

The Academic Human Pavilion was open from March to July 1903 in Osaka and attracted 4.35 million visitors. It exhibited native peoples from Ryukyu (Okinawa), Taiwan, Indonesia, and Malaya and the Ainu of northern Japan. At the request of the organizer of the pavilion, Tsuboi collaborated with the exhibition through the loan of maps and anthropological and ethnographic materials on these peoples. Some critics argue that Tsuboi must have harbored imperialistic and racist ideas because he played a major role in such an exhibition of indigenous peoples from colonized territories. Judging from his writings and lectures, however, such criticisms of Tsuboi are unfounded. In an age when racial discrimination was common even among anthropologists, Tsuboi's attitude toward the Ainu people was notable: he acknowledged that they suffered from poverty and from prejudice and were losing their cultural identity as a hunter-gatherer group. This was in marked contrast to the view of the anatomist Koganei Yoshikiyo, who was well known for calling the Ainu a "racial island" and who publicly declared that the Ainu people were innately inferior and that their fate was to become extinct in the future.

Tsuboi clearly denied their innate inferiority and insisted on the need for education among Ainu children. He recognized that the poverty and low social status of the Ainu was the result of the lack of opportunities for a proper education. Moreover, Tsuboi joined a group of Japanese volunteers who established an elementary school for Ainu children in Iburi Province, Hokkaido (Kawamura 2013).

SEE ALSO: American Anthropological Association (AAA); Japan, Anthropology in; Japanese Society of Cultural Anthropology (JASCA); Oka, Masao (1898–1982); Torii Ryūzō (1870–1953); Tylor, Edward (1832–1917)

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

- Kawamura Nobuhide. 2013. *Tsuboi Shōgorō: The First Anthropologist in Japan*. Tokyo: Kobundo [in Japanese].
- Terada Kazuo. 1975. *The History of Japanese Anthropology*. Tokyo: Shisakusha [in Japanese].

Turkey, Anthropology in

HANDE A. BIRKALAN-GEDIK
Goethe Universität, Germany

History of anthropology in Turkey

Although the German orientalist Andreas David Mordtmann conducted classes on ethnography at the Mülkiye Mektebi (School of Political Sciences) at the Istanbul Darülfünun (renamed Istanbul University after 1933), anthropology was introduced to the academy by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881–1938) the founder of modern Turkey, as physical anthropology under the Faculty of Medicine in 1925. The anthropology of

Turkey presents an eclectic case, since its emergence as an academic discipline in the early 1920s coincided with the fall of the Ottoman empire and the rise of the Turkish Republic. Composed of elements drawn from various anthropological and political sources, its eclecticism is characterized by three features.

The first is the emergence of a so-called colonial discipline within the context of “peripheral” anthropologies, specifically in the context of a nation-state that employed nationalistic discourses in the process of its establishment and relied on anthropology, especially physical anthropology which later evolved into social and cultural anthropology. Turkish anthropology was used to serve the Turkish nation-state. As Hans Lukas Kieser aptly observed, Turkish nationalism used anthropology to “crown” (Kieser 2006, 106) 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 civilization. For the most part, locating national and racial identity as the basic concept for the new republic was an attempt to exalt the value of Turkishness, especially after World War I (1914–18), and the War of Independence (1918–22). Furthermore, this was an attempt to set itself off from Islam and to eradicate it as a state religion by introducing secular ideas of national belonging. At the same time, the republic aimed at establishing a revolutionary historical self-understanding opposed to that of the Ottomans (Kieser 2006, 106). With reference to the state discourse on nationalism and race, some scholars argued that the national ideology even integrated racism into its discourse. This is evident in the writings that appeared in *Turkish Review of Anthropology* (Maksudyan [2005] 2007).

The second feature relates to the disciplinary location of anthropology as a social science and its relations to sister disciplines such as folklore, sociology, ethnology, and archaeology, all of which produce anthropological knowledge about the native other, derived mainly from ethnographic fieldwork. In terms of disciplinarity, anthropology covers a large part of this “ethnological landscape,” to borrow a term from the late Swedish ethnologist Barbro Klein (2013) (Birkalan-Gedik 2013b).

The third feature in Turkish anthropology is the use of progressive discourse in the form of Darwinist ideas, which date back to the Ottoman elite of the nineteenth century (Özbudun-Demirer 2011, 111). This feature interplays with the first and the second features, with evolutionism employed as a master framework for according a higher place to the Turkish nation and race and enabling the aforementioned disciplines to work together. In fact, progress was a notion commonly held by the Ottoman elite (Özbudun-Demirer 2011), and the first traces of Darwinism can be found in late Ottoman intellectual history. Writings that used Darwinism as a general framework were translated into Turkish and printed in Ottoman script. There is evidence that versions of Darwinism, such as the one by German scientist Ernst Haeckel, made its way through the Ottoman intellectuals, who can be identified as “proto-anthropologists.”

Anthropology and national history in Turkey

The history of anthropology in Turkey is strongly linked to the country’s national history. The narrative of nation building of the young Turkish Republic, especially between

1923 and 1940, played a very important role. In this period anthropology was considered as an important element in the nation-building process (Özbudun-Demirer 2011, 111). One of the first major frameworks of the development of anthropology in Turkey was the political relation of the discipline to the state ideology, widely known as Kemalism—the grounding ideas and principles of the Turkish state that constituted its official ideology. The term derives from the founder of the Turkish Republic, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and can be summarized under six headings: republicanism, statism (in economic policy), populism, laicism, nationalism, and reformism (Tunçay, n.d.).

Many anthropologists in Turkey might argue that the country never had a colonial anthropological heritage. However, Turkish anthropology was subject to a certain degree of hegemony exerted by the statist vision of development and progress colored by national ideals (Birkalan-Gedik 2013a). In the earlier days of the Turkish Republic, other social sciences and humanities disciplines also relied on nationalist ideas. A particular case is that of the sister discipline of folklore. Together with folklore, the development of social and cultural anthropology aimed to show the “Turkishness” of Anatolia. While folklore studies mainly focused on the artistic forms to make its case, anthropology aimed at the same goal by way of physical anthropology.

Aydın underlines that the common ground for anthropology and archaeology was the Turkishness of Anatolia (2000, 31), and in the 1930s physical anthropology took archaeology as its comrade. Contrary to common belief that saw the “Turkish race” as “Mongoloid” and dolichocephalic, the discipline was useful in proving that the Turkish race was “Caucasoid” and brachycephalic. In a similar vein, archaeology also worked—together with anthropology—to serve the nationalist ideals of the newly founded republic. Several excavations took place, such as the one in Karacaahmet Cemetery between 1925 and 1929 (Kansu 1940). In this way, anthropology relied on excavations to show the value of Turkish material culture in Anatolia and thus the superiority of the Turkish race. Excavations in Alacahöyük, which were called “anthropological researches,” aimed to prove this idea (Birkalan-Gedik 2013a, 179). This extreme obsession with Turkishness led the discipline to develop with an increasing concern with “race” that is much criticized by several anthropologists in Turkey today.

The idea that anthropology can and should help nation building shaped the approaches of the study of primarily rural cultures. Furthermore, with the anxiety of the nation-state’s establishment based on biological-cultural foundations, anthropology was recognized as promoting the Turkish race, an idea that was then also customary in other national anthropological traditions. The foundations of anthropology in Turkey were shaped by the nationalist, neoevolutionist, and modernist paradigms. Thus, the early years of anthropology in Turkey displayed an “internal-other” approach, which was contrary to the mainstream colonial anthropological traditions of scholarship in other countries, which were interested in foreign, non-Western populations (Birkalan-Gedik 2005, 74). To a large degree, the statist ideology still holds sway among some anthropologists. It is noticeable in the approaches they use in the study of anthropology in present-day Turkey. The topics and groups studied are also conceptualized in tune with the official discourse.

Anthropology in Turkey was interested in another kind of other, the peasant. At the time of the foundation of the Turkish Republic, peasants composed more than 80

percent of the total population and were targeted for westernization through reforms. Anthropology, as it was then practiced, approached people as objects to be developed, while creating an internal domination over them by way of the notion of progress. This meant, in the larger framework of *mission civilatrice*, imposing so-called Western ideas onto people; modernizing villages and villagers; and “Turkifying” non-Turkish groups—as a way of achieving national progress and national unity. Therefore, as in other anthropological traditions in Europe and America, “ideology” is a key word for understanding the formation of anthropology in Turkey (Birkalan-Gedik 2011, 6).

Academic anthropological studies in Turkey started as physical anthropology at the Anthropological Research Center of Turkey, as a part of the establishment at Istanbul University’s Medical School, in 1925. In October 1925 the first issue of *Turkish Anthropology Journal*, the official journal of the institute, was printed, and twenty-two more issues were published until 1939. Having started as physical anthropology and taking the paradigm of race as its precursory movement, anthropological practices in the years to follow would evolve and move into the social and cultural realms.

Anthropology in Turkey adopted different theoretical stances. In the formative years, the impact of German conceptions of nation and nationalism was noticeable. Such influences shaped the understanding and study of culture. In the German conceptualization, culture is understood as a historical continuity. What makes this even more particular is that culture is seen as an example of the national spirit and, according to German philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder, national culture should be kept away from external influences. While following the German tradition, Turkish anthropology also focused on the relationship between race and culture and on concepts such as national unity, historical unity, and racial unity.

Much later, this emphasis on history and culture was slowly abandoned and functionalist structuralism borrowed from British anthropology. After World War II, another turn in the anthropological traditions in Turkey took place. Now, the American influence became visible in the choice of topics and approaches to the study of different topics. As Aydın notes, “starting with the 1950’s, the impact of European sociology, which was visible in the earlier days of the discipline, had weakened” (2000, 35, author’s translation). By the 1960s, the impact of US approaches reached its highest point.

The analysis of the character of early anthropological work in Turkey provides an interesting case compared to classical, mainstream anthropological histories. While the classical anthropologies of British and the American schools were primarily concerned with non-Western cultures and located the other outside and far from their national territories, the field of Turkish anthropology was the internal other seen through “Western” theories. At the same time, it was an anthropology at home with a “Turko-centric” approach. As a part of the modernist, home-based anthropological project, the groups under study were sometimes turned into objects of progress, objects to be educated and modernized, in internal colonialist fashion (Birkalan-Gedik 2005, 74).

In the period between the 1930s and the 1950s, anthropological studies on Turkey had the village as its core unit. In the 1940s village studies were the most favored topics of the educated elite. This was also the period of rural ethnographic studies. The sociologists Mediha Berkes (1914–80) and Niyazi Berkes (1908–88) were an example

of the growing interest in villages. Mediha Berkes's work was conducted as ethnology and produced pioneer writings on rural Turkey. She had taken classes at the University of Chicago in the mid-1930s, when she accompanied her husband. Niyazi Berkes's work on Ankara villages tried to map out the characteristics of the villages near the capital city. Behice Boran's (1910–87) work in the Aegean relied on survey and compared two villages: one near the plateau, another in the mountains. These were important studies in the late 1940s, monographs that provided information on marriage, family, and kinship. In fact, most of the information on family today come from these sources. Alan Duben pioneered fieldwork on families in urban contexts pointed to a fairly new topic in anthropology in Turkey (Birkalan-Gedik 2011, 12).

In the 1930s to 1950s studies at Ankara University's Department of Ethnology focused more on material culture issues and other cultural elements, using a descriptive approach, while the tradition established by sociologists and ethnologists such as Mübeccel Kıray (1923–2007), İbrahim Yasa (1908–93), and Behice Boran (1910–87) used a sociological understanding in the framework of British-oriented structuralist–functionalist theories. Both traditions kept an interest in history. But, after the 1950s, in the work of Kıray, the historical aspect receded into the background and sociological methods, such as surveys and questionnaires, were used in field research.

The 1940s and 1950s can be described as a period of development in which fieldwork-based anthropological publications appeared as monographs, first focusing on the village and later on the city. As structural change in society became a buzzword for anthropology and sociology, the village, which was thought to be more homogeneous and static, was studied through the lens of social change. The best example of such a perspective is the work of İbrahim Yasa in the 1950s, in Hasanoğlan, a village near Ankara. Trained primarily in sociology in the United States, Yasa relied on participant observation and questionnaires. Yasa revisited another study in the same village twenty-five years later, maintaining a focus on social change (Birkalan-Gedik 2013a, 197).

The early republic's ideal of a "progressed village" meant the collecting of firsthand information on the villages and presenting that information in the form of monographs. Delaney (1998, 191) reminds that village studies in Turkey were characterized by studies on mode of production, social organization, social change, and state and village relationships. They were done under the supervision of the state, which aimed at creating a sociocultural profile of villages in tune with state ideology.

In the post-1950s period the reasons for the increasing interest in villagers can be explained by internal and external reasons. Since the evolutionist approach was the main theoretical framework for social change, many researchers turned to *gecekondu* (literally, houses built overnight on a piece of unoccupied land and thus mostly described through their illegal statuses) and grounded their understanding in the realm of the traditional-versus-modern paradigm. The research was also supported and even financed by the state institutions to have a more in-depth view of social change. University departments as diverse as architecture, urban planning, sociology, and anthropology took part in field research conducted by native researchers from Turkey and by foreign research teams. The data were basically obtained through surveys, without much attention paid to in-depth interviews (Birkalan-Gedik 2011, 14).

Studies of *kasaba* (provincial town), although important today in understanding the political transformation from the city bourgeois to the provincial elites, were produced only in the 1970s. However, from the 1960s onwards and well into the 1970s, there were a handful of ethnographies that are outstanding ethnographic examples of research on small towns. Furthermore, the transformation of class and gender roles was discussed in detail in the context of the provincial town. Taken together, these studies form a small number of research studies on people living in urban situations. This might be because the small-town population at that time constituted only 5 percent to 6 percent of the total Turkish population. A leading anthropologist, Bozkurt Güvenç (b. 1926) emphasized that anthropologists elsewhere were trying to theorize the small town (Güvenç 1994), but since these studies were in English the results did not inform Turkish anthropology at that time.

New causes of internal migration to the cities emerged in the 1980s, after the September 12, 1980, coup d'état, due to the ongoing low-intensity war in southeastern Turkey. With the imposition of martial law, especially in rural areas, research was conducted with difficulty. However, there are two important and distinctive studies on villages to note that were completed as PhD dissertations: Lale Yalçın earned her PhD in 1986 with a dissertation entitled "Kinship and Tribal Organization in the Province of Hakkari, Southeast Turkey" (Yalçın-Heckmann 1986). Her work was mostly based on the fieldwork she conducted between 1980 and 1982 in Hakkari, and it was later published as books in Turkish and English. Nükhet Sirman completed her dissertation entitled "Peasants and Family Farms: The Position of Households in Cotton Production in a Village of Western Turkey" in 1988 (Sirman 1988).

Apart from the works mentioned earlier, a new field emerged in the 1980s: urban studies. It was not limited to work done by anthropologists. Several studies focused on the change of family composition and were supported by the Turkish Social Sciences Association. The framework of new modes of production (which was implemented by the neoliberal Özal government in the 1980s, favoring privatization right after the coup) and the consecutive emergence of new social class dynamics can be seen in the small-town studies. They presented various approaches to network research while classical studies on migration also continued. The work on provincial towns had a different turn: rather than doing ethnography to produce monograph-length books, the studies chose to work on a certain theme. For example, a focus on women emerged especially among the third-generation anthropologists in Turkey after Kıray (1964) documented the social institutions, relationships, and values of the Eregli community in 1962, following the construction of a massive steel plant in 1961. She also mapped out the general characteristics of women in small towns.

Anthropology in Turkey and its relation to the other disciplines

Anthropology has certainly had relations with other branches of the social sciences as they were practiced in Turkey. The interplay between sociology and anthropology is an interesting, complicated case to note. From the earlier days of anthropology, the

field intersected with sociology, producing ethnographies in the rural areas and creating common methodologies at times. The anthropological praxis in Turkey chose “home” as its “field” and in this way overlapped with the research site of sociology. In short, anthropology of Turkey was an anthropology at home. Much later, in the 1940s and 1950s, as many anthropologists were educated in the United States and came back home, they found jobs in the sociology departments and labeled their work as sociology. This was partly due to the disciplinary hierarchies and partly to the definition of the field of anthropology in Turkey mainly as physical anthropology. After World War II the two disciplines came even closer with respect to their research sites and methods.

Another important characteristic of anthropology in Turkey was the impact of Western theories which also worked together with the idea of “progress” inherent in the state ideology. This impact was especially felt in sociology. In the development of anthropology, Continental approaches and theories heavily influenced the field until World War II. On the theoretical level, Durkheim’s and Le Play’s ideas had a noticeable influence until the 1950s, creating a sociological– ethnographic school (Birkalan-Gedik 2005). At times the application of Western theories in the social sciences occurred without critically questioning their validity or their applicability to non-Western contexts.

The US impact in anthropology became more apparent after World War II, when the United States became the greatest power in the world system. The influence of US anthropology in the years that followed was first seen in the translations of the writings of American anthropologists and later in the works and teachings of the US-educated Turkish anthropologists and sociologists who returned home. Starting in the 1950s, the impact of the Chicago school of sociology became more apparent. The writings of, first, Wirth and then Oscar Lewis impacted urban studies in Turkey, for the most part focusing on the application of the culture-of-poverty approach, doing research on the *gecekondu* (squatter), and especially on urban villagers. The idea of the village in the city has been one that was exhausted explored in urban studies well into the 2000s, following villagers as the unit of research from rural to urban life (Birkalan-Gedik 2011, 8).

Main institutions

The Anthropological Research Center of Turkey was founded in 1925 at Istanbul University’s Faculty of Medicine because it was primarily dedicated to physical anthropology in the European tradition. Among the founders were the anatomists of the Faculty of Medicine including Nurettin Ali (Berkol) (1880–1952), Neşet Ömer (İrdelp) (1882 – 1948), Süreyya Ali (Kayacan) (1877–1961), and literary critic (Köprülüzade) Fuat (Köprülü) (1890–1966), anthropologist [Jean] Aimé Mouchet (1886–1941), and pedagogue and politician İsmayıl Hakkı [Baltacıoğlu] (1886–1978). To provide the necessary human resources for the center, Sevket Aziz (Kansu) (1903–83), then an assistant in the Faculty of Medicine, was sent to Paris to study anthropology in 1927. Kansu became the first professional physical anthropologist in Turkey, and upon his return in 1929 he tried to make anthropology a profession that was taught at

universities. Although the center offered a few courses on ethnology, its main focus was physical anthropology and paleoanthropology (Kansu 1940). It devoted itself to research and publication during the period between 1925 and 1929 and had a journal to promote its ideals and research. When the name of Istanbul Darülfünun was changed to Istanbul University as part of university reforms in 1933, the center merged with the Faculty of Science at Istanbul University and continued its activities under the name of the Turkish Anthropological Institute. In 1935, when Atatürk decided to establish the Faculty of Languages, History, and Geography, the anthropology chair was moved to Ankara, first to an apartment building and then to the newly created campus of Ankara University. In 1962 there was another name change and the center became the Research Institute of Anthropological Sciences.

From Istanbul University Medical School to Ankara University

Some key personalities were selected for further education abroad. The new republic considered the education of women to be important, so in the 1930s two women academics were sent abroad. In 1934 Seniha Tunakan (1908–2000) was sent to Berlin University, while between 1936 and 1938, Afet İnan (1908–85), one of Atatürk's adopted daughters, was sent to Geneva to study with Eugéne Pittard (Birkalan-Gedik 2013a, 181). İnan was a scholar trained in history but became famous through her work in anthropology. She was chosen for adoption by the founder of the Republic, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, and in 1925, three years after her meeting with him, she was sent to Lausanne to study French. After that she studied history and thought of anthropology as a science that could be of help to historians. For İnan the period before written history could be understood only through (physical) anthropological studies. As mentioned earlier, history and anthropology were allied disciplines when the republic aimed to show that Anatolia was primarily Turkish. İnan was never associated with any anthropology department but she participated in the formation of the "Turkish history thesis," where her role was restricted to history although she used anthropological–archaeological materials (Münüsoğlu 2010, 16). However, it is not a coincidence that İnan worked with Eugéne Pittard when she was sent to Switzerland in 1935 for her doctoral studies. As an expert on physical anthropology, 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 (Kieser 2006).

Ankara University's Faculty of Languages, History and Geography

An important anthropologist at Ankara University was Muzaffer Süleyman Şenyürek (1915–61), who focused on the "Turkish race." In 1935 he was sent to Harvard University to pursue a doctoral degree in physical anthropology; after completing his

studies he returned to Turkey. The same year, he became an assistant professor and a full professor in 1950. Important in his research was that he had distanced himself from the previous notions of race and culture as though they were the same thing. For example, he argued that a positive correlation cannot be found between blood types and races (Şenyürek 1939), therefore breaking the ideologically informed research on races.

Continuing the tradition in Ankara, a student of Kansu, Nermin Erdentuğ (1917–2000), conducted research in physical anthropology on the one hand, and turned to ethnological research on the social and cultural structure of the villages of Hal and Sün-Elazığ in eastern Turkey on the other. Erdentuğ's ethnographic work was influenced by structural functionalism. It focused on family and kinship relations, and cultural units were understood as parts of a greater unit. Erdentuğ was a key figure in the shift from physical to social anthropology. She received her PhD with a dissertation about the agricultural change caused by nut cultivation in a village; after this, her work focused on classical topics of anthropology such as family and kinship, in both rural and urban contexts. Her work, however, did not methodologically distinguish between different environments (Birkalan-Gedik 2011, 9).

Pertev Naili Boratav (1907–98) was the founder of folklore studies in Turkey at Ankara University. He trained in folklore studies in Germany, after which he returned to Turkey in 1937. As a young scholar 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 funding to establish a department of folklore (Birkalan 2000). However, during the 1947–48 winter semester, several professors, including Boratav were charged with promoting nonnationalist ideas, which were then interpreted as leftist, forcing Boratav to defend himself in a trial. The folklore classes came to a halt, as Boratav's case began in 1948 and was not resolved until 1950. He had to leave his position at the university and was never able to return.

Until 1980, folklore studies remained dormant. Sedat Veyis Örnek (1929–80), 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.

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. Doctoral and master's degree courses are offered in all three disciplines.

In Ankara University, a wave of Turkish researchers returned from the United States with an education in sociology and anthropology and introduced theoretical perspectives of the Chicago School to Turkey. An important name in urban research was Mübeccel Kıray (1923–2007), an example of the intersection between urban anthropology and sociology. Kıray's work shows traces of the functionalist approach, whereby she saw historical aspects as secondary. Niyazi Berkes established excellent links between field settings and theory, leaning toward a theoretical understanding

of conflict that was influenced by Marxist approaches. To this day Berkes's work is exemplary of rural studies in Turkey. Behice Boran, a pioneer in rural studies, had studied sociology at the University of Michigan and returned to Turkey in 1939. She did research in several villages and was able to observe the villagers in terms of their economy and culture. Also a Marxist activist, she aspired to achieve a quality of development of the villages that was comparable with that of the cities, especially in terms of their infrastructure. Her urban research was very much rooted in the anthropological tradition.

Social and cultural anthropology at Istanbul University

After physical anthropology moved to Ankara, no anthropological studies were conducted in Istanbul University until the establishment of the Department of Social Anthropology in 1960. The department was structured with a focus in urban anthropology and with a particular emphasis on applied work and social problems. This was due to the interest at the time in the resolution of problems and the perception that anthropology could not possibly contribute to finding solutions. It is also related to the inclinations of its founder, Charles William Merton Hart (1905–76), an Australian-born, naturalized US citizen, who received his education at the universities of Chicago and of London and taught at Toronto and Wisconsin universities. He represented a continuity of the Radcliffe-Brown tradition as well as of the US anthropological heritage. A third reason might be the fact that Istanbul University had a cosmopolitan character, as it was established in the heart of Istanbul's old city, which was growing rapidly at the time. The department considered anthropology as a tool for solving social problems, showing an affinity with the urban studies of the Chicago School. For example, Nephân Saran (1924–2008) and Taylan Akkayan (b. 1945), the two heads of department after Hart, focused on the transportation system in Istanbul and discussed a particular methodology employed in their research. Currently, located within the Faculty of Literature, there is a Department of Anthropology, under which three different directions exist: social anthropology, physical anthropology, and paleoanthropology (Birkalan-Gedik 2011, 10).

Hacettepe University

The anthropology department at Hacettepe University was established in 1976 as a department of social anthropology which developed both teaching and research activities. It can be defined as a department that used modern and comparative perspectives that enabled a popular understanding of anthropology among lay people (Aydın 2000). Bozkurt Güvenç was a key figure in the department, as he criticized sociological survey methods and instead spearheaded the use of ethnographic methods and underlined the importance of emic categories. However, the department closed in 2010 and several of its scholars were dispersed to teach at different universities or in different departments in the same university, including the Department of Communication.

Yeditepe University

Yeditepe University's Department of Anthropology was among the first establishments of anthropology in Turkey in private universities. Initially named the Department of Social Anthropology, it offers courses at undergraduate, master's, and PhD levels. It follows a four-field Boasian approach with particular emphasis on Turkish culture and employs scholars from different anthropological traditions.

Anthropology departments and interdisciplinary approaches

Today, anthropology courses at the universities follow different paths and models. There are autonomous departments in which anthropology is taught in different configurations and under different "variants" of anthropology, such as social anthropology, physical anthropology, and paleoanthropology. Additionally, anthropologists are also employed in departments such as communication, radio and television studies, sociology, and political science. After almost 100 years, the discipline does not present one but many coexisting perspectives. Yet, anthropology in Turkey has not been able to develop a school of its own.

The Anthropology Association: Anthropology outside the academy

The Anthropology Association (Antropoloji Derneği), established by Nephân Saran and her students in 1992, is active in Turkey. After Saran's presidency Belkıs Kümbetoğlu led the association. Between 2010 and 2014, Hande Birkalan-Gedik served as president. The association organized three national congresses (2002, 2004, 2009) and an international congress in 2006. Selected presentations from the Second National Meeting were published under the editorship of Kümbetoğlu and Birkalan-Gedik (2005), while the papers from the First International Congress were compiled and edited by Hande Birkalan-Gedik (2013b) with the help of a group of anthropologists and translators.

Anthropology and its political importance in Turkey

In different ways, anthropology in Turkey has always been involved in the country's political scenarios. Early studies were sponsored, even commissioned, by the state, and these studies reflected state interests. After the 1950s and 1960s, anthropological studies that were not directly linked to state interests were carried out. While early on nationalism was a decisive factor in the production of anthropology, recent studies have reflected a distance from this situation. The discipline of folklore has been a tool of identity construction for leftists and rightists and has been used in the representation of nationalism as well. In fact, a critical anthropology was not

possible until recent years. Today some taboo topics have come under anthropological scrutiny. For instance, the study of Islam by scholars of Turkish origin also reflected Turkey's own ideological dynamics, especially its fascination with secularism. The new Islamism in the cities prompted researchers to reconsider the great narrative of the state which supported the idea of progress away from religion and tradition. Turkish social scientists, especially those whose ideology are sympathetic to Kemalism, were surprised to find that rural social practices, identities, and cultural locations—so-called traditional behaviors—could coexist with religious ideas, discourses, and practices in different urban settings. In other words, there were not clear-cut boundaries between traditionalism and modernity and the boundaries between them can blur the preestablished cultural categories.

The 1990s in particular witnessed studies on culture, identity politics, and networks. In that decade, the metropolitan areas became spaces where different cultures came together and interacted with one another. Consequently, space, memory, identity, belonging, acceptance, and difference in politics all appeared as issues in their own right. The main issues defining the post-1990s are the debates on identity politics and an empowered political Islam that transformed new elites and their lifestyles. Many social scientists realized that Turkey had an ambivalent relationship with modernity and had problems of its own. The encounter with the concept of modernity in a context different from Kemalism complicated the scholarly analysis of categorical implications of embedded identities. It should be mentioned that urban life in Turkey was not always analyzed through the lens of cultural or identity politics. Rather, it was located in the creative tension between Western theory and national ideologies, a framework in which the idea of “progress” was understood as Kemalism and vice versa (Birkalan-Gedik 2011).

Why did an identity politics approach come to dominate scholarship in this period? Here, the term “identity politics” is used not as a disciplinary fad but as a concept through which neoliberal governments produced and applied politics. That scholars turned to using this framework in their academic work is illustrative of their sensitivity to the political climate in Turkey. Especially after 2002, the Justice and Development Party's (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi [AKP]) governmental policy of “openings” prompted social scientists to study ethnicity and religion in the cities, as these issues have a higher visibility in urban settings. At the same time, in the 1990s scholars started to conceptualize modernity in relation to globalization. Research also clearly revealed that the lower middle classes and the countryside played critical roles in the urban context.

Anthropologists in Turkey today not only study civil society but are active in political struggles. Many anthropologists took part, for example, in the massive protests and marches, when an Armenian-born Turkish citizen, the journalist Hrant Dink, was brutally killed in 2007. Dink's untimely death prompted many scholars, including anthropologists, to build bridges with Armenia and to connect the two cultures on both sides of Mount Ararat. Furthermore, the activism of women and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) groups is important in the relationships between civil society, state, and academia. There is a growing number of theses written on women, feminism, and the LGBT movement, as well as conferences on thinking about a new model of the

family. Many anthropologists who call themselves feminists are activists as well. The current political issues need to be seen in the context of the AKP's conservatism and of the brutal suppression of individuals after the Gezi Park protests, the civil unrest in Istanbul, which began on May 28, 2013, and lasted until August 20, 2013. People initially gathered to protest the urban development plan for Istanbul—Taksim Gezi Park—but it turned into a brutal denial of the right to peaceful protest against the AKP government. As a result of police violence, eleven people were killed and more than 8,000 were injured during the protest. These and other topics are important for the civil rights and human rights movement.

Furthermore, in recent decades, the issue of normative homogeneity has been seriously called into question. Several works were produced by scholars emphasizing the plurality of peoples and cultures while patriarchy and nationalism, nationalism, and militarism were criticized. There are anthropologists who also work as columnists in newspapers and are, therefore, helping lay people to see things through anthropological lenses.

International connections and relations

Until recent decades, anthropology in Turkey tended to turn inward to focus on local issues, publishing mainly in Turkish and, more importantly, limiting itself to the nationalist paradigm. The return of anthropologists from abroad, publishing in English in addition to Turkish, and the Bologna process helped to internationalize the profile of anthropology in Turkey. Today, in addition to several international connections and relations maintained by academic departments, Turkish anthropologists also play a role in the meetings of European associations such as the European Association of Social Anthropologists and the Société Internationale d'Ethnologie et de Folklore / International Society for Ethnology and Folklore, of the International Association for Southeast European Anthropology, of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, and of the American Anthropological Association. These and other academic conferences function as meeting points, drawing together scholars from Turkey in the context of European(ist) anthropology, ethnology, and regional studies (such as different Balkan networks). For example, Border Crossings Network organized a student conference at Yeditepe University in Istanbul in 2012, cooperating with Turkish colleagues who are faculty members of the network. Some of these congresses have been held in different cities in Turkey and have brought a large number of scholars to the country. Furthermore, anthropologists from Turkey have served as board members of academic associations and global institutions such as UNESCO. Likewise, scholars of anthropology of Turkey have also established links relating to their subject of study such as in the anthropology of religion, the anthropology of state, and rural anthropology. TÜBİTAK, the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey, an active body supporting international and national scholarship in the social sciences, has been important in the establishment of international networks. Over the years, several projects in anthropology have been launched with different partner universities all over the world.

Some anthropologists in Turkey favored publishing solely in Turkish, and their excellent ethnographic texts are produced only in Turkish and remain untranslated. One could refer to this issue as a problem of or with language. However, it is more than that and may be better explained in terms of hierarchies of power. Turkish anthropologists frequently publish in English—and to a limited degree in German—as a reflection of a trend of graduate students being trained in the United States. There is, however, another stream of publication that appears in Turkish, mostly maintained by “native” anthropologists, who unwittingly or otherwise choose to or can only write in Turkish. Turkish scholars are expected to read the work of the anthropologists who write in English, but the reverse is not often seen. The issue then becomes not a language problem but a part of epistemic textuality, presenting an asymmetrical communication of ethnographic knowledge.

Turkish is the medium of education in many universities, though some universities use English. While Turkish scholars tend to write both in English and in Turkish, foreign scholars mostly write in English. This situation results in a sort of knowledge gap, as most of the literature reviewed by foreign scholars working on Turkey relies on writings in English. At the same time, publications in English are much more available to Turkish scholars, resulting in an asymmetric exchange against local researchers. Writing for a foreign audience creates networks between Turkish anthropologists and anthropologists outside Turkey, but the knowledge produced locally also has its own epistemic value. For some, the choice of writing in a particular language is also a political stance, as it determines for whom they are producing anthropological knowledge.

Today, the anthropology of Turkey cannot be limited to the scholars who are based and work in Turkey. Scholars are dispersed in the world, from the United States to the United Kingdom, from Germany to Japan. Despite the absence of a common base for exchanging information about research results, this also stimulates the internationalization of Turkish scholarship.

Important subjects of research

The early years of social anthropology focused on village life in Turkey; researchers considered different aspects and wrote about them in monographs. Besides studies on villages, work was also done on different aspects of squatters, including informality and women’s labor in the music of the *geceköndü*. Overall, one can talk about a change of direction in anthropological studies in Turkey. For instance, in the 1990s the observable paradigm change created an environment in which the reproduction of everyday life (family, community relations, and local politics) was placed in relation to macro mechanisms of change (postmodern knowledge, state regulation, etc.).

Since the 1950s, anthropologists have produced studies on migration. Anthropological studies also emerged on ethnicity, identity, and nationalism, not only in relation to the people living in Turkey but also on migratory flows into and from Turkey. Especially after the 1990s, with new forms of migration due to war and displacement and to natural disasters in the Middle East, Turkey became the favorite waiting room for asylum seekers, the deterritorialized, and the “colored.” There were studies on African migrants

in Istanbul based on surveys; other focused especially on West African migrants; and yet others considered women migrants in Istanbul.

As a result of social, historical, and political changes, new topics have increased in importance in recent years. Internal changes in anthropology itself have also contributed to the change in approach to the study of anthropology in Turkey. The dialogues between scholars living in Turkey and abroad, writing in Turkish, English, German, and French, have also expanded both the number and the methodologies of the studies. Thus, since the 1990s, studies on Islam, ethnicity, identity, gender, and poverty have started to emerge, bringing critical perspectives to those fields. The most extensively studied issues, however, are gentrification, urban transformation, and gated communities, which can be labeled as the main frameworks of recent urban research in Turkey. Contributions from such disciplines as feminist studies (with a particular focus on women's labor and domestic work, as well as on gendered poverty), oral history, memory studies, geography, and architecture have also contributed to the liveliness of urban research in Turkey.

The shift in the 1990s included the study of reconfigurations of ethnic and religious identities (especially Kurds and the Alevi, a heterodox group of Muslims of Anatolia) in rural, urban, and transurban contexts. Studying migration in transnational contexts facilitated studies on peoples from Turkey in Germany. This new transnational anthropology, as well as anthropology at home, presents new terrains where anthropologists' identities are negotiated. Categories of the self and the other have been blurred, as most anthropologists in Turkey today have multiple belongings, by way of their education or academic career. In a similar fashion, the separation of the field from home (Gupta and Ferguson 1997, 112), based on the classical anthropological tradition, has also been blurred as field, the site of data collection, and home, where ethnographies are written, now rest on a different praxis of Turkish anthropologists.

Marriage, family, and kinship make up another field of anthropology in Turkey. Indeed, there have been many anthropological interpretations of family since the early days of anthropological studies. The first monographs that considered the social organization inevitably looked at the family. Studies produced between the 1940s and 1960s can be considered as examples of heteronormative family descriptions and examinations of marriage and kinship systems. A feature of these ethnographies is the lack of a gendered perspective, as the aim of the studies were to present village life from a holistic perspective. These works also used a structural-functionalist approach and did not consider marriage, family, and kinship whether in a historical or in a comparative vein. In the study of kinship several parallels could have been developed and more links could have been established, especially on parallel cousin (ortho-cousin) marriages, which are widely practiced in the Middle East.

From a different perspective, several foreign or foreign-funded scholars have also worked on Turkish-related topics. As a result of the Cold War and Turkey's increasing importance to the West, foreign researchers became increasingly involved in the study of the country. It became an anthropological destination from the 1950s well into the 1990s, mostly for US scholars. The financial support for this interest, which was interrupted after the collapse of the Soviet Union, became prominent again in the 2000s. This time the topics changed. There was, for example, interest in studying the Fethullah

Gülen movement and Islamism. The Gülen movement is a transnational religious and social movement under the leadership of Turkish preacher Fethullah Gülen, who has lived in the United States since 1999 and who allegedly attempted a coup against the AKP on July 15, 2016. Not only political Islamicism, but Islam as everyday practice, also drew scholars who were interested in the study of everyday life in the city as it was affected by national politics and international politics and processes. The study of Islam by Turkish scholars also reflected the country's own ideological context, especially its fascination with secularism. The new Islamism prompted researchers to reconsider the great narrative of the state, which supported the idea of progress away from religion and tradition. Turkish social scientists, especially those whose ideology is influenced by Kemalism, were surprised that "traditional," religious ideas coexisted with modern, secular ones in urban settings. Many anthropologists in Turkey favor the idea that anthropologists should work within the state, while a minority hold that anthropology should critique the state. Between 2000 and 2010 there was a production of exceptionally critical ethnographies of the state (Birkalan-Gedik 2011, 48).

Turkish anthropology and its contributions to the discipline

Turkey is an interesting case of anthropology at home—an important concept that received the attention of anthropologists in the Western world, especially in American anthropology and to some degree in Europeanist anthropology, in the 1980s. Turkey does not share a history of the so-called Western classical anthropological distinction of home and field as two separate sites located in separate geographies. However, anthropologists in Turkey have not yet been interested in examining its uniqueness, its eclecticism, in the context of nation-state and disciplinary formations and of the plurality of ethnographic landscapes in the country (Birkalan-Gedik 2013a, 175). The eclectic nature of the discipline was clearer in its formative years when there was, on the one hand, an impact of physical anthropology and, on the other, the impacts of the ethnological sciences and of the German conceptions of culture.

One of the great strengths of anthropologists in Turkey is their practice of field research and the resulting production of ethnographies. The ethnographic enterprise was mostly concentrated in villages and small towns, and rarely did nomads come under the ethnographic gaze. With the incoming and outgoing flows of migration, especially after the 1990s, the main method (i.e., participant observation), the sine qua non of Turkish anthropology in rural settings, renewed itself in the urban context. In a way, the rural, classical fashion of doing ethnographies was forgotten, as most of the former villagers today live in cities or even abroad. Therefore, most anthropologists became urban anthropologists and extended the classical methodologies by acquiring new skills through a series of dialogues with other disciplines including surveys, historical studies, discourse analyses, and oral histories. The challenge was then to grasp the realities of larger groups without giving up ethnography and without reducing culture to a mere text. In the 1990s and in the twenty-first century, ethnographies of social relations and network analyses in the city focused on political alliances (city origin, ethnicity, religion) and market relationships. In this period, studies of community

and family displayed characteristics of more sophisticated versions of the classical anthropological topics. Ethnographically, political alliances and the role of Islamic power in low-income neighborhoods became important gateways to understanding the complexities of city life on the national level. After the 1990s, ethnicity and women in the city emerged as research topics, but not all studies on women in the city can be classified as feminist. Until now, most of the anthropological studies have focused on women's work and workplaces in the informal sphere: the market, homework, and domestic service. But an emphasis on the gendered city is still lacking (Birkalan-Gedik 2011, 44).

On the theoretical level, while the Turkish village was overgeneralized, there is no standing anthropological theoretical perspective on the Turkish city. There are compartmentalized discussions and emergent topics, and networking among scholars is weak. As there is no single tradition of Turkish anthropology in terms of theory production (though there are theory "applications"), there is not a single tradition of urban anthropology either. Instead the research is fragmented: diverse ideas, a constellation of concepts, and a bundle of frameworks used to analyze and to write about the city.

Anthropologists in Turkey were reluctant or unable to establish dialogues with their counterparts in the Middle East and the Balkans and to a degree in Europe. One would think that Turkey shares a great deal of culture with the Middle East through Islam. However, exactly because of Islam, many anthropologists have turned to Europe and the United States, and this is also partly because of imported theory in Turkish anthropology. Another reason might have been that Middle Eastern anthropology is not visible in larger anthropological debates, and anthropological literature on Middle Eastern countries has been scant in comparison to bigger regions such as Africa, the Far East, and Oceania. Thus, the place and role of the Middle East in the history of anthropology and in contemporary anthropological thought have not yet been clearly established or discussed, although some of Western anthropological theory's raw material comes from the Middle East, through ethnographies conducted by Western scholars.

Anthropology in Turkey has developed throughout the years, sometimes challenging classical notions of anthropological practices in the "Western" sense, sometimes criticizing these notions. But, despite its unique characterization, it was not recognized in the general anthropological debate. Unless Western anthropologists change their discourses on the history of their discipline and recognize that anthropology has been practiced differently in different countries that are not a part of the colonial geography, it will be difficult to produce a holistic mapping of the discipline throughout the world.

Nearly almost after a century of its practice in Turkey, the development of anthropology has been criticized by scholars including Atay, Aydın, Maksudyan, Birkalan-Gedik, and others. Interestingly enough, Atay refers to the fact that anthropology was understood as a science of race. According to him, anthropology had started as such but has included social and cultural anthropology. But even today the common understanding is that anthropology is widely related to racial studies. For Atay, the most interesting point is that the nation-state, which, at the stage of its establishment, had biocultural anxieties continues to normalize the emphasis of anthropology as a "science of race" (Atay 2000). Suavi Aydın and Nazan Maksudyan have looked at the development of anthropology in Turkey and at its relation to national and racial ideologies

because they wanted to criticize the ways in which anthropology flirted with the concepts of race and nationalism. Birkalan-Gedik has formulated a criticism from a different angle. Today, anthropology relating to Turkey is practiced by scholars of different identities—native, others, “halfies,” and more. Despite the fact that anthropology in Turkey has been practiced by native scholars, the existence of colonial minds cannot be overlooked. The concept refers to the mind-set of westernized scholars, some of whom were also pseudo-ethnographers, imbued with an ideology similar to the state. They were obsessed with anthropology as a civilizing device of villagers and of the sedentarizing of the nomads, all of which constituted the “uncivilized” Turkish villagers, the Alevi, and the Kurds. Therefore, an “original” and “emancipated” anthropology has never emerged (Birkalan-Gedik 2005). Fieldwork done with Western lenses has also impacted theory production, and this may be one of the reasons why anthropologists in Turkey could not develop a unique theoretical stance and could not contribute to wider developments on the theoretical plane. It should also be mentioned that several scholars who study Turkey look down upon the work by Turkish scholars. At an international meeting an anthropologist remarked that Turkish anthropologists should write in English if they want to be read by a wide audience. As another sign of the existing uneven scholarly exchange, most anthropologists who write in English, and to a degree in German, have been widely accepted and translated into Turkish, while the same is not true of anthropologists writing in Turkish (Birkalan-Gedik 2013a).

Today, in the light of the attempted coup of July 15, 2016, the state–anthropology relationship must be rethought, as academic freedom is under serious threat. This political development should prompt anthropologists to investigate the possibility of conducting fieldwork under the prolonged “state of emergency,” the ways in which ethnographic rapport can be established between anthropologists and their collaborators, and the validity of anthropological data under these circumstances. The time is also ripe to rethink McCarthyism in the United States in the 1950s, the long duration of Francoist Spain, and witch hunting in Turkey in the 1930s and 1940s as similar historical conjunctures when academic freedom was threatened by politics.

SEE ALSO: American Anthropological Association (AAA); Anthropological Knowledge and Styles of Publication; Built Environment; Darwin, Charles, Influence on Anthropology of; European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA); Germany, Anthropology in; International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES); Islam; Migration; Transnationalism; United Kingdom, Anthropology in; United States, Anthropology in; Urban Ecology; Urbanism; Urbanization and Urban Environments; Velho, Gilberto (1945–2012); World Anthropologies

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

- Atay, Tayfun. 2000. “Erken bir Doğumdan Gecikmiş bir Büyümeye ... Türkiye’de Antropoloji: Bir Kongrenin Çağrıştırdıkları [From a Premature Birth to Delayed Growth ... Anthropology in Turkey: Ideas Evoked by a Congress].” *Folklor/Edebiyat* 6 (21): 5–10.

- Aydın, Suavi. 2000. "Arkeoloji ve Sosyolojinin Kısılcasında Türkiye'de Antropolojinin Geri Kalmışlığı [The Backwardness of Anthropology Constrained by Archaeology and Sociology]." *Folklor/Edebiyat* 6 (22): 17–42.
- Aydın, Suavi. 2001. "Cumhuriyet'in İdeolojik Şekillenmesinde Antropolojinin Rolü: Irkçı Paradigmanın Yükselişi ve Düşüşü [The Role of Anthropology in the Ideological Formation of the Republic: The Rise and Fall of the Racist Paradigm]." In *Kemalizm [Kemalism]*, edited by Tanıl Bora, Murat Gülteginil, and Ahmet İnel, 344–69. Vol. 2 of *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce [Political Thought in Modern Turkey]*. Istanbul: İletişim.
- Birkalan, Hande. 2000. "Pertev Naili Boratav, Turkish Politics, and University Events." *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 25 (1): 39–60.
- Birkalan-Gedik, Hande. 2005. "Özgün ve Özgür Bir Antropolojiye Doğru [Towards a Unique and Liberated Anthropology]." In *Gelenekten Geleceğe Antropoloji [Anthropology from the Past to the Future]*, edited by Belkıs Kümbetoğlu and Hande Birkalan-Gedik, 73–89. Istanbul: Epsilon.
- Birkalan-Gedik, Hande. 2011. "Anthropological Writings on Urban Turkey: A Historical Overview." *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development* 40 (1–2): 1–66.
- Birkalan-Gedik, Hande. 2013a. "Türkiye'de Antropolojilerin Kesişmesi: Avrupa Etnolojisi ve Amerikan Antropolojisi [Intersecting Anthropologies in Turkey: European Ethnology and American Anthropology]." In *Sınırlar, İmajlar Kültürler: Antropolojik Açıdan Avrupalılığı Düşünmek [Borders, Images, Cultures: Thinking about Europeans from an Anthropological Perspective]*, edited by Hande Birkalan-Gedik, 173–235. Ankara: Dip Not.
- Birkalan-Gedik, Hande, ed. 2013b. *Sınırlar, İmajlar Kültürler: Antropolojik Açıdan Avrupalılığı Düşünmek [Borders, Images, Cultures: Thinking about Europeans from an Anthropological Perspective]*. Ankara: Dip Not.
- Delaney, Carol. 1998. "The Rise and Demise of Village Life in Turkey." In *Bilanço 1923–1998 [A Balance 1923–1998]*, vol. 2 of *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin 75 Yılına Toplu Bakış [A Holistic Look at 75 Years of the Turkish Republic]*, edited by Zeynep Rona, 191–97. Ankara: Tarih Vakfı.
- Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson. 1997. "Discipline and Practice: 'The Field' as Site, Method, and Location in Anthropology." In *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*, edited by Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, 101–46. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Güvenç, Bozkurt. 1994. *Türkiye'de Sosyal Bilimler: Gelişmeler ve Süreklilikler [Social Sciences in Turkey: Progress and Continuities]*. Ankara: TÜBİTAK.
- Kansu, Şevket Aziz. 1940. *Türk Antropoloji Enstitüsü Tarihçesi [A History of the Turkish Anthropological Institute]*. Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası.
- Kieser, Hans Lucas. 2006. "Türkische Nationalrevolution, anthropologisch gekrönt: Kemal Atatürk und Eugène Pittard [Turkish National Revolution, Anthropologically Crowned: Kemal Atatürk and Eugène Pittard]." *Historische Anthropologie* 1: 105–18.
- Klein, Barbro. 2013. "Antropoloji, Etnoloji ve Başka İlişkiler: Avrupa'dan Bazı Önermeler [Anthropology, Ethnology and Other Relations: Some European Implications]." In *Sınırlar, İmajlar, Kültürler: Antropolojik Açıdan Avrupalılığı Düşünmek [Borders, Images, Cultures: Thinking about Europeans from an Anthropological Perspective]*, edited by Hande Birkalan-Gedik, 122–43. Ankara: Dip Not.
- Kümbetoğlu, Belkıs, and Hande Birkalan-Gedik, eds. 2005. *Gelenekten Geleceğe Antropoloji [Anthropology from the Past to the Future]*. Istanbul: Epsilon.
- Kutlu, Muhtar. 2009. Interview by Hande Birkalan-Gedik, December 30, 2009. Yeditepe University, Istanbul.
- Maksudyan, Nazan. (2005) 2007. *Türklüğü Ölçmek: Bilimkurgusal Antropoloji ve Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Irkçı Yüzü [Measuring Turkishness: Scientific Anthropology and the Racist Face of Turkish Nationalism]*. 2nd ed. Istanbul: Metis.

- Münisoğlu, Hasan. 2010. "Türkiye'de Antropolojinin Kuruma ve Kurumsallaşma Sorunlarına Tarihsel bir Yaklaşım: DTCF Örneği [A Historical Approach to the Establishment and Institutionalization of Anthropology in Turkey]." Master's thesis, Ankara University.
- Özbudun-Demirer, Sibel. 2011. "Anthropology as a Nation-Building Rhetoric: The Shaping of Turkish Anthropology (from 1850s to 1940s)." *Dialectic Anthropology* 35: 111–29.
- Şenyürek, Muzaffer Süleyman. 1939. "Kan Grupları ve Irk [Blood Types and Race]." *Ülkü* 15 (90): 500–502.
- Sirman, Nükhet. 1988. "Peasants and Family Farms: The Position of Households in Cotton Production in a Village of Western Turkey." PhD thesis, University of London.
- Sirman, Nükhet. 1996. "From Economic Integration to Cultural Strategies of Power: The Study of Rural Change in Turkey." *New Perspectives on Turkey* 14: 115–25.
- Sirman, Nükhet. 2001. "Sosyal Bilimlerde Gelişmecilik ve Köy Çalışmaları [Development Studies and Village Studies in the Social Sciences]." *Toplum ve Bilim* 88: 251–54.
- Tunçay, Mete. n.d. "Kemalism." In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Islamic World*. Accessed March 7, 2017, <http://www.oxfordislamicstudies.com/article/opr/t236/e0440>.
- White, Jenny B. 2003. "The Anthropology of Turkey: A Retrospective." In *Turkish Studies in the United States*, edited by Donald Quataert and Sabri Sayarı, 75–98. Bloomington: Indiana University Ottoman and Modern Turkish Studies.
- Yalçın-Heckmann, Lale. 1986. "Kinship and Tribal Organization in the Province of Hakkari, Southeast Turkey." PhD thesis, University of London.

Turner, Edith (1921–2016)

MATTHEW ENGELKE

London School of Economics and Political Science, United Kingdom

Edith Davis Turner was an anthropologist of religion who conducted research in a wide range of places, notably Zambia, Alaska, Ireland, and Mexico. She made important contributions to the study of ritual and pilgrimage. What most distinguished the approach of her scholarship was the extent to which she refused to rest easy with the received categories of anthropology and the human sciences. Ritual and religion were never social facts for Turner; they were deeply moving modes of experiencing the world and of making sense of the cosmos. She refused to write in a secular, scientific register. In one of her best-known studies, this approach involved trying to explain seeing a spirit during the course of a healing ritual in Zambia.

Edith Davis was born June 21, 1921, in Ely, England. She died on June 18, 2016, in Charlottesville, Virginia, which had been her home for almost forty years. It was in Charlottesville, at the University of Virginia, that she held her only formal academic position, from 1984 to 2016, as a lecturer in the Department of Anthropology.

Turner's career was atypical. She did not receive a university education and had no formal credentials in anthropology. During World War II, she met Victor Witter Turner in Oxford, where she was working in the Land Army and he was serving in a bomb disposal squad. They married six months later and thus began an intensely strong and intellectually absorbing relationship until his death in 1983.

After the war Victor Turner took a PhD in social anthropology at the University of Manchester, which had the most vibrant department in Britain. Turner accompanied