

Graz, 18.10.2018

Burkhard Pöttler, Katharina Eisch-Angus,
Johann Verhovsek (Hrsg.)

Fundstücke
europäisch-ethnologischen Forschens

Eine Festschrift für Helmut Eberhart



© Uni Graz/Lunghammer



Waxmann 2018
Münster · New York

Gedruckt mit freundlicher Unterstützung von



Bibliografische Informationen der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Print-ISBN 978-3-8309-3870-5

E-Book-ISBN 978-3-8309-8870-0

© Waxmann Verlag GmbH, 2018

www.waxmann.com

info@waxmann.com

Umschlaggestaltung: Matthias Grunert, Münster

Titelbild: © Burkhard Pöttler

Redaktion: Lisa Erlenbusch, Lisa Eidenhammer, Johanna Menhard

Satz: Stoddart Satz- und Layoutservice, Münster

Druck: Elanders GmbH, Waiblingen.

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier,
säurefrei gemäß ISO 9706

Printed in Germany

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Nachdruck, auch auszugsweise, verboten.
Kein Teil dieses Werkes darf ohne schriftliche Genehmigung des
Verlages in irgendeiner Form reproduziert oder unter Verwendung
elektronischer Systeme verarbeitet, vervielfältigt oder verbreitet werden.

Fundstücke europäisch-ethnologischen Forschens – eine Hinführung

Der Wissenschaftler, der Volkskundler und Europäische Ethnologe, der Hochschul-
lehrer, der Studiendekan und Universitätspolitiker, der regionale Kulturaktivist, der
Sozialdemokrat, der Museologe und Radiomitarbeiter, Ausstellungsmacher und Pu-
blizist, der Sammler und Kunstverständige, der Europäer, der Weltgereiste, der Netz-
werker, der herzliche Kollege und Freund: Dieser Diversität, dieser Vielfalt von Kom-
petenzen, Aktivitäten und Anliegen gerecht zu werden, ist eine Herausforderung, der
sich eine Festschrift für Helmut Eberhart stellen muss. Zugleich aber kann sie aus dem
Reichtum schöpfen, den das Lebenswerk des Jubilars und angehenden (Un-)Ruhe-
ständlers in sich birgt. Ausgehend von Graz, der Steiermark und Österreich öffnet es
den Blick auf die europäischen und internationalen Horizonte empirischer Alltagskul-
turforschung; volkskundliches Wissen fundiert eine engagierte Europäische Ethno-
logie, die bei Helmut Eberhart stets auch die Vermittlung von Forschung zurück ins
Alltags- und Kulturleben mitdenkt und die, mit Humor und Menschlichkeit, kultur-
wissenschaftliche und gesellschaftliche Erkenntnis in verantwortliches Tätigwerden
überführt.

So wie dieses Lebenswerk den gemeinsamen Bezugspunkt der Autorinnen und Au-
toren dieses Buches darstellt, haben wir – anstelle einer ausführlichen Einleitung im
üblichen Sinne – den fachlichen Beiträgen eine Berufsbiografie von Helmut Eberhart
vorangestellt. Sie bietet den Dreh- und Angelpunkt der durchaus diversen Fundstücke
europäisch-ethnologischen Forschens, die wir den zentralen wissenschaftlichen Inter-
essen und Aktivitäten von Helmut Eberhart entsprechend in vier Themenbereiche ge-
gliedert haben:

WISSEN UND SCHAFFEN

Eine bedeutsame Tradition am Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Eth-
nologie der Universität Graz besteht darin, dass, wer sein Studium bei Helmut Eber-
hart abschließt, bei der mündlichen Prüfung stets auch Fragen zur Geschichte des
Faches gestellt bekommt. Die Denk- und Forschungswege der Volkskunde, ihre per-
sönlichen und wissenschaftlichen Verflechtungen, aber auch ihre ideologischen und
politischen Einlassungen und Verirrungen werden damit zum Wissensfundament ei-
ner zeitgemäßen Kulturwissenschaft und ihrer verantwortungsvollen Anwendung: Das
Wissen führt zum Schaffen, zugleich gibt der Schaffensimpuls dem Wissen seine Rich-
tung und Bedeutung.

Aus dieser Überzeugung heraus nehmen die sechs Beiträge des Einstiegskapitels
die historischen Formierungen der Kulturanthropologie, der Volks- und Völkerkunde,
mit einem Schwerpunkt um die Zäsuren der beiden Weltkriege und der menschlichen

Inhalt

Fundstücke europäisch-ethnologischen Forschens – eine Hinführung 5

Burkhard Pöttler

Helmut Eberhart zum 65. Geburtstag – ein Lebenslauf..... 13

WISSEN UND SCHAFFEN

Helmut Konrad

Die Textsorte Festschrift

Für Helmut Eberhart..... 27

Johanna Rolshoven

Französische Ethnologinnen im Widerstand

Kulturanalytische Zugänge zu einer europäischen Fachgeschichte..... 35

Hande Birkalan-Gedik

The Curious Travels of German Ethnology to Ottoman Turkey

Some Preliminary Thoughts on Anthropology, Ethnology and

Folklore (1850–ca. 1950) 55

Michael J. Greger

„Ich bitte Sie mir darum nicht böse zu sein.“

Aus Post an Viktor Geramb als Schriftleiter der „Heimatgrüße“

im Ersten Weltkrieg 69

Judith Laister

Ästhetische Allianzen

Sichtbarkeitsregimes und Wissensproduktion in und zwischen den Weltkriegen..... 85

James R. Dow

Gesandter Otto Bene

Von der Volksdeutschen-Umsiedlung aus Südtirol zur

Juden-Deportation aus Holland 97

DIESEITS UND JENSEITS

Martin Scharfe

Dreierlei Frömmigkeitsgebärden

Carl Bantzers Wallfahrerbild von 1888 als Experiment und Symptom

der Moderne..... 117

<i>Herbert Nikitsch</i> Ur-Schnurren, Kontingenz und Bibelstechen Einige Assoziationen zur Religiositätsforschung	133
<i>Elke Hammer-Luza</i> Rosenkränze und Teufelsposen Seelsorge, Religion und Volksglaube im Grazer Zucht- und Arbeitshaus des 18. Jahrhunderts.....	145
<i>Dieter A. Binder</i> Pietas Austriaca? Das imperiale Erbe der Republik Österreich.....	159
<i>Karl Kaser</i> Islam, Istanbul und die visuelle Moderne in spätosmanischer Zeit	173
<i>Snježana Zorić</i> Die widersprüchliche Natur des koreanischen Christentums.....	187
<i>Gábor Barna</i> Wallfahrten heute in Ungarn Ein Bericht.....	201
<i>Olaf Bockhorn</i> Wallfahren mit Helmut – der Heiligenbluter Kreuzgang nach Obermauern	213
BEGEGNEN UND FREMD SEIN	
<i>Katharina Eisch-Angus</i> 2015. 1945. Erzählen von der Ankunft Ein Versuch zum Flüchtlingsgedächtnis in der Willkommenskultur	221
<i>Ulrika Wolf-Knuts</i> Der stumme Fahrstuhl Wie man eine neue Identität konstruieren kann.....	241
<i>Brigitte Bönisch-Brednich</i> 'Getting by in English'? Scholarly Mobility, Language Decisions and Cognitive Capital	251
<i>Rolf Wilhelm Brednich</i> Viewing Public Humour A Migrant's Exploration of New Zealand and Related Places	265
<i>Adelheid Schrutka-Rechtenstamm</i> Geschenkte Zeit Anmerkungen zu neuen Formen des Ehrenamtes	283

<i>Konrad Köstlin</i> Es ist noch Suppe da Metamorphosen der Schlürfspeise	293
SAMMELN UND ZEIGEN	
<i>Johann Verhovsek</i> Museum und Migration Einblicke in eine kontroverse Diskussion	305
<i>Ulrike Kammerhofer-Aggermann</i> Wilde Männer – vom gotischen Wappenhalter zur Faschingsfigur	319
<i>Herlinde Menardi</i> Verschleppung eines Renaissance-Plafonds – ein Verwirrspiel Von Schloss Caldes nach Schloss Fürstenstein.....	337
<i>Karl C. Berger</i> Tuifelemaler Anmerkungen zu Malern „anonymer Volkskunst“ in Tirol.....	349
<i>Karl Stocker</i> Nach der Orgie Zur Praxis des Ausstellens am Beispiel dreier kulturhistorischer Ausstellungsprojekte	365
<i>Katharina Krenn</i> Museumswörter – oder wenn Plan A nicht funktioniert	381
Veröffentlichungen von Helmut Eberhart.....	395

und macht sich in der Kunstgeschichte der Moderne einen Namen.¹⁰⁰ Auch nach 1945 ist Humbert politisch aktiv. Gemeinsam mit den Überlebenden ihrer Widerstandsgruppe engagiert sie sich für die französisch-jugoslawische Freundschaft und schreibt ein politisches Reisebuch über Jugoslawien¹⁰¹. Tillion ersucht nach ihrer Rückkehr aus der Deportation im CNRS um ihre Versetzung aus der Ethnologie in die Sektionen Soziologie und Zeitgeschichte. Erst der Algerienkrieg veranlasst sie später, erneut, jedoch unter dringlichen politischen Vorzeichen, auf die Ethnologie zurückzukommen.

Innerhalb von Denkkollektiven, wie Ludwik Fleck sie beschrieben hat,¹⁰² haben Generationenbeziehungen – Gerd Dressel hebt dies hervor – einen wissenschaftsstabilisierenden Effekt¹⁰³. Was, wenn diese Beziehungen unterbrochen, unterlassen werden und aus den wissenschaftshistorischen Diskursen als fehlende Denkbarekeiten herausfallen? Aus der Perspektive einer kulturanalytischen Wissenschaftsforschung, die nicht einer hegemonial-wirkmächtigen *doxa* verpflichtet ist, sondern an Widersprüchlichkeiten, Gegenteilsbehauptungen und weißen Flecken ansetzt¹⁰⁴, verweisen solche Bruchstellen auf kulturelle Konstellationen als fruchtbare Orte, an denen „verborgene gesellschaftliche Möglichkeiten“¹⁰⁵, das heißt aus der Gegenwart einer Vergangenheit noch nicht denkbare oder ideologisch nicht gewünschte Entwicklungswege anknüpfbar werden. Die Auseinandersetzung mit Humbert und Tillion und mit vielen anderen Ethnolog_innen und Mauss-Schüler_innen, die im Résistancenetzwerk des *Musée de l'Homme* aktiv waren und deren Geschichte(n) es noch zu erzählen gilt¹⁰⁶, ermöglicht es, solche Anknüpfungen und Denkbarekeiten im dialektischen Spannungsfeld zwischen Leben und Werk zu rekonstruieren und gegenwartsbezüglich auszudeuten. Es ist höchste Zeit.

100 Agnès Humbert hat in den 1950er Jahren kunsthistorische Grundlagenwerke verfasst, die auch ins Deutsche übersetzt wurden, z.B. Agnès Humbert/Nadeshda Ferber: Die französische Malerei von den Anfängen zum Impressionismus. Berlin 1949.

101 L'association France-Yougoslavie. Siehe auch Agnès Humbert: Vu et entendu en Yougoslavie. Paris 1950.

102 Ludwik Fleck definiert ein Denkkollektiv „als Gemeinschaft der Menschen, die im Gedankenaustausch oder in gedanklicher Wechselwirkung stehen“ und die Träger_innen sind „einer geschichtliche[n] Entwicklung eines Denkgebietes, eines bestimmten Wissensbestandes und Kulturstandes, also eines besonderen Denkstiles.“ Vgl. ders.: Entstehung, S. 54.

103 Vgl. Gert Dressel: Wandel durch biografische Erfahrungen? Zum Beispiel Kulturwissenschaftler und Kulturwissenschaftlerinnen. In: Nikola Langreiter/Margareth Lanzinger (Hg.): Kontinuität : Wandel. Wien 2003, S. 209–234, hier S. 214.

104 Vgl. Rolf Lindner: Vom Wesen der Kulturanalyse. In: Zeitschrift für Volkskunde 99 (2003), S. 177–188.

105 Loïc Wacquant: Kritisches Denken als Zersetzung der *doxa*. In: Ders.: Das Janusgesicht des Ghettos und andere Essays. Basel u.a. 2006, S. 192–200, hier S. 195.

106 U.a. Thérèse Rivière, Jeanne Cuisinier, Yvette Leleu, Yvonne Oddon, Deborah Lifchitz sowie mit ihren schriftlichen Äußerungen Simone Martin-Chauffier: A bientôt quand-même. Paris 1976 und Louise Alcan: Sans armes et sans bagages. Limoges 1946.

Hande Birkalan-Gedik

The Curious Travels of German Ethnology to Ottoman Turkey

Some Preliminary Thoughts on Anthropology, Ethnology and Folklore (1850–ca. 1950)

An interested reader to peruse through several accounts on anthropology in Turkey will discover that anthropology's establishment as an academic discipline at the Turkish universities dates back roughly to the foundation of the Turkish Republic itself.¹ It is true that anthropology, that is physical anthropology then, was professionalised in 1925 at the Istanbul University under the Faculty of Medicine as Türkiye Antropoloji Tetkikat Merkezi (Centre of Anthropological Research of Turkey), which was later named as Türk Antropoloji Enstitüsü (Turkish Anthropological Institute). Anthropology was established upon the orders of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881–1938), the founder of modern Turkey, who claimed:

“If there is a nation that is worthy of being thoroughly researched, it is our nation who, nowadays, is experiencing victory and progress. In that respect, is it not apparent that Turks should possess some special characteristics? As it is our right, through politics, to ask for our status among the nations in the world; it is also our duty to restore for our race the place it deserves among the peoples and human populations. This is the duty of anthropology, in the first place.”²

With these words, Atatürk was disproving a common belief which saw the ‘Turkish race’ as ‘Mongoloid’ and dolichocephalic, simultaneously urging anthropology to prove that the ‘Turkish race’ was ‘Caucasoid’ and brachycephalic: The ‘Turkish race’ was of the Alpine race – the ‘civilised,’ the ‘European,’ using race to refer to the ‘Turkish nation.’ Anthropology seemed like a good tool to make his point.

Academising anthropology was more than a pure disciplinary endeavor. The Centre propagated the official thesis on ‘Turkish race’ through its official *Turkish Anthropology Journal* (1925–1939) in 22 issues. Anthropologists kept producing scientific theses for the ungrounded, presupposed arguments of the state, presenting them as though they were scientific. Some foreign scientists have also submitted to the legitimisation of this type of racist nationalism by abusing the language and methods of science. But, again, this story should not sound so unfamiliar to the German-speaking

1 Cf. Paul Magneralla/Orhan Türkdoğan: The Development of Turkish Social Anthropology. In: Current Anthropology 17 (1976) 1, pp. 263–274. For a recent and brief account, see: Zerrin G. Tandoğan: Anthropology in Turkey: Impressions for an Overview. In: Alexandar Bošković (ed.): Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins. Oxford 2008, pp. 97–109; Hande Birkalan-Gedik: Turkey, Anthropology in. In: Hilary Callan (ed.): The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology, New Jersey 2018.

2 Şevket Aziz Kansu: Türkiye'de Antropolojik İlimlerin İnkişaf Tarihi [A Developmental History of the Anthropological Sciences in Turkey]. In: Türk Antropoloji Enstitüsü Tarihçesi. [History of the Turkish Anthropological Institute]. Istanbul 1940, p. 1–6, see p. 1 (Translation HBG).

folklorists and ethnologists. This ideological baggage identified anthropology as a discipline of scientific aberrations and labeled it as the study of races, bones, and skulls, even though it carried adjectives of 'social' and 'cultural' in some contemporary disciplinary configurations at the Turkish universities in later years.

However, our reader should also know that the discourses of race, culture, folk, and nation have not always been used in this way in the anthropological discourse in Turkey, whatever names the discipline might have had in the past. But, how did this hodge-podge of terms lead to a misnomer for anthropology? Did these concepts connote to other signifiers beyond ethno-racial ideologies in earlier periods of the discipline?

The text presented here is a part of my on-going research on the history of anthropology in Turkey, where I engage with the interactions of the Turkish and European ethnological landscapes in the years between 1850 and 1950, examining these interactions in a more in-depth fashion. In this long-term project, I trace the travels of *Rasse*, *Volk*, *Kultur*, and *Nation* in the Ottoman-Turkish context.

Here, too, I argue that the ushering of these concepts had different points of entry to the social science and humanities at the end of the nineteenth century Ottoman intellectual sphere. From a disciplinary perspective, race was the core concept of anthropology in the Ottoman Empire, as it was in many other countries until World War II, many of its practitioners coming from biology and natural history, or medical studies.³ Until the late-nineteenth century, on the other hand, ethnology had been driven by the impetus to discover the hidden laws of human development. Scholars hoped to do this by aggregating data about as many cultures as possible – both past and present – and by tabulating and classifying them.⁴ This was also true of the way how anthropology and ethnology developed in the Ottoman Empire, until the point when the Turkish Republic employed race as a synonym for nation. Therefore, for offering possible answers to the above inquiries, I rely on selective scholars and texts. I maintain that these concepts should be contextualised in the framework of a paradigm shift in anthropological understandings from an empire to a nation; from the Ottoman to the Turkish, nonetheless challenging the neat categories of 'empire-building' versus 'nation-building' anthropologies of the Euro-American traditions, once offered by George Stocking.⁵ To the contrary, the case of Ottoman-Turkish anthropology complicates such a distinction, as it emerged at a point of 'empire-saving' efforts.

Imagine the Ottoman Empire at the end of the nineteenth century: An empire in decline ... Many intellectuals believed that science, advancement, and European modernity were cures to an Islamic empire. However, the reception of evolution-related

3 Vermeulen also notes that during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, anthropology was a medical, biological, or philosophical study of humankind. Terms such as social and cultural anthropology emerged in the early twentieth century to replace ethnology. Cf. Han Vermeulen: *Before Boas. Genesis of Ethnography and Ethnology in the German Enlightenment*. Nebraska 2015, p. 35.

4 Cf. Gisela Welz: *Ethnology*. In: *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* 8 (2015), pp. 198–202, see p. 198.

5 Cf. George W. Stocking, Jr.: *Afterword: A View from the Center*. In: *Ethnos* 47 (1982) 1–2, pp. 172–186.

ideas in a dominantly Muslim society led by the Islamic Khalifs required a careful, intellectual maneuver among the Ottoman elite. But they wanted to follow ideas of development, progress, and science which they believed could be obtained from Europe. This was a natural, national reaction seen in many histories of capitalist transition of non-western countries, where Europe was imagined to be the original site of modernity.⁶ The Ottoman elite, attentive to positivist, scientific thinking showed interest in what is referred to in anthropological and ethnological studies, too. By translating original texts, and compiling their own texts, they facilitated a travel of theory. But they did not simply transfer European knowledge of science: "Their science, but not their values" became a motto for them for saving the empire.

On the other hand, 'scientific' concepts also followed a different path among the twentieth century Turkish elite. Especially the founding cadre of the Republic were trying to set themselves off from the Ottoman Empire. Wittingly, they charged their concepts politically and used them pseudo-scientifically, modifying and adapting them to the nation-building process, as these concepts were congruent with notions of peopledom. Although modernity remained a key term in the Turkish Republic as well, it was conceived as a tool to compete with Europe – to "reach the level of civilization," not to "save the Empire" any more. While the Ottoman elite clung to scientific discourses as modernisation apparatuses, the Turkish Republican discourse created a *Mischmasch*, a patch-work, where anthropology was used to serve the new republic's ideals. This important shift in political thought also impacted both praxis and understanding of anthropology, which still impacts its trajectories even today.

Going back to the opening scene, let me introduce the founders of the Centre of Anthropological Research of Turkey, which will point to some important directions that anthropology took. The cadre of the institute was mostly composed of anatomists of the Faculty of Medicine – Nurettin Ali (Berkol) (1880–1952), Neşet Ömer (İrdelp) (1882–1948), Süreyya Ali (Kayacan) (1877–1961). It also included a French physician [Jean] Aimé Mouchet (1886–1941)⁷, İsmayıl Hakkı (Baltacıoğlu) (1886–1978), a pedagogue and politician,⁸ and Şevket Aziz (Kansu) (1903–83), an assistant in the Faculty of Medicine. Kansu went to Paris with a scholarship of the Dar'ul Fünûn⁹ and studied with Georges Papillault (1863–1934) at the l'École d'Anthropologie – Paris and at the Paul Broca Laboratory (*École des Hautes Études*),¹⁰ familiarizing himself with Johann

6 Cf. Dipesh Chakrabarty: *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. New Jersey 2008 [2000].

7 Mouchet's presence at the Medical School, where the language of education was French, marks the end of the French influence in medicine in Turkey, levering more room to the German school. Cf. Şeref Etker: *Dr. Aimeé Mouchet ve Tıbbiyede Fransız Kültürel Egemenliğinin Sonu* [Dr. Aimeé Mouchet and the end of the French cultural hegemony at the School of Medicine]. In: *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları* VI/2 (2005), pp. 35–70.

8 Cf. Kansu: *Türkiye'de Antropolojik İlimlerin*, p. 1.

9 House of Sciences. Established in 1900, it was modelled after the modern understanding of 'university'. The Ottoman Minister of Education of the time, Münif Paşa, established the Cemiyet-i İlmiye-i Osmaniye [Society of Ottoman Knowledge] to deal with the affairs of Dar'ul Fünûn. Society's journal *Mecmua-i Fünun* [Journal of Sciences] published several articles, some of which were translations of scientific texts and which also helped promoting anthropology.

10 Cf. Kansu: *Türkiye'de Antropolojik İlimlerin*, p. 3.

Friedrich Blumenbach's (1752–1840) approaches and terminology to the study of races. Kansu became the first professional physical anthropologist in Turkey in 1929, teaching courses on physical anthropology and ethnology.¹¹ The later eventually led to the emergence of a social branch of anthropology, nonetheless confusing the public more because of many different disciplinary configurations.

The physicians' presence determined the way how anthropology was to be 'performed.' It also seconds the view that three educational institutions were singled out as having made major contributions to the establishment of a modernised Turkey: Harbiye (Military Academy, established in 1834), Tibbiye (School of Medicine, established as Tiphane-i Amire in 1827), and Mekteb-i Fünûn-i Mülkiye (School of Public Administrative Sciences, established in 1859), Mülkiye, thereafter. No doubt, the Military academy has been the main site and the carrier of national thought in the Turkish Republic. The importance of Mülkiye in the Turkish nationalist movement is not any lesser.¹²

As a detailed textual analysis has shown so far, the Ottoman-Turkish political elite did not re-invent the ideas of *Rasse*, *Kultur*, *Volk*, and *Nation*, all of which played into defining the scope of anthropology. Rather they selectively borrowed these concepts from Germany, Switzerland, and France, but they agglutinated them, in different fashions, to the state discourses of the day.¹³ The curious journey of 'race' negotiated its sources. At the turn of the nineteenth century, there was a concurrence between French and German traditions; despite the rapprochement with Germany, years-long interactions with France could not have been abandoned at once. I will turn to this point later.

For my analysis I borrowed the term "traveling theory" from Edward Said, who pointed out that theories have "no fixed political meanings, but take on different implications depending on where, when and how they are deployed."¹⁴ This process raises important questions about the relationship between locales and contexts of theory. During their travel, concepts can cross, transcend and transform, and sometimes blur the boundaries between different academic contexts, as in our case, which shows that theory's travel is not simply a unilinear transformation from one ethnological tradition to the other. As Dipesh Chakrabarty has argued every case of transferring a cultural, economic or political model or theory from one context to another always involves "a

problem of translation,"¹⁵ a point which locates travelling concepts facing a process of reception and adaptation into local contexts.

To understand the ways in which theory travelled, I examine specific situations, contexts, sites, receptions and/or rejections of certain anthropological knowledge between Turkey and Germany, which reveals that theory travelled in many ways: Persons travelled from and to the respective countries for research or teaching.¹⁶ By the turn of the nineteenth century, a German colony with a population of some thousands existed in Istanbul, and comprised of intellectuals, engineers, and cultural personages.¹⁷ Similarly, especially since 1871, a group of Ottoman and Turkish intellectuals stayed, in different durations, in Berlin.¹⁸ On the Turkish part, several anthropological texts from German tradition were translated into Turkish. On the German part, several archaeological excavations started in Asia Minor.

Theory also travelled through institutions and texts used in teaching. Interestingly, having been opened for supplying state officials to be employed at the Ministries of Finance, Interior, and Exterior at the middle and upper ranks, the Mülkiye produced, utilised, and disseminated anthropological knowledge to its students, viewing anthropology mainly as an applied science that could furnish the imperial officials' knowledge on the birth of human populations and their diversity. Tainted with Turkish nationalist tendencies which opposed the Sultanate, the school was suspended between 1876 and 1908, when the Ottoman Empire was ruled by Abdülhamit II, an enlightened despot.¹⁹ The source of Kemalist policies and thus of the emergent Turkish nationalism can be traced back to several thinkers and writers of the Second Constitutional Period, who had a connection to Mülkiye.²⁰

For example, Blumenbach's (1752–1840) explorations into the study of mankind as an aspect of natural history and his classification of human races were known already among the Ottoman elite and were later employed in the Turkish nationalist project. The work of Karl (in some sources Carl) Vogt (1817–1895), a philosopher and politician who emigrated to Switzerland and worked on racial typology at the University of

11 Ibid, p. 3.

12 For the role of Mülkiye in Turkey, see: Joseph S. Szyliowicz: Elite Recruitment in Turkey. The Role of Mülkiye. In: World Politics 23 (1971) 3, pp. 371–398.

13 The racist nationalism was also coloured with linguistic nationalism, going as far as commissioning Hermann Feodor Kvergić, a Viennese scholar, to produce a theory based on psycho-ethnology. In submitting his work *La psychologie de quelques éléments des langues turques to Atatürk*, Kvergić argued that proto-Turkish was the first language in which simple sounds, later to become words, were uttered. Cf. Feodor Kvergić: *La psychologie de quelques éléments des langues turques to Atatürk*, Vienna 1935; Jens Peter Laut: *Noch einmal zu Dr. Kvergić*. In: *Turkic Languages* 6 (2002), pp. 120–133; Jens Peter Laut: *Das Türkische als Ursprache? Sprachwissenschaftliche Theorien in der Zeit des erwachenden türkischen Nationalismus*. Wiesbaden 2000.

14 Edward Said: *Traveling Theory*. In: *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. Harvard 1983, pp. 226–247, see p. 226.

15 Chakrabarty: *Provincializing Europe*, p. 17.

16 Cf. Yavuz Köse (ed.): *Osmanen in Hamburg – eine Beziehungsgeschichte zur Zeit des Ersten Weltkrieges*. Hamburg 2016, http://hup.sub.uni-hamburg.de/volltexte/2016/159/pdf/HamburgUP_Koese_Osmanen.pdf (accessed 31.03.2018).

17 Cf. Erald Pauw (ed.): *Daheim Konstantinapole. Deutsche Spuren am Bosphorus ab 1850*. Nürnberg 2014.

18 Cf. Ingeborg Boer/Ruth Haerkötter/Petra Kappers (eds.): *Türken in Berlin 1871–1945: Eine Metropole in den Erinnerungen osmanischer und türkischer Zeitzeugen*. Berlin 2002. On the impact of German scholars during the Republican Period, also see: İnan Kalaycıoğulları: *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Bilim ve Teknoloji Politikalarının Oluşumunda Alman Bilim İnsanlarının Katkıları* [Contributions of the German Scientists to the Science and Technology Politics during the Republican Period]. In: Kasım Karakütük (ed.): *İkinci Vatan ve Ankara Üniversitesi (1933–1970)* [The Second Homeland and Ankara University (1933–1970)]. Ankara 2016, pp. 101–130.

19 Cf. Raul Motika: *Modernization and Westernization in the Late Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic – A Prelude for Democracy?* In: Wolfgang Seifert/I. Hoppner (eds.): *Aspects of Democracy – Preconditions, Paths of Development and Contemporary Issues* (= Publications of the Japanese-German Center Berlin 25). Berlin 2007, pp. 70–79, <http://www.jdzb.de/fileadmin/Redaktion/PDF/veroeffentlichungen/tagungsbaende/E25/10-p1131%20motika.pdf> (accessed: 18.01.2018).

20 Cf. Erik-Jan Zürcher. *Ottoman sources of Kemalist thought*. In: Elisabeth Özdalga (ed.): *Late Ottoman Society. The Intellectual Legacy*. London 2005, pp. 13–26.

Geneva, was also known. Theories of the idiosyncratic Viennese physician Franz Joseph Gall (1758–1828) in phrenology were adopted into the Turkish context as well. It could be assumed that while ideological speculations on the biological grounds of race were used to prove the superiority of the Aryans during the Nationalsozialismus, a similar argument was adopted for the Turkish case, positing that the Turks were a *biologically* distinct and superior sub-group of humanity, denying the existence of several ethnic groups in Anatolia and claiming autochthonism for Turks.

With an accumulation of theoretical knowledge on racial research, anthropology in the Republican period took archaeology as its comrade.²¹ Several excavations took place, such as the one in Karacaahmet Cemetery, one of the oldest Muslim cemeteries of Istanbul (1925–1929) for the measuring of skulls.²² Anthropological excavations aimed to prove a prehistoric Turkish material culture in Anatolia, and with this the superiority of the Turkish race.²³ Following Gustav Kossinna's (1858–1931) argument that a regionally delimited ethnicity can be defined by the objects from material culture excavated from a site (known as culture history theory), Phrygians, Hittites, Sumerians and many ancient inhabitants of Anatolia were Turks!

As the new republic was obsessed with showing the superiority of Turks, racially and nationally, Turkishness referred to a politically and culturally salient distinctiveness. Therefore, Atatürk's words should be read in the context of an organised nationalist movement after World War I (1914–18) that successfully renegotiated the terms of the Treaty of Sevres and launched the Turkish War of Independence (1918–22).²⁴ Hans Lukas Kieser is apt to note that Turkish nationalism used anthropology to “crown”²⁵ its national revolution in the 1930s through the employment of a *Turkish history thesis*, a belief in Turkish early settlement in Asia Minor and the role of Turkishness in the making of world civilisation.²⁶

To understand the processes in which theory travelled, I now turn to examine the inter-imperial discourses. The breach of relationships with France and its conflicting interests with Britain brought it into a close contact with the German Empire, which resulted in a long-lasting cultural and political relationship.²⁷ Germany did not follow a colonialist route to Turkey, but supported the Empire's integrity, trying to gain influence in the political, economic, and cultural spheres through cultural imperialism. The

21 Cf. Suavi Aydın: Arkeoloji ve Sosyolojinin Kısacasında Türkiye'de Antropolojinin Geri Kalmışlığı [The Backwardness of Anthropology Constrained by Archaeology and Sociology]. In: Folklor/Edebiyat 6 (2000) 22, pp. 17–42, see p. 31.

22 Cf. Kansu: Türkiye'de Antropolojik İlimlerin.

23 Cf. Hande Birkalan-Gedik: Türkiye'de Antropolojilerin Kesişmesi: Avrupa Etnolojisi ve Amerikan Antropolojisi [Intersecting Anthropologies in Turkey: European Ethnology and American Anthropology]. In: Hande Birkalan-Gedik (ed.): Sınırlar, İmajlar Kültürler: Antropolojik Açıdan Avrupalılığı Düşünmek [Borders, Images, Cultures: Thinking about Europeaness from an Anthropological Perspective]. Ankara 2013, pp. 173–235, see p. 179.

24 Cf. Birkalan-Gedik: Turkey, Anthropology.

25 Hans Lucas Kieser: Türkische Nationalrevolution, anthropologisch gekrönt: Kemal Atatürk und Eugene Pittard. In: Historische Anthropologie 1 (2006), pp. 105–18, see p. 106.

26 Ibid, p. 119.

27 Cf. Suzanne Marchand: Orientalism as Kulturpolitik. German Archaeology and Cultural Imperialism in Asia Minor. In: George W. Stocking, Jr. (ed.): Volksgeist as Method and Ethic. The History of Anthropology, vol. 8. Madison 1996, pp. 298–336.

rapprochement of German and Ottoman Empires was also observable in a knowledge transfer in the natural and social sciences; especially between 1850 and 1950, several encounters of anthropological and ethnological traditions took place. Several orientalist societies that were founded in Germany also conducted archaeological excavations in Asia Minor.²⁸ German texts were translated into Turkish. Orientalists and ethnologists travelled to the Ottoman Empire. The German colony in Istanbul was on the rise. All this mobility helped to transmit the scientific paradigms of anthropological discourse.

The travelling of theory, for the most part, took place during the Tanzimat Period (1839–1876), the period of political re-organisation, when the first elements of westernisation were introduced through a series of reforms, which appeared in several aspects of the society.²⁹ The first Ottoman constitution in 1876 was followed by the establishment of an indirectly elected parliament, which convened in 1877. In this period, not one, but several solutions were offered: Pan-Ottomanism argued that a nation should include all subjects of the Ottoman Empire, and Pan-Islamism argued that the nation should be comprised of only Muslims. The Pan-Turkist solution was that the nation was to be comprised of Turks. At the end, Turkey followed the last cure – emerging as a secular-Muslim, Turkish democracy.

In this period, ethnology, a science with an interest in the creation and the physical characteristics of human beings, developed theories to replace the Creation myth. Anthropological versions of Darwinism, such as the theory by Ernst Haeckel, travelled to the Ottoman context via Ahmed Nebil's translations and writings³⁰ such as *İnsânın Menşei* [The Origin of Humans] (1911) shows. Şemseddin Sami in *İnsân* [Human] (1878) and in *Yine İnsân* [Human, Again] (1886) explored the nature of human beings.³¹ Baha Tevfik (1884–1914) also cooperated with Ahmed Nebil on texts on the origins of the humans. Among many other publications in this period, an important one is *Etnografya: İlm-i Akvâm* [Ethnography: The Science of the Ethnic Groups] (1911) by Mustafa Satı el Nusri (1884–1968) followed the general tendencies of ethnography, as he was interested in the diversity of the peoples of the world. Based on his lecture notes of his ethnography course at Mülkiye, he questioned the concept of sacred history in this work.³² Interestingly, he also received his education from Mülkiye (1900), which produced a cadre of elite nationalists of the Republic. Later in his life, he diverged from the Turkish nationalists and joined the Pan-Arab movement.

As a learned man in law, philosophy and physics in Berlin, and the minister of education, Münif Paşa himself published a 18 page-long collection on different people's eating, housing, and clothing habits with the title *Adat-ı Ümem* [Customs of Peoples], originally published as separate articles as of 1861, which he brought together in

28 Cf. *ibid.*

29 Cf. Halil İnalçık: Application of the Tanzimat and Its Social Effects. Lisee 1976.

30 For a commentary, see: İnan Kalaycıoğulları/İsmail Dinçarslan: İnsanın Menşei/Nesl-i Beşer. Ernst Haeckel. Çeviren: Ahmet Nebil. Konya 2015.

31 Cf. *ibid.*

32 Cf. İnan Kalaycıoğulları: The Birth of the New Perception of Humankind from Şemseddin Sami to Ahmed Nebil. In: FLSF (2016) 21, pp. 181–195, see p. 183.

a single manuscript in the 1880s.³³ This work speaks to the general understanding of eighteenth-century ethnology, as a systematic attempt to acquire and compare information about nations throughout the world.

The work of Mordtmann-Osman Bey can be read as a palimpsest of travelling theory. Osman Bey published *İlm-i Ahval-i Akvam* [Science of the State of Ethnic Groups – literally, Ethnology] (1884), based on the lecture notes of Andreas David Mordtmann (father) (1811–1879) at the Mülkiye, bringing ethnology and ethnography together.³⁴ Osman Bey (1856–1920) was Mordtmann's student at the Mülkiye, becoming the principal of the same school after his graduation. This was not unusual, if one thinks about the regulations then, which enabled fresh graduates to become directors of seasoned teachers.

Born in Hamburg,³⁵ Mordtmann had grown up in financially distressed conditions and was self-taught in orientalist studies. On the geographer Karl Ritter's suggestion, he translated Istakhri's work from Arabic into German as *Das Buch der Länder* (Hamburg, 1845) and earned an honorary doctorate from the University of Kiel.³⁶ Aided by Karl Sieveking (1787–1847), he was appointed to Istanbul in 1846, where he lived almost 35 years, even obtaining a citizenship of the Ottoman Empire.³⁷ He worked as *chargé d'affaires* until the Hanseatic embassy was closed in 1859.³⁸ Afterwards, he continued to work as a protestant missionary, taking a protestant and an anti-Prussian position.³⁹ In terms of a charitable organisation, a *Wohlthätigkeitsverein*, he advocated the establishment of a pastorate, the construction of a hospital, a nursing school and a cemetery, and the founding of the German cultural association Teutonia in 1847. He became a judge for trade law between the Hansa states and the Ottoman Empire and worked as judge, journalist, and teacher, mediating knowledge between the German and the Turkish state and society.⁴⁰

As an orientalist, Mordtmann travelled through Anatolia and published from 1855 to 1859 several travel notes in the journal *Das Ausland*, among many periodicals. Franz Babinger (1891–1967) collected and annotated them in 1925.⁴¹ Although temperate in style, Mordtmann viewed the Turks as Barbarians from Asia who were

threatening European culture.⁴² As a teacher, Mordtmann taught statistics, ethnology, and ethnography at Mülkiye in Istanbul upon the appointment of Münif Paşa in 1877. He left many writings such as legation reports, scientific and journalistic works, and personal letters behind when he died in 1880.

I consider Mordtmann as a “cosmopolitan cultural broker,” borrowing the term from Ulf Hannerz.⁴³ He was a participant observer, witnessing the late nineteenth century Ottoman cultural and political life and participated in it. As a cultural translator for both sides, he transmitted knowledge about ‘the Orient’ for the readers in Germany and carried ethnological and ethnographic understandings of the nineteenth century to the Ottoman students.

To show the ways in which scientific discourses were received, let me now turn to the text, which has an ethnological beginning, in the sense that it introduces general information on the emergence of human beings. Osman Bey asks: “How did human beings come into being?” – “Were they directly created [by God] or did they descend from animals such as from monkeys?”, juxtaposing Darwinist and Creationist perspectives at once. After a long discussion, Osman Bey defines humans as sub-species of mammals in the chapter of his work *What is Humankind?*. He notes that humans possess abilities such as intelligence, differentiation, abstraction, dreaming, and speaking, which distinguish humans from animals.

He, then, shifts to a brief presentation of races, based on the typology of Blumenbach. The rest of the lecture notes introduces and describes human diversity, this time based not on race, but on ethnicity – presenting different ethnic and national groups and their religious ceremonies and customs (Afghan, Baluch, Persian, Hindu, Brahman, Coptic, Kurdish, Yezidi, Armenian, Georgian, Caucasian, Swedish and Norwegian). This final part discusses some of the cultural characteristics of these peoples, such as their religious ceremonies, much in the fashion of ‘manners and customs’ and making a transition to what would be today called social and cultural anthropology.

Clearly, the text carries the traces of lecture notes showing abrupt transitions between its sections. We do not know if they all belong to one course, or to many courses; to one semester or to many. Osman Bey, who became a high rank official, had strong religious beliefs and it is not always clear if it is Mordtmann or Osman Bey speaking in the text. Mordtmann's training in orientalism might have had an effect on the text, especially in the presentation of different peoples based on their customs and traditions. Lastly, this text might have functioned for preparing officials for public duty, where they would be interacting with different peoples. Certainly, the text by Mordtmann-Osman Bey is among many other texts of late nineteenth century Ottoman scientific discourses. It presents similarities and differences with other works I

33 Cf. Ali Budak: Münif Paşa'nın Gölgede Kalmış Antropolojik Bir İlkeseri: Âdât-ı Ümem [An Overshadowed Work of Münif Paşa: Âdât-ı Ümem]. In: Akademik Bakış 2006 (8), pp. 19.

34 Cf. Yeliz Okay: Etnografya'nın Türkiye'ye Girişi ve İlm-i Ahval-i Akvam [Emergence of ethnography in Turkey and İlm-i Ahval-i Akvam]. Istanbul 2012.

35 Cf. Franz Babinger: Andreas David Mordtmann's Leben und Schriften. In: Andreas D. Mordtmann: Anatolien, Skizzen und Reisebriefe aus Kleinasien (1850–1859), eingeleitet und mit Anmerkungen versehen von Franz Babinger. Hannover 1925 [reprint 1972], pp. vi-xxxiv; Semavi Eyice: A. D. Mordtmann. In: Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi V (1993–1995), pp. 489–90/91.

36 Cf. Hilal Görgün: Mordtmann, Andreas David. In: İslam Ansiklopedisi 30 (2005), pp. 286–287, <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/mordtmann-andreas-david> (accessed: 15.12.2017).

37 Cf. *ibid.*

38 Cf. Tobias Völker: Istanbul, Türkei: Andreas David Mordtmann und die protestantische Gemeinde in Istanbul, <http://www.global-archives.de/forschung/istanbul-tuerkei-andreas-david-mordtmann-und-die-protestantische-gemeinde-in-istanbul-tobias-voelker/> (accessed: 21.08.2017).

39 Cf. *ibid.*

40 Cf. *ibid.*

41 Cf. Babinger: Andreas David Mordtmann's Leben und Schriften.

42 Cf. Tobias Völker: Vom „Johanneum“ an die „Hohe Pforte“ – das Leben und Wirken des Hamburger Orientalisten und Diplomaten Andreas David Mordtmann d. Ä. In: Köse: Osmanen in Hamburg, pp. 25–44, http://hup.sub.uni-hamburg.de/volltexte/2016/159/chapter/HamburgUP_Osmanen_Voelker.pdf (accessed: 25.03.2018).

43 Ulf Hannerz: Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning. New York 1992, see p. 177.

named above. This point requires a more attentive examination, which will reveal important points in the due course of my project.

Besides positivist, scientific, and materialistic transfer of ideas, the Tanzimat Period witnessed another field of transfer that exhibited romantic-nationalist understandings of the idea of *Volk*.⁴⁴ Johann Gottfried Herder's writings found reception, predominantly in the writings of Ziya Gökalp (1875–1924), known as the father of Turkish nationalism. Among others, Ahmed Vefik Paşa (1823–1891), Şemseddin Sami (1850–1904), Ziya Paşa (1829–1880), and Rıza Tevfik (1869–1949) turned to folk and folk literature, arguing that everything Turkish was good, and everything Ottoman was detrimental – a threat for the national culture. While folklore brought the issue of nationality into the discussion, it was busy discussing the value and the meaning of Turkish oral literature. For example, Ahmed Vefik Paşa revised the *Müntehabât ı Durub-ı Emsal* [Dictionary of Proverbs], increasing the listings of proverbs to 5000 items and publishing it in 1881.⁴⁵

Folklor or *Halkbilim* in Turkish refers to folkloristics in English, which is disguised as *Volkskunde*, *Kulturanthropologie*, *Europäische Ethnologie* or *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft* in German-speaking countries. Today, folklore studies and cultural anthropology in Turkey represent different disciplines in different departmental configurations, mainly following the initial configuration at the Ankara University. This case shows that, despite their different origins, at times divergent, at times parallel, trajectories, folklore, emerge from a nascent interest in *Volk* and *Nation* which was observable in national literature. On the other hand, anthropology aimed at maintaining the nation by using physical anthropology and chose race as its main concept.

Throughout this paper, I have pointed to a paradigm shift that occurred during the transformation of the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic, when the disciplines of anthropology, ethnology, and folklore, that had developed separately but parallel, were merged into the discourses of the process of nation-building.

When the name of Dar'ul Fünûn was changed to Istanbul University as part of the university reform in 1933, the Anthropology Centre merged with the Faculty of Science at Istanbul University, taking the name of Turkish Anthropological Institute. In 1935, Atatürk decided to establish the Faculty of Languages, History, and Geography at the Ankara University, and the anthropology chair was moved to Ankara. Seniha Tunakan (1908–2000), who was a student of Kansu, studied in Berlin at the *Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik* between 1936 and 1938 with the *Rassenhygieniker* Eugen Fischer (1874–1967).⁴⁶ Coming back to Turkey, Tunakan joined the crew of anthropologists, which offered a few courses in ethnology after moving to Ankara, with a focus on physical anthropology and paleo-anthropology.⁴⁷

44 Cf. Hande Birkalan-Gedik: *Pertev Naili Boratav and His Contributions to Turkish Folklore*. M.A. Thesis. Bloomington 1996.

45 Cf. Hande Birkalan-Gedik: *Pertev Naili Boratav, Turkish Politics and the University Events*. In: *The Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 25 (2001) 1, pp. 39–60.

46 Cf. Birkalan-Gedik: *Turkey, Anthropology*.

47 Cf. Kansu: *Türkiyede Antropolojik İlimlerin*.

Afet İnan (1908–1985), one of Atatürk's adopted daughters, in 1925, three years after meeting Atatürk, was sent to Lausanne to study French, continuing her studies at the French High School of Notre Dame de Sion in Istanbul. Atatürk charged her with a mission, as a firm believer in the Turkish version of history, which needed physical anthropology. Later, she was sent to Geneva to study with Eugene Pittard.⁴⁸ Although trained in history, she became famous through her work in anthropology. For İnan the period before written history could be understood only through (physical) anthropological studies. İnan was never associated with any anthropology department, but she participated in the formation of the *Turkish history thesis*, for which she used anthropological and archaeological materials.⁴⁹ İnan became the head of the Department of Turkish Republic and Turkish Revolutionary History at the Ankara University. On the other hand, Pittard created the Musée d'Ethnographie de Geneva (1911), the Swiss Institute of Anthropology (1912), and he became the Chair of Anthropology and Prehistory of the same university. It is not a coincidence that İnan worked with Eugene Pittard, when she was sent to Switzerland in 1935 for her doctoral studies. With his thesis *Les Races et l'Histoire* (1924), Pittard firmly believed that the Neolithic turn was due to the brachycephalic race. And when he researched the Turks of Asia he concluded that they were also brachycephalic.⁵⁰

An exception to the racial anthropological discourses at the Ankara University was Muzaffer Süleyman Şenyürek (1915–1961), who focused on the 'Turkish race' at the Ankara University, distancing himself from the previous notions of race and culture as though they were the same thing. Having studied at the Harvard University, he argued, for example, that no positive correlation can be found between blood types and races, therefore breaking off with the ideologically informed racial research. However, his attempts can only be seen on an individual level, while there has been no institutional movement that could come to terms with the racist past of the Turkish anthropology similar to what we can see it in the German-speaking traditions.

Although a little bit off the time scope, let me say a few sentences about the directions anthropology took after the 1950s.

In 1962, the Centre adopted the name of Research Institute of Anthropological Sciences. In 1993, the social branch of anthropology became a separate chair, and it adopted the disciplinary name of physical- and paleoanthropology, joining back to the department, and altogether forming a Department of Anthropology in 2002. The formation of ethnology since that time took place when Nermin Erdentuğ (1917–2000), a student of Kansu, became the chairperson of ethnology (1961–1980). She conducted research in physical anthropology on the one hand, and used ethnographic approaches

48 Hande Birkalan-Gedik: "Türkiyede Antropolojilerin Kesişmesi: Avrupa Etnolojisi ve Amerikan Antropolojisi [Intersecting Anthropologies in Turkey: European Ethnology and American Anthropology]." In: Hande Birkalan-Gedik (ed.): *Sınırlar, İmajlar Kültürler: Antropolojik Açıdan Avrupalılığı Düşünmek* [Borders, Images, Cultures: Thinking about Europeanness from an Anthropological Perspective]. Ankara. p. 173–235, here p. 181.

49 Cf. Hasan Münüsoğlu: *Türkiyede Antropolojinin Kurulma ve Kurumsallaşma Sorunlarına Tarihsel bir Yaklaşım: DTCF Örneği* [A Historical Approach to the Establishment and Institutionalization of Anthropology in Turkey: Example of DTCF]. M.A. Thesis. Ankara 2010, p. 16.

50 Cf. Kieser: *Türkische Nationalrevolution*.

in her research on the social and cultural structure of villages on the other, producing a standard form of knowledge in mainly descriptive village monographs.⁵¹

Anthropology, named as ethnology, approached villagers as objects to be developed, while creating an internal domination over them by way of the notion of progress. Villages were thought to be homogeneous and static in the larger framework of *mission civilisatrice*. They had to be westernised and modernised. The non-Turkish groups had to be 'Turkified' for further achieving of national progress and national unity.⁵²

There is one more episode to the story that concerns folklore: Pertev Naili Boratav (1907–1998) was the founder of folklore studies in Turkey at Ankara University. He was assigned to the Department of Turkish Language and Literature in the Faculty of Languages, History and Geography in 1938, where he introduced folklore courses into the curriculum. Folklore was taught in the department until 1947, and Boratav received state funding to establish an autonomous department of folklore.⁵³ However, during the 1947–48 winter semester, several professors, including Boratav, were charged with promoting non-nationalist ideas, which were then interpreted as left-wing. Boratav was even forced to defend himself in a trial. To make the long story short, Boratav's case began in 1948 and was not resolved until 1950. His funding for the department was cancelled and folklore classes came to a halt. He could not work in Turkey anymore and had to leave his position at the university. He moved to France, continuing his studies there. He died in Paris in 1998.

Between his death and the year of 1980, folklore studies remained almost dormant at Ankara University. Sedat Veyis Örnek (1929–1980), who received his doctoral degree at the University of Tübingen in 1960, was appointed to the Department of Ethnology in Ankara University as an assistant in the same year. Örnek aimed to reintroduce folklore studies at Ankara University in the fall of 1980 but he died unexpectedly in November of the same year.

Then, in 1980 the chair was divided between social anthropology and folklore culture (folklore), and Erdentuğ became the chair of social anthropology. Today, the Department of Anthropology has three conjoined disciplines: physical anthropology, paleoanthropology, and social anthropology. Folklore and ethnology are also different disciplines within social anthropology.

The history of anthropology, which began with classes in ethnology and ethnography in Mülkiye, followed by a re-institutionalisation at Istanbul University, shows one trajectory of the travelling theory, in fact, of a travelling anthropological theory. The establishment of anthropology in 1925 that followed a route to Ankara also complicates the disciplinary history of anthropology, ethnology, and folklore in Turkey. To date, anthropology in Turkey is still known not only as the discipline of the study of races, but as a racist discipline as well. This also overshadows folklore studies that started as an autonomous discipline through the attempts of Pertev Naili Boratav.

Regarding the questions I asked at the beginning of this paper: The answers may lie in the above condensed history and beyond.

In the course of an on-going project, I cannot offer definite conclusions for the moment, but speculate in several possible directions that I will take into my research. The diverse common ground between German and Turkish traditions illustrates that multiply practiced anthropological pathways were followed – although some of them used anthropological knowledge for ideological political claims. The adaptation of German-derived theories and concepts was constitutive for the development of anthropology in Turkey especially between 1850 and 1950. Beginning with a scientific interest, the route of theory changed into a political one in the Turkish Republic. The travelling theory did not follow a unidimensional direction, but it was received, modified, and performed for different audiences and different aims.

For that matter, one is to reconsider that what could have been identified at one point as marginal could play a role in the centre at another point. Clearly, the German ethnological landscape, which could have been identified as marginal in the face of Anglo-American and French anthropologies, was very central for almost a century starting with 1850s, not only for Turkish anthropology, but also for ethnology and folklore.

To wrap up, as an unfinished project, anthropology in Turkey negotiated the dynamic and competing traditions, schools, ideas and approaches between German, French, and Swiss traditions in its earlier decades and ended up with giving more leverage to French sociology, British and American anthropologies respectively, after the 1950s. Especially by looking at the earlier years, I could pin-point several sites of the travelling theory, beginning with Mülkiye, continuing through Dar'ul Fünûn, Istanbul University, and Ankara University. In that respect, my conclusive remark is on a more local level, which points toward writing a revisionist history of anthropology that will simultaneously consider the possible routes that the travelling theory took. That would lead us to an *Institutionsgeschichte* not of one, but of many institutions where anthropology was taught in disciplinary or interdisciplinary formats. Such an effort should consider the interactions among multiple trajectories of anthropology in Turkey. One needs to trace the travels of the theory – the ways in which it was received, played out, and used in different knowledge formats – which is to analyse the contexts and performances of museums, journals, state discourses not as containers of thought or theory but as active agents of it.

My last point concerns a moral responsibility. In the text presented here, I alluded to a similar case in German-speaking *Volkskunde*, which I did not elaborate. I urge for a *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* of the past of Turkish anthropology and folklore to a degree, which requires a paradigm shift that prioritises self-reflexivity. I find this a necessary step – a moral duty for anthropologists and folklorists, something, which is lacking in the Turkish case. I have noted earlier that such an *Abschied* is necessary in other places “where scholars and intelligentsia suffered from extremist ideologies, lost their jobs, were tried in courts for their work, imprisoned, and even forced to leave their

51 Cf. Birkalan-Gedik: Turkey, Anthropology.

52 Cf. *ibid.*

53 Cf. Birkalan-Gedik: Pertev Naili Boratav, Turkish Politics and the University Events.

countries at the cost of standing up against infamy.”⁵⁴ What can sound more familiar now, when we think about the current politics in Turkey?

Michael J. Greger

„Ich bitte Sie mir darum nicht böse zu sein.“

Aus Post an Viktor Geramb als Schriftleiter der „Heimatgrüße“ im Ersten Weltkrieg

Überlegungen zum 100-jährigen Jubiläum des Endes des Ersten Weltkrieges¹ und zu einer Person stehen am Anfang dieses Textes, der Helmut Eberhart über viele Jahre immer wieder, als Forscher und auch als Universitätslehrer viel Aufmerksamkeit widmete: Viktor Geramb. Von 1915–1918 war der Pionier der steirischen universitären und musealen Volkskunde, der Volksbildner und Heimatschützer Viktor Geramb² (1884–1958) u.a. als Schriftleiter der *Heimatgrüße* des „Vereins für Heimatschutz in Steiermark“³ tätig. Vom 12. Februar 1915 bis zum Dezember 1919 (das letzte quasi als Friedensbotschaft und Epilog 1919) erschienen 52 „Kriegsflugblätter“, zuerst zweiwöchig,⁴ ab dem 40. Gruß, gedruckt im Impressum des 41. Grußes, erschienen die Flugblätter monatlich, zuletzt ab 1917 in immer selteneren Intervallen, „zwanglos“⁵; im Jahr 1918 nur mehr ein Gruß. Es geht hier keinesfalls um eine vollständige Auswertung all dieser Zuschriften oder gar eine Edition, sondern um einen hoffentlich scharfen ersten Blick auf Aspekte dieser Zuschriften.

Es soll in diesem Artikel auch nicht um eine Analyse der Ausrichtung und Gestaltung dieser „Kriegsflugblätter“ gehen, diese hat bereits Werner Suppanz⁶ 2013 vor-

- 1 Zu vielen Details der Geschichte des I. Weltkrieges vgl. Manfred Rauchensteiner: *Der Erste Weltkrieg und das Ende der Habsburgermonarchie 1914–1918*. Wien/Köln/Weimar 2013, bes. S. 853–864 zu Spottnamen für die jeweiligen Feinde, Forschungen in den Gefangenenlagern sowie fremdsprachigen Zeitungen für Kriegsgefangene.
- 2 Zu Leben und Werk Viktor Geramb vgl. die zahlreichen Publikationen Helmut Eberharts, hier nur beispielhaft Helmut Eberhart: *Nationalgedanke und Heimatpflege*. Viktor Geramb und die Institutionalisierung der Volkskunde in Graz. In: Wolfgang Jacobeit/Hannjost Lixfeld/Olaf Bockhorn (Hg.): *Völkische Wissenschaft. Gestalten und Tendenzen der deutschen und österreichischen Volkskunde in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Wien/Köln/Weimar 1994, S. 427–439; ders.: *Viktor Geramb und seine Bedeutung für die Österreichische Volkskunde*. In: Othmar Pickl (Hg.): *800 Jahre Steiermark und Österreich 1192–1992. Der Beitrag der Steiermark zu Österreichs Größe (= Forschungen zur geschichtlichen Landeskunde der Steiermark XXXV)*. Graz 1992, S. 681–702; vgl. auch, ermöglicht und angeregt durch Helmut Eberhart: Michael J. Greger/Johann Verhovsek: *Viktor Geramb. 1884–1958. Leben und Werk (= Buchreihe der Österreichischen Zeitschrift für Volkskunde. Neue Serie 22)*. Wien 2007.
- 3 Antje Senarclens de Grancy (Hg.): *Identität Politik Architektur. Der „Verein für Heimatschutz in Steiermark“ (= Architektur + Analyse 4)*. Berlin 2013. Zu Viktor Geramb's Aktivitäten innerhalb des Vereines in der Zwischenkriegszeit vgl. Helmut Eberhart: „... auf heimatlicher Grundlage ...“. Viktor Geramb und der Heimatschutz 1918–1938. In: Ebd., S. 71–87.
- 4 Werner Suppanz hat 2013 darauf hingewiesen, dass der Begriff „Kriegsflugblätter“ eigentlich irrig ist, geht man von einer heute verwendeten Definition als „Druckschriften, die während eines Krieges von den jeweiligen Propagandaabteilungen [...] herausgegeben werden, um sie im Herrschaftsbereich des Gegners zu verbreiten“, aus, vgl. Werner Suppanz: *Eine Liebesgabe für das deutsche Herz. Die Kriegsflugblätter *Heimatgrüße* des Vereins für Heimatschutz im Ersten Weltkrieg*. In: Senarclens de Grancy (Hg.): *Identität Politik Architektur*, S. 55–70, hier S. 57, FN 5. Eher fallen in die hier verwendete Konnotation Beilagen zu Zeitungen oder Zeitschriften unterschiedlichen Inhalts, jedenfalls waren die *Heimatgrüße* Teil der „literarischen Kriegsfürsorge“.
- 5 *Heimatgrüße* (= HG) 49, 31.10.1917, S. 16.
- 6 Vgl. Suppanz: *Eine Liebesgabe für das deutsche Herz*.

54 Hande A. Birkalan-Gedik: Review of *The Study of European Ethnology in Austria*, by James R. Dow and Olaf Bockhorn. In: *The Journal of American Folklore* 122/484 (2009), pp. 233–234, see p. 234.