

system, intimately related to the larger society and affected by it through both emigration and immigration.

In his introduction the editor summarizes and integrates the studies and contributes a highly enlightening analysis of certain contrasts between northern and southern Spain in terms of social structure and persistence among the Basques and the Andalusians. He demonstrates that stereotyped characterizations of rural versus urban do not apply to this case, with many urban characteristics applying to the agricultural Andalusians.

This book makes a number of contributions. It marks the maturation of the social anthropology of the Mediterranean area, and is proof that anthropologists are now willing and able to fruitfully turn their attention to historically old and well-documented societies which are central to the development of the Western tradition. These societies lack the "advantage" of those traditionally studied by anthropologists, societies usually ignored by other disciplines, primarily because they have left no written records. In the Mediterranean the anthropologist joins the historian and must sustain his labors with arguments more sophisticated than those which justify his working in an area simply because it was previously unstudied. He must demonstrate that what he does complements the work of others, be they social scientists or humanists. This book is a good beginning. We can look forward with anticipation to the next volume which will take up the significance of the ideas of honor and shame in Mediterranean culture.

Oakland University
Rochester, Michigan

LEONARD KASDAN

Bernard Lewis, *Istanbul and the Civilization of the Ottoman Empire*. Norman, Okla: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963. Pp. 189.

The Centers of Civilization Series is devoted "...to cities which have exercised a radiating influence upon the civilizations in which they existed." If any city fits that description certainly Istanbul in Ottoman times is it. Istanbul was both the physical and psychological center of the empire; all influences radiated out from it just as naturally as all talent was drawn to it by the magnetic force of its attraction. Through both governmental policy and irresistible attraction all sorts of people from sections of the empire, and even from beyond its borders, mingled in Istanbul, which according to a description found in Vasif Efendi's chronicle, "is a model to the world for making unity out of diversity."

Officials left the city for far off posts with reluctance, and returned with a sense of reprieve. Mahmet Ragip echoed this sentiment after the *mamluks* had forced his retirement as *paşa* of Egypt:

Full weary we of governing the Mother of the world (Cairo)

Enow this care of Cairo, let us hence to Rum (Istanbul) again.

Istanbul still casts her spell. Her silhouette, with the minarets of her imperial mosques rising from the hills along the Golden Horn, has no equal in the world. As the tide of tourism makes its way to the East, many more visitors will come to agree with the observation of the Ottoman poet Nabi (d. 1712).

The heavens may turn about the earth as they will

They will find no city like Istanbul.

Within the compass of six chapters — entitled the conquest, the conquerors, sovereigns and rulers, palace and government, the city, faith and learning, — Professor Lewis surveys the history, political and social organization, and culture of the Ottoman Turks from their early march-warden days in the thirteenth century to the first stirrings of the reform movement under Selim III at the close of the eighteenth century. The pace is of necessity swift, slowed only occasionally by several overly long excerpts from Western and Turkish sources. There is much more about Ottoman civilization than about Istanbul in this book, but in such a work of synthesis the author is at the mercy of his predecessors. Having written prior to the appearance of Robert Mantran's detailed study of Istanbul in the second half of the seventeenth century, Professor Lewis did not have very much at his disposal to draw upon a description of the city in all aspects. Those wishing to know more about the city itself can curl up with Mantran's work for a week or two.

Several themes are stressed in this book. The fundamental notion is that of the tension between the high Islamic tradition as represented by the central authority of the state and the folk Islamic tradition of the frontier. Here Lewis acknowledges his debt to Professor Paul Wittek, as do we all. In admirably constructed paragraphs Lewis takes the reader from the *gazi* origins of the Ottomans, with its folk Islamic overtones through the sultanate of Rum and the introduction of the apparatus of an Islamic state based on the traditions of high Islam, to the conquest of Istanbul and the subsequent emergence of the sultan as the *Padişah-i Islam* and of a society weighed down by a traditional, self-perpetuating bureaucracy and ulema organization. Professor Lewis points out that all this was not achieved without resistance from the represent-

atives of the frontier element, notably the feudal cavalry, but these elements had little change of success. The tension was never fully resolved, and Lewis highlights this through what he refers to as the Rumelia-Anatolia antagonism. He might have added that this antagonism was even evident under Atatürk who, together with his retinue, was considered by some Anatolians as a Rumelian intruder into the Turkish Anatolian heartland.

In addition to always being in complete command of his materials, Professor Lewis writes with a keen awareness of style. Where others often pen themselves into corners, Lewis' command of the English language enables him to write his way past many a pitfall while at the same time illuminating the subject. An instance is his treatment of the concept of justice in Islam in general and its role among the Ottomans in particular (chapter III). Here Lewis bases his discussion on the ideas expressed in Tursun Beg's biography of Fatih Mehmet. Paraphrasing Tursun Beg, Lewis asserts that "justice means to maintain the proper order of the world, keeping each in his place and giving each his due, and preventing transgressions and infringements." This concept of justice, masterfully introduced by Lewis, needs to be developed, for it is clear that it is connected to the reform movements of late Ottoman times. In Ottoman society there was a place for everyone, but everyone was to be kept in his place. To those whose places (in the Namier sense) were in jeopardy, reform may have appeared as a viable alternative to the loss of status. We are now fortunate in having a good translation of Nasir ad-Din Tusi by G. M. Wickens, entitled *The Nasirean Ethics* (London, 1964), and studies of this and other *ahlak* literature could expand our knowledge of the relationship between this crucial concept and the organization of society. Professor Lewis is not quite up to his own high standards in his discussion of bureaucracy, both religious and civil. Here he successfully manages to avoid most of the terminology of the Lybyer-Gibb and Bowen thesis, especially the twin concepts of the ruling institution and the Muslim institution. His discussion would have been sharper had he been more meticulous about both dates and the definition of categories. It is true, for example, that many ulema held the office of *defterdar* (p. 149) but this was more prevalent in the fifteenth than in the sixteenth century. In the seventeenth century the office was in the process of being professionalized. Most *defterdars* in that century were men who had grown up in the financial administration. In the fourth and fifth decades of that century the office appears to have been captured by the janissaries with ex-janissary *ağas* occupying the office. Order was re-

stored under the Köprülüs. Of the thirty-seven men who held the office of *defterdar* in the eighteenth century before 1774, at least twenty-eight were professional bureaucrats from the financial administration.

With reference to the education of future bureaucrats, Lewis maintains (p. 92) that the boys studied in mosque primary schools and Muslim religious seminaries until the age of sixteen or seventeen when they were placed in government offices as apprentices to learn the work and enter upon the ladder of promotion. Here again one would like to know the period being described. For in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries boys destined for the civil bureaucracy usually attended local schools (*sibyan mektebi*) for an introduction to reading and writing, and then at about the age of ten were enrolled in bureaus (usually those in which their fathers worked) where part of the day was devoted to learning the business of being a secretary, while the boys would attend classes during the remaining part in the traditional Islamic sciences offered at the various mosques. Education for both the *ilmiyye* and the *kalemiyye* careers needs further study. ✓

Professor Lewis has written an informative, thoughtful and stimulating book. It deserves a prominent place on all reading lists for undergraduate courses. He has also demonstrated that the specialist can write for the general reader without any lowering of scholarly standards. In this age of the communications specialist it is refreshing to read a specialist who really can communicate.

Princeton University

NORMAN ITZKOWITZ

Alan Palmer, *The Gardeners of Salonika*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965. Pp. 285.

On October 5, 1915, a small number of British and French units were disembarked at Thessaloniki in a rather half-hearted attempt to coerce neutral Greece into joining the Allies and to provide relief for the Serbian army then retreating before a massive Austro-German offensive. Initially, the venture failed on both counts. The Greek government refused to take action, and weak Allied forces were forced to retreat and to entrench themselves in a vast fortified camp around the port. From this base, however, the Allies eventually forced the neutralist King Constantine into exile and brought the Greeks into the war. Meanwhile, a number of offensives were undertaken in 1916-1917, especially after the entrance of Rumania into the conflict failed to achieve any major suc-