

principautés danubiennes, souligne combien ces immigrants grecs, et en particulier les commerçants, contribuèrent largement au développement économique de ces régions à l'époque préphanariote. Cependant, un phénomène d'une telle importance pour l'histoire économique de la péninsule balkanique devrait, selon nous, faire l'objet d'une étude plus spécifique, dans le cadre d'un chapitre distinct, par exemple. Un autre point encore auquel nous n'apportons pas notre totale adhésion est la distinction que propose M. Athanassios E. Karathanassis entre le "*λόγιος*" (*lettré*) et le "*διανοούμενος*" (*intellectuel*), à savoir l'homme studieux et l'"érudit militant". Mais il s'agit là d'un sujet purement théorique et je laisse aux spécialistes de l'histoire de théorie de la littérature le soin d'en discuter. Pour conclure, nous aimerions insister sur l'apport considérable que constitue le livre de M. Athanassios E. Karathanassis dans le domaine de la Littérature néohellénique: une telle étude, en effet, nous apparaît comme une digne contribution à la connaissance de l'Histoire du Néohellénisme pendant l'occupation turque, c'est-à-dire à une époque qui prépara la Renaissance de la Grèce avec ce qu'il est courant d'appeler l'"Aufklärung". Mais voudrions clore cette critique du livre de M. Athanassios Karathanassis en émettant le souhait suivant: que cet ouvrage incite d'autres chercheurs grecs à se pencher, à leur tour, sur de tels sujets en rapport avec l'"interbalkanisme", dont l'étude est-avouons le-fortement négligée dans notre pays.

*Thessalonique, Institut des Etudes Balkaniques*

IOANNIS A. PAPADRIANOS

C. V. Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire: the Sublime Porte, 1789-1922* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1980), xxxiii + 419 pp.

For readers of this journal, Findley's book provides not only specific information but acts as a catalytic agent, to turn antiquated impressions about the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire into an accurate view of the foreign policies of Constantinople: how they emerged, were articulated, and carried out, from Napoleonic to modern times. Information can be found here concerning Balkans affairs, how foreign policy was designed for the Balkans problems and directly affected the destinies of their peoples. General institutional information explains the evolution from a medieval world power to a great but waning Empire, the power, ossification, and eventually the end. Carefully establishing a Weberian frame of reference, the author explains with formidable scholarly apparatus the evolution of the various divisions of bureaucratic power within the Ottoman foreign ministry. It is a picture of movement, of change, of an emergence from a conservative non-Western Empire to a modernizing state constantly in conflict with the Great Powers aiming at its dissolution.

Institutional history, unlike social history, often tends toward dry, often pedantic prose descriptions of administrative functions, those wearisome paper-rustling exercises which necessarily keep bureaucracies running and bureaucrats paid. In this book, however, Findley presents the Ottoman scribal institution with a liveliness of style that focuses our attention on the positive values of bureaucrats rather than their weaknesses. He follows the grand vizirate from its peak about 1600 to its demise in 1923 without boring the reader with unimportant details of method, of artificially arrayed sociological schemes, or heavy emphasis on minor figures. The book falls nicely into six sections: an explanatory introduction of the various actors in determining Ottoman foreign policy, two chapters of description of the

scribal service from its reform in 1789 (as the Empire was actually beginning its long decline) to the various reforms of the *Tanzimat*. Then follow three chapters on the reaction of the Hamidian regime, the sultanic dominion, and the dismantling of that dominion by Young Turks as the Empire became mired in the international politics of World War I.

The author uses examples skillfully to help us understand certain important concepts, such as the "efendi-turned-pasha" syndrome: the upstart who by cleverness or intrigue (or both) becomes a part of the most important leadership in the Empire. An example is Kodja Yusuf, a manumitted Georgian coffeemaker who became Grand Vizier. Another type is Ismail Ferruh, son of a Muslim merchant, who found himself appointed to vitally important diplomatic service abroad. Then there is Mustafa Reshid Pasha's charming gift of a gold watch to a satirist of the pasha's politics. The author thus explains important points: the difficulties the early reforming sultans had in obtaining first rate candidates for important positions; the extraordinary problems Ottoman diplomats faced as they prepared without any experience to serve in the world of the *gavur*; and the evidence of the deep-seated nature of ancient Ottoman convention (in this case, the reaction of an Ottoman gentleman to personal insult) in periods of crisis.

For specialists in the Balkans the book gives information as a television camera focuses on the depths of the ocean. Far more exists than Findley can give us, but what we see excites and explains. His "camera" is his learned ability to understand the Ottoman *Geist* and the complicated Ottoman language, along with his native ability to chisel his sentences and balance his phrases. Even the flow charts, explaining the administrative functioning of the Grand Viziers's ever changing official labors, skillfully draw our attention to important issues. We also notice these charts become increasingly more complicated (another of Findley's points) as the Empire becomes more Westernized and takes on more of the obligations and the panoply of Western diplomatic methods.

What special points does he touch? Findley explains the *Millet* system under which Balkans people existed for so long, especially the limitations of the non-Muslim people, and how important and influential some of these non-Muslims became, despite their legal limitations. He describes the office of the translator of the imperial Divan which became a virtual monopoly of Phanariot Greek families from about 1650 to 1821 who represented a kind of *nobless de robe* in the Ottoman palace. He notes the rise of non-Muslim merchants under Selim III who were given special privileges to compete successfully with European traders. He illustrates the use of minority Greeks in the consular field, citing the case of J. Mavroyeni who performed as a kind of Ottoman *chargé d'affaires* in Vienna. He mentions the enormous reliance the Ottomans had on these Greeks and, when they changed loyalties to an independent state after 1821 and left the Ottoman foreign service denuded, they caused a temporary break in the entire Ottoman diplomatic service. This unreliability of Greeks eventually resulted in the establishment of an Ottoman Translation office. Yet the use of non-Muslims continued. When the last Greek was fired from the translation service in 1822 the Ottomans hired a Christian Armenian to act as assistant to the Ottoman bureau chief.

In the section *Non-Muslims in the Civil Bureaucracy* (pp. 205-09), Findley insightfully describes the "relative precocity with which non-Muslims had espoused cultural westernism valued by the [Ottoman] reformers" (p. 205). So, even after the destruction of the Phanariot *nobless de robe* after 1822, numbers of non-Muslims (increasingly Armenians) found employment in the *Tanzimat* Foreign Ministry, amounting to just under forty percent of the entire service by 1876. Some non-Muslims even became cabinet ministers, though at no time were

any considered for the post of minister of war, foreign affairs, or the grand vizirate. Those posts always remained in the hands of Muslims.

Findley examines the Foreign Ministry as it dissolved under the pressures of the Balkans Wars and World War I. He carefully follows the Balkans Wars not as political issues but as they affected the diplomatic functions of the time: from the dismantling by the Young Turks of the Hamidian regime in 1908 to the development of new organizational structures and the War in 1914. He suggests a general outline of the Ottoman legation service at this period in cities as Athens, Bucharest, Belgrade, and Sofia. He concludes as the ancient Ottoman edifice moved to Anatolia under a completely new polity but carrying with it some of the baggage of the Ottoman past.

Obviously, Professor Findley's book presents an Ottoman view of the institutions of the Ottoman foreign ministry without speculating over or arguing any of the controversies concerning the role of the various foreign policy decisions on peoples of the Balkans or other regions of the Empire. The book explains clearly and lucidly how the foreign ministry system worked. It also explains how the Ottomans, from the Sultan down through the lowest scribal person, eventually realized (usually much too late) that changes had to be made in order to face the future successfully. Yet who are we to smile knowingly, with the command of hindsight, over the errors made and missteps taken by those Ottoman gropers toward security and modernity for their Empire? In the light of present-day affairs, have not the Western Powers often been told of the need to move away from their conservative past, to adopt radical plans that bear the imprint of foreign interpretation and even foreign origin? One will not learn much of what we should do from the Ottoman political experience, for our foreign policy problems differ greatly from mid-nineteenth century Istanbul. But we should view the Ottoman planners and leaders with some degree of compassion as they fumbled to preserve what they thought was a God-given responsibility and saw their actions eventually lead to the demise of their Empire.

Colorado State University

WILLIAM J. GRISWOLD

Panteleimon K. Karanicolas, *Documents Greco-Turks, Concernant la Region de Corinthe, Corinthe, 1983.*

S.E. le Métropolitte de Corinthe Monseigneur Pantéléimon vient de publier un recueil de Documents gréco-turcs concernant la région de Corinthe. Une partie de ces documents, qui constituent une source importante pour l'étude de l'histoire de cette ville et celle du Péloponèse en général, furent découverts dernièrement dans la cave de l'ancien palais épiscopal de Corinthe lors d'un transfert de l'ancienne à la nouvelle résidence du Métropolitte, récemment construite. L'autre partie avait été cédée au prélat par le Monastère de St. Georges dit de Phéneon (Phonia), un vieux Monastère pour hommes au sud du département de Corinthe.

Tout d'abord, un premier classement des documents avait été opéré suivant leur origine: grecs et turcs. Une autre classification avait été effectuée suivant leur taille: grecs de grande taille (33 doc.) et grecs de petite taille (124 doc.); turcs de grande taille (23 doc.) et turcs de petite taille (100 doc.) la numérotation de ces documents qui se trouvent exposés au Musée Ecclésiastique de la ville de Corinthe, récemment construit, avait été faite indépendamment de leur contenu et de la datation.