

HOUSE MUSEUM: A NEW FUNCTION FOR OLD BUILDINGS

Ayşen SAVAŞ

Received: 06.06.2009; **Final Text:** 18.05.2010

Keywords: museum architecture; public sphere; function.

1. Artun (2004) and Shaw (2006).

As one of the influential by-products of Modernism, the enlightened envisioning of humanity, museums have been acting as the intellectual agents of society since the end of the 18th century. The development of "museology as a discipline" and "museum as a building type" in Turkey followed a different path from the established museum culture in Europe. That could have never been considered as a coincidence, as Modernism itself had revealed its own track in the country. Very few researches have been accomplished on the subject, and fewer have been published until recently. In the last couple of years, the seminal works of art historians and art critics such as Ali Artun and Wendy M.K. Shaw, initiated a necessary interest on museum studies in Turkey (1). While Artun collected the translations of selected essays in his book, he was claiming a "critical stand" for art museums in general. Besides the meticulous selection of the authors and the almost architectural structure of the book, its value lies in the fact that it is a translated anthology, which made this intellectual agenda available for the Turkish reader. Shaw, on the other hand, via narrating the history of a museum, presents an original idea supported by a vast amount of material on the "visualization of History in the Late Ottoman Empire". At the first glance, it is a known nostalgia that is overruling her work, yet a thorough reading unveils a pride, which is again the common feeling supporting the contemporary criticism of the "project of Modernity" in Turkey.

The introduction of museology to Turkish academic curriculum, conversely, was first made in 1989 by a graduate degree program at Yıldız Technical University. The academic institutionalization of the field continued with the other graduate programs opened at Gazi and Koç Universities. Their contribution was characterized with the professional and intellectual demands of their graduates.

Terms like, "field management", "cultural economy", "interactive exhibitions", "object identification" or "security survey systems", were

2. Türkiye Müzeciler Derneği; Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü; Türkiye Tarih Vakfı.

3. Habermas (1992).

4. Habermas (1992, 176).

introduced to the daily terminology of museum employees in Turkey. As well as the permanent institutions supporting museology, such as the Museum Institute in Ankara, the History Foundation of Turkey, and the Department of Foundations of Turkey; temporary organizations such as Istanbul 2010 The European Capital of Culture and virtual private organizations such as Arkitera, became the free platforms of museological discussions (2). However, none of the above mentioned intellectual efforts were powerful enough to disseminate the significance of the issues related to museums to the public in general. The over longing cry of government museums, on the other hand, had been suppressed for the last decade, to give way particularly, to the privatization of the archaeological museums and the historical sites in the country.

The establishment of private museums in general and the international exhibitions organized by these institutions in particular, had started a new awareness, if not a trend, in Turkey. Established in 1999 the Sabancı Museum was known as the initiator of this new development. Every exhibition organized or hosted by the museum was on the headlines of the newspapers; every celebrity invited to the weekend events were the natural guests of primetime television programs. For a media departed from the ideological, thus, artistic products of the Enlightenment, it was astonishing to see the influential power of the institution. Highly modest in its spatial dimensions, a few months after its establishment, the Sabancı Museum managed to expand its borders for a larger audience not only in Turkey, but also abroad. Originally initiated as part of a University curriculum, recently the institution declared its autonomy to develop its own academic endeavour. Unlike the most popular museums of the world, such as the Guggenheim Bilbao and the Tate Gallery in London, its power has been based neither on its site nor on its collections. And unlike the worldwide known museums such as Louvre and MoMA, it did not have a history, which could be seen as an inspiration for art historians or experts. Therefore, it is the claim of this paper that the establishment and the rapid growth of “private museums” accelerated a belated awareness towards the pragmatic and epistemological problems of museology in Turkey. It was not the already existing, worldwide known permanent historical and archaeological collections of the government museums, but the temporary exhibitions of the newly establishing private museums in Turkey that marked a turning point in the discipline. And Sabancı Museum was one of the initiators of this “transformation” or “shift”; and has managed to maintain its leadership, almost a decade after its establishment. Another reason for the rise is its being a powerful organisation, both in size and in level of self-contained expertise, able to invest in substantial exhibitions and world-wide, up-to-date displays and happenings.

A critical inquiry into the transformation of this “private house” first into a “public institution” and then into a “private cultural enterprise”, moreover, not only unveils issues related to museum studies, but also helps to understand the contemporary private/public dichotomy in Turkey, which has been epitomized with the critique of the local history of modernization in the country. Jurgen Habermas’ renowned book, the “Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere” introduced a modernist vision of “publicity” originated in the late 18th century, which was the birth date of contemporary museology (3). Particularly focusing on language and philosophy, Habermas traced the history of the division between “public” and “private” and defined to criticize what he called the “public sphere” (4). For Habermas, it developed out of the private domain

5. Habermas (1992, 30).

6. Sargin (2001).

where discussions on social life became possible. Inclusive by definition, the public sphere developed into both the subject and the space of criticism. Among the new institutions of the public sphere, the “coffee houses” were the legendary spaces of the late 18th century; as they were the new locus of cultural life, and increasingly in time, that of political and economical debate. Coffee houses were used by Habermas to signify one of the most significant features of the public sphere, as they existed in the eighteenth century where the “public use of reason in rational-critical debate” took place. They were acting as a free forum for discussions available to all who wish to express their views without considerations of social hierarchies and official positions.

“The ‘town’ was the life centre of civil society not only economically; in cultural-political contrast to the court, it designated exactly an early public sphere in the world of letters whose institutions were the coffee houses, the *salons*, and the *Tischgesellschaften* (table societies)” (5).

Although it is possible to claim that this terminology could only be relevant in its historical and epistemological context, the significance of contemporary museological developments in Turkey had declared its contemporary relevancy. “Public”, as a historically constructed term, finds one of its definitions in the work of Habermas as it relates to public authority of the state. “Private”, on the other hand, relates to the society and the family. Although public and private are defined and separated in terms of law in Turkey, the acts of certain institutions blur their established limits. The relationship between public and private has always been very complex and dynamic in the country, and recently, with the introduction of ideological debates on the definition of “public space” in the governmental institutions, the complexity reached to other dimensions (6). Both in spatial and conceptual connotations, “public” means “open to all”, yet in Habermas’ definition, it also relates to the development of the modernist conventions of public consciousness and critical thought. The underlining quality of the 18th century institutions in general and museums in particular was that they managed to provide a space for all; a space where the free expression of ideas and ideals were possible.

The term “museum” had mostly been identified with archeological museums in Turkey. The establishment of more than 90 museums had been considered as a natural outcome of archeological excavations. Located at historical sites, such as Ephesus and Çatalhöyük, their collections formed the bases of their physical and institutional foundations. This almost organic relationship between the collections and institutions declined the necessary development of critical re-evaluations. Therefore, more than the natural development of archeological museums, the constructed emergence of private museums should be understood through the said critical perspective. Jürgen Habermas’ seminal criticism of the late 18th early 19th century institutions symbolized with coffee houses, therefore, forms the epistemological and physical structure of this paper. Divided into five subtitles, this study unfolds an unpublished history of Sabancı Museum and its critical status in “public sphere” as defined by Habermas. Whereas narrating the history of this family house, the goal is to reveal the problems of terminology in Turkish museology. The transformation of the house, first into a public institution and then back to a “private enterprise” epitomizes the necessity of further critical inquires within and outside the field of architecture and museum studies.

7. The British Museum acquired Montagu House in Bloomsbury, in 1754. The Montagu House was built around 1676 for Ralph, Duke of Montagu by architect Robert Hooke (1635-1703). It was damaged by fire in 1686 and restored by French architect, 'Puget', in the French style. For basic information, see Miller (1974).

At the recent site of the Louvre Museum, there used to be a castle built here around 1190, and in 1370 it was converted into a Palace on the orders of King Charles V. This was demolished in 1527 and a Renaissance design was planned for Francis I, completed during the reign of Henry II. Further developments continued until in 1667. In 1678 the royal residence moved to Versailles and the Palais du Louvre became an art gallery. The Louvre became the "Museum Napoleon" in 1803. For basic information, see McClellan (1999).

"MUSEUM", A NEW FUNCTION FOR OLD BUILDINGS

"Function" as an eminent term, particularly after the 1960s, has been at the focus of the nourishing architectural theory and criticism. Indeed it was a weakly defined term required redefinition in the expanded history of Modern Architecture. Ironically enough, it was in the 1980s that the term function was identified with the term "fiction" to loose its credibility as a reliable source of inspiration for architects who tried to go beyond the limits of established canons and styles in the profession. And it was again in the 1980s that the old city centres in Europe started seeking for new "functions" to maintain their existence. Those were the years when museums also went through a reassessment period concluded with the restructuring and renovation of existing buildings. The belated reflections of these theoretical, critical, historical, and museological rehabilitation processes echoed in Turkey two decades later. It was yet again not a coincidence that at that time, the "project" of Modernity went under a continuing period of scrutiny in retard. As Modernism was requiring a critical distance from the past to allow a new beginning, its criticism was searching for space at the historical city centres and museums of the country.

Museum, indeed, had always been accepted as a suitable function for an existing historical building. Neither Louvre nor the British Museum had purposely designed buildings (7). Topkapı and Dolmabahçe building complexes had served as royal palaces for centuries before renamed after museums. The almost magical touch, which allowed the transformation of the function of a building from a palace or a cathedral to a museum, remained to be explored. Was that the inherited architectural qualities of these historical buildings that made it possible to accommodate museographical requirements; or was it the museum, as an architectural program malleable enough, to fit in any existing structure? Is there any epistemological difference between the transformation of the 18th century palaces into museums and the functional transformations took place in 1980s?

If the term function were to be conceived as an architectural requirement list, than the answer to these questions can be found in more pragmatic aspects. In the 18th century, the old palaces with their large entrance halls, high ceiling flats, huge storage and service floors and with linear spatial organizations were welcoming museum functions without major spatial and structural changes. The visual representation of history in a chronological layout (period rooms) could easily overlap with the linear flow of rooms in old palaces. The necessary infrastructure including lighting, air conditioning, and security systems already designed for public use purposes, was considered appropriate for the preservation, conservation, and the exhibition of museum objects. Today, the recent developments in museological and museographical technologies, however, had altered the spatial expectations from existing buildings. Nowadays, the storage and exhibition spaces of museums have been equipped with the latest electronic and mechanical technologies. The mechanical equipment necessary to provide suitable climatic conditions has been developed to include dust and moisture control; security systems have become highly elaborate; even the lighting has transformed into a special system including UV control, central automation and dimmers. The new developments in the electronic environment have provided a layered display and information access medium. Moreover, for the preservation of the

collections, the specifications were extremely detailed. As museums started requiring certain standards regarding the preservation and exhibition of their collections, researchers and visitors too increased their demands from these buildings. The new regulations made it obligatory to include elevators, escalators, and other technical equipment within the buildings to make every space accessible for all. As the spaces of museums were made available for all, they start accommodating supporting services for their visitors including, shops, restaurants, conference halls, libraries, and auditoriums.

The said specifications of the required contemporary infrastructure were exceeding the available physical capacity of the existing buildings. All the above-mentioned structural and infrastructural developments, introduced a number of small and large-scale mechanical devices supplied by thick clusters of canals and cables circulating around and within the historical buildings. The physical integration of a large spectrum of technical devices ranging from chillers to spot lights, fire alarm systems to seismic control equipments, have been damaging the historical buildings to find access to their mechanical layout. However, the laws and regulations related to the conservation, preservation, and restoration of historical buildings in the country were against this stream. The members of the Monuments High Boards in Turkey were sceptical about the new developments taking place in museography. Historical monuments were no longer suitable to accommodate all these technical equipment and the necessary infrastructure. As the demands of museology and museography were increasing, the historic buildings were becoming more vulnerable.

Theoretical and critical studies in architecture proved that the term “function” on the other hand, has never been limited with the “use” of the building (8). A discourse developed particularly following the publication of Adolf Behne’s book “The Modern Functional Building”, indicated the necessity of the re-evaluation of this limited and limiting perception. Behne, who wrote frequently on the role of museums in society, implicitly underlined their functional significance, to expand the meaning of the term to include social functions of cultural institutions. His criticism was against the common interpretation of many architectural historians for whom Modernism and functionalism have become nearly synonymous (9). Needless to say that it is beyond the scope of this study to show the already discussed complexity of functionalist notions in Modern Architecture, however it is inevitable to underline its significance for a discussion on functional and “structural transformations” (10). To go beyond utilitarian, mechanical and organic analogies, a conventional understanding of what has been called the ethical or better the social functionalism is crucial for the discussion (11). The social function of a museum as a public institution and its related responsibilities have not changed but developed since the establishment of first museums in the late 18th early 19th century. They have always been engaged in didactic and social activities. The 19th century museums were not only setting the minimum standards of taste, artistic quality and didactic refinement but also developing the rules of historical and national excellence. Since then, they have faced the challenge of going beyond their traditional exhibition – conservation centered roles in order to respond to the demands of society. They are now expected to play expanded social roles to become more critical and more inclusive. This significant stand had the potential to reinforce the social status of museums as the accessible places for public debates and social criticism. They had

8. Behne (1996).

9. Behne (1996, 1), introduction by Rosemarie Haag Bletter.

10. Behne (1996, 13). The present-day misunderstanding of modernist functionalism does not in fact spring from either Taut’s or Hannes Meyer’s conception; it is based on and overly narrow definition of function as a single issue that is presumed to be a practical design response within a specific building, one that does not seem to embrace environmental, social, or economic factors. In this later, simplistic version of functionalism biological and utilitarian ideas have become not only hopelessly abbreviated, frozen, and canonical but also nearly meaningless.

11. A discussion started particularly following the publication of Watkin’s book: *Morality and Architecture*.

12. One of the most significant features of the public sphere as it existed in the eighteenth century was the public use of reason in rational-critical debate. Rational-critical debate occurred within the bourgeois reading public, in response to literature, and in institutions such as salons and coffee-houses. For an inspiring discussion on the topic and a comparative history of the development of coffee houses in İstanbul and London, see Ellis (2004) and Cowan (2005).

13. Basin (1967).

been provided with the opportunity to become the new “coffee houses” of the twentieth century (12).

SMALL HOUSES, BIG AMBITIONS

As indicated before, while the new awareness in museum studies was rising in Turkey, the number of private museums was also increasing rapidly. İstanbul Modern, Rahmi Koç Museum, Rezan Has Museum, and Sabancı Museum were all established during the last decade. Different in size, location, and vision, they were determined to use historical buildings to accommodate their developing collections. It was implicit in their mission statements that they wanted to preserve not only their collections but also the historical buildings and sites for future generations. Highly small in size, the Sabancı Museum was unique for the fact that it was the only museum in Turkey, including the government owned institutions, which had the necessary infra-structure required from a contemporary museum. From humidity control to motion sensors, it had all the equipment necessary to fulfil the loan requirements of the well-known museums in the world. While preserving its temporary collections, the museum could provide the necessary spatial qualities for the travelling exhibitions. Considering its very modest scale and location in a natural preservation site, it could have been conceived as a real challenge to transform this historical family house into a public museum. It is the claim of this paper however the said “functional change” was hereditary for the Sabancı House. The unique history of the site and the family house, unveils a series of qualities that were inherited in the museum.

As collectors, the members of the Sabancı family followed a tradition that began in the Renaissance; a period originated two museological types: the antiquarium and the cabinet (13). During the Renaissance, the fragmented objects collected from ruins and historical sites were representing antiquity; a period identified with wealth, refined workmanship and good taste. Originality, authenticity, and rarity were the values believed to be inherited in these objects that yet to be discovered in the following centuries. Curiosity cabinets, on the other hand, were trying to go beyond aesthetic contemplations to discover the truth in the collected objects. Seemingly unrelated items amassed in the curiosity cabinets were classified to lead the way to more scientific collections.

Like Renaissance collectors, the members of the Sabancı Family were primarily concerned with the objects of the past; a past, which was created,

Figure 1a. Sir John Soane Museum interior.

Figure 1b. Sakıp Sabancı Museum interior, author's collection.



14. (2002) Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, special issue, *P. Sanat Kültür Antika Dergisi*, v: 25.

15. The architect Sir John Soane's house, museum and library at No. 13 Lincoln's Inn Fields, has been a public museum since the early 19th century. Soane demolished and rebuilt three houses in succession on the north side of Lincoln's Inn Fields, beginning with No. 12 between 1792 and 1794, moving on to No. 13, re-built in two phases in 1808-9 and 1812, and concluding with No. 14, rebuilt in 1823-24. For more information: Soane (1987); Summerson (1986).

more than lived. Besides the antiques, they had acquired a considerable amount of art and calligraphy work through many channels including auctions, exchange of favors, private solicitation and direct patronage (14). While the family was still using the house, it was transformed to indicate obvious similarities with the eighteenth century collectors' houses. Although the historical context, or better, the paradigmatic existence was slightly different, the spatial organization of the house called for the systematic efforts of Sir John Soane, among many others. Soane, an architect himself, designed his house located at the center of London, to live in, but during his life time it was transformed to become a setting for his antiquities and collected works of art. After the death of his wife, he lived there alone, constantly adding and rearranging his collections (15). He was still living in the house when it was converted into a museum. Sir John, like Sakıp Sabancı, used to take his visitors on a personal tour of his house and collections. Towards the end of his life very little space was left for his private use. During his lifetime, the house was neither an antiquarium nor a curiosity cabinet, and the possessions connoted neither a pure connoisseurship nor individuality in this case. It was more of a desire to evoke the grandeur of "bourgeois supremacy" to become a symbol of a new public consciousness. (Figure 1a, 1b).

In the Sabancı house, the owners of the residence collected antiques, paintings and calligraphy and exhibited them in the selected parts of the house. Particularly, the second floor was organized in such a way that the coexistence of the showcases with family rooms was hardly comprehensible. Sabancı, hired designers and cabinetmakers to transform some of the second floor rooms into an exhibition area where the works of calligraphy and Qurans were kept in a constructed museological environment. The showcases were designed and equipped in such a way that the environment created and the materials used would not harm the objects in continuous display. The windows were sealed to prevent direct sun light; the lighting was connected to a sensor system that would limit the time the objects were exposed to ultraviolet light. The showcases were placed next to the walls to leave enough space for the circulation of the visitors. The rooms were dark and the objects were lit so that for a brief moment one could assume being in a museum. The ground floor arrangement was slightly different. The rooms at this floor -the dining room, guest room, and the parlor- were organized around an entrance lobby, and they were furnished with antiques and art works of the relatively recent past. Unlike the calligraphy collection, which was creating its own space in the family house, the desire was to integrate the collected objects with the daily life at the entrance floor.

This hybrid condition of the house, acting in between an antiquarium/ cabinet and house/ museum created primarily terminological and subsequently epistemological ambiguities. After its transformation into a public museum, this ambiguity had amplified. Today, if the term function was to be interpreted as simply as use, it can, without any hesitation be called a "house museum". A thorough analysis of the transformation of this "private" house into a "public" institution however, may indicate that the familiar terms, "house" and "museum" and their institutional coexistence require further investigation.

16. Butcher-Younghands (1993).

17. Sweet (2004); Hunter (1989).

18. A final assessment made following the symposium, underwritten by The Barra Foundation Fund at The Athenæum of Philadelphia, indicates the number of historical house museums in the United States as nearly 8,000. Some house museums are independent, privately funded, non-profit corporations; many are operated by regional organizations; an even greater number are owned by public agencies at the state and local level.

19. Pinna (1997).

20. For an insightful discussion, see for instance, Cengizkan (2002).

21. As stated before, although it was a very well kept house, and although it had been registered and used as a museum for years, the last restoration project of the Atatürk House Museum took almost four years. It was not the application of the project, however, but the discussions related to the restoration decisions that took more than two years. The personal belongings of the architect of a nation were part of the cultural heritage to be preserved for centuries and the historical house could not accommodate the necessary infrastructure. It was unacceptable for a twenty first century museum to exclude physically challenged visitors, and it was equally unacceptable for a historic building to include an elevator within its physical borders. While a historic house museum could not jeopardize the direct relationship established between the museum visitor and history, it could not ignore the necessity of the visibility of the exit signs dictated by the security. In the case of Atatürk House Museum, museology took a step back to allow the application of the strict regulations of restoration.

22. Atatürk House Museum, besides comprising distinguished architectural values that could witness the Republic History and the development of a public memory, has been a precious archive including the rare documents of the said period. The spatial transformation of this house, once constructed without the guidance of an architect remains to be scrutinized. Necessary documents have been gathered in the author's personal archives.

HOUSE MUSEUM

It was only a year before the establishment of the Sabancı Museum in Istanbul the International Confederation of Museums (ICOM) discovered the significance of House Museums in the world. Demhist, the ICOM committee for Historic House Museums was born at the world conference of ICOM in 1998 (16). One of the first projects of this committee was to create a system for classifying types of historic house museum along homogenous museological lines.

The Renaissance tradition of collecting crossed the English Channel in the early 17th century (17). Collectors such as Sir Hans Sloane, John Aubrey and Sir John Soane transformed their personal properties to accommodate various objects they had gathered. These collections were the initiators of the renowned museums in Europe. In the late 18th and early 19th centuries it was not unusual for the affluent people to have a collection of gems, specimens, both original and cast decoration elements and antiques (18). However, not every historic house furnished with antiquities was later classified as a house museum. Giovanni Pinna, one of the founders of Demhist, gives the definition of historical house museum as:

“Historic houses, when they are open to the public and conserved in their original condition (i.e. with the furnishing and collections made by the people who used to live in them) and do not have been converted to accommodate collections put together from different sources, constitute a museum category of a special and a rather varied kind. Historic house museums comply with museological and technical constraints that are different from those used in other museums. Their category is different because historic houses may comprise sites of all sizes and kinds, ranging from royal palaces to residences of powerful personages, artist's studios, rich bourgeois houses and even modest cottages. The historic house is certainly incomparable and unique museum in that it is used to conserve, exhibit or reconstruct real atmospheres which are difficult to manipulate (except to very slight extent) if one does not wish to alter the very meaning of 'historic house'” (19).

Pinna continues to say that “the significance of the historic house, in which emphasis is placed not on the value of the individual objects but on the whole set of objects and its integration with the spirit of the people who lived in the house”. Obviously, there is an epistemological difference between a historic house and a house museum. The former singles out for the container and the narrations attached to what is contained in it.

As the categorization does rely on neither the style nor the size of the houses, recent developments in the traditional vineyard lodges in Ankara can be the best subject to understand the implications of the above mentioned classification (20). One of the well-known house museums in Turkey, the Atatürk House, had recently been reopened to public after a meticulous renovation process that had taken almost three years (21). Between the years 1921 and 1932, Atatürk, as the first president of the country, settled in this vineyard lodge bought directly from Bulgurzade Mehmet and Fuat Bey, which, after some minor additions came to be known as the “Çankaya Villa” (22). In 1924, while Atatürk was still living in it, the modest house went under a major renovation realized by the famous architect Mehmet Vedat Bey and additions including a second floor for bedrooms, a tower for the library, a pantry and kitchen were made in those years. Needless to say the villa has held a very significant place in the history of the Republic; as besides being a private residence, it served as a headquarters during the War of Independence and the years of revolution.

23. İnönü House Museum comprise similar qualities with the Atatürk House Museum. Particularly the first known expansions made by Refik Bey, a former apprentice of Kemalettin Bey and the last additions to the house require a further research to seek for the traces of well known architects of the period, especially of Ernest Egli. Necessary documents have been gathered in the author's personal archives.

24. Interviews: with Özden Toker, September 2005; with September Erdal İnönü 2006.

When it was transformed into a museum in 1950, museology had not been established as an autonomous discipline in the country. The 1989 and 2005 restorations however, were well informed by the new developments in the field and managed to implement a professional preservation program to keep the villa in its original form with all its original furniture and fittings.

There was another vineyard lodge in Ankara that played a comparatively significant role during the establishment of the Republic. It was known as the "Pembe Köşk" and was not located far from the Atatürk House. İsmet İnönü, the second President of the country (1938-1950), besides his military and political traits was known for his virtues as a family head. As stated by his daughter, Özden Toker, the family house had always been more than a household. Gradual editions also expanded this modest house to provide the necessary spatial quality for formal gatherings (23). The garden, the ballroom, the dining hall, and particularly the rooms at the first floor, hosted various ceremonies, including the official anniversaries of the establishment of the Republic. It had been the regular place of formal dinners where the international visitors were gathered (24). Özden Toker followed the tradition, and in fact transformed the house into a museum, where the anniversaries of the establishment of the Republic on the 29th of October and special related dates such as the 23rd of April, have been celebrated with annual exhibitions. The exhibitions she prepared were so thorough that each served as a document for the historians of the period. Although the recent project of the family foundation to convert the family house into a house museum, a public archive, and a library specialized on the Republican period, interrupted by the impediments of the leading ideology, she is still collecting the disseminated fittings, furniture and family belongings to bring the house into its original state in the 1930s (Figure 2a, 2b).

Unlike these two vineyard lodges, two other recent renovations proved the necessity of further classifications in historical house museums in the country. Similar to Sabancı Family, the Koç family is a "dynasty of business people" founded by Vehbi Koç, one of the wealthiest self-made persons in Turkey. The members of the family were also fond of collecting, and their collections were transformed into two industrial museums, an art museum and a historical museum of art and antiques. Besides these worldwide known museums, the family owned two vineyard lodges in Ankara. In 1923, Vehbi Koç bought one of the houses from Fevzi Çakmak, who was a field marshal during the War of Independence, served as a prime minister during the first years of the Republic and was a close companion of Atatürk. The Koç family had used this house for many years, until the family moved to Istanbul. In 1989 it was converted into a research center,



Figure 2a. Pembe Köşk (İnönü House).



Figure 2b. Atatürk House.



Figure 3a. VEKAM.



Figure 3b. Vine House.

25. For further information: www.vekam.org.tr.

26. As stated in the family website: "The Gediklioğlu Vineyard, which Vehbi Koç Foundation's Chair person Semahat Arsel donated to the Vehbi Koç Foundation in 2007, welcomes visitors under VEKAM's management as Ankara Vineyard House".

27. Bann (1984). Successive strategies identified by Bann as "metonym and metaphor" Lenoir' arrangement of the exhibits at the Musée des Monuments Français (1795) with Alexandre Du Sommerard's cabinet at the Hotel des Cluny (1832).

28. Another historic house was purchased by the Koç family in 1950 and was used by them as a summer-house until the decision to convert it into a museum was taken in 1978. The museum, now called "Sadberk Hanım Museum", occupies two separate buildings. The original building, known as the "Azeryan Yalısı", was a three-story wooden mansion that was believed to have been built in the late 19th century and whose architecture was inspired by European vernacular traditions. The conversion to a museum was carried out between 1978 and 1980 according to a restoration project that had been prepared by Sedat Hakkı Eldem. The museum opened its doors to the public on October 14th, 1980 with the Sadberk Koç collection on display.

29. Butcher-Youngmans (1993).

VEKAM focused particularly on the life of Vehbi Koç and the history of Ankara (25). The second lodge was purchased by the daughter of Vehbi Koç from a close relative of the family and restored to be converted into a historical "Ankara Vineyard House" (26). Although VEKAM was established to conserve and exhibit the visual and textual documents of Vehbi Koç's personal archives and his personal belongings, it had never been named after a museum. The objects were collected from different places and belonged to different periods of his lifetime and the exhibition layout was never about their authentication. The Gediklioğlu Vineyard lodge on the other hand, ethnographic in every sense, was decorated with the meticulously selected objects of "historic Ankara houses", and the permanent exhibit was reflecting every minor detail of a constructed daily life, including the smell, color, and the texture of the materials (Figure 3a, 3b).

These two different representational approaches call for the remarkable comparison made by Stephen Bann, historian and museologist, in his seminal book *The Clothing of Clio* (27). Bann identifies two principles governing the poetic narration of the historical collections: the progressive display of the Renaissance galleries and the period rooms of modern historical museums. Going beyond this 19th century museography and with an epistemological consciousness, however, neither of these old houses in Ankara was called museums. They were named after "historical Ankara houses" and had been made public with their historical physical qualities and constructed narrations (28).

Further evidences of this terminology can be traced in the classification studies of historic house museums of the International Council of Museums (ICOM). As stated above, the first known classification of house museums was made by Shery Butcher-Youngmans in her book, published in 1993 (29). Her classification of "documentary, representative, and aesthetic historic house museums" was followed by a meticulous work of Rosanna Pavoni and Ornella Selvafolta in 1998. Their continuing research indicated the risks of any aesthetic categorization which will at the end jeopardize the significance of historical value of house museums. While the former classification system underlines the value of historic house museum to represent a life style of a certain period, reflect a style or an ideology or acquire a value devoid of its owner and the objects it contained; Pavoni

and Selvafolta offers sub-categories in their classification system, such as: palaces, mansions of famous personalities, houses of artists, houses representing certain styles, collectors' houses, houses with social and cultural significance.

Therefore, the two vineyard lodges owned by the Koç Foundation, VEKAM and the "Historic Ankara House" were representing the life style, the architecture and the environmental qualities of a region; and with their rapidly growing collections they were rightly called "historic houses" and not "house museums". With the same token, the Atatürk House and the İnönü House obtained the necessary qualities, museological and museographical merits to be called "house museums".

The Sabancı Museum in Istanbul, however, was resisting above listed denominations, particularly after it expanded its physical borders and had become the major venue of temporary international exhibitions in the country. As it was indicated before, the house had been providing the services of a museum when it had been still used as a private family house. It was Sakıp Sabancı's dream to bring the rare collections of worldwide known artists, particularly of Picasso and Rodin to his house. After it was converted into a museum, the garden and the certain parts of the house were kept in their original states. Besides the main entrance hall, the dining room, and the guest rooms of the old family house, the calligraphy exhibition at the second floor was also kept in its original place. Following the first years of its establishment, as the household spaces were kept in

Figure 4a. Serpentine road, Circulation Pattern, drawing, author's collection.

Figure 4b. Staircase interrupted with wide terraces, Circulation Pattern, drawing, author's collection.



their original conditions at the first floor, the calligraphy collection has expanded to cover the whole second floor. As the major part of the life of the Sabancı family continued to be displayed after the transformation of the house into a museum, the new institution after its first transformation could be called a “house museum”.

Regardless of their contexts, contents, or containers, house museums and historical houses had common denominators that made them indisputable for the world culture. The enormous variety characteristic of the intellectual and artistic assets displayed in these houses stimulated innovative strategies to deal with specific challenges in the areas varying from conservation and restoration to representation, education and communication. They were the natural grounds for creating dialogue and developed new capacities within the established institutions of cultural heritage. Besides these universal eminencies, there was another aspect which made these institutions significant for the redefinition of “public” cultural institutions in Turkey. It is with their establishment that “museums” went under a rehabilitation and reassessment process. This belated awareness created a dynamic critical ground for the possible critical reevaluations of the existing government museums.

“PRIVATE” VS. “PUBLIC” (30)

Sabancı Museum was legally registered and legislated by the state as a “Private Museum” on the 30th of October 2001. As stated above, before it was converted into a museum, it was a family house owned by the head of Turkey’s one of the largest business conglomerates, Sakıp Sabancı and his family. One of Istanbul’s oldest settlements on the Bosphorus, the house’s inspiring ownership history, indicates its unique characteristics, where the private life exists as part of the “public sphere”. The following historical account conforms that it was not unusual for the mansions at the premises of the house to draw very thin demarcation lines between “public” and “private”, both in spatial and epistemological meanings of the terms. Before converted into a public institution, the Sabancı house had a double life. The spatial representation of this duality “shifted” as the function of the “house” transformed into a “museum”.

Although the history of the house goes to the 1920s, the site it is situated that connects the Emirgan Grove to the Bosphorus has a long past that leads back to the sixteenth century (31). Hidden behind the thick walls of cypress trees, the site remained out of sight in the fifteenth century, during the reign of Fatih Sultan Mehmet. He was Kanuni the Magnificent who allocated the entire forest to Ahmet Feridun Paşa as a token of his appreciation after the Zigetvar War. This was the first documented transformation of the land from the Sultan, the ultimate ruler of the empire, to the private ownership of a successful individual. There, Ahmet Feridun Paşa built a wonderful summer mansion and gardens surrounding it. As he was a well-educated, well-traveled man, it did not take long for this mansion and gardens to become the meeting point of the distinguished artists, poets and notables of the time. The gardens were open to general use, yet the entry was restricted with unwritten rules. Almost a century after, when Sultan Murad IV returned from Iran with a victory, he gave the site and its premises, than called “the Feridun Bey Gardens”, to the sun of Emir Güneoğlu, Tahmasb Kuli Khan for very similar reasons. Although the name of the gardens change from “Feridun Bey Gardens” to “Emirganoğlu Grove”, its domain did not change as it became one of the regular leisure-

30. Although Habermas often emphasizes the “spatial dimension” of the public sphere, it is necessary to underline here that he does not refer to an actual place. Therefore, the spatial analysis is made here not to reduce Habermas’ definition to actual space but to show its relevancy in the visualization of the said transformation.

31. Tuğal and Tuğal (2002).

time locations of the Sultan and his associates. After the death of the Sultan Murad IV, it did not take long for the owner of the mansion to be beheaded and replaced by another public figure, Sadrazam Kara Mustafa Paşa. And after him, the owners of the Emirgan Grove changed in the following decades due to the victories and defeats in the wars. What had never changed, however, was the remarkably close relation between the Sultans of the Ottoman Empire and the owners of this mansion and the site. Due to these intimate relations, the mansion never had the intimacy of a “private house”.

In 1781-82, during the reign of Abdülmecid I, the mansion was demolished and the land was divided into parcels. After this division, with the construction of a mosque, fountains, a Turkish bath, and several shops, the prospect of the Grove changed from royal gardens to a small Bosphorus village (32). A re-transformation had occurred, on the other hand, during the reign of Sultan Selim III (1789-1807), when towards the end of the 18th century, the whole district became one of the most popular residential areas of the high officials of the Palace. Until the end of the 19th century, due to the official positions of their owners, these mansions had been the unequaled meeting places of the time, yet entry, again depended on the visitor’s position and qualification as a public personage. It no longer involved the Sultan to represent himself before a selected audience, but in his absence, the notables of the Palace gathered to exchange their ideas not only on food, music and pleasure but also on imperial matters. The boundaries between the Palace and the society blurred, leading to a new domain where the Palace and society became involved in each other’s matters.

In 1927, Prince Mehmed Ali Hasan of the Hidiv family of Egypt commissioned the Italian architect Edouard De Nari to build the villa, now the museum’s main building, and it was used as a summer house for many years by various members of the Hidiv family; for a short time it also served as the Montenegrin Embassy. Following the traditions established by its ancestors, the villa served both for the demands of their owners and their family and for the purposes of social exchange, local and international public affairs. When Hacı Ömer Sabancı, who started his life as a cotton picker in the Southern part of Turkey and became a wealthy entrepreneur in Istanbul, bought this house in 1951, his only desire was to own “a big house” for his family (33). Ömer Sabancı had a large family, and he wanted this house to become a “home” for their private life. Indeed, the house had been used as a summer residence for the entire family for many years.

During those years, the house was also serving for a very unusual purpose. Those were the years that Ömer Sabancı developed a hobby of collecting antiques and art works. During his business trips, he had the chance to visit the houses of known collectors in Europe, particularly in Italy. He admired those “beautiful and rich houses” and wanted to purchase similar objects. So he did, and used the summerhouse to store them. The transformation of this house, which was already furnished with a small collection of antiques, into a storage place was interrupted by the decision of the family to spend their winters in the premises. It was a very short-term interruption because as he continued collecting, the family started to adopt these objects into their daily life. The antique chairs, dining tables, chandeliers, ornaments, and other “objects of curiosity” gradually found their permanent locations in the house.

32. Tuğal and Tuğal (2002, 25).

33. Interview with Sakıp Sabancı, İstanbul, Atlı Köşk, 2000.



Figure 5. Exterior view of Sabancı House, author's collection.

The entrance of the house was transformed into an art room and the living room and parlor were furnished with the antiques. A few sculptures in the garden, a few paintings on the walls, and a nice chandelier at the center of the entrance hall could easily amalgamate with the existing furnishing. Except for the legendary horses in the house, the discovery of the real motivation behind development of the collection has remained as a challenge for the historians.

After the death of Hacı Ömer Sabancı in 1966, the house had begun to be used permanently as a home by Sakıp Sabancı, the eldest of the family. He took over his father's hobby and enlarged it to include a rich collection of calligraphy and paintings. As a determined collector himself, he inherited the family collections kept in the house. Sabancı was an exceptional businessman and became the wealthiest man of the country. Although he was a very private person, he managed to become a beloved public figure with his humorous and humble personality. His house at the Emirgan Grove was always open to visitors, ranging from high school students to kings and presidents of foreign countries. His house was both his private sanctuary where he lived with his family and the center of public attraction where he hosted his visitors mostly accompanied with the members of the media. This duality divided the house almost into two parts, "private" "and" public. This division, however, was more than the simple split of household spaces.

The literal separation of the private from the public was made possible with the use of different circulation patterns in the Sabancı Family House. In fact, different circulation patterns were offered starting from the main entrance to the garden. There were two different paths to follow (fig. 4a, 4b). One was climbing the hill with a serpentine road successfully hiding the house at the end, and the other cut across the garden with a steep staircase interrupted with wide terraces opening to Bosphorus. Approaching the house from the serpentine road, gave the first impression of a majestic space surrounded by a thick forest. The thick green wall, composed of a variety of grand and small trees, various colored shrubs and flowers, created an illusion of a natural forest. High natural stone



Figure 6. Statues, fountains in the garden, author's collection.

34. (2002) *Bir Kuruluşun Öyküsü: Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, SSM Yayınları, İstanbul.*

retaining walls, covered with aged moss, supported this created grandeur. The staircase, on the other hand, called for an intimacy epitomized with the sound of the running water on both sides. Each landing was transformed into a platform with a framed view of the Grove and Bosphorus. Although both paths reached to the same platform leading to the main entrance terrace, the perception of scale and experience was completely different in each case. While the former was suggesting the entry of a larger group of people, the later was offering an intimate privacy.

Climbing up to the raised platform of the main entrance of the house, created another illusion of depth and the house looked much massive than it actually was (**Figure 5**). The sculptures placed symmetrically on the both sides of the steps were the first indicators of nobility (**Figure 6**). The ornamented double wooden doors opened to an entrance hall surrounded with fine wood and paintings on the walls. Two rooms on the both sides of the entrance door, furnished elegantly with the 18th and 19th century objects, were representing the wealth and the taste of the distinguished. The central wooden staircase was descending to make the magnificent chandelier visible from different angles. It reached to the main corridor with its elegant wooden columns and coffering that acted as a mezzanine floor opening to a number of adjacent rooms. These rooms were also divided in a very meticulous manner. Among many choices, only one door was providing entry to the rooms where one of the most valuable calligraphy collections in the world was kept. Not all the visitors of the house could reach to this point, and only few of them were allowed to the family rooms (**34**) (**Figure 7-10**).

The four main entrance doors of the house, indeed, were the first “functional” dividers, separating the family members not only from the visitors coming from outside but also from the servants living in the house. There was one main entrance from the front, facing Bosphorus, and one secondary entrance at the back of the house facing a small street. The service doors were placed at South and North. Depending on the choice of the entrance door, the whole circulation pattern, and thus the whole experience of the house, would alter (**Figure 11**). The vertical circulation supported this multiple choice. The main staircase placed at the center of the house, a second one at the rear, and the elevator, had provided the necessary separation. An autonomous staircase was merely connecting the service floor to the ground floor and did not continue to the upper levels. Moreover, as almost every room had two doors, one opening to the main corridors and one to the adjacent rooms, the permutation of the open doors had too led to several possible circulation patterns.

While the main entrance door was welcoming the presidents of foreign countries, government and private sector executives and selected celebrities, the rear door was used only by the family members and the close relatives. The highly modest entrance hall of the secondary entrance was connected to the upper floor and to the attic by a very narrow, free-standing staircase. The doors of the rooms at the ground floor and the first floor were arranged in such a way that there were no overlaps with the previously mentioned path. The spatial treatments of the corridors and the rooms, the choices of the furniture were the other indicators of this separation.

At the first glance, like the other mansions located at the Grove, the Sabancı house was a “representative” place. It involved the owner representing his collections before a selected group of people. Sabancı took a great



Figure 7. Staircase (public) of Sabancı House, author's collection.



Figure 8. Staircase (private) of Sabancı House, author's collection.



Figure 9. Dining Room of Sabancı House, author's collection.



Figure 10. Living Room of Sabancı House, author's collection.



Figure 11. Entrances of Sabancı House, drawing, author's collection.

pride in displaying his calligraphy collections to his guests consisted of foreign presidents, governors, mayors, governmental representatives, and celebrities in various fields. As depicted above, the first floor of his house, particularly the entrance, living room and the dining room were furnished in such a way that they were ready to be used both for entertainment and display purposes. The placement of each object, each furniture piece or painting within its architectonic framework were creating an illusion of a museological display in a natural house setting.

Moreover, Sakıp Sabancı was very fond of popular music and art; and well-known singers and artist gathered at his tea and dinner parties to discuss their new projects to seek for support. The distinguished members of media were accompanying the celebrities, to reflect the outline of the discussions in the related columns of the daily publications. Hence, the old house was accommodating different social groups, for the representatives of the “civil society” were gathering to articulate their interests. With all those social gatherings, the family house was transforming to provide space for endless discussions on economy, politics, and art. The garden surrounding the family house, with the flat roofs of historical cisterns were providing the necessary space for the garden parties and the formal receptions taking place in the house. The garden was perceptually part of the historical Emirgan Grove and cascading down to Bosphorus to cover a 14.000 m² area. Including the famous sculpture of a horse, it was decorated with a unique collection of historical fountains and figurative sculptures. The comfort provided with the art works, the plantation and the breathtaking vistas of the Bosphorus, allowed the visitors prolong the duration of their stay to late hours. The hospitality of the family extended its borders to include the neighbors and friends, and represented in the tea parties accompanied with bagel and cheese, and crowned with traditional dishes. Therefore, the said “inclusiveness” of the house was due to the convivial nature of the Sabancı family and the social power they encompassed. Although the spatial separations were meticulously achieved in the house, the public and private realms, in Habermas’ terms, were not separated. Sabancı house in a way, was acting as a late eighteenth century “coffee house”.

35. Besides the decoration of the first floor and the calligraphy exhibition at the second floor, the vertical circulation, the service spaces, and even the structural system of the house was modified to accommodate the necessary functions of a museum. As the valuable calligraphy collection required the construction of special display cases, they were equipped with sensors and fiber optic lighting system, the walls were painted into dark blue to provide the necessary background for the objects in display, wall washers were placed to lit paintings, the sky light at the central hall was reinforced with I beams to hang the 18th century chandelier.

36. Habermas has been criticized for his support of Enlightenment and its direct connection with modernist ideology. But as indicated above, museum as a public institution stimulates its relevancy. Habermas points to Britain in the eighteenth century, with its social life and emerging institutions such as salons, coffee houses, clubs, theaters, and societies as well as the printed media. For further reading, Peters (1993).

ESTABLISHING A PUBLIC INSTITUTION

As stated above, most of the spatial changes in the house were already made during the collector’s lifetime (35). All the major changes were made by the collector himself, to expand the limited space of the family house and provide room for the visitors. As there were no ticket booths, security checks and information desks, guests were making best of their stay in this house/ museum. Moreover, the sociable environment created by the hospitality of its owner, was not imposing any official code over the visitors. They were free to express their ideas, make their comments and suggestions. Whether it was an official party or a social gathering, they were treated cordially in the house. Even the food and the music were arranged in accordance with their taste. In other words, it was a perfect “inclusive public space”, to use Habermas’ terminology (36).

House Museums emerge to support this democratic environment as the institutions of public representation. Outshined by the sixteenth century Enlightenment, these museums played a very active role in the accumulation of knowledge. The general belief was the scientific classification and display of knowledge to the broadest possible public

would help society to improve its immediate values reflected on the daily lives of people. Early museums, besides being the “storage houses of high culture” symbolizing the values of a nation or the power of the state, had been evaluated as the natural ground of art and social criticism. Their didactic mission was enhanced with the developing academic thought.

Here it is crucial to note that the institutional establishment of the Sabancı Museum in 1998 had coincided with the establishment of the Sabancı University. Couple of years apart, they were the products of a unified project. In 1998, together with its collections and furnishings, which were intermingled, as they were, the Sabancı House was allocated to Sabancı University to be transformed into a museum. Therefore, it was not a coincidence that Sabancı Family was conceiving the Museum as being a natural extension of the University curriculum (37). The story of the functional transformation of the Sabancı House into a University Museum has been narrated in the first publication of the museum. The book was indicating an intellectual context, an interdisciplinary environment within which the house became the subject of an academic research. Indeed, the original architectural project was prepared by an academic group to transform the Sabancı House into a historical house museum with minimum possible intervention (38). That decision required the administrative structure and therefore the architectural program of the museum to be kept in their minimums. The additional underground galleries were built in their minimum dimensions to keep and follow the traces of the existing paved surfaces in the historic garden. This “minimalist” approach was learning from its precedents not merely in functionalist aspects but also in terms of socio-ethical responsibilities.

In the beginning, the museum was planned to be part of an academic curriculum. This decision was supporting the initial idea and presenting the possibility of using the man-power and the spatial infrastructure of the University. The related art programs of the University could provide all the extra space required for the support functions such as the meeting and conference rooms. Moreover, the rapidly growing campus could offer the necessary administrative and curatorial offices, and storage facilities. In fact the University too was brand new in those days and opening its doors to “a new art education” that would go beyond the established structure of the existing, conventional art departments. Thus, even the curatorial responsibilities of the Museum were going to be shared with the permanent staff of the art and social sciences programs. The participative and interdisciplinary environment of the University was believed to create the necessary foundations for the Museum’s institutional mission. Like the developing curriculum, the mission of the Museum was set down to expand the limits of existing borders in art production to become inclusive. Therefore, it was intentional that the rector and the general secretary of the Sabancı University were the active members of the brain storming sessions and workshops organized during the establishment of the Museum (39). The foundational dean of the art program was also participating in the workshops and search committee meetings to help the development of the architectural program, which was written in the guidance of this academic endeavour.

37. (2002) *Bir Kuruluşun Öyküsü: Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi*, SSM Yayınları, İstanbul.

38. Academic staff of the METU Department of Architecture: Ayşen Savaş, Namık Erkal, Alişan Çırakoğlu.

39. From the unpublished notes of the first international workshop organized in İstanbul with the participation of the directors of Museums such as MoMA and Louvre, Specialized Institutions such as Getty Research Center, and Universities.

In 2000 the architectural program of the Sabancı Museum was written in the guidance of this collaboration. The original project was ambitious but not excessive in its applications. When the first phase of the architectural project was executed, the house and the existing building fragments in

the garden were interconnected to unfold into underground galleries and storage facilities. The mission of the museum was to expand its permanent calligraphy and art collections with temporary exhibitions. To support its mission, the basement floor was converted into a paper conservation laboratory; and following a meticulous research, the necessary infrastructure was designed and placed accordingly. A winter garden was designed to include a small café, which could be converted into a small, informal forum space for public lectures and discussions. With the annex of a modern gallery, the exhibition areas of the museum opened to visitors in 2002; with a further extension of the layout in 2005, the floor area reached to 6.500 square meters for the technical level of the museum accomplished international standards.

Reflecting the University's mission, the goal was "to create a dynamic intellectual environment for the promotion of art, its research and criticism". As planned, the new museum was going to be a neutral confrontation space of art with its public audience. Consequently, the educational expectations of the newly establishing University would carry this museum beyond the simple definition of a "historical house museum".

EXCLUSIVE PUBLIC SPACE: THE SABANCI MUSEUM AS A PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

The recent developments at the Museum indicated a radical shift in the initial mission of the institution. It is subject to a recent transformation, which interrupted the academic interrelation. In fact following a change in the managerial structure of the Museum in 2003, the Sakıp Sabancı University Sabancı Museum, disposed of the first part of its title to declare its autonomy. This detachment was more of a "functional" transformation rather than an institutional reformation.

By declaring its authority, the Sabancı Museum expanded its architectural program to build extracurricular spaces for its own demands. The Museum was already equipped with the international standards as Picasso and Rodin were two exhibitions initiated by Sakıp Sabancı himself. His goal was to provide the necessary space for the temporary exhibitions of the "original" works of art; and Picasso's work was the symbol of Sabancı's expectations. And with its international architectural standards, the museum managed to bring the original works of worldwide known artists. Picasso and Rodin were two exhibitions organized to fulfill the founder's will. Besides the symbolic authority these two names acquired, the loan policy of the owner museums set the level of functional transformation for the Sabancı Museum. Following these two exhibitions, it indeed became the local venue of international, so called blockbuster exhibitions. The physical transformation required for these exhibitions were not related with the technical standards but more with the support services. Besides the edition of an auditorium, it did not take long for the small café to be transformed into a gourmet restaurant; the sculpture gardens to be converted into temporary stages for regular jazz concerts, the winter garden to become an ornamented authentic café. The graduate education of the University curriculum was successfully replaced with a museological education program directed towards the children. The space required for this function needed to be borrowed from service and exhibition spaces (40).

40. Recent re-evaluations in architectural discursive culture indicated that interpreting functionalism as if it were a law or mathematical theorem, in other words, the belief that there is indeed a specific form for each possible function, is that is based on a fundamental misapprehension of architectural production. The final expansions of the Sabancı Museum in 2008, against the academic approach of the original project, proved that it is equally a mistake to push the limits of the historical house museums to include all the facilities provided by the Louvre of the British Museum.

With these recent transformations, The Sabancı Museum was very successfully increasing its standards in its temporary exhibitions and was not allowing any unauthorized work to penetrate from its walls. With each temporary exhibition challenging its own standards and claiming an authority in high art, the Museum was there to say the last word in contemporary artistic production. For people on the street queues at the gates of the Sabancı Museum has become a common public event. People has become accustomed to wait for the exclusive concerts, receptions, performances, and needless to say the most exclusive exhibitions of the worldwide known artists and art collectors. The term “exclusive” is used here in its dual meaning; while referring to the élite, it also connotes exclusion or in better terms, “privacy”. Now the exclusion lays in its recent architectural program and the perception of museum as a private enterprise.

Detached from the University, the museum not only expands its physical borders but also defines its own conception of “art” which in fact legitimizes the already institutionalized works and classical trends. International exhibitions epitomize the museums conception of not only what art is and should be, but also the role of museum as a public institution. As the Museum becomes the ultimate authority, the museumgoer, by definition, loses his/her previously defined position as “a critical judge”.

Recalling Pinna’s definition, if the significance of house museums was the conservation and exhibition of the objects in a house to integrate with the “spirit of the people who lived in it”, that spirit has long been lost that it is no longer the inclusive space created by the modest family house. Therefore, the Museum cannot claim any authority as a “house museum”. Nor the “historical house” could accommodate the recent developments in its original historical site. However, more than the physical transformations the impossibility of criticism is the major evidence of this lose. Criticism, as stated before, helps to understand both how social act functions in art and how artistic production works in society. If there is no room for new experimentations and untested acts, artistic production can no longer be considered as a manifestation of society. And if there is nothing left to be criticized; and then museum is no longer an open space for public confrontation. In its entire history, the Sabancı house represented a public sphere and often opposed exclusive action, and prevented domination by the powerful authority. In its contemporary form, however, the public sphere is no more than a manipulative form of publicity, as media, advertising agents, and public relation experts try to create and represent an “exclusive institution”. With this representative publicity, the Sabancı Museum is no longer an all inclusive public space, therefore no longer a “coffee house”.

REFERENCES

- ARTUN, A. ed. (2004) *Müze ve Eleştirel Düşünce: Tarih Sahneleri Sanat Müzeleri II*, ed. Ali Artun, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2006.
- BANN, S. (1984) *The Clothing of Clio: A Study of the Representation of History in Nineteenth-Century Britain and France*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- BASIN, G. (1967) *The Museum Age*, tr. J. van Nuis Chaill, Universe Books, New York.

- BEHNE, A. (1996) *The Modern Functional Building*, tr. by Michael Robinson, Getty Publications, Santa Monica. (originally published in German as *Der Modern Zweckbau*, 1926).
- BUTCHER-YOUNGHANS, S. (1993) *Historic House Museums, a Practical Handbook, for their Care, Preservation, and Management*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- CENGİZKAN, A. (2002) Bağ Evi'nden Villa'ya: Ankara Keçiören Bağ Evleri ve Kent Konutu Tipolojisinde Dönüşüm, *Modernin Saati*, Mimarlar Derneği 1927 and Boyut Yayıncılık, Ankara; 119-42.
- COWAN, B. (2005) *The Social Life of Coffee*, Yale UP, New Haven.
- ELLIS, M. (2004) *The Coffee House. A Cultural History*, Orian House, London.
- HABERMAS, J. (1992) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, tr. by Thomas Burger, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA. (originally published in German in 1962).
- HUNTER, M. (1989) Between Cabinet of Curiosities and Research Collection: The History of the Royal Society's "Repository", in *Establishing the New Science: the Experience of the Early Royal Society*, Boydell, London.
- McCLELLAN, A. (1999) *Inventing the Louvre: Art, Politics, and the Origins of the Modern Museum*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- MILLER, E. (1974) *That Noble Cabinet: A History of the British Museum*, University Press, Ohio.
- PETERS, J.D. (1993) Distrust of Representation: Habermas on the Public Sphere, *Media, Culture and Society*, v: 15, n: 4, 1993; 541-57.
- PINNA, G. (1997) Introduction to Historic House Museums, *Museum International*, v: 53, n: 2; 4-9.
- SARGIN, G. A. (2001) On the Verge of Civic Breakdown: Community and Territorial Division. The Town of Sincan, ACSA International Conference: Oriental-Occidental.
- SHAW, M.K.W. (2004) *Osmanlı Müzeciliği: Müzeler, Arkeoloji ve Tarihin Görselleştirilmesi*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- SOANE, J. (1987) Description of the House and Museum on the North Side of Lincoln's Inn Fields, (Originally published in 1830) S.F. Millenson, Sir John Soane's Museum, Ann Arbor.
- SUMMERSON, J. (1986) A New Description of Sir John Soane's Museum, (originally published in) 1986 Helen Dorey, A Miscelany of Objects from Sir John Soane Museum.
- SWEET, R. (2004) *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, Continuum Int., London.
- TUĞAL, E.Ç. and TUĞAL, M.S. (2002) Boğaz'ın Sularına Yansıdı Erguvan, Emirgan ve Atlı Köşk'te Zaman, *SSM Bir Kuruluşun Öyküsü*, Sakın Sabancı Müzesi Yayını, İstanbul; 20-51.
- WATKIN, D. (1977) *Morality and Architecture*, Oxford, Clarendon.

Alındı: 06.06.2009; **Son Metin:** 18.05.2010

Anahtar Sözcükler: müze mimarlığı;
kamusal alan; işlev

EV MÜZE: TARİHİ BİNALAR İÇİN YENİ BİR İŞLEV

Aydınlanma projesinin düşünsel ve kurumsal son ürünlerinden biri olarak ele alınan müzeler, 18. yüzyıl sonundan bu yana toplumsal dönüşümlerin temsil ortamı olarak değerlendirilmişlerdir. Türkiye’de Müze Bilimi’nin bir araştırma alanı ve müzenin de bir yapı tipi olarak gelişme süreci, Avrupa’daki benzerlerinden farklı bir yol izlemiştir. Modernizm’in kendisinin de ülkede farklı bir süreçle evrildiği gözönüne alındığında, bunun bir rastlantı olduğu düşünülemez.

Son yıllarda, özellikle sanat tarihçileri ve eleştirmenleri tarafından yayımlanan sınırlı sayıda kitap ve ilk mezunlarını 1990’lı yıllarda veren yüksek lisans programları, müze çalışmalarının akademik bir ortamda tartışmaya açılmasına öncülük etmişlerdir. Kültür ekonomisi, alan yönetimi, nesne kimliklendirmesi, etkileşimli sergileme gibi terimler, müze çalışanlarının günlük dilinin doğal parçaları haline gelmiştir. Buna koşut olarak yapılan yasal düzenlemeler, kamusal dönüşümler ve sivil toplum kurumlarının hazırladıkları değerlendirme raporları sonucunda, müze bilimi üzerine eleştirel bir söylem oluşturulmaya başlanmıştır. Ancak bunlardan hiç biri, yıllardır konuyu gündeme taşımaya çalışan devlet müzelerinin serzenişlerini duyurmaya yetmemiş, tam tersine geri dönüşü olmayan bir özelleştirme sürecinin başlangıcı için beklenen uygun bir zeminin temel taşları olarak değerlendirilmişlerdir. Öte yandan, yeni kurulan ve sayıları hızla artan özel müzeler ve bu kurumlar tarafından düzenlenen uluslararası geçici sergiler, kamu oyununda yeni bir farkındalık yaratmaya başlamışlardır. Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, özellikle son yıllarda izlediği işletme politikası ile özerk bir kurum haline gelmiş, Türkiye müze çalışmaları için eşsiz bir örnek oluşturmuştur. Adı geçen müzenin önce “özel konuttan” “kamusal bir kuruma” dönüşmesi ve daha sonra tekrar kendini “özel bir kültür yatırımı” olarak tanımlaması sürecinin araştırılması, salt Türkiye müzeciliğinin bugün geldiği noktanın anlaşılması için değil, aynı zamanda ülkede Modernizmin eleştirisi ile gündeme gelen özel/kamusal ikililiğinin/karşıtlığının kuramsal yorumlara açılabilmesi açısından da önemlidir. Alman sosyal bilimci Jurgen Habermas’ın müzelerin doğum yılları ile çakışan dönemin kamusallığını ve bunun tarih içindeki yapısal dönüşümünü incelediği kitabı, bugün anladığımız anlamı ile “kamusal alan”ı yeniden tanımlarken, onun mekansal karşılıklarını da tartışmaya açmaktadır.

AYŞEN SAVAŞ; B.Arch., M.Arch, Ph.D.

Received M.Arch degrees at METU and Bartlett School of Architecture, London; her Ph.D. degree at Massachusetts Institute of Technology; acted as an advisor to the president of METU (2000-2008). Has been publishing extensively on exhibition design, organizing and curating national and international exhibitions; received many awards including The Schlossman Prize (1994), AAUW International Doctoral Fellowship (1993), Fellowships from Sir John Soane’s Museum and Canadian Centre for Architecture (1992), AIA, American Institute of Architects Special Prize (1990). Currently, teaches courses on representation, museology and architectural design, and acting as a designer and advisor to the public and private museums in Turkey. aysens@metu.edu.tr