

YILLIK

Annual of Istanbul Studies

2023

5



İSTANBUL
RESEARCH
INSTITUTE

semantic field, and makes a case for the possibility that some of the landscape and cityscape depictions in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century wall paintings might also be considered paradise imagery on some level. In this way, he manages to connect a phenomenon usually viewed through the lens of modernization or Westernization to earlier Ottoman and more broadly Islamic practices. The chapter is rounded out by a discussion of Western furniture that appears in wall paintings as a symbol of modernity.

The third and longest chapter is a systematic analysis of the image of Istanbul in Ottoman wall painting. After a brief discussion of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Istanbul imagery in maps and manuscripts, the bulk of the chapter is devoted to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century murals. Examples in Anatolia (Muğla, Bursa, Birgi [Izmir], Merzifon [Amasya], Tokat, Manisa, and Çanakkale), are followed by those from Rumelia (Plovdiv, three examples from Lesbos, three from Larissa [Thessaly], and an engraving in the Benaki Museum), Syria (five examples from Damascus), and finally Istanbul. Okçuoğlu is careful to point out that the paintings in the provinces prefer the topographical depiction of the city, while depictions within Istanbul tend to focus on individual buildings or gardenscapes as synecdoches of the capital. There are differences, too, he notes as he analyzes individual paintings, among the provinces. While depictions in Syrian mansions are the most detailed

of all, depicting the newest buildings alongside older symbolic ones with great care, those in Greece tend to prefer the overall depiction of the city without its mosques. Thus, while Arab nationalism does not yet seem to clash with allegiance to the empire, Okçuoğlu argues, the depictions in Greece and the Balkans have a different story to tell. Of particular interest here are the depictions in different parts of the Topkapı Palace, some of which are only available through photographs. The paintings have a wide variety of components, ranging from contemporary architecture to archaeological ruins to steamboats, combining real and imaginary spaces and buildings. Other buildings in the capital spread over its vast geography from Bebek to Vefa display a variety of themes and buildings, but almost all of them ride that fine line indicated in the title of the book, between the imaginary and the real.

The conclusion restates some of the major findings of the book, laying the emphasis on the difference between the center and the peripheral regions of the empire, questioning once again why wall paintings in Istanbul do not depict the city in toto, focusing instead on individual building types, while wall paintings in the provinces, from the Balkans to Syria, prefer the topographical depictions of the city. He connects this to the capital being an object of desire for those located outside of it, and somewhat taken for granted by those within it. The differences among the provincial depictions are summed up once again. One

point mentioned most clearly in the conclusion and perhaps not equally explicitly in the book itself is change over time: how in the time frame extending from the reign of Mahmud II to that of Abdülaziz, or from 1808 to 1876, images and their meanings naturally changed. Also emphasized in the conclusion is the lack of human figures in the depictions, as well as an altogether absence of wall paintings in mosques of the capital.

This survey of images of Istanbul in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century murals brings together an important group of artworks and outlines for us how the capital is depicted and thus perceived. It is to be commended for bringing together examples from different parts of the empire, of different styles, and carrying variant meanings. Its examination of meaning and purpose, going beyond stylistic analysis, is an important step in the direction of understanding these beautiful images. Okçuoğlu convincingly shows that even if the images themselves are to be located somewhere between the real and the imaginary, they have a lot to tell us about the social, political, and artistic realities of Ottoman life in the period.

Emine Fetvacı
Boston College
fetvacı@bc.edu

ORCID: 0000-0002-3931-3560

CC BY 3.0
<https://doi.org/10.53979/yillik.2023.15>

Dimitris Stamatopoulos,
*Byzantium after the Nation:
The Problem of Continuity
in Balkan Historiographies.*
Translated by Diane
Shugart. Budapest: Central
European University Press,
2022. 410 pages, 2 tables.
ISBN: 9789633863077

Originally published in Greek in 2009,¹ in the new English version *Byzantium after the Nation: The Problem of Continuity in Balkan Historiographies* published in 2022, Dimitris Stamatopoulos provides a critical comparative analysis of historians found, to a greater or lesser extent, on the margins of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Balkan historiography. Thus, Stamatopoulos delves into the writings of scholars who went against the tide of mainstream nation-state building and consciously

diverged from the canon by focusing on the empire. In the case of Greek historiography, Stamatopoulos reads Manouel Gedeon against Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, the doyen of modern Greek nation-state-focused historiography, and to a lesser degree, Spyridon Zambelios. As far as the Bulgarian historiography is concerned, Stamatopoulos focuses on Gavril Krâstevich's work, which he analyzes in contradistinction to various models of origins put forth in his time by his compatriots, especially Marin Dri-

212 nov. The Russian diplomat Konstantin Leont'ev provides an extremely interesting case of a man who served pan-Slavism in his professional capacity but questioned it in his writings. Şemseddin Sami, or Frashëri, was the Ottoman Albanian who initially espoused the empire along ideas developed by the Young Ottomans, only to break with it later, when he shifted to promoting Albanian nationalism. In the post-Ottoman period, Nicolae Iorga focused on the Byzantine Middle Ages and investigated the continuity issue in Romanian historiography largely by suggesting a correction to the canon set by his teacher Alexandru Dimitrie Xenopol. In Turkey, M. Fuat Köprülü developed his approach to Byzantium and the Ottoman Empire largely against the grain of his time, as expressed by Afet Inan.

In his comparative investigation, Stamatopoulos is not content with simply comparing the works of scholars populating such a rich pantheon of Ottoman and post-Ottoman historiography. For him, Byzantium and, within Byzantium, Iconoclasm hold a key position for understanding the reasons behind canonical and divergent interpretations of history. As he rightly points out, history should not be studied in a vacuum. Historians are always byproducts of their era, and their work reflects their quest for political meaning and value. Thus, Stamatopoulos argues that the positioning of each historian from the margins (as well as those making up the canon) should be treated as much like a scholarly exercise as a covert political declaration. This is what makes iconoclasm a metonymy for a modern fight between those in favor of the national—identified in *Byzantium after the Nation* with the iconoclasts—versus the imperial—identified with the iconolaters. In other words, except for Iorga, the divergent historians whom Stamatopoulos studies wish to save the Ottoman Empire, either literally as a state or metaphorically as a legacy, because by saving the Ottoman Empire they may safeguard continuity. Of course, continuity means different things to each one of its defenders, but the common denominator is that it relates to rescuing the empire. Significantly, saving the

Ottoman Empire is conditioned on the kind of interpretation each historian provides for Byzantium and its continuity or discontinuity in Ottoman times. Interestingly, these divergent historians do not question the nation. Their intention is to suggest alternative-to-the-canon ways to adapt ethnic identity to a supranational imperial identity and, conversely, imperial identity to ethnic identity. For example, Gedeon wished to save the Ottoman Empire because, in his mind, it was the last bulwark against the dissolution of a pan-Orthodox ecumene, which the emerging nation-states in the Balkans threatened. Given Paparrigopoulos's predisposition in favor of iconoclasm, Gedeon had to protect iconolatry. In other words, if, for Paparrigopoulos, iconoclasm was a metonymy for rationalization and secularization—namely, processes that could secure a place among the Western “civilized” world for Greece—then, for Gedeon, iconolatry acquired a new meaning, that of resistance to the defeat of the empire that could stand guardian of a unified Orthodox world. In doing so, however, Gedeon does not dispute the Greek nation. In his turn, Köprülü wished to save the Ottoman Empire from Byzantium in order to contribute to the formation of the nascent Turkish nation-state. In his work, he elaborated on what he viewed as the discontinuity between the Byzantine Empire and the Ottoman Empire and on alternative sources of statehood for the Ottomans, ones that would be more Turkish/Turkic and more Islamic, in order to buttress Ottoman history. In other words, for Köprülü, the Ottoman Empire needed to be preserved so that the modern Turks maintained their connection to their distant past. Iconoclasm offered Köprülü with an example of how an-ionic Islam influenced, in his view, Byzantium, meaning that not only was Byzantium rather insignificant as a model to be emulated by the Ottomans but instead that Islam—namely, the religion of the Ottoman Turks—had influenced a key chapter in the history of the Byzantines.

Byzantium after the Nation proves the breadth of its author's versatile erudition. Stamatopoulos is known to be

well-versed in modern Balkan history. Likewise, he is confident with working on the Balkans' medieval past as well as antiquity. Moreover, he critically analyzes Balkan historiography in its various expressions in juxtaposition with Western historiography, with which Balkan historians found themselves either in agreement or disagreement. More than a purely textual approach, Stamatopoulos provides a contextual analysis. He delves into the history of the historians that he examines with a view to understanding the processes and turning points that made them who they were: he discusses their education, professional careers, and especially the intellectual networks in which they belonged. To do so, he relies on the work of other contemporary historians, many of them from the Balkans, as well as on archival research. Thus, Stamatopoulos carves for his readers a rare path into the work produced in the Balkans in Balkan languages. He thereby turns himself into a critical conveyor of knowledge that would otherwise have been inaccessible to most of his readers. He is a critical conveyor both in the sense that the material discussed is critical for a better understanding of Byzantium and continuity debates in the Ottoman and post-Ottoman world, and because Stamatopoulos reads this material in a critical manner. This allows him to produce not just parallel expositions of different Balkan historiographies but, importantly, a composite work on the topic of continuity in Balkan historiography, the place of empire and nation-state, and of the metonymic of iconoclasm in it. Yet, Stamatopoulos does not convey only the approaches of contemporary historians and archival finds that would have otherwise been unknown to most of his readers; he also similarly weaves into his analysis excerpts in translation from the works produced by the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century historians themselves. Carefully placed in his text, they turn his analysis even more vivid and convincing.

Stamatopoulos's work is for advanced readers: people who have a good enough knowledge not only of the late Ottoman period and the post-Ot-

toman nation-states but also of Byzantine history and, at least a cursory, knowledge of antiquity in the Balkans; specifically, one needs to be acquainted with the Pelasgians, and the Proto-Bulgarians, the Leleges, and the Huns. As a translation from Greek, the book was originally written with the advanced Greek reader in mind. As much as the Greek reader profits, for example, by Stamatopoulos's masterful explanation of Romanticism as a cultural and political movement in the period he discusses, the non-Greek reader would in all probability have benefitted by a lengthier explanation of iconoclasm as a historical phenomenon. This is even more so, if one takes into consideration the centrality of iconoclasm in Stamatopoulos's analysis. Other readers might benefit from a short introduction to the Tanzimat and the Hamidian eras,

as well as Balkan nationalisms and the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. In this way, this book would become more approachable for scholars who study other parts of the world and could be more easily used for comparisons with such other geographies. Also, although particularly rare, it might be that titles of publications mentioned in the original language come to the reader with spelling mistakes; for example, *İslamiyetin Yayılması İçin Yapılan Çalışmalar* instead of *İslamiyet'in Yayılması için Yapılan Çalışmalar* (p. 282).

Yet these criticisms are all minor compared to the strengths of this book. For an advanced reader, Stamatopoulos's critical synthesis of Balkan historiographies from the margins offers not only an understanding of these particular works but also a better

grasp of the period in question and, finally, the canon as well. It likewise opens up more paths for comparative works with other empires and other geographies. Stamatopoulos has produced a vastly interesting and unique analysis and, in doing so, has suggested a useful and original methodology.

Artemis Papatheodorou

Harvard University,
Koç University
artemisuni@yahoo.gr

ORCID: 0000-0001-5587-2891

CC BY 3.0

<https://doi.org/10.53979/yillik.2023.16>

1 Stamatopoulos, *To Βυζάντιο μετά το έθνος: Το πρόβλημα της συνέχειας στις βαλκανικές ιστοριογραφίες* (Athens: Alexandria, 2009).

Uğur Tanyeli, *Korku Metropolü İstanbul:*

18. Yüzyıldan Bugüne.

İstanbul: Metis, 2022. 432

sayfa, 26 şekil. ISBN:

9786053162643

Korkular mekânı nasıl kurarlar? Modernleşmeyi metropoller ve korkular ilişkisi üzerinden okuyabilir miyiz? Öyleyse, bu metropollerden İstanbul'a özgü korkular var mıdır—İstanbulullar nelerden korkar, bu korkularla nasıl kentsel mekânlar üretirler? Ve bugün bu korkuların tarihlerini yazmak nasıl tarihyografik potansiyeller barındırır? Uğur Tanyeli'nin Metis'ten çıkan kitabı *Korku Metropolü İstanbul: 18. Yüzyıldan Bugüne*, bu soruların izini sürüyor. İstanbul'un son üç yüzyılda bir "korku imparatorluğu" olarak nasıl var edildiğinin, bu korkularla başa çıkmak için toplumca nasıl disiplin rejim ve mekânları üretildiğinin tarihini yazmayı deniyor.

Mekânların betonla, demirle, taşla inşa edildiği kadar beşeri pratiklerce de üretildiği önermesi, Tanyeli'nin mimarlık tarihi düşüncesinde kurucu bir yere sahip—güncel söyleşilerinde, kitaplarında, köşe yazılarında, derslerindeki tartışmaları çoğunlukla mekân

nın toplumsallığını ve bu yüzden de kaçınılmaz olarak siyasallığını merkeze alıyor. Bir başka deyişle, Tanyeli'nin mimarlık kavrayışı mekânların salt fiziksel özelliklerine odaklanıp bunları bağımsız ve verili olgular olarak değerlendirmeye karşı çıkarak bu mekânların hangi toplumsal pratiklerce tarihsel olarak nasıl kurulduğunun önemi üzerine temelleniyor. Bunda özellikle gündelik hayattaki davranış örüntülerinin ve alışkanlıkların rolüne bakıyor; toplumsal hâletiruhiyelerin, imgelerin, normların, dolaşımdaki sembollerin, gündelik ilişki ve eylemlerin kentte nasıl mekânsallıklar-kamusallıklar ürettiği ile ilgileniyor.

Toplumsal olanın ontolojik olarak mekânsal oluşu, sosyal bilimlerin 1990'lı yıllardaki "mekânsal dönüm"ü ile artık kanıksanmış bir bakış açısı olsa da, Tanyeli'nin de işaret ettiği gibi, bu anlayışın mimarlık tarihinde, özellikle Türkiye'de yaygınlaşması görece yeni ve çok zengin bir literatür hâlâ yazılmayı bekliyor.¹ Tanyeli'nin son dönemdeki ilgisi özellikle toplumsal davranış ve duyulanma kalıplarının mekânı nasıl zihnen ve fiziksel olarak inşa ettiğini, yani psikososyal hallerin mekânı örgütleyişini anlamaya ve bunların yazılmamış tarihlerini yazmaya yönelik; yine Metis'in yayım-

ladığı bir önceki kitabı *Mimar Sinan: Tarihsel ve Muhayyel*, günümüz Türkiye'sindeki psikozları, mitleri, kaygıları Mimar Sinan kültürü üzerinden anlamaya dair bir denemeydi.² Bu ilginin devamı olarak görülebilecek *Korku Metropolü İstanbul* ise kolektif korkuların ve bu korkuların yarattığı travmaların, paranoyaların, disiplin arzularının İstanbul'u nasıl biçimlendirdiğine odaklanıyor.

Metropollerin korku ile ilişkisine, modernleşme süreçlerini anlamak için sıkça başvurulmuştur; Tanyeli'nin de kitabında işaret ettiği gibi, Paris, New York, Berlin, Londra gibi metropoller sık sık korku ile beraber anılırlar. Zira modernleşme ile dönüşen kentler hem metropole yabancılaşmayı hem de bilinmeyene, değişime, "öteki"ne dair kolektif bir korku ortamı yaratırlar. Dedektif öykülerinin tehlikeler ve tekinsizliklerle dolu Londra'sı ya da uzaylılar, nükleer silahlar, zombiler, esrarengiz virüslerin tehdidindeki New York gibi temsiller popüler kültürde de sıkça işlenmiş, hepimizin aşına olduğu metropol imgeleridir. Tarihyazımında da korku ve metropol ilişkisine dair zengin bir külliyat oluşmuşsa da İstanbul'un bu tür bir ilgiden uzak kalmış oluşunu Tanyeli, kitabın yazılma gerekçesi olarak açıklıyor. Oysaki Tanyeli'nin iddiasına göre