

PRIME MINISTRY OTTOMAN ARCHIVES: INVENTORY OF WRITTEN ARCHIVAL SOURCES FOR OTTOMAN CINEMA HISTORY

Özde Çeliktemel-Thomen

Abstract

This article explores the need for a new archive-based scrutiny that has yet to be fully employed and briefly describes the historiography of cinema over the last decade in Turkey. A selection of currently authorized archival sources gathered from the *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri* (Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives, BOA) is assembled here to demonstrate the potential value they hold. Clearly, the reader may realize the abundance of the written sources from the BOA and their significance in understanding Ottoman cinema history. While acknowledging the mediated nature of state records, this article suggests that empirical methods and historically-oriented scholarship are both viable and crucial for research into cinema history in the late Ottoman context.

Key Words: Ottoman cinema history, historiography of cinema in Turkey, *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri* (Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives), written sources, archival research

1. Introduction

Cinema history is the study of the past that explains the events, structures and processes of cinema and individual films based on written and visual sources in a form of narration. Clearly, it is “more than just the history of individual films.”¹ There are different views about the definitions of cinema/film history and a consensus has recently been suggested by various scholars.² What exactly cinema history is may vary; yet here I present the historiography of the phenomenon. As cinema history deals with the past, it requires historical research based on scrutinizing written archival sources, in other words “non-filmic sources.”³ Obviously, not only are written sources a conduit for the past events of cinema, but there are also visual and digital resources, in the forms of available films, frame enlargements, and photographs. As all these textual and visual sources present various meanings, the scholar may place herself in different epistemological and methodological orientations within her narration. My intention in this article is to examine the contribution and function of archival research for Ottoman cinema history, which is yet to be fully written.

Historian Gülru Necipoğlu regards archival sources as “clues to follow up in the manner of a detective” in order to make a sensible use of them.⁴ While emphasizing the critical role of empirical data in making history, Necipoğlu recognizes the importance of holding research questions in mind in order to comprehend various ideologies and discourses affecting the sources. She also suggests that “substantial interpretation” and “critical outlook” become crucial for escaping from “text-fetishism.”⁵ As her metaphorical explanations show, archival sources give historians “food for imagination.”⁶ Moreover, archive-based scrutiny helps us to formulate wider interpretative horizons within contextualized ideology and factual information (i.e., especially data on dates, characters, and certain events) as can be seen in the sources below.

In this article, I firstly present brief information on the literature of the last decade surrounding the cinema histories of Turkey and the Ottoman Empire.⁷ Secondly, I provide a preliminary description of the Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri’s (Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives, İstanbul; hereafter BOA) currently authorized records in various topics regarding the Ottoman cinema history. Previously, this type of extensive archival research has not been widely used in cinema historiography in Turkey. My goal here is not to criticize current works or the problems of theory, methodology or practice of cinema historians.⁸ Instead, I aim to endorse this understudied discipline to students of history and researchers by introducing a selection from the BOA records which abounds in material for fruitful projects. In doing so, I also discuss how these sources can contribute to the further development of cinema history in Turkey.

2. The Last Decade of Cinema History in Turkey

Before presenting archival sources on Ottoman cinema history, I would like to briefly note the most recent contributions in the historiography of film studies since 2000. What have Turkey’s cinema historians produced recently? What new subjects have been raised? What kinds of problems were indicated in the field? Overall, what has the last decade of cinema history of the late Ottoman and early Turkish periods demonstrated?

What we have constituting the discipline of cinema history now is a new route to different histories with more archival research and a revisionist approach since the publication of Rakım Çalapala’s work in 1946.⁹ A relatively increasing number of graduate dissertations have tackled the issues of early and silent cinema mostly by relying on press reviews and some archival sources.¹⁰ Although the subject matter of these studies varies in terms of periodization and interdisciplinary approach, for my purpose let me list some of the major subjects here:

1. censorship
2. film reception/spectatorship
3. early and silent filmmaking
4. film exhibition and distribution
5. intellectual value of cinema in literary works
6. cinema and propaganda
7. film as evidence in historical studies

In 2009, two issues of *Kebikeç* featured articles about film studies in Turkey.¹¹ In introducing them, the editor Ahmet Gürata noted that, regarding the relationship between cinema and history, “a theoretical approach without a historical perspective cannot exist; equally a history without a theoretical background cannot be imagined.”¹² This attempt to break down the disciplinary differences between cinema and history creates awareness among scholars of the need for an insightful and common method. The articles in these two issues covered fascinating topics such as historians’ views on cinema, intersections between cinema and history, cinema and space, historical films, İstanbul and cinema, and the re-publishing of survey works. Furthermore, the annually organized conference series *Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler* (New Directions in Turkish Film Studies) has served academics and students of cinema history for more than a decade. For instance, the conference proceedings of 2006 tackled the relationship between cinema and history, the debates among academia-based and non-academic cinema historians’ works, the use of music in silent cinema, and the Pathé Frères’ entrepreneurship in imperial İstanbul.¹³

Moreover, *Mithat Alam Film Center’s Türk Sineması Görsel Hafıza Projesi* (MAFM, Turkish Cinema Visual Memory Project) has also produced an oral history database initiated by the MAFM’s director, Yamaç Okur, the students of Boğaziçi University and other volunteers. The project has helped to provide information from the silent years of cinema up until the contemporary period, based on the methods of oral history.¹⁴ The interviews were conducted with various groups of people such as scriptwriters, directors, actors, and cinema historians.¹⁵ Another cooperative project run by Nezih Erdoğan, *Sinema-Seyir Belge Arşivi* (Cinema-Spectacle Documents Archive), has brought together Ottoman Turkish language experts and cinema scholars to locate and introduce historical sources gathered from the late Ottoman and early republican press. This digital database includes commentaries and news from periodicals such as *İkdam* (1894-95, 1898, 1900, 1902-03, 1905-08, 1910), *Sinema Postası* (1920) and *Türk Sineması* (1928) that are available online for researchers and students of cinema history.¹⁶ Overall, the study of cinema history has flourished lately because of various nationwide initiatives, such as joint seminars by neighboring disciplines, institutional research projects and the use of language experts.

Cinema scholars in Turkey often express regret about the scarcity of visual and written sources on the early and silent eras.¹⁷ Clearly, there is lack of visual resources; many films have been reported lost or destroyed.¹⁸ However, there is an abundance of written archival records regarding the subject. Indeed, a lack of knowledge of Ottoman Turkish restricts many cinema scholars' ability to research within the late Ottoman context.¹⁹ Archival sources concerning the subject of early Turkish and late Ottoman cinema are scattered in various collections of the BOA, as well as those at the *Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivleri*, (Prime Ministry Republican Archives, Ankara; hereafter BCA), *Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri Foto Film Merkezi* (the Turkish Armed Forces' Photographic Film Centre), and at national, public and university libraries throughout Turkey.²⁰ Archival sources are not only found in Turkey, but also in other former Ottoman territories, such as Macedonia, as well as in the national and private archives of France, the USA and the UK; countries which distributed films widely throughout the region.²¹

Recent leading studies employing archival research and showing its important place in the discipline include Serdar Öztürk's essays and book.²² Of the existing scholarship, Öztürk pinpoints the empirical and theoretical problems of current scholarship and makes use of the BOA and BCA sources widely in his texts.²³ Ali Özuyar, Saadet Özen and Mustafa Özen's studies are also significant in terms of their initiatives to present available data from state archives and periodicals.²⁴ These works are striking in regards to their considerable use of archive-based research.

Turkey unfortunately lacks a film museum covering the early and silent eras of cinema/film history.²⁵ Material held in private collections of Burçak Evren, Ağâh Özgüç, Gökhan Akçura and sources from *Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri Foto Film Merkezi* could serve as a nucleus in which to preserve the cinema heritage of the Ottoman Empire and of Turkey.²⁶ Thanks to the efforts of Mimar Sinan University's Centre of Cinema and TV, some silent films have been restored from nitrate print into video-tape format. Although the department does not have an accessible catalog, some of these films can be viewed at the department's library.²⁷ However, many films have been lost due to the lack of preservation and the chemical nature of prints. The absence of a film museum/archive causes hardship for scholars at different stages of research. Therefore, the examination of the sources in the BOA and BCA would contribute to a significant accumulation of information and new perspectives for exploring the cinema history of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey.

Undertaking extensive research in state archives may at first appear outside the range of mainstream cinema historians and empirical skeptics. However, world cinema history has already had "a community of scholars whose work was historical and based on archival research" mostly in North

America and the UK in the late 1970s.²⁸ Western cinema scholarship has a long tradition of consulting available films and written sources. The objectives of a cinema historian—based on various topics of the aesthetic, technological, economic, and social history of cinema—can be informed by written sources such as municipal regulations, trade agreements, corporate records, governmental decrees, correspondence, maps, and press reviews. Above all, the use of these non-filmic sources is very much dependent on the scholar's skills and expertise, and the type of research questions posed.

Periodicals can enhance the scholarship's outlook and introduce valuable empirical data.²⁹ For instance, before scrutinizing daily newspapers scholars actually did not know enough about the early film exhibitions in İstanbul (i.e., regarding the initial film exhibitions in imperial İstanbul on December 9, 1896).³⁰ Despite the rising use of periodicals, archival sources from various departments of the state are still lacking in recent publications.³¹

Periods of early and silent cinema abound in written sources in various catalogs in the BOA: from governmental decrees and cinematograph privileges, to correspondence and reports surrounding film production, distribution and exhibition, and other sources for the social history of cinema. While archival materials highlight the ideology of the state about cinema, they also allow us to engage with the broader political, social, cultural and economic issues of cinema history. This article is not a crude guide to writing cinema history by emphasizing the importance of fact-gathering from archives. Rather, I attempt to demonstrate the preliminary and authorized archival records in the fourth section, which, I hope, may open up new research opportunities. Many scholars acknowledge the need for the employment of original sources in order to uncover unknowns and add more knowledge to the fragmented historiography of cinema in Turkey.³² Given the filtered and mediated nature of state sources, the reader might question or even oppose the examination of BOA and BCA records. In that case, researchers have alternatives, such as other foreign and private archives, and fall-back methods of neighboring disciplines as noted briefly above.

3. Why Archival Sources?

The purpose of this section is to stress the need for extensive archival research for writing Ottoman cinema history. The “archival turn” of the nineteenth century clearly showed how historians produce historical knowledge at the archives. Historical methodology also witnessed other competing methodologies such as the “social turn”, “cultural turn”, “linguistic turn” and others.³³ Nevertheless, the study of early and silent cinema can benefit greatly from archival research alongside current methods of social sciences and literary studies. How, then, can we know that archive-based research is important for the study of cinema history within the context

of the late Ottoman Empire? The contribution of archive-based research is two-fold. It may allow scholars firstly to overcome the current paradigms of cinema historiography (mainly nationalist and essentialist discourses). Secondly, archival research helps to examine different regions surrounding cinema history in the late Ottoman era. Currently, İstanbul is the spatial focus in the field, yet investigating the cinema history of provinces and other major Ottoman cities in the Balkans and the Middle East will expand the boundaries of the discipline.³⁴

a. Current Paradigms

A number of paradigms exist within the cinema history of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey which can be classified in two groups. Firstly, nationalization discourse—inherited from the modernist and Kemalist views of the Turkish Republican period—confines many scholars' perspectives in understanding the Ottoman state and society. Secondly, the mystification of Sultan Abdülhamid II's (r. 1876-1909) character leads to an essentialist discourse and ill-defined historical description for the period under discussion.

Nationalization Discourse

First, let's briefly discuss the nationalization discourse embedded within the scholarship of Ottoman cinema. Due to the scope of this article, I shall limit myself by noting that one dimension of this discourse is related to the Turkification of Ottoman cinema in the historiography. It also appears that there is a lack of chronological, institutional and geographical divisions between the Ottoman Empire and Turkey which has been constructed within the nationalization discourse. On the one hand, this view breaks from the past with the Ottomans, even though there is still a continuity and similarity. On the other hand, cinema during the Ottoman era is Turkified by crowning "Turkish filmmakers" and partially excluding other ethnicities of the empire (i.e., situating Fuat Uzkınay as the "first Turkish filmmaker" with his so-called 1914 newsreel and excluding the films by the Manaki brothers, Ottoman citizens of Vlach origin).³⁵ In fact, some scholars have recently attempted to discuss other Ottoman filmmakers' productions.³⁶

Scholars should distinguish different state institutions, political and administrative leaders, the changes in society throughout the periods and their various reflections on cinema history.³⁷ This distinction can be achieved with the help of precise concepts, reasonable periodization and contextual emphasis. For instance, new structures created for cinema during the republican era may be quite distinct from those of the Ottoman era. General norms and practices change over time and certain trends, ideology, structure and political outcomes surrounding cinema definitely emerged in the 1920s.

The meaning that scholars attribute to the changes in historical reality and transformation of values in a certain period establish the current historiography of cinema in Turkey.³⁸

Perhaps periodization of current works undermines different formations of state and society, namely the Ottoman Empire and Republic of Turkey. I do not necessarily suggest an arbitrary separation of the two. Furthermore, there may be distinctions and similarities between Ottoman and Turkish cinema history—if we can indeed define those cinemas based on state and society formations. There is also a fundamental problem with conceptual schemes. Obviously, the majority of mainstream scholarship does not employ the concepts of “Ottoman film”, “Ottoman filmmaker”, and/or “Ottoman cinema”, yet compartmentalizes history into national or transnational cinema theories and emphasizes the “Turkishness” of cinema.³⁹ It would be a rather striking question to pose as to why scholars consent to the use of “Ottoman painting”, but not that of “Ottoman cinema”. Use of this concept, Ottoman cinema, would not only help to identify individual films of Ottoman filmmakers and cinematographers (such as Sigmund Weinberg, Yanaki and Milton Manaki,⁴⁰ Fuat Uzkinay, Ahmet Fehim, Sadi Fikret Karagözoğlu and Cemil Filmer), but also Ottoman cinema-going, the experience of cinema, and the film distribution and exhibition during the late Ottoman period. Above all, we still need to discern what is Ottoman and Turkish about the “Ottoman” and “Turkish” cinemas.

In a recent work, Savaş Arslan notes the speculations about the existence of the first “Turkish” film in 1914 and he reasonably questions “the possibility of a Turkish film when there was no Turkish state.”⁴¹ While Arslan highlights the multiplicity of cinema and questions the “national cinema” theory, he wonders if we can argue that “the Turkish cinema predates the Turkish Republic.”⁴² Throughout his book, Arslan successfully builds his arguments about the cinema in Turkey “without necessarily considering it as Turkish or expressive of national identity.”⁴³ Yet, he does not go beyond and fully apply his theories to the late Ottoman context already covered in his book.

Now, it is time to recognize the complex nature of the late Ottoman Empire when cinema first arrived and flourished, as a multi-ethnic, multi-linguistic and multi-religious imperial state in transition to a number of emergent nation-states. While films were mostly available only to the Ottoman upper and middle classes, the geography and population of the empire were gradually changing boundaries in the early 1900s. The formulations of Charles Tilly on the “criteria for real units” and the “units of analysis” show how scholars should be “generalizing soundly” for their explanations and comparisons among various entities of state and society.⁴⁴ Indeed cinema experience of Ottoman and Turkish societies is currently formed within scholars’ over-generalizations.

A separation of chronology and geography in the light of archival sources may help scholars escape from current nationalization discourses and they may consequently introduce a more solid contextualization. Cinema historians should thus separate different periods from one another. This periodization can be classified not only based on film distribution and exhibition practices, film genres, and filmmakers, but also according to other factors such as different formations of state and society, as well as turning points and crossroads in the history of cinema. For instance, the Yıldız Palace catalog in the BOA yields that the year 1903 marks the first cinematograph privileges in the Ottoman Empire.⁴⁵ This data may be a relevant chronological turn solely for Ottoman cinema. Due to the emergence of new institutions and infrastructures that were gradually created during the early republican years, the 1903 cinema privileges may not be valid for the following periods.⁴⁶

Essentialist Discourse

The second paradigm, the essentialist discourse, centers on the characterization of Sultan Abdülhamid II, and is indeed shared by the cinema historiography of Turkey and that of the wider international scene. Scholars assume that it was Sultan Abdülhamid II's "fear" about the use of electricity for films that undermined the development of cinema in the late Ottoman context. Most works reiterate a certain myth of the sultan's so-called "fear" of electricity and consequent prohibition of film screenings.⁴⁷

During Abdülhamid's regime, widely referred to as the Hamidian era, censorship and banning of certain films undeniably existed. Nevertheless, the overall Hamidian cinema regulation was not always as "repressive" and "despotic" as it has been usually portrayed in the discipline of film studies. Explanation of certain characters and agents is a common method in order to show causality in historical studies. As is known from the clichés of historical writing, we likely see various images of Abdülhamid II as a strong "Kızıl Sultan" (The Crimson Sultan) or for the neo-Ottomanist ascription of "Ulu Hakan" (The Great Khan).⁴⁸ Scholars tend to situate historical figures either as strong or weak characters based on their knowledge of that figure.⁴⁹ Moreover, scholars apply another common method whereby they attribute essentialist and conceptual frameworks to historical figures. Thus, a figure can be formed within an idea, theme, or literary device.⁵⁰ For instance, in most of the current film studies' literature, the Sultan is mostly depicted as a "conservative," the prohibition of films have been interpreted as a "failure" and he somehow always had a "fear" of permitting film screenings.⁵¹ Indeed, Sultan Abdülhamid II was as "modern" as the preceding *Tanzimat* reformers, and introduced "well intentioned but poorly organized" reforms.⁵² However, current cinema scholarship definitely

exaggerates the “mistakes” of the Sultan.⁵³ Despite the fact that the Sultan was an autocrat, Stanford J. Shaw’s proposal to “look at him in his own context and his own time”⁵⁴ may be one way to avoid this tendency. From its beginnings, cinema established itself within a varied set of processes and structures determined by the internal and international norms and practices in the empire. The factors affecting cinema’s development varied in terms of politics, technology, culture, and economics. Thus, it is important to be cautious and not to view cinema history as always affected merely by the actions of one person—be it the sultan, the cinema entrepreneur and/or an individual spectator. I do not ignore the role of individuals, yet the choices made by individuals “can only be understood within the context of a given set of institutional arrangements.”⁵⁵

In opposition to the above-mentioned views, sources from the Yıldız Palace catalog and other agencies show differing accounts about the use of cinema during the Hamidian era. For some cases, these unhelpful discourses could be overcome by consulting archival sources. The reader might view this suggestion as a naive one, especially when the major discursive problems involve interpretative skills, and most importantly the scholars’ orientation, beliefs, preferences and statements. The quality and quantity of BOA sources may provide a solid groundwork and multilayered insights for less simplistic generalizations and more supportive discourses to understand the institutional structures and processes of Ottoman cinema. Above all, these BOA sources may allow a better contextualization of the Hamidian era, along with the use of specialized monographs and historically focused seminal books on the period.⁵⁶

b. Spatial Focus

The spatial focus of cinema history constitutes my second argument regarding the contribution of archive-based research. Evidently, there is a scarcity of academic works covering the different geographies’ of Ottoman cinema history. When cinema arrived in 1896 through the initiatives of European traveling operators, the Ottoman Empire still stretched from the Balkans to Anatolia and Arabia.⁵⁷ Indeed, the imperial capital, İstanbul, did play a determining role for cinema due to its commercial, financial, social and cultural character as a “contact” space for “encounters between cultures.”⁵⁸ Yet, in addition to İstanbul, fruitful inquiry could also relate the Anatolian cinema experience to the histories of the Ottoman Balkans and Arabia. For such a challenging project, a collaboration between scholars is a must.

Interestingly, early and silent cinema can be observed in various provinces of the empire from Mersin and Tripoli to Salonika and Konya. The history of cinema in various cities might be distinctive and/or similar from one region to another. Yet even mainstream film/cinema history books

implicitly focus on the center, namely İstanbul (while claiming to be total histories), and ignore the cinema experiences of other Ottoman cities.⁵⁹ The cinema history of the Ottoman provinces has yet to be written. The BOA sources may help introduce a wider geographical span for writing the cinema history of the late Ottoman Empire showing multiplicity and different accounts in both center and periphery. Overall, the regional cinema history of the empire is made possible due to the abundance of archival sources at the BOA and other archives located in the former territories of the Ottoman Empire.

4. Archives: Traces of the Past

Having discussed the potential contribution of archive-based research, the following part is a modest attempt to trace and briefly describe the various archival sources based on research conducted between 2007 and 2011. With its approximately 150 million files, the BOA stands as the most voluminous archive for the study of the Ottoman Empire and its successor states.⁶⁰ Below, I present a preliminary selection of records from the late Ottoman period relevant to the early and silent cinema. Most of these are in Ottoman Turkish, in the combination of Arabic and Persian alphabet, and are chiefly in *rik'a* writing style. There are also some sources in English, French and German relating to the subject. The BOA guidelines are accessible to every researcher except for documents labeled as unauthorized documents. Some files have been omitted due to the fact that it would have been a rather ambitious task to include them all here.⁶¹

As a site of historical knowledge, the state archives contain sources about different subjects of interest and expertise for cinema historians and social scientists. These include film production, distribution and exhibition practices in the empire, moral concerns, and license applications, to name a few, and these will be briefly explained in turn below. Beyond that, these sources also intersect with other disciplines' areas of interest. As a business activity, film distribution, production and exhibition may be important for economic history, cinema as public entertainment is relevant to social history, and, as an aspect of city life, cinema is a significant component of urban history.⁶²

Below, I start by providing brief information about each catalog and locate the relevant documents with the BOA abbreviations.⁶³ The calendar used in these BOA records varies, but I include information regarding both the *Hicri* and *Miladi* calendars for the catalogs under discussion.⁶⁴ Researchers can also consult different records in the Yıldız Palace's catalogs and various sections of the *Dahiliye Nezareti* (Ministry of the Interior) the *Zaptiye Nezareti* (Ministry of Police and Security Forces) and the *Hariciye*

Nezareti (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) that were re-classified in 1987 and 1999.⁶⁵

The Yıldız Palace Catalog

Materials on cinema from the reign of Abdülhamid II have been preserved in the Yıldız Palace catalog at the BOA since 1949.⁶⁶ Previously, these records were kept at the Yıldız Palace Archives in line with the Sultan's strict regulations, and some of them are still unauthorized for research.⁶⁷ This catalog is organized into five different subdivisions and the *Yıldız Perakende* documents (hereafter Y.PRK) is especially abundant in diverse topics from daily news to other documents presented to the Sultan, including those on cinema and theater. Summaries of the catalog can be obtained online.⁶⁸ Furthermore, the periodicals from the Y.PRK, including commentaries from periodicals and news in Arabic, German, Bulgarian, Armenian, Persian, French, English, Spanish, Italian, Russian, Serbian, Turkish, Urdu, and Greek are kept in sixty-four different dossiers consisting of 3,215 cases. The *Yıldız Sadaret Resmî Maruzatı* documents (hereafter Y.A.RES) is the second catalog, containing three volumes of records, from the *Sadaret* department of the state regarding official *tezkires* (biographies) between the years of 1876 and 1909.⁶⁹

*Table 1*⁷⁰ includes the relevant sources from the Y.PRK and the Y.A.RES, covering issues such as permission requests for the use of electricity during film exhibitions, a list of films shot with the cinematograph, permission requests from Sultan Abdülhamid II to screen and make films for the Ottoman army, cinematograph privileges, and a list of cinematographs purchased for different state agencies and the Ottoman army.

Table 1. Records in the Yıldız Perakende and Yıldız Sadaret Resmî Maruzatı documents by BOA catalog abbreviation

Catalog	Hicri Date	Number of Records
Y.PRK.TKM	1296	1
Y.PRK.MYD	1317	1
Y.PRK.EŞA	1320	1
Y.PRK.AZJ	1320	1
Y.PRK.M	1320	1
Y.PRK.ZB	1325	1
Y.A.RES	1318-1323	2
Total		8

The Dahiliye Nezareti Catalog

The *Dahiliye Nezareti* (Ministry of the Interior) catalog holds a wide range of sources dealing with the internal affairs of the state, which were managed by the municipality and *zaptiye*, such as policing, records of ports, inventory lists, censorship, banditry, charity organizations, archaeological excavation licensing, army registers, promotion of officers, education, printing, and natural disasters.⁷¹ The selection focuses on the sources from the *Dahiliye Nezareti* that are relevant for the history of cinema. As in the selection displayed in *Table 2*, I list 104 authorized records surrounding various topics of the Ottoman cinema from the *Dahiliye Nezareti* catalog. Below, the reader can find brief information on different offices of the *Dahiliye* that contains sources on the subject.

Table 2. Records in the Dahiliye Nezareti catalog relating to Ottoman cinema

Catalog	Hicri Date	Number of Records
DH.UMVM	1330-1341	51
DH.MKT	1320-1327	7
DH.İD	1329-1333	3
DH.ŞFR	1330-1335	4
DH.KMS	1332-1340	5
DH.EUM.SSM	1336-1341	2
DH.EUM.LVZ	1338-1341	4
DH.EUM.MH	1327-1338	3
DH.EUM.AYŞ	1337-1340	4
DH.EUM.VRK	1333-1337	11
DH.EUM.5.Şb	1335-1336	4
DH.EUM.6.Şb	1335-1337	4
DH.EUM.KLU	1333	2
Total		104

Umur-ı Mahalliyye ve Vilayat Müdürlüğü records (hereafter DH.UMVM) have been kept under the *Dahiliye Nezareti* since 1913/1914 (1332 in *Hicri*) after the introduction of regulatory amendments within the entire ministry in 1912/1913.⁷² It stands as the largest catalog relating to Ottoman cinema history with fifty-one different records. *Table 3* demonstrates a selection of the wide range of subjects available in the DH.UMVM.

Table 3. Selected records from the DH.UMVM

Subject	Hicri Date
Regulation governing the generation of income from movie theaters by the <i>Darülaceze</i> (Poorhouse)	1330
Film screening fundraising at <i>Halep Mektebi Sanayi</i> (Aleppo Technical School) for children-in-need	1333
Exemption of charges and cinema licenses for the <i>Donanma</i> (the Navy) and <i>Müdafaa-i Milliye Cemiyeti</i> (the Society of National Defense)	1333
Report submitted to the municipality about the <i>Darülaceze</i> 's cinema activities and generation of income	1334
The <i>Darülaceze</i> 's request for a fee from the <i>Harbiye Nezareti</i> (Ministry of War) regarding the movie theater in Şehzadebaşı, İstanbul	1334
The <i>Darülaceze</i> 's notice to the <i>Askeri Müze Sineması</i> (Military Museum Cinema) to pay a fee for screening films	1335
The <i>Darülaceze</i> 's budget and staffing details for movie theater inspectors	1336
Regulation governing the distribution of income generated from film screenings in the province of Syria	1336
The promotion of a new director in <i>Manisa Belediye Sineması</i> (Manisa Municipality Cinema)	1337
Report on the stamping of cinema tickets by the <i>Darülaceze</i> in Beyoğlu Municipality, İstanbul	1337
Report to the province of Trabzon about the Madam Pavlidi Cinema in Giresun	1337
Report to the <i>Hariciye Nezareti</i> (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) about the taxation regulations on cinema	1338
Agreement by the <i>Konya Sanayi Mektebi</i> (Konya Technical School) to purchase films from the Gomon Cinema Company	1338
Decision on the exemption of fees for <i>Konya Sanayi Mektebi</i>	1338
Report to the <i>Hariciye Nezareti</i> about the legal arrangements on cinema taxation and fees between the Allied Forces and the Municipality of the Princes' Islands	1338
Report to <i>Maliye Nezareti</i> (Ministry of Treasury) about the cinema taxation	1338
Report submitted to the <i>Harbiye Nezareti</i> on the dispute of film screenings and fee arrangements between the <i>Malulin-i Guzzata Muavenet Cemiyeti</i> (Society of Disabled Veterans) and the <i>Darülaceze</i>	1338
The <i>Darülaceze</i> 's commissioning of a film by the <i>Malulin-i Guzzata Muavenet Heyeti Sinema Film Fabrikası</i> (Society of Disabled Veterans Film Factory)	1338
Regulation governing the generation of income from film screenings by the <i>Darülaceze</i>	1339

30 Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives: Inventory of Written Archival Sources for Ottoman Cinema History

Subject	Hicri Date
Confirmation of the Allied Powers on the regulation of fees for cinema by the <i>Darülaceze</i> during the occupation	1339
Confirmation of the <i>Darülaceze</i> to follow the instructions of <i>Maliye Nezareti</i> about the incomes generated from movie theaters	1339
Resolution about the salary payments of movie theater inspectors	1339
Inquiry by the <i>Malulîn-i Guzzata Muavenet Cemiyeti</i> about sharing income from film screenings with the <i>Darülaceze</i> and its disputed resolution	1339
Audit and inspection of <i>Düyun-ı Umumiye</i> (Public Debts Office) at movie theaters' ticket boxes	1339
Promotion of movie theater inspectors and directors in Old İstanbul, Beyoğlu, and Galata in İstanbul	1339
Report prepared by the <i>Darülaceze</i> for the <i>Maliye Nezareti</i> about the inspection and control of movie theater tickets	1339
Index of movie theaters in İstanbul	1340
Inspectors' investigation about the director of Beyoğlu's movie theater and theater owned by the <i>Darülaceze</i>	1340
Income generated from movie theaters for the <i>Darülaceze</i> from the municipality of the Princes' Islands	1340
Average ticket pricing in İstanbul's movie theaters	1340
Report submitted to the Civil Service Inspector about the theater and movie theater activities of the <i>Darülaceze</i>	1340
Data on ticket pricing from İstanbul	1340
Regulation about the movie theater ticket inspectors in İstanbul	1340
Report on movie theater inspectors in İstanbul (Beyoğlu, Galata, Kadıköy and Old İstanbul), including the locations of these inspectors in the Princes' Islands	1340
Regulation on film tickets with the collaboration of the <i>Emniyet Müdürlüğü</i> (Police Department)	1340

The *Dahiliye Nezareti Mektubi Kalemi* (hereafter DH.MKT) contains seven different records between the *Hicri* years 1320 (1902/1903) and 1327 (1909/1910) on a different range of subjects as can be observed in Table 4.

Table 4. Selected subjects under the records of the DH.MKT

Subject	Hicri Date
Banning of a film, which contained the image of Sultan Abdülaziz, in Mersin	1320
Investigation of S. Weinberg's photography shop	1324
Banning of a cinematograph notice in Beyoğlu, İstanbul	1324
Investigation of the films' content and custom papers of two English cinematograph operators	1325
Inspection of a cinematograph advertisement in İstanbul	1326
Request by two French to make and screen films in a ship along the coast of İstanbul	1326
Regulation for film exhibitions in Tripoli	1327

Included in the *İdari Kısım* catalog (hereafter DH.İD) are three records on the complaints about cinematograph in Beirut, permits for female audiences to attend film screenings, and a controversy about a film. The catalog of *Şifre Kalemî* (hereafter DH.ŞFR) holds the records of various telegraph messages between the central government and the provinces of the empire. This catalog became an independent office in 1914 due to the changing needs of the state during the war years.⁷³ DH.ŞFR can be investigated for the records of the Austrian Gold Smiths' film screenings throughout Anatolia (Konya, Adana, Aleppo, and Niğde) and for other telegraph messages from the *Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti* (Police and Security General Directorate) to Beirut about the permitting of Austrian Gold Smiths' film screenings. The *Kalem-i Mahsus Müdüriyeti* catalog (hereafter DH.KMS) contains records regarding the private and top secret correspondence between the *Dahiliye* and *Hariciye Nezareti* from 1913 to 1922. The index of this catalog is organized chronologically in the guidelines and it can also be reached online.⁷⁴ In Table 2, I present five different records from DH.KMS about film screenings, the opening of a movie theater, moral concerns about films, and a permit for making films about the Balkan Wars.

After the demolition of the *Zaptiye Nezareti* in 1908/1909 the *Emniyet Müdürlüğü* (Police Department) was connected to the *Dahiliye Nezareti* in 1909/1910.⁷⁵ Not only public safety issues concerning the cinema business but also applications for film screenings, licensing movie theaters, inspections of film content and ticketing were arranged within eight different offices of the *Emniyet Müdürlüğü*. As shown in Table 2, the records on cinema regarding the *Emniyet Müdürlüğü* were reported to the *Dahiliye Nezareti* starting from 1909/1910 (1327 in *Hicri*). Below, the individual

records of the *Zaptiye Nezareti* are also covered, though these are less abundant compared to the *Dahiliye* records.

The eight offices of *Emniyet Müdürlüğü* under the *Dahiliye* include: *Dahiliye Nezareti Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti Seyrüsefer Kalemi* (hereafter DH.EUM.SSM), *Dahiliye Nezareti Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti Asayiş Kalemi* (hereafter DH.EUM.AYŞ), *Dahiliye Nezareti Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti Evrak Odası Kalemi* (hereafter DH.EUM.VRK), *Dahiliye Nezareti Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti Beşinci Şube* (hereafter DH.EUM.5.Şb), *Dahiliye Nezareti Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti Altıncı Şube* (hereafter DH.EUM.6.Şb), *Dahiliye Nezareti Emniyet-i Umumiye Levazım Kalemi* (hereafter DH.EUM.LVZ), *Dahiliye Nezareti Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti Kalem-i Umumi* (hereafter DH.EUM.KLU), *Dahiliye Nezareti Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti Muhasebe Kalemi* (hereafter DH.EUM.MH). Table 5 demonstrates a collection of the various subjects of the *Emniyet Müdürlüğü*'s records.

Table 5. Selected records from the offices of the DH.EUM

Catalog	Subject	Hicri Date
DH.EUM.SSM	Cinema regulations	1341
	The Austrian Film company's passport checks by the state	1336
DH.EUM.LVZ	Purchase of a cinematograph for the <i>Emniyet Müdürlüğü</i> (Police Department)	1338-1341
	Shipment of cinematograph to <i>Harbiye Nezareti</i> (Ministry of War) in Anatolia	1340
DH.EUM.MH	Permit for İzmir Police Office to screen films	1327
	Purchase of a cinematograph for <i>Dersaadet Polis Mektebi</i> (İstanbul Police Academy)	1335
	Films made for the <i>Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti</i> (Police and Security General Directorate) by the <i>Malulin-i Guzzata Muavenet Heyeti Sinema Film Fabrikası</i> (Society of Disabled Veterans Film Factory)	1338
DH.EUM.AYŞ	Film exhibition at the <i>Osmanlı İhtiyat Zabitanı Sineması</i> (Ottoman Reserve Police Officers Cinema)	1337
	Declaration of General Wilson on the banning of German, Austrian, Hungarian, and Bulgarian films during the occupation of İstanbul	1337
	Banning of a film exhibition due to the birthday of Prophet Muhammad	1339
	Theft at a movie theatre in Beyoğlu	1340

Catalog	Subject	Hicri Date
DH.EUM.VRK	Request from Erzurum to have cinematograph in order to entertain soldiers	1333
	Regulation for founding movie theaters	1334
	New cinema regulations regarding children under the age of sixteen	1335
	Regulation on maintaining license for cinemas	1336
	Request from the <i>Zabıta</i> to the Ottoman consulates to obtain information about world movie theater regulations	1336
	The Bulgarian model for the control of cinema	1336
	The Swedish model for cinema regulations	1336
	The Austrian model for cinema regulations	1336
	Regulations for movie theaters	1336
	The French model for the control of cinema	1337
	Models for censoring films	1337
DH.EUM.5.Şb	Confirmation for S. Weinberg to go to Berlin in order to purchase cinematograph	1335
	Purchase of a cinematograph for a school in Çorum	1335
	The Apollon Cinema at Şişhane, İstanbul	1336
	Cinematograph conference about the Ottoman territories	1336
DH.EUM.6.Şb	Permit for film screenings organized for the female audiences in Şehzadebaşı, İstanbul	1335
	Banning of printed cinema advertisements	1336
	Regulations regarding the opening of movie theaters	1336
	Moral concerns regarding the distribution of the European films	1337
DH.EUM.KLU	Permit for the German Intelligence Office to make films for the <i>Osmanlı İstihbarat Odası</i> (Ottoman Intelligence Office)	1333
	Transfer of the <i>Sansür Heyeti's</i> (Censor Board) responsibility to regulate and censor cinema to the <i>Emniyet-i Umumiye Müdüriyeti</i>	1333

The Hariciye Nezareti Catalog

The *Hariciye Nezareti Siyasi Kısım* catalog (hereafter HR.SYS) holds correspondence between the central administration and the provinces, and also the consulates and embassies of the empire.⁷⁶ There are currently four records from the HR.SYS that include information about the “anarchy” at Olympia Cinema in Salonika, a correspondence with the Embassy in Berlin regarding the cinematograph conference between the Ottomans and Germany, and a request by Germans to screen cinematograph in the empire between the years 1915 and 1917.

Table 6. Number of records at the Hariciye Nezareti Siyasi Kısım

Catalog	Miladi Date	Number of Records
HR.SYS	1915- 1917	4

The Zaptiye Nezareti Catalog

The last catalog in this section is from the BOA's *Zaptiye Nezareti* (hereafter ZB) that currently contains seven sources about the banning of the cinematograph exhibition due to inappropriate images and safety issues, the applications to cinematograph licensing and the use of electricity for film screenings.

Table 7. Number of records at the Zaptiye Nezareti

Catalog	Hicri Date	Number of Records
ZB	1323- 1325	7

5. Conclusion

This article has explored the contribution and function of written archival scrutiny for Ottoman cinema history. I reviewed the major developments in the historiography of film studies since 2000 in Turkey. I also assessed the contribution of archive-based research for the writing of Ottoman cinema history by identifying the current discourses of cinema scholarship that confine the discipline. In the last section, I briefly presented currently available and authorized written sources from the *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri* (BOA) explaining each catalog's classifications and the common themes surrounding cinema history of the Ottoman Empire. The reader should bear in mind that these state records may reflect the ideology of the Ottoman administrators and consequently may be positioned, altered and concealed for different purposes. As the BOA sources are accessible to every researcher, the entire collection is not presented here due to the scope of this article. Rather, I have attempted to explore the preliminary written sources in order to highlight their availability for future projects. Obviously, I have not included visual sources and potentially valuable sources from the *Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivleri* due to the subject matter and limits of this study.

Throughout the article, I regarded the value of empirical evidence as a sensitive issue, especially when scholars interpret and contextualize sources in various settings. The scholar should therefore search for inconsistency,

false information, and mistakes in the sources in order to examine the historical moment's events, structures and processes.⁷⁷ While "source fetishism" remains a danger, we should have a critical eye on a source due to its filtered and mediated nature. Furthermore, the scholar's employment of evidence, selecting or ignoring of it, and the interpretative skills that give meaning to evidence all shape the entire research. Above all, each scholar's analytical and narrative approaches represent a past that is embedded in written and visual evidence. Thus, I suggest that both written and visual sources and the scholar all have an important role in the historical inquiry which will constitute the history of cinema within the late Ottoman context.

Notes

¹ Robert C. Allen and Douglas Gomery, *Film History Theory and Practice* (New York: Knopf, 1985), 3-6; 37.

² I acknowledge the terminological and methodological differences regarding the terms of "film history" and "cinema history" as they are shaped by the Western European and North American scholarship. Film history centers on the individual films themselves—as forms of art and technology, and as cultural productions—along with the filmmakers, stars, and other cultural production processes. Cinema history not only focuses on the material existence of cinema but also the socio-cultural history of audiences and their cinematic experiences. For the purpose of this article, I mostly refer to cinema history and when the two terms are interchangeable I use them in such forms "film/cinema history", "film/cinema studies" and "film/cinema scholars". For more information, see Richard Maltby, "How Can Cinema History Matter?," *Screening the Past*, 22 (2007),

<http://www.latrobe.edu.au/screeningthepast/22/board-richard-maltby.html>;

Jeffrey Richards, "Rethinking British Cinema," in *British Cinema: Past and Present*, ed. Justine Ashby and Andrew Higson (London: Routledge, 2000), 21-34; Robert C. Allen and Douglas Gomery, *Film History Theory and Practice* (New York: Knopf, 1985). There are also scholars who suggest that "film history" should be thought of more as "media history." See Janet Staiger, "The Future of the Past," *Cinema Journal* 44 (2004): 126-129.

³ Alun Munslow, *Narrative and History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 27.

⁴ Gizem Tongo, "Interview with Professor Gülru Necipoğlu," *Tarih: Graduate History Journal*, 1 (2009): 8. Accessed January 25, 2012, graduatehistoryjournal.boun.edu.tr/papers/ISSUE1.2009.REPRESENTATION/1.GizemTongo.Interview.GULRU.NECIPOGLU.pdf.

For other references portraying the historian as a detective please see C. Salzani, "Benjamin and the Traces of the Detective." *New German Critique*

34, no. 1, (2007): 165-187; C. Hugh Holman, "Absalom, Absalom!": The Historian as Detective Author(s)," in *The Sewanee Review*, 79, no. 4 (1971): 542-553.

⁵ Tongo, "Gülru Necipoğlu," 11.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁷ In this article, early and silent cinema history for the region under discussion covers the period from the introduction of the cinematograph in İstanbul in 1896 until the early 1930s. For various approaches on periodization Kristin Thompson and David Bordwell offer a twofold model for the silent era that firstly covers the early era between the mid-1890s and 1919 and the late silent era of 1919-1929. See Kristin Thompson and David Bordwell, *Film History: an Introduction* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2003), 7, 9; Tom Gunning's periodization for early cinema covers the period from 1895 up to the First World War. See Tom Gunning, "Making Sense of Films," in *History Matters: the U.S. Survey Course on the Web*, Accessed January 22, 2012, [www. historymatters.qmu.edu/mse/film](http://www.historymatters.qmu.edu/mse/film), February 2002, 1. Gunning and André Gaudreault also define the earliest period of cinema as the "cinema of attractions," continuing until the emergence of an articulated narrative in films in 1906. See Tom Gunning, "Cinema of Attractions", in *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*, ed. Richard Abel (New York: Routledge, 2005), 124. Nijad Özön's periodization, adapted to the development of cinema in the study region, does not center around the introduction of synchronized sound era but is based on filmmaking practices. He suggests four divisions for the silent era: "Arrival of Cinema to Turkey" (Sinemanın Türkiye Gelişi, 1896-1914), "Initial Steps" (İlk Adımlar, 1914-1922) and "Theatre Filmmakers" in two parts (Tiyatrocular, 1922-1924 and Tiyatrocular [devam], 1928-1939). See Nijad Özön, *Türk Sineması Tarihi (Dünden Bugüne) 1896-1960* (İstanbul: Artist Sinema Ortaklığı Yayınları, 1962), 4-5. In this study, the reader may encounter different spellings of individual's names such as Nijad Özön and Nijat Özön. I follow the original names as written in Özön's works.

⁸ Numerous scholars wrote on this subject, see Emrah Özen, "Geçmiş Bakmak: Sinema Tarihi Çalışmaları Üzerine Eleştirel Bir İnceleme," *Kebikeç Sinema ve Tarih* 27, 2009: 131-155; Murat Akser, "Türk Sinema Tarihi Yazılımı: Bir Yöntem Önerisi," in *Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler, Karşılaşmalar* 3, ed. Deniz Bayraktar, (İstanbul: Bağlam, 2001), 41-48; Zeynep Tül Akbal Süalp, "Bir Deneyimin Tarihi; Tarih Deneyimleri ve Deneyim Tarihi," in *Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler, Sinema ve Tarih* 5, ed. Deniz Bayraktar, (İstanbul: Bağlam, 2006), 41-47.

⁹ Rakım Çalapala, "Türkiye'de Filmcilik," in *Filmlerimiz, Yerli Film Yapanlar Cemiyeti*, 1946; For a re-publication of this piece, see Rakım

Çalapala, "Türkiye'de Filmcilik," *Kebikeç, Sinema ve Tarih II* 28, 2009: 103-112.

¹⁰ Just to name a number of unpublished dissertations and theses since 2000, see M. Özen, "De Opkomst van Het Moderne Medium Cinema in de Ottomaanse Hoofdstad İstanbul 1896-1914" (PhD diss., University of Utrecht, 2007); Ö. Çeliktemel-Thomen, "The Curtain of Dreams: Early Cinema in İstanbul 1896-1923" (master's thesis, Central European University 2009); C. Özmen, "From Movie/Script to Novel: Translated Popular Cinema Novels in Turkey from 1944 to 1957" (master's thesis, Dokuz Eylül University, 2010); C. Balan, "Changing Pleasures of Spectatorship: Early and Silent Cinema in İstanbul" (PhD diss., St Andrews University, 2010); S. Özen, "Rethinking the Young Turk Revolution: Manaki Brothers' Still and Moving Images" (master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2010); P. Sönmez, "Türk Sinemasında Sansür ve Metin Erksan Örneği" (master's thesis, Selçuk University, 2010).

¹¹ *Kebikeç Sinema ve Tarih* 27, (2009); *Kebikeç Sinema ve Tarih II* 28 (2009).

¹² Ahmet Gürata, Introduction to *Sinema ve Tarih, Kebikeç Sinema ve Tarih* 27 (2009): 107-108.

¹³ Deniz Bayraktar ed., *Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler Sinema ve Tarih* 5, (İstanbul: Bağlam, 2006), 7-93.

¹⁴ A selection of the *Türk Sineması Görsel Hafıza Projesi* as follows, Rekin Teksoy (cinema historian), Project Team: Özde Çeliktemel, Seda Gökçe, Rumeysa Özel, Camera: Özgür Çağdaş. Rekin Teksoy, Memduh Ün and Kadri Yurdatap, *Türk Sineması Görsel Hafıza Projesi*, Boğaziçi University, 2007, DVD. For more details about other projects please see <http://www.mafm.boun.edu.tr/kategori/51/turk-sineması-görsel-hafıza-projesi> Accessed August 2, 2012.

¹⁵ The interviewees include İlhan Arakon, Bülent Oran, Sezer Sezin, Filiz Akın, Yılmaz Atadeniz, Giovanni Scognamillo, Rekin Teksoy, Memduh Ün, and Kadri Yurdatap (2007); Orhan Günşiray, Safa Önal, Vedat Türkali, Nijat Özön, Fikret Hakan, and Muzaffer Tema (2008); Duygu Sağıroğlu, Birsen Kaya, Aydemir Akbaş, Jeyan Mahfi, Ayrıl Tözüm, Şadan Kamil, and Eşref Kolçak (2009); İzzet Günay, Nevin Aypar, Ülkü Erakalın, Şeref Gür, Ahmet Mekin, Erol Günaydın, Mehmet Dinler, Nilüfer Aydan, and Aram Gülyüz (2010); Tuncel Kurtiz, Suzan Avcı, and İlham Filmer (2011).

¹⁶ This project was supported by İstanbul Bilgi University and the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism. For further information and the list of contributors find the web site at: <http://arsivsinemaseyir.com/#/ana-sayfa>. Accessed January 26, 2012.

¹⁷ It is remarkable to read Giovanni Scognamillo's account that he and the late Nijat Özön conducted research at the İstanbul Belediyesi Atatürk

Library's periodicals but could not find any data on early and silent cinema. Scognamillo mentions that they scanned all the available materials in English and French newspapers and journals and could not locate any information on the topic. For detailed information from the conference proceedings see Deniz Bayraktar ed., Interview in "Sinema ve Tarih," (Cemal Kafadar, Ağâh Özgüç, Giovanni Scognamillo, Deniz Bayraktar), *Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler Sinema ve Tarih 5*, (İstanbul: Bağlam, 2006), 26-27.

¹⁸ For the selected film reviews of these silent films, see Özde Çeliktemel-Thomen, "Binnaz," in: *Directory of World Cinema: Turkey*, ed. Eylem Atakav, (Bristol: Intellect, 2013, forthcoming); Özde Çeliktemel-Thomen, "The Governess," in: *Directory of World Cinema: Turkey*, ed. Eylem Atakav, (Bristol: Intellect, 2013, forthcoming); Özde Çeliktemel-Thomen, "Bican Efendi the Butler," in: *Directory of World Cinema: Turkey*, ed. Eylem Atakav, (Bristol: Intellect, 2013 forthcoming).

¹⁹ Most of the sources before 1928 are in Ottoman Turkish.

²⁰ Nijat Özön is the only person who is known to have accessed the *Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri Foto Film Merkezi* for film research purposes.

²¹ Apart from the archives in Turkey, the following institutions may be helpful for locating the various countries' consular and trade reports, foreign film company's records, and other relevant sources on cinema: The State Archives of the Republic of Macedonia, Department of Bitola, the Cinematheque of Macedonia, Ministère des Affaires Étrangères et Européennes Direction des Archives in La Courneuve, the Library of Congress and the National Archives in Washington DC, and the British Film Institute and the National Archives in London. Particularly, Saadet Özen's extensive archival research at the Cinematheque of Macedonia and the Bitola Archives in Macedonia has revealed important data about the Manaki brothers' filmmaking. See Saadet Özen, "'Balkanların İlk Sinemacıları' mı? Manaki Biraderler," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 219 (March 2012): 60-67; Saadet Özen, "Manakilerin Objektifinden Hürriyet," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 220 (April 2012): 50-57.

²² Serdar Öztürk, "Söylemsel İnşalardan Üretilen Sansür ve Denetim Efsanesi (1896-1923)," in *Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler Sinema ve Politika 8*, ed. Deniz Bayraktar, (İstanbul: Bağlam, 2011), 43-56. Serdar Öztürk, "Türk Sinemasında Sansür Tartışmaları ve Yeni Belgeler," *Galatasaray İletişim*, June, (2006): 47-76; Serdar Öztürk, "Erken Cumhuriyet Yıllarında Sinema Konusunda Başarısız Kalmış İki Girişim: Çekilemeyen İki Propaganda Filmi (1939) ve İbret Yerleri Projesi (1923)," *Selçuk İletişim*, June (2004): 77-82; Serdar Öztürk, *Osmanlı'da İletişimin Diyalektiği* (Ankara: Phoenix, 2010).

²³ Öztürk, "Söylemsel İnşalardan," 43-56.

²⁴ Ali Özuyar, *Babiali'de Sinema* (İstanbul: İzdüşüm Yayınları, 2004); Ali Özuyar, "Varlık Vergisi Mağduru Sinemacılar," *Kebikeç Sinema ve Tarih*, 27, (2009): 291-305; S. Özen, "Rethinking the Young Turk Revolution: Manaki Brothers' Still and Moving Images"; Mustafa Özen, "Travelling Cinema in Istanbul," in *Travelling Cinema in Europe: Sources and Perspectives*, ed. Martin Loiperdinger, (Kintop Schriften, 2008): 47-53.

²⁵ It is worth mentioning here that the Türvak's Türker İnanoğlu Museum holds some visual materials regarding cinema from the early 1930s in İstanbul.

²⁶ For substantial information about the early and silent film preservation and film archives see Elif Rongen Kaynakçı, "Sessiz Sinema ve Film Arşivleri," *Kebikeç Sinema ve Tarih II* 28, (2009): 69-76; Elif Rongen Kaynakçı, "Türk Sinema Tarihi ve Kayıp Filmler," in *Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler, Sinema ve Tarih 5*, ed. Deniz Bayrakdar, (İstanbul: Bağlam, 2006), 73-79.

²⁷ The films available to watch in 2009 included *Mürebbiye* (*The Governess*, Ahmet Fehim, 1919), *Binnaz*, (Ahmet Fehim, 1919), *Bican Efendi Vekilharç* (*Bican Efendi the Butler*, Sadi Fikret Karagözoğlu, 1921) at the Mimar Sinan University's Centre of Cinema and TV.

²⁸ Charles Musser, "Historiographic Method and the Study of Early Cinema," *Cinema Journal* 44, no. 1, (2004): 101.

²⁹ Richard Abel, "History Can Work for You, You Know How to Use It," *Cinema Journal* 44, no. 1, (2004): 109. There are a number of periodicals that are useful for scrutiny such as *Yarın*, *Dergah*, *Artistic Cine*, *Le Film*, *Temaşa*, *Sinema Gazetesi* and *Yıldız*. For an overview of cinema journals and other periodicals regarding cinema see Burçak Evren, "Başlangıcından Günümüze Sinema Dergileri," in *Türkiye'de Dergiler ve Ansiklopediler (1849-1984)*, (İstanbul: Gelişim Yayınları, 1984): 135-148. For a number of translations from various Ottoman Turkish journals regarding the early and silent cinema see Ali Özuyar, *Sinemanın Osmanlıca Serüveni* (Ankara: Öteki Yayınevi, 1999).

³⁰ It would be interesting to study other existing local newspapers to obtain more data on the periphery; cities such as İzmir, Trabzon, Mersin and Salonika are not widely reflected in the current literature compared to İstanbul. Indeed, cinema magazines and daily newspapers are essential sources for tracing the local cinema experiences. For the initial film exhibitions in İstanbul please see "Théâtres," *Stamboul*, Journal quotidien, politique et littéraire, (9 December 1896), Eduard Chester (ed.), Pera, [NP]. For another source on film screenings in İstanbul in late December 1896 see Özen, "Travelling Cinema," 47-53.

³¹ For a recent piece relying on newspapers and other periodicals between 1894 and 1928, see Nezih Erdoğan, "The Spectator in the Making: Modernity and Cinema in Istanbul, 1896-1928," in *Orienting Istanbul Cultural Capital of Europe*, eds. Deniz Göktürk, Levent Soysal and İpek Türeli, (London: Routledge, 2010): 129-143.

³² Bayrakdar, "Sinema ve Tarih," 26-27.; Öztürk, "Söylemsel İnşalardan," 43-56.

³³ Kasper Risbjerg Eskildsen, "Leopold Ranke's Archival Turn: Location and Evidence in Modern Historiography," *Modern Intellectual History* 5, no. 3, (2008): 425.

³⁴ For cinema in the Balkans, particularly in Manastır (Bitola), see Özen, "'Balkanların İlk Sinemacıları' mı? Manaki Biraderler," 60-67; Özen, "Manakilerin Objektifinden Hürriyet," 50-57; Özen, S. "Rethinking the Young Turk Revolution: Manaki Brothers' Still and Moving Images."

³⁵ For a detailed examination of Fuat Uzkınay's "newsreel", see Dilek Kaya-Mutlu, "Ayastefanos'taki Rus Abidesi: Kim Yıktı? Kim Çekti? Kim Yazdı?," *Seyir*, no. 3 (Spring 2006): 12-21.

³⁶ I refer to the works of Burçak Evren, Mustafa Özen and Saadet Özen, to name only a few.

³⁷ Stephen D. Krasner, "Approaches to the State: Alternative Conceptions and Historical Dynamics," *Comparative Politics* 16, no. 2 (1984): 240.

³⁸ E. P. Thompson, "Historical Logic," in *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays*, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1978), 451-452.

³⁹ I acknowledge Serdar Öztürk's attempt and formulations to escape from this sort of compartmentalization within the context of late Ottoman period. See Öztürk, "Söylemsel İnşalardan Üretilen," (2011): 43-56. Öztürk, "Türk Sinemasında Sansür Tartışmaları," (2006): 47-76; Öztürk, *Osmanlı'da İletişimin Diyalektiği*, 2010.

⁴⁰ I employ the Manaki brothers' names written as they are written in Turkish, Yanaki and Milton Manaki, instead of other versions in Macedonian, Greek or Aromanian.

⁴¹ Savaş Arslan, *Cinema in Turkey: A New Critical History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011): 33.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 33.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, xi.

⁴⁴ Charles Tilly, *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1984), 79-80.

⁴⁵ BOA.Y.PRK.AZJ/46/16, (29/Z/1320), [March 29, 1903]. For the 1903 cinematograph privileges, see Özde Çeliktemel-Thomen, "1903 Sinematograf İmtiyazı," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 229 (January 2013): 26-32.

⁴⁶ BOA.Y.PRK.AZJ/46/16, (29/Z/1320), [March 29, 1903].

⁴⁷ Nijat Özön, “Sansürden Kesitler,” in *Türk Sinemasında Sansür*, ed. Ağâh Özgüç, (Ankara: Kitle, 2000), 145-162; Arslan, *Cinema in Turkey*, 25; Stephen Bottomore, “Turkey/Ottoman Empire,” in *Encyclopaedia of Early Cinema*, ed. Richard Abel, (New York: Routledge, 2005), 646.

⁴⁸ For an insightful view on Sultan Abdülhamid II and his reign, see Yavuz Selim Karakışla, “II. Abdülhamid’in Saltanatı (1876-1909): Kızıl Sultan mı? Ulu Hakan mı?,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 103 (July 2002): 10-19.

⁴⁹ Munslow, *Narrative and History*, 61.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 61-62.

⁵¹ For the descriptions of Sultan Abdülhamid II as a “conservative”, see Arslan, *Cinema in Turkey*, 31; For the depiction of the Hamidian era as a “failure” regarding cinema see Özön, “Sansürden Kesitler,” 145-162; For Sultan Abdülhamid II’s “fear” and so-called reluctance to use electricity for film screenings, Mustafa Özen presents different views. In his 2008 article entitled “Travelling Cinema in Istanbul”, Özen shows Sultan’s “modern” side and the use of “new technologies” for the purpose of “propaganda.” See Mustafa Özen, “Travelling Cinema,” 48. In a recent work, Özen escapes from common generalizations and successfully contextualizes the Hamidian period. See Mustafa Özen, “‘Hareketli Resimler’ İstanbul’da 1896-1908,” *Kebikeç Sinema ve Tarih* 27, 2009: 183-189.

⁵² *Tanzimat* refers to the reformation period starting from the 1839 onwards when the empire began to modernize its certain institutions. Stanford J. Shaw, “Sultan Abdülhamid II: The Last Man of the Tanzimat,” in *Tanzimat’ın 150. Yıldönümü Uluslararası Sempozyum (Bildiriler)*, 25-27 December 1989 (Ankara: Milli Kütüphane, 1991), 179.

⁵³ Shaw, “Sultan Abdülhamid II,” 179.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 180.

⁵⁵ Krasner, “Approaches to the State,” 237.

⁵⁶ There are a number of seminal works on the Hamidian era, just to name a few, see Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876–1909* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1999); Benjamin C. Fortna, “The Reign of Abdülhamid.” in *The Cambridge History of Turkey, Turkey in the Modern World*, edited by Reşat Kasaba, vol. 4, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); François Georgeon, *Sultan Abdülhamid*, trans.: Ali Bertay (İstanbul: Homer Kitabevi, 2006); Engin D. Akarlı, “II. Abdülhamid: Hayatı ve İktidarı,” in *Osmanlı*, ed. Kemal Çiçek, vol.2, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999); Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Sosyal Devlet Siyaset, İktidar ve Meşruiyet 1876-1914* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004).

⁵⁷ For an overview on the travelling cinema see Özen, “Travelling Cinema,” 47-53. For the French operator Eugène Promio’s experience in İstanbul, İzmir, Jerusalem and Haifa, see Jacques Rittaud-Hutinet, *Le Cinéma des*

Origines Les Frères Lumière et Leurs Opérateurs (Seysssel: Champ Vallon, 1985), 141.

⁵⁸ Edhem Eldem, "İstanbul: From Imperial to Peripheralized Capital," in *The Ottoman City between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir and Istanbul*, eds. Edhem Eldem, Daniel Goffman and Bruce Masters (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 138. For further literature on cinema in İstanbul see Hakan Kaynar, "Al Gözüm Seyreyle Dünyayı: İstanbul ve Cinema," *Kebikeç, Sinema ve Tarih* 27, (2009): 191-220; Erdoğan, "The Spectator in the Making"; Özen, "'Hareketli Resimler' İstanbul'da".

⁵⁹ For the mainstream cinema/film history books that focus on İstanbul and cover cinema during the late Ottoman era see Rekin Teksoy, *Turkish Cinema* trans., Martin Thomen and Özde Çeliktemel, (İstanbul: Oğlak Yayınları, 2008); Nijat Özön, *Türk Sineması Tarihi (Dünden Bugüne) 1896-1960* (Ankara: Antalya Kültür Sanat Vakfı, 2003); Alim Şerif Onaran, *Türk Sineması* (Ankara: Kitle, 1999); Giovanni Scognamillo, *Türk Sinema Tarihi 1896-1959* (İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi, 1998).

⁶⁰ Attila Çetin, *Başbakanlık Arşivleri Kılavuzu* (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1979).

⁶¹ Necati Aktaş, Necati Gültepe and Yusuf İhsan Genç et al., *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi Rehberi*, İkinci Baskı, (İstanbul, 2000), XXXV; LII.

⁶² Allen and Gomery, *Film History*, 41.

⁶³ The BOA holds almost 150 million dossiers of which only 50 million are available for research, see Necati Aktaş, Necati Gültepe and Yusuf İhsan Genç et al., *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi Rehberi*, XXXV; LII.

⁶⁴ The *Hicri* calendar, based on lunar months starts from 622 AD, and the *Miladi* calendar refers to the Gregorian calendar.

⁶⁵ Aktaş, *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi*, XXXV-LII.

⁶⁶ Stanford J. Shaw, "Ottoman Archival Materials for the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 6 (1975): 110.

⁶⁷ Çetin, *Başbakanlık Arşivleri Kılavuzu*, 35-36.

⁶⁸ Aktaş, 368.; <http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/katalog/>, Accessed January 25, 2012.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 365.

⁷⁰ All the information I present in these tables is subject to any change due to the BOA's catalog and holdings in the future.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 373.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 377.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 384.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 374.; <http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/katalog/> Accessed January 25, 2012.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 379.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 385.

⁷⁷ Eskildsen, "Leopold Ranke's Archival," 436.

Bibliography

- Abel, Richard. "History Can Work for You, You Know How to Use It." *Cinema Journal* 44, no. 1 (2004): 107-112.
- Akarlı, Engin Deniz. "Geçmiş İle Uzlaşmak." In *Bilanço 1923-1998: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin 75. Yılına Toplu Bakış, I. Cilt: Siyaset-Kültür-Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 10-12 Aralık 1998, edited by Zeynep Rona, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1999.
- . "II. Abdülhamid: Hayatı ve İktidarı." In *Osmanlı*, edited by Kemal Çiçek, vol. 2, Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999.
- Akbal Süalp, Zeynep Tül. "Bir Deneyimin Tarihi; Tarih Deneyimleri ve Deneyim Tarihi." In *Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler, Sinema ve Tarih 5*, edited by Deniz Bayrakdar, 41-47. İstanbul: Bağlam, 2006.
- Akser, Murat. "Türk Sinema Tarihi Yazılımı: Bir Yöntem Önerisi." In *Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler, Karşılaşmalar 3*, edited by Deniz Bayrakdar, 41-48. İstanbul: Bağlam, 2001.
- Aktaş, Necati, Gültepe, Necati and Genç, Yusuf İhsan. *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi Rehberi*. İkinci Baskı, İstanbul, 2000.
- Allen, Robert C., and Gomery, Douglas. *Film History Theory and Practice*. New York: Knopf, 1985.
- Arslan, Savaş. *Cinema in Turkey A: New Critical History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Balan, C. "Changing Pleasures of Spectatorship: Early and Silent Cinema in İstanbul." PhD diss., St Andrews University, 2010.
- Bayrakdar Deniz edited by. *Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler Sinema ve Tarih 5*. İstanbul: Bağlam, 2006.
- Bottomore, Stephen. "Turkey/Ottoman Empire." In *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*, edited by Richard Abel, 646. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Çalapala, Rakım. "Türkiye'de Filmcilik." *Filmlerimiz, Yerli Film Yapanlar Cemiyeti*, 1946.
- . "Türkiye'de Filmcilik." *Kebikeç, Sinema ve Tarih II* 28 (2009): 103-112.
- Çeliktemel-Thomen, Özde. "Binnaz." In *Directory of World Cinema: Turkey*, edited by Eylem Atakav, (Bristol: Intellect, 2013, Forthcoming).
- . "The Governess." In *Directory of World Cinema: Turkey*, edited by Eylem Atakav, (Bristol: Intellect, 2013, Forthcoming).

- . “Bican Efendi the Butler.” In *Directory of World Cinema: Turkey*, edited by Eylem Atakav, (Bristol: Intellect, 2013, Forthcoming).
- . “1903 Sinematograf İmtiyazı.” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 229 (January 2013): 26-32.
- . “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Sinema ve Propaganda (1908-1922).” *Kurgu Online International Journal of Communication Studies*, vol. 2, June, 2010: 1-17. Accessed February 2, 2012, <http://www.kurgu.anadolu.edu.tr/dosyalar/22.pdf>.
- . “The Curtain of Dreams: Early Cinema in İstanbul 1896-1923.” MA thes., Central European University, 2009.
- Çetin, Attila. *Başbakanlık Arşivleri Kılavuzu*. İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1979.
- Deringil, Selim. *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876–1909*. London: I.B. Tauris, 1999.
- Eldem, Edhem. “İstanbul: From Imperial to Peripheralized Capital.” In *The Ottoman City between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir and Istanbul*, edited by Edhem Eldem, Daniel Goffman and Bruce Masters, 135-206. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Erdoğan, Nezihe. “The Spectator in the Making: Modernity and Cinema in İstanbul, 1896-1928.” In *Orienting Istanbul Cultural Capital of Europe*, edited by Deniz Göktürk, Levent Soysal and İpek Türel, 129-143. London: Routledge, 2010.
- Eskildsen, Kasper Risbjerg. “Leopold Ranke’s Archival Turn: Location and Evidence in Modern Historiography.” *Modern Intellectual History* 5, no. 3 (2008): 425-453.
- Evren, Burçak. “Başlangıcından Günümüze Sinema Dergileri.” In *Türkiye’de Dergiler ve Ansiklopediler (1849-1984)*, 135-148. İstanbul: Gelişim Yayınları, 1984.
- Fortna, Benjamin C. “The Reign of Abdülhamid.” In *The Cambridge History of Turkey, Turkey in the Modern World*, edited by Reşat Kasaba, vol. 4, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Georgeon, François. *Sultan Abdülhamid*, trans.: Ali Berktaş, İstanbul: Homer Kitabevi, 2006.
- Gunning, Tom. “Making Sense of Films.” In *History Matters: the U.S. Survey Course on the Web*, Accessed January 22, 2012, <http://historymatters.qmu.edu/mse/film>, February 2002.
- . “Cinema of Attractions.” In *Encyclopaedia of Early Cinema*, edited by Richard Abel, 124-127. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Gürata, Ahmet. Introduction to *Sinema ve Tarih, Kebikeç Sinema ve Tarih* 27, 107-108. (2009).

- Hanioglu, Şükrü M. *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *On History*. New York: New Press, 1997.
- Holman, C. Hugh. "Absalom, Absalom!": The Historian as Detective Author(s)." *The Sewanee Review* 79, no. 4, (1971): 542-553.
- Karakışla, Yavuz Selim. "II. Abdülhamid'in Saltanatı (1876-1909): Kızıl Sultan mı? Ulu Hakan mı?" *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 103, (July 2002): 10-19.
- . "Sultan II. Abdülhamid'in İstibdat Döneminde (1876-1909) Hafiyelik ve Jurnalcılık." *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 119 (November 2003): 12-21.
- Kaya-Mutlu, Dilek. "Ayastefanos'taki Rus Abidesi: Kim Yıktı? Kim Çekti? Kim 'Yazdı?'" *Seyir*, no. 3 (Spring 2006): 12-21.
- Kaynar, Hakan. "Al Gözüm Seyreyle Dünyayı: İstanbul ve Cinema." *Kebikeç, Sinema ve Tarih* 27, (2009): 191-220.
- Krasner, Stephen D. "Approaches to the State: Alternative Conceptions and Historical Dynamics." *Comparative Politics* 16, no. 2 (1984): 223-246.
- Maltby, Richard. "How Can Cinema History Matter." *Screening the Past*, no. 22, (2007), Accessed January 25, 2012, <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/screeningthepast/22/board-richard-maltby.html>.
- Munslow, Alun. *Narrative and History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Musser, Charles. "Historiographic Method and the Study of Early Cinema." *Cinema Journal* 44, no. 1 (2004): 101-107.
- Onaran, Alim Şerif. *Türk Sineması*. Ankara: Kitle, 1999.
- Özbek, Nadir. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet Siyaset, İktidar ve Meşruiyet 1876-1914*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004.
- Özen, Emrah. "Geçmiş Bakmak: Sinema Tarihi Çalışmaları Üzerine Eleştirel Bir İnceleme." *Kebikeç Sinema ve Tarih* 27 (2009): 131-155.
- Özen, M. "De Opkomst van Het Moderne Medium Cinema in de Ottomaanse Hoofdstad İstanbul 1896-1914." PhD diss., University of Utrecht, 2007.
- Özen, Mustafa. "'Hareketli Resimler' İstanbul'da 1896-1908." *Kebikeç Sinema ve Tarih* 27, 2009: 183-189.
- . "Travelling Cinema in Istanbul." In *Travelling Cinema in Europe: Sources and Perspectives*, edited by Martin Loiperdinger, 47-53. Kintop Schriften, 2008.
- . "İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde Belgesel Sinema ve Propaganda 1908-1914." *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, no. 3 (Spring 2006): 91-102.

- Özen, S. "Rethinking the Young Turk Revolution: Manaki Brothers' Still and Moving Images." MA thes., Boğaziçi University, 2010.
- . "'Balkanların İlk Sinemacıları' mı? Manaki Biraderler." *Toplumsal Tarih*, March, no. 219 (2012): 60-67.
- . "Manakilerin Objektifinden Hürriyet." *Toplumsal Tarih*, April, no. 220 (2012): 50-57.
- Özmen, C. "From Movie/Script to Novel: Translated Popular Cinema Novels in Turkey from 1944 to 1957." MA thes., Dokuz Eylül University, 2010.
- Özön, Nijat. *Türk Sineması Tarihi (Dünden Bugüne) 1896-1960*. Ankara: Antalya Kültür Sanat Vakfı, 2003.
- . *Türk Sineması Tarihi (Dünden Bugüne) 1896-1960*. İstanbul: Artist Sinema Ortaklığı Yayınları, 1962.
- . "Sansürden Kesitler." In *Türk Sinemasında Sansür*, edited by Ağâh Özgüç, 145-162. Ankara: Kitle, 2000.
- Öztürk, Serdar. "Erken Cumhuriyet Yıllarında Sinema Konusunda Başarısız Kalmış İki Girişim: Çekilemeyen İki Propaganda Filmi (1939) ve İbret Yerleri Projesi (1923)." *Selçuk İletişim*, June, (2004): 77-82.
- . "Söylemsel İnşalardan Üretilen Sansür ve Denetim Efsanesi (1896-1923)." In *Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler Sinema ve Politika 8*, edited by Deniz Bayraktar, 43-56. İstanbul: Bağlam, 2011.
- . "Türk Sinemasında Sansür Tartışmaları ve Yeni Belgeler." *Galatasaray İletişim*, June, (2006): 47-76.
- . *Osmanlı'da İletişimin Diyalektiği*. Ankara: Phoenix, 2010.
- Özuyar, Ali. "Varlık Vergisi Mağduru Sinemacılar." *Kebikeç Sinema ve Tarih 27*, (2009): 291-305.
- . *Babıali'de Sinema*. İstanbul: İzdüşüm Yayınları, 2004.
- . *Sinemanın Osmanlıca Serüveni*. Ankara: Öteki Yayınevi, 1999.
- Panofsky, Erwin. *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. London: Penguin Books, 1993.
- Richards, Jeffrey. "Rethinking British Cinema." In *British Cinema: Past and Present*, edited by Justine Ashby and Andrew Higson, 21-34. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Rittaud-Hutinet, Jacques. *Le Cinéma des Origines Les Frères Lumière et Leurs Opérateurs*. Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 1985.
- Rongen Kaynakçı, Elif. "Sessiz Sinema ve Film Arşivleri." *Kebikeç Sinema ve Tarih II 28*, (2009): 69-76.
- . "Türk Sinema Tarihi ve Kayıp Filmler." In *Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler, Sinema ve Tarih 5*, edited by Deniz Bayraktar, 73-79. İstanbul: Bağlam, 2006.

- Salzani, Carlo. "Benjamin and the Traces of the Detective." *New German Critique* 34, no. 1, (2007): 165-187.
- Scognamillo, Giovanni. *Türk Sinema Tarihi 1896-1959*. İstanbul: Kabalıcı Yayınevi, 1998.
- Shaw, Stanford J. "Ottoman Archival Materials for the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 6 (1975): 94-114.
- . "Sultan Abdülhamid II: The Last Man of the Tanzimat." In *Tanzimat'ın 150. Yıldönümü Uluslararası Sempozyum (Bildiriler)*, 25-27 December 1989, 179-197. Ankara: Milli Kütüphane, 1991.
- Sönmez, P. "Türk Sinemasında Sansür ve Metin Erksan Örneği." MA thes., Selçuk University, 2010.
- Staiger, Janet. "The Future of the Past." *Cinema Journal* 44, no. 1, (2004): 126-129.
- Teksoy, Rekin. *Turkish Cinema*. trans., Martin Thomen and Özde Çeliktemel, İstanbul: Oğlak Yayınları, 2008.
- Thompson, Kristin, and Bordwell, David. *Film History an Introduction*. Second Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill, 2003.
- Tilly, Charles. *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1984.
- "Théâtres." *Stamboul*, Journal quotidien, politique et littéraire, (9 December 1896), Eduard Chester (ed.), Pera, [NP].
- Thompson, E. P. "Historical Logic." In *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays*, 445-459. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1978.
- Tongo, Gizem. "Interview with Professor Gülru Necipoğlu," *Tarih: Graduate History Journal*, 1, (2009), no.1, 8, Accessed January 25, 2012, www.graduatehistoryjournal.boun.edu.tr/papers/ISSUE1.2009.REPRESENTATION/1.GizemTongo.Interview.GULRU.NECIPOGLU.pdf.
- Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri (BOA, Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives) BOA.Y.PRK.AZJ/46/16, (29/Z/1320), [March 29, 1903].

Filmography

Bican Efendi Vekilharç (Bican Efendi the Butler), Sadi Fikret Karagözoğlu, 1921.

Binnaz, Ahmet Fehim, 1919.

Mürebbiye (The Governess), Ahmet Fehim, 1919.

Türk Sineması Görsel Hafıza Projesi, Rekin Teksoy (Turkish Cinema Visual Memory Project, Rekin Teksoy), (film historian), Project Team: Özde Çeliktemel, Seda Gökçe, Rumeysa Özel, Camera: Özgür Çağdaş, DVD: Rekin Teksoy, Memduh Ün and Kadri Yurdatap, *Türk Sineması Görsel Hafıza Projesi*, Mithat Alam Film Centre, 2007.

Özde Çeliktemel-Thomen received her BA in History from Boğaziçi University in 2006. After finishing an MA degree in History at Central European University in 2009, she began her doctoral studies at University College London in the Centre for Intercultural Studies. She is currently writing her dissertation on the regulation of cinema within the context of late Ottoman Empire and early Turkish Republic. Her primary research area is late Ottoman history with particular interest in cinema history and, theory and history of visual culture.