

# YILLIK

Annual of Istanbul Studies

2022

4



İSTANBUL  
RESEARCH  
INSTITUTE

# YILLIK: Annual of Istanbul Studies

4 (2022)

YILLIK is a peer-reviewed annual journal, published simultaneously in print and online (via Dergipark).

## Editorial Board

Editor: K. Mehmet Kentel, *Istanbul Research Institute*

Emir Alışık, *Istanbul Research Institute*

Brigitte Pitarakis, *Centre national de la recherche scientifique; Istanbul Research Institute*

M. Baha Tanman, *Istanbul University (emeritus); Istanbul Research Institute*

Gülrü Tanman, *Istanbul Research Institute*

## Advisory Board

Ashlan Akışık, *Bahçeşehir University*

Engin Akyürek, *Koç University*

Serpil Bağcı, *Hacettepe University*

Sarah Bassett, *Indiana University*

Cem Behar

Sibel Bozdoğan, *Boston University*

Ayfer Bartu Candan, *Boğaziçi University*

Zeynep Çelik, *New Jersey Institute of Technology*

Koray Durak, *Boğaziçi University*

Ayşe Ereğ, *Kadir Has University*

Ahmet Ersoy, *Boğaziçi University*

Walter Feldman, *New York University, Abu Dhabi*

Emine Fetvacı, *Boston University*

Murat Güvenç, *Kadir Has University*

Shirine Hamadeh, *Koç University*

Ivana Jevtić, *Koç University*

Cemal Kafadar, *Harvard University*

Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, *Boğaziçi University*

Leyla Kayhan Elbirlik, *Özyeğin University*

Selim S. Kuru, *University of Washington*

Tuna Kuyucu, *Boğaziçi University*

Gülru Necipoğlu, *Harvard University*

Nevra Necipoğlu, *Boğaziçi University*

Tarkan Okçuoğlu, *Istanbul University*

Rana Özbal, *Koç University*

Mehmet Özdoğan, *Istanbul University*

Christine Philliou, *University of California, Berkeley*

Ünver Rüstem, *Johns Hopkins University*

Turgut Saner, *Istanbul Technical University*

Uğur Tanyeli, *İstinye University*

Ceylan Tözeren, *Boğaziçi University*

Uşun Tükel, *Istanbul University*

## Title history

2012–2018 | İstanbul Araştırmaları Yıllığı / Annual of Istanbul Studies, 1–7

2019– | YILLIK: Annual of Istanbul Studies

**Mode of publication:** Worldwide periodical, published annually every December

**Note to contributors:** *YILLIK: Annual of Istanbul Studies* accepts submissions in English and Turkish. Articles should conform to the usage of The Chicago Manual of Style (CMOS), 17th edition, and to the style guides published on the journal's website. Articles in Turkish conform to a customized CMOS style available at the website. Research articles are subject to review by two anonymous reviewers and the editorial board. All other submissions are reviewed by the editorial board.

Istanbul Research Institute Publications 49

Periodicals 11

Istanbul, December 2022

ISSN: 2687-5012

**Publisher:** On behalf of the Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation, Necmettin Tosun

**Graphic Design:** Volkan Şenozan

**Typesetting:** Elif Rifat Türkay

**Copyediting:** Emily Arauz, Miray Eroğlu

**Assistants:** Ahmet Can Karapınar, Elizabeth Concepcion

**Contact:** istanbulstudies@iae.org.tr

**Color Separation and Print:** A4 Ofset Matbaacılık San. ve Tic. A.Ş. (Certificate no: 44739)

Yeşilce Mahallesi, Donanma Sokak. No:16 D:1-2 Seyrantepe 34418 Kağıthane/Istanbul

© Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation Istanbul Research Institute

Meşrutiyet Caddesi no. 47, 34430, Tepebaşı - Beyoğlu/Istanbul

www.iae.org.tr

Certificate no: 12482

The views expressed in the articles published in the journal are the authors' own for which the Istanbul Research Institute may not be held accountable. The online edition is open access. Publishing in *YILLIK* is free of charge. Authors of articles published remain the copyright holders and grant third parties the right to use, reproduce, and share the article according to Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported (CC BY 3.0), upon proper citation and acknowledgment.

150 than a memory, whereas Istanbul's leisure culture was hitting its stride and gaining strength. In playing up such themes, the collection helps to strike a new balance, which is long overdue in Ottoman studies.

*A Companion to Early Modern Istanbul* is the culmination of a generation of new research. Each of the chapters will serve as a valuable overview of topics ranging across many different subfields of history. Readers will not only find the latest historiographical debates, but a trove of information about primary documents and essential studies from the historical literature. The collection will stand as a landmark in Istanbul studies for its breadth of research and willingness to re-examine received ideas. Students

Nathanael Aschenbrenner and Jake Ransohoff, eds., *The Invention of Byzantium in Early Modern Europe*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 2021. xviii + 457 pages. ISBN: 9780884024842

One wonders why this compelling volume is not entitled more simply *The Inventions of Byzantium*, since in their excellent conclusion the editors demonstrate precisely that there was no single invention of Byzantium. Certainly, it was not invented by Hieronymus Wolf in 1562. As Anthony Kaldellis shows clearly in his characteristically pellucid chapter, Laonikos Chalkokondyles used Byzantium as a synonym for the Eastern Roman Empire a century before Wolf. More than that, even the use of *historiae byzantinae*, attributed to Wolf by many (including this reviewer), should instead be attributed to his publisher, when Wolf's translations of Zonaras and Choniates were joined with a Latin translation of Laonikos by Conrad Clauser. Still more than that, in

who are looking for new ideas and questions about the history of Istanbul would do well to start here.

**James Grehan**  
Portland State University  
grehanjp@pdx.edu

ORCID: 0000-0002-6305-9267  
CC BY 3.0  
<https://doi.org/10.53979/yjillik.2022.13>

---

1 See respectively Robert Mantran, *Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVIIe siècle: essai d'histoire institutionnelle, économique et sociale* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1962); Ebru Boyar and Kate Fleet, *A Social History of Ottoman Istanbul* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Kaldellis' view, it made no difference at the time to the way in which the eastern empire was viewed. Kaldellis traces the invention of Byzantium, as a new designation for the Eastern Roman Empire, through discussions of "the Eastern Question" and the Crimean War to the creation of the discipline, *Byzantinistik*, by Krumbacher. What more is there to say? A good deal more, according to the editors and other contributors. Most contributors, although not all, focus on early modern thinkers and their engagement with Byzantium. However, just as clearly, together they refute the notion that we should search for a single inventor of Byzantium in that period or later.

Fabio Pagani offers a foundation to the volume by establishing the importance of Gemistos Pletho and his student Bessarion. These are familiar names whose articulation of the decline and fall of, as they saw it, a Greek world, are situated in richly textured political and ideological contexts. Anthony Grafton introduces the Western humanists who encountered Greek texts, tracing in necessary detail the prehistory of what he identifies as the year (1691), when "Byzantine studies and clas-

2 For a sampling of this literature, see for example Kathryn Babayan, *The City as Anthology: Eroticism and Urbanity in Early Modern Isfahan* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2021); Stephen P. Blake, *Shahjahanabad: the Sovereign City in Mughal India, 1639–1739* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Peter Clark and Bernard Lepetit, eds., *Capital Cities and Their Hinterlands in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot: Scolar, 1996); Gerald Groemer, *Portraits of Edo and Early Modern Japan: the Shogun's Capital in Zuihitsu Writings, 1657–1855* (Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019); Abhishek Kaiker, *The King and the People: Sovereignty and Popular Politics in Mughal Delhi* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020); Paul Keenan, *St. Petersburg and the Russian Court, 1703–1761* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); James McClain et al, ed., *Edo and Paris: Urban Life and the State in the Early Modern Era* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994); Matsunosuke Nishiyama, *Edo Culture: Daily Life and Diversions in Urban Japan, 1600–1868* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997); David Ringrose, *Madrid and the Spanish Economy, 1560–1850* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); Anthony Wrigley, "A Simple Model of London's Importance, 1650–1750," *Past and Present* 37 (1967): 44–70.

sical scholarship celebrated their divorce" (p. 72). Thereafter, classical scholars would look to medieval Greek only for what it preserved of antiquity, excising and collating quotations. Before 1691, however, Latin scholars had been more generous. If some, like Wolf, came to their subject reluctantly ("he treated Choniates' prose as affected and hyperbolic" [p. 89]), others like Clauser embraced it. So did Martin Crusius, a Tübingen professor, who saw Byzantine authors like Eustathios, author of detailed commentaries on Homer as well as his own works, as both communicators of ancient knowledge and learned commentators on them. Richard Calis explores Crusius' career and the "full richness of his engagement with Byzantine materials" (p. 106) in a detailed chapter, beautifully illustrated with images of Crusius' own textual and visual glosses in his own books, now in the Tübingen University Library. Teresa Shawcross turns our attention to a rather better known author, Charles du Cange, addressing in turn *La byzantine du Louvre* (Paris Corpus), inspired in part by a French concern for the Ottomans, and Du Cange's reinvention in the eighteenth century as a French national historian, following the

diminution of the Ottoman threat. There are well chosen images of Du Cange's notes and, even better, two appendices: Of works published by Du Cange, and an edition and translation of the 1756 inventory of Du Cange's papers.

Two papers expand our field of vision, to art and drama. Elena Boeck's reflections offer a fuller exploration of visual invention, drawing on her research into the colossal columnar equestrian statue of Justinian, the subject of a recent monograph. Boeck shows how, because Chrysoloras had demonstrated the value of material evidence, and Cyriac had made monuments "worthy of admiration" by antiquarians, Mantegna was able to transplant Constantinople's greatest sculptural monument to the older Rome. Przemysław Marciniak offers important commentary on early modern plays with Byzantine themes or sources of inspiration written and performed for European audiences, beginning with the last, Voltaire's *Irène* (1778). The beginning of interest in dramatizing Byzantine historical events is identified in so-called "school theatre," plays written and performed for the purpose of moral improvement. For that reason, certain tragic characters liked Maurice, the emperor murdered with his whole family, or Leo the Armenian, the iconoclast murdered by his generals, proved popular.

John Considine's study of later Greek dictionaries reacquaints us with Wolf and Crusius as lexicographers, following a survey of earlier printed Byzantine dictionaries, notably the *Suda* and Hesychius. Having dispensed with the notion that Wolf invented Byzantine history, we are offered the opportunity to consider him the inventor of the notion that Byzantine Greek was "barbarized." The idea of the later language as *graecobarbarus* was well established between the later sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. Crusius wrote instead of the *vulgaris lingua graeca*, which overlapped with the language spoken in his day, and was distinct from the *antiqua et pura* (to which

many later Greek authors aspired) and the *ecclesiastica*. Attention is also given to Henri Estienne, Nicolas Rigault, and Johannes Meursius, who emphasized progression and complexity over the corruption of language.

William North's detailed analysis of the life and work of the Silesian librarian, Martin Hanke, revives the reputation of a neglected figure, whose work was characterized by Krumbacher as superficial. North argues, to the contrary, that Agostino Pertusi was correct: Hanke's *De Byzantinarum rerum scriptoribus Graecis*, was "the first history of Byzantine historiography" (p. 251), and the necessary foundation for later studies of Byzantine literature. Shane Bobrycki diverts attention to Hanke's younger contemporary, Bernard de Montfaucon, whose study of medieval Greek scripts, "dating manuscripts and explaining peculiarities of Greek" (p. 282) eschewed the novel ideas then circulating that Byzantium should be treated apart from the broad sweep of Greek civilization. Wolf makes another desultory appearance here, again evincing his lack of enthusiasm for the Byzantines. Montfaucon ignored him, preferring Crusius' warmer treatment, although at the same time he avoided the terms Byzantine and Byzantium. The declining threat of the Turks is shown to have allowed Montfaucon's purely academic engagement with Byzantine material.

As for Montfaucon, Byzantine Greek was subordinated to Greek, so for the Bollandists, a fascination with Byzantine hagiography was subordinated to the desire to catalog all aspects of Christian sainthood, and to record all saints regardless of whether "a life or passion was available" (p. 309). In his chapter on hagiography, Xavier Lequeu, writes eloquently that with the publication of the first volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum*, many previously unknown "saints honored in Byzantium and the rest of the Christian East made a triumphant entry into the consciousness of the Catholic Church" (p. 312). The protagonist is not Bolland himself, but

his younger collaborator, Daniel Papebroch, who traveled widely collating and translating texts that swiftly reached a wider readership, including Du Cange.

Frederick Clark frames his chapter with reflections on Edward Gibbon, a writer almost always cited by Byzantinists for his hostility to Byzantium, but who has appeared agreeably infrequently earlier in the volume. In fact, Gibbon's approach to the Byzantine centuries was more often melancholic than hostile. If Wolf has replaced him as the early modern villain of the piece, still Gibbon deserves credit for "formalizing a periodization" (p. 326) that would endure, and which had many precedents. Clark surveys earlier views on when antiquity ended, from Petrarch onwards, including some familiar names (Chrysoloras), and others who have appeared only in passing, such as Flavio Biondo (mentioned once each by Boeck and Grafton). Of course, Hieronymous Wolf appears, because his *Corpus historiae byzantinae*, whoever conceived of its title, "described that millennium from Constantine to the fall of Constantinople as a coherent unit of history" (p. 333).

The young scholars who conceived of the conference of which this volume is the record deserve our gratitude for pursuing this valuable undertaking, editing (and translating) the works of others so carefully, and preparing an exemplary introduction and conclusion. I give them my own thanks, for inviting me to participate in the conference, which I was unable to attend. I see now how much I would have learned then, and how little of originality I would have been able to contribute, in contrast to the authors of these compelling essays.

#### Paul Stephenson

Pennsylvania State University  
paul.stephenson@psu.edu

ORCID: 0000-0001-9242-3200

CC BY 3.0

<https://doi.org/10.53979/yillik.2022.14>