can be traced regarding three main historical phases.

- **The rationalist philosophy of Enlightenment** which epitomizes nature – the understanding of the nature through rationalist principles - as its main stimulant. / nature analogy – architecture as the imitation of nature
- **The modernist doctrine** which takes the industry and progress as its stimulant / machine analogy – architecture as the manifestation of purpose
- **The Neo-rationalism of 1960s** / which takes the architecture and the city itself as its main stimulant / city analogy – architecture as the continuation and extension of the city.

3.1.1 Type-nature: The Rationalist Philosophy of Enlightenment

The rise of scientific knowledge pursued by naturalism in 17th century marked the desire for the classification of nature and knowledge as the predominant impetus that prioritizes the “epistemological sense of form” over its former comprehensions

such as “aesthetic-phenomenological, mythological or religious.”

The quest for finding architectural forms that best represented the Enlightenment ideal of a harmonious – as well as an utopian – society built upon the notion of reason, resulted with the “questioning of the classical orders and the long series of proposals for their perfection as ultimate arbiters of architectural nature.”

The search for origins dominated the whole natural sciences and the concept of “type” emerged as a result of this curiosity. The first use of the notion of “type” in architectural discourse was also pinpointed to this period, which was defined by Antoine Quatremère de Quincy, in *Encyclopédie méthodique* written in 1788 but published in 1825. Another significant reference is Marc-Antoine Laugier’s conceptualization of “cabane” – the primitive hut – as the origin of architecture.

Both attempts aspired to find rational guiding principles which originated in nature and translated into the forms of the architecture of antiquity, instead of seeking formal characteristics defined by classical orders.

The process of imitation for Quatremère de Quincy is not to reproduce the mere appearance of things through copying but to understand the principles behind their formation. An act of appropriation of these principles to the present conditions is needed to achieve an architectural form instead of replicating an already existing one. Thus, the operation of imitation needs not just a comprehensive historical knowledge of architecture and architectural forms (the architecture of the antiquity for Quatremère de Quincy) but also requires the interpretation of the knowledge and so depends on the creativeness of the architect. In his words;

> […] the architect here, finds a given number of forms, parts, or members – kin to what in rhetoric is known as the parts of the discourse – that are the necessary elements for implementation, only whose values derives from the reason that

---

determines their place, and the genius that employs them toward the proposed goal.\textsuperscript{61}

By distinguishing the type from the model and the act of imitation from copying, Quatremère de Quincy underlines the rational aspect of the architectural type over the formal appearance. It is important to note that for 18th-century thinking, perception is seen as subsidiary to conception which means that reading of an architectural form without considering the rational structure behind its formation was postulated as deceptive. In other words, the phenomenological meaning of the form can only be the manifestation of the epistemological construct. Here, Quatremère de Quincy’s distinction of type and model clarify his conception:

The word ‘type’ presents less the image of a thing to copy or imitate completely than the idea of an element which ought itself to serve as a rule for the model … The model, as understood in the particular execution of the art, is an object that should be repeated as it is; the type, on the contrary, is an object after which one may conceive works of art with no resemblance one to another at all. All is precise and given in the model; all is more or less vague in the type.\textsuperscript{62}

Because the forms of antiquity – the Greek Temple as its ultimate manifestation – were understood as the ideal models that reflect the inherent characteristics of nature, imitating antiquity for Quatremère de Quincy means not simply a process of reproducing the semblance of existing forms but an active contemplation of the reasoning behind the emergence of those forms, which have their roots in nature. In his words;

The true manner of imitating the antique consists, then, in a wise penetration of the spirit and the reasons behind its works; in an understanding of the motives that once caused the artist to employ certain means of execution; and in discovering the veritable causes of the impressions that we receive from such and such a combination of correlations, dimensions, or decorations.\textsuperscript{63}


\textsuperscript{63} Quatremère de Quincy, \textit{The Historical Dictionary of Architecture}, 69.
By confronting the complete formal interpretation of the historic architectural forms, Quatremère de Quincy tried to search for a theory that prioritize the discovery of the act of reasoning that created these forms and tried to adapt this formulation to the newly emerging need of the society by considering utility and need as additional principal generators. For him, the type is an operative and dynamic notion, a rational framework or a set of principles derived from the past forms for the architect to work within while facing the challenges of the new needs and uses.

3.1.2 Type-machine: Typology in Modernity and Modernism

The Western world was exposed to a rapid transformation beginning with the Industrial Revolution and then the French enlightenment. The social, political and economic foundations of western civilization were subjected to a radical evolution and began to be reshaped and redefined by the notion of ‘modernity’. This evolution created a moment of crisis for nineteenth-century architectural discourse in which the historical vocabulary of forms, principles and methodologies fall short against the newly emerged needs of a bourgeois society. On one hand, those needs were encapsulated into a utilitarian perspective through the emergence of new architectural typologies such as train stations, iron bridges or conservatories, which are associated with the new modes of production and technological innovations that introduced new techniques and new materials such as iron and glass. On the other hand, such necessities also have a cultural and social perspective, the shift of power from aristocracy to bourgeois also created a condition that transformed and expanded the already existing typologies such as the concert hall-opera, exhibition hall-museum or town-hall. These two perspectives (more observable in the latter) also connote a representational dimension, which is in search for new formal codes or formulations for the rising class of bourgeois. Although, the use of new

---

materials or the introduction of new construction techniques seem to dominate both utilitarian and representational architectural typologies, the architectural discourse of the nineteenth century chose to seek for a new possible representational system for architecture amongst the archive of historical forms.

The conceptualization of typology in architecture seems to be caught between two opposing poles through modernity: (1) its acceptance and later its misinterpretation and abuse as an analytical tool for developing a visual vocabulary or a foundation of principles by focusing on the “past” architectural patterns or paradigms that shaped the built environment – such as in nineteenth century architectural discourse of historical revivalisms (2) its total negation and re-definition as “prototype” in parallel with the machine-analogy of modernist thinkers because of its limitative nature as opposed to progressive spirit of the “present.”

The prominent historians which celebrated the architectural modernism such as Pevsner, Giedion and Hitchcock condemned the nineteenth century as a transitional era which lacks a unifying conception of space or a dominant architectural language as the manifestation of the revolutionary spirit of the industrial society. Although the use of structural iron was underlined as a revolution and the increasing of use of glass as a step toward modernist transparency, the historicism of nineteenth century overshadowed the revolutionary potentials of such architectural experiments according to those writers.

The revolt of modernism is against the hegemony of historical forms – or more precisely the imitation of historical forms – which transmuted into an architecture of a decorative overlay. Although modernists condemned nineteenth century architectural discourse as an era of fake historical revivalisms that lacks the ability to reflect the spirit of the era, the search for both a novel visual language and a methodological framework for architectural discipline was at the core of this period’s historicism. While they adopted history as the main repository of

66 Schwarzer, 15.
architecture towards the discovery of a new representational system for the current conditions of the society, they also tried to formulate an adaptation of the historical knowledge as a means of a protective operation against the shifting and transformative power of modernity.\(^{67}\)

By ignoring the ideological context regarding both the changing role of the state and the subject, and degrading the complexity of divergent artistic, philosophical and political debates on historicism at that era, these writers condemned historicism as antimodern and defined Modern Architecture as the outcome of a linear progression towards a “liberating language of form.”\(^{68}\)

Although a similar exaltation of rationalism embedded in the type-nature paradigm is actually apparent for the modernist period, modernism prioritized the function and mode of production as the driving forces that determines architectural forms instead of taking nature as its source and seeking its proxies throughout history. The typological method was condemned as an outdated tool that belonged to the age of craft in which the relation between the model and the craftsman had much more importance before the introduction of the industrialism and scientific method as the new means of production.\(^{69}\)

The interest in nature still existed but since the man has equipped with the advanced scientific means to grasp the guiding laws of nature in comparison with the 18\(^{th}\) century, the spirit of innovation and progress rendered the need for an analytical method for the historical architectures such as Quatremère’s doctrine of imitation useless. The conceptualization of nature for modernism appears in the shape of “biotechnical determinism” as described by Alan Colquhoun:

> The Modern movement in architecture was an attempt to modify the representational systems which had been inherited form the pre-industrial past and which no longer seemed meaningful within the context of a rapidly changing

\(^{67}\) Schwarzer, 13.

\(^{68}\) Schwarzer, 20.

technology. One of the main doctrines at the root of this transformation was based essentially on a return to nature, deriving from the Romantic movement but ostensibly changed from a desire to imitate the surface of natural forms, or to operate at a craft level, to a belief in the ability of science to reveal the essence of nature’s mode of operation.

The motivation behind modernist architecture is this rebellion against the normative principles and forms defined by tradition and history. The rejection of the authority of architectural tradition and the recognition of science and technology as the main initiator of architectural profession is the main inspiration of modernism. Reyner Banham is one of the important figures who emphasized this rupture from tradition and theorizes that for modernism, technology “represents the converse of tradition.” Banham claims; “For the first time in history the world of what is suddenly torn by the discovery that what could be is no longer dependent on what was.”

The quest for an original universal language, which has the potential to organize the present and the future of architectural production, resulted in the setting of new norms and principles; so science and technology became the new authority for architectural production. Under the aegis of this new authority, the search for a universal language in architecture gives way to modernist ideals like “form follows function,” “less is more” or “ornament is crime.” The so-called ideal image of modernist language, namely the geometric and abstract compositions of white surfaces and glass mostly devoid of a strong connection to the context was not

---

71 Habermas clarifies this tendency of modernity, the ‘exaltation of present’ and the degradation of the past as followed: “Modernity revolt against the normalizing functions of tradition; modernity lives on the experience of rebelling against all that is normative.” Habermas, “Modernity – An Incomplete Project”, 3-15.
stimulated solely by these ideals or international standards on function and technology.\textsuperscript{74}

Contrary to the reliance to objectivity, the subjective interpretation of the architect also emerges as a strong factor while deciding the final composition of the architectural forms. There are many writings on how modernism in architecture emerges as a complex and heterogeneous structure with a great variety of possibilities in itself that cannot be explained by the functionalist paradigm only.\textsuperscript{75}

3.1.3 Type-city: Post-Rationalist Theory of Typology

Modernism celebrated the dynamism of industrialism against the limitative tyranny of historical revivalisms (forms) and theorized the machine analogy as a means of constructing an entirely new language of architecture.\textsuperscript{76} This machine-analogy either neglected the “type” entirely or degraded it to the level of a “proto-type.” An opposition to that conception began to arise in the 1960s. The negation of history that diminishes the role of typology as an analytical and productive/generative method was vastly criticized by Italian architects at that time. The core of their criticism lies within the inconsistency that modernism created in-between the historical city and the modernist extensions of it. They believe that the architectural success of modernist ideals can only be observed through a dispersed set of small scale projects mostly belonging to the master architects. The application of these

\textsuperscript{74} By the help of photography, the construction of a common visual language as the manifestation of these modernist ideals - or even rules and methods which lies beneath the built-form – became possible. The camera was actually used extensively as a creative tool far from being just a passive documentary gadget and the ideal image of modernist language was stimulated by the abstraction power of photography. Instead of an objective tool to transmit the “machine aesthetic” of the built from originated from the emphasis on function; the camera becomes an active and fictive tool in the construction of such an aesthetic.

\textsuperscript{75} “Modernist architecture, conceived not as a style but as a discourse, becomes a heterologous array of individual positions and formal practices within a loosely structured field, of which a fundamental premise has been that architecture must instantiate an ethically grounded material practice that grapples with (rather than categorically rejects ignores) the phenomenon of modernity itself.” Sarah Williams Goldhagen, “Something to Talk About: Modernism, Discourse, Style”, \textit{JSAH}, vol. 64, no. 2 (June2005): 144-167.

\textsuperscript{76} Vidler, “The Third Typology,” 14.
ideals to the city scale was condemned as a failure that ends up with monotonous and repetitive urban spaces without a distinctive character.\textsuperscript{77}

The “object-in-a-field”\textsuperscript{78} approach of modernism without giving much attention to the contextual and historical data regarding the existing urban morphology was held responsible for the alienation of the city and the citizens to the spaces that modernist architecture created. The typology was revoked as a method to respond the rising questions of “meaning” and “urban legibility” of architectural forms in parallel with the conception of “historical continuity” which gives every city its unique character.\textsuperscript{79} The post-rationalist critique brought back the notion of typology as the main methodology for constructing an architectural language through the multiple histories of architecture including modernism.

The concept of “type” and “typology” re-appear for the first time in Carlo Argan's text, “On the typology of architecture.”\textsuperscript{80} The core of Argan’s text is based on the argument that a conception of type always existed in the mind of the architect originated from the working process composed of the plan, the structural system and the surface treatment. The architect’s perception and conceiving of the existing built forms follow the traces of the same working process and so, while designing a new building architect consciously or unconsciously repeat the same procedure. Whether the architect is consciously influenced by the type or chooses to diverge from it entirely - even to create a new building typology – does not change the fact that he/she has to work within an accumulated knowledge of architecture.\textsuperscript{81} In other words, the entire negation of the type seems impossible for architectural discourse

\textsuperscript{77} Vidler, 15-16.


\textsuperscript{81} Argan, “On the Typology of Architecture,” 244.
because an opposite methodology to typology consciously or unconsciously should involve a typological definition in order to escape from its limitations or ready-made solutions. Argan developed an understanding of typology that operates on the levels of formal configuration, structure, and decorative elements. For Argan, type represents the existence of a set of principles that can be derived from the architectural discourse itself instead of an external source like nature or function and construct a rational basis both to respond the contemporary problems of the society and to create architectural variations in terms of the tectonic exploration of form. This methodology, built on the notion of “type,” can even be applied to generate new building typologies. The reciprocal operation introduced by Argan between the analysis and synthesis of architectural forms intended to construct a dialect between past and present.

Argan’s conception of typology seems to resonate with the contemporary understanding of the term. Typological analysis is holistic and historical in nature: to define an architectural typology means either to the search for a consistent structure of reason underneath past architectures or a repetitive morphology of historical built-forms. It requires a process of classification by creating groups based on commonalities and simultaneously defines distinctions between them. In another words, typological analysis is a reductive/deductive operation in which the sophisticated web of rational relations behind the design process or the complexity of formal variables of architecture were distilled into a common understanding of a “type,” which organizes the multiplicity of architectural objects or ideas into a coherent set. According to Argan;

In the process of comparing and superimposing individual forms so as to determine the ‘type,’ particular characteristics of each individual building are eliminated and only those remain which are common to every unit of the series. The ‘type’ therefore, is formed through a process of reducing a complex of formal variants to a common root form. If the ‘type’ is produced through such a process of regression, the root form which is then found cannot be taken as analogue to something as neutral as a structural grid. It has to be understood as the interior

82 Argan, 244.
83 Madrazo, “The Concept of Type in Architecture,” 325.
structure of a form or as a principle which contains the possibility of infinite formal variation and further structural modification of the ‘type’ itself.\textsuperscript{84}

Here, Argan also emphasizes how this inherent character of typology as a reductive/deductive act renders type simultaneously generative to establish new network of correlations in-between divergent architectures of the past “as an interior structure of a form or as a principle.”\textsuperscript{85} The type is not only a tool of encryption that presents how architectural forms came into being at first place but also an innovative tool for the architect to respond contemporary problems within the accumulated knowledge of the architectural discipline. Typological study necessitates an act of translation and interpretation of those common principles or forms that are defined by the “type,” which renders it as an active method for creativity rather than a passive operation of imitation or copying of historical forms. The duality of analysis and synthesis is apparent at the core of typological studies.\textsuperscript{86}

Another critic of the rejection of architectural tradition is Alan Colquhoun who questions the so-called objective methodology of modernist architecture. He underlines that although the primary component of modernism, the “biotechnical determinism” – described as the reduction of the design problem to mere function or objective knowledge – can define some constants for the design, it is not enough

\textsuperscript{84} Argan, “On the Typology of Architecture,” 243. The double connotation of type as an epistemological or a phenomenological structure can also be observed in Argan’s understanding.

\textsuperscript{85} Argan, 243.

\textsuperscript{86} Madrazo, “The Concept of Type in Architecture,” 325. It is important to note that while Argan and other post-rationalists re-introduced Quatremère de Quincy’s definition of type and placed his separation of type and model at the core of their conception; the methodology they offer – especially defined by Argan – resonates with the work of Durand who is after ‘root forms’ and a “geometric scheme” that reflects common principles within architectural discourse: “Italian architects not only restored Quatremère's concept of type, but they gave to it a significance that did not have in its original formulation. It is not at all clear that Quatremère had thought of type as a link between modernity and tradition, as the advocates of typology have assumed. Furthermore, it is certain that Quatremère's type had little to do with urban morphology. But this was, in fact, the meaning that Type had for architects like Aymonino and Rossi. Still, there is one fundamental difference between Quatremère's type and the interpretation that architects like Rossi made of it. Quatremère's type needs to be understood within the context of his concern with the classic doctrine of art as imitation. In this regard, type was for Quatremère a principle underlying both natural and artistic forms. But for architects like Rossi, mimesis and nature are no longer a significant issue in the architectural debate. For them, the interest of the idea of Type lies in the possibility of building a scientific basis for the discipline of architecture.” Madrazo, “The Concept of Type in Architecture,” 326.
to determine the final configuration of the forms. There appears to be a rather contradictory and secondary component of intuition, which relies on the subjective selections an interpretation of the architect’s.\textsuperscript{87} Colquhoun claims that;

What seems to have happened is that, in the act of giving a new validity to the demands of the function as an extension of nature’s mode of operation, a vacuum has been left where previously there was a body of traditional practice. The whole field of aesthetics, with its ideological foundations and its belief in ideal beauty, has been swept aside. All that is left in its place is permissive expression, the total freedom of the genius which, if we but knew it, resides in us all. What appears on the surface as a hard, rational discipline of design turns out rather paradoxically to be a mystical belief in the intuitive process.\textsuperscript{88}

For Colquhoun, this intuitive methodology failed to respond to intricate urban problems and an effective tool of analysis and classification is needed to revoke the inherent potential in architectural discourse; that is typology. He accepted the fact that an act of interpretation is needed to develop type-solutions for contemporary problems, but it should be grounded on the accumulated knowledge of architecture instead of relying on the intuition of the architect’s genius. He also contended that the intuition of the modernist architects was either unconsciously based on that knowledge or the typological influence were consciously hidden for the sake of a consistent narrative of functionalism.\textsuperscript{89}

Borrowing Ernst Gombrich’s criticism of expressionist theory and his claim that the “forms themselves are relatively empty of meaning,” Colquhoun asserted that the architectural forms that the architect intuit tend to “attract themselves certain association of meaning” in the unconscious mind. While Argan ends up with a similar claim by focusing on the internal dynamics of design process, Colquhoun

\textsuperscript{87} “After all the known operational needs have been satisfied there is still a wide area of choice in the final configuration – intuition. At whatever stage in the design process it may occur, it seems that the designer is always faced with making voluntary decisions and that the configurations which he arrives at must be the result of an intention and not merely the result of a deterministic process […] It is indeed never possible to state all the parameters of a problem. Truly quantifiable criteria always leave a choice for the designer to make. In modern architectural theory this choice has been generally conceived of as based on intuition working in cultural vacuum.” Colquhoun, “Typology and Design Method,” 253.

\textsuperscript{88} Colquhoun, 254.

\textsuperscript{89} Colquhoun, 254-255.
focuses on the act of formal exploration and the intuition of the architect embedded within it. Colquhoun claims that:

If, as Gombrich suggests, forms by themselves are relatively empty of meaning, it follows that the forms which we intuit will, in the unconscious mind, tend to attract themselves certain association of meaning. This could mean not only that we are not free from the forms of the past and from the availability of these forms as typological models but that, if we assume we are free, we have lost control over a very active sector of our imagination and of our power to communicate with others. It would seem that we ought to try to establish a value system which takes account of the forms and solutions of the past if we are to gain control over concepts which will obtrude themselves into the creative process, whether we like it or not.  

Colquhoun’s “recognition that type, like language, fulfills a communicative and social role, linking tradition with the present” seems to be at the kernel of his writings. By invoking the questions about the meanings and continuity of forms he concluded that architectural discourse encapsulates a kind of language in itself which defines a methodological framework within which the creativity of the architect operates. The notion of type is required to generate such a system and typology emerges as the generative tool for architect to navigate through that network and enables him/her to contribute to it. Colquhoun’s comparison between the language and the type can be understood with this paragraph briefly:

A language which was simply the expression of emotions would be a series of single-word exclamations; in fact, language is a complex system of representation in which the basic emotions are structured into an intellectually coherent system. It would be impossible to conceive of constructing a language a priori. The ability to construct such a language would have to presuppose the language itself. Similarly, a plastic system of representation such as architecture has to presuppose the existence of a given system of representation. In neither case can the problem of formal representation be reduced to some preexistent essence outside the formal system itself, of which the form is merely a reflection. In both cases it is necessary to postulate a conventional system embodied in typological problem-solution complexes.

---

90 Colquhoun, 256.
91 Madrazo, “The Concept of Type in Architecture,” 350.
92 Giving reference to Ernst Cassirer, The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms. Colquhoun, “Typology and Design Method,” 257. A similar conception of type as a language can be encountered in Colquhoun other essays on modern architecture: “Like language, architecture was held to be a universal form of knowledge, but one that was not thoroughly worked out. It had come about through
Both Argan and Colquhoun anticipates a conception of type intrinsic to architectural discourse, through which the implicit motivations behind the architectural form resurface as certain precepts and devise a basis of inspiration to handle the future problems. With the contribution of other architects like Aldo Rossi and Carlo Aymonino, post-rationalist critique of modernism in the 1960s epitomized the city as the source of knowledge and inspiration for architecture that can be revealed through the typological analysis. In other words, post-rationalist theory proposes the city as a repository of past architectures and the primary source for typological analysis that cultivates the imagination of the architect.

The notion of *continuità* namely the continuation and existence of architectural formal patterns or urban relations that enabled the emergence of architectural forms, brings forth as the main denominator of post-rationalist theory. This approach also provides the return of some banished traditional forms back to the vocabulary of architecture such as pitched roofs or porticoes.

Although the search for architectural inspiration and meaning among the discourse of architecture in itself rather than nature or machine analogy introduced a new and fresh standpoint, the theory is too condensed in the historical context of the city and its permanence. Some patterns (new architectural types) introduced through modernity especially in between the second half of the nineteenth century and the first half of the 20th century, which had a relatively short lifespan because of the

the rough-and-ready ordering of our representations. The history and practice of both language and architecture presented the observer with the elements of truth; it was up to him to unravel the skein that had been wound up through the centuries without system, and to put its threads into the right order. It is only in terms of such a linguistics that we can understand what the eighteenth century meant by ontological truth, and how it was applied in architectural discourse.” Alan Colquhoun, “Vernacular Classicism,” in *Modernity and the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge Mass.: The MIT Press, 1989), 30. A similar analogy between type and language is also apparent in Quatremère’s conception, see; Sylvia Lavin, *Quatremère de Quincy and the Invention of a Modern Language of Architecture* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1992).


94 Forty, “Type,” in *Words and Buildings*, 304-311.
massive transformation of the European cities at that time, were automatically excluded from the set.

The shifting ground of modernity also brings forward ephemeral architectural typologies – such as photograph studios – that do not exist anymore but have a contribution to the architectural and urban vocabulary. The notion of *continuità* in spite of its unique creative perspective of the urban space, also limited the discourse to a set of existing historical forms or relations (urban artefacts of Rossi) while unintentionally excluding a set of long-lost architectures of industrialism which were also mentioned partially by the modernist themselves.

Although both modernists and post-rationalists were after epistemological principles and accepted that the forms can be achieved only through the rationalization of these principles; they are inclined to bend these principles or re-formulate it through the aesthetics they aim to achieve.

### 3.2 Photography Studios as a Hybrid Architectural Typology

The aim of this typological research is neither to find the perfect formal manifestation of these photography studios by conducting a comparative analysis, nor to pinpoint the origin of these forms by revealing the hidden dynamics behind them. It is not suggesting a mere deductive process of analysis that aims to end up with a common root form or a ground principle of the photography studios as defined by Argan (and as conducted by Durand), even though it refers to such kind of a synthesis regarding the conceptualization of the studios as a possible formal precedent and a significant program element for pre-modernist architecture.

Rather than achieving a unique or a singular architectural precept/image abstraction of the photography studio, the research intends to demonstrate the opposite by emphasizing the multiplicity of its variations. The variety implied here does not only represent the “rational” definition of the formal variation that is grounded on the definition of the type-root form; but also includes a contextual
perspective – in reference to the four capital cities chosen – concerning their visual perception by the citizen as an architectural object and their social/urban perception as a cultural artefact (which is underlined by their multiple locations through the city).

Their simultaneous and abundant emergence throughout the city in certain significant locations (cultural, economic, educational hubs/points such as squares, plazas, boulevards,) for a brief period between the 1850s and 1910s, is what accredits a transformative/generative power to that add-on photography studios.

This research embraces all the three conceptions/paradigm of typology rather than accepting one as a superior conception so as to define photography studio as a hybrid typology.

For the type-nature paradigm - the search for a rational basis for architecture brings forth nature as fundamental of all things. The emergence of Neoclassicism at that period is the direct result of this understanding which criticized of the exploitation of the classical forms and orders without paying attention to the rational process behind the emergence of that forms. Quatremère's theory of imitation, seeks to find that rational principles of nature amongst the forms of classical architecture, which is idealized as the utmost embodiment of natural laws. The separation of ‘model’ and ‘type,’ which has its roots in Plato’s dichotomy of image and idea, refers to the differentiation of the act of copying and imitation; which underlines the latter as an active process of contemplation in regard to the relation between nature and architecture.

Although modernism has a similar tendency to seek rational principles of architecture, the advanced technology and scientific tools of the time enabled a more comprehensive understanding of the operations of the nature. Therefore, for the modernist thinker, the forms or principles of the past architectures became redundant in terms of their inadequacy of adaptation to current unique transformations of society. The spirit of innovation and discovery (which also actively contributed to the expansion of knowledge about nature) appeared as the
main impetus for the modernists and the utilitarian dimension of architecture began to gain importance. Instead of imitating the past forms or principles, a process of innovative design that prioritize the notion of “function” is embraced. The type for architecture transforms into an understanding of a “prototype” which is defined only through the standards of mass-production and use.

The post-rationalist critique of modernism brings back the notion of typology as a creative and necessary element of analysis and synthesis for architecture and introduces the city with its complex web of interrelations of ideological, social and cultural meanings as the basis for historical continuity.

This study tries to respond to the first paradigm of type-nature by focusing on the impact of photography on the vision and arts. Although the photography studio as a typology seems to be directly connected to the machine-analogy in terms of the scientific and technical knowledge behind its formation, the purpose of its utilization is not just to create enough light for exposure but also to create the perfect natural light conditions for the photographer.

It is possible to trace the influence of photography on art in architectural terms. Painters and sculptors had similar workshops referred as artist studios that existed before the invention of photography. These artist studios also had bigger window openings facing north or alternatively used skylights for the illumination of the subject. What is unique for the photography studios is the uniform lighting effect that is desired, which transforms the wall and the roof together into a continuous transparent surface or alternatively propose a full glass structure like a pavilion. Apart from the similarities in between them, the examples gathered for this study show that portrait studios emerged as a coherent and definitive set of architectural typology that is embraced as a model later by painters’ studios. A closer look at the “the changing conceptions of the natural environment in the nineteenth century” that “contributed to the emergence of new studio paradigms” can be helpful to grasp that transformation. Amy Wallace tries to illustrate this change in her dissertation, “Studio of Nature: The Transformation of Artists' Studios, 1845–1910”:
[…] dramatic transformation in the character of artists' studios that both reflected and contributed to wider changes in modern art. The continued rise of landscape painting and the emergence of Realism challenged inherited notions of the studio as a place of retreat that had prevailed since the Renaissance. The positivism that informed artistic movements around midcentury encouraged a direct engagement with reality; withdrawing to the studio necessarily ran counter to such modern concerns. This epistemological shift catalyzed numerous studio innovations that unfolded in the decades that followed.95

Wallace emphasizes how the paradigm shift from romanticism to realism challenged the idea of working in a studio when plein-air practice became popular amongst painters with the rise of landscape painting. Although the direct engagement with reality is important even before the invention of photography triggered by the use of portable camera obscuras, the introduction of photography camera accelerated the number of artist who left their studios for plein-air practice. The portable studios, which were both used by painters and itinerary photographers, emerged during the first half of the nineteenth century. Eventually not only the conceptualization of the painter’s studio as a place of retreat but also the lighting conditions it offered began to be transformed. With the rise of naturalism in the

1870s, the studio gained importance once more and the glass studio of the photographers emerge as a model for the painter to achieve naturalist goals. Wallace explains how the glass studios of photography emerged as a precedent in the transformation of painter’s studio with the influence of naturalism in the 1870s.

In addition to challenging the function of artists’ studios, the invention of photography influenced studio design. For instance, the caravans and tents used by itinerant photographers provided a model for portable artists' studios. As well, photographic manuals recommended the use of glass studios, which likely led to their adoption by painters beginning in the 1870s […] Nadar's studio on the Boulevard des Capucines featured an impressive glass façade, both functional and self-promotional by virtue of its monumentality.

This link to naturalism evokes the enlightenment dream of reaching the perfect natural aesthetic and vision. The goal to provide a perfected naturalist (not realistic) vision embedded within the raison d’être of the photography studio, can be associated with the 18th century conception of nature as the source of knowledge.

In parallel with the rise of naturalism, remarkable examples of artist residences were built especially in Paris in the 1890s, which bear similar architectural characteristics with the photography studios. These buildings were constructed by using the leftover materials of 1889 Universal Paris Exhibition, and especially the “villa des arts” designed by the architect Henry Cambon brings forth as a holistic architectural example dominated by the notion of the glass studio typology. This study claims that the portrait studio emerged as a precedent for the design of these artist residences and ateliers as well.

---

The connection to the second paradigm of **type-machine** is the most obvious one as mentioned before. The photography studio, with its other components (such as dark rooms, drying areas, reception, etc.), has a very neat architectural program that works indeed like a machine. Other than its cultural significance, it is also a space for production and printing and can even be postulated as an industrial typology which can be formulated in the form of prototypes. As the direct manifestation of the function it bears, the studios have a relatively modest architectural language due to their scale and the temporal logic behind their construction. This language is
resonant with modernist ideals such as the architectural form as the direct representation/reflection of the function and the dissolution of the historical façade through the introduction of transparency.

The rapid and autonomous occurrence of the photography studios on the roof scape of the city as well as their growing popularity among the public underlines them as significant architectural and cultural elements of urban life. The crowded and popular zones of the city (Boulevard des Capucines in Paris or Regent Street in London etc.) were favored by photographers to establish their studios, which also strengthened their visibility and recognition in daily life. It is possible to assess that these “glass houses” as long lost urban artefacts which had a substantial role in the collective memory of the city and also contributed to the concept of remembrance by the photographic archives they produced from within. This cultural significance marked the connection to the third paradigm of type-city.

Although architectural elements of different scales (doors, windows, ornaments, etc.) were subjected to typological analysis; they were analyzed in a holistic manner, namely, they were evaluated to the degree of their pertinence of a coherent architecture whole. The transformation and transfigurations of these architectural elements, namely the architectural interventions and interpretations of the existing building stock, under the pressure of a new web of urban relations and functions, were rarely studied within a typological framework. In particular, the depictions of the architecture of the nineteenth century seems to be stuck in between historical revivalism and the spirit of the industrial innovation, although it introduced new building technologies as well as generating its architectural typologies.

If typology is defined as a means of analyzing and representing the urban environment through an accumulated knowledge of architecture for developing a methodology to respond to emerging design problems simultaneously, then the understanding of the city as an amalgamation of intertwined relations (social, cultural, economic, political) manifested through architectural forms can lead
to/learn from typological readings focused on rather utilitarian, transitory, and humble architectures.

The next chapter will focus on the writings of Sigfried Giedion and Walter Benjamin who introduced two different perspectives for looking through the neglected architectural typologies of the nineteenth century. Although Giedion’s theorization of modernism does not include typological analysis as its stimulant, still a connection to the type-machine analogy can be established parallel to his search for the spirit of construction amongst the nineteenth century utilitarian forms. Similarly, there are certain connotations in between type-city analogy and Benjamin’s reading of the nineteenth century city and his fascination of the neglected urban artefacts. Despite these parallels, these two writers propose unique ways to analyze the neglected and humble architectures of the nineteenth century which will contribute to this study to formulate the photography studio as a hybrid typology.
CHAPTER 4

THE “GLASS HOUSE” STUDIO AND ARCHITECTURES OF THE UTILITARIAN

4.1 Architectures of the Subconscious

Sigfried Giedion defines the notion of “invention” as the main impetus of the nineteenth century which is expressed in every aspect of everyday life through industrialization. However, he also underlines the lack of this influence of progress and innovation on the architectural language of the time. This is why he tries to seek for the earlier sparks of modern architecture amongst the utilitarian structures of iron & glass instead of the “official” architecture. Gideon states that;

Invention, carried on in this way by men of all nations and all walks of life, led to the industrialization of almost every human pursuit. But this movement which was to give the nineteenth century its essential character is scarcely reflected at all in its official architecture. We should never be able to perceive the real nature of the period from a study of public buildings, state residences, or great monuments. We must turn instead to an examination of humbler structures. It was in routine and entirely practical construction, and not in the Gothic or classical revivals of the early nineteenth century, that the decisive events occurred, the events that led to the evolution of new potentialities.98

Here, Giedion’s choice of words as “practical construction” or “humble structure” instead of building refers to his diagnosis of the nineteenth century within the framework of “schism between engineering and architecture.”99 According to Giedion, architectural discipline cannot keep up with the developments of science and technology during that era, so a split between engineering and architecture began to emerge. While cast-iron structural systems offer new and practical ways of creating spaces with bigger spans, the same production method also enables the

98 Giedion, Space, Time and Architecture, 166-167.
production of these structural elements in any desired shape or form. This is why
the typological coding of past architectures continued to dominate the architectural
discourse despite the introduction of new revolutionary materials that has the power
to transform the built-from entirely both in regards to the structural logic and the
tectonic composition. This gap between engineering and architecture began to
disappear not until the end of the century.  

Similarly, Giedion’s focus on the “routine and everyday” reflects the utilitarian
aspect of architecture which has an increasing impact on nineteenth-century cities.
What makes these structures such as bridges, train stations or market halls “humble”
is their function-oriented nature which made the extensive use of iron and glass
possible with a relatively less coded historicist language. The main critique of
Giedion and other modernist historians is the lack of a proper architectural language
– namely a conception of space – that reflects the industrial and its newly emerging
utilitarian typologies.

It is possible to reverse that argument. While “fake” monolithic facades tried to hide
the visual potential introduced by the iron structure and glass surfaces, the utilitarian
purposes embedded within the cultural transformation of the city triggers an
invasive condition manifested by these new materials. The monolithic wholeness
of the stone facades with historical coding began to be decomposed and dissolved
by a new visual language formed by transparent and lightweight architectural
extensions or additions. “Humbler” typologies such as shopfronts or photography
studios may have escaped the grandeur gestures of historicism in terms of their scale
and add-on nature.

It is possible to catch a glimpse of the impact of these small-scale architectures on
modernism in Giedion’s text in which he refers to the shopfronts. Although Gideon
mentioned the role of shopfronts in the process of achieving a modernist
transparency, he sees it only as a technical issue and again refers to the structural

\[100\] Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture*, 292.
\[101\] Giedion, 292.
logic behind it. His focus is not the on the transformation of the conventional shop windows to large transparent surfaces of glazing that alters the urban experience and perception of the citizen, but on the “set-back pillar,” the main structural element introduced to demolish the load-bearing walls in the façade to achieve larger areas of glass:

Important preliminary work for later construction was carried out in the show windows of stores, where, as industrialization continued, ever-larger glassed surfaces were needed. The manuals of iron construction that were published from the fifties to the nineties are filled with instructions for supporting the brickwork of the upper stories on iron girders. These iron columns were the only structural elements of the building visible behind the wide display windows. In view of the fact that the set-back pillar is used in so many modern buildings, a continuous account of the evolution of this practice would be most interesting. It was from these store windows that we first learned how to use large glass areas in dwelling houses.102

In comparison to the shopfronts, the photography studio appears as an even more pristine architectural form due to its relatively resistant character to ornamental features because of its functional description to provide the most possible homogenous light conditions. Many prototypes of the “glasshouse studios” were developed in the earlier stages according to these technical requirements and they evolved to be a well-defined spatial element in photographic discourse. However, for architectural discourse, the daylight studios mostly remain as a footnote under the nineteenth-century glass obsession. The glass daylight studios are also an underrated field of study as they are generally recognized as part of a transitional and experimental period through the transparency of modern architecture.

Giedion and his book “Building in France” published in 1928 has a significant impact on Walter Benjamin who already started his work on the “Arcades Project.” There are many citations from Giedion amongst the convolutes of the book as well as Benjamin’s own notes that emphasizes the significance of Giedion’s text on his own quest for describing how “the beginnings of modern architecture to some
extent lies in the arcade"\textsuperscript{103} which is for Benjamin the most important architectural typology of nineteenth century that witness the pre-modern transformations of the society.

Shortly after Benjamin wrote a letter to Giedion for a meeting in Paris in terms of his fascination about the book \textit{Building in France}, Benjamin’s essay “surrealism” was published.\textsuperscript{104} The influence of Giedion is visible as the names of Le Corbusier, J.J.P. Oud and the Bauhaus appeared first time in Benjamin’s text and also celebrated in his later writings as the revolutionary figures that present a new vision to architecture.\textsuperscript{105} As Detlef Mertins summarizes:

\begin{quote}
Benjamin understood their buildings to have realized the latent potential of industrial means of construction and new synthetic materials (glass, iron and concrete) finally liberated from the false bourgeois Kultur that had imposed the forms of previous historical epochs onto the ‘new,’ enveloping them in myth: throughout the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{106}
\end{quote}

Besides the introduction of the innovative works of significant modern architects at the time, Benjamin was also impressed by Giedion’s methodology to pinpoint the initial impulses of 20\textsuperscript{th}-century modern architecture amidst the nineteenth-century structures. Although, Gideon’s formulation of the transformative power of the engineering over nineteenth-century utilitarian architecture – namely the subconscious of the construction\textsuperscript{107} – is also celebrated by Benjamin, his understanding of these “despised, everyday” utilitarian structures is far more complex than Giedion’s. Benjamin introduces the social dimension of architecture and its role as a catalyst towards a modern way of life and he argues that:

The most characteristic building projects of the nineteenth-century – railroad stations, exhibition halls, department stores (according to Giedion) – all have matters of collective importance as their object. The flaneur feels drawn to these

\begin{footnotes}
\item[103] Benjamin, \textit{The Arcades Project}, [B3,6], 69.
\item[107] Mertins, “Transparencies Yet to Come,” 248.
\end{footnotes}
“despised, everyday” structures, as Gideon calls them. In these constructions, the appearance of great masses on the stage of history was already foreseen. They form the eccentric frame within which the last privateers so readily displayed themselves.\(^{108}\)

Benjamin’s interpretation of these pre-modern architectural typologies focused on the new forms of social relations and practices that they introduced to the nineteenth century city which is both the common ground and the initiator of transformation and innovation on the way to modernity. Although he is also fascinated with the newly emerging architectural language of steel and glass constructions, his interest was not based solely on the architectonics of these buildings. For Benjamin, it is possible to understand today’s condition by deciphering the architectural remnants of the nineteenth-century city and tracing the web of relations that these buildings once manifested. In Benjamin’s words:

> Apart from a certain haut-goût charm, the artistic trappings of the last century have gone musty,” says Giedion. (Giedion, Bauen in Frankreich, Lpz Berlin, 1928, p. 3) By contrast, we believe that the charm they exert on us reveals that they still contain materials of vital importance to us- not, of course, for our architecture, the way the iron truss-work anticipates our design; but they are vital for our perception. In other words: just as Giedion teaches us to read off the basic features of today’s architecture in the buildings erected around 1850, we, in turn, would recognize today’s life, today’s forms, in the life and in the apparently secondary, lost forms of that epoch.\(^{109}\)

Giedion is after the initial glimpses of a modern language of architecture amongst the nineteenth-century utilitarian structures, which escape the historicist coding of façade architecture to a degree in terms of the extensive use of glass and iron. The interest of Giedion about the “despised and everyday” resonates with that search for discovering the role of function and the logic of construction as the main determinants of a relatively modern architectural language. Giedion’s reading of modern architecture built upon his diagnosis of the struggle of nineteenth–century architectural discourse to adapt the exponential progress of science and technology

\(^{108}\) Benjamin, *The Arcades Project*, [M21a,2], 455.

\(^{109}\) Benjamin, *The Arcades Project*, [N1,11], 458.
which results with a “schism between engineering and architecture.” While the engineering and building technologies of iron and concrete advanced throughout the century, architecture turned to history in order to respond the shifting grounds of modernity and to develop a new language to satisfy the needs of the rising class of bourgeois. This gap between architecture and engineering finally began to fade at the beginning of twentieth century when the architectural discourse recognize the notion of function and construction as its main motivators; and finally with modernist architecture the industrial spirit is liberated from the burden of history which is abused by the bourgeois culture during nineteenth-century.

Giedion aims to trace back the origins of modern architecture to the early utilitarian structures of the nineteenth century – which are mostly neglected by the traditional architectural histories - in terms of revealing the “subconscious” role of “construction” as an emerging revolutionary impetus which inevitably procured the conditions for the birth of a truly modern architecture. He sees these architectural forms as the precursors of modernist architecture in terms of the structural logic behind their production and, so, the very materiality of these forms were not really significant for him. However, Benjamin treated these structures as artefacts which carry the traces of history within their materiality. As Patricia Morton emphasizes;

In Benjamin’s theory, architecture makes visible the transience of the ‘new’ and the lie of the promise of progress in commodity culture by physically embodying outmoded styles and functions beyond their moment of fashion. Precisely because of the delay between the generation of new modes of consumption and the production of architectural forms, architecture served him as a gauge for the illusion of ‘progress’ under capitalism. The intractable nature of architecture’s gross physicality was the measure of its value to Benjamin’s struggle against the myth of progress. Architectural artifacts, rather than the intentions of architects or architectural theory, are his ‘witnesses.’

111 Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture*.
Benjamin focused not only the innovative architectonic qualities of these structures but also their intertwined relations with the nineteenth-century urban life that bear “witness” to the social, economic and political transformations of the society at first hand. The traces of that transitions – physical of ephemeral - can be found amongst the “material remains” of the bourgeois culture in which it is possible “to capture an image of history, in the detritus of the present existence.”

Stephane Symons explains Benjamin’s attitude as follows:

The manner in which the nineteenth century becomes historical, in the twentieth century, is determined by the material remains that it has left behind; not on account of the initial grandeur of its buildings and the original splendor of its avenues but through the ruins of the former and through the over-used and worn-out state of the latter.

This interest of Benjamin for the objects, architectures or narratives that is left behind by the nineteenth-century bourgeois culture is the result of the influence of surrealism on his thinking. As he especially emphasizes in his text on surrealism, Andre Breton’s Nadja and Louis Aragon’s Paris Peasant are the two significant surrealist novels on which he built up his understanding and deciphering of the city along with his reading of Charles Baudelaire. The everyday life routines amongst a nostalgia of objects and places located in the neglected parts of Paris depicted in these two novels demonstrates the surrealist impulse to search for a

---

113 “Architecture’s importance to Benjamin lies in the fact that it is both a product of culture and implicated with economic structures of development. One of architecture’s most important attributes is its physicality, its material content, in Benjamin’s terms. It is vital as a material ‘witness’ because it resists easy erasure and remains within the city as a reminder of the lack of progress and the transience of the ‘new’ in modern life. The ‘afterlife’ of the buildings is critical evidence of the origins of the present in the ‘trash of history.’ (The arcades illustrate how Benjamin used architecture to produce dialectical images in opposition to the phantasmagoric illusions of capitalism.” Morton, “The Afterlife of Buildings,” 222.


“philosophical insight in the debris of mass culture, or the ruins of the bourgeois: street signs, wax figures, souvenirs, photographs or architecture.”  

The materiality of these objects and photographs, as well as architectures of the nineteenth-century, appear as artefacts imbued with revolutionary potentials for Benjamin. By celebrating Breton, Benjamin claims that:

"Breton was the first to perceive the revolutionary energies that seem dated in the first iron constructions, the first industrial buildings, the first photographs, the objects that are beginning to become extinct […] No one before these visionaries and augurs [Aragon and Breton] perceived as destruction - not only social, but also architectural, the poverty of interiors and objects - can be transformed into revolutionary nihilism. […] They bring the immense forces of “atmosphere” concealed in these things to the point of explosion."

Although both Benjamin and Giedion were impressed by the early modern utilitarian and everyday structures of the nineteenth century rather than the so-called official architecture of the period, the essence of their quest for an archeology of pre-modern architectures is differentiated through their conception of history. Giedion embraces a progressive understanding of history which renders a passive reading of nineteenth-century architectural forms by assigning significance to them only in the (structural) role they bear as the harbingers of modernism.

Alternatively, what Benjamin offers is to construct a “dialectical” web of relations between the present and the past by concentrating on the things themselves rather than proposing a grand narrative of history that tends to omit such connections.

---

120 “Giedion held that the new forms of iron construction, and the new forms of life (mass society) that emerged with them, began as kernels struggling within the old to gradually assume their own identity. His historical account of iron construction follows a morphological evolution — from the simple iron roof frame of the Theatre Frangais of 1786 to the full realization of iron’s potential in the vast spans and gracefully engineered arcs of the Palais des Machines of 1889. This natural progression was, in his portrayal, hindered by the persistence of tradition among architects, until the twentieth century when they finally took up the task of bringing what had emerged in the dark subconscious of industrial labor into the clarity of a self-conscious architectural system, distinguished by a new kind of spatial experience.” Mertins, “Transparencies Yet to Come,” 248-249.
Benjamin used the term “dialectical image” for explaining his methodology of history:

It is not that what is past casts its light on what is present, or what is present its light on what is past; rather, image is that wherein what has been comes together in a flash with the now to form a constellation. In other words: image is dialectics at a standstill. For while the relation of the present to the past is purely temporal, the relation of what-has-been to the now is dialectical: not temporal in nature but figural.¹²¹

Benjamin’s conception of the “dialectical image” proposes an intricate relationship between the past and the present in comparison with Giedion’s understanding of nineteenth-century as a period imbued with a subconscious predetermination towards modernist architecture. Instead of a unilateral conception of history, Benjamin proposes to bring together “the extreme polar opposites” and create a “dialectic” which is clearly inspired by the “shocking cognitive effect of Dada montage.”¹²² While his fascination with Giedion’s book represents a materialist account of architecture based on the logic of construction and the tectonics of iron and glass – a focus on the objective knowledge - he adds a surrealist’s perspective that search for the traces of a revolutionary transformation amongst the city and everyday life of the citizen – a glimpse into the “dream-like” and unofficial memory of the city. The engagement of surrealism and modern architecture which was epitomized in the image of the arcade in Benjamin’s thought is underlined by Brian Elliott:

Just as modernist architecture converts the previous century’s unconscious principles of construction into a conscious historical task, so surrealism reveals the revolutionary potential of nineteenth-century bourgeois material culture.¹²³

The surrealist practice and the modern architectural constructions are intertwined in Benjamin’s interpretation who is looking for the hidden aspects of nineteenth-century culture that works in the level of the “subconscious” of the city. The

¹²¹ Benjamin, The Arcades Project, [N3,1], 462-463.
everyday dynamics of the nineteenth-century citizen clustered around the emerging modern architectural typologies are as significant as the morphology of the buildings themselves. In Benjamin’s words:

Attempt to develop Giedion's thesis. "In the nineteenth century," he writes, "construction plays the role of the subconscious"; Wouldn't it be better to say "the role of bodily processes" around which "artistic" architectures gather, like dreams around the framework of physiological processes?\textsuperscript{124}

Benjamin’s enthusiasm for nineteenth-century modern architectural forms is inseparable from the context of the city and its history in contrast to Giedion’s formulation of them as antecedent architectural structures devoid of urban and cultural meaning besides their function. Benjamin sees them as artefacts of the bourgeois culture, through which the history of modernity unveils in the form of a “dialectical image.” Detlef Mertins claims;

Benjamin describes the arcades and bourgeois interiors, the exhibitions and panoramas of the nineteenth century as the "residues of a dream world" at the beginning of the bourgeois epoch, as products of bourgeois class consciousness. They became a focus of his study, for in them he thought it was possible to glimpse the true face of prehistory.\textsuperscript{125}

4.2 Despised Architectures of Modernity

4.2.1 The Arcade at the Urban Threshold

The nineteenth-century modern arcade has never achieved a primary status as a typology for architectural discourse.\textsuperscript{126} Johann Friedrich Geist’s book “Arcades: the History of a Building Type” is one of the most comprehensive sources that question the typological evolution of the arcade while cataloguing more than 300 arcades scattered across Europe and America in an alphabetical order by city.\textsuperscript{127} Geist notes the difficulty in tracking down the emergence and development of the modern

\textsuperscript{124} Benjamin, \textit{The Arcades Project}, [K1,a7], 391.

\textsuperscript{125} Mertins, “Transparencies Yet to Come”.

\textsuperscript{126} Elliott, \textit{Benjamin for Architects}, 43.

\textsuperscript{127} Johann Friedrich Geist, \textit{Arcades: the History of a Building Type} (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1983).
arcade due to the lack of architectural documents belonging the first stages as well as the records that reflects the motives of the builders. The unofficial and ambiguous nature of its conceptual origins and the negligence of its later existence by the architectural discourse underscore the arcade as an intriguing architectural phenomenon for Walter Benjamin.

The emergence of the modern arcade coincides with a time in which the streets of major European cities were crowded with people, overloaded with vehicular traffic and suffered with major infrastructural problems that cause serious problems of public hygiene. The prominent characteristic of the arcade appears as its re-introduction of a public space since the carriages, and later automobiles, infested the streets which restricts the movement of the pedestrians in a considerable degree by confining them to narrow sidewalks. The arcade proposes an alternative architectural space, an urban sanctuary which shields the flaneur from the noise and vehicular traffic of carriages and automobiles as well as bad weather conditions and dirt.

In the space of the arcade, the dynamics of the city is condensed into a one uniform introverted space – an interior network of streets – which forms a city in itself. Benjamin opens the Arcades Project with this quotation from Illustrated Guide to Paris which he also used for the opening paragraph of his exposes from the book:

In speaking of the inner boulevards, we have made mention again and again of the arcades which open onto them. These arcades, a recent invention of industrial luxury, are glass-roofed, marble-paneled corridors extending through whole blocks of buildings, whose owners have joined together for such enterprises. Lining both sides of these corridors, which get their light from above, are the most elegant shops, so that the arcade is a city, a world in miniature.

---

128 Geist, Arcades, 64.

129 Benjamin’s notes with the tag flaneur: Until 1870, the carriage ruled the streets. On the narrow sidewalks the pedestrian was extremely cramped, and so strolling took place principally in the arcades, which offered protection from bad weather and from the traffic. “Our larger streets and our wider sidewalks are suited to the sweet flânerie that for our fathers was impossible except in the arcades.” The Arcades Project, [A1a,1], 32. Quotation from Edmond Beaurepaire, La Chronique des rues (Paris, 1900), p. 67.

130 Benjamin, The Arcades Project, [A1,1], 31.
Benjamin emphasizes the diffusion of interior and exterior in the arcade and differentiates the architectural logic of it from similar modern typologies: “Actually, in the arcades it is not a matter of illuminating the interior space, as in other forms of iron construction, but of damping the exterior space.”

Amongst all of the revolutionary iron constructions of the time, the arcade comes forward for Benjamin as the ultimate architectural manifestation of modernity because of its capacity to dissolve urban thresholds: it is neither an interior space nor an exterior one, it simultaneously transforms the street to an interior urban space while extending the boundaries of the interior spaces through the street. It provides a modern architectural stage for urban life.

The arcade somehow symbolizes a potential common ground of a dialectic in between the surrealist emphasis on everyday life and the principles of Modern Architecture posited by Giedion. On one hand, arcade emerges as a pre-eminent architectural space purely devoted to the mass consumption of industrially produced goods which symbolizes the distraction and alienation of the observer. But on the other, it also provides a stage for social interaction, a dream world in which one can also trace the revolutionary potentials of the nineteenth-century amongst the phantasmagoria of everyday life. The arcade is the architectural manifestation of that duality, as it represents the power of capitalism and commerce as a precedent of the department store while proposing also a transformative power that dissolves the boundaries of traditional architectural spaces. It marks the shattering of domestic Bourgeois interior – which Benjamin criticizes – and presents a new way of modern living. What attracts Benjamin architecturally about arcades is not only their character as an emerging modern typology marked by the use of iron and glass, but the vague architectural space they defined in the city. Benjamin’s fascination with the arcades of Paris as the ultimate architectural

\[\text{131 Benjamin, The Arcades Project, [R1a,7].}\]
\[\text{132 Benjamin, The Arcades Project.}\]
manifestation of modernity lies within this spatially and conceptually in-between condition. According to Brian Elliott;

Recalling the dialectic between the accursed bourgeois interior of dwelling and the profane openness of modernist glass housing, it is clear that the arcade for Benjamin simultaneously the material and symbolic meeting point of these dialectically opposed terms.¹³³

Figure 28. Hotel de Russie, the entrance of one of the nineteenth-century arcades of Hamburg; Sillem’s Bazaar. The glass dome of the arcade is visible at the top of the building. At both sides, the glass photography studios are also visible, with a "photographices atelier" sign on the left. Source: Geist, Arcades: the History of a Building Type, 274-275. (Highlights by the author.)

It is difficult to establish a direct link between the architectonics of the arcade and the studio in terms of their spatial character and function apart from the fact that they are modern constructions of iron and glass. However, they both appear as significant architectural typologies related to commerce while simultaneously create a new form of urban stage: a sheltered inner street that proposes a condensed

¹³³ Elliott, Benjamin for Architects, 94.
urban experience and a transparent box that suggest an alternative public space on the roof level. In them, it is possible to glimpse the material culture of the bourgeois since they both encapsulate the everyday routines of the nineteenth century in the form of an architectural phenomenon.

4.2.2 Transparency of the Loggia

Benjamin has a tendency to establish a connection between his own bodily experience of architectural and urban spaces with the shifting dynamics of modern capitalist society in his search for the revolutionary impulses hidden beyond the daily routine. While it is definitely the arcades for him which comes forward as the ultimate architectural typology that symbolizes the intertwined social, economic and spatial conditions of the nineteenth century. Another description of a particular architectural space, “the loggia” appears in “Berlin Childhood Around 1900:”

> The most important for these secluded rooms [in my grandmother’s apartment] was for me the loggia. This may have been because it was more modestly furnished and hence less appreciated by the adults, or because muted street noise would carry up there, or because it offered me a view of the courtyard with porters, children, and organ grinders.

For Benjamin’s childhood memories, “loggia” represents a disparate architectural space resistant to the invasion of personal objects and things as a typical characteristic of Bourgeois interior condemned by Benjamin. In contrast to the poorly lit interior of a typical nineteenth-century apartment through a window that is buried under a layer of draperies, the loggia emerged as a neutral semi-open space illuminated with a probable abundant use of glass:

> Time grew old in those shadowy little rooms which looked onto the courtyards. And that was why the morning, whenever I encountered it on our loggia, had

---


135 “The characteristic and, properly speaking, sole decoration of the Biedermeier room ‘was afforded by the curtains, which – extremely refined and compounded preferably from several fabrics of different colors – were furnished by the upholsterer. For nearly a whole century afterward, interior decoration amounts, in theory, to providing instructions to upholsterers for the tasteful arrangement of draperies.’” Max Von Boehn, *Die Mode in XIX. Jahrhundert*, vol2 (Munich, 1907): 130, quoted in Benjamin, *The Arcades Project*, [E1,1], 120.
already been morning for so long that it seemed more itself there than at any other spot. Never did I have the chance to wait for morning on the loggia; every time, it was already waiting for me. It had long since arrived – was effectively out of fashion – when I finally came upon it.\textsuperscript{136}

The transparency of the loggia not only presents an airy and luminous architectural space, but also defines a visual and auditory dialogue between the introverted bourgeois house and the urban life by directing the senses towards outside. In comparison to the other ‘secluded’ rooms, the loggia is the only part of the house that lets the city penetrate inside in which the strict boundaries of the indoor space began to dissolve through outside. This ambiguous spatial character makes the “loggia” as a transitional space in between the interior and the exterior, which is the main reason why it left a significant mark on Benjamin’s childhood memories:

It is much more on account of the solace that lies in their uninhabitability for one who himself no longer has a proper abode. They mark the outer limit of the Berliner’s lodging. Berlin – the city god itself – begins in them. The god remains such a presence there that nothing transitory can hold its ground beside him. In his safekeeping, space and time come into their own and find each other.\textsuperscript{137}

It is possible to sense a strong impulse of a metaphor of photography under the mental images (Denkbild) Benjamin rediscovered amongst his childhood memories.\textsuperscript{138} His interest on the architectural space that enables the view of the courtyard rather than just the image framed by it, and his choice of beginning the book with this short section titled “Loggias” – which he described as “the most exact portrait that I am able to make of myself”\textsuperscript{139} – strengthen this connection between the photographic image and the memory. Michael W. Jennings who describes the photographic impetus behind Benjamin’s text in his article “The

\textsuperscript{136} Benjamin, “Loggias,” \textit{Berlin Childhood around 1900}, 41.
\textsuperscript{137} Benjamin, “Loggias,” 42.
\textsuperscript{139} Benjamin quoted in Jennings, “The Mausoleum of Youth,” 313.
Mausoleum of Youth,” introduces an intriguing analogy between the “loggia” and the photographic camera:

The loggia itself is a box-like structure whose heavy 'roll-up shutters' seal it off from the windows of the apartment while the shutter-like 'roller blinds' control the perceptibility of the courtyard. The loggia figures, in other words, not just a theatrical loge, but a view camera.

The “loggia” is epitomized by Benjamin both as a symbolic mnemonic towards his recollections of Berlin childhood and more importantly, as a literal architectural space – resonating with his obsession of the Parisian arcades - representing the vague hints of the revolutionary aspects of modernity hidden amongst the fake historical crust of nineteenth-century bourgeois life. The connotation of a transparency is hidden in the description of loggia in a twofold manner: as a literal architectural space; a viewpoint and a transparent threshold towards exterior and as a characteristic of the modern individual who is susceptible as well as contributive, namely transparent to the things and events around him/her. The creative spirit of the individual no longer bound to the enclosed bourgeois room as a place of reclusion, but to the perception of the modern city as the common ground for inspiration and knowledge with all its emergent transparent architectural spaces and daily routines. Loggia represents the dialogue between the house and the city through its transparency. A similar account of the loggia can be encountered in Scheerbart’s glass utopia with the title “the end of the window; the loggia and the balcony:”

When glass architecture comes in, there will not be much more talk of windows either; the word ‘window’ will disappear from dictionaries. Whoever wants to look at nature can go on to his balcony or into his loggia, which of course can be arranged for enjoying nature as before. But then it will not be spoilt by hideous brick houses.

The description of the “loggia” by Benjamin as an in-between architectural space that provides an elevated viewpoint through city - which is elaborated further with

---

140 Jennings, 316.
the analogy of the loggia as a photography camera by Jennings - strongly resembles the spatial characteristics of the photography studio. The glass studio transforms the low, unlit and dusty space of the attic into an airy, hygienic and naturally illuminated public space defined by iron and glass. The transparency of the glass used to maximize the amount of light in the studio coincidentally provides the visitor with unexpected vistas of the city. The glass enclosure of the studio transmutes the traditional enclosed space of the attic and gives the roof an exteriority via its transparency.

Unfortunately, Benjamin’s own childhood experience of a photography studio – which coincide with advent of artificial lighting and decline of the transparent daylight studios around the 1900s – was not an illuminative encounter that reflects the possible similarities with the studio and the loggia or the arcade. Benjamin’s recollection of the studio is so much stuck with the objects inside that dominates the space which reminds him the claustrophobia of the Bourgeois interior. He was telling the story of a carte de visite of him with his brother and describe his experience in *Berlin Childhood* as followed:

And that explains why I was at such a loss when someone demanded of me similarity to myself. This would happen at the photographer’s studio. Wherever I looked, I saw myself surrounded by folding screens, cushions, and pedestals which craved my image much as the shades of Hades craved the blood of the sacrificial animal.  

While he was not fond of being photographed and links that hesitation to the artificiality of the studio setting, he underlines the importance of certain portrait photographers during the early days of the invention including Nadar. If he was able to catch a glimpse of Nadar’s studio at Boulevard des Capucines – “a building dedicated to photography” as Nadar described – which was a social gathering point for the Paris citizens and as a venue for special meetings and exhibitions for intelligentsia; he may be intrigued by the architectural qualities of the space beyond the phantasmagoria of the objects it contains. The photography studio stands out as

---

a modern architectural object marked by the use of iron and glass, which is shaped according to the function it houses; the very same function which imbues it as an intermediate space between the interior and the exterior, the individual and the city as well as the reality and phantasm.

Besides the similarities between the studio and arcade as neglected modern architectural typologies, the description of loggia by Benjamin bears some resemblance to the photography studio in terms of transparency. While the perception of the arcade as an in-between architectural space is imbued with shopfront transparency, the transparency of the photography studio resonates more with Benjamin’s loggia.

The transparency of the shopfronts connotes an introverted gaze of the subject to the objects of display through the interior. However, in the well-illuminated space of the glass studio it is the subject that temporarily transforms into an object of display for the eye of the photographer. The studio is an intermediary space that enables the photographer to capture the moment with proper light conditions and transform it into a real object as the photograph. The gaze of the subject turns towards the exterior through the process and the transparency of the studio also provides extroverted views through the city. The gaze of the observer is concentrated always inside of the arcade with all its distractions and phantasmagoria. The photography studio reverses that process, as it distracts the observer’s gaze in a different manner, by providing surprising vistas of the city.

For shop windows, the aim is to provide an introverted gaze through the interior to capture the attention of the subject while it also makes the space of the shop exterior, as a part of the street. For the photography studio, transparency is needed to provide the most convenient illumination for the process. It becomes an exterior space, an extension of the street as a viewing platform with the extensive use of glass. Simultaneously, the manifestation of the studio as a “glass box,” renders it as a self-representative urban typology as an easily recognizable architectural object throughout the nineteenth-century city.
4.2.3 Photography Studio as a Lost Artefact

While Benjamin celebrated the first decades of portrait photography as “pre-industrial hey-day of photography” in reference to the works of David Octavius Hill, Julia Margaret Cameron, Victor Hugo and Nadar, he condemned the invention of visiting card picture (carte de visite) which induced the commodification of the photographic image. He criticized the phantasmagoric backgrounds and posed subjects in these photographs, which constitutes a fake artistic visual vocabulary that emulates the traditional portrait painting. He mentioned the photographic studios of nineteenth century with this statement:

This was the period of these studios, with their draperies and palm trees, their tapestries and easels, which occupied so ambiguous a place between execution and representation, between torture chamber and throne room, and to which an early portrait of Kafka bears pathetic witness.


Figure 30. (middle) Portrait of Walter Benjamin which was produced by Selle und Kuntze photography studio in Potsdam, retrieved from the book cover of Berlin Childhood around 1900.

Figure 31. (right) Selle und Kuntze photography studio in Potsdam, which is barely visible on the upper part. Source: Brandenburg Museum digital archive, accessed August 08, 2023. https://brandenburg.museum-digital.de/object/2629

---

143 “The latest writings on the subject point up the fact that the flowering of photography – the work of Hill and Cameron, Hugo and Nadar – came in the first decade. But this was the decade which preceded its industrialization. Not that hucksters and charlatans did not appropriate the new techniques for gain, even in that early period; indeed, they did so en masse. But that was closer to the arts of the fairground, where photography is at home to this day, than to industry. Industry made its first real inroads with the visiting card picture, whose first manufacturers significantly became a millionaire.” Benjamin, “The Short History of Photography,” in One Way Street and Other Writings, 240-241.

However, he also talked about the unique “atmosphere” of the early portrait photographs, which originated both from the technical features like “coherent lighting” or “visual composition” and the confrontation of photographer and the subject as a member of the bourgeoisie which gives a symbolic meaning to the photograph. That is why there was an “aura” emanating from this early archive of images, that is much more significant than the “artistic perfection or taste” of these photographs.

The rapid industrialization of portrait photography tainted by the new re-touching techniques and artificial lighting simultaneous with “the degeneration of the imperialist bourgeoisie” marked the fall of the medium especially after 1880s according to Benjamin. He found the salvation of photography in the works of Eugene Atget at this period and furthermore, he acclaimed Atget as the virtuosi who discovered the inherent power of the medium that can release the objects from the aura and created a new way of seeing that was later associated with surrealism. Benjamin claims that;

[Atget] was the first to disinfect the stifling atmosphere generated by conventional portrait photography in the age of decline. He cleanses this atmosphere, indeed he dispels it altogether: he initiates the emancipation of the object from aura which is the most significant achievement of the latest school of photography.

The term “aura” has a major role in Benjamin’s other writings and was at the heart of his canonical text “The Works of Art in the age of Mechanical Reproduction” that celebrated photography and cinema as the new art forms that have the revolutionary capacity to transform the modern culture. He gave the definition of the “aura” after mentioning Atget in “The Short History of Photography”:

---

145 These pictures were made in rooms where every client was confronted, in the photographer, with a technician of the latest school; whereas the photographer was confronted, in every client, with a member of a rising class equipped with an aura that had seeped into the very folds of the man’s frock coat or floppy cravat. For that aura was by no means the mere product of a primitive camera.” Benjamin, “The Short History of Photography,” 248.

146 Benjamin, 248.

147 Benjamin, 249-250.
A strange weave of space and time: the unique appearance or semblance of distance, no matter how close the object may be…Now, to bring things closer to us, or rather to the masses, is just as passionate an inclination in our day as the overcoming of whatever is unique in every situation by means of its reproduction… The stripping bare of the object, the destruction of the aura, is the mark of a perception whose sense of the sameness of things has grown to the point where even the singular, the unique, is divested of its uniqueness – by means of its reproduction.148

The aura surrounding the nineteenth century European cities was constructed by the variety of selective images of the tourist itinerary and national landmarks. The photography of Atget gave way to the exposure of the “real” urban spaces as the area of confrontation and conflict which underlines the political and revolutionary power inherent in the urban dynamics of the city discovered through the photographic image. Instead of the popular sights or the great landmarks, Atget was after the ordinary everyday life that is “unremarked, forgotten and cast adrift.” Amongst the discreet urban topology of nineteenth century Paris, some of the photographic studios were also captured by Atget. Even though these studios were very popular at the time, their short existence against the pace of industrial growth and urban transformations rendered them invisible through time. Once more, through the photographs of Atget, one can discover the presence of these long-lost urban artefacts. These artefacts may have a more significant part for architectural discourse as early reflections or glimpses of a modernist language, manifested through their formal and functional resistance to the parade of the fake historical coding of nineteenth century architecture.

While photographic image destroys the uniqueness of the object by multiplying it and make it available for masses, the photographic space as a glass box disrupts the uniqueness of the architectural façade formed by established historical proportions and rules. The aura of the historical façade began to fade and transform with the introduction of this new architectural language. Although the picturesque language of conventional portrait photography was criticized by Benjamin, the photography studio that enables the production of those images emerged at a significant

148 Benjamin, 250.
intersection point between the surrealist curiosity towards bourgeois material culture and the transformation of the nineteenth century built environment by newborn modern architectural typologies.

Benjamin’s methodology helps us to analyze the photography studio as a forgotten and neglected architectural artefact of the past like the arcade and understand its historical significance through the urban practices and cultural meanings that embedded within its architecture. His conception of architecture as the “witness” to the transformations of the society and as a stage for social interaction in the city brings forth an operation of archeology that focuses not only to the buildings themselves but also to the traces and remnants of these long-lost narratives that also had a role in the transformation of the architecture in return. The in-between and transitional architectural typologies which were neglected by the grand histories of architecture, appears as significant as the grand, pre-modern examples when they were observed with a Benjaminian perspective. Although it differs from the arcade in terms of scale or function, the photography studio is also a ruin and a forgotten artefact of the bourgeois culture.

Figure 33. Place St. André des Arts – Eugene Atget 1912. 9 Place St. André des Arts – Studio Graffe (still stands).
https://www.parismuseescollections.paris.fr/fr/musee-carnavalet/oeuvres/angle-de-la-place-saint-andre-des-arts-et-de-la-rue-hautefeuille-6eme#infos-principales
CHAPTER 5

IN PURSUIT OF A LOST ARCHITECTURAL ARTEFACT: TRACING PHOTOGRAPHY STUDIOS

The visual material regarding the nineteenth-century photography studios is immense in terms of the vast portrait archives they produced. Even though many of the original negatives were lost after portrait businesses lost their glamour, as too the photographic prints in various family albums were forgotten through time, a considerable number of *cartes de visite* and cabinet photographs survived to this day thanks to their widespread social use as items of exchange. They still maintain this feature by attracting attention from collectors and they can be found on many online sale websites, which contribute a great deal to the production and dissemination of the digitized versions of these photographs. Compared to other forms of collectible photographic reproductions such as postcards or stereographs that were produced and exchanged in large numbers, the carte de visite and cabinet formats constitute by far the most widespread and scattered image database on the web.

Within this vast pile of imagery, it is challenging to navigate and find specific materials about the architecture of the photography studios. The keywords and tags such as “photography studio,” “daylight studio,” “fotoatelier” or “atelier de photographie” result in thousands of images, among which finding a coherent set of actual photographs, drawings or illustrations that depicts the architecture of the studio itself is impossible. Adding the keyword “architecture” or “architektur” rarely works because usually there is no such tag due to the absence of a comprehensive study on the architectural quality of the photographic studios. Only a small number of generic studio interior views or diagrams categorized under the title “nineteenth-century photography studio” can be found, which generally lack further information about the establishment such as its owner or its location. All the
diverse photographic establishments of the nineteenth century seem to be condensed into a limited selection of visual and textual information amongst which it is unlikely to gather detailed information about a specific studio.

Bits and pieces of information from all around Europe can be collected through architectural heritage or photographic history studies – from professional projects to personal photography blogs – which are mostly focused on the small number of studios that still exist today. There are some unique examples, such as the Mai Mano House (Figure 34 & Figure 37) in Budapest – Hungary, Seidel Fotoatelier (Figure 40) in Cesky Krumlov - Czechia, Casa Relvas (Figure 42) in Golege - Portugal, Atelier Malicot (Figure 49) in Sablé-sur-Sarthe - France and Josip Pelikan Studio (Figure 46) in Celje – Slovenia, used as photography museums from which historical information, photographs, and even architectural drawings (of the first three) are obtained via the online archive of these institutions. Additional information regarding the architecture and urban visuality of the studios is also unveiled with the data gathered from the limited range of books focusing mainly the famous photographers and studios of the time such as Nadar’s canonical establishment in Boulevard des Capucines in Paris.

Although a preliminary catalogue of studios was created at an early stage of this research, the tracing of the photography studios was considerably slow-paced, and the result was an incoherent set of scattered buildings from various urban contexts across the world (especially in Europe and America). A holistic strategy was required both to determine the scope of this study and to understand and re-create the urban conditions of the nineteenth century city in which these studios appeared in remarkable numbers instead of isolated remnants of the past. This chapter determines the urban manifestation of the studios and their intricate connection to

149 Mai Mano House - Budapest, Hungary: https://www.maimano.hu
Atelier Malicot - Sablé-sur-Sarthe, France: https://ateliermalicot.wixsite.com/ateliermalicot
the cultural life of nineteenth-century cities as its primary motivation to define the photography studio as a hybrid architectural typology and therefore, does not satisfy with arbitrary drawings or images of the studios found during the research. Because it is hard to compete with all these diverse urban contexts, the extent of the tracing operation is re-established by concentrating on a selection of cities as case studies.

Figure 34. Mai Mano Studio, Budepest. Purpose-built house with studios and bookshop. Architects: Rezso Nay and Muki Strausz.
https://archivum.maimanoarchiv.hu/index_en.html
Figure 35. Mai Mano House, Budapest, 2023.¹⁵⁰
https://archivum.maimanoarchiv.hu/maimanohaz_en.html

Figure 36. Mai Mano House, cabinet photography mount.
https://archivum.maimanoarchiv.hu/maimanohaz_02_en.html

¹⁵⁰ “What made the studio building of Manó Mai even superior to these others was that it was a purpose-built entire block, one that from cellar to loft space served photography. The other thing: the exquisite, Neo-Renaissance façade that was rare even among the public buildings of pomp-happy Hungarian “Gründerzeit.” It is a mere 13 meters in width, but is incredibly richly sprinkled with ornaments. It is a summary of the Beaux Arts style of Budapest, moments before Budapest was thunderstruck by art nouveau.” András Török, “Resurrecting Budapest Photographer Manó Mai and his Studio/Home,” in Photography and Research in Austria, Vienna, the Door to the European East (Passau: Dietmar Klinger Verlag, 2002), 57-67.
Figure 37. Mai Mano House section drawing.
Figure 38. Seidel’s Studio, Český Krumlov, 2022 [1888].

Figure 39. Seidel’s Studio, Český Krumlov, 2022 [1888].
Figure 40. Façade drawing of Seidel’s Studio, Český Krumlov, 1888.

Figure 41. Interior of Seidel’s Studio, Český Krumlov, 2022 [1888].
Figure 43. Casa Relvas. Photographed by Carlos Relvas, 1876.

Figure 44. Casa Relvas, Jornal Arquitectos, Publicação Trimestral da Ordem dos Arquitectos, Portuga, Outubro-Dezembro 2007.

Figure 47. Interior of Josip Pelikan Studio. Source: Josip Pelikan Photography Studio Museum: https://www.muzej-nz-ce.si/
Figure 48. Atelier Mallicot, Sablé-sur-Sarthe, France, 1899.

Figure 49. Atelier Mallicot after restoration in 2009, Sablé-sur-Sarthe, France.
Source: Atelier Malicot, https://ateliermalicot.wixsite.com/ateliermalicot
Figure 50. Atelier Mallicot after restoration, Sablé-sur-Sarthe, France. Source: Atelier Mallicot, https://ateliermalicot.wixsite.com/ateliermalicot

Figure 51. Interior of Atelier Mallicot, Sablé-sur-Sarthe, France. Source: Atelier Mallicot, https://ateliermalicot.wixsite.com/ateliermalicot
The book *The Photographic Studios of Europe* by H. Baden Pritchard\(^{151}\) published in 1882 is the only comprehensive written resource of the period that focused on the practices of nineteenth-century photographers by visiting them in their own studios. Although it presents a compilation of prominent studios of the time, it heavily relies on textual information rather than visuals, which are based on the assessment of the writer about the facilities of the establishments. The book consists of general sections according to country and region such as England, Scotland, France, Prussia, Austria, Hungary, Bavaria, and Belgium, through which four cities can be distinguished in parallel with the abundance of the studios that were visited by Pritchard: London, Paris, Berlin, and Vienna. While London and Paris were already part of this research from the beginning regarding their importance for the history of photography as the birthplaces of the process, Berlin and Vienna were designated as the following cities of importance for research by the help of Pritchard’s book. Although exemplary studios from various urban contexts are included within the text and extensively catalogued in the appendices, this dissertation analyses these four primary cities in a comprehensive manner to define the necessary tools for tracing the photography studios and to develop a methodological framework which can be applied to other cities as well. In line with the objectives of the research to identify and relate the abundance of photographic establishments, to understand their impact on urban scale and to define them as a hybrid architectural typology, four different types of materials are instrumentalized as research tools, as will be explained in the following part.

5.1 Research in-between Visuality and Materiality: Tools for Tracing Photography Studios

The studios mentioned in Pritchard’s book initiated a starting point and the research then was expanded by developing a strategy that associates four different types of materials – the map, the index, the image and the object – to define an operation of “tracing” the existences of photography studios throughout the four cities selected. Before elaborating the four pillars of this research, a brief overview of these tools is necessary to understand the motivation behind the utilization of this quadripartite system.

The four major capital cities have vast formal documentary archives of nineteenth-century urban imagery kept in national libraries and museums. A considerable part of these archives were digitized and made accessible via the online databases of these institutions, which is one of the reasons for the selection of these four cities. As an element of an institutional archive, these photographs commonly have detailed information about their provenance: “they were made by known or important photographers; they are accompanied by collateral information, such as written documentation; or they are well-known and have been studied by generations of scholars.”

In addition, a second enormous and informal archive emerges, consisting of “vernacular photographs” which come from ambiguous or anonymous sources and lack adequate written data about the context of the photograph. These informal photographs, which usually depict the mundane events, objects or people of everyday life in the city setting, gain significance with the growing interest on the heritage of the cities; an interest which fuses into different layers of the society. Along with the photography sharing websites, such as Flickr or Pinterest, there are many active groups on social media, such as Facebook, Instagram or Tumblr, as

153 Margolis and Rowe, 337.
well as other online platforms in which anyone can post and share historic photographs, comment on them or tag explanatory information about the images. These participatory and growing yet unofficial archives are transforming into a significant source of visual information for scholarly research and take the attention of institutions for upgrading their collections or for establishing new museums focusing particularly on the manifold narratives embedded in the history of the city.

In spite of the existence of these easily accessible and immense archives of formal and unformal imagery, a very small number of urban photographs or architectural depictions of the photography studios can be unveiled. The challenge of the absence of an extensive architectural study on the matter and the disorganization of the discovered data during the process necessitates a system to browse through such enormous digital archives and to detect visual and textual information on the architecture of the photography studios. The quadripartite correlation established between the four different materials – map, index, image, and object – constitutes a framework to formulate a research methodology for tracing the photography studios of the nineteenth-century for various European and American cities by studying four capitals – London, Paris, Berlin, and Vienna – as model cities.

While the maps of these cities help to determine the locations of the studios hand in hand with the nineteenth-century indexes of photographic businesses, the image refers to the urban representation of the studios depicted in photographs or engravings as well as the architectural drawings, and finally, the object embodies cartes de visit and cabinet format photographs produced by the studios together with the books and journals on photography published and circulated amongst society as a medium of professional communication.

5.1.1 Map

To overcome the complexity originating from the abundance of the photographic establishments in nineteenth-century cities and to catalyze the operation of tracing the studios, the identification of convenient urban plans of every city is crucial for this study to pinpoint the studio addresses and ascertain the pivotal locations. These
maps should belong to the end of the nineteenth century or the beginning of the twentieth century regarding the period between the 1850s and 1910s when these studios were extensively active. Additionally, these primary capital cities were exposed to enormous urban transformations during the same period which makes it especially hard to specify some locations in reference to the current conditions of the cities. There was a wide range of cartographical studies of these cities in nineteenth century, but the ones with detailed address information including building numbers as well as the names of important buildings and landmarks have been chosen in order to navigate through the maps efficiently. The identification of culturally significant buildings of urban memory as well as the landmarks on the maps was beneficial to pinpoint and find the studios in photographs amongst the immense pile of nineteenth-century urban scenery. Particularly for the images without any indexical information about the location, these reference buildings help to match the information between the image and the map. This is why specific public buildings were also highlighted in the base maps along with the studios.

Goad Insurance Plans of 1887 for London, the Municipal Plot Plans of 1894 for Paris, Straube Plan of 1910 for Berlin, and Stadtplan of 1887 for Vienna,\(^\text{154}\) are designated as base maps according to the principles explained above. Except Berlin, which has a high resolution singular detailed map, the other three base maps were partially re-constructed by combining various sheets according to the initial research which shows the specific locations where the photography studios were concentrated.

Amongst these four maps, the map of London has a particular importance since it is a detailed cartographical study specifically prepared to assess the liability of the

built environment against the danger of fire. ‘Insurance Plan of London’ was produced by Charles E. Goad Ltd. in 1887\(^{155}\) for the purpose of providing detailed information of the buildings for fire insurance. Aside from the general characteristics of the buildings such as the number of floors or the building height, more detailed data about the construction material or the occupied businesses were also included with textual indications on the map to better assess the fire risks of the edifices. Therefore, the glass photography studios at the rooftops were all charted and shown as blue-purple or yellow rectangles according to the construction material color assigned on these plans with the addition of an explanatory text, such as a “photo” or “studio” in short.\(^{156}\)

Figure 52. London base map showing the Regent Street produced by the author by combining four fragments of Goad Insurance Plan of London.

\(^{155}\) The Insurance Plans of London were discovered through the website of London Picture Archive: https://www.londonpicturearchive.org.uk and also acquired from Wikimedia Commons website (https://commons.wikimedia.org) in higher resolution. Because they are very detailed maps, there are actually several different volumes according to the regions. The relevant map fragments are selected and combined to construct the base maps for studying Regent Street and Cheapside Street.

\(^{156}\) The glass and steel skylights on two-storey buildings were represented with blue color, while the ones on higher buildings were designated with purple. The studios were shown in the same manner as the skylights with an explanatory text, while the yellow color represents the use of wood as a structural element. In some examples there is just a descriptive text pointing out to the existence of a glass studio on the roof, although it is not shown graphically.
Figure 53. Detail from Goad Fire Insurance Plan of Dublin, 1893. Various photography studios were indicated along Grafton Street.

Figure 54. Detail from Goad Fire Insurance Plan of Dublin, Grafton Street, no: 52 with the note “PHOTO”.
Source: UK Web Archive, https://www.webarchive.org.uk/

Figure 55. “Roadworks at the junction of Grafton Street, St. Stephen’s Green and South King’s Street,” photographed by J.J. Clarke, 1897.
A quick operation of scanning of the insurance maps of Glasgow reveals Jamaica Street as a possible significant location for photographic establishments as highlighted with the color green on the map above. When the address information taken from the map was searched in various databases, the carte de visit mounts and the name of the photographer (or photographers) can be found, which also gives a rough idea of the period when the studio was active. Simultaneously, a quick search of the address information on visual databases regarding Glasgow can yield urban images of a studio. Although the historic photographs of Jamaica Street demonstrate the existence of many of these studios, a quick research of one particular studio located at the intersections of Jamaica and Argyle Street (the large studio on the top-right of the map), which is a privileged location for urban visibility, results with the discovery of both a clear view of the studio and the drawing used on the mount as can be observed below.

Figure 57. The carte de visite mount of Turnbull & Sons Artistic Photographers on Jamaica Street, Glasgow. Source: Victorian and Edwardian Photographs – Roger Vaughan Picture Library collection, accessed via http://www.oldphoto.freeuk.com/

Figure 58. Photograph showing the glass rooftop studio of Turnbull & Sons Artistic Photographers on Jamaica Street, Glasgow. Source: Victorian Glasgow Facebook group, accessed March 17, 2023. https://www.facebook.com/victorianglasgow
Figure 59. Photography studios located along Grand Rue de Pera / İstiklal Street highlighted with green color by the author on Goad Insurance Plan of Istanbul. Source: Salt Research Institute online archive, accessed January 09, 2023. https://archives.saltresearch.org

Figure 60. (left) Detail from Goad Insurance Plan of Istanbul: Phibus Studio, Pera. Source: Salt Research Institute online archive: https://archives.saltresearch.org/handle/123456789/114965

Figure 61. (middle & right) A photograph mount of Phibus Studio. Source: Salt Research Institute online archive: https://archives.saltresearch.org/handle/123456789/5660

Figure 62. (left) Detail from Goad Insurance Plan of Istanbul: a photography studio in Kadıköy marked with blue color. Source: Salt Research Institute online archive: https://archives.saltresearch.org/handle/123456789/1819

Figure 63. (right) Detail from Goad Insurance Plan of Izmir: Tatikian photography and printing studio marked with blue color. Source: Salt Research Institute online archive: https://archives.saltresearch.org/handle/123456789/1817

The note on blue-colored studio: “IMPRIMENTE TATIKIAN PHOTOGRAPHE.” It probably refers to the Tatikian Printing House that belongs to Bogos Tatikian, a worldwide famous lithographer and painter of Smyrna. It is possible that he also dealt with photography in his studio, at least as an aiding tool for the production of lithographs or similar types of print.
For the cities of United Kingdom, the insurance plans that were prepared by Goad Insurance Company comes forward as a significant source – including primary cities such as Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow (Figure 56), Edinburgh, Dublin (Figure 53), Belfast and Cardiff.\textsuperscript{157} Apart from UK, there were many cities throughout the world including Istanbul and İzmir,\textsuperscript{158} which also have these insurance maps that contain information about the photography studios (Figure 59, Figure 60, and Figure 62). Similar maps for fire insurance such as Sanborn maps of American cities, can facilitate studies to pursue the photography studios for various cities.\textsuperscript{159} The map can be utilized as the primary source of the tracing operation in different contexts as will be illustrated by the case of London.

\textbf{5.1.2 Index}

For all four cities, there are pre-existing indexical studies focused only on the photographic establishments among the extensive annuals and almanacs of commercial activities of the nineteenth century as well as the postal records. For London, there is a published directory that enlists all the London photographers between 1841 and 1908 according to the postal records, written by Michael Pritchard.\textsuperscript{160} For Berlin, there is an active database about nineteenth-century photographers (Figure 64) which was generated (further expanded) by an academic research project in parallel with a number of museology courses conducted in Berlin University of Applied Sciences.\textsuperscript{161} For Vienna, neither a comprehensive directory nor an index could be found and the information acquired so far is quite fragmented.\textsuperscript{162} For Paris, Elizabeth Anne McCauley’s book \textit{Industrial Madness}:

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{157}] British Library Online Archive, accessed via UK web archive page: https://www.webarchive.org.uk/en/ukwa/
\item[\textsuperscript{158}] Salt Research Online Archive: https://archives.saltresearch.org/handle/123456789/1815.
\item[\textsuperscript{159}] Similarly, Sanborn insurance maps charted significant areas of US cities (12,000 U.S. cities and towns) as well as Cuba, Canada and Mexico.
\item[\textsuperscript{160}] Michael Pritchard, \textit{A Directory of London Photographers 1841-1908} (Watford: PhotoResearch; 2\textsuperscript{nd} revised edition, 1994).
\item[\textsuperscript{161}] \textit{Berliner Fotografenateliers des 19. Jahrhunderts}, https://www.berliner-fotografenateliers.de/
\item[\textsuperscript{162}] There is an extensive study compiled by Bodo Kralik, \textit{Lexicon der Wiener Photographen, 1840-1900} (Wien: 2004) which could not be accessed during this research.
\end{itemize}
Commercial Photography in Paris: 1848-1871 emerge as a significant source that presents a listing of photography studios active between 1848 and 1871 in Paris based on the information of Bottin and Firmin-Didot directories of Paris (including the 1848 and 1860 partial maps of Paris that show approximate locations of studios). Besides the indexical data compiled on its appendix section, this book is an illuminating source for this study with its focus on the flourishing of photography in the nineteenth century as an integral part of the urban environment and everyday life of Paris through the lens of several important figures from different genres of photography. Particularly the second chapter, entitled “The Business of Photography,” includes textual and visual data about the studios of Paris that contributes to this research significantly.

Before further elaborating the role of these indexes, it is important to reiterate that the aim of this study is not to transfer all the indexical data to the base maps by pinpointing every possible location on which the photography studios were situated. It is particularly the rooftop studios that this study aims to trace, demonstrating their recognition as a nineteenth-century urban phenomenon and as a definitive architectural typology that transformed the roofscape of the cities. Unveiling the exterior photographs of these studios as well as their architectural drawings or sketches is the ultimate motivation of this research.


164 McCauley defines the aim of her book as followed: “The purpose of this book is to explain not only how photography was transformed from a novel curiosity to an accepted and vital part of the urban environment but also why its appeal was so powerful and its applications so diverse. On the one hand, this is the story of the producers – the innovators, entrepreneurs, hacks, and self-proclaimed “artistes” who took up the mysterious wooden boxes and set forth to earn their fortunes. On the other, it is a history of an amorphous mass of consumers – from aristocrats to gamins in Latin Quarter – who found in the new medium all that the industrial age admired: precision, objectivity, speed, reproducibility, convenience, and lowered cost. Although photography did not provoke the same responses or associations in all segments of society, there was remarkably consistent agreement over what the medium did well. And there was a similar, if rarely articulated, consensus that the world had been irrevocably changes by this latest child of the industrial revolution. Photography, like the flaneur, the railroad, the roman feuilleton, and the ready-made frockcoat, was above all ‘modern,’ and made the older modes of visual communication suddenly look quaint, distorted, and inefficient.”
Figure 64. Screenshot from Berliner Fotografenateliers des 19. Jahrhunderts – Berlin Photographer Studios of the nineteenth century website.
https://www.berliner-fotografenateliers.de/

Figure 65. Detail from A Directory of London Photographers by Michael Pritchard.
The index, therefore, works more as a tool for cross-referencing in order to verify the information about the location of a studio that can be distinguished from photographs or the written address information gathered from the mounts of carte de visite and cabinet photographs. In addition, this study is expanded through the repetitive addresses mentioned in these indexes even though the studio owners changed over time. The additional information about the dates of activity (if it is included) also makes it possible to designate the time interval that a studio location was active under the management of different photographers. Besides being a tool of validating the address information, the index effectively contributes to the research in terms of demonstrating persistent studio locations which possibly created a stronger impact on urban memory and urban topography.

It is important to note here that the information on the indexes is not entirely reliable. There might be missing information about the businesses or spelling mistakes about the names which can be confusing. But most importantly, some establishments chose not to spend money to be on those listings and almanacs or simply missed the chance to take part in them because of the shifting dynamics of the photography business such as change in management, bankruptcy, or moving out for a better or cheaper location. Therefore, there were possibly more active studios on a specific year than the number of listed ones. For example, there are studios distinguished through the scanning of urban photographs of possible popular locations in the cities. It was possible to find examples amongst such studios and validate them by cross-referencing the signs visible on the photographs and the carte de visite mounts, although their records do not appear on the indexes.

165 For Berlin, there is an extensive database of different cartes de visite of different photographers: https://www.diegeschichteberlins.de/geschichteberlins/datenbanken/historische-fotografien. For Paris, the online archive of the Bibliothèque Nationale is the main resource: https://gallica.bnf.fr. For London, there is a website “Photographers of Great Britain & Ireland 1840-1940” in which several carte de visit covers can be found: https://www.cartedevisite.co.uk/.

166 Even famous studios, such as Disdéri and Nadar, had to declare bankruptcy or change their locations due to the increasing expense on rent.
Figure 66. Paul Auguste Gueuvin’s studio in 20 Rue Cassette, Paris, 1862. Because of high rents, Gueuvin decided to relocate his studio in this less commercialized area and constructed a garden atelier. His former location was in 11 Boulevard des Italiens, a popular studio used by many photographers.
Source: Elizabeth Anne McCaul, Industrial Madness, 68.

Figure 67. (left) Oscar Gustave Rejlander’s atelier in London.
Source: Photographisches Archiv - Journal des allgemeinen deutschen Photographen-Vereins, 1869

Figure 68. (right) W. Notman’s atelier in Montreal.
Source: Photographisches Archiv, 1866.
Establishments related to photographic commerce have many variations such as the equipment vendors and small shops that sell postcards, stereographs, or other ready-made photographic images along with prints. Some of the studio owners also had a separate shop in a more practical location for the trading of these ready-made photographs and celebrity cartes, which contributed to the promotion of the studio as well. These shops can easily be confused with a branch studio since most of the famous photographers chose to expand their businesses through multiple locations. The differentiation may not be clear for every case if there is indeed a glass studio at the location or it is just a photographic store. Thus, the data acquired from the indexes had to be supported by photographs or other kinds of visual data since the main motivation of this research is to trace the urban manifestation of the glass photography studios as a striking architectural typology rather than compiling historical data about their locations. In addition, not necessarily all the portrait businesses have glass studios on the roof level. There were some establishments that preferred to install a small glass pavilion at the garden or the courtyard of their building (Figure 66). Some photographers preferred picturesque lighting schemes with small skylights and side windows (Figure 67 & Figure 68) that do not require a substantial intervention to the building. Some of the rooftop studios are also facing inner courtyards (Figure 80) to adjust the suitable direction for the sunlight and they are not visible from the street level. Therefore, it becomes challenging to detect the very existence of the glass studio or its manifestation as a strong architectural element for each establishment through the scanning of the visual data. Still, significant examples such as long-term studio locations detected through the index, popular studios discovered in literature reviews or the establishments detected in photographs through the visible signs, are included in the tracing operation. Even though no visual data can be unveiled particularly about the glass structures, these locations are also indicated on the maps with small dots.

5.1.3 Image

Image refers to all kind of visual documents such as photographs, engravings, illustrations or architectural drawings of the photography studios. Before delving
further into the crucial role of the image as a tool for tracing and demonstrating the architecture of the studios and re-constructing the spatial and urban condition they stimulate, a brief framework on photography itself is introduced to reflect how photographic images are methodologically read and interpreted within this research.

Photographs I

The historiography of photography is exhausted by the endless repetitions of the origins of photography, where or when it was invented or by whom, and how it evolved in the hand of certain innovative figures from a humble tool of documentation to an expressive medium. This established historical framework of the origins and evolutionary progression of the photographical medium appears in almost every text written on photography.

The early years of photography in the nineteenth century are mainly conceptualized as a documentary period regarding the mechanical nature of the medium and the assumed transparent relation between the photographic image and the object photographed. The revolutionary aspect of the photographic medium was associated with its ability to “represent things as they really are,” and so, if a photograph carried any artistic or expressive value, it was either originated from the qualities of the object in a photograph or the camera’s and photographer’s ability of mimicking the conventions of certain pictorial traditions like landscape or portraiture. In other words, a distinction between the documentary/scientific and interpretive/artistic uses of the camera was introduced. While the former is commonly accepted as the inherent strength of the medium, the latter was not associated with the very core of photographical discourse in the nineteenth century. That means photography cannot be an autonomous form of art, because it is a passive recorder and so, any artistic use of the medium is bound to the tradition of other arts, mainly the painting. This is why photography was criticized by many writers in these early years when it was used in a more expressive and artistic
manner since it was perceived as a threat especially to painting. The strongest objection comes from Charles Baudelaire in 1859:

Let photography quickly enrich the traveler's album, and restore to his eyes the precision his memory lack; let it adorn the library of the naturalist, magnify microscopic events, even strengthen, with a few facts, the hypotheses of the astronomer; let it, in short, be the secretary and record-keeper of whomsoever needs absolute material accuracy for professional reasons.167

The nineteenth-century architectural photography, or more correctly the cumulative photographic work produced at that period are mostly accepted as an output of a consistent documentary approach. This early period was described as an era of “archival impulse,”168 constructed upon a shared desire to document and reproduce especially buildings with historical importance (and the historic districts of cities) because of the intense interest in cultural heritage.

Within this framework, the ontological underpinnings and philosophical questionings of photography are always caught between conceptual and contradictory poles: science and art, objective and subjective, nature and culture, transparent and expressive, frontal and perspective and so on.169 Even though these dichotomies tend to display a pattern that approximates their claims, each of them


My master thesis, supervised by Ayşen Savaş, mainly questioned the objectivity and reliability of the photographic representations of architecture by focusing on many of these dichotomies such as “objective knowledge” and “subjective interpretation”, “photogenic representation” and “tactile experience” or “transparent” and “reflection;” so it can be approached as an important touchstone and a starting point for this study. With a similar archaeological approach, I tried to “dig” the fragments of “statements” and “images” from my own thesis, namely from my academic/intellectual “archive,” to extend and elaborate the scope of my research on architectural photography and to construct a more comprehensive epistemological framework for my future research in PhD. See, Esatcan Coşkun, “Documentation of Architecture: Photography as an Objective Tool?” (Unpublished Master’s Thesis, METU, 2009).
has their own unique reasoning and they are not simply the derivatives of some kind of a primary division as in science versus art (i.e., a subjectivist reading does not necessarily mean that it is also cultural). The emergence of these “dichotomies” can be approached as useful in triggering new discussions about the medium of photography however, they are critically restrictive because one side of these binary oppositions was always assessed as dominant over the other. The history of photography therefore also appears, and is thus perceived, in cascading episodes of developing practices defined by a leading conceptual pole while the other remains as recessive. In other words, photography’s historiography is either built upon a homogenous structure of chronological progress (only disrupted by certain important figures that contributed to this progress positively); or alternatively, constructed upon specific dichotomies superseding one another in different time periods. Both approaches choose to ignore the discontinuities and disruptions to achieve a coherent framework, while the photographic images themselves become just the subsidiary parts of these consistent narratives that are based on origins, key figures or dichotomies.

A similar dichotomy re-appears in Eric Margolis and Jeremy Rowe’s text titled “Methodological Approaches to Disclosing Historic Photographs,” which underlines two methodological approaches regarding photographic research: the post-positivist perspective based on the “evidentiary / face value” of the image benefitting from the indexical sources and the hermeneutic approach which focuses on the symbolic dimensions of the image on the pursuit of discovering meaning through semiotic and semantic interpretation. However this time, instead of evoking the never-ending battle between objectivity/subjectivity and evidence/interpretation haunting photography since its invention, the text tries to
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170 Eric Margolis and Jeremy Rowe, “Methodological Approaches to Disclosing Historic Photographs,” in The Sage Handbook of Visual Research Methods, 339. Also see, Sekula, Photography against the Grain, 193. The iconic and symbolic life of photographs is the basis that the hermeneutic approach insists on for meaning — photographs are defined by their social and cultural contexts and, as a result, can never be either ethically or aesthetically neutral.
demonstrate the intricate correlations between these two approaches and proposes a reciprocal dialogue in spite of the supposedly sharp distinction in-between them.

While post-positivist approach differentiated from the traditional understanding of the photographic medium as a mechanical reproduction tool that correctly mirror or represent objective reality without any personal distortions by its recognition of the impact of the photographer’s choice (frame, composition, exposure, depth of field, time, etc.) infused on the image; it still underlines that the photographs represent “the thing is the world” and “the most important quality of a photograph is its indexical connection to things in the world.”171 The hermeneutic perspective accepts that the “photographs are defined by their social and cultural contexts and, as a result, can never be either ethically or aesthetically neutral”172 and so, it focuses the symbolic and iconic dimensions of the image. The camera does not only capture the thing in front of the lens but also encapsulates a web of complex social, economic or political conditions within the image. This kind of contextual data which can be explicit or hidden within the photograph, needs interpretation and analysis to deduce meaning and differs from the indexical historical data fixed to the image.

Although this study benefits from the documentary approach and the archival impulse of the nineteenth century by digging into the layers of urban photographs to uncover the photography studios, it also considers the symbolic and iconic dimensions of the urban image of the studios. The photographs unveiled through this research are interpreted with a methodology constructed upon a tripartite set of values benefitting from both the post-positivist and hermeneutic approaches:

- **Evidentiary value / face value:**

  Even though the cross-referencing of the information gathered from the mounts of the photographs and the address indexes of photographic

---

171 Margolis and Rowe, “Methodological Approaches to Disclosing Historic Photographs,” 340.
172 Margolis and Rowe, 341.
establishments seem sufficient to pinpoint the studios on the map, the photographs maintain evidentiary value as a tool for validation. They also demonstrate if the establishment has a glass rooftop extension visible form the public areas of the city or not. The additional indexical data that the photograph carries besides the view of the studio itself, such as the signs and building numbers as well as the landmarks and significant public spaces are also helpful to pinpoint the studios on the map with accuracy.

- **Explanatory value:**

Besides utilizing photographic imagery as a tool of verification for detecting studio locations as well as determining their visibility, this study aims to match the visual information gathered from the photographs and the technical data of architectural drawings for a better understanding of the architecture of the studios. In that sense, the explanatory power of the interior and exterior images unveiled through this research comes forward as a key element to decode the spatial characteristics of the studio.

The explanatory value appears as a derivative of the evidentiary/face value at the first glance in terms of the correspondence of the visual data with a historical narrative. It is the image content, the things in the photograph that dominates our visual perception and carry at least an indexical relation to reality/history. Here, it is defined as a separate notion because the reading of the architectural features of a studio from a photograph is dependent on a set of subsidiary operations of comparison and deduction based on the accumulated knowledge of the architecture of the studio. In other words, the typological analysis of a forgotten and neglected architectural phenomenon necessitates a particular way of looking.

- **Symbolic value:**

In most of the photographs, even without the intention to depict the photography studio, the manifestation of certain architectural characteristics discussed in this study was apparent such as the tension between the add-on
glass box and the existent urban tissue. However, those photographs — together with other forms of illustrations and engravings — depict unique urban conditions which are open to multiple readings and the interpretation of the viewer instead of acting as passive architectural documents. The urban manifestation and the self-representative nature of the studios originating from the contrast between their modern architectural language and the façade architecture of nineteenth-century based on fake historical coding can trigger more discussions on various topics such as the tension between the modern and the historical; the contrast of transparency and opacity or the transformation of the dark, shallow and dusty space of attic into a luminous, airy and sterile modern architectural space; and the impact of that transformation on the rooftops of the city not only architecturally but also socially as a new public level besides the existing streetscape.

To conclude, it is important to emphasize that the photographs are not only treated in a strict documentative manner to confirm the accuracy of the locations presented by the index and indicated on the map, but also to discover the visual equivalents of the data collected about a specific studio to evaluate its architectural qualities. On one hand, the exterior views depict very effectively the self-representative nature of the studios in accordance with their austere architecture and support the assumption that they have the potential to create an impact in urban scale in terms of their abundance and recognizability. On the other hand, the photographs assist the understanding of the architecture of the studio in relation to the urban context as well as helping the production of the 3-D models of some examples together with the drawings found. The correlation of the evidentiary, explanatory and symbolic values of the photographs is crucial for this research in parallel with the interpretation of the notion of architectural typology with its cultural and urban influences.

173 Even in some examples, the photograph itself emerge as a sufficient source for the operation of modelling since the planar dimensions can be taken from the maps while the information on proportions and height can be estimated from the data acquired by the photograph itself. The human figures in the photographs as well as the known edifices around allow a comparable analysis about the approximate dimensions of the buildings with a photography studio.
dimensions without diminishing it into a formal analysis. In light of this tripartite conception of the photographic images, the following section will focus on how photographs are utilized for the four cities to trace the existence of the photography studios.

Figure 69. 3D model of Nadar’s studio, produced by the author.

Figure 70. 3D model of the photography studio at 7 Place Gutenberg, Strasbourg, produced by Sinan Cem Kızıl.

Figure 71. 3D model of the photography studio at 14 Avenue de la Marseillaise, Strasbourg, produced by Caner Arkboğa.
Figure 72. 3D model of the photography studio in Markthalle IV, produced by the author.

Figure 73. A glasshouse studio type, modeled by the author.
Photographs II

The pinning of the studios on a base map according to the information derived from the objects and the indexes allows the instruction of the address information as an additional search parameter. The first step is to determine the most comprehensive image archives for the four cities. For London, the London Picture Archive and the image library of National Archives\textsuperscript{174} come forward as the most comprehensive source of photographs, while for Paris, the online database of Bibliothèque Nationale and the joint digital collection of Paris Museums\textsuperscript{175} present an extensive image collection including some drawings regarding the studios. The search on the digital archives of Stadtmuseum Berlin, Deutsche Digitale Bibliothek and Deutsche Fototek\textsuperscript{176} resulted in the best results on photographic imagery which underline Berlin as the model city with the most pristine urban photographs of the photography studios. The online databases of Wienbibliothek im Rathaus, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek and Wien Museum\textsuperscript{177} are the primary sources for Vienna. While the application of the address parameters on these databases results in the discovery of a respectable number of photographs and illustrations that depict the exterior and urban views of the mapped studios, it is still necessary to produce alternative interpretations of the images to expand the research.

Although “the image” seems to be the ultimate outcome of the research, for a considerable number of cases, a photograph appears as the main initiator of the process. Because of their self-representative nature, the photography studios can be clearly detected in a photograph if someone is consciously looking for them. Therefore, in some cases the studio was discovered in a photograph directly and through the important buildings in its vicinity, the location of the studio could be

\textsuperscript{174} London Picture Archive: https://www.londonpicturearchive.org.uk
\textsuperscript{175} Bibliothèque nationale de France: gallica.bnf.fr
\textsuperscript{176} “Stadtmuseum Berlin: https://sammlung-online.stadtmuseum.de; Deutsche Digitale Bibliothek: https://www.deutsche-digitale-bibliothek.de; Deutsche Fototek: https://www.deutschefototek.de
\textsuperscript{177} Wienbibliothek im Rathaus: https://www.wienbibliothek.at/; Österreichische Nationalbibliothek https://onb.digital ; Wien Museum,: https://sammlung.wienmuseum.at/en/
designated on the map. Then the index and the object were used for the verification of the address and the photographer.

Apart from some photographs taken by the studio owners themselves for the purpose of advertising, the studios were generally documented unintentionally amongst the vast pile of urban imagery of nineteenth century. While some of them were recorded during the vast documentation projects utilized before major urban transformations – such as Charles Marville’s photographs of Paris – another group can be detected at the background of certain significant public events that were documented via photography.

As mentioned above, the photographers mostly preferred visible locations in popular social, educational, or commercial zones of the city. Therefore, through the photographs that depict the sophisticated aspects of the modern way of life on the new boulevards or the public squares, it is possible to detect the studios or the signs of the photographers amongst the urban scenery. The postcards of nineteenth-century European cities, particularly depicting these modern popular zones, comes forward as a prolific source. Same postcards are also significant as objects that circulated amongst nineteenth century society which enables the dissemination of the image of the studios within the urban scenery.

Similarly, the significant landmarks located in the vicinity of these fashionable public areas are another important input because of their popularity as architectural subjects that were repeatedly photographed throughout history. Once the locations of the photographic establishments had been designated, the nearby landmarks were also searched in image databases (besides the address information of the studio) hoping to find the frames that also captured the exterior views of the studios nearby. In addition, the panoramic images taken from the highest point of these landmarks occasionally captured the roof studios in clarity. To put it directly, to designate a glass photography studio in those black and white images is similar to a “photo-hunt” operation and navigation through these images also necessitates the matching of the viewpoint of the photograph with the map.
Not just the landmarks but also notable places of urban memory, which are absent on the maps but were discovered during the search of address information, particularly cafés and event spaces also supported the research. Although, the relation between the studio locations and urban memory places for these four primary cities is quite a broad and intense topic beyond the scope of this study; certain locations discovered through this research, such as Café Anglais in Paris (Figure 75), Café Kranzler, Café Bauer and Biearhaus Siechen (Figure 74) in Berlin, Casa Pikola in Vienna, emerge as triggering search parameters and tags. The utilization of these memory places as research parameters reveal the existence of the studios through photographs, and even through objects such as postcards or advertising posters, in case the search for the location returned empty-handed.

Figure 75. Café Anglais and the adjacent photography studio at 15 Boulevard Italiens, Paris. Source: Gallica – BnF, accessed March 17, 2023. https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b69143613.r=cafe%20anglais?rk=21459;2
Architectural Drawings and Diagrams

The leading journals and books on photography and architecture for the four cities indicate another important research field as potential sources to extract more images or drawings about these studios. As further explained in the next section, these written resources are considered as “objects” within the research methodology similar to the material significance of cartes de visite and cabinet photographs as a medium of communication which allowed these objects to reach wider audiences throughout nineteenth-century society. The research utilized on these materials demonstrates the significance of their visual content for understanding and representing the architectural character of photographic studios through many findings including diagrams, photographs and most importantly drawings. Even for some studios, full sets of architectural drawings are uncovered with the help of photographic journals.
Figure 77. Otto Van Bosch’s studio drawings.  

Figure 78. Full set of architectural drawings of a studio in Darmstadt. *Das Atelier des Photographen* (1894), 65.  
Figure 79. Plan drawings of Fritz Moeller’s studio, *Das Atelier des Photographen* (1899), 172-173. Source: Saxon State and University Library Dresden online archive: https://www.slub-dresden.de/

Figure 80. Photograph of Fritz Moeller’s studio, *Das Atelier des Photographen* (1899), 174. Source: Saxon State and University Library Dresden online archive: https://www.slub-dresden.de/
Other than these whole sets that appear in limited numbers, the diagrams or drawings exemplified in these journals were scattered and mostly associated only with the name of the photographers without any detailed identification of the location. The tracing operation based on the four research tools enables to match these diagrams and drawings with the photographs and illustrations of the studio via the help of address and owner information. Such drawings and diagrams, which become more explanatory when matched with the photographs depicting the exterior and interior views, were significant in terms of describing the architecture of the photography studios. The understanding of the functional requirements via drawings is also crucial for revealing the common architectural characteristics that enable the definition of the photography studio as a consistent architectural typology.

**Ground Ateliers vs. Roof Ateliers**

For the image, it is important to evoke the differentiation between the rooftop ateliers and the ground level studios as already mentioned in the index section. The ground level is apparently more suitable for a commercial establishment in terms of its accessibility. However, the installation of a studio requires a certain amount of space at the ground level to maintain suitable lighting conditions without overshadowed by nearby buildings. It was nearly impossible to find such wide spaces near popular locations such as the new boulevards or squares and even it was possible, the price of land made it impossible for the photographer to compensate. While the rooftop atelier has the disadvantage of accessibility, the amount of rent demanded for the attic was considerably cheaper in accordance with the incredibly high prices of land at such popular locations. Although the construction costs for intervening the building were relatively higher and also have technical difficulties when compared with the ground level photographic pavilions, these high prices of land and rent seems to push the photographers to rooftop studios particularly at trendy locations. However, some photographers preferred to seek for affordable spaces in remote locations for installing a photographic pavilion at the ground level.
Even though the ground level studios had the advantage of easy public access, their visibility from the street were very limited compared to the rooftop studios and they were dependent on signs or advertisements that describe their locations. Apart from some unique examples that is built in public parks or similar public spaces (Figure 77) with a relatively articulated architectural language such as conservatories, the urban manifestation of these establishments were not as powerful as the skylight studios. This situation is also related to the difficulty of finding images, especially exterior photographs that depict the studios’ relationship with the urban environment. Although it can be deduced from the images found that the hidden nature of these ground floor studios still offered an alternative urban experience based on encounter and surprise, with unique architectural solutions that transformed the courtyard or garden into a photographic setting for plein-air shots as well as utilizing the open space for exhibitions or events (Figure 81), their visibility and recognizability in the urban context was limited in comparison to their rooftop counterparts.

The initial configurational diagrams and the first detailed prototypes of the photography studios were built upon a logic of a separated box-like structure and they were mostly thought to be located on ground level without the unique conditions that a rooftop studio might require on different buildings. This is why it is rather difficult to find the complete drawing sets of rooftop ateliers, while there is an abundance of architectural drawings uncovered for the garden ateliers in contrast to the lack of exterior photographs. Although the main focus of this study is the rooftop photography studios that enabled the transformation of the dark, shallow and dusty space of the attic into a luminous, airy and sterile modern architectural space, the garden ateliers significantly contribute to the research as the detailed documents discovered, such as architectural drawings and diagrams, powerfully reflect the spatial qualities of the studio. In addition, it is also possible
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to trace the fusion of this earlier prototype boxes on the roofscape of the nineteenth-century city.

Figure 81. Photographs of Victor Angerer’s garden where his studio was located, 6 Theresianumgasse, Vienna. Source: Albertina Museum online archive, accessed May 12, 2023. https://sammlungenonline.albertina.at/
On voit dans la figure 57 que le toit de la maison est enlevé, et

Fig. 57. — Atelier vitré placé à la partie supérieure d'une maison dont on a enlevé le toit. La longueur totale IK est de 12 mètres, celle CF du vitrage est de 6 mètres. La hauteur FG est de 2 mètres 50 centimètres, suite OL de fond de 5 mètres 50 centimètres. La hauteur EF du vitrage est de 1 mètre 60 centimètres, la longueur PE du vitrage est de 3 mètres. La porte-néf KN, de 1 mètre 20 centimètres de haut, divise le toit ALIG en deux. La longueur KL de l'atelier est de 6 mètres. Le vitrage de l'atelier regarde le nord. Les fonds et accessoires se placent sous la partie ouverte.

Fig. 58. — Atelier de forme américaine. Le vitrage incliné B regarde le nord, la partie vitrée C l'est; la partie vitrée opposée F l'est. La longueur est de 8 mètres. Le longueur totale HL, 15 mètres, y compris le cabinet chez F. La hauteur NO est 7 mètres. Le plancher est à 180 centimètres au-dessus du niveau du sol. Ces dimensions peuvent, du reste, être modifiées suivant l'espace dont on dispose.

Figure 82. Atelier vitré / Glass atelier.
5.1.4 Object

The photograph was very old, the corners were blunted from having been pasted in an album, the sepia print had faded, and the picture just managed to show two children standing together at the end of a little wooden bridge in a glassed-in conservatory, what was called a Winter Garden in those days.\(^{179}\)

As stated previously, this research approaches photographs not solely as visuals but also as material objects to construct a comprehensive methodology that embraces photography’s indexical, evidential, or visual value as well as its material traces. The photograph as object can carry various connotations regardless of its image content, and its materiality is bound to the ways it presented as it’s a reproduction of a captured image in a negative (a transparent image on a glass negative regarding the period). It can be a part of a broader visual narrative when placed in an album or it assumes the role as the initiator of various cultural practices of nineteenth century, namely as an item of exchange belonging to a broader social practice. Specifically for this study, the carte de visit and cabinet photographs are the most significant presentation formats that justify a material approach towards photographic images.

For these formats, a thin photo paper was mounted on a more durable piece of cardboard on which the name, logo and address were imprinted. This presentation format secures the copyright of the image in favor of the photographer and gives the client the opportunity to remember and revisit the studio if more reproductions of the same photograph is needed.\(^{180}\) Simultaneously, it transforms the photographic image into an “object” of advertising and graphic design which aims to increase the recognizability and popularity of the studio amongst public. The engagement between the photographic print and the engraved card strengthens the conception of the photographs created by the studios as historical artefacts, and


\(^{180}\) Every glass negative was kept in the vast archives of the studio and if the establishment is sold to another photographer, this archive was also the part of the deal. Even the name of the studio changed, there will be the indication “successor”.
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therefore they emerge as a crucial data source for the tracing operation, rather than documents reduced to their image content.

Apart from the identification of the studio, additional advertising information such as the successes and medals of the photographer were included as graphic design elements on carte de visite mounts. However, the outstanding examples are the ones that used the exterior views of the photographic establishments as the main graphic of advertisement which provided a great deal of information about the architectural characteristics of the studio. These “objects” that carry direct information about the architecture of the studio, become one of the main initiators of this study.

However, what renders the materiality of these photographs significant is their role in nineteenth-century social practice as an item of exchange that circulates amongst nineteenth-century bourgeois society. While the indexical information embedded in the cards help the tracing operation and underlines the object as a methodological tool as the other three sources, the social and cultural meanings and practices that are embodied in these objects impose another layer of symbolic value. The materiality of the photograph becomes a critical research method in this study which is crucial to understand the significance of the photography studio for nineteenth-century city life as an architectural typology. Therefore, this section further elaborates the “object” as a research tool by starting with the carte de visite format, which enabled the mass-production of portrait photographs and transformed them into objects of exchange.

**Carte de Visite**

Although many photographers tried to develop similar versions at the time, it was André Adolphe-Eugène Disdéri who made the carte de visite format world famous. The system is based on acquiring smaller size images – six by nine centimeters – in one full print rather than a singular detailed one. With the four-lens camera Disdéri developed, it became possible to capture eight different poses and exposures in one-
full sized plate that can be cut later to be used as *cartes de visite*. While the full-sized singular photographic print needs intensive polishing and re-touching which takes a lot of time and labor, this method enables the photographer to manipulate and print the images very quickly and in large numbers with a variety. The revolutionary aspect of carte de visit format lies with the possibilities of mass-production it proposes, which significantly reduced the production costs and the workload and of the photographic studio at one hand and presented customers reproducibility, portability, variety and most importantly, cheaper prices on the other.

The standardization of the process through the *carte de visit* format was mostly understood as a negative milestone for the history of photography, which rendered the search for originality in portraiture unnecessary by offering a quick and cheaper way to create the exact likeness of the clients. Although *carte de visite* marked the commercialization of portrait photography and condemned by many writers including Walter Benjamin in terms of prioritizing the speed and quantity over the quality of the photographic images, it also had a significant social impact by making the medium available for a wider range of people due to the modest prices it required. The middle and lower-middle classes who could not afford the prices of the most prestigious studios of the time became acquainted with the phenomenon of portrait photography and had to chance to experience the studios repetitively. As Elizabeth Anne McCauley summarizes, “the carte, with its uniform size and limited compositional range, became a great equalizer.”
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181 “Disdéri made many experiment with the camera to adjust the process in a more suitable way for mass-production. There were other experiments that ends up six or ten different cartes in a single plate instead of eight. However the existence of uncut photographs that consists of eight images shows that this the most widespread method.” Elizabeth Anne McCauley, *A.A.E. Disdéri and the Carte de Visite Portrait Photograph* (New Haven and London: Yale University Pres, 1985), 2.


184 McCauley, 3.
The accessibility, compactness and the reproducibility of this format, together with its widespread use as a calling card that can be devoted to someone with a personal inscription, accelerated the circulation of photographic imagery and strengthen the position of photography as a new means of social communication. The carte quickly evolved into an item of exchange and a collectible in the form of a social practice. As Deborah Poole explains;

As the European carte-de-visite fashion of 1860s caught on, the practice of exchanging pictures as sentimental keepsakes among friends and relatives rapidly evolved into a social obligation in which visitors were more or less expected to proffer a portrait of themselves as "payment" for visiting a particular home or salon. Cartes de visite were collected in albums, and shown of as evidence of the breadth – and quality – of an individual’s circle of acquaintances.  

Therefore, the carte de visite albums became widely popular at the nineteenth century, as the portraits of relatives, friends or acquaintances along with the celebrities were collected and presented to the guests, whose photographs would also became a part of the album later. The fame of the studio in which the photographs taken were also important as the images themselves, as an indicator of social and economic status. Poole referred to the importance of the mounts of the photographs which contains data about the studio:

[...] most cartes carried an embossed logo on the back indicating the photographic studio where the portrait was made. Like today’s designer labels, the logos confirmed the taste and social standing of the purchaser of the portrait.  

In some of the albums, it is possible to see that the photographs were not placed back-to-back, probably intentionally, to make visible the backside of the card which gives information about the photography studio to the viewer (Figure 83). Besides the narratives based on the image content of these photographs, these albums transform into a kind of an index that presents a selection of active portrait studios.

---


of the time from different cities and even countries. It is possible to encounter the façade of a studio amongst a group of photographs in a family album (Figure 84).

The materiality of the photograph connotes two broad, interrelated concepts:

[F]irst is the the plasticity of the image itself, its chemistry, the paper it is printed on, the toning, the resulting surface variations […] second are the presentational forms; such as cartes de visite, cabinet cards, albums, mounts and frames with which photographs are inseparably enmeshed and which have constituted a major consumer market since the nineteenth century […] Both of these forms of materiality carry another key element, the physical traces of usage and time.187

Along with the carte de visite album, the engraved cardboard with the logo of the studio on which the photograph mounted also falls under the category of “presentational forms.” These forms are also “communicative forms” which contributes to the circulation of these photographs as the initiators of the act of sharing, collecting and exhibiting as well as providing textual and graphic information about the studio. The public enthusiasm for photography evolved into a form of social interaction and communication that spreads through all the layers of society with the introduction of the carte de visite format. As Deborah Poole emphasizes,

As tokens of status and prestige, the cartes de visite circulated through middle-class society as a form of symbolic capital or social currency […] As a visible, iconic trace of social relationships, cartes de visite penetrated to the very heart of nineteenth-century bourgeois culture.188

This penetration was so powerful that one might even argue that the carte de visite fashion of the nineteenth century reflects the first glimpses of an early form of social media. The sending of a carte indeed became the substitute for a real face-to-face visit for special occasions or celebrations of certain events. Similarly, the

---

188 Poole, Vision, Race and Modernity, 109. She adds: “The worldwide rush to purchase carte-de-viste photographs during the 1860s 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. As a form of social currency […] the carte de visite circulated through channels much broader than the immediate network of friends and acquaintances through which any single portrait card traveled.” Poole, 112.
photographs of famous figures became widespread as a collectible throughout society which “values the appearances of the things and dwells upon the present more than any other before.”

As McCauley summarizes:

The acceptance of the carte portrait as an item for exchange, a collectable, by the middle class and the subsequent adoption of the practice by the workers themselves represent the insidious transformation of the individual into a malleable commodity. Direct human intercourse was in a sense supplemented by the interaction with a machine-generated and therefore irrefutably exact alter-ego, a fabricated “other.”

The engraved card on which the photographs were mounted as a presentational format enables the easy circulation of the images as objects by protecting the stability of the photographic paper, and the album emerges as a means of collecting and preserving these photographs. However, their merits were not only dependent on the functional properties they incorporate but also the symbolical value they possess via the social practices and cultural meanings that were attached to them. Visiting photography studios became a significant part of the routines of nineteenth-century city life, not only with its own materiality as a recognizable and familiar modern architectural typology but also through its contribution to the production of such popular objects/artefacts. These objects bear the traces of a long-lost architectural space which was also “penetrate to the very heart of nineteenth-century bourgeois culture.”

As Elizabeth Edward and Janice Hart summarizes:

Through dwelling upon the more mundane sensual and material qualities of the object, we are able to unpack the more subtle connotations with cultural lives and values that are objectified through these forms, in part because of the qualities they possess.

The fusion of carte de visite to the nineteenth-century city life as objects of fascination that imbued with cultural meanings and that embedded within the social practices, resonated with the surrealists’ interest on the materiality of the bourgeois culture discussed in Chapter Four. The artefacts of the bourgeois with social
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189 McCauley, Disdéri, 221.
190 McCauley, 224.
191 Edward and Hart, Photographs, Objects, Histories, 6.
routines and connotations intrinsic to it, also have revolutionary potential within themselves despite their relation to fashion or economy as commodities. While the arcade – as a forgotten and neglected architectural type without any significant literature on it and as the precedent of the department store – seemed to be the ultimate manifestation of capitalist architectural space at first glance, it became the symbol of opposition for Walter Benjamin in the 1930s. The dialectics he suggested by combining Marxist and surrealist perspectives relies on the fact that the arcade proposes the first glimpses of an in-between architectural space that generates a unique urban stage of social interaction and a state of phantasmagoria, through which the hidden avant-garde impulses of modernity can be discovered as epitomized in the figure of the “flaneur.”

It is “the whole-hearted embrace of the boulevard spectacle that characterizes the flaneur,” and the arcade proposes a modern way of a condensed nineteenth-century urban experience for the flaneur to observe and analyze. Similarly, the photography studios were a significant part of this boulevard spectacle not only through the unique experience they offer to the clients as a modern architectural space but also through social routines and cultural experiences that clustered around the cartes de visite and images they created from within.

Considering the materiality of photography, this research asserts cartes de visite and cabinet photographs as presentational mediums through which the architectural characteristics and visual representations of photography studios can be read, as it tries to trace the cultural, social, economic values they have for the nineteenth-century society.

---

192 Benjamin, *The Arcades Project.*
193 Mertins, “Transparencies Yet to Come.”
Figure 83. Excerpts from Grisi – Gautier – Bergerat family album.
Source: Gallica – BnF, accessed August 08, 2023. https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8432324z.r=

Figure 84. Excerpts from Vibert – Chaurant family album.
Photographic journals and manuals

The leading journals and books on photography and architecture for the four cities indicate another important research field as potential sources to extract more images or drawings about these studios. These publications are considered as “objects” within the research methodology similar to the material significance of cartes de visite and cabinet photographs as a medium of communication which allow these objects to reach wider audiences throughout nineteenth-century society.

Selected Journals:

- *Photographische Mitteilungen*, Berlin
- *Photographisches Archiv*, Berlin
- *Das Atelier des Photographen*, Halle
- *Jahrbuch für Photographie*, Halle
- *Photographische Korrespondenz*, Wien
- *Photographische Notizen*, Wien
- *Bulletin de la Société Française de photographie*, Paris
- *Bulletin du Photo-club de Paris*, Paris

Selected Books:

- Paul Eduard Liesegang, *Illustriertes Handbuch der Photographie*, 1864
- Otto Buehler, *Atelier und Apparat des Photographen*, 1869
- Alphonse Liébert, *La photographie en Amérique: Traité Complet de Photographie Pratique*, 1864
- Josef Maria Eder, *Das Atelier und Laboratorium des Photographen*, 1893
- Franz Stolze, *Handwerksbūch für Photographen*, 1898
- Désiré Van Monckhoven, *Traité général de photographie*, 1865
Figure 85. Tables showing the issues of journals in German and French scanned by the author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Bulletin de la Société Française</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>La Photographie</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Revue Photographique</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Bulletin de la Société Française</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Revue Photographique</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Bulletin de la Société Française</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 86. Research tools and model cities for tracing nineteenth-century photography studios.
5.2.1 London

For London, the map emerges as the primary source for tracing the photography studios as the result of a detailed cartographical study of London, which was specifically prepared to assess the liability of the built environment against the danger of fire. ‘Insurance Plan of London’ was produced by Charles E. Goad Ltd. in 1887\textsuperscript{194} for the purpose of providing detailed information of the buildings for insurance companies. Aside from the general characteristics of the buildings such as the number of floors or the height of the building, more particular data about the construction material or the occupied businesses were also included with textual references in the map to better assess the fire risks of the edifices. The glass photography studios at the rooftops, therefore, were all charted and shown as blue-purple or yellow rectangles according to the construction material on these plans with an explanatory text such as a “photo” or “studio” in short.\textsuperscript{195}

However, scanning of the maps and navigating through them was still a challenge because the survey consists of 23 separate sheets with the scale of 1/480 (1 inch to 40 feet) due to the amount of detail that had to be indicated. The slow-paced scanning of the maps for designating the studio locations were hastened thanks to the website “Layers of London,”\textsuperscript{196} an interactive map-based historical resource including textual and visual information about significant locations for urban memory (which were also pinned on the map). Historic maps of London can be designated as overlays to the interactive base which makes it very easy to navigate through the Goad maps and trace the studios. Unfortunately, very few images can

\textsuperscript{194} The Insurance Plans of London were discovered through the website of London Picture Archive: https://www.londonpicturearchive.org.uk and also acquired from Wikimedia Commons website (https://commons.wikimedia.org) in higher resolution. Because they are very detailed maps, there are actually several different volumes according to the regions. The relevant map fragments are selected and combined to construct the base maps for studying Regent Street and Cheapside Street.

\textsuperscript{195} The glass and steel skylights on two-storey buildings were represented with blue color, while the ones on higher buildings were designated with purple. The studios were shown in the same manner as the skylights with an explanatory text, while the yellow color represents the use of wood as a structural element. In some examples there is just a descriptive text pointing out to the existence of a glass studio on the roof, although it is not shown graphically.

\textsuperscript{196} https://www.layersoflondon.org/map The website was developed by the Institute of Historical.
be gathered from the website since the pinned memory spaces mostly belong to 20th century for now and there is relatively less information about the period this research focused on.

Figure 87. Research methodology applied in tracing nineteenth-century photography studios in London.

In addition to the insurance maps that gives direct data about the studio locations, there is an exhaustive index of London photographers including the address information and the dates of activity which were compiled in “Directory of London Photographers 1841-1908” by Michael Pritchard. While cross-referencing the locations indicated on the insurance plans of London and the address information given in the nineteenth-century index of London photographers, the historic photographic archives of London were also explored according to the locations in which studios seem to be documented in large numbers. The crowded photographic establishments on the rooftops along Regent Street particularly become visible through these insurance maps. Cheapside Street appears to be


another important location for photographic establishments as a result of this study. Through the photographer’s index, it is also observed that many of these addresses were used as studios for a long period of time. While the owners of the studios changed, the addresses mostly remain the same.

For the cities of the United Kingdom, the insurance plans that were prepared by Goad Insurance Company comes forward as a significant source – including primary cities such as Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Dublin, Belfast and Cardiff. Apart from UK, there were many cities throughout the world including İstanbul and İzmir, which also have these insurance maps. Similar to London, Goad fire insurance maps can facilitate the search to trace the photography studios for all these cities. Similarly, Sanborn insurance maps also charted significant areas of US cities (12,000 U.S. cities and towns) as well as Cuba, Canada and Mexico.

Apart from the online database of London Picture Archive and the image library of National Archives which were mentioned before, the online collection of Victoria and Albert Museum comes forward not only as a source for photographs but also as an archive of objects such as cartes de visite and cabinet photographs. The digital library of Institute of Historical Research named British History Online is another significant source for photographs and even drawings of the studios. Along with the visual material, this website also includes a broad compilation of textual references which is beneficial for this study to grasp the brief history of the studied areas such as Regent Street.

---

200 Salt Online Archive: https://archives.saltresearch.org/handle/123456789/1815
201 The online collection of Victoria and Albert Museum: https://www.vam.ac.uk
202 British History Online: https://www.british-history.ac.uk. Historic England is also an another large database, which mainly focuses on the history of the existing building environment https://historicengland.org.uk.
Regent Street is one of the earliest urban transformation projects of London, which aims to propose a modern layout instead of the disorderly and obscure web of streets and buildings. The project designed by the architect John Nash was accepted in 1813 and executed till 1825, before the invention of photography. John Nash’s idea of encapsulating several dwellings with holistic plastered façades as longitudinal blocks create a continuous perception of the street resonated with the spatial characteristics of new Paris Boulevards.203

This concept of bringing similar units into a single block creates a roofscape consisting of a repetitive pattern of chimneys and fire walls among which the glass studios were installed. The continuous form and iterative language of the façade strengthen the add-on nature of the glass structures as if they are docked into the slots defined by the chimneys and fire walls. Although the height of the blocks is relatively lower in comparison with the Haussmann Blocks of Paris, these walls also limit the visibility of the studios when the street was photographed in perspective. In other words, the fusion of the glass studio and the existing building is not observable in Regent and Cheapside streets while more intricate cases were discovered throughout London and England.

Another challenge for the photographers of London is to compensate for the low amount of light available in nineteenth-century London in terms of the perpetual mist caused by industrial production together with the cloudy weather conditions. It is possible to deduce that London photographers mostly chose detached glass studios installed on the roof level like a garden pavilion to prevent any possible obstruction of light from the building itself as well as the nearby edifices. Although this assumption needs further research and visual evidence on London studios, the way studios were drawn in the Goad map seem to support this theory for now. This is probably why the research on London comes up with a relatively small number

---

of photographs and illustrations despite the existence of the Goad map that charts a considerable number of the studios.

Although this assumption needs further research and visual evidence on the Regent Street studios, the way studios were drawn in the Goad map and the lack of the studio views from the street seem to support this theory for now. This is probably why the research on London comes up with the less number of photographs and illustrations in spite of the existence of the Goad map that charts a considerable amount of the studios. Due to the regulations about intervening the building blocks, the studios were located with a set back without disturbing the façade which also enhance the perception of the studios as detached structures. Even bigger signs of “portrait” or “photography,” which can be observed in many of the examples, are not visible in Regent Street where smaller signs placed on the entrance were preferred instead.

Unfortunately, there are not any remnants of these crowded photography studios today because the add-on nature of the studios. The redevelopment of Regent Street that took place between 1895 and 1927 probably resulted with the removal of these glass structures since the portrait studios lose their charm with the advance of portable cameras.
Figure 88. Nineteenth-century photography studios discovered on Regent Street, London. Base map constructed and highlighted by the author.

The photography studios discovered by cross-referencing the map and the index are highlighted with green color, while green dots indicate either past or future locations of the studios.

Figure 89. Close-ups from Insurance Plan of London by Goad Ltd., 1887. Photography studios at the roof level are indicated with blue-purple (glass) or yellow color (timber constructions) as well as with short textual notes, such as “PHOTO,” “STUDIO” or “STUDIO 5TH GLASS 5TH”.
7 & 8 – 153 (& 155) Regent Street (active 1864-1908_44 years)

1864-1871  Henry Charles Heath
1876-1908  Andrew & George Taylor

Figure 90. 153-155 Regent Street, photographed in 1910.

Figure 91. Carte de visite mounts of A&G Taylor, 153 Regent Street, London, 1876-1908.
Source: Photographers of Great Britain and Ireland 1840-1940, https://www.cartedevisite.co.uk/
14 – 204 Regent Street (active 1854-1886_32 years)

1854-1855  James Henderson
1856      Thomas George Hemery
1857-1874  Edwin Sutton
1877-1878  William Henry Tuck & Co
1880      Artist Co-Operative assoc.
1882      Natrowsky Colson & Co. / Natrowsky & Co.
1884-1886  Bijou Photo Co. (William Crouch, manager)

Figure 92. 204 Regent Street, photographed in 1910.

Figure 93. Carte de visite mounts of Edwin Sutton, 204 Regent Street, London, 1857-1874.
Source: Photographers of Great Britain and Ireland 1840-1940, https://www.cartedevisite.co.uk/
15 – 211-213 Regent Street (active 1863-1908_45 years)

1863-1864 Horne & Thornthwaite
1865-1867 United Association of Photography (William Morgan Brown secretary)
1874 Watkins & Haigh
1875-1877 Edward Haigh
1878 Haigh & Hemery
1879-1880 Thomas George Hemery
1889-1906 Robert Hellis & Sons
1907-1908 Ernest Walter Manders

Figure 94. 211-213 Regent Street, photographed in 1910.

Figure 95. Carte de visite mounts of Haigh & Hemery and Hellis & Sons, 211-213 Regent Street, London.
Source: Photographers of Great Britain and Ireland 1840-1940, https://www.cartedevisite.co.uk/
16 – 224 (& 226) Regent Street (active 1852-1901_49 years)
1852-1894  John & Edwin Mayall
1897-1901  London Photographic Co.

Figure 96. 224-226 Regent Street, photographed in 1908.
Source: Alte Ansichtskarten, https://www.ansichtskartenversand.com/ak/

Figure 97. Photography studio at the rooftop of 224 Regent Street at the front and 226 at the back are highlighted by the author.
Figure 98. 19th-century photography studios on Cheapside Street, London. Base map constructed and highlighted by the author. The photography studios discovered by cross-referencing the map and the index are highlighted with green color, while green dots indicate either past or future locations of the studios.
54 Cheapside Street – London Stereographic Company Studio (1856 – 1908)

Figure 99. The photography studio at 52 Cheapside Street is barely visible next to London Stereoscopic Company.
25 Old Bond Street (active 1878-1908, 30 years; same owner)

1878-1903 Alexander Bassano
1904-1908 Bassano Ltd. or Studios (after Bassano himself retired) until 1921
1921-1977 still operates with different partnerships in different addresses

Figure 100. 25 Old Bond Street studio with blue-purple color & the note “STUDIO 5TH GLASS 5TH.”
Source: London Picture Archive, https://www.londonpicturearchive.org.uk

Alexander Bassano’s photography studio at 25 Old Bond Street was visited by H. Baden Pritchard and was mentioned in “The Photographic Studios of Europe” as “it is exactly the sort of studio we should all of us like to have” and “a model establishment of the West End.”
Figure 101. (left) 25 Old Bond Street Bassano Studio photographed in 1913 by Bedford Lemere. Source: The Historic England Archive online, https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/archive/

Figure 102. (right) 25 Old Bond Street photographed in 1923 by Bedford Lemere. Source: The Historic England Archive online, https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/archive/

Figure 103. (left) 25 Old Bond Street photographed in 1942 – the glass façade of the studio had changed. Source: The Historic England Archive online, https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/archive/

Figure 104. (right) 25 Old Bond Street photographed in 2010 by Andy Connoly – glass façade still stands. Source: Andy Connoly Flickr account, https://www.flickr.com/photos/conaz/4767878717/
55 Baker Street (& 56 later) (active 1865-1908, 43 years / same owner)

Figure 105. Elliott & Fry’s photography studio at 55 (& 56) Baker Street was visited by H. Baden Pritchard and mentioned in The Photographic Studios of Europe.

Pritchard talks about the lack of a northern light studio (because photographers took over the place, not build themselves) and the existence of a main studio with easterly light conditions with other two smaller ones. The blue rectangle which can be seen adjacent to the façade of the building in the plan must be the main studio; and the other two rectangles probably indicate the smaller studios. When Pritchard visited the establishment, the extension at 56 Baker Street was not built yet. In the plan, we can see the note about both 55 and 56 that for the 4 & 5th floors, there was a photographic establishment. Therefore, the yellow hatched part (wood and glass construction) is most probably the new studio on the rooftop at 56, adjusted through the north with the strange angles as observed in the plan.

Henry Walter Barnett Photography Studio

1 Park Side, Hyde Park Corner S.W. / 1899-03 - 12 Knightsbridge S.W./ 1904-08

Figure 107. Photograph of Henry Walter Barnett’s Photography Studio, 1 Hyde Park Corner, by Barnett himself, early 1900s.
Source: National Portrait Gallery of London,
Figure 108. Henry Walter Barnett Photography Studio.
Source: Victoria & Albert Museum online catalogue,
First of all, there are the flaneurs of the boulevard, whose entire existence unfolds between the Church of the Madeleine and the Theatre du Gymnase. Each day sees them returning to this narrow space, which they never pass beyond, examining the display of goods, surveying the shoppers seated before the doors of cafes....They would be able to tell you if Goupil or Deforge have put out a new print or a new painting, and if Barbedienne has repositioned a vase or an arrangement; they know all the photographers’ studios by heart and could recite the sequence of signs without omitting a single one.  

This entry on the “flaneur” on Larousse grand dictionary quoted by Walter Benjamin in *The Arcades Project* emerge as the main initiator for the tracing of the photography studios in Paris. The route defined for the flaneur between Church of the Madeleine and Theatre du Gymnase includes six grand boulevards; Boulevard de la Madeleine, Boulevard des Capucines, Boulevard des Italiens, Boulevard Montmartre, Boulevard Poissonniere and Boulevard de Bonne Nouvelle.

Another significant input is Nadar’s photography studio at Boulevard des Capucines which is a considerably famous case regarding the first impressionist exhibition that took place in there in 1874.  

Nadar’s photography atelier was of the trendiest and energetic spaces along the boulevard with lots of visitors and a crucial meeting point for the intelligentsia. This is the reason why Nadar, who was already a famous portrait photographer at that time, chose that spot on 35 Capucines for his new studio in 1860. The boulevard was transforming into a more dynamic public space due to the construction of the Grand Hotel and especially the new Opera House at that time. While all the new grand boulevards of Paris emerged as the symbol of transformation, Boulevard des Capucines especially reflected the cultural atmosphere of the urban life of nineteenth-century Paris which continued through Boulevard des Italiens and Boulevard Montmartre. These three boulevards form a cultural spine along which all the urban activities took place including the establishments of famous photographers. The importance of Boulevard des

---


205 Bibliothèque nationale de France: http://expositions.bnf.fr/les-nadar/
Capucines and Italiens for the history of commercial photography is also highlighted by Helmut and Allison Gernsheim, who identified the areas as the main locations where the first portrait studios were established.206

Therefore, the study on Paris focused on these three boulevards as possible locations for the nineteenth-century photography studios the numbers of which increased rapidly and steadily between 1851-1890 by creating a strong urban impact on the city fabric and everyday life. The research process confirmed this assumption, which became visible through the map by pinpointing a considerable number of photographic studios along these boulevards and the vicinity.

Because the study was designated beforehand unlike the other cities, the image emerges as the main stimulant of the research on photography studios of Paris. There is an extensive number of photographs, postcards, and illustrations regarding these three boulevards on various resources. The online database of Bibliothèque Nationale and the joint digital collection of Paris Museums emerge as the most resourceful and significant sources. Many of the studios along the three boulevards were detected via the image archive of these institutions.

While scanning the historic photographs of the three boulevards to detect the photography studios, their locations were also pinpointed to the municipal plot plans of late nineteenth century Paris.207 Because this set of maps shows the number of the buildings in a detailed manner which makes it easier to locate the exact locations of the studios through the photographs (some of the building numbers are visible in the photographs) or in reference to some important buildings. This study was expanded with the subsidiary information gathered by this mapping activity to

---


207 The municipal plot plans of late 19th century Paris (after 1860) were acquired via the digitized archive of the city of Paris: https://archives.paris.fr/ Because they are in the form of separate sheets according to 1/500 scale for different regions, I had to designate the necessary ones and combined them in a whole to show all three boulevards (Capucines, Italiens, Montmartre). I also add the Boulevard de la Madeleine later to show the location of the photographic studio at Place de Madeleine which was active till 1930s.
include additional studio locations. Besides the three boulevards that are chosen as the main focal point, some other important urban locations which are especially near landmarks or urban squares are also checked in terms of their potential as attraction points for nineteenth-century Paris. As a result of that research, more studios scattered around Paris are designated.

Figure 109. Research methodology applied in tracing nineteenth-century photography studios in Paris.

Although the index in Elizabeth Anne McGauley’s book, *Industrial Madness: Commercial Photography in Paris 1848-1871* was helpful to locate the earlier studio addresses, the information gathered from the mounts of the *cartes de visite* emerge as a significant source to detect the studio locations after 1871. The online database of the Bibliothèque Nationale is the most beneficial source to find the *cartes de visite* along with other objects like postcards, advertisement posters or books and journals.

The specific addresses of the detected photography studios are also cross-checked through different sources to understand how long and in which period they existed. This is important to determine if a multitude of photography studios existed through

---

a certain amount of time at the same vicinity with a powerful urban impact. The study about Paris (similar to the other three cities) shows that even if the owner of the establishments changed, the studios and addresses remained the same considering the carefully selected locations regarding the everyday life of the city.

Within the scope of the research for photographic images, the online archive of the Département d'Histoire de l'Architecture et d'Archéologie de la Ville de Paris (DHAAP) emerges also as a significant source. Although it is mostly focused on the heritage buildings that still exist today, the interactive map which pins some old photographs taken between 1916 and 1930s as part of the mission of the Old Paris Commission to locate the buildings whose conservation was desirable. Some of the photographs of Charles Lansiaux in 1916 and then his successor Edouard Desprez in 1930s managed to capture some of the photographic studios while documenting the built environment of Paris. Although most of the buildings that were documented in this mission still exist today, most of the studios are lost in accordance with their add-on nature. However, with the tracing operation many examples discovered which were totally transformed by a new use but still recognizable as former studios. This study identifies and validates eight examples that still exists today as described or at least bear the marks of a former studio: 35 Boulevard de Capucines – Nadar’s atelier [totally transformed, only façade remains], 23 Boulevard des Capucines, 13 [former 222] Rue Saint-Antoine, 3 Place Franz Liszt [former 112 Place La Fayette], 37 Boulevard de Chapelle, 9 Place Saint-Andre des Arts, 59 Rue de Rivoli and 9 Rue de Cadet. These findings also underline Paris as the foremost case in which the largest number of photography studios have managed to reach so far. In addition, the existence of the studios in the photographs of Old Paris Commission taken between 1916 and 1930 shows that, the studios last longer in Paris in comparison with the other cities.

For now, this research demonstrates the existence of a vast number of photographic studios along the three boulevards of Capucines, Italiens and Montmarte in parallel with their popularity for urban life of nineteenth-century Paris. Although the exterior views of the studios are quite difficult to detect due to the strong and deep
perspectives of the grand boulevards formed by the height of the Hausmanian blocks, there is enough photographic evidence to deduce that the glass studios of the portrait photographers had a strong visual manifestation along these three boulevards. Besides Nadar, other influential figures of photography had studios along these boulevards. The studio of Disdéri, who was the inventor of the *carte de visite* that became a commercial success and sparked the increase of portrait studios, was located in Boulevard des Italiens. Another famous photographer Charles Reutlinger established a studio on 21 Boulevard Montmartre in 1853 which lasted until 1930 and remained as an important meeting point for Parisians for nearly 73 years with the same name.

Figure 110. Paris base-map produced by combining of ten different map fragments of Paris Municipal Plot Plans by the author. The combined base map includes Place de la Madeleine, Boulevard des Capucines, Boulevard des Italiens and Boulevard Montmartre.
Figure 111. Nineteenth-century photography studios discovered on the four major boulevards in Paris. Base map constructed and highlighted by the author. The photography studios discovered are highlighted with yellow color, while yellow dots show other important photographic establishments without visual data. Significant buildings and popular public places, which are helpful in locating and mapping the studios, of the era are highlighted with blue color.
1 – 35 Boulevard des Capucines 1855
Gustave Le Gray Photography Studio, Paris (Nadar’ Studio)

Figure 112. Nadar’s atelier in 35 Boulevard des Capucines and its red neon sign.
Figure 113. Interior views of the lavishly decorated studio of Nadar.
Nadar’s studio can be differentiated from the other buildings with its huge glass facade. Next to it, another photographic studio of François Willème (a photosculpture studio, l’établissement de Photosculpture de France) is also visible with its distinctive architectural feature, a glass dome on the rooftop.

**Photosculpture studio of François Willème**

Figure 115. Willème’s glass dome, housing a perimeter ring of cameras directed inward at a central subject

Figure 116. Interior view of a photosculpture studio by François Willème published in *Le Monde Illustré*, 31 Décembre 1864, 428.
Source: Gallica – BnF: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k62289833/f12.item
Figure 117. A photographic studio which was established in 1899 on Boulevard Des Capucines, which was recently renovated by Vincent Parreira Atelier Architecture AAVP by replacing the entire glass and steel construction while preserving the exact dimensions of the studio with respect to the placement of the glazed parts on the façade and roof.


It seems like a totally new rooftop addition to the historical building parallel to the contemporary understanding of intervening historic buildings: emphasizing the differentiation of the periods and styles of construction by creating a contrast with the historical facade in terms of material and transparency.
6 – 29 Boulevard des Italiens

Figure 118. Kiwatizky Photography Studio, photographed by Charles Lansieux in 1916. The studio on 32 Rue la Grande near Pavillon de Hanovre is also visible on the top-right corner of the photograph. Source: Photographs from the Old Paris Commission interactive map, https://fnp.huma-num.fr/adws/app/515ec27b-90ee-11ec-a660-a15a22dfde2b/

Figure 119. Zoomed-in view of the Kiwatizky Photography Studio.
5 – Boulevard des Italiens + 32 Rue Louis-Le-Grande

Figure 120. The "PHOTOGRAPHIE" sign and the glass façade of the studio at 32 Rue la Grande, near Pavillon de Hanovre, is visible on the right, photographed by Jean Barry in 1900.

Figure 121. 32 Rue Louis-Le-Grande, Charles Lansiaux, 1916.

Figure 122. According to the information on the carte de visite mount, J. Emile Tourtin, who was a famous portrait photographer having another workshop at 8 Boulevard des Italiens, used this studio as well.
Figure 123. Photography studio next to Café Anglais, photographed by Agence Rol in 1910. Source: Gallica – BnF: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b6914360p.item
8 & 9 – 6 & 8 Boulevard des Italiens – Disdéri, Tourtin and Felix Studios

Figure 124. Photograph showing the signs of Disdéri (6) and Tourtin (8) on Boulevard des Italiens. The studios were probably located over the roof which were highlighted with the signs. Source: Rijksmuseum online collection, https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/nl/collectie/RP-F-F16437

Figure 125. Boulevard des Italiens, photographed by Edouard Desprez in 1925. One of the later occupants of 6 Boulevard des Italiens is Studio Felix, who added another glass studio on the façade. Source: Photographs from the Old Paris Commission interactive map, https://fnp.huma-num.fr/adws/app/515ec27b-90ce-11ec-a660-af5a22dfde2b/
10 – 21 Boulevard Montmartre – Reutlinger Studio

Figure 126. Postcard – Le Boulevard Montmartre. First two studios are visible upon the Reutlinger sign. Source: Paris Bibliothèques Patrimoniales, https://bibliotheques-specialisees.paris.fr/accueil

Figure 128. Reutlinger’s studio is visible on the left and Felix Studio is also visible across the street, highlighted by the author.
Source: Gallica – BnF, https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b53127501v.item
Figure 129. Interior of the Reutlinger studio published in a photography manual. Source: Josef Maria Eder’s *Das Atelier und Laboratorium des Photographen*, 29.

Figure 130. *Carte de visite* mount of Reutlinger Studios and the portrait photograph of Giuseppe Verdi. Source: Paris Musées Collections, https://www.parismuseescollections.paris.fr/fr/
11 & 12 – 13 Boulevard Montmartre – 48 Rue Vivienne & 10 Blv. Montmartre

Figure 131. Reutlinger Studio is at the right of the image; at the background a glass studio highlighted by yellow is visible at the intersection of 13 Boulevard Montmartre and 48 Rue Vivienne. Three photographers can be identified through their carte de visite covers that operated the studio: Hippolyte Vauvray, Clovis Claret and Ernest Bichon. The sign of another studio at 10 Boulevard Montmartre is partially seen on the left. Source: Wikipedia, https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Paris_Boulevard_Montmartre.jpg

Figure 132. (left & middle) Carte de visite covers of Vauvray and Claret, 48 Rue Vivienne. Figure 133. (right) Carte de visite cover of the photography studio at 10 Boulevard Montmartre. Source: La Photo du XIX Canalblog, http://laphotoduxix.canalblog.com/
14 – 3 Place de la Madeleine

Figure 134. Place de la Madeleine, photographed by Edouard Desprez in 1930. Source: Photographs from the Old Paris Commission interactive map, https://fnp.huma-num.fr/adws/app/515ec27b-90ce-11ec-a660-af5a22dfde2b/

Figure 135. Place de la Madeleine photographed by Charles Lansiaux in 1916. Source: Photographs from the Old Paris Commission interactive map.
Figure 136. 3 Place de la Madeleine at the back, Rue Royal Façade from Boulevard de Madeleine, 1898. Source: Paris Musées Collections, https://www.parismuseescollections.paris.fr/fr/museecarnavalet/oeuvres/funerailles-de-cecile-carnot-eglise-de-la-madeleine-place-de-la-madeleine-0

Figure 137. Detail from the photograph above showing the photography studio at 3 Place de la Madeleine: “PHOTOGRAPHIE OTTO” sign is visible with the glass façades of two studios. Studio Otto was active at this address between 1885 and 1898.
46 Le Boulevard Barbès

Figure 138. Postcard showing Le Boulevard Barbès, Paris.

Figure 139. The location of Otto Mertens’ studio and its carte de visite mount of at 46 Le Boulevard Barbès.
13 Rue Saint-Antoine (222 Rue Saint-Antoine)

Figure 140. Photography studio at 222 Rue Saint-Antoine highlighted on Paris Municipal Plot Plan.

Figure 141. Engraving by Charles Fichot published in L’illustration, June 10, 1871.
Source: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Commune_de_Paris_25_mai_combat_%C3%A0_Saint-Antoine.jpg
Figure 142. Photographs of Temple du Marais, by Edouard Desprez, 1934. Photography studio near the temple highlighted by the author.

Source: Photographs from the Old Paris Commission interactive map, https://fnp.huma-num.fr/adws/app/515ec27b-90ce-11ec-a660-af5a22dfe2b/

Figure 143. Carte de visite mounts of G. Blanc photography studio at 222 Rue Saint-Antoine.
Figure 144. 222 Rue Saint-Antoine, photographs by the author, February 03, 2023.
112 Place La Fayette

Figure 145. The photography studio at 112 Place La Fayette. The photographs on top and below-left are from 1967, the photograph on below-right is from 1920 by Charles Lansiaux. Source: Photographs from the Old Paris Commission interactive map, https://fnp.huma-num.fr/adws/app/515ec27b-90ee-11cc-a660-af5a22dfde2b/
Figure 146. Google street view of 2 Place Franz Liszt, former 112 Place La Fayette.

Figure 147. Carte de visite mount of St. Vincent de Paul photography studio at 112 Place de Lafayette. Source: La Photo du XIX Canalblog, http://laphotoduxix.canalblog.com/archives/courtheoux/index.html
Figure 148. This panorama, one of the eight surviving daguerreotypes of Paris, taken between 1845 and 1850 by an anonymous photographer, captured one of the first daguerreotype portrait studios of Paris belonging to Bisson brothers. The image is mirrored yet, in the detail below, the signs “daguerreotype” and “Bisson” is visible. Because this part of the city demolished during urban transformations, the location could be pinned on the base map. It is shown on an earlier map and validated through the mount information. Source: Paris Musées Collections, https://www.parismuseescollections.paris.fr/fr/musee-carnavalet/oeuvres/panorama-le-pont-neuf-le-louvre-et-le-quai-de-la-megisserie-1er#infos-principales

Figure 149. Mirrored and zoomed-in panorama of Paris showing “daguerreotype” and “Bisson” signs.

Figure 150. Bisson studio located on Paris plan 1840 and Bisson’s carte de visite. Source: Paris Musées Collections, https://www.parismuseescollections.paris.fr/fr/musee-carnavalet/oeuvres/portrait-de-femme-2
The Ateliers of Lerebours and Chevallier – Pont Neuf

Figure 151. Photograph of Lerebours and Chevalier optic shops and studios on Place du Pont-Neuf, YIL. Source: Elizabeth Anne McCauley, *Industrial Madness*, 57.

Figure 152. A detail from Charles Marville’s photograph of Place du Pont-Neuf in 1855. Source: Paris Musées Collections, https://www.parismuseescollections.paris.fr/fr/museecarnavalet/oeuvres/le-pont-neuf-6eme-arrondissement-paris

Lerebours and Chevalier optic shops and the studios on the roof is visible on the photograph on the left. The sign “portraits” that belongs to Lerebours is also visible on the detail photograph on the right. Lerebours is accepted as the first portrait studio of Paris.

13 Boulevard des Capucines


Liébert is also a significant figure who wrote the book “La photographie en Amérique” in 1878, which includes textual and visual information about how to build a glass atelier. The building is demolished during the construction of Place L’Opera and so, indicated with dashed lines on the base map.
27-29-31 Place Cadet - Pierre Petit’s Atelier - 1859

Figure 154. Pierre Petit’s new photographic ateliers, the lithograph of the establishment drawn by H. Meyer. Source: Paris Musées Collections, https://www.parismuseescollections.paris.fr/fr/musee-carnavalet/oeuvres/les-nouveaux-ateliers-photographiques-de-pierre-petit

One of the earliest examples built in 1859 for the purpose of photography entirely. Similar to Nadar’s, the transparent façade of the building takes attention and the main studios on the top are recognizable through their articulated features.

Figure 155. Several advertisements of Pierre Petit and an example of his carte de visite mounts. Source: Paris Musées Collections, https://www.parismuseescollections.paris.fr
51 Rue D’Anjou – Nadar’s second atelier after Capucines

Figure 156. Photographs from Nadar’s second atelier at 51 Rue D’Anjou.
2 Place de Clichy

Figure 157. 2 Place de Clichy, 48 Avenue République and 37 Boulevard de Chapelle are three locations discovered through postcards while scanning the significant urban squares of Paris. Source: Paris Musées Collections, https://www.parismuseescollections.paris.fr
48 Avenue République

Figure 158. Postcard – the photography studio at 48 Avenue de la République is visible. Source: Paris Bibliothèques Patrimoniales, https://bibliotheques-specialisees.paris.fr/ark:/73873/pf0002225985/0012?highlight=avenue%20republique

37 Boulevard de la Chapelle / Théâtre des Bouffes

Figure 159. Postcard – Théâtre des Bouffes and the photography studio at 37 Boulevard de la Chapelle. Source: Paris Bibliothèques Patrimoniales https://bibliotheques-specialisees.paris.fr/ark:/73873/pf0002225830/0002
59 Rue de Rivoli

Figure 160. Photograph of 59 Rivoli, February 2014. The building has 30 artists’ studios and 1 exhibition space. Source: 59 Rivoli website, https://www.59rivoli.org/homepage/


157 Rue du Faubourg Saint Honoré

Figure 162. Vue de vieilles maisons sur le Faubourg St Honoré, photographed by Henri Emile Cimarosa Godefroy, 1908. Source: Paris Musées Collections, https://www.parismuseescollections.paris.fr/fr/museecarnavalet/oeuvres/vue-de-vieilles-maisons-sur-le-faubourg-st-honore-8eme-arrondissement-paris
5.2.3 Berlin

Because of the extensive transformation of the city after the devastation of World War two, Berlin was the hardest subject of this study. Along with the photography studios, most of the nineteenth century buildings themselves did not exist anymore which renders a great deal of architectural heritage and restoration studies of Berlin useless for this research. Therefore, the progress of the initial research based mostly on carte de visit mounts was slow paced and resulted with the designation of very few studios scattered around the city.

However, one particular study with the aim of creating an index of nineteenth-century photography studios of Berlin becomes prominent as a strong stimulator for tracing the studios throughout Berlin. The long-term project “Berliner Fotografenateliers des 19. Jahrhunderts,” evolved as part of the museum studies course at Hochschule für Technik und Wirtschaft supervised by Prof. Dr. Sibylle Einholz. The modest website of the project, which consists of a limited archive of portrait photographs, actually emerged as the most important source for Berlin because it contains an extensive index of all the photography studios including their branches. Along with the photographer or studio names, it is also possible to gain information about the addresses they occupied and the time interval of which the studio was active. The time periods designated alone are very helpful to understand the important photographers and their establishments that lasted enough to be a part of the urban memory of the nineteenth century.

---

209 In the museology course at the Berlin University of Applied Sciences (HTW), a long-term research project on 19th-century Berlin photographers’ studios has been carried out since the summer semester of 2003. The study is based on albums and individual photographs from private and public holdings from the specified period. The students involved researched and documented Berlin studios, embedded in the city's history of photography. An important focus of the project work was the lexical recording of all studios in a database and a collection of material on the subject. [translated from German] https://www.berliner-fotografenateliers.de/
Figure 163. Research process conducted by correlating with four different research tools for Berlin. From top to bottom, the index (addresses), the object (*carte de visite*), the image (aerial photograph), and the map.
With the crucial information provided by the index such as the direct address information, the names of the establishments and the period of activity, it became possible to utilize detailed searches in various image databases such as the as the online archive of Stadtmuseum Berlin, Deutsche Digitale Bibliothek and Deutsche Fototek. In order to concentrate the search to the location where studios appeared in large numbers, the long-termed photographic establishments are pinpointed on the 1910 Straube Plan of Berlin, which includes the information about the building numbers and makes it easier to pinpoint the exact addresses. With the help of the map, the tracing operation was expanded including the landmarks or significant places in the vicinity of the popular locations preferred by photographic establishments. The map ensures to associate the found urban images without sufficient contextual data with the exact locations with the help of recognizable buildings. Simultaneously, address information and the name of the establishments were also double checked with the search of cartes de visite in the database of Berlin Historical Association which consists of the findings of the project Berliner Fotografenateliers des 19. Jahrhunderts. Since these carte de visit format photographs are also objects of interest for collectors, one unique website of a collectible store, Bartko-Reher GmbH & Co emerge as a resourceful database for this study not only to find the studios which is not included in the index of Berlin, but also various carte de visit mounts that includes the façade drawing of the studio. The same website also includes various collections of cartes de visit and postcard from all around the world which was also beneficial for the other three cities.

210 “Stadtmuseum Berlin: https://sammlung-online.stadtmuseum.de
Deutsche Digitale Bibliothek: https://www.deutsche-digitale-bibliothek.de
Deutsche Fototek https://www.deutschefotothek.de

211 Another vast image database of Berlin can be found on a website called “pastvu.com” which pinpoints the location of the photographs on the contemporary map of Berlin. Pastvu is an online platform for gathering, geo-tagging, attributing and discussing retro images. It also presents the users the opportunity to contribute by uploading or attributing images with location information which is very useful for this study.

212 Die Geschichte Berlins: https://www.diegeschichteberlins.de. The website is in German but also includes significant information about the history of photography in Berlin.

213 Bartko and Reher online shop: https://www.ansichtskartenversand.com
This cross-referencing between the four materials demonstrated that the streets such as Unter den Linden, Friedrichstrasse or Leipzigerstrasse come forward as dynamic social and commercial zones in which photography studios were constructed extensively including the urban squares such as Alexanderplatz or Dönhofplatz. The expanded research on the visuals concentrated on these designated areas resulted in success and a great number of photographs that depicts the studios in urban context were uncovered. Berlin is the city with the clearest and most descriptive photographs of the studios in comparison to the other three cities.

The last piece of the puzzle is the photography and architecture journals which were scanned to designate the architectural drawings of the studios. In fact, the books and journals published in Austria and Germany comes forward as the most prolific sources for uncovering the architectural drawings of the photography studios. Photographic journals such as Photographisches Archiv published in Berlin and Das Atelier des Photographen published in Halle\(^\text{214}\) contains various plans,\(^\text{214}\) These journals were accessed via:

One of the most comprehensive books that contains different typologies of photography studios from all around the world is also uncovered during the search in German databases. Otto Buehler’s “Atelier und Apparat des Photographen” is the touchstone of this research.
diagrams or sections about the ateliers scattered around Germany (Figure 166). They were also helpful to locate some glass ateliers which are not visible from the street through photographs. After Vienna, Berlin comes as the second city in which the higher number of architectural drawings regarding the studios were discovered. When the research is expanded through some architectural journals, even the name of the architects in several examples were unveiled.

Figure 165. A residential building designed with a photography studio on its rooftop

Figure 166. Drawings of a rooftop photography studio designed as part of Market Hall in Berlin.
Source: August Lindeman, Die Markthallen Berlins, (Berlin: Julius Springer) 1899.
Figure 167. Nineteenth-century photography studios discovered in Berlin. Base map constructed and highlighted by the author. Purple colored highlights indicate the glasshouse studios detected in photographs, while the orange colored dots refer to the other establishments located through indexes or address books. All the indicated ateliers were north-facing. Unter den Linten, Friedrichstraße, Leipzigerstraße (general plan above) and Alexanderplatz (zoom-in plan below) appear as dynamic commercial zones in which studios was constructed extensively.
Figure 168. Unter den Linden 24, photographed by F. Albert Schwartz in 1885. Source: Stadtmuseum Berlin online archive, https://sammlung-online.stadtmuseum.de/Details/Index/241444

Figure 169. Photograph by F. Albert Schwartz in 1880. Photography studio highlighted by the author. Source: Stadtmuseum Berlin online archive, https://sammlung-online.stadtmuseum.de/Details/Index/255511
Figure 170. Unter den Linden 24, photographed by Max Missmann, 1911. Source: Stadtmuseum Berlin, https://sammlung-online.stadtmuseum.de/Details/Index/269096

Figure 171. Postcard showing Unter den Linden, 1907. Source: Wikimedia Commons, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Berlin,_Mitte,_Berlin_-_Unter_den_Linden_Kranzler-Ecke_%28Zeno_Ansichtskarten%29.jpg
Photograph by Max Missmann taken in 1911 shows that it was a late atelier constructed between 1911 and 1913. Café Kranzler located on the ground level of the same building was one of the most famous places at that time together with the Café Bauer just across the street. “Schloss Atelier” sign is visible in both the photograph above from 1913 and the one below from 1921.

Figure 172. Unter den Linden 25, photographed by Max Missmann, 1913. Source: Stadtmuseum Berlin, https://sammlung-online.stadtmuseum.de/Details/Index/269097

Figure 173. “Schloss Atelier” on top Café Kranzler, photograph from 1921. Source: Alte Ansichtskarten, https://www.ansichtskartenversand.com/ak/91-old-postcard/30895-Ecke-Friedrichstrasse/12440215-AK-Berlin-Unter-den-Linden-Kranzler-Ecke
3 – **Behrenstraße 24** – Architect: Armin Wegner

![Figure 174](image1.png)

Figure 174. Carl Günther photography studio, Berlin.  
Source: Berlin und Seine Bauten, 2/3, Der Hochbau, Berlin: Ernst, 1896.

![Figure 175](image2.png)

Figure 175. Carl Günther’s *carte de visite* with his address. Located again near a famous place, Biearhaus Siechen.  
4 – Friedrichstraße 185 (at the intersection of Mohrenstraße)

Figure 176. Emil Wellhausen & Co.’s advertisement in *Panorama von Berlin* für die Gewerbe-Ausstellung 1896 [for the commercial exhibition in 1896]. The photography studio can be seen on top of the building.
Figure 177. Photograph showing U-Bahnhof Friedrichstraße, 1912. Source: Alte Ansichtskarten, https://www.ansichtskartenversand.com/ak/

Figure 178. Carte de visite mounts of two photographers who operated the studio: Hermann Bock between 1870 and 1875, Delank between 1889 and 1899. Source: Alte Ansichtskarten, https://www.ansichtskartenversand.com/ak/
5 – Markgrafenstraße 40 (at the intersection of Mohrenstraße)

Figure 179. Photographed by F. Albert Schwartz, 1886.
Source: Stadtmuseum Berlin, https://sammlung-online.stadtmuseum.de/Details/Index/283659

Figure 180. *Carte de visite* mounts of Reichard & Lindner between 1873 and 1882 on the left and middle; and J. Stiehm between 1868 and 1872 on the right.
6-7-8 – Krausenstraße 34,35 and 36 / Dönhoffplatz

Figure 181. Berlin Dönhoffplatz, photographed by Waldemar Titzenthaler, 1904. Source: Wikimedia Commons, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Berlin_D%C3%B6nhoffplatz_Anscicht_1904.jpg

Figure 182. Zoomed-in photograph of Berlin Dönhoffplatz. The three glass studios next to each other can be seen at the background.
Figure 183. The residential building at Mauerstraße 81, designed by Julius Reinicke, with a photography studio on its rooftop.
Source: *Blätter für Architektur und Kunsthandwerk*, no: 4 (April 1899), plate 35.
The steel structure of the studio clearly is visible from street level due to the transparency of both the wall and the roof.
Figure 184. The floor plans of the building with a rooftop photography studio at Mauerstraße 81. Source: Blätter für Architektur und Kunsthandwerk, no. 4 (April 1899), 26.

“In IV. und V. Stockwerk war ein photographisches Atelier mit den erforderlichen Nebenräumen anzulegen.“ [A photographic studio with the necessary ancillary rooms was to be built on the fourth and fifth floors.]

Figure 185. Zoomed-in partial plans of the 4th floor and attic (5th floor) showing photography studio’s spatial organization by welcoming and service spaces as well as the photographer’s house, annotated by the author.
Figure 186. Photograph of Königskolonnaden at Königstraße, 1903.

Figure 187. (left) A close-up view of Königstraße shows the glass studio; (middle & right) Max Pflaum’s carte de visite mounts. Pflaum operated this studio between 1865-1879.
The transparency of the glass façade is so powerful that the entire interior is visible from street level. “Atelier Hugo Leman” sign can be seen. At the background, the sign and the glass façade of the “Pflaum Studio” (Königstraße 31) can also be observed. Leman was active at this address between 1870 and 1880.

Figure 189. Carte de visite mounts of Photographisches Atelier Hugo Leman.
Source: Alte Ansichtskarten, https://www.ansichtskartenversand.com/ak/
Figure 190. Atelier Leman (on the left) and Königsbrücke from a different perspective.

Figure 191. Königsbrücke, Königstraße, photographed by F. A. Schwartz, 1880. Atelier Leman on the left.
Source: StadtBild Deutschland, https://www.stadtbild-deutschland.org/forum/gallery/index.php?image%2F12290-k%C3%B6nigsgraben-k%C3%B6nigsbr%C3%Bcke-1880e-zusch%C3%BCettung-schwartz%2F
12 – Alexanderplatz 2
Built on the roof of old Königsstädtisches Theater by C. Theodor Ottmer

Figure 192. Detail from Alexanderplatz panorama, photographed by Max Missmann, 1903. Source: Stadtmuseum Berlin, https://sammlung-online.stadtmuseum.de/Details/Index/181015

Figure 193. Alexanderplatz, photographed in 1908. Source: http://www.weimarberlin.com/2018/08/have-quick-bite-at-aschingers.html
Figure 194. Alexanderstraße 44, photographed by Georg Bartels, 1897. 
Source: Stadtmuseum Berlin, https://sammlung-online.stadtmuseum.de/Details/Index/262305

According to the 19th century Berlin photographers’ database, this studio was active at least 46 years, in between 1854 and 1900 under the management of different photographers

Figure 195. (left) Studio is visible at the end of the street; (right) A carte de visite example from this address. 
Source: Deutsche Fotothek, https://www.deutschefotothek.de/documents/obj/71196804/b_am_0111232
Figure 196. Carte de visite mount of Atelier Martin Balg that depicts the glass studio, 1899. Source: Deutsche Fotothek, https://www.deutschefotothek.de/documents/obj/90041143/df_dat_0011926_02

Figure 197. Alexanderplatz, photographed by Max Missmann, 1925. Source: Stadtmuseum Berlin, https://sammlung-online.stadtmuseum.de/Details/Index/181046
15 – Leipzigerstraße 47

Figure 198. Albert Grunder’s fotoatelier at Leipzigerstraße 47.

Figure 199. Carte de visite of Albert Grunder.
Berlin, Königl. Gewerbe Institute Atelier


Figure 201. Gewerbe Institute Atelier plan. Source: Photographische Mitteilungen, vol. 2 (1865): 84.
Berlin, Loescher & Petsch Atelier

Figure 202. Berlin, Loescher & Petsch Atelier is not visible in 1910 Berlin plan since it was demolished. The atelier is therefore indicated with a dot on the base map.

Figure 203. Berlin, Loescher & Petsch Atelier’s plan.
Source: Photographische Mitteilungen, vol. 6 (1870): 258.
5.2.4 Vienna

The tracing of the photography studios of Vienna was challenging due to the inaccessibility of the indexical studies about the photographic establishments. The primary tool utilized in the research is the object, such as the carte de visite and cabinet photographs along with photographic journals and books. While the digital archive of the National Library of Austria – Österreichische Nationalbibliothek – is the leading source to discover the photographs produced by the studios, there are also some blogs that aided the search. The location information was mostly gathered from these objects and pinned down on the map of 1887 Vienna’s Stadtplan, which is a holistic and high-resolution map like Berlin that covers the whole city. The base map is created with the combining of the six separate sheets, which also shows the different zones of the city with a color coding.

After the locations pinned on the map, they were searched in the online databases of Wienbibliothek im Rathaus, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek and Wien Museum, which are the most resourceful image databases for Vienna. Although many photographs were uncovered in these databases, the utmost motivator of the research is the photographic journals published in Vienna. Particularly, “Photographische Correspondenz” is an extensive journal on photography which includes many architectural drawings as well as typological diagrams of photography studios in between the issues of 1867 – 1908. Some of the studio locations were designated with the help of these journals which enables to find more photographs depicting these establishments. The Vienna Photography School is a significant example discovered through the journals since it is not a commercial establishment and there are no objects verifying the location. The identification of the institution and the plan drawings comes first, then the images and location were

---

215 Österreichische Nationalbibliothek: https://onb.digital. The online blog cabinetcardgallery is also a crucial source for the research: https://cabinetcardgallery.com


217 Accessed through the online database of Austrian National Library: https://www.onb.ac.at/ Addressbuch de Photographen in Wien by Bodo Kralik helped to locate some of the studios.
discovered. These drawings also deliver valuable technical information about the studios, which will make it possible to produce 3D digital models of varying cases with precision rather than a presumptive approach.

While the survey of the photographic and architectural journals is a crucial part of the research which catalyzes the discovery of many architectural projects or drawings of the photography studios in all the four cities, Vienna is the most fruitful city in that manner.\textsuperscript{218} Considerably a small number of materials were discovered in London through journals, followed by Paris. The search of Berlin databases is also productive as Vienna but many of the studios found during the process were located outside Berlin. They are still included in the appendix part. But for the case of Vienna, the journals actively contributed to the tracing operation by locating the studios on the map with their visual and textual data rather than being an image source.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure204}

\caption{Research methodology applied in tracing photography studios in Vienna.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{218} Respectively a small number of materials were discovered in journals for London, followed by Paris. The search of Berlin databases is also as fruitful as Vienna but many of the studios found were located outside Berlin. They are still included in the appendix.
Another finding that emerged in Vienna as a result of this research was that studios belonging to famous photographers such as Victor Angerer, Josef Löwy or Atelier Bohr were mostly located outside the city. Although these photographers also established branch studios in the popular areas near the city center, their resident ateliers seem to last the longest. Thanks to the detailed drawing sets discovered through journals, it became possible to distinguish the separate photography studio building on the base map by comparing it with the drawing set.

Although the photographic and visual information is quite satisfactory for Vienna which also aids the spatial analysis and 3D modelling of the photography studios, the locations are mostly scattered around the city. While Mariahilfer Strasse or Graben emerge as possible popular points of concentration for the studios, there is not an equivalent of the similar urban spaces of the other three cities such as the Regent Street in London, boulevards of Paris or squares of Berlin. Two assumptions can be deduced as the diagnosis of this condition: either Viennese photographers mostly preferred ground ateliers like Löwy, Angerer or Bohr, which is difficult to trace in the image archive, or the lack of a comprehensive index prevents the discovery of many other rooftop studios concentrated on different locations.
Figure 205. Nineteenth-century photography studios discovered in Vienna. Base map constructed and highlighted by the author. Orange colored highlights indicate the glasshouse studios detected in photographs, while the orange colored dots refer to the other establishments located through indexes or address books.
1 – 15-17 Parkgasse – Joseph Löwy Atelier

Figure 206. J. Löwy Atelier’s drawings, *Photographische Correspondenz*, no: 10 (1873), plate between 160-61. Source: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, https://anno.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/anno-plus?aid=phc&datum=1873&size=45

Figure 207. (left) Zoomed-in plan, the location of the studio at 15-17 Parkgasse is marked; (right) *Carte de visite* of J. Löwy photography studio.

Figure 208. A later institution founded by Löwy at the same location. Source: Albertina Museum, https://sammlungenonline.albertina.at/?language=de#!/query/cdaaec1-dcd4-4acc-a2a6-67adb9bd7cc5
2 – 6 Theresianumgasse – Victor Angerer Atelier

Figure 209. Illustrations of Victor Angerer Atelier, 1875.  

Figure 210. Photograph showing the garden of Angerer’s atelier, which is partially visible on the right.  
Source: Monoskop, https://monoskop.org/Ludwig_Angerer

Figure 211. Drawing of another studio that belongs to Angerer.  
Source: Photographische Correspondenz, no: 5, (1868), plate introduced between pages 70-71.
Figure 212. Carte de visite of Atelier Bohr.

Figure 213. Plan drawings of Atelier Bohr.
Figure 214. Exterior view of Atelier Bohr.
Source: *Photographische Correspondenz*, no: 1, (1864), plate introduced between 180-181.

Figure 215. Interior view of Atelier Bohr.
Source: *Photographische Correspondenz*, no: 1, (1864), plate introduced between 180-181.
Figure 216. The drawings of the studio prototype which is applied on Hotel National’s rooftop. Source: *Photographische Correspondenz*, no: 7, (1870): plate introduced between pages 218 and 219.

Figure 217. The atelier at 18 Taborstraße is still recognizable in Google street views.
Figure 218. Advertisement and plan drawing of Phillip Ritter Von Schoeller Atelier.
Source: Wiener Photographische Blätter, vol. 1 (1894): 190. Also see appendices including advertisements.
6-7-8 – Graben 17, 18 and 19


After Graben 18 demolished, a new building that was constructed on the same plot designed with a glass studio on roof level.
9-10 – 1B Mariahilfer Straße and Casa Picola

Figure 221. Two engravings of Casa Picola in 1830 by Johann Wenzel Zinke and 1896 by Erwin Pendl show the transformation of existing buildings after the installation of two photography studios.
Source: Wien Museum online archive,
(bottom) https://sammlung.wienmuseum.at/objekt/69669-casa-piccola-6-mariahilfer-strasse-1b/
Figure 222. Engraving by Carl Pippich showing two studios next to Rahlstiege, Mariahilfer Straße, 1895. Source: Wien Museum, https://sammlung.wienmuseum.at/objekt/1977614-6-rahlstiege-mariahilfer-strasse/
Figure 223. Photographs of 1B Mariahilfer Straße, before and after 1860.

Figure 224. Although only these two ateliers can be located through images, other establishments are found along Mariahilfer Straße and indicated with orange dots.

Figure 225. Carte de visite mounts of Carl Pietzner photography studio on Mariahilfer Straße.
Source: Alte Ansichtskarten, https://www.ansichtskartenversand.com/ak/
11 – Marienbrücke, Photo-Palast

Figure 226. Photograph from Marienbrücke by Marianne Strobl, 1908. 

Figure 227. Carte de visite mount of Photographie Palast. 

Figure 228. Postcard of Marienbrücke. 
Source: Alte Ansichtskarten, https://www.ansichtskartenversand.com
12 – Atelier at Franz Josef Kai


Figure 231. Location of the photography studio at Franz-Josefs-Kai.
14 – Ankerhaus, Graben 10 / Architect: Otto Wagner, 1895 (still stands)

Figure 233. Façade of Ankerhaus facing Spiegelgasse and Graben.  

Figure 234. Photograph of Ankerhaus on Graben, 1897.  

Figure 235. Ankerhaus with photo atelier on roof, 1895.  
Photograph: Joseph Dapra.  
Source: Claire Zimmerman, Photographic Architecture in the Twentieth Century (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 12.
Figure 236. Otto Wagner’s proposal for the Academy of Fine Arts on the Schmelz with glass ateliers. 

Figure 237. Drawings for the glass ateliers for sculptors and artists, by Otto Wagner, 1910. 
15 – Research Institute for Photography and Reproduction Processes

Figure 238. Plans of Lehr und Versuchsanstalt für Photographie und Reproduktionsverfahren in Wien. Source: Photographische Correspondenz, no. 1, (1888): 198.
Figure 239. Exterior view of Lehr und Versuchsanstalt für Photographie und Reproduktionsverfahren in Wien. Source: Photographische Correspondenz, no. 1, (1888): 199.

Figure 240. Photograph of Lehr und Versuchsanstalt für Photographie und Reproduktionsverfahren in Wien. Source: https://sammlungenonline.albertina.at/?query=search=/record/objectnumbersearch=[FotoGLV2000/14696]&showtype=record#/query/016f4ed-76d0-414a-9d0e-ed5f1b2cf99a
Figure 241. Interior photograph of the portrait studio, Research Institute For photography in Vienna. Source: https://sammlungenonline.albertina.at/?query=search=/record/objectnumbersearch=[FotoGLV2000/3578]&showtype=record#/query/11d25f39-9153-4390-b2ef-806380760261

Figure 242. Interior photograph of the portrait studio, Research Institute For photography in Vienna. Source: https://sammlungenonline.albertina.at/?query=search=/record/objectnumbersearch=[FotoGLV2000/3579]&showtype=record#/query/2d29f98f-d854-4b79-97f3-eb9f23d3bd4d
16-17 – Waldfischgasse 11 – Victor Angerer

Figure 243. Angerer’s studio probably built after 1887 because the building is not in the map.

Kärntner Straße 51, Palais Tedesco – Atelier Leth / Architect: Förster

Figure 245. Drawing of a photography atelier in Vienna, which probably belonged to Atelier Leth located on top of Palais Tedesco. The partial façade drawing seen on the plate resembles the façade pattern of Palais Tedesco. The location is indicated with an orange dot on the map on the previous page.
Source: Photographische Correspondenz, no: 4 (1868), plate introduced between pages 70 and 71.

Figure 246. Photograph of Palais Tedesco, by Michael Frankenstein & Comp., around 1870.
Kahlenberg Tower Studio


Figure 248. Postcard of Kahlenberg Tower, Sperlings Postkartenverlag, after 1904. Source: https://sammlung.wienmuseum.at/objekt/130495-stefaniewarte-auf-dem-kahlenberg/

Figure 249. Postcard of Kahlenberg Tower, by Carl Ledermann jun., 1900-1905. Source: https://sammlung.wienmuseum.at/objekt/1041306-19-kahlenberg-stephaniewarte-ansichtskarte/
Rabending and Monckhoven Atelier

Figure 250. Plans of Rabending and Monckhoven Atelier.
Figure 251. Principal diagram of Rabending and Monckhoven Atelier. Source: *Photographische Mitteilungen*, vol 4 (1868): 251.

Figure 252. A detailed isometric drawing of Rabending and Monckhoven Atelier. Source: *Photographische Korrespondenz*, no: 4, (1867): 2.
Photoatelier Setzer & Tschedel

Figure 253. Interior photographs of Photoatelier Setzer & Tschedel. 
Source: Photoatelier Setzer and Tschedel official website, https://www.tschedel.at/

Figure 254. Aerial view of Photoatelier Setzer and Tschedel from Google Earth.
5.3 Assessment of Research Process and Outcomes of Tracing Photography Studios

The research concentrated on the cities of London, Paris, Berlin and Vienna demonstrates that the glass rooftop studios had a widespread architectural manifestation in nineteenth-century urban context even though the traces of these photography studios were almost entirely disappeared in the contemporary city.219 Only a small percentage of photography studios in these four cities have survived in their original configuration and those that have are only recognizable by the lasting transparent mass of the glass studio while their entire spatial layout was altered and remodeled with the introduction of new uses.

Paris has the most cases in which the existence of the glass daylight studio is still readable on the façade while the interior is reconfigured completely mostly with residential uses. Even for the famous studio of Nadar, only the façade is preserved while the whole building was re-built in order to create more space for commercial uses including shops and offices in 1990s. The recent renovation project is also a continuation of the same attitude. Amongst the four primary cities, Photoatelier Setzer & Tschiedel in Museumstrasse, Vienna (Figure 253 & Figure 254) is the only example that is preserved in almost its original condition as a photography studio and still exists in its entirety including the vast archive of photographs produced within. This late example, built in 1908, is a relatively small but popular attic studio that remained in active use till 1979. Refurbished by the former family members who inherited the studio, it is still open to the public as an exhibition space and event venue.220

Amongst the catalogue of studios discovered through this research, there are nine building in Paris, one in Berlin, one in London and five in Vienna (except Photoatelier Setzer & Tschiedel) which still bear the marks of an existence of a

---

219 See, mappings of discovered photography studios and images of selected studios compiled for each city at the end of this section.

220 Photoatelier Setzer and Tschidel: https://www.tschiedel.at/. Also see, Wien Geschicte Wiki: https://www.geschichtewiki.wien.gv.at/Atelier_Setzer-Tschiedel
glass rooftop studio. It seems that especially in Paris, the historic significance of the glass studio extensions was considered while the listings for architectural heritage of Paris were created. The exterior integrity of the building was accepted as a must to be preserved in transformation projects which results with the conservation or the restitution of the mass of the glass studios with respect to the original placement of the glazed parts and steel construction. Thus, in few remaining examples – such as 23 Boulevard des Capucines (Figure 117) and 13 Rue Saint-Antoine (Figure 144) in Paris, 25 Old Bond Street (Figure 104) in London, and Ankerhaus (Figure 235) – it is possible to observe the studios in a state close to the original, at least in exterior appearance and urban perception.

Several photography studios across Europe were also discovered during the research process which were listed in the appendices part. Those examples show that intact photography studios are more likely to be found in smaller cities. Except for the unique example of Mai Mano house located in Budapest, the other surviving examples mentioned at the beginning of this chapter; Fotoatelier Seidel, Casa Relvas, Atelier Malicot and Josip Pelikan Studio are all located in smaller cities of Cesky Krumlow, Golege, Sablè-sur-Sarthe and Celje. The urban fabric of such small cities may be more preserved than the larger ones that have been subjected to major urban transformations which renders this kind of minor cities as more probable candidates that may house surviving examples of photography studios. During this research other similar cases were also found which are still employed with a photography-related business or alternatively converted into a museum in parallel with their historical importance. Here is a selected short list of additional studios that were re-purposed consistent with their original use and spatial configuration:

- Memorial Studio in Hastings: still used as a studio for special events,\(^{221}\)
- W. W. Winter Studio in Derby which is still in use although the glass studio had some alterations. It is accepted as the longest running photography

\(^{221}\) See, https://www.photolacey.com/
business in Britain and protected by The W. W. Winter Heritage Trust launched in 2018.\textsuperscript{222}

- Charles Aramborou Studio in Châtellerault, France: not in use but seems to survive in good shape.\textsuperscript{223}

- Jean Laurent Studio in Madrid: Although it was renovated later as a school later, the integrity of the building seems to be preserved and it is a significant surviving example as a purpose-built example including the photographers’ house designed by the architect Velazquez Bosco in 1884.\textsuperscript{224}

Although the findings listed in the appendix part are not systematically mapped as the model cities studied in this dissertation, the research operation conducted on those four cities motivated and contributed a great deal towards various branching quests of tracing more studios. This is why it is possible to evaluate the examples listed in appendix section as initiators for future research to discover photography studios beyond the framework of this research.

At this point, going back to the main four cities to compare the results of the research can be fruitful for creating a brief summary about the tracing operation. In Paris, along the four boulevards of Madeleine, Capucines, Italiens and Montmartre, fifteen rooftop studios were validated through photographs or drawings while another significant studio locations derived from only index or the object (and indicated with dots on the map) were not included in this number. Similarly, there are twenty-five more studios designated via this research which were scattered around Paris and mostly located near other public attraction points such as squares or near important landmarks. In London nineteen studios in Regent Street and seven studios in Cheapside Street is pinpointed while the total number of studios is thirty

\textsuperscript{222} See, https://wwwwinter.co.uk/ and https://heritagetrust.wwwinter.co.uk/

\textsuperscript{223} Christiane Escanecrab and Jean-François Millet, Les photographes châtelleraudais 1861-1939, in Le Picton, n° 186 (novembre-déc. 2007): 2-10 accessed via the website of Centre Châtelleraudais d'Histoire et d'Archives: http://ccha.fr/

\textsuperscript{224} Miguel Ángel Baldellou, El taller y estudio de Laurent. Un proyecto desconocido de Velázquez Bosco, in “Cuaderno de notas” no. 13 (year) : 41-47, accessed via the digital archive of Universidad Politécnica de Madrid : https://oa.upm.es/49058
one. In Berlin thirty eight studios were uncovered while twenty seven of them can be pinned on the selected sections of the map. Lastly, eighteen studios were designated in Vienna. In comparison to the other three cities it may be a relatively small number due to the inaccessibility of the index while the documentation uncovered for these eighteen examples were rich.

Considering that the aim of this study is not to map all active photography studios in the nineteenth century for these four cities, these numbers are quite sufficient to show the prevalence and urban visibility of the photography studio as an architectural typology.

This study argues that photography studios have the initial sparks of a truly modernist architectural space and worked as a catalyst in the metamorphosis of the historical roofscape of the city. The add-on nature of the photography studio underlines it as an architectural element that can be attached to an existing building and transform not only the roof level but also the lower floors in accordance with the other service spaces required such as the reception, dressing rooms, exhibition hall, negative archive or even photographer’s house (Figure 258 & Figure 259). Photographic establishments designed as whole new buildings (Figure 15, Figure 35, Figure 154, Figure 206, Figure 255, Figure 256, and Figure 257) also reflected the dominant façade architecture of the nineteenth century which is obsessed with historical styles, proportions, or forms. However, the glass photography studio manifests itself amongst this phantasmagoria of outmoded architectural forms as a truly modern extension with its modest but powerful architecture.

Remembering the discussions in Chapter Four clustered around the concepts of Giedion’s “subconscious of construction” and Benjamin’s “subconscious of the city,” it is constructive to evoke the Carlo Argan’s and Alan Colquhoun’s formulation of typology as something that works in the “subconscious of the architect” like a language whether he chose to use it or not. Although they were not mentioned much by architectural discourse, it may be possible to assess that their well-established architecture based on illumination and their multiple existence in
nineteenth-century city underline them as a unique typology that may reside in the subconscious of the architect.

Figure 255. Plans of Rothschild’s photography laboratory. Architect: M. Emile Longfils. Source: Bulletin de la Société française photographie, vol. 1 (1896), plate introduced between pages 512 and 513.
Figure 256. Façade drawing of Rothschild’s photography laboratory. Architect: M. Emile Longfils. Source: *Bulletin de la Société française photographie*, vo. 1 (1896), plate introduced between pages 512 and 513.

Figure 257. 3D digital model of Rothschild’s photography laboratory, produced by the author.
Figure 258. Partial floor plans of the building with a rooftop photography studio at Mauerstraße 81 in Berlin. 4th floor and attic (5th floor) plans show the photography studio’s spatial organization including welcoming and service spaces as well as the photographer’s house. Plans annotated by the author.

Figure 259. Plans and spatial configuration of Atelier Adele at Graben 19, Vienna. Plans annotated by the author.
Source: Franz Stolze, Handwerksbüch für Photographen (Halle: Knapp, 1898), 43.
It is possible to observe how the typology of photography studio became a later model for artist ateliers (Figure 25, Figure 26 and Figure 27). They borrowed the same configuration of natural lighting achieved with the simultaneous transformation of the north-facing wall and roof into continuous transparent surface. In fact, there are more surviving examples of these artist ateliers while the photography studios have mostly disappeared.

While central locations were preferred for photography studios near the trendy and crowded areas of the city in which the prices of land and rent were very high, artist ateliers were mostly built in more economical zones as the attention of the public was not a strong denominator. This is why artist ateliers were luckier to escape the vast urban transformations in comparison to the commercial areas of the cities. In addition, these workshops were able to maintain their original use through time under different owners unlike the photography studios which were mostly abandoned by the photographers at the beginning of the twentieth century. Despite the architectural resemblance, the photography studio is differentiated from the artist atelier with its extroverted character as a common public space rather than defining a secluded space for creativeness of the artist. While artist ateliers were associated with certain significant figures for painting and sculpture, which contributes to their conservation in parallel with their historical value; the photographers’ studio fall into the oblivion under the pressure of the capitalist economy.

The spatial tectonics introduced by the photography studios are also visible in the educational facilities related to art and architecture. While the Research Institute for Photography and Reproduction Processes in Vienna (Figure 238) is one of the first examples of such an institution founded in 1888, the studios became more and more integrated to the architectural composition with the shifting dynamics of architectural discourse that started to abandon the historical language of the past. The influence of the photography studio as an architectural typology in the creation of new architectural forms can be traced in these two examples which are also considered as significant proto-modernist examples in the pursuit of truly modern
architecture: Charles Rennie Mackintosh’s school in Glasgow (Figure 260 & Figure 261) and Henry Van der Velde’s Weimar Bauhaus (Figure 262 & Figure 263).


Figure 261. Photograph of glass rooftop ateliers in Glasgow School of Art. Source: Wikiarquitectura, https://en.wikiarquitectura.com/escuela_de_arte_de_glasgow_283029-2/


As mentioned, the physical traces of photography studios are mostly lost, not only in the sense that we cannot see these glass boxes in the city but also, we can no longer identify the photography studio as a glass light-weight construction. However, the subconscious traces of architectural premises of the photography studio such as its transparency, temporality, and distinguishability by the use of industrial materials which challenges the existing structure, can be observed in artist studios, the “studio” formations of proto-modern examples, and, arguably, in
contemporary examples of adaptive reuse and architectural conservation projects with glass extensions.
Figure 264. 19th-century photography studios on Regent Street, London discovered and mapped by the author.

Figure 265. 19th-century photography studios on Cheapside Street, London discovered and mapped by the author.
Figure 266. Selection of nineteenth-century photography studios discovered in London by the author.
Figure 267. 19th-century photography studios in Paris discovered and mapped by the author.
Figure 268. Selection of nineteenth-century photography studios discovered in Paris by the author.
Figure 269. 19th-century photography studios in Berlin discovered and mapped by the author.
Figure 270. Selection of nineteenth-century photography studios discovered in Berlin by the author.
Figure 271. 19th-century photography studios in Vienna discovered and mapped by the author.
Figure 272. Selection of nineteenth-century photography studios discovered in Vienna by the author.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This dissertation proposes a research framework constructed upon the notion of typology to examine the photography studio as a long-lost architectural artefact of nineteenth-century city. These glass studios dedicated to portrait photography had a short-term but ubiquitous existence as a generative architectural and cultural pattern that transformed the roofscape of the city particularly in between the years 1851 and 1910. While it is possible to encounter several architectural representations explaining the spatial characteristics of the photography studios amongst the early literature on photography, the studios have not been studied or analyzed extensively in the field of architecture. In other words, the photography studio is not recognized as a distinct typology within architectural discourse.

This study defines the photography studio as a hybrid typology in reference to its intricate connection to the three dominant paradigms of typology in architectural discourse: type-nature, type-machine and type-city. It responds to these concepts respectively as follows: as an influential medium on the transformation of perception and visual standards of nineteenth century, as an architectural space standardized by the scientific norms and the notion of function, and as an urban phenomenon with cultural significance and symbolic value for nineteenth-century society.

Apart from this formulation based on the literature on architectural typology, the add-on nature of the studios also introduced a hybrid condition in which the modern architectural space of the studio defined by the extensive use of glass and iron is juxtaposed with the nineteenth-century façades of existing buildings. By tracing the forgotten studio examples, this research seeks the potential impact of the
photographic spaces on architecture within this definition of hybrid architectural typology.

One of the significant questionings emerging from this study is whether the architectural typology introduced by the photography studio can be assessed as a premise in the development of the principles of Modern Architecture. By tracing the hidden impacts of photographic architecture in artist studio houses and education ateliers such as Mackintosh’s school in Glasgow and Van der Velde’s Weimar Bauhaus which are considered as proto-modernist examples, the investigation evokes the possibility of an analytical reading of the photography studio as a precedent for the functionalist forms desired by Modern Architecture. This topic can be further expanded with a comparative analysis between the architecture of the studios and similar precedents of Modern Architecture including cases from Art Nouveau and Art Deco.

The urban manifestation and the self-representative nature of the studios originating from the contrast between their modern architectural language and the façade architecture of nineteenth century based on fake historical coding can trigger more discussions on various contemporary topics orbiting around the tension between the modern and the historical architecture or the contrast of transparency and opacity. The photography studios may be interpreted as the first instances of an architectural language about how an intervention can be made to an existing building considering the similarities with several contemporary conservation projects designed as glass extensions integrated to historical contexts.

This dissertation develops a research methodology for tracing the photography studios based on a quadripartite correlation of four materials: map, index, image and object. Even though this tracing operation remains to be inevitably unfinished, it expresses the abundance and urban/social impact of photography studios by cataloguing and mapping them for the cities of London, Paris, Berlin and Vienna as it compiles a considerable amount of visual information to assess the
architectural qualities of the studio. It re-constructs the architectural space of the studios in relation to their urban context with the help of the gathered data.

By the application of the proposed research methodology on four model cities, this study also enables the possibility to trace photography studios in different cities by employing the same methodology. The examples presented in the Appendices validate that if the same research methodology applied to the different cities, the catalogue can be expanded by the discovery of new studios. Amongst these studios further discovered, it also becomes possible to reach architects and architectural materials (as observed in Strasbourg), which powerfully depict the spatial and architectonic features of the photography studio typology.

The methodology developed for tracing the lost photography studios in the selected cities has potential beyond being a specific strategy that can be applied in other cities for the same purpose. It also presents a methodological framework that can be utilized or at least tested for discovering other neglected architectural typologies of the nineteenth century such as artist ateliers or shopfronts (specific shopfront designs articulated according to the business it houses).

Due to the global pandemic between 2020 and 2023, which was the biggest challenge faced during this study, the research on the photography studios condensed mainly on digitized archives and online collections. Because the digitalization of the catalogues and collections of certain institutions also paced up with the pandemic period, the results of the research process are more than satisfactory. However, in-situ research can also be conducted in future to discover more architectural documents about the studios as well as more information about their architects.

This dissertation not only contributes to the architectural discourse but also presents an inventory of photography studios that also has the potential to support further research on cultural and heritage studies as well as art history. The data gathered during the research but not presented in this study such as company owners, the history of the business and their regional significance or even social and
professional relationships between the photographers and architects can initiate new narratives and research topics within the fields of urban history and archival studies.

While it is beyond the scope of this study, another probable research track may focus on analyzing the ecological impacts of the photography studios. On one hand, the effective use of daylight which is at the core of the studio typology has positive connotations regarding the reduction of energy consumption, on the other hand, these glass constructions created many challenges for the users in terms of heating and cooling. For instance, some photographers installed special pipe systems to cool down the glass studio with water in summer days while some preferred to use extra shading elements both inside and outside of the studio. But most importantly, the chemicals used in the developing and printing process was very flammable and there are a considerable number of studio fires in history that cause the destruction of significant photographic archives along with the studio equipment.

All the potential future research topics and activities mentioned above can contribute to the expansion and elaboration of the initial catalogue of photography studios presented in this study. Apart from tracing the studios in nineteenth-century city via photographs and architectural representations, three-dimensional models were also produced with the help of these uncovered images to grasp the architectural characteristics of the studios, which in turn can become a digital humanities project to visualize their urban impact by partial reconstructions of urban areas. The three-dimensional models presented in this study were generated only for a few cases selected amongst the vast archive of studios discovered through this research. With the introduction of new architectural documents, the number of three-dimensional models may increase and eventually provide a more detailed comparative analysis in-between the photography studios themselves.
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APPENDICES

A. France

France, Strasbourg, 7 Place Gutenberg (transformed but still stands)

Figure 273. Elevation and plan drawings of 7 Place Gutenberg, 1902. Architects A. Muller and Mossler. Source: Archi-wiki, https://www.archi-wiki.org/Adresse:7_place_Gutenberg_%28Strasbourg%29

Figure 274. Photograph of 7 Place Gutenberg. Source: Gallica – BnF, https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b102217554
Figure 275. Elevation and section drawings of the photography studio at 7 Place Gutenberg.

Figure 276. Postcard of Place Gutenberg, 1900.
France, Strasbourg, 14 Avenue de la Marseillaise

Figure 277. Plan, section and elevation drawings of 14 Avenue de la Marseillaise, 1895–96. Architect: Frédéric Haussmann. Source: Archi-wiki, https://www.archi-wiki.org/Adresse:14_Avenue_de_la_Marseillaise_(Strasbourg)

Figure 278. Photograph of 14 Avenue de la Marseillaise, by Wilfred Hemlinger, July 15, 2019. Source: Archi-wiki, https://www.archi-wiki.org/Adresse:14_Avenue_de_la_Marseillaise_(Strasbourg)
France, Strasbourg, 5 Boulevard Leblois

Figure 279. Elevation drawing of 5 Boulevard Leblois.
Source: Archi-wiki, https://www.archi-wiki.org/Adresse:5_Boulevard_Leblois_(Strasbourg)

3 rue de la Mésange, Gerschel Brothers

Figure 280. Elevation and section drawings for a rooftop photography studio at 3 rue de la Mésange.
Source: Archi-wiki, https://www.archi-wiki.org/Adresse:3_rue_de_la_M%C3%A9sange_(Strasbourg)
France, Strasbourg, Place des Orphelins 11 (former Waisenplatz)

Figure 281. Carte de visite mount and photograph of the rooftop studio at 11 Place des Orphelins. Source: Archi-wiki, https://www.archi-wiki.org/Fichier:11_place_des_Orphelins_Strasbourg_5500.jpg

Figure 282. Patrick Hamm, Strasbourg au début du siècle (Strasbourg: Editions du Rhin, 1989).
France, Marseille, Nadar’s Atelier

Figure 283. Section-axonometric view of Nadar’s atelier in Marseille, illustration by Catherine D’Ortoli. Source: Catherine D’Ortoli and Catherine Dureuil-Bourachau, Marseille Monuments, Marseille: Editions Parenthèses, 2019.

France, Colmar, 48 Avenue de la République

Figure 285. Elevation and section drawings of 48 Avenue de la République, 1905. Architect: Charles Matter. Source: Archi-wiki, https://www.archi-wiki.org/Adresse:48_avenue_de_la_R%C3%A9publique_(Colmar)
B. Austria

Austria, Linz, Jungwirthstrasse 8, Fleischmann Fotostudio, 1898

Figure 286. Illustration of the photography studio at Jungwirthstrasse in 1898. The studio is still active and operated by Nik Fleischmann in the same location although the glass studios no longer stands. Source: Nik Fleischmann Fotostudio’s website, https://www.foto-fleischmann.at/

Figure 287. Carte de visite mounts of Fleischmann Fotostudio. Source: Alte Ansichtskarten, https://www.ansichtskartenversand.de
C. Germany

Germany, Lippstadt (am Bahnhof), Philipp Strieth Fotoatelier, 1905

Figure 288. Plan, elevation and carte de visite mount of Philip Strieth Fotoatelier, 1905.
Germany, Hannover


Figure 290. Postcard by Edmund Lill showing his photography studio in Hannover, 1910. Source: Dewiki, https://dewiki.de/Lexikon/Edmund_Lill
Germany, Lueneburg, Brodbänken 5 (transformed into a flat, but still stands)

Figure 291. Eduard Lühr Photo Atelier at the bottom right of the photograph. Source: Stadtarchiv Lüneburg Facebook group, https://m.facebook.com/458710037563744/photos/a.472043559563725/2735942889840436/?type=3&mibext id=2JQ9oc

Figure 292. (left) Photographs of Eduard Lühr Photo Atelier published in Karl-Eckhard Gieseking, “Fotografie in Lüneburg,” Quadrat: magazin über das leben in Lüneburg No: 5 (May 2016); (middle) Google street view of the atelier today; (right) Eduard Lühr Photo Atelier highlighted by the author.
Germany, Zwickau, Oswald Graf Atelier

Figure 293. Carte de visite mount of Oswald Graf Atelier. The atelier is visible in the postcard of Kaiser-Wilhelm Platz, Zwickau.
Source: Alte Ansichtskarten, https://www.ansichtskartenversand.de

Germany, Bingen, J. Dahlem Atelier

Figure 294. Carte de visite mount and street view of J. Dahlem Atelier.
Source: (left) Alte Ansichtskarten, https://www.ansichtskartenversand.de; (right) Google street view.

Germany, Chemnitz, Clemens Seeber Atelier

Figure 295. Carte de visite mount and street of Clemens Seeber Atelier.
Germany, Frankfurt, Atelier Van Bosch

Figure 296. Otto Van Bosch’s studio drawings.
Source: Photographisches Archiv (1879): 182.
Germany, Altenburg, Arno Kersten

Figure 297. Arno Kersten Fotoatelier.

Germany, other examples discovered through *carte de visite* mounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holzkirchen</th>
<th>Wittenberg</th>
<th>Grosschönau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fritz Hugel Atelier</td>
<td>A. C Mohns Atelier</td>
<td>Hartmann Atelier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 298. Carte de visite mounts with the illustration of the photography studios.
Source: Alte Ansichtskarten, https://www.ansichtskartenversand.de
D. England

England, Southampton, Ordnance Survey Photography Studio, 1860, H.James

Figure 299. Photograph of the Ordnance Survey Photography Studio.

Figure 300. Section drawing of the Ordnance Survey Photography Studio.
Source: Luminous-Lint, http://www.luminouslint.com
Figure 301. Plans and sections of Ordnance Survey Photography Studio. 
Source: Josef Maria Eder, Das Atelier und Laboratorium des Photographen (1893), 38.

Figure 302. Interior photograph of Ordnance Survey Photography Studio. 
https://www.militarysurvey.org.uk/Historic/%20/Archive/Equipment/%20&%20Techniques/Lithography/Photo.html
England, Hastings, Memorial Studio, 1864

Figure 303. Photographs of purpose-built Memorial photographic studio and gallery on the upper floor. Source: Historic England online archive, https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1393677

Figure 304. Hastings Cambriedge Road, 1907-08. Source: https://www.gravelroots.net/history/454_2.html
England, Preston, Grand Imperial Studios, 1879

Figure 305. Grand Imperial Studios right before demolition.
Sources: (left) The surviving Victorian Photography Studios in https://www.petworthpenthouse.com
(right) Preston Digital Archive Flickr account: https://www.flickr.com/photos/rsmithbarney

Figure 306. Carte de visite mount of Grand Imperial Studios.
Source: The surviving Victorian Photography Studios in https://www.petworthpenthouse.com
England, Derbyshire, W.W. Winter Studios, 1867

Architect: *Henry Isaac Stevens*

Henry Isaac Stevens is a famous architect in Derby, especially with his church designs, somehow recognizable from the proportions of the windows he used for the facade of the studio. It is a purpose-built two-storey building for the photographer Walter William Winter including a studio on the upper floor and a shop on the street level.

Figure 307. W. W. Winter Studio, 1867.
Source: https://wwwinter.co.uk/; W. W. Winter Heritage Trust https://heritagetrust.wwwinter.co.uk/
Figure 308. Interior photograph of W. W. Winter Studio with the glass skylight.
Source: W. W. Winter Heritage Trust https://heritagetrust.wwwinter.co.uk/

Figure 309. Carte de visite mounts of W. W. Winter Studio.
Source: W. W. Winter Heritage Trust https://heritagetrust.wwwinter.co.uk/
England, Bradford, Appleton Studios, 1887

Figure 310. Appleton Studios, Bradford, 1887.  
Source: Leeds & Bradford Studios  
https://sites.google.com/site/leedsandbradfordstudios/home/appleton-co
England, Loueceston – Cornwall, Haymans Studio, 1890

Figure 311. Haymans Studio, Cornwall, 1890.
Source: The surviving Victorian Photography Studios in https://www.petworthpenthouse.com

England, Nottingham, Studio Morel, 1892

Figure 312. Studio Morel, Notthingham, 1892.
Source: The surviving Victorian Photography Studios in https://www.petworthpenthouse.com
E. Poland

Poland, Gnesen, Atelier Make

Figure 313. Carte de visite mount of Atelier Make.  
Source: Alte Ansichtskarten, https://www.ansichtskartenversand.de
Figure 314. Google street of Atelier Meke.

Figure 315. Postcard of Gnesen Cathedral.  
Source: Polona Digital Library, https://polona.pl/preview/a7183864-43b5-43db-998e-a7ed065ba600
F. Switzerland

Switzerland, Gossauer, Rapperswil Atelier, 1892

Figure 316. *Carte de visite* mount of Rapperswil Atelier.
Source: Alte Ansichtskarten, https://www.ansichtskartenversand.de

Figure 317. Google street view of Rapperswil Atelier.
G. USA

USA, Buffalo, Werner Photography Building, 1895
Architect: Richard A. Waite / a purpose-built daylight studio and shops

Figure 318. Werner Photography Building, Buffalo.
Source: Buffalo photo blog, https://buffalophotoblog.com/the-genesee-gateway

Figure 319. Street elevation of Genesee Street, Buffalo.
Source: “Clinton Brown Company Architecture Project Report,” Genesee Gateway,
http://www.geneseegateway.com/
Figure 320. Werner Photography Building, Buffalo, August 2011.  

Figure 321. Caulkins Building across Werner Photography Building also has a glass rooftop studio. Architect: Franklin Wellington (F.W.) Caulkins, 1886. 
USA, Chicago, Nemecek Studio, 1903

Architect: Frank Randak / a purpose-built daylight studio and shop

Figure 322. Nemecek Studio, Chicago, 1903.
Source: http://www.chicagocacc.org/the-historical-czech-chicagoland

Figure 323. Photograph showing the current interior of Nemecek Studio.
Figure 324. Nemecek Studio, Chicago, photographed by Irina Hynes, 2011.
Source: Irina Hynes Flickr account, https://www.flickr.com/photos/ihynz/5879167663
USA, Texas, Frey and Braunig Studio, 1895

Architect: Mauer & Wesling / a purpose-built building with a studio, bookshop and stationery

Figure 325. Frey and Braunig Studio, Texas [1895].
Source: The Portal to Texas History, https://texashistory.unt.edu/

Figure 326. Frey and Braunig Studio, Texas [1895].
Source: The Portal to Texas History, https://texashistory.unt.edu/
USA, Fort Wayne, Charles Miner Studio, 1887

Figure 327. Exterior and interior views of Charles Miner Studio, Fort Wayne, 1887.
USA, St. Louis, J.C. Strauss Studio, 1896
Architect: Louis Christian Mullgardt

Figure 328. Illustration of J.C. Strauss Studio, St. Louis.
Source: Thomas Yanul’s blog, https://www.thomasyanul.com/strauss1index.html

Figure 329. Photograph of J.C. Strauss’s custom designed studio from the Catalogue of the Annual Exhibition of the Saint Louis Architectural Club, 1899.
USA, Chicago, Melander studio

Figure 330. *Carte de visite* mount of Melander Studio, Chicago.  
Source: Luminous-Lint, http://www.luminouslint.com

Figure 331. Melander Studio, Chicago, photographed by Harold Allen.  
Source: School of the Art Institute of Chicago Library & Special Collections,  
https://digitalcollections.saic.edu/islandora/object/islandora%3Ahallen_378
H. Canada

Canada Québec, Studio Livernois, 1889 (1892)

Architect: Frederick Hacker (studio added later)

Figure 332. Livernois Studio, Québec, 1900.
Source: Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec, https://www.banq.qc.ca/

Figure 333. Livernois Studio, Québec, 1987.
I. New Zealand

New Zealand, Dunedin, 1913

Figure 334. Before the installation of a “glasshouse” to the historic building, Dunedin, 1885. 
Source: Built in Dunedin, https://builtindunedin.com/2013/07/15/lost-undin-4-gillies-street-building/

Figure 335. A glasshouse was installed to the historic building in 1913, photograph from the early 1940s. 
Source: Built in Dunedin, https://builtindunedin.com/2013/07/15/lost-undin-4-gillies-street-building/
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<td>2017 - Present</td>
<td>TED University</td>
<td>Part-Time Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 2019</td>
<td>Başkent University</td>
<td>Part-Time Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 - Present</td>
<td>Stüdyo Nüve Architecture</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 - 2013</td>
<td>CYMZ Architecture</td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 - 2011</td>
<td>Coşkun Architecture</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 - 2007</td>
<td>Birartibir Architecture</td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLICATIONS


AWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Architectural Conservation and Adaptive Reuse of the British Oil Mill in Mersin, XVIII. National Architecture Awards Project/Preservation Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Ulus Modern Culture and Art Center National Architectural Competition, Honorable Mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Thanksgiving and Remembrance Space for the Health Workers Project Competition, Healthcare Workers, Honorable Mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>The Archeological Site of Theodosius Harbor National Architectural Competition, 2nd Prize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Adıyaman active life center, National Architectural Competition, Honorable Mention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021 - 2022</td>
<td>K-Odak Kommagene Visitor Center in Adıyaman, Exhibition Design and Curation, with Stüdyo Nüve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 - 2021</td>
<td>Harbiye Military Museum, Museum and Exhibition Design, with ANB Mimarlık, Stüdyo Nüve and Namık Erkal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 - 2020</td>
<td>Fatsa City Museum, with Stüdyo Nüve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 - 2018</td>
<td>Story of the Hazelnut Museum, with Stüdyo Nüve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 - 2021</td>
<td>Bodrum Castle Underwater Archaeology Museum, Museum and Exhibition Design, with ANB Mimarlık and Stüdyo Nüve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 - 2013</td>
<td>Mersin University Nevit Kodallı Concert Hall Adaptive Reuse Project, with CYMZ Mimarlık and SFMM Mimarlık</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>İstanbul Kurtköy Evleri, with Coşkun Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Can Child Health Clinic, Fatsa, with Coşkun Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 - 2010</td>
<td>Coşkun Residence, with Coşkun Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 - 2007</td>
<td>Siirt University Campus, with Birartbir Architecture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER WORKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2022</td>
<td>Ankara City Atlas, TMMOB Chamber of Architects 2012 publication, graphic design team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>“Smart Cities – Parallel Cases 2” International Design Competition Entry, presentation and exhibition in Westminster University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 - 2010</td>
<td>Metu Faculty of Architecture Catalogue, photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 - 2010</td>
<td>Architectural Design Studios Journal, METU Faculty of Architecture, photographs (for 4 issues)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2006  “Metamorfoz: Kentin Yok Anı” Exhibition, TMMOB Chamber of Architects Architecture Week Events, photographs

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Turkish (mother tongue), English (fluent)