lists of products bought for the hospitals, in addition to the narration of travelers. These sources are used to show social hierarchies within Ottoman society via descriptions of existing medical environment. The vague nature of the borders between medical branches (or disciplines) lead to a complex structure formed of several treatments, such as bloodletting, cauterization, surgery, and drug preparation. Her differentiation of disease and illness is an important emphasis to the study of a history of medicine. The modern concept of disease, she underlines, is a biomedical definition based on germs and viruses, and very different from the concept of "illness," which designates a social and cultural condition, under which the person cannot fulfill his/her "normal" behavior.

Shefer-Mossensohn's most important contribution is to move both Middle Eastern studies and history of medicine in a non-Western case to a theoretical level. She demonstrates that sanitary issues, which might be (and have been) placed at the margins of the study of non-Western early modernity, can also be a legitimate and necessary subject to illustrate the dynamics of early modern Ottoman society.

On the whole, Shefer-Mossensohn offers a distinctive account of the medical world in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries within a broad perspective. She introduces social history to the tradition of writing Ottoman and Turkish history of medicine as well as a variety of concepts and ideas from Michel Foucault to Roy Porter and their revisionist successors, useful for understanding a society through medical terms. Few scholars have worked in the field of Ottoman Turkish medicine, and Shefer-Mossensohn offers readers a guide to the study of early modern Ottoman society in respect to health and disease/illness.

Ceren Gülser İlikan Rasimoğlu
Boğaziçi University

Wendy M.K. Shaw. *Ottoman Painting: Reflections of Western Art from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic*. I.B. Tauris: London, 2011, xv + 208 pages.

Last year, Wendy M.K. Shaw published a new study on painting and its institutions in the late Ottoman Empire and early Republican Turkey. It presents a discussion which leaves out miniature paintings and covers the period from the late eighteenth century to the Kemalist 1930s. The

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600001618 Published online by Cambridge University Press

study is organized as a textbook, a genre which has some precedents in studies of this era, such as the works of Nurullah Berk and Sezer Tansuğ, and thus basically follows a chronological order. But, unlike in her study on the Ottoman Imperial Museum, *Possessors and Possessed*,[1] Shaw has used very few archival and primary sources here. The book does not intend to be a comprehensive new investigation; not many hitherto little-known artists or artworks are brought to our attention, and several publications from the last half century of the period under consideration remain neglected. It mainly aims to express the author's reflections on the social role and meta-meaning of painting in Ottoman/Turkish society. The author writes:

> Ottoman painting in the Western modality emerges as a copy of European art without the kind of intellectual leap at the heart of Western aesthetics—without what Kant might term "genius." Understood from this perspective, there is nothing to analyze in Ottoman painting: it is derivative, always epigonic, and does nothing to further the discourse of art.
>
> This might have been the case if Ottoman painting succeeded in its imitation, producing artworks indistinguishable from Western originals. However, it fails to replicate the Western tradition; its camouflage is weak and readily discernible. [...] Early Ottoman painting changed the position of the viewing subject from one rooted in perspective to one mobile within architectural and cross-cultural space. These paintings are less windows onto the world than windows onto a process of cultural adaptation; they are designed to be seen, but not necessarily looked at. Just as in evolutionary theory, a species becomes increasingly viable through the mutations that enable it to succeed in a particular environmental niche, painting in the Western modality adapted to the new environment of an Ottoman world in flux. By taking on the act of looking, art made in the Ottoman Empire did something that was structurally original even though its product was work designed to do nothing other than follow the rules (p. 39).

In fact, throughout the book Shaw claims that the primary and predominant function of painting in nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century Ottoman society, for practitioners and viewers alike, was to help them feel themselves Western. Participation in acts related to painting was

1 Wendy M.K. Shaw, *Possessors and Possessed: Museums, Archaeology, and the Visualization of History in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

performative more than anything else, she believes. This function, performing Western-ness, or "being contemporary" (p. 5), was the "structurally original" thing that painting did in the Ottoman Empire.

The account begins with the eighteenth-century landscape murals in the Topkapı Palace and elsewhere, some Christian Ottoman painters' works (including sultans' portraits) in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, and several nineteenth-century oil-on-canvas landscapes, mostly by soldier artists, many of which were made as copies of photographs (and sometimes of European lithographs). By "early" Ottoman painting in the above-quoted passage she means this period, when, she argues, the role that these pictures played for the viewing persons—"mobile within architectural space"—was definitively formed. The subsequent chapters cover the exhibits organized in the country; the emergence of a market for paintings; the weight of the depiction of historic monuments around the beginning of the twentieth century as a manifestation of concerns about heritage; the use of paintings in military exhibitions such as in the Naval Museum as a tool for patriotic education; the foundation of the Society of Ottoman Artists in 1908 and its journal published between 1911 and 1914; the generation of artists who studied in Paris in the early 1910s but showed "resistance" to the latest novelties and avant-garde movements there (p. 127); and the near-subservience of this art to the propaganda demands of the state in the initial two decades of the republic.

About the *Journal of the Society of Ottoman Artists* (*Osmanlı Ressamlar Cemiyeti Gazetesi*) Shaw writes that, "[i]n contrast to most Western critical discourse, this journal was far more interested in the role of art and the artist in society and in the technical aspects of art than in its communicative function [...]" (p. 117). That the communicative function of art was greatly overshadowed by the agenda of national identity and of "being contemporary" becomes a central theme of the book, and this explains why the author spends very little effort to explore expressive qualities or psychological dimensions in the Ottoman artists' different works.

Shaw believes that the students who were trained in Paris from the so-called 1914 Generation resisted avant-gardes despite their acquaintance and "knew that as artists back in the Ottoman Empire their duty would be not to shock the public through radical innovation, but to persuade the public into an initial relationship with art" (p. 127). However, in the very last footnote of the book, she writes: "Turkish artists have often been understood by critics as having imported outdated artistic practices as they returned from education abroad. Rather, this seeming time delay can be attributed to the gap between the art historiographical

focus on founding moments and the dissolution of those moments into the normalized practice of an epoch" (p. 191, n. 88). One regrets that the perspective expressed in this footnote is far from influential in much of the book. Reducing the work of three generations of artists largely to a defense mechanism developed in the face of the threat of colonialism, which she sees in surprising biological analogies like a "camouflage [of] insects" (p. 39), the author argues throughout the narrative that Ottoman painting was incapable of "furthering" art's discourse, with a striking insistence on portraying a "contrast" between what she assumes to be the West and Ottoman society in this respect. It is difficult to understand her being oblivious of the fact that artists in several other societies, including many in Europe and North America, also were almost always "receivers" of ideas in the art world—let alone to understand her embrace of Kant's category of the "genius" (which actually denoted an indescribable gift of Nature that allowed its owner to set new rules in art, art not necessarily leaping forward with this, rather than an "intellectual" endeavor).

Finally, Shaw conflates the woman artist Celile Hikmet's father (in other words, Nâzım Hikmet's grandfather) Hasan Enver Pasha with "the revolutionary leader Enver Pasha" (p. 137).[2] A memorable mistake.

Yavuz Sezer
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

2 There is one single entry for "Enver Pasha" in the book's index and it refers to two passages. One of them is on page 119, and obviously about İsmail Enver Pasha: "The connection of the paper [*Journal of the Society of Ottoman Artists*] with the notion of progress had overt political connotations, affiliating it with the Committee for Union and Progress which had led the Second Constitutional Revolution. The repeated emphasis on copying from nature in discussions of aesthetics strengthened this association with scientific endeavor. Indeed, the initiator of the organization [The Society of Ottoman Artists], Mehmed Ruhi, worked at the mansion of the party leader Enver Pasha, and painted his portrait there." The other one is the passage about Celile Hikmet, her father, and her son Nâzım Hikmet, mentioned here by name, on page 137.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600001618 Published online by Cambridge University Press