

graphy, historical demography, military and political history, economic life, social history, religious and artistic life, the study of place-names and personal names, and the study of language in general.

E. MICROYANNAKIS

Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, editors. *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The Functioning of a Plural Society*. Volume I. *The Central Lands*, p.p. 447. Volume II. *The Arabic-Speaking Lands*, pp. 207, New York and London, Holmes and Meier, 1982. Bibliography and index.

The last generation has seen increased interest in the study of the relationship between the Ottomans and their subjects and the mechanism of minority self-preservation. The two volumes under review, presenting thirty of the papers from an extended research seminar on the «Millet System» held at Princeton University in 1978, fill a long overdue lacuna in the scholarly treatment of the subject populations of the Ottoman Empire. Volume I contains five parts: The Islamic Background, the early history of the subject communities, the institutional framework of the minorities in the eighteenth century, an examination of the socio-economic changes during the nineteenth century and of the constitutional experience of the various minorities toward the end of the empire, and a concluding survey of the Ottoman archival materials on the Millets. Volume II deals with Egypt, Palestine, Lebanon and Syria from the sixteenth to the early twentieth century and the regional peculiarities within the empire. There is also a bibliography for further study.

The value of these essays lies in the new approaches to old problems and re-definitions, e. g., of the term 'millet', based on a necessary and contemporary re-examination of familiar and some new sources. They explore older, more simplistic myths, but also indicate welcome lines for future research. In a work of this nature there are necessary overlaps in terms of material discussed and conclusions reached albeit from a different perspective in each case. Yet these overlaps reinforce the overall impressions gained for each piece. Each complements the other to reproduce the complicated interactions that denoted the reality of Ottoman society. The wide range of subjects treated in these volumes are beyond the expertise of one reviewer to handle adequately. The following comments then are restricted primarily to those subjects within this reviewer's areas of competence.

The two volumes are placed in an historical and historiographical perspective in Lewis' introductory essay. Noting the contemporary relevance of ethnic studies, he argues that the Ottoman Empire presents a successful model of a pluralistic society, one that is best understood through an analysis of the centrality of religion and community among each of the subject populations. His essay incidentally contains the only survey of the complex Greek-Ottoman relations in the two volumes, although the Greek story appears in a fragmented way in many of the succeeding essays.

Lewis perceptively examines the myths that new-born peoples tend to create to justify their right to be new-born peoples. He outlines several layers of history

in the process: that which serves local, national or ethnic apologiae, that which non-regional powers need to understand in order to function within or manipulate sensitive areas, and that which the uninolved observer must have to construct an 'impartial' history of the world. He emphasizes that the pluralistic society of the Ottomans practised a tolerance which was sorely lacking in the successor nation states. For all the ethnic groups whose interests touch the eastern Mediterranean lands, including the Balkans, his essay must bring forth disturbing confrontations: contemporary myth versus historical reality. Under the Ottomans all could dream in a harmony of subjugation. During the Ottoman decline and after the disappearance of the empire, all would suffer the historical and psychological vicissitudes of the reality and ugliness of ethnic rivalries without rules or constraint.

Bosworth's essay on the *dhimma*, i.e., the status of tolerated but dependent non-Muslim minorities under classical Islam, tries to accomplish too much in too little space. His prefatory historical remarks (37-40) are occasionally misleading. The following may suffice: the *deuterosis* of Justinian's Novella 146 refers to the entire oral tradition developed by the rabbis (which he banned) rather than just the Mishnah (a second-century code of Jewish law); Targum is a technical term for the Aramaic translation of the Bible; the Novella stipulates what translation of the Scriptures is to be used; the question of the Jewish tax in Byzantium has been excessively studied since 1930. We should also note that Jews as well as Christians were persecuted on occasion in Sassanian Persia; and finally but not the least, the *jizya* came to be regarded as substitute for military service only under the Ottomans. Bosworth's subsequent description of the *dhimma* status however is still useful, though we should delete his anachronistic use of the connotation *ghetto* for the '*evraiike* and the *mellah* both of which were organized along ethnic and occupational lines rather than government fiat.

In his valuable essay, Kunt examines one of the secrets of Ottoman success, i.e., «the transformation of members of non-Muslim communities of the Ottoman realm into full-fledged members of the ruling group», through *devşirme* recruitment which involved conversion to Islam and *timar*-holders who maintained their original religious affiliation. Kunt denotes the dividing line in early Ottoman society between those who were paid by the state through services rendered (*askeri* and bureaucracy) and those who paid taxes (*raya*). This breakdown obviates the religious distinctions of the classical Islamic state since Christians and at least one Jew are listed as *timar*-holders, while Muslim subjects paid regular taxes to the state except for the *cizye* of course which was the defining feature of the *zimmi*. He notes that conquered military men entered directly into the Ottoman ruling establishment without even becoming *zimmis*, a reflection of the frontier nature of the young state which allowed for deviations from the classic Islamic position. *Zimmis* who became Ottomans went through the *devşirme* route. By the seventeenth century, due to historical circumstances, the dividing line became more traditional, that is, between Muslim and non-Muslim. By 1600 non Muslims lost all avenues to leadership positions in Ottoman society which led to their increasing alienation toward the state. During the 1800s these *zimmi* families became leaders of national movements.

In Volume I, Braude, Hacker, and Bardakjian and in Volume II, Cohen, all offer valuable new interpretations and criticisms of the *millet* system. It is unfor-

fortunate that Halil Inalcik's thorough reexamination of the foundation of the Greek Patriarchate based on the Turkish sources is not included among these.

Braude's examination of the «Foundation Myths of the Millet System» serves to preface the next three articles all of which provide a needed corrective to the standard literature. Braude analyzes the multi-faceted usage of the term *millet* in Ottoman sources and cautions against use of the term before its more commonly accepted meaning which dates only from the nineteenth century. Prior to the nineteenth century we should not use the term *millet* but rather study and describe each ethnic group according to the various and differing arrangements that dictated the relationship of each to the Ottoman government. Braude then shows the untrustworthiness of the Greek, Jewish, and Armenian literary sources regarding the foundations of their respective communities and offers an historical re-examination.

With respect to the chief rabbinate in the Ottoman Empire, Hacker's essay redefines the situation as follows: as Jews were transplanted to Constantinople by Mehmet II, a central authority was appointed to interact with the Ottomans. The territorial extent of authority of this leader (a former Byzantine subject) is not delineated in any source; most likely it was restricted to the capital. This position lost its authority after 1526, that is two generations after the conquest and one generation after the influx of Iberian refugees. (Already the latter outnumbered their Greek-speaking co-religionists by the early sixteenth century). In retrospect the chief rabbinate seems to have been a successful stop-gap to deal with an emergency situation until the Jews themselves could work out a satisfactory arrangement with the Ottoman government; the latter, after all, was interested in *zimmi* stability and regularity of tax collection both of which were an internal function of the Jewish community. Epstein's survey takes up where Hacker's left off and argues for three types of Jewish leadership which interacted in the century and a half after the Ottoman conquest: a central rabbinic office for the Empire, regional rabbinic authorities after a generation, and also the role of secular leaders of influence, e.g., physicians, entrepreneurs, and/or favorites. The model is applicable to other groups as well.

Bardakjian presents a long awaited revision of the traditional story of the founding of the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople based on a sound methodological analysis of the extant sources and a necessary revision of the older scholarship through his English summary of recent Armenian historiography. He argues convincingly that the Ottomans recognized a local autonomy for the vicar of Constantinople who became *primus inter pares* among the Armenian bishops of the expanding empire and ultimately emerged as a universal patriarch only in the nineteenth century. What is tantalizing in both Epstein's and Bardakjian's surveys is the unanswered observation that the terms 'patriarch' and 'metropolitan' are first applied to the Armenian and Jewish leaders only in the reign of Suleiman.

Several contributions to the vast Arab-speaking areas of the empire in Volume II are of particular interest for their long-term ramifications. Not only do we have in these essays reliable updated surveys of the ethnic minorities of the Mustariba regions, but also a scholarly critique of the history and sources of these variegated groups: sc. the Christians of Damascus, Melkites, Copts (the millennial sci-

ons of Egypt are shown to be the fundamental element in Egyptian bureaucracy into the contemporary period), the tragic roots of ethnic conflict in Lebanon, and eighteenth-nineteenth-century Egypt. There are no studies on North Africa or Arabia.

Both Cohen's study of Jerusalem in the sixteenth century and Chevallier's comments on Aleppo in the nineteenth argue for a new understanding of society in these areas. Rather than isolated ethnic communities existing within their own quarters as previously perceived, the various religious groups lived within an integrated environment with common social, economic, and religious patterns. This totally new picture of the emerging Ottoman environment emerges from the new sources introduced by Cohen and is complemented by Chevallier's reanalysis of the Aleppan social scene. Even so we should not overlook the necessity of Muslims (especially the Arabic-speaking ones who were disparaged by their Turkish co-religionists) to prove their superiority through visible social manifestations which became more and more frequent as the general level of Ottoman society declined. As indicated by Moshe Maoz, the breakdown of traditional patterns of authority through *dhimmi* advances toward emancipation led to increased ethnic conflict in Syria during the Tanzimat period. The external threat of Christian European powers ('western' and 'imperial') was exacerbated by changing socioeconomic factors within Syrian society, in particular the rapid enrichment of Syrian Christians attending their ongoing emancipation and new role as intermediaries to western economic (supplanting the Jews) and political inroads. While some Muslim leaders prospered in tacit alliance with the new trends, the Muslim masses suffered both economically and psychologically. It was the latter who took out their frustrations on the Christians during the Tanzimat period. Whereas Muslim contempt for the Christians had changed to hatred, Jews continued to be tolerated (at least until the twentieth century). The Christian response to these situations was to turn their growing hostility against the Jews through increased blood libels. (Arab Muslims would not resort to this libellous mediaeval anti-Jewish tactic until the twentieth century).

Samir Khalaf offers Lebanon as a case study of the theoretical structure that Maoz presents. He traces the origin of the destabilizing factors in modern Lebanon to the 'new system' initiated by Ibrahim Pasha which elevated the Christians to a position of equality or even superiority vis-a-vis the Muslims. Ultimately this led to a break-up of the Maronite-Druze confederacy which had hitherto maintained the fabric of Lebanese autonomy. The events of 1861 were final blow to Lebanese stability and repercussions of that tragedy are still evident today in the chaos that permeates the contemporary Lebanese scene.

One further observation of value for its contemporary influence is offered in Braude's brief comments on nineteenth-century doctrinal dissent in the Greek Church in Palestine. There the Russian-Orthodox supported the Arabic-speaking Orthodox in their ethnic-linguistic struggle against the Greek-speaking leadership of the Church. This Arab Orthodoxy identifies later with Arab nationalism as it begins to articulate itself within the nineteenth-century scene. In one paragraph Braude adumbrates a central issue of the contemporary Palestinian problem, i.e., the role of the Orthodox Arabs in the PLO and their attitude toward Israel. On the other hand, one should note that the leadership of the Rakah (Communist)

Party in the Israeli Parliament comes from the Arabic-speaking Orthodox community. Thus doctrinal dissent in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries must be studied in order to understand many of the groups who appear as ideologically autonomous in the twentieth. This is also shown by Haddad with respect to the Melkites in Syria.

In these two volumes there is much of value for the specialists. They are strongly recommended too for the general reader interested in the complex origins of the contemporary Middle East and Balkan controversies. We now have a valuable introduction to the study of the ethnic minorities of the Ottoman Empire and their constitutional experiences and along with it an indication of the kinds of research planned for the coming decade. The new questions raised are as fascinating as the new material and interpretations offered.

*University of Cincinnati*

STEVEN BOWMAN

Paul N. Hehn, *The German Struggle Against Yugoslav Guerrillas in World War II: German Counter-Insurgency in Yugoslavia 1941-1943*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), 153 pages.

This is a rather curious little book. First, it is really a translation of «Die Bekämpfung der Aufstandsbewegung in Südostraum» by Ernst Wisshaupt who was an archivist for the German Chief of Staff of the Commander in Chief in Southeast Europe (Army Group F) dated February 1, 1944, and covered the period from June 1941 through August 1942. This is available in abbreviated form as Document No. NOKW-1898, Office of the Chief of Counsel, Nuremberg, mimeographed copy, 190 pages. As such, Hehn is really more of a translator, and the real author is Ernst Wisshaupt. Hehn does acknowledge in the introduction that the work was «written by General (sic) Wisshaupt while the conflict was still going on» (p. 1). However, that is not accurate since no one by that name or rank can be located on the army lists of the Third Reich of Nazi Germany. Nonetheless, Hehn did write an interesting introduction, conclusion and some bibliographic notes.

Procedurally, the book is rather difficult to read even for someone familiar with the wartime campaigns and resistance movements in Yugoslavia. First, the book lacks a «German Chain of Command at the Start of the Balkan Campaigns» such as is available in A.C. Smith, *The German Campaigns in the Balkans* (Spring 1941), Washington, D. C.: Department of the Army, November 1953), p. 152A. Without such a chart, it is difficult for the uninitiated to know the various acronyms such as OKH-Army High Command, OKW-Armed Forces High Command, AOK-Armed Forces Operations, *et cetera*, as well as the *dramatis personae* such as Chief of OKH-Halder, Chief of OKW-Keitel, and Chief of AOK-Jodl. The profusion of military organs and commanders becomes even greater at the lower levels of command such as the XVIII Mountain Corps under General Boehme. The problem becomes even worse as commanders are changed, and military units replaced. In short, it is very difficult for an experienced military historian to keep track of the organization and all the changes, and virtually impossible for the ca-