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In contemporary writing about nineteenth-century photography of the Middle East it has become almost a cliché to describe many of these images as 'Orientalist'—that is, reflecting or propagating a system of representation that creates an essentialized difference between the 'Orient' and the 'West'. Most of these scholars draw on Edward Said's influential book Orientalism, which traces how Europe manufactured an imaginary Orient through literary works and the social sciences. For example, Nissan N. Perez writes in his book Focus East: Early Photography in the Near East (1839-1885) that 'Literature, painting, and photography fit the real Orient into the imaginary or mental mold existing in the Westerner's mind. ... These attitudes are mirrored in many of the photographs taken during this time [the nineteenth century] ... Either staged or carefully selected from a large array of possibilities, they became living visual documents to prove an imaginary reality'.

While the trend to extend Said's analysis to apply equally to visual representations has resulted in trenchant critical analysis, it has also at times been used too broadly, obscuring nuances and inconsistencies, not only between different photographers' bodies of work but also within them. Jiilide Aker explains in her exhibition publication Sight-seeing: Photography of the Middle East and Its Audiences, 1840–1940 that 'Orientalism is, then, a discourse in Michel Foucault's sense of the word: a system of meaning and representation that pervades an entire culture, one that delimits what can be thought or said about its subject and has a specific ideological function. By this definition, no photographic image of the Middle East escapes the net of Western ideas about the region'.

Ayşeh Erdogdu, writing about the sale of photographs of Ottoman 'types' in the Victorian market, concludes that 'In order to be considered authentic enough to circulate in the market, a photograph had to conform to the premises of Victorian society's regime of truth, regardless of the nationality or intentions of the individual photographer who took it. In search of commercial success, Ottoman photographers and Europeans alike embraced the style and subject-matter of picturesque illustrations and orientalist paintings, which were already encoded with the ideology of cultural alterity'. Aker, Erdogdu and others neglect to consider how indigenous photographers, or indeed those Western photographers whose thinking did not precisely match the stereotype of the Orientalist, created individual stylistic responses to the complexities of the real world around them while also contending with that vast 'net of Western ideas'.

The photographic visual conventions of late-nineteenth-century representations of the Middle East were, contrary to the emphasis of much scholarship, not monolithic or hegemonic, but rather reflect a complex range of perspectives—from fictional Orientalist clichés such as erotic harem scenes to the documentary images of modernization found in the Ottoman Sultan Abdul Hamid II's photographic albums. A portion of this range can be illustrated through an analysis of photographs created by the Istanbul-based Sébah family commercial studio in terms of visual form and content, especially in comparison with the work of a prolific and long-standing French family studio located in Beirut, that of the Bonfils. The focus here is on how these two studios chose to photograph people in public places such as markets, streets, mosques, and baths in the period 1870–1900. Looking closely at this portion of their work, it appears that the Bonfils work was generally unable to transcend popular European notions of the 'Orient', while the Sébah family developed a mode of representation that combined a detailed view of local Ottoman society with visual signs of a new modern order. In particular, the Sébah family created a unique style of photographing groups of people in public spaces—what I call 'community portraits'. This style reveals a negotiation between tourist desires for exotic images and local Ottoman self-conceptions as
modern citizens, in the process subverting common European notions of a static and backward Middle East.7

Late-nineteenth-century photography worldwide may at first appear to have a uniformity of style, an easily recognized 'look'. There are certainly characteristics of photographs made in this period that are broadly consistent, such as the sharp focus and minute detail provided by the use of large glass plate negatives. There was also a widespread interest in cataloguing people according to ethnic group or occupation as well as commonalities in the use of studio backdrops, props and poses.8 However, upon closer inspection it becomes clear that there are also significant variations in visual conventions and style. Describing these variations raises complex issues of how representational practices are influenced by cross-cultural interactions, social context, national politics, and personal and group identity. Furthermore, in questioning the usefulness of applying the term Orientalist to a majority of images of the Middle East, I hope to help create a space for seeing the nuances within and between bodies of photographic work and to begin exploring the ways in which non-western photographers adapted and responded to European stylistic influences in the realm of photography.9 Before looking at the work of the Sébah and Bonfils studios, it is important to review the historical context of late-nineteenth-century photographic practice in the Middle East and the deepening relations between Europe and the Ottoman Empire.

Photography and European desires

The desire to document the Middle East in photographs existed from the first unveiling of the photographic process. In the public announcement in Paris of Louis-Jacques-Mandé Daguerre's invention of the daguerreotype process in August 1839, the scientist and politician François Arago described its great future potential with this example:

How archaeology is going to benefit from this new process! It would require twenty years and legions of draftsmen to copy the millions and millions of hieroglyphics covering just the outside of the great monuments of Thebes, Memphis, Karnak, etc. A single man can accomplish this same enormous task with the daguerreotype.10

The nineteenth century's passion for cataloging, collecting and explaining the world in scientific, empirical terms was manifested in the formation of new disciplines such as anthropology and sociology, new theories like Darwin's evolution, as well as in the ways society used the new technology of photography. The photographer's ability to record more life-like detail than any other process led to its use as a tool for accumulating visual surveys of urban space, historical monuments, colonial possessions, and people as ethnic or occupational 'types'.

The Middle East was the first region outside Europe and the USA to be subject to these visual surveys of landscape, architecture and people. By the time Daguerre's photographic process was announced in Paris in 1839 as a new invention, European popular interest in the Middle East had already been firmly established. Oriental motifs had been appropriated for use in clothing fashions, literature, music, furniture, drawings and paintings since the sixteenth century. As soon as photographers developed ways to photograph outside their own backyards they immediately headed to Egypt, Palestine and Istanbul. The earliest photographers to travel to the Middle East did not photograph for commercial purposes but were primarily wealthy tourists or explorers of archaeological ruins (often for government sponsors) such as Maxime Du Camp—traveling with Gustave Flaubert—and Auguste Salzmann. By the late 1850s the wet collodion process of making glass negatives allowed for the creation of multiple, affordable prints for mass consumption. From the 1860s, photographers like Francis Frith and Félix Bonfils quickly found commercial success with a European public fascinated by the 'East' as well as with tourists travelling in the region seeking mementos to take home.

Commercial photography studios: the Sébah and Bonfils families

The Sébah and Bonfils families were permanent residents of the Ottoman Empire and established long-lasting local studios, unlike many other photographers who worked in the Middle East for a short period and then returned to Europe with their negatives. However, the Sébah family was of local heritage, while the Bonfils were Europeans who had moved to Beirut from France. Pascal Sébah was born in 1823 in Istanbul to a Syrian Catholic father and an Armenian mother. In 1857 he opened his first photography studio.11 Upon moving in 1860 to a better location, on the fashionable Grande Rue de Féra, he employed a young Frenchman, A. Laroche, to run the studio. In 1873 Sébah was successful enough to open a studio in Cairo, which is when Laroche left to work elsewhere. Most of Sébah's customers in both cities were tourists, but he also participated regularly in exhibitions in Paris, winning a number of medals and becoming a member of the Société Française de Photographie, an organization devoted to furthering the art and science of photography.

In 1873 Sébah began a collaboration with the acclaimed Turkish painter Osman Hamdi to photograph models for his paintings. Although Hamdi painted in the traditional Orientalist style of Europeans such as his mentor Jean-Léon Gérôme, he utilized compositions that countered their exoticized and eroticized vision. Instead he offered a view of life in the Ottoman Empire where girls in sumptuous palaces read books rather than recline voluptuously in semi-nudity and where men of religion debate and study rather than worship fanatically.12 It was through his relationship with Osman Hamdi that Sébah landed the commission to photograph folk costumes of the Empire's provinces for the Ottoman Exhibition in Vienna in 1873, bringing him acclaim from both Europe and the Ottoman court.
Pascal Sébah died in 1886 and his brother Cosmi Sébah then managed his studio until Pascal’s son, Jean, joined him in 1888. At this time Jean Sébah acquired a French partner, Policarpe Joalllier, and they worked together until the early 1900s. In addition to their studio work in Istanbul, Sébah and Joalllier were commissioned to provide photographs of neatly arranged rows of school children across the Empire for the 1893 Abdul Hamid II albums depicting modernization. One set of these fifty-one albums was featured in the Ottoman displays at the World’s Colombian Exposition held in Chicago in 1893 and was then donated to the United States Library of Congress.

Félix Bonfils, a former book-binder in France, moved with his wife Marie-Lydie and son Adrien in 1867 to Beirut, where they set up their photographic studio, later operating additional studios in Cairo and Alexandria. According to Nissan Perez, the Bonfils family created one of the largest bodies of photographic work in the Near East. Their subjects included all the usual themes from Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Greece: monuments, landscapes (often titled with Biblical references), and people classified according to type. Certain studio shots of people have been shown to be false representations, with the same model posing as a rabbi in one and a cotton carder in another. When Félix died in 1885 (just a year before Pascal Sébah), his wife and son continued the business along with a number of assistants.

Relations between the Ottoman Empire and Europe

In the late nineteenth century, Beirut and Istanbul were still part of the Ottoman Empire. Especially in Istanbul, indigenous photographers such as Pascal Sébah emerged early in photographic history, and, although they interacted with many European social forces, they were not under colonial rule. In 1839, when photography was officially revealed, Europe had economic and political interests in the Middle East, in addition to popular cultural fascinations. In 1838, for instance, the Ottoman Empire had signed the Anglo-Ottoman Convention, the first of several treaties that opened up the Ottoman provinces to European merchants, giving them unprecedented access to markets. Since the eighteenth century the sultans had been implementing reforms based on European models in military, educational, technological and scientific fields. Inspired by Eugène Hausmann’s rebuilding of Paris in the late nineteenth century, architectural and urban planning efforts had begun to transform Istanbul into a modernized European-style capital.

Sébah’s ‘community portrait’ style

Photographers in the Middle East, especially those in commercial studios catering to both local residents and tourists, had to contend with these various representations of the Ottoman Empire that ranged from European fantasies to local efforts to promote modernization. In surveying the work of the Sébah and Bonfils studios, one particular style of photographing people stands out as a unique response to these pressures. This style recurred especially in the work of Pascel Sébah but also in the work of his son Jean Sébah with Jean’s partner Joalllier, but rarely elsewhere. This is what I call the ‘community portrait’. The basic form is that of a group photographed in a public setting, with the subjects all looking into the camera and not posed as if engaged in typical activities. In the work of European photographers like Frith and the Bonfils family this particular visual mode of depicting individuals is seen only vaguely in occasional market scenes. Instead, they preferred to photograph people as recognizable ‘types’, posed as if engaged in traditional and timeless activities, such as brewing coffee, selling...
produce, praying or playing musical instruments. The arrangement of people for a photograph was deliberately decided by the photographer; most photographs in this period had to be set up and posed due to slow shutter speeds and large, heavy camera equipment that required a tripod. The Sébah style appears to be a deliberate attempt to depict the Ottoman Empire, particularly Istanbul and Bursa, as orderly, prosperous and modern but not explicitly Western. Instead of portraying modern life as existing in the most Europeanized sections of the city such as Péra or in modernized institutions such as military academies, the Sébah family created an impression of modern order within community life in 'traditional' and historical locations. This focus seems to make a claim that Ottoman modernity was emerging from Ottoman history and culture, rather than being imported from Europe.

A clear example of this unique community portrait style is entitled 'Intérieur du Grand Bazar' (figure 1). The Grand Bazaar is the central market of Istanbul, built in the late fifteenth century, and a place all tourists would likely visit. Most people in this Grand Bazaar photograph are well dressed, the scene is orderly and clean, and the shops look prosperous and well maintained. What is most striking about this photograph is that it has the character of a modern promotional image advertising what appears to be Istanbul's productive business climate rather than illustrating an ethnographic or exotic scene of difference. Everyone in the frame is standing still and virtually all are looking at the camera in what is surely a busy market. The blurred dog reveals this as a long exposure during which the merchants had to hold their poses. Why would Sébah go to the trouble to set this up as a portrait when he could have made a lively photograph showing the movement of the crowds bustling through the market? It is probable that, being indoors, the exposure would be so long that people moving would become too obscured for Sébah’s taste. It is also possible that tourists preferred photos where the individuals could be looked at closely, as in the ubiquitous studio shots of people as ‘types’, which the Sébah family also made. However, the group’s direct gaze at the camera and their straightforward poses—without the excessive use of props that would signify them as types—makes this photograph a group portrait of an active community in their everyday environment.

Another photograph of the same subject, dated ca. 1873, uses the same arrangement of merchants lined up in front of shops in the Grand Bazaar (figure 2). The compositions of both photographs locate the subjects in their social context. Sébah has done this by angling the camera so that in looking down the street we gather information, seeing, for example, how the market is structured so that shops that sell fabric or clothing are clustered together or how not all fabric merchants dress alike. This may seem trivial information, but it is quite different from the impression given by a more typical nineteenth-century image of a Middle Eastern working man. For example, the Bonfils photograph ‘Water carriers emptying their goat skin waterbags’ (approx. 1885–1901), carries an Orientalist implication of the Middle East as a place outside of time (figure 3). By consciously omitting any individual or social details in the photograph, Bonfils proposes that this is how all Egyptian water carriers appear. The corner where two walls come together that he uses as background reveals nothing about either the water carriers or about the city fabric around them. This set-up is as close to a studio photograph as possible, without being inside the studio. Even the wooden latticework over the windows look suspiciously like props. In this type of Bonfils photograph the focus is on the individual body and the symbolic props or postures it displays that point to a stereotype known to Europeans. The Sébah community portrait style, in contrast, emphasizes a group of individuals and their connections to a larger society, a complex interaction that is difficult to deduce from the photograph, thus eluding easy stereotyping.

Bonfils photographs that come closest to the formal style of Sébah community portraits still present noticeable differences in composition, and thus impact. For example, a Bonfils photograph of Cairo’s Khan Khalili market, ‘Magasin de tapis au Khan Khalil au Caire’, at first glance appears simply to depict merchants as they wait for customers in their shop (figure 4). However, the arrangement of two men seated on the floor, with carpets spread out between them and watched over by three other men (who are marked as their superiors by their clothing and positions on chairs), implies that the men are deliberately posed. One man even holds up the end of a carpet, half-heartedly, as if a potential customer is on the other side of the camera. The viewer of the photograph is inserted into the place where the traveler would stand to gaze at the merchants hawking their merchandise. The oblique view in the Sébah photographs of the Grand Bazaar in Istanbul does not narrow the gaze to one ‘typical’ shop, but instead reveals an orderly but busy social scene.

The ‘Marchand de Kebabs à Stamboul’ by Sébah falls into the category of a community portrait in that a wide variety of men are simply standing in their environment rather than being posed in the simulation of a street or shop scene (figure 5). It is this emphasis on individuals rather than types acting out a scenario that makes this image different from the Bonfils carpet merchants, who fill roles rather than representing themselves. In this photograph, besides the heterogeneous clothing styles that hint at the diversity of people within the Ottoman Empire, one of the most interesting details is the photograph framed and hanging behind the kebab chef. It is hanging to the left of a calendar and 2 clock on the wall, prominently displayed for patrons to see. Looking closely at the pattern of lights and darks, it is possible to make out a scene very similar to the one shown in this photograph. Clearly the kebab stand, along with its proprietors and customers, has been photographed before, raising interesting
Figure 1. Sébhad and Joaillier, 858: Intérieur du Grand Bazar, gelatin silver print, 8⅝ × 10⅝ in, undated. Visual Collections of the Fine Arts Library, Harvard University, James Ackerman Photograph Collection, JAC.111.

Figure 2. Sébhad and Joaillier, untitled, albumen print, 8⅝ × 10⅝ in, ca. 1873. University of Pennsylvania Museum Archives Photographic Collection.
questions about the social uses and circulation of photographs in the Ottoman Empire in the late nineteenth century. Was the photograph on the wall taken expressly as a portrait for this local merchant or was it an image taken for tourists that then wound up on his wall? The people here look to the camera without wielding props, as if their individual portraits rather than their occupational or ethnic identities are what is important. This mode of posing makes them coalesce into a community rather than appear as types, anonymous passers-by or as undifferentiated members of a crowd.

Presenting Disorder, Representing Order

An example of a market scene photographed in a style that contrasts with the community portrait mode is the Bonfils photograph ‘Rue du Caire et mosquée Sultan Barkouk’ (ca. 1885–1901) (figure 6). The fact that no one is looking at the camera or posing makes this image appear to illustrate the city of Cairo more successfully than those Bonfils photographs that are clearly set-up to represent a pre-conceived idea. We may see this photograph now as more neutral than those that are orchestrated—whether by Sébah or Bonfils—but at the turn-of-the-century a photograph like this may have reflected and helped perpetuate common notions of the Middle East as chaotic and backward, and thus in need of Western governance.

Timothy Mitchell’s book Colonising Egypt explains how the colonising process undertaken by Britain in Egypt was designed to impose order on what was seen as a system without structure. Mitchell reproduces a Bonfils photograph of the al-Azhar mosque in Cairo as an example of European descriptions of what they saw as the disorder prevailing in this teaching-mosque. Bonfils’ market scenes (and those of many other photographers) often give an impression of disorder and decay, such as the Bonfils photograph ‘Vue générale du marche de Bosla’ (figure 7). The jumble of jars in the foreground is mirrored by the scattered figures seated and wandering in the background. There is no obvious pathway through the market, and it is impossible to distinguish between customers and merchants or to understand how this market is structured. In the context of this sort of representation and its potential to validate European intervention in the Middle East, the Sébah style of community portrait looks like a conscious effort to counteract the prevailing image of disorder with an image of a non-western, locally produced order and structure. In the community portrait style, order and structure are emphasized, not only in people’s dress and attentive and composed demeanor but also in the architecture of buildings and the organization of shops, which is highlighted by an arrangement of people that allows an unobstructed view (figures 1 and 2).

While the Bonfils photograph of carpet merchants appears orderly (figure 4), there is a difference between the deliberately casual arrangement of individuals in Sébah’s work and this photograph’s posed quality. The Bonfils family’s work was explicitly created for the purpose of capturing what they saw as a timeless unchanging Orient on the verge of disruption by modernity. Adrien Bonfils wrote that ‘Before that happens, before Progress has completed its destructive work, before this present—which is still the past—has disappeared forever, we have tried, so to speak, to fix and immobilize it in a series of photographic views’. The Bonfils family was not interested in illustrating present-day realities, but preferred to recreate for the camera what they saw as the region’s ‘pristine character and special cachet’. This desire can be seen in their posed photographs of water-sellers, carpet merchants, tinsmiths and other occupational and ethnic types, as well as in their deliberate focus on the traditional, rural and Biblical, to the exclusion of all indications of modernization.

Contrary to the Bonfils studio, the Sébah family seems to have gone to great lengths to create the impression of contemporary order, efficiency and progress. Sébah photographs do not participate in the creation of an image of backwardness and decay in the empire, an impression that was commonly evoked in Europe as a reason for the Ottoman Empire’s decline in power. But rather than depict the Empire’s modernizing nature as residing solely in its adoption of European dress, schooling, architecture, urban planning, or military training, as Sultan Abdul Hamid’s albums did, Sébah photographs use the community portrait

Figure 5. Sébah and Joaillier, 707: *Marchand de Kébabs à Stamboul*, gelatin silver print, 8¼ × 19½ in, undated. Visual Collections of the Fine Arts Library, Harvard University, James Ackerman Photograph Collection, JAC.112.
style to show order within indigenous structures. The markets are seen as commercially thriving and well organized in the photographs analysed above. Later photographs, especially many made in Bursa in 1894 (taken by Pascal’s son Jean Sébah and partner Joaillier), maintain this spirit but extend it into different settings and compositions.

The year 1894 in Bursa seems significant to the Sébah and Joaillier studio. Unlike most Sébah photographs, many of their Bursa photographs are dated directly on each image. Perhaps they were taken on commission or the photographers simply decided this former Ottoman capital was under-represented in their stock. Whatever the explanation for this focus, the photographs are intriguing for their composed but natural depictions of people. A rare depiction of modern manufacturing is the photograph ‘Intérieur de la Filature à Soie de Bay Frères’ (Interior of the Bay Brothers Silk Spinning Factory) (figure 8). The women and girls sit in their work positions in rows on right and left, looking at the camera, while a male supervisor stands, with hands in pockets, between the rows and towards the back. At the far end of the room a woman with hands clasped at her waist stands alertly
in the doorway. The composition mirrors earlier Sébah photographs taken in the community portrait style; people sit for a portrait without pretending to be working or wielding excessive props to signify their identity as types. The photograph of silk spinners is a representation of modern work practices, rather than the more typical romantic image of lone craftsmen working with traditional tools, such as the Bonfils photograph of a tinsmith titled 'Ferblantier juif à Jerusalem', ca. 1876–1885 (figure 9).

Two additional examples of Sébah and Joaillier photographs of Bursa in 1894 that were taken in the community portrait style are 'Bains de Yani-Kaplidja. Intérieur' and 'Intérieur de la grand Mosquee, Oulou' (figures 10, 11). In both the bath and the mosque the men and boys depicted are compositionally arranged for aesthetic effect but are not shown engaged in any activity such as bathing or praying; instead they gaze confidently at the camera. This portrayal is in stark contrast to the photograph 'Prière musulmane' by Bonfils, ca. 1885–1901 (figure 12). The two men are clearly in a studio with a painted backdrop, demonstrating prayer positions explicitly for the benefit of the camera and the tourist gaze.

**Between Orientalism and Modernity**

Many of the Sébah family's photographs make use of conventional European clichés prevalent at the time in
deictions of the Middle East, prompting some writers to label their work Orientalist. Upon closer examination, however, a portion of their work also reveals a vision of the Ottoman Empire different from that of European photographers. In particular, their unique community portraits, which emphasize order and modernity within indigenous historical structures, indicate a perspective that does not fit comfortably into the Orientalist mode.

As Zeynep Çelik has noted in the context of Ottoman representations in the late-nineteenth-century world’s fairs,
while ‘many Muslim nations accepted European supremacy and attempted to remodel their institutions according to Western precedents, they were also searching for cultural identity under the strong impact of European paradigms’.

She goes on to explain that ‘European paradigms were not simplistically appropriated; they were often filtered through a corrective process, which reshaped them according to self-visions and aspirations’. Similarly, the Sébah family’s photographic studio creatively adapted some European conventions, such as photographs of occupational types, to suit their ‘self-visions’ as modernizing and yet possessing a rich history, and as dignified members of diverse, cohesive local communities. They achieved this adaptation through the development of a community portrait style. The style diverged from the typical European perspective of the Ottoman Empire by emphasizing order within the context of the local social fabric, while at the same time depicting places and peoples that tourists were curious about, such as markets, merchants, bath houses and mosques. The Bonfils family may have felt ‘love’ for their adopted country, as Carney E. S. Gavin maintains, but their affection was for a European vision of a static, romantically traditional world whose people could be described through familiar character-types from the Bible or tales from 1001 Nights. While Bonfils photographs are certainly not the most extreme of European Orientalist representations of the Middle East, they make a useful comparison with those of the Sébah family since both were prolific, long-standing studios that represented the Ottoman Empire through the end of the nineteenth century.

What do the Sébah family’s community portraits reveal about photographic practice in the Ottoman Empire? These unique images suggest that photographic visual style in commercial studios did not copy European conventions and clichés and cater to pre-existing desires in the tourist markets as uncritically as is generally assumed. The Sébah family appears to have introduced a new style of representation to the tourist audience—or perhaps they developed other clients with different needs. The ghostly presence of the framed photograph hanging on the wall of the kebab stand provokes us to investigate further the intriguing and little-known social life of photographs in the Ottoman Empire.
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20. Other typical uses of figures by all photographers in this era was as a measure of scale when depicting monuments, and studio portraits of both individuals and types. These practices will not be addressed here.

21. Although the image is marked with the Sébah and Joallier signature, Engin Özende, in her book *From Sébâh & Joallier to Foto Sébah: Orientalism in Photography*, identifies this photograph as one taken by Pascal Sébah but gives no date. However, this would certainly date the photo before 1886, the year Pascal died. An observation by Jeffrey B. Spurr, the Cataloguer for Islamic Art at the Aga Khan Program for Islamic Architecture, Fine Arts Library, Harvard University suggests a later date. He notes that Sébah and Joallier did not appear to erase or even cross out Pascal Sébah’s signatures on negatives, but would only add their own number. This would suggest that the photograph, which bears no evidence of Pascal Sébah’s signature, is indeed by Sébah and Joallier not Pascal Sébah and would thus date between 1888 and the early 1900s. Öztuncay notes that it sold for many years as a postcard and in souvenir albums, indicating that at least one audience for this image was tourists.

22. This photograph is untitled, except with the number 76, but is identified as the Grand Bazaar in Istanbul.
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