

YILLIK

Annual of Istanbul Studies

2024

6



İSTANBUL
RESEARCH
INSTITUTE

moves beyond the factory in sections regarding working-class housing. She demonstrates that Istanbul's factories did not offer housing, unlike their counterparts in Anatolia, except for barrack-style lodging for some single migrant workers. Consequently, many workers constructed *gecekondu*s in close proximity to the factory (p. 220). Nevertheless, she provides no elucidation of the potential impact of *gecekondu*s on workers' politicization and the city as a whole. I strongly suspect that a more detailed examination of *gecekondu*s might have prompted the author to identify a further example of workers' struggle and aspirations for a political alternative. It is notable that Akgöz herself states that by the end of the 1940s, residents had begun to form neighborhood associations (p. 220). Additionally, she notes that some families were reluctant to relocate to *gecekondu*s because of concerns about safety (pp. 222–223). This also suggests the possibility of intra-class conflict in the urban environment, which is likely to have been mutually reinforcing with the tensions within the factory. Finally, the distinctive nature of Istanbul's factories with regard to housing invites comparison with other factories to ascertain whether housing provision engendered mean-

ingful differences in workers' discontent. These aspects of workers' lives outside the factory cast doubt on the assertion that the predominant site of workers' politicization and struggle was the shop floor, although they do not refute any other major claims of the book. A more balanced approach between the two sides of the factory gate may well have proved more illuminating.

That said, pairing an account of Turkey's political economy in the first half of the twentieth century with an account of workers' politicization and struggle is a great achievement. Essentially, this work tests the premises of Kemalist developmentalism and modernism at their very heart: the factory. Akgöz demonstrates that the Kemalist regime prioritized fostering conditions of capitalist development and solidifying state-centered authority over workers' welfare and political and social rights. However, welfare provisions and a partial relaxation of restrictions on political and social rights emerged as a response to both the imagined threat of communism and the imminent danger of workers' increasing politicization and struggle. The Turkish economic and political regime between the 1920s

and 1950s was therefore negotiated between different groups of actors, and workers were a significant part of these negotiations, albeit in different ways at different times. Akgöz skillfully demonstrates this by using a variety of sources, including expert reports on factories, workers' personal files, and petitions, to weave together a comprehensive and successful account of Turkish state-led industrialization.

Göker Giresunlu

Central European University
giresunlu_goker@student.ceu.edu

ORCID: 0009-0003-2637-5038

CC BY 3.0

<https://doi.org/10.53979/yillik.2024.14>

1 See, for example, Ahmet Makal, *Ameleden İşçiye: Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Emek Tarihi Çalışmaları* (Istanbul: İletişim, 2007), 159. Also cited by Akgöz on page 182, where she counters Makal's calculations about wages in state-run factories.

2 Can Nacar, "Our Lives Were Not as Valuable as an Animal: Workers in State-Run Industries in World-War-II Turkey," in "Ottoman and Republican Turkish Labour History," ed. Touraj Atabaki and Gavin D. Brockett, supplement, *International Review of Social History* 54, no. S17 (December 2009): S143–S166; Caroline E. Arnold, "In the Service of Industrialization: Etatism, Social Services and the Construction of Industrial Labour Forces in Turkey (1930–50)," *Middle Eastern Studies* 48, no. 3 (May 2012): 363–385.

Batu Bayülgen and Turgut Saner, *Architectural Description of Byzantine Remains in Istanbul: Excavations and Surveys in the City within the Walls (1927–2021)*. Istanbul: Koç University Press, 2024. xxii + 696 pages, 44 plans. ISBN 9786259433493

Istanbul has seen significant urban renewal and expansion projects since the 1970s. These developments have yielded a wealth of archaeological data and created numerous opportunities to explore the city's complex settlement history. However, despite the potential of this new archaeological data and growing interest in Byzantium, the archaeology of Byzant-

tine Constantinople remains poorly understood because of a notorious lack of systematic publications, especially in recent decades.¹ Apart from well-documented sites like St. Polyeuktos, the Hippodrome, the Great Palace, Yenikapı, and Haydarpaşa, our knowledge of Istanbul's Byzantine archaeology remains considerably limited, particularly regarding miscellaneous remains discovered at tiny building plots throughout the city. However, if carefully documented and analyzed, these scattered archaeological records could significantly enhance our understanding of the Byzantine capital as a physical space and of past human life in the city.²

In their long-awaited *Architectural Description of Byzantine Remains in Istanbul*, Batu Bayülgen and Turgut Saner seek to fill this scholarly gap

by making previously unpublished physical evidence from the archives of the Istanbul Archaeological Museums (IAM) accessible for further scientific analysis. This unique work, the product of nearly two decades of meticulous digitization, data analysis, and processing, features detailed descriptions of architectural remains and plans mapping the archaeological remains excavated within the Theodosian Land Walls. Bayülgen and Saner, both architectural historians trained at Istanbul Technical University (where Saner still serves as a faculty member), have digitized the IAM excavation files, covering fieldwork conducted between 1927 and 2021.³ The extensive data presented in this much-anticipated work introduce new questions for Byzantine archaeologists and Byzantinists in general, and provide substantial material to

162 stimulate further research on Byzantine archaeology, late Antique and Byzantine Constantinople, and Istanbul's historical topography.

The publication comprises two substantial volumes, with the first consisting of a comprehensive text and the second a selection of architectural plans. The first volume, spanning 696 pages, is divided into two parts. The first part provides a brief introduction to archaeological research on Byzantine Constantinople, offering a concise overview of previous studies. It covers the literature on Byzantine-period excavations in Istanbul, focusing on work conducted by foreign institutions (1927–1974) and the IAM. The second part delves into the regions of Byzantine Constantinople and the city's major architectural monuments, presenting a brief overview of the physical remains uncovered and documented by the IAM. An appendix follows, where Bayülgen shares his insights on the Church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus based on his own architectural survey of the monument, which resulted in an updated—and much-anticipated—architectural plan of this intriguing Justinianic monument.

The second volume (the folio volume) contains forty-four plans based on the 2006 photogrammetric cadastral plan of Istanbul. Plan 1 (scale: 1:10,000), which seeks to update Wolfgang Müller-Wiener's map of Byzantine Constantinople, illustrates the historical peninsula of Istanbul, mapping the architectural remains of Byzantine structures superimposed onto the modern urban layout. Plans 2 through 7 (scale: 1:2,000) offer detailed views of urban areas, while Plans 8 through 44 focus on regional plans, specific monuments (e.g., the Golden Gate, Gül Camii, the so-called Beyazid churches, the Arch of Theodosius, the Polyeuktos Complex and its environs, the Myrelaion), and historical neighborhoods such as the Mangana and Blachernae. These plans are valuable assets for precisely locating Byzantine remains within Istanbul's dense urban layout.

While there is much to commend this publication, it also has a number of

limitations. Regarding the publication's coverage, Bayülgen and Saner focus exclusively on archaeological excavations conducted within the limits of Istanbul's "historical peninsula"—specifically, the area enclosed by the Theodosian Land Walls. It would certainly be valuable to see the archaeology of Byzantine Constantinople's hinterland covered in a future publication, especially given the significant archaeological discoveries made there in recent years. These include the monastic complexes currently being excavated in Tuzla and Küçükyalı, unique bath complexes in Kartal and Eyüp, and important remains found in Bakırköy, Silivri, Dragos, Samandıra, and Küçükçekmece.

An additional matter concerns the timeframe. While the publication's title promises coverage of the excavation files from 1927 to 2021, Byzantinists familiar with the archaeology of Byzantine Constantinople may notice that recent fieldwork data is not fully represented in this publication. For instance, Plan 8 lacks information on the fieldwork conducted between the 1980s and 2020s along the Marmara Sea Walls, and there is no mention of the stone docks discovered in Yenikapı, which are among the most distinctive examples of Byzantine maritime architecture. Additionally, the south chapel recently uncovered during the latest restoration of the Pantokrator Monastery in Zeyrek is similarly absent from the architectural plans, even though it was published in 2017.⁴

Another key observation concerns Bayülgen and Saner's intended audience and the goals they aim to achieve. As they explain in the introduction, their publication seeks to update Müller-Wiener's seminal *Bildleikon zur Topographie Istanbul's*, which remains indispensable for scholars of Byzantium and serves as an excellent guide for anyone exploring the remains of Byzantine Constantinople. Unlike Müller-Wiener's influential book, Bayülgen and Saner's study is aimed more narrowly at advanced readers in the field of Byzantine architectural history. However, as I explain below, Bayülgen and Saner fall short of

fully meeting their objective, largely because of structural issues and a lack of sufficient depth and scholarly context regarding previous literature. Their publication thus compares unfavorably to Müller-Wiener's work and its clear organization, comprehensive categorization of architectural remains, and detailed references to prior scholarship.

Two observations can be made about the structure of Bayülgen and Saner's book. First, its internal categorization is problematic. The physical evidence of architectural monuments and complexes is separated into two sections, one covering fieldwork by "foreign" archaeologists and another focusing on work by the IAM. Unfortunately, this fragments the information, spreading details about the same architectural monument or archaeological site across different chapters rather than considering them holistically. Moreover, this categorization results in an imbalance in the coverage of the archival material on previous fieldwork, with excavations conducted by the IAM, with its abundant archival material and trench photographs, occupying a disproportionate amount of space. In contrast, the archival material related to "foreign excavations" is considerably limited, except for resources from the German Archaeological Institute in Istanbul.

Another structural issue concerns the authors' methodology of mapping Byzantine remains using a spatial division based on the "regions of Byzantine Constantinople." These regions were first delineated in the fifth-century *Notitia*, but they did not remain static throughout the history of Byzantine Constantinople.⁵ For instance, while there were fourteen regions in the fifth century (the number used by the authors), this may have decreased to twelve after the ninth century, according to Paul Magdalino.⁶ Taking this into account, is mapping the monuments from late Antiquity through the late Byzantine period using these regional divisions a sound choice? Do we even know the exact boundaries of these regions?⁷ Would it not be more reliable to use today's urban plan together with contemporary urban

districts? Unfortunately, these questions are not adequately addressed in the authors' text, despite their inclusion of a section on the descriptions of the regions. That section also lacks references to key works on the regions of Constantinople by scholars like Thomas Matthews, Albrecht Berger, and Paul Magdalino, leaving readers without a thorough analysis of a major structural choice in the text.⁸

Considering the architectural data presented in the publication, one can say that while Bayülgen and Saner's text is comprehensive, it is not always comprehensible (especially compared to Müller-Wiener's). The information presented in the entries is often difficult to digest because of the lengthy descriptions of architectural remains. While such detailed descriptions could have been a distinguishing strength, the text does not contain sufficient visuals to help readers visualize the described spaces and orient themselves within the archaeological sites, resulting in a significant weakness. For example, detailed measurements and specifications, such as the diameter of every single column in the Basilica Cistern and the distances between each column (pp. 252–254), are overwhelming without visual aids.

Moreover, these detailed entries lack information on the archaeological contexts of these architectural complexes (and, expectedly, discussions of small finds). Archaeologists will likely be dissatisfied with this aspect of the publication, as it hinders a holistic understanding of these sites in terms of architectural chronology, function, identification, period of use, reasons for abandonment, renewal, reoccupation, and the like. While a publication focused on architecture cannot cover all aspects of archaeological contexts, the omission of architectural chronology is a significant weakness (both in the text and in the architectural plans). Consequently, the human aspect is largely absent, and the architectural descriptions do not fully convey the broader dynamics of past human life in Byzantine Constantinople.

Another issue is that throughout the text, the authors consistently

adhere to traditional labels proposed by earlier scholarship that are often based on ambiguous physical evidence and a common tendency to link newly uncovered remains to well-known monuments. Bayülgen and Saner uncritically accept these established identifications for most monuments, even though many have been challenged in recent scholarship. For example, the so-called "baptistry of the Hodegon Monastery" is now widely recognized as not being part of the Hodegon complex.⁹ Similarly, the Monastery of Christ the Savior Philanthropos, traditionally placed in the Mangana region, is now generally accepted to be located elsewhere.¹⁰

The meticulously crafted architectural plans are the most distinguishing feature of this publication. However, an area for improvement would be the inclusion of architectural layers and chronological details concerning the monuments, to better illustrate the city's architectural development, urban expansion, and landscape transformation over time. One issue, noted above, is the omission of certain architectural features. For example, Plan 4 fails to include all the architectural remains of the Theodosian harbor at Yenikapı, particularly the stone docks, one of the few physical remnants of a Byzantine-period harbor in Constantinople, as well as the wooden docks discovered in Yenikapı. These unique wooden remains, which also present an incomparable opportunity to date archaeological remains and layers through archaeometric analysis, are entirely omitted by the authors. This omission raises the question of whether architecture is being considered in this publication solely in terms of brick and stone, and why the detailed documentation does not also include wooden remains (such as those uncovered at Yenikapı) as evidence of "soft architecture."

Lastly, if the book undergoes a second edition, it would benefit greatly from a careful copyeditor, as well as an editor with extensive knowledge of Byzantine Constantinople, to address numerous errors, including typos in both the text and the bibliography. For example, in French titles, "Andréossy"

is missing an accent on pages 3 and 679; in German, "M'it" appears on page 680; and in Turkish, "Serदारoğlu" is misspelled as "Serdaroglu" on page 23, footnote 67, while "Mufid" should be corrected to "Müfid." More critical issues involve errors in transliterating Latin into Ancient Greek, such as rendering "Antiochus praepositus" as "Αντιόχου πρεποσίτου" instead of the correct "Αντιόχου πραιποσίτου" on page 47, footnote 4. The lack of a skilled editor is also evident in the imbalance and absence of footnotes referencing previous fieldwork and scholarship. For example, Ward Perkins's work is mentioned on page 49 but lacks a corresponding footnote. While the extensive literature on the archaeology of Byzantine Constantinople cannot be fully accommodated in a single publication, a few key omissions should have been included in the literature review. Notably, the archaeological reports by Karl Lehmann-Hartleben, Raymond Janin, and Ernest Mamboury would have been valuable additions.¹¹ More critically, the omission of Ken Dark and Ferudun Özgümüş's book as well as some of the most recent archaeological reports, articles, and dissertations is a significant oversight, which I also attribute to the editor.

Overall, the publication under review represents a significant contribution to the Byzantine archaeology of Istanbul. It will undoubtedly serve as a valuable resource for scholars in the coming decades. The new data presented in the publication is complex and intriguing, ideally suited for analysis by a team of archaeologists, art historians, and architects. Looking ahead, two main tasks await us: first, Bayülgen and Saner's book, which many Byzantinists would like to see available in a digital database format, represents a crucial step toward making the archival material from the Istanbul Archaeological Museums accessible to a broader audience for further scientific inquiry. Second, it is up to us to interpret, and critically examine, the published data, establishing multilayered connections between Byzantine remains to better understand and reconstruct Byzantine Constantinople as a physical space. As field archaeologists of Byzantium, we should also consider building a data-

164 base for a more holistic understanding of past human life in the Byzantine capital, one that will allow us to better engage with and integrate data relating to the palaeoenvironmental sciences, palynology, archaeobotany, zooarchaeology, bioarchaeology, and other related fields.

Ayşe Ercan Kydonakis
Simon Fraser University
ayse_ercan_kydonakis@sfu.ca

ORCID: 0000-0003-3228-4784

CC BY 3.0
<https://doi.org/10.53979/yillik.2024.15>

1 For an analysis of the history and the politics of Byzantine archaeology in Istanbul, see Barış Altan and Ayşe Ercan Kydonakis, "Discovering and Preserving Byzantine Constantinople: Archaeology and Heritage Policies in Istanbul," in *Proceedings of the Plenary Sessions: The 24th International Congress of Byzantine Studies; Venice and Padua, 22–27 August 2022*, ed. Emiliano Fiori and Michele Trizio (Venice: Edizioni Ca' Foscari, 2022), 7–25; and my forthcoming article, Ayşe Ercan Kydonakis, "Historia (Non?) Grata: Byzantine Archaeology of Istanbul during World War I and the Allied Occupation," *European Review of History* (forthcoming, 2024).

2 A notable effort in this regard, one that somehow receives no mention in the work under review here, is the lengthy analysis of survey data published by Ken Dark and Ferudun Özgümüş, *Constantinople: Archaeology of a Byzantine Megapolis* (Oxford: Oxbow, 2013).

3 Although the book's title specifically refers to these dates, the 1921–1923 Mangana excavations by Robert Demangel and Ernest Mamboury are given considerable space, while the most recent fieldwork remains uncovered. For further information on these recent excavations, see Ayşe

Ercan (Kydonakis), "The Mangana Quarter in Byzantine Constantinople (843–1453 C.E.): Reinterpreting an Architectural Complex in Sarayburnu/Istanbul Through Archaeology" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2022); and, Ercan Kydonakis, "Archaeology between Imperial Imagination and Territorial Sovereignty: The French Occupation Army and the Mangana Excavations in Sarayburnu/Gülhane, 1920–23," in *Discovering Byzantium in Istanbul: Scholars, Institutions, and Challenges, 1800–1955*, ed. Olivier Delouis and Brigitte Pitarakis (Istanbul: Istanbul Research Institute, 2022), 303–328.

4 Ferudun Özgümüş, Ü. Melda Ermiş, and Hayri Fehmi Yılmaz, "Report of the New Findings from Byzantine Istanbul," *Istanbul Mitteilungen* 67 (2017): 329–356.

5 The earliest scholarship on the regions of Constantinople is by the sixteenth-century French traveler Pierre Gilles, followed by the seventeenth-century contributions of Charles du Fresne du Cange, who argued for possible borders for the regions (Gilles, *Antiquities of Constantinople; Du Cange, Historia Byzantina*, 1680). In the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, A. Van Millingen, A. M. Schneider, G. Prinzing, E. Mamboury, R. Janin, W. Müller-Wiener, and A. Berger dealt with the regional divisions in Constantinople. Paul Magdalino's recent contribution presents a detailed discussion on the concept of territorial subdivisions in Constantinople and their changing meaning through the centuries. For instance, regarding the transformation of urban terms, Magdalino observes that in the twelfth century, "regions" and "geitonia" were used interchangeably, with the former term replacing the latter after the thirteenth century. For this, see page 24 in Paul Magdalino, "Neighbourhoods in Byzantine Constantinople," in *Hinter den Mauern und auf dem offenen Land: Leben im Byzantinischen Reich*, ed. Falko Daim and Jörg Drauschke (Mainz: Verlag des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums, 2016), 23–30. For the most recent publication on Byzantine neighborhoods, see Fotini Kondyli and Benjamin Anderson, eds., *The Byzantine Neighbourhood: Urban Space and Political Action* (London: Routledge, 2021).

6 Magdalino, "Neighbourhoods," 24. See also pages 352–353 in Albrecht Berger, "Regionen und Strassen im frühen Konstantinopel," *IstMitt* 47 (1997): 349–414.

7 For instance, for the fourteenth century, see Cyril A. Mango, "Le mystère de la XIV^e région de Constantinople," in *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron*, ed. Vincent Déroche, Denis Feissel, and Cécile Morrisson (Paris: Association des amis du Centre d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 2002), 449–455.

8 John Matthews, "The *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae*," in *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*, ed. Lucy Grig and Gavin Kelly (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 81–115. For Magdalino and Berger, see note 6, above.

9 For an alternative location for the Hodegon Monastery somewhere closer to the Church of St. Sophia, see Alfons Maria Schneider, *Byzanz: Vorarbeiten zur Topographie und Archäologie der Stadt* (Berlin, 1936), 90; Albrecht Berger, "Streets and Public Spaces in Constantinople," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 54 (2000): 161–172.

10 For a recent historical analysis of the Christ Philanthropos Monasteries in Constantinople, see Nicholas Melvani, "The Duplication of the Double Monastery of Christ Philanthropos in Constantinople," *Revue des études byzantines* 74 (2016): 361–384.

11 Karl Lehmann-Hartleben, *Die antiken Hafenanlagen des Mittelmeeres: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Städtebaues im Altertum* (Leipzig: Dieterich, 1923; Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1963); Ernest Mamboury, "La nouvelle citerne byzantine de Tchifté-Sérail (Istanbul)," *Byzantion* 11, no. 1 (1936): 167–180; Mamboury, "Les fouilles byzantines à Istanbul et dans sa banlieue immédiate aux XIX^e et XX^e siècles," *Byzantion* 11, no. 1 (1936): 229–283; Mamboury, "Les fouilles byzantines à Istanbul et dans sa banlieue immédiate en 1936–1937," *Byzantion* 13, no. 1 (1938): 301–310; Raymond Janin, "La banlieue asiatique de Constantinople: Étude historique et topographique," *Échos d'Orient* 21, nos. 127–128 (1922): 335–386; Janin, "La banlieue asiatique de Constantinople (suite [I])," *Échos d'Orient* 22, no. 129 (1923): 50–58; Janin, "La topographie de Constantinople byzantine: Études et découvertes (1918–1938)," *Échos d'Orient* 38, nos. 193–194 (1939): 118–150; Janin, "La topographie de Constantinople byzantine: Études et découvertes (1938–1950)," *Revue des études byzantines* 8 (1950): 197–214; Janin, "Constantinople byzantine: Notes sur de nouvelles découvertes," *Revue des études byzantines* 12 (1954): 210–213.

Nurçin İleri, der. *Bir Cereyan Hâsıl Oldu: Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e İstanbul'da Elektrikli Yaşam. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2024. x + 231 sayfa, 39 şekil, 1 tablo. ISBN: 9789753334273*

Elektriğin üretimi, dağıtımı ve tüketimi, teknik altyapının gelişimine bağlı olduğu kadar İbrahim Şinasi'nin 1864 yılında *Tasvir-i Efkâr* gazetesinde gecenin aydınlatılmasına (*tenvir-i leyl*) (s. 32) metaforik olarak yaklaştığı yazısındaki gibi toplumsal, ekonomik ve kültürel veçheleri de olan çok

katmanlı bir konudur. *Bir Cereyan Hâsıl Oldu: Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e İstanbul'da Elektrikli Yaşam*, elektriğin gündelik hayatımıza ne şekilde girdiğini, elektrik ile emeğin ve üretimin değişen yüzünü, gecenin ve binaların aydınlatılmasının kent hayatı ve tüketim kültürüne etkilerini tarih, iktisat, mimarlık, şehir planlama ve endüstriyel tasarım gibi farklı disiplinlerin perspektifinden ele alıyor. Birinci bölümde, kitabın editörü Nurçin İleri, on dokuzuncu yüzyıl sonlarından yirminci yüzyıla elektriğin üretimi, dağıtımı ve tüketimine ilişkin aydınlatıcı bir giriş ile Osmanlı'dan cumhuriyete elektrikli hayata geçişin mihenk taşlarına dokunarak

okuyucunun ufkunu açan tarihsel ve analitik bir çerçeve çiziyor. İleri, on dokuzuncu yüzyılda Avrupalı şirketlerin Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndan aldıkları imtiyazlar neticesinde İstanbul, İzmir, Selanik ve Beyrut gibi nüfusun ve ticaretin yoğun olduğu büyük liman kentlerinin havagazı ile aydınlatılmasından elektrik ile aydınlatılmasına geçiş sürecinin İstanbul'da şehir şebekesinin kurulduğu 1910'lu yıllara dek devam ettiğini belirtiyor (s. 2). Bu genel girişin ardından, *Bir Cereyan Hâsıl Oldu*, elektriğin Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndan Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'ne İstanbul'daki mace-rasını kronolojik olarak takip eden metinlerden ziyade tematik, müstakil,