

nun yanında, altıncı bir duyunun varlığını kabul etmemektedir. Ancak bu beş duyuya baęlı olarak çeşitli nesnelere bir arada algılayabilen “ortak duyum”un varlığından bahseder. Ancak bu ortak duyuya başka herhangi bir organ tahsis etmez. Bu ortak duyuyu dięer bütün duyu organlarımız vasıtasıyla idrak ederiz; yani bu, bir nevi beş duyu organının bir sentezidir .

Eserin çevirisinin ağır bir dili olup anlaşılması son derece güçtür. Her ne kadar Türkçeye çevrilmesi ilim dünyasında takdir edilecek bir durumsa da, eserde yer yer birbirinden kopuk, karmaşık ve birtakım malumat yığınlarına dönüşen kısımlar vardır. Ayrıca mütercim uzun dipnotlarla sık sık metne müdahale etmektedir ki bu da okuyucuda sanki şerhli bir metin okuyormuş gibi bir izlenim uyandırmaktadır.

Anar Gafarov

### **Ottoman Reform and Muslim Regeneration: Studies in Honour of Prof. Butrus Abu-Manneh**

Edited by Itzhak Weismann and Fruma Zachs

London: I. B. Tauris, 2005. 240 pages.

This collection of twelve essays is concerned, in the words of the editors, “with the centre-periphery and state-Islam cleavages during the long nineteenth century of Ottoman attempts at regeneration and reform” (p.3). The volume makes a contribution to the ongoing reassessment to the era, which presents late Ottoman history from an approach of continuum between traditional and modern aspects, instead of a dichotomist understanding. The new emphasis is on the inner processes of change undertaken by a complex society instead of an exaggerated influence of Western actors. I see this substantial shift as a consequence of our *zeitgeist*, which has taught many historians not to see the world from within the cages of actual political settings, like that of the Cold War.

In the opening essay, Ş. Tufan Buzpınar introduces the debate about the caliphate under the last sultans. He identifies two periods of the Ottoman Caliphate and deals with issues concerning the second period, beginning after the Küçük Kaynarca Treaty of 1774. Buzpınar emphasizes the developments that shaped the Ottoman sultans’ modern concepts about the Caliphate, es-

pecially during the reign of Abdülhamid II, whose position as caliph was challenged by the writings of retired civil servants of the British government in India who were being inconvenienced by the Indian Muslim support for the Ottoman Caliph. Buzpinar briefly introduces some of the many treatises devoted to the subject in a variety of languages during the Hamidian reign. He also refers to the debate about the hadith that reserved the caliphate for the tribe of Prophet Muhammad, the Quraysh, by pointing out the views of Lutfi Pasha, Pirizade, Ibn Khaldun, and others. Buzpinar comes to the conclusion that from the 1770's on the Ottoman Sultans increasingly employed the institution of the Caliphate for political reasons like legitimating internal reforms and supporting Muslims in the colonised territories.

Hakan T. Karateke explores the attempts to change the rule of Ottoman succession, which had been the rule of seniority since 1617. In line with Friedrich Giese, he argues that the attempt to change the rule of succession to a patriarchal system, with the son inheriting from the father, was a part of Sultan Abdülmecid's project to bring the Ottoman monarchy closer to that of the European monarchies. As the rule of seniority allowed elderly members of the dynasty to become Sultans, the rule of seniority came to be regarded as an obstacle to modernization. Abdülmecid's plan, which was intended to allow his eldest son Murad to succeed to the throne instead of his brother Abdülaziz, proceeded in a carefully planned way: Semi-official newspapers began to publish articles on the modes of succession in European monarchies; the Sultan took Murad along on trips, contrary protocol. Although Abdülmecid's sudden death left his plan unrealized, rumors were so pervasive that tension arose between the statesmen who supported the two different sides for succession. Interestingly, after his ascent to power, Sultan Abdülaziz began to capitalize on the issue that had been created, wanting to use it in favor of his son, Yusuf İzzeddin, but in vain. Karateke closes the issue by noting that Sultan Abdülhamid II later had intentions to leave the throne to his son Burhaneddin. The second part of Karateke's article is concerned with the idea of dethroning the Ottoman dynasty, where he compiles interesting rumors about transferring the Caliphate to the Mevlevi *chelebi* family of Konya, to Midhat Pasha, to Sharif Abdulmuttalib, to the Muhammad Ali dynasty of Egypt or to the Crimean Khans.

After providing a brief overview about the Khâlidî branch of the Naqshbandiyya brotherhood, which successfully spread through Daghestan and motivated the resistance against Russia in the first half of the nineteenth century,

Moshe Gammer illustrates how Ottoman reforms influenced the Khâlidî leadership, particularly that of the famous Shaykh Shâmil. By doing so, Gammer presents an alternative to Russian sources, which take it for granted that Shâmil's regulations were an imitation of the Russian military and administration, due to the several hundred Russian captives and deserters in his territory. He demonstrates the close relationship between Shâmil and the Ottoman Empire and Shâmil's respect for the empire as a source of imitation and legislation, and briefly identifies the agents of this relationship. Gammer's contribution is important in tying Daghestan and Chechnya's history with the Islamic world, which is a perspective that is generally discouraged by Western scholars to date.

Itzchak Weismann deals with another associate of the Naqshbandiyya-Khâlidîyya brotherhood. Ibn Âbidîn, the outstanding religious scholar in the Syrian lands during the early nineteenth century is known as the last major traditional jurist in the Hanafi School. Weismann repeats Wael Hallaq's presentation of Ibn Âbidîn as an innovator who elevated custom (*'urf*) to the status of a legal source, and paved the way to modern legal reform. This approach is exaggerated by Haim Gerber to the extent that he calls Ibn Âbidîn's treatment of *'urf* 'the practical secularization of Islamic law'. These authors fail to see that *'urf* was always a vital source of Islamic jurisprudence. After having touched shortly to these comments, Weismann illustrates a forgotten side of Ibn Âbidîn's life, thought and work, namely the Sufi aspect. Weismann identifies the place that Sufism came to hold within Ibn Âbidîn's overall program of legal reform, referring to his books. Weismann narrates Ibn Âbidîn's relations with the contemporary Naqshbandî Shaikh Khâlid al-Baghdâdî and his attraction with the Shari'a-minded Sufism, noting that a chance of history brought together the last major pre-modern Hanafi jurist and the last major pre-modern Sufi master. It is interesting to learn that the jurist's last treatise, an epistle defending Shaikh Khâlid against the slander of Abdulwahhâb al-Sûsî, was about Sufi beliefs and practices.

David Commins draws attention to an unexamined dimension of the Ottoman-Wahhâbi relations. Previous assumptions neglected Ottoman Arabian Hanbalis, sourcing all Hanbalis of the peninsula to the anti-Ottoman Wahhâbi side. Commins' interpretation of traditional anti-Wahhâbi Hanbalism relies on a nineteenth-century biographical dictionary by Ibn Humayd (1820-78). Commins states that "Western scholars have been wrong to ascribe to Hanbalis a deep-seated antipathy toward Sufism", referring to the re-

visionist historians of Hanbalism, John Voll and George Makdisi, and reminding us that the latter established the Sufi affiliation of the supposedly anti-Sufi Ibn Taymiyya.

A case study of Hamidian Islamic policy is Gökhan Çetinsaya's contribution to the collection. He examines Abdülhamid II's relations with the Quadi-ri families in the province of Musul, reinforcing the arguments about the Sultan's Islamic policy and the history of the Quadi-riyya brotherhood in Iraq. He touches upon the issue of tribal conflict between the Barzinjis and the Talabani and how the authorities dealt with it, basing his study on Ottoman archival documents. Tribal and religious infighting in the 1890s troubled the government that proposed radical measures to the Sultan, with the latter declining these proposals from a fear that they would alienate the sheikhs and *agh-has*. The Sultan continued to be anxious to conciliate the *tariqa* leaders, even in his last years, the 1900s. He refused to use armed forces against religious notables and did not pursue radical measures against them. The joining of the sheikh families to the oppositional forces of the Young Turk era should be regarded as a consequence of this Hamidian policy.

Fruma Zachs and Basilius Bawardi trace the ideas of Ottomanism and the Syrian patriotism of Sâlim al-Bustânî (1846-84), a Christian Arab intellectual in Beirut and the son of the well-known Butrus al-Bustânî (1819-93). His writings in the periodical *al-Jinân* (publ. 1870-86) are the main source for the writers, who illustrate how Christian intellectuals continued to regard Ottomanism and Syrian patriotism as complementary. The Ottoman Constitution of 1876 was significant in the eyes of Sâlim al-Bustânî, because of its potential to protect him as a member of a minority group against the possible tyranny of unjust governors, and as an essential condition for *tamaddun* in the empire. During these years, Ottomanism received more emphasis in his writings at the expense of his local Syrian identity. He upholds his local patriotism through his vision of Ottomanism, as did many other intellectuals like him. From the beginning of the 1880s, after Midhat Pasha's exile and the continuation of the suspension of the constitution, Sâlim softened the call for reforms and the idea of Ottomanism. He began to criticize the Ottoman Empire by emphasizing the confederate systems of the United States and Switzerland, and giving Egypt as a model as a place where many local intellectuals had emigrated.

The Syrian educated elite and their literary renaissance that evolved in the late nineteenth century forms the main focus of Ami Ayalon's essay. He identifies Beirut, Cairo, and Istanbul as the three active centers of this awakening. Here he focuses on the activities in Syrian cities beyond the Lebanese epicentre by investigating the letters that came from Syria to the Egyptian based periodicals of *al-Muqtataf* and *al-Hilâl*. Ayalon adds more interesting data to his study by examining the lists of subscribers to Butrus al-Bustânî's journal *al-Jinân* (1870-86). His findings show that educated readers of the region were predominantly Christian townsmen, although many Ottoman Muslim civil and religious officials were included, as can be seen from the elaborately prepared lists in the appendix. Ayalon's article underlines the necessity of carefully examining a broader type of material in Ottoman studies, as well as the role of prosopographic methods.

Kais M. Firro, in his contribution that deals with the impact of Ottoman reforms on Jabal Hawran from 1860, summarizes the decline of Druze power in Lebanon and the emergence of Hawran as the Druzes' new political centre after a civil war and immigration. The feudal *mashyakha* system of the Druzes was led by eight families of whom the Atrash family took the supremacy between 1862 and 1878. Firro describes the Ottoman struggle to establish direct rule over the area, as well as the dilemma of the Tanzimat state, whose general thrust was to foster the stratum of the local notables, but which designed the administrative divisions in Jabal al-Duruz according to the internal balance of forces within the Druze society. The double process of strengthening the indigenous *mashyaka* system and the extension of Ottoman central control was completed in twenty years. Firro incorrectly describes Huseyin Fawzi Pasha as the governor of Damascus who was the predecessor of Nashid Pasha; rather he was the *müşir* of the Fifth Army between August 1880 and April 1882.

Mustafa Abbasi undertakes an assessment of the impact of the Tanzimat reforms on the small interior rural town of Safad, with a special emphasis on the Arab notables. This is also the first modern study on the Arab community of this small town. Abbasi examines how reforms were applied in a remote interior town without much delay and how notable families were integrated into the new administrative system.

Nimrod Luz, who is an Israeli fellow of the Ben-Gurion University, approaches the issue of the so-called imperialistic character of the Ottoman regime

through a twenty-page long analysis of the creation of the town of Beersheba in the Negev desert. He highlights the enforcement of a grid-patterned city plan and the symbolism invested in the city landscape. Luz highlights the recurrent theme of “ongoing feuds, tribal rivalry, and outbursts of intertribal wars”, “the violence and instability in the region of Arab Bedouins”, and defines the Ottoman attitude towards these tribes as one of suspicion and mistrust. He concurs with the controversial fashionable “Ottoman imperialism” approach of Hansen, Philip and Weber, who think that this was a case of imperialism without colonies, but which still generated colonial situations in certain places and at certain times. Luz, who never uses the Ottoman name of Beersheba (*Bi’r al-Sab’*) in his article, or any original Ottoman document, mistakenly supposes that the “Jamal Pasha Park”, the construction of which began in 1901, was “named after the Ottoman governor of Syria”, whereas there was never any such Ottoman governor in Syria. The park could have been named after the famous commander Cemal Pasha, who was with the Ottoman army in Syria from 1915-1917.

The concluding essay by Thomas Philipp, based on his analysis of three journals, takes up the issue of the perceptions of the First World War in the contemporary Arab press. Philipp traces the course of the Arab intellectuals’ understanding of the Great War and the fighting sides. He adds *al-Manâr*, which was published by the Muslim intellectual Rashid Rida, to the two magazines, which as mentioned, Ami Ayalon concentrated on. The examined magazines, *al-Manâr*, *al-Hilâl* and *al-Muqtataf*, were all published in Egypt and were a major means of reproducing European ideas for the Arabic reader and popularizing Western thought. Disengagement from the Ottoman Empire and its history, as well as the faith in the European model of progress are other themes explored in Philipp’s essay. In particular, he compares the ideas of Rashid Rida with the writers of the two other magazines, who differed strongly in their responses to the Great War.

This is a provocative piece, based on extensive use of archival material, including sources that have only become available in the past two decades. Previous historians have failed to undertake the kind of exhaustive research in the relevant languages and from a broad international perspective that would bring us closer to the perspectives of Islam in the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire.

Although the individual essays make useful contributions on their specific topics, cumulatively the collection does not add up to a coherent and persuasive overall reassessment of the period. This might have been supplied by a concluding synthetic essay bringing together the insights of the various essays and systematically pitting them against the prevailing consensus. Some of the essays do not make a sufficient attempt to address the broader historiography or to clearly spell out how their findings qualify or subvert our existing interpretations of the era. For experts in the field this presents less of a problem, but for others less well versed in the historiography of the post-Tanzimat period it is more difficult to discern the key elements of the claimed reassessment and to determine their significance. But it is still an important work, as previous scholarly works on these topics have been highly politicized. This book is a valuable contribution to our understanding of Ottoman reform and Islam in general, as well as the particular process of the later era, which was full of conflicts.

Abdülhamit Kırmızı

### **Kadın Karşıtı Söylemin İslâm Geleneğindeki İzdüşümleri**

Hidayet Şevkatli Tuksal

Ankara: Kitabiyat, 2000. 267 sayfa.

Bu eser 2000 yılından bu yana yayımlanan kendi sahasındaki en önemli kitaplardan biridir. Hidayet Şevkatli Tuksal, bilhassa tarihî bir bakış açısıyla kadın karşıtı söylemin İslâm geleneğindeki izdüşümlerini sürüp kitabına önce ataerkil anlayış ve bu anlayışla mücadele eden kadın hareketinin kısa bir özetini vererek başlamaktadır. Tuksal öncelikle Kur'an'ın insana bakışını ve insan anlayışını ortaya koymaya çalışmıştır.

Eser, "Önsöz", "Giriş", dört bölüm, "Sonuç", "Ekler", "Kaynakça" ve "Dizin"den oluşmaktadır. "Kur'an Muhtevasında Kadının Konumu ve Ataerkil Geleneğin Tesirleri" başlıklı "I. Bölüm"de Kur'an'ın çizdiği insan tipolojisinden ve Kur'an'ın kadına yönelik mesajlarından bahsedilmiştir. "II. Bölüm"de ise kendisinin kadın karşıtı saydığı hadislerden birinde geçen kadının eğriliği ifadesini ele almaktadır. "III. Bölüm"de ise eksiklik söylemine değinmektedir. Bu rivayetleri ele almadan önce eksiklik söylemine ilişkin rivayetlerin başka