



BRILL

"What Have You Done for Anatolia Today?": Islamic Archaeology in the Early Years of the Turkish Republic

Author(s): Scott Redford

Source: *Muqarnas*, Vol. 24, History and Ideology: Architectural Heritage of the "Lands of Rum" (2007), pp. 243-252

Published by: Brill

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25482462>

Accessed: 06-12-2017 05:43 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Brill is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Muqarnas*

SCOTT REDFORD

“WHAT HAVE YOU DONE FOR ANATOLIA TODAY?”: ISLAMIC ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE EARLY YEARS OF THE TURKISH REPUBLIC

In 1968, Karl Menges published an overview of Turcology entitled *The Turkic Languages and Peoples*. After surveying development of the field in Russia, Germany, and elsewhere, he devoted the following lines to Turkey:

Turkish scholarship suffered from the quasi-totalitarian superimposition upon all historical, philological, and linguistic studies of the official Kemalist state myth proclaiming the Proto-Anatolian origin of the entire Turkish “race” and the Proto-Turkish nature of the Hittite language. Naturally, under such conditions, with a state doctrine contrary to all historical and linguistic evidence, objective scholarship was suffocated or prevented from developing.¹

In this essay, I shall examine a few of the origins and originators of certain intellectual trends in the 1920s and 1930s, the early years of the Republic of Turkey. In doing so, I aim to contribute to an analysis of the early republican approach to the Islamic past, as expressed in its material culture. How did this “Kemalist state myth” form and deform intellectual trends as part of the intimately linked processes of nation building and Westernization in Turkey? What role did European and European-trained scholars play in integrating the Islamic past with a new Turkish and Anatolian state ideology and identity?

One day in 1929, Mustafa Kemal, president of the Republic of Turkey, is said to have showed Afet, the oldest of his adopted daughters and a high school teacher, a book he was reading. It was a work by the French Enlightenment historian, Joseph de Guignes, the *Histoire générale des Huns, des Mongoles, des Turcs, et des autres Tatares occidentaux*, published in five volumes between 1756 and 1758. He pointed out a passage that stated that the Turks were a “yellow” race sharing a common origin with the Mongols in Mon-

golia. Afet reportedly responded, “Bunu çalışalım,” “Let’s work on this.”²

Both Mustafa Kemal and Afet were intimately involved in the national project of writing a history of the Turks, mainly, it seems, in order to educate Turkish high school students. (Education and culture were very much of one piece in the early years of the Turkish Republic. In 1935, the Ministry of Education [Maarif Vekaleti] changed its name to the Ministry of Culture [Kültür Bakanlığı] while continuing to translate its own name into French as “Ministère de l’instruction publique.”)³ This national history, called *Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları* (Outline of Turkish History), was to present the civilization of the Turks in its “rightful place” as equal or superior to Indo-European “nations” or “races” (which also originated in Central Asia) and, paradoxically, as the prime force for the rise of civilization in Anatolia and indeed elsewhere in the Near East and the Aegean. As late as 1937, the year before the death of Atatürk, as Mustafa Kemal was by then called, Prof. Şemseddin Günaltay, writing the lead article in the first issue of the Istanbul University journal *Tarih Semineri Dergisi*, attacked the words of the long-dead de Guignes. The Turks were not yellow but white, Alpine, and brachiocephalic; their home was not Mongolia but the Altay Mountains of Turkistan, wrote Günaltay (note the name). The journal in which Günaltay’s article appeared was founded by M. Fuad Köprülü, the leading Turkish historian of the day, and a professor at Istanbul University.⁴

CARGO CULT

At the invitation of Prof. Köprülü, who was also the founder and director of the Türkiyat Enstitüsü, or Turcology Institute, at Istanbul University, the eminent

Austrian art historian Josef Strzygowski wrote the lead, eighty-page, article for the 1933 issue of *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, the journal of the institute. Entitled “Türkler ve Orta Asya San’atı Meselesi” (The Turks and the Question of Central Asian Art), it recast, with additions pertinent to the times and the audience, Strzygowski’s 1917 work on the art of the Altay region of Central Asia and Iran.⁵ Professor Köprülü’s son translated it into Turkish, as he did another article published in the same issue of the journal.⁶

The author of this second article, entitled “Türk San’atının Dünyadaki Mevkii” (The Place of Turkish Art in the World) was Heinrich Glück, another art historian and a pupil of Strzygowski.⁷ These two articles staked out the position of the Viennese school of art history, the most influential in Turkey and one of the most prominent, if controversial, of the time, concerning the relationship between the material culture of a Turkish race and its relationship to the art—Turkish and non-Turkish, Islamic and non—of Anatolia, the homeland of the new Turkish Republic.

Strzygowski, in line with philology, the leading science of the day, was looking for an *Ursprache*, or original language, for Aryan art.⁸ In his article in *Türkiyat Mecmuası* he applied his method to identifying the fundamental characteristics of a pure Turkish art, one originating in Turkish Central Asia but present in all Turkish dynasties whenever and wherever they might have been. The features of this pure Turkish art, in Strzygowski’s view, concerned the tent, the carpet, and metalworking. The Austrian art historian proposed the foundation of a museum of pure Turkish art, which he hoped would also contain art from Central Asia. He wanted this museum to be situated in Ankara, as the capital of the new Turkish state, or in the Alaeddin Mosque in Konya, due to its connection with the Seljuks. The already present Istanbul Archaeology Museum should remain, or perhaps include Ottoman art in a context allowing comparison with the Greek, Roman, and Byzantine works there. He also suggested the creation of a museum of Ottoman art in Bursa.⁹

According to Strzygowski, Turkish art, like that of the Germans, was a northern art, and the art of the Greeks and of the Mediterranean was a southern art. Islamic civilization and its art were main inheritors of the Hellenistic Mediterranean tradition, which was also prominent in Byzantine art. Turkish art should be displayed separately, in order to free it from the tyranny of the standards of representational art of the

Greeks and the Mediterranean (read: Semitic) weight of Islamic art.

Strzygowski’s student Glück is probably best known as the coauthor with Ernst Diez of the *Propyläen-Kunstgeschichte* volume on Islamic art.¹⁰ By this time, however, he had also published on Roman, Byzantine, and Ottoman architecture.¹¹ The article in *Türkiyat Mecmuası* was based on his previous articles published in the proceedings of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1917 and by the Museum für angewandte Kunst in Vienna in 1920. After ridding Ottoman architecture of any connection with Byzantium by citing Mehmet Aga-Oglu’s then-current “proof” of Sinan’s Turkishness, Glück attacked the same Western European targets of naturalism and Hellenocentrism as did his teacher Strzygowski. At the end of the article, noting the central position of Central Asia vis à vis many world civilizations, he wrote that Turkish art, despite being exposed to the arts of almost all world civilizations, never descended into mere eclecticism but kept its principles and unity. He concluded by mentioning his intention to write a book on Turkish art together with Aga-Oglu. This project was never completed; Glück died soon thereafter, and Aga-Oglu moved on to the University of Michigan. The project of writing a history of Turkish art would fall to another student of art from the Viennese school, Ernst Diez, and to his pupil Oktay Aslanapa.¹²

A third foreign scholar, Albert Gabriel, can also be connected to a grand project of discovering and mapping a “Turkish” material culture. An architect and art historian by training, Gabriel was offered the chair of archaeology at Istanbul University in 1926. The authorities there asked him to include as part of his courses instruction pertinent to a national antiquities examination. He set out to write *Monuments turcs d’Anatolie*, published in 1931, because, as he notes in the preface, “there existed no publication permitting the soundly based study of the ensemble of the Islamic antiquities of Turkey.” The Turkish Ministry of Education/Culture paid for the research trips behind this book as well as Gabriel’s subsequent books on Turkish architecture. In the foreword to *Monuments turcs d’Anatolie*, he acknowledges the moral support of Prof. Köprülü. Strzygowski had proposed a museum of Turkish art and Glück a history thereof. Gabriel, along with the Turkish art historian Celâl Arseven, was the first to actually embark on the didactic project of transforming the material culture of Anatolia into a history of the Turks.¹³

Prof. Köprülü published the lead article in the first (1938) issue of another newly established journal, *Vakıflar Dergisi* (Journal of the Ministry of Pious Endowments), but he also gave prominence to his friend Gabriel, who for the same issue wrote "The Restoration of Turkish Historical Monuments," in which he acted as a scourge, as he had two years previously in "The Role of Archaeology," published in 1936 in *Türk Tarih, Arkeologya ve Etnografya Dergisi* (Journal of Turkish History, Archaeology, and Ethnography).¹⁴ The earlier article had argued for the importance of museums as well as works of art as sources of inspiration to a young nation, and not, as Gabriel put it, as hardware stores stacked with utilitarian implements; it also promoted archaeology as an autonomous science, not attendant on history. In his *Vakıflar Dergisi* article, Gabriel addressed the issue, not of archaeology or museums, but of architectural preservation in the face of the greed for development of a fast-growing nation and the new, easy technique of reinforced concrete. In order to preserve and restore historic Turkish buildings (by which he meant Seljuk and Ottoman monuments), he called for the establishment of a national restoration service. Together with Köprülü's exhortations on the value of endowment deeds, or *vakfiyes*, this article signaled problems with a trend that had already begun. Gabriel's most lasting contribution to architectural history—his beautifully rendered drawings of historic buildings—are themselves reconstructions, not only of buildings often half-ruined at the time, but of their urban and topographic setting. What he could not accomplish in fact he imagined on paper.

A list of activities of the Turkish Department of Antiquities for the year 1933 displays an active, if schizophrenic, approach to the past. On one hand, a regard for the newly unfolding pre- and early historical archaeology of Anatolia is evident: a record of the twenty-three different interventions undertaken to bring works of art, most of them large stone statues or reliefs, to museums shows all these works dating to the Bronze or Iron age, with most noted as being *Eti*, or Hittite. On the other hand, the same article notes the formation of a committee for the preservation of monuments. Of the thirty-two activities recorded for 1933 or planned for 1934, only five, two in Izmir and three in Ankara, did not involve the repair of Seljuk monuments. Ottoman monuments did not figure in this list at all.¹⁴

This can be contrasted with the activities of Osman

Hamdi Bey and other Ottoman archaeologists during the late years of the Ottoman Empire. At that time, the emphasis was placed on the excavation and collection of the past of an empire, not of a nation-state. Ottoman activities in these domains aimed to equal the great museums of European states, with their universalist and encyclopedic pretensions. These late Ottoman ventures led, for instance, to the great collections of classical sculpture and Mesopotamian artifacts at what would become the Istanbul Archaeology Museums.¹⁵

DISCIPLINARY FLUIDITY

To someone (cons)trained by the disciplinary and temporal divisions of the late twentieth century, this cast of characters appears both strange and alluring in terms of subject, discipline, and temporal or civilizational specialization. In this era of East-West, Muslim-Christian confrontation and disciplinary and topical separation, one is struck by the ease with which, for instance, an Austrian art historian of the early twentieth century, at a time rife with the rhetoric of colonialism, could move from early medieval hoards in the Balkans through the art of the Hellenistic, Byzantine, Islamic, Central Asian, and even Chinese worlds. Reading *The Decline of the West*, written by Strzygowski's contemporary Oswald Spengler, one is also struck by the centrality of material culture in the writing of history: in Spengler's opus, works of art are essential for defining the spirit and essence of civilizations. In parts of his opus, Spengler drew heavily on Strzygowski and his rival, Riegl.¹⁶

In Strzygowski's work, Islamic art and its study were entertained but lightly, treated as mere extensions of the study of Greek and Mediterranean art, the "southern" art disparaged due to its very hegemony in European universities and museums, where the Greco-Roman and Italian Renaissance periods were privileged. Gabriel, a French architect and architectural historian who knew little Turkish, was hired as a professor of archaeology at Istanbul University, where he taught, in French, not archaeology but a history of architecture that consisted primarily of the earliest Turkish architecture in Anatolia—that of the Seljuks—and, to a lesser extent, that of the Ottomans.

The disciplinary confusion was not limited to the examples given above. Ekrem Akurgal, sent by the Turkish government to study in Berlin from 1932 to 1941,

and the first professor of classical archaeology at the newly founded Ankara University, studied Islamic art with Ernst Diez, in addition to classical archaeology, art history, philology, and Hittite and Sumerian language. Although he undertook many archaeological excavations during his career, Akurgal's own scholarship was heavily art historical, relying on stylistic analysis for dating and context. During his years in Berlin, Akurgal studied all things that concerned the history of Turkey in any way, shape, or form.¹⁷

Similarly, in 1926, a promising young teacher, Remzi Oğuz Arık, had been sent by the Turkish state to Paris to study archaeology.¹⁹ There he received a diploma from the École du Louvre in archaeology and art history. In addition to studying classical and French art, he also studied Arabic at the École des langues orientales. While in Paris, he was known for asking his fellow Turkish students, "Bugün Anadolu için ne yaptın?" (What have you done for Anatolia today?), a calque on the still-current Turkish phrase, "Bugün Allah için ne yaptın?" (What have you done for God today?).

When he returned to Turkey in 1931, Arık was appointed to the Istanbul Archaeology Museum as a classical archaeologist. His stay at Istanbul was brief, however; he soon moved to Ankara and began working for the Turkish Historical Society, the organization set up by Atatürk in 1931 to research Turkish history. His initial job there was as codirector of the Turkish Historical Society's first excavations, at Alaca Höyük, an early Bronze Age site near the Hittite capital of Boğazköy, then as now dug by the German Archaeology Institute. Arık's book on Alaca Höyük, published by the Turkish Historical Society in 1937, begins with a photograph of a Turkish villager at the site, establishing an ethnographic link between the lives of villagers and those of the site in the Bronze Age.²⁰

The project of national history did not limit Arık to prehistoric or early historic sites; perhaps it was his position as a chief archaeologist of the Turkish Historical Society that prompted him to publish a series of yearly reports on archaeological activity in Turkey. In one of these, he records the visit of K. A. C. Creswell, the well-known English scholar of Islamic architecture and professor at the American University in Cairo, to southeastern Turkey in 1936. After mentioning Creswell's visit to Mardin and Diyarbakır and his ideas of the influence of Christian architecture on that of early Islam, Arık closes his report on this visit with the following parenthesis: "(We had expected that this valued scholar, because of his proximity in

Cairo, would correct the shallow and slightly *a priori* judgments on 'Islamic art' of art history professors in Europe and America. However, force of habit is more powerful than either science or method!)." The thrust of his comments is evident here: Creswell continued the Western European tradition of undervaluing Turkish art and emphasizing connections between the formative period of Islam and earlier civilizations, primarily Byzantine and Sasanian, instead of valuing their cultural autonomy.²¹

After a long career as archaeologist, director of the Museum in Ankara, and professor at Ankara and Gazi universities, Arık left the world of museums and universities and entered politics in 1950, winning a seat in parliament as a representative of the Demokrat party. In 1952 he founded the new "Peasant's Party," which stressed the values of the Anatolian villager.

Theodor Bossert, the German scholar asked to found Istanbul University's Turkish Institute of Archaeology (note the name) in 1934, was an expert on Bronze Age archaeology, specifically that of Crete and Hittite Anatolia. Bossert was made chair of the Sumerian-Hittite Philology Department. Bossert's title underlines the primacy given to philology at the time, and the role assigned to archaeology in helping establish historical fact through the recovery of texts; his scholarly reputation does indeed rest in the field of philology, for his work in deciphering Hittite hieroglyphics. Before he specialized, however, Bossert had worked in Germany on a multivolume history of the folk art of the world, publishing on such topics as Navajo blankets.²²

The examples given above show the ease with which scholars combined data and methodologies from what are today different disciplines: architectural history, art history, archaeology, museum studies, philology, history, ethnography, physical anthropology, and what American academia names "area studies." The origins of these trends can be attributed not only to Strzygowski, but also to his contemporary and rival Alois Riegl, whose liberation of form from context and whose devotion to the so-called decorative arts contributed to the formation of the study of national or folk traditions. Riegl was not an ethnic nationalist; in fact, as curator at the Museum für angewandte Kunst in Vienna, as well as professor at the University of Vienna, he was a student and promoter of the multiplicity inherent in the many kinds of art of different peoples within an empire. Yet he also partook of the pessimism enveloping parts of Europe at the end of the nineteenth century and looked outside

Europe for answers. The burgeoning archaeological and ethnographic collections from around the world accumulating in museums in Vienna, Budapest, and Berlin contributed to that search. It was possible for scholars like Strzygowski, later beloved of the Nazis, to combine these elements and collapse their temporal and spatial boundaries into studies of folk culture that expressed features of a nation or race.²³

The pure forms of Armenian, Iranian, and Central Asian art posited by Strzygowski expressed an Aryan, Northern, Germanic culture untainted by religion and Hellenism. They provided a model by which émigré German, Austrian, and European-trained Turkish scholars could look for a pure Turkishness beneath what they saw as the accretions of Ottoman Islam. The philological counterpart to the Turkish Historical Society, of course, was the Turkish Language Society, established by Mustafa Kemal in 1932 in order to purify the Turkish language of Arabic and Persian "additions."

As stated above, Gabriel proclaimed archaeology, likely using its broader French definition as the study of the past rather than the science of digging historic sites, autonomous from history. Arık, too, believed in a larger definition of archaeology than that commonly accepted today: to him it included architecture, sculpture, painting, and design as well as sigillography, ceramology, and the study of figurines. As for Islamic archaeology, in a book published in 1947, he had the following to say: "Archaeology is a unified science, but there are many different kinds of archaeologist." He then proceeded to define what an Egyptologist and an Assyriologist were. And finally he stated, "Those who study the civilizations, history and archaeology, language and writing of the East are called Orientalists." (For Arık, then, the definition of an Orientalist was very similar to that of a classical archaeologist today.)²⁴

However, Islamic archaeology, in the strict definition of the excavation of a site with Islamic-period finds, was never undertaken by an Orientalist of Arık's definition. Along with Arık, Hamit Zübeyr Koşay, a Muslim from the Ural Mountains with a doctorate in Turcology from Budapest, codirected the first excavations by the Turkish Historical Society; these excavations, however, were of the early Bronze Age site mentioned above. Koşay imported to Turkey another Turcologist, a Hungarian named Julius Meszaroş (Gyula Mészáros) from the Ethnographic Museum in Budapest, to help collect works for and organize the displays of the Eth-

nography Museum of Ankara, of which Koşay was named the director.

The visit of the King of Afghanistan to Ankara in 1929 occasioned an offer to exchange Buddhist for Hittite artifacts, an exchange seemingly never realized.²⁵ As far as I know, this was the only gesture made to broaden the collections of the museum from Anatolia to the greater Turkic world, as envisioned by Strzygowski in his article.

What we would call Islamic archaeology consisted of but one part of the Turkish national project, which focused on an area within the borders of the Republic of Turkey, emphasizing Turkish presence in Anatolia. For instance, in the 1939 issue of *Belleten*, the journal of the Turkish Historical Society, Şevket Aziz Kansu, later to be dean of Ankara University, wrote an article entitled "An Anthropological Investigation into the Racial History of Anatolia." In this article, he reported the results of the measurement of bones from various excavations and eras, including "the skeletons of Seljuk Turks uncovered in Ankara in 1935," calling to mind the destruction of Seljuk monuments occasioned by the construction of institutions of the new Turkish capital.²⁶

The real Islamic archaeology in the early years of the Turkish Republic was being undertaken as part of the same interest in collapsing time periods that characterized Viennese art history. The large German and Austrian research projects in Turkey—at Miletus, Pergamon, Ephesus, and Iznik—were multiperiod, interdisciplinary affairs: one only has to think of the origins of the historian Paul Wittek's interest in the early Ottomans arising out of his work at Miletus on the coinage of the Menteşe dynasty (ca. 1290–1425), and of Friedrich Sarre's work on Ottoman pottery from Miletus.²⁷ In the mid-1930s there was also a large German project at Iznik—mainly classical, but also involving Katharina Otto-Dorn, a young student of Strzygowski who had written her dissertation on Sasanian silver in 1934.²⁸

Otto-Dorn had met Ekrem Akurgal while working as Ernst Kühnel's assistant in Berlin. When a chair of Islamic art and archaeology was finally established at Ankara University in 1954, Akurgal asked her to fill it.²⁹ It was Otto-Dorn herself, at Kubadabad, her students Oluş Arık, Rüçhan Arık, and Gönül Öney, and their students who are the mainstay of Islamic archaeology in Turkey today. In his *Türkische Fliesen und Keramik in Anatolien*, Oktay Aslanapa, who studied with Diez and succeeded him at Istanbul University, makes

explicit mention of this German/Austrian precedent; in describing his first excavations at Iznik in 1963–64, he refers to Sarre's publication of "Miletus ware" and Otto-Dorn's work on Iznik before claiming Iznik as the center of Ottoman tile production.³⁰

Despite the pan-Turkic approach of these Austrian or Austrian-trained scholars, however, other Turkish architectural historians such as Doğan Kuban and Aptullah Kuran have focused on Anatolian and Mediterranean traditions, effecting a dualism in the art-historical literature.³¹

The Museum für angewandte Kunst in Vienna was established in 1869 in response to the success of the South Kensington Museum in London, which had been founded with the remnants of the Crystal Palace exhibition. Both participated in the Arts and Crafts movement in the second half of the nineteenth century, as British and continental Europeans sought an alternative to the mass-produced, machine-made present. Except for Albert Gabriel's longing for sympathetic stonemasons to counter the spread of reinforced concrete, this kind of nostalgia for craft was not found in the early decades of the Turkish Republic. It did not arise until 1951, when Hamit Zübeyr Koşay finally published the ethnographic survey he had helped undertake at Alaca Höyük fifteen years earlier. In this publication, Koşay urgently calls for the establishment of a People's Museum in Ankara, where the traditions of the Anatolian Turks (that for him still stretched back to the Hittites) would be preserved, and decries the influx of modernism, the uniformity of life, and the introduction of machines—the "gramophone that silences the saz in the tent of the nomad." The "Kemalist state myth" had done its job of forming a modern Turkish state, a state whose very modernity was now being decried by one of its founders.³²

CONCLUSION

I conclude by raising a larger issue: the inability of the competing ideologies of race- and language-based nationalism of Turkishness, or of a more traditional "humanistic" approach that situated the material culture of Islamic Anatolia within the parameters of Islamdom, to use these competing ideologies to produce scholars, or challenging scholarship, of what is currently called in Turkey the "Turkish-Islamic synthesis" (*Türk-İslam sentezi*).

The greatest scholars of early-twentieth-century Islamic archaeology were all Orientalists. In their works, they stressed the continuities of the early Islamic period with the late antique Mediterranean and ancient Near Eastern sedentary cultures. None worked on the national project examined here. Ernst Herzfeld was the sworn enemy of Strzygowski, who disliked his historicist approach. Jean Sauvaget accompanied Albert Gabriel on his later travels through Turkey, the ones that would result in Gabriel's *Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie orientale*, in the introduction to which Gabriel, probably tempered by long months of travel and discussion with his compatriot, or perhaps disillusioned by almost twenty years of teaching "Turkish archaeology," refers to the buildings he documents in the book not as monuments of Turkish art but as pertaining to medieval Islamic civilization.³³

The legacy of the practices of the early Republic lies in a continued emphasis by Turkish scholars on the excavation of Islamic sites of the medieval period. The Ottoman kiln excavations begun by Oktay Aslanapa at Iznik are a principal exception to this. In recent decades in Turkey, alongside continued excavation of medieval Islamic sites, interest in the Ottoman period has increased, as the Ottoman imperial past ceases to threaten and is turned into a source of national pride and touristic destination. The Museum of Turkish and Islamic art moved to a new location in 1983—a sixteenth-century Ottoman palace that frames a linear, chronological presentation of Islamic and Turkish art, some of it from the lost provinces of the Ottoman Empire. The Seljuks constitute but one of a series of dynasties whose presentation culminates in a large hall primarily devoted to works of Ottoman art. Downstairs from this main floor is a second and secondary space devoted to ethnography. This, too, presents a linear development from nomadic tent through village house, culminating in a Westernized, late-Ottoman house with Western-costumed mannequins seated at a table reading newspapers.

As mentioned above, the project of writing a history of Turkish art fell to Ernst Diez, who taught at Istanbul University before leaving Turkey in 1946. He and his student Aslanapa wrote the textbooks still used in Turkish universities. Aslanapa also continued the traditions of his Austrian teachers by writing on Turkish carpets and, beginning in 1964, by excavating the pottery kilns of Ottoman Iznik, again in direct reference to his Austrian and German predecessors. With Otto-Dorn in Ankara and Aslanapa in Istanbul, the dead-



Fig. 1. Ethnography Museum, Ankara, Arif Hikmet Koyunoğlu, 1925–28. (Nezih Başgelen Collection, Istanbul)

weight of Turkish nationalism continued to burden the teaching of and research on Islamic material culture in Turkey. This nationalist approach emphasized Central Asian origins and abandoned the “Orientalist” training of the previous generation, thus separating works of material culture from the written word, whether in Persian, Arabic, or Ottoman Turkish, and therefore from history.

All states have founding myths, but that of Turkey is particularly paradoxical. Much of the ideology of modern Turkey was based on the ideas of European scholars profoundly discontented with European civilization in the early twentieth century. Atatürk’s project of Westernization did not engage this pessimistic view of European civilization; it only took advantage of the search, especially on the part of Austrian scholars, for answers outside of Europe—mainly, but not exclusively, in Central Asia. The episode quoted at the beginning of this paper suggests that Atatürk was more intellectually engaged with the Europe of the Enlightenment than with that of the new, inward-

and outward-looking Europe of early-twentieth-century Vienna and Berlin.

To my mind, the Ethnography Museum of Ankara constitutes a fitting image for the ideals, continuities, and discontinuities of this period (fig. 1). Designed and built between 1925 and 1928 in the national style by Arif Hikmet Koyunoğlu, its neo-Ottoman architecture belied the fresh, modern ideology of the new Turkish Republic.³⁴ It was built on a hill outside Ankara, Namazgâh Tepesi, the former site of a Muslim cemetery and open-air prayer hall that had been the location of important national and religious ceremonies during the Turkish war of independence.³⁵

In order to fill this palace of culture, a commission of prominent citizens was established to help form its collection. But the holdings of the museum were also augmented by artifacts from mosques pulled down to build the new capital, and from other religious buildings closed down on the order of the new secular state.

The development of the museum was entrusted to

a Central Asian Turk schooled in Salonica and Budapest and to his Hungarian colleague. In addition to works of Turkish folk and Islamic art, the relics of the more distant "Hittite" past were also displayed. Here, surrounded by the traditional present and the historic past of Anatolia, Atatürk's corpse lay in state for fifteen years after his death.³⁶

Georgetown University
Koç University

NOTES

Author's note: I would like to thank Chris Murphy and Oya Pancaroğlu for their bibliographic assistance and Gülrü Necipoğlu for her comments and criticisms. Nezihe Başgelen kindly gave me permission to use a photograph of the Ethnography Museum from his collection.

General articles on the genesis of Turkish art history and archaeology include Oktay Aslanapa, "Les études sur l'art turc à l'époque de la naissance d'Atatürk et leurs développements ultérieurs," and Rahmi Hüseyin Ünal, "La part des chercheurs turcs dans l'étude de l'art turc," in *Études médiévales et patrimoine turc*, ed. Janine Sourdel-Thomine (Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 1983) and M. Oluş Arık, "Heutiger Zustand der Forschungen und Studien zur türkischen Kunst in der Türkei," in *Essays in Islamic Art and Architecture in Honor of Katharina Otto-Dorn*, ed. Abbas Daneshvari (Malibu: Undena, 1981).

1. Karl Menges, *The Turkic Languages and Peoples* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1968), 9–10.
2. Andrew Mango, *Atatürk* (Woodstock and New York: Overlook Press, 2000), 468–69 reports the incident differently, with Afet complaining to Mustafa Kemal about the "yellow race" classification she had read in a textbook given her at the French convent school, Notre Dame de Sion, in Istanbul.
3. In the first volume of the journal of the Turkish Historical Society, *Belleten*, published in 1937, Remzi Oğuz Arık (about whom more below) is called "Kültür Bakanlığı Arkeolog'u" in Turkish (210) but "Archéologue du Ministère de l'instruction publique" in the French translation (222). The ministry's name was changed back to the Ministry of Education in 1941.
4. Şemseddin Günaltay, "Türklerin Ana Yurdu ve Irkı Mes'elesi," *Tarih Semineri Dergisi* 1 (1937): 12–13. For Köprülü see Ömer Faruk Akın, "Mehmed Fuad Köprülü," in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2003), vol. 28, 471–86, and the short translators' introduction in Mehmet Fuad Köprülü, *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*, ed. and trans. Gary Leiser and Robert Dankoff (London: Routledge, 2006), xxviii–xxxi.
5. Josef Strzygowski, "Türkler ve Orta Asya San'atı Meselesi," *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 3 (1926–33): 1–80. In 1935, the Turkish Historical Society put Prof. Köprülü (and a colleague, Prof. Muzaffer Göker) in charge of making contact with foreign establishments and authorities, "especially those foreign scholars close to our national thesis" (*Ecnebi müesseseler ve otoritel-*
6. Cemal Köprülü collected these and other translations in a book: J. Strzygowski, H. Glück, and F. Köprülü, *Eski Türk Sanatı ve Avrupa'ya Etkisi* (Ankara: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1973). The essay by F. Köprülü suggests that students be sent abroad to study with Strzygowski and that Glück perhaps be invited to teach in Istanbul. I owe this reference to G. Necipoğlu.
7. Heinrich Glück, "Türk San'atının Dünyadaki Mevkii," *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 3 (1926–33): 119–28.
8. Christine Maranci, *Medieval Armenian Architecture: Constructions of Race and Nation* (Peeters: Leuven, 2001), 116–17 cites a linguistic origin for Strzygowski's search for a "root" form of an original language, an *Ursprache*. For the development of Nazi theories of Aryanism and their intersection of philology, archaeology, and anthropology see Heather Pringle, *The Master Plan: Himmler's Scholars and the Holocaust* (London: Fourth Estate, 2006). In the Soviet Union, Nikolay Marr, excavator of Ani, developed a parallel theory of the original "Japhetic" languages of the Caucasus.
9. Strzygowski, "Türkler," 53 (for tents, metalwork, and geometric spirals as characteristics of Turkish art), 54 (for carpets), 77 (for an attack on representational art). See 78 for proposed museums.
10. Heinrich Glück and Ernst Diez, *Die Kunst des Islam* (Berlin: Propyläen-Verlag, 1925). This book, like Glück's brief *Die Kunst der Seldschuken in Kleinasien und Armenien* (Leipzig: E. A. Seemann, 1923), fronts the contribution of Armenian art to that of the Seljuks: it starts its discussion of Seljuk architecture with the mosque at Ani.
11. In 1918, Glück published *Die Bäder Konstantinopels*, on the baths of Istanbul; two years later, Ernst Diez and he published *Alt-Konstantinopel: Hundertzehn photographische Aufnahmen der Stadt und ihrer Bau- und Kunst-Denkmäler* (Munich: Roland-Verlag, 1920). While the latter is essentially a picture book, its introduction provides a fascinating view of the way Istanbul was viewed by Strzygowski and his students. For them, Byzantine art is essentially Hellenistic (5). From its Phoenician (!) origins (3) on, the city exemplifies a mixture of national and Oriental styles, making Ottoman art just the last of these manifestations (6).
12. Glück, "Mevki," 127 (for eclecticism and its role in the "national art" of the Turks), 128 (for his projected work with Mehmet Aga-Oğlu). For a review by Turgut Cansever of Diez's book *Türk Sanatı*, trans. Oktay Aslanapa (Istanbul: Istanbul University, 1946), see *Felsefe Arkiivi* 2 (1947): 251–59. For the then-current "proof" of Sinan's Turkishness, see Gülrü Necipoğlu's article in this volume.
13. For a short biography of Gabriel see Fehmi Karatay, Nihad Belger, and Reşad Ekrem Koçu, "Gabriel, Albert Louis," in *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 11 (Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1971), 5874–78: "In the years 1926–30 he was entrusted by the Turkish government with many archaeological duties in Anatolia" (5875). From 1930 to 1941, and again from 1945 to 1956, Gabriel served as founding director of the Institut français d'études anatoliennes (note the name): see Semavi Eyice, "Albert-Louis Gabriel," in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam*

- Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1996), vol. 13, 275–78, and the essays in Pierre Pinon, ed., *Albert Gabriel (1883–1972): Architecte, archéologue, artiste, voyageur* (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi, 2006). The quote in the body of the article comes from Albert Gabriel, *Monuments turcs d'Anatolie* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1931), i.
14. Albert Gabriel, “Arkeolojinin Rolü,” *Türk Tarih, Arkeologya ve Etnografya Dergisi* 3 (1936): 159–161; idem, “La Restauration des Monuments Historiques Turcs,” *Vakıflar Dergisi* 1 (1938): 11–19.
 15. “Müzecilik Haberleri,” *Türk Tarih, Arkeologya ve Etnografya Dergisi* 2 (1934): 286–91.
 16. See Zeynep Rona, ed., *Osman Hamdi Bey ve Dönemi* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993); Wendy Shaw, *Possessors and Possessed: Museums, Archaeology, and the Visualization of History in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).
 17. Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*, 2 vols., trans. Charles Francis Atkinson, (New York: Knopf, 1928), 1:208–9: “In reality, in matters of style as in those of religion, science and social-political life, what we find there is only an irradiation from outside the Eastern border of the Empire. Riegl and Strzygowski have discovered this, but if we are to go further and arrive at a conspectus of the development of Arabian art we have to shed many philological and religious prepossessions. The misfortune is that our art-research, although it no longer recognizes the religious frontiers, nevertheless unconsciously assumes them. For there is in reality no such thing as a Late-Classical nor an Early-Christian nor yet an Islamic art in the sense of an art proper to each of those faiths and evolved by the community of believers as such.” Spengler then proceeds to find a like spirituality expressed in the religious buildings of Christianity, in “Hellenistic, Hebrew and Baal-cults, and in the Mithraeum, the Mazdaist fire-temple and the Mosque...it is the *Cavern-feeling*.”
 18. Ekrem Akurgal, *Bir Arkeoloğun Anıları: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Kültür Tarihinden Birkaç Yapı* (Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi, 1999), 17 (for the beginning of his time in Germany), 28 (for the mention of classes with Kühnel).
 19. The text of a talk given by Arık at the Sorbonne in 1937 links his departure for Paris with the arrival of Gabriel in Istanbul. After noting that thirty-nine Turks were chosen by the state to get European educations (“avec l’objectif de former le personnel scientifique des musées”), Arık states that a shortage of funds forced the number of students sent abroad to be limited to one (himself), with another student sent to study in Berlin at the expense of the German government. He then adds: “Ce principe fut aussi appliqué d’une manière inverse et qui consista d’assurer la collaboration des maîtres étrangers. Qu’il me soit permis de rappeler que ce premier secous de cette nouvelle catégories [*sic*] des collaborateurs vint encores [*sic*] d’un français”: Remzi Oğuz Arık, *L’histoire et l’organisation des musées turcs* (Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1953), 11–12. Although Gabriel is not named, it must be he who is referred to by this comment: 1926 was indeed the year Gabriel took up his position at Istanbul University. For “What have you done for Anatolia today?” see Haluk Karamağaralı, “Çalışma ve Mücadele ile Dolu Bir Ömür,” *Istanbul* 7 (May 1954), reprinted in Ziya Bakırcıoğlu, ed. *Remzi Oğuz Arık’ın Fikir Dünyası* (Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2000), 214. For a short account of Arık’s life see H. Emin Sezer, “Remzi Oğuz Arık,” in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1991), vol. 3, 357–58. For the general phenomenon of Turkish students studying in Europe in the 1920s and 1930s see Kansu Şarman, *Türk Promethe’ler: Cumhuriyet’in Öğrencileri Avrupa’da* (Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası, n.d.).
 20. Remzi Oğuz Arık, *Les fouilles d’Alaca Höyük entreprises par la Société d’histoire turque*, vol. 1 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1937); Hamit Zübeyr Koşay, *Les fouilles d’Alaca Höyük entreprises par la Société d’histoire turque*, vol. 2 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1938).
 21. Remzi Oğuz Arık, *Türkiye’de 1936 Yılındaki Arkeoloji İşleri* (Istanbul: Kenan Basımevi ve Kılış Fabrikası, 1938), 24: “(Bütün bu bedii ve mukaddes heyecanlarına iştirak etmekle beraber, Sir Creswell’in bütün hükümlerini hakikatin ta kendisi olarak almaktan uzağız. Avrupa ve Amerika san’at tarihi Profesörlerinin derinleşmiyen ve biraz da ‘a priori’ olan ‘İslam san’atı’ hükümlerini; Kahiredeki mesaisini yakından gördüğümüz bu değerli âlimin tadil etmesini beklerdik. Fakat alışkanlık ilimden de metottan da baskın geliyor!).”
 22. See the biography of Bossert on the website of www.hethitologie.de; see also Oktay Belli, ed., *Istanbul University’s Contributions to Archaeology in Turkey (1932–2000)* (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2001), ix.
 23. Alois Riegl, *Problems of Style: Foundations for a History of Ornament*, trans. Evelyn Kain (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); Margaret Olin, “Art History and Ideology: Alois Riegl and Josef Strzygowski,” in *Cultural Visions: Essays in the History of Culture*, ed. Penny Schine Gold and Benjamin Sax (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 2000), 151–70; Maranci, *Medieval Armenian Architecture*, 163–65 (for Strzygowski’s interest in the formation of national schools of architecture).
 24. Remzi Oğuz Arık, *Halkevlerinde Müze, Tarih ve Folklor Çalışmaları Kılavuzu* (Ankara: [Ulus Basımevi], 1947), 27 (for the different branches [*kollar*] of archaeology), 34 (for definitions of different kinds of archaeologists).
 25. Hamit Zübeyr Koşay, *Etnografya Müzesi Kılavuzu* (Istanbul: Maarif Basımevi, 1956), 4 (for the visit and offer). I am grateful to Andras Riedlmayer for providing me with information about Mészáros from his own investigation of the website of the Hungarian National Library, the online version of *Magyar életrajzi lexikon*, the encyclopedia of Hungarian biography, and other Hungarian-language sources. A fruitful avenue for future research is the relationship between the Ethnography Museums in Ankara and Budapest in the collection of artifacts, design, and installation.
 26. Şevket Aziz Kansu, “Anadolunun İlk Tarihi Üzerine Antropolojik Bir Tetkik,” *Belleten* 3 (1939): 128. Other skeletons analyzed were from earlier, pre-Islamic, periods. See Gönül Öney, *Ankara’da Türk Devri Dini ve Sosyal Yapıları* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, 1971) for mention of Seljuk buildings destroyed during the Republican period.
 27. Karl Wulzinger, Paul Wittek, and Friedrich Sarre, *Das islamische Milet* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1935); Paul Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentesche: Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens in 13.–15. Jahrhundert* (Istanbul: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 1934). In 1916, Wulzinger had been one of the founding members of the extraordinarily named Deutsch-Türkisches Denkmalschutz-Kommando, which worked in Syria and Jordan on Islamic and pre-Islamic sites (Damascus and Petra).

28. Dorothea Duda, in *Essays in Islamic Art and Architecture in Honor of Katharina Otto-Dorn*, ed. Abbas Daneshvari (Malibu: Undena, 1981), viii. In the introduction to her *Türkische Keramik* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1957), Otto-Dorn states that the book was an outgrowth of her earlier work in Iznik.
29. Akurgal, *Bir Arkeoloğun Anıları*, 28.
30. Oktay Aslanapa, *Türkische Fliesen und Keramik in Anatolien* (Istanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1965), 29ff. Later in his career, Aslanapa catalogued the numbers of scholars, either Austrian or trained in Austria, who had worked in Turkey: see his *Türkiye'de Avusturyalı Sanat Tarihçileri ve Sanatkârlar* (Istanbul: Eren, 1993).
31. For a discussion of pan-Turkic vs. Anatolian synthetic perspectives, see the papers of Gülru Necipoğlu and Can Bilşel in this volume.
32. Hamit Zübeyr Koşay, *Alaca Höyük: Anadolu'nun Etnografya ve Folklorına Dair Malzeme* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1951), 4.
33. Albert Gabriel, *Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie orientale*, 2 vols. (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1940), 1:vii, writes of "...les monuments du moyen âge musulman..." and not, as he had earlier, of Turkish culture.
34. Sibel Bozdoğan, *Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001), 25, 39, 40; Yıldırım Yavuz and Suha Özkan, "Finding a National Idiom: The First National Style," in *Modern Turkish Architecture*, ed. Renata Holod and Ahmet Evin (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984), 63: "The Museum of Ethnography was organized and commissioned by Atatürk himself who saw it as the repository of folk art and culture, the base for his new cultural policy. The site for the museum was carefully chosen as well: a prominent hill half way between old and new Ankara, as if this repository were meant to be the mediator between tradition and revolution."
35. Koşay, *Etnografya*, 1.
36. The ancient art was housed in the Ethnography Museum until it was moved to the partially opened Anatolian Civilizations Museum in Ankara in 1943. Atatürk's corpse remained until 1955, when his mausoleum elsewhere in Ankara was completed.