

dünyada savaş konuşulurken ortaya atılan barış söylemi, Ankara'yı kaygılandırarak ve kongrenin hemen ertesinde Türk Kadınlar Birliği kapatılacaktı. Bu olayın ardından Türkiye'de kadın hareketi, otuz yıllık bir uykuya dönemine girecekti.

Toprak'ın, Sabiha Sertel'in *Resimli Ay* mecmuasında yayınlanan "Bizde Feminizm Bir İlim Olarak Var mıdır?" başlıklı makalesiyle bitirdiği eseri, yukarıda belirttiğimiz gibi son derece detaylı bir çalışmanın sonucu. Eser, kadın hareketi ve kadın özgürlüğü üzerine farklı zamanlarda yazılmış ve ilk başta birbirleriyle içerik açısından çok bağlantılı gibi görünmeyen makaleleri başarıyla, bir bütünlük içinde bir araya getiriyor. Kronolojik bir seyir takip eden kitabın, konular arasında zaman zaman kopukluklar olsa da genel bir akışa sahip olduğunu söyleyebiliriz. Ayrıca bu tür derlemelerde karşılaşılabileceğimiz konu tekrarlarına, Toprak'ın kitabında pek rastlamıyoruz. Öte yandan, bu derecede detaylı çalışmalarda kaynakların, son not olarak değil de metin içinde dipnot olarak verilmesinin, kaynağa hemen göz atmak isteyen okuyucunun işini kolaylaştıracağı kanısındayız. Böyle bir yöntem tasnif edilmiş ayrı bir bibliyografya metnini de gerekli kılacaktır. Toprak'ın eserinde böyle bir bibliyografyanın varlığı Türkiye kadın hareketi tarihine ilgi duyan araştırmacılara kolaylık sağlayabilirdi.

Genel olarak baktığımızda, çalışmada II. Meşrutiyet ile başlayan özgürlükler dünyasında güç kazanan kadın hareketinin 1935'e kadar olan serüvenini kesintisiz bir şekilde izleyebiliyoruz. Toprak'ın önemli belgeler, tanıklıklar ve fotoğraflarla zenginleştirdiği eserinin, bundan böyle Türkiye'de kadın özgürlüğü ve kadın hareketi tarihinin önemli başvuru kaynakları arasında yer alacağı düşüncesindeyiz.

Çiçek Coşkun

Stephen Ortega,

Negotiating Transcultural Relations in the Early Modern Mediterranean

Surrey: Ashgate, 2014, xiv+212 pp., ISBN 978-140-9428-59-6.

Stephen Ortega's work concentrates on Ottoman Muslims who visited Venetian territories and their "transcultural" relations with Venetian authorities as well as Christians living in those territories. It aims to accentuate the integrated

social, cultural, economic and political practices between Christians and Muslims, undertaken by a number of different actors such as diplomats, converts, merchants and brokers.

The book covers the peaceful period between the War of Cyprus (1570-1573) and the War of Candia (1645-1669) in five chapters. Chapter One focuses on the Ottoman Muslim community in Venice and state efforts to supervise Muslims' actions in the Laguna. Chapter Two examines how Ottoman Muslims were able to interact with Venetian authorities through magistrates such as the trade board or the *Cinque Savi* which served as a "portal for a dialog" (12). Chapter Three deals with issues such as cross-cultural contact and conversion and studies boundary crossers along the Ottoman – Venetian borderlands. Chapter Four is an essay on how Ottoman power in Venice was projected through diplomatic institutions. It demonstrates the ways in which Ottoman subjects marshaled Istanbul's support in resolving conflicts with the Venetians. The final chapter concentrates on a dispute arising from the capture of Ottoman goods under Venetian protection by the Spanish fleet in 1618. It shows us how such diplomatic problems could be solved outside the purview of central governments, between elites whose trans-cultural cooperation is a proof to the porosity of religious boundaries.

Negotiating Transcultural Relations relies on a wide range of primary sources from Venetian, Ottoman, and Spanish archives. Moreover, Ortega effectively contextualizes his material within the framework of larger debates not only in Ottoman or Venetian, but also in wider Mediterranean and European historiography. For instance, he makes references to a large canvas of cities such as Barcelona, Jerusalem, Nice, Frankfurt, Damascus, occasionally reaching to the Balkans and Anatolia. Moreover, he successfully calls attention to a wide range of Mediterranean-wide networks and practices such as the *fondacolfunduqs* that spread throughout the Mediterranean (p. 24), the issues of honor and shame that for so long dominated Mediterranean historiography (p. 96), and ceremonies and their political implications in the early modern Europe (p. 113). Finally, he touches upon several historiographical issues regarding poverty and deviance, smuggling, petitions, marriage, conversion, the relationship between the individual and society, the issue of sovereignty, the gift mode, the relationship between power and the epistolary correspondence, international law on sovereignty over the sea, etc.

The author makes a number of small mistakes that need correction: Gazanfer was not a *devşirme* as suggested in p. 103. *Devşirme* does not mean renegade, it refers to a child levy system (as well as the recruit himself) which was the main, if

not the only, mechanism for Christians to be incorporated into Ottoman ruling class (albeit by foregoing their faith). Gazanfer was kidnapped and then sold as a slave and not levied from among the Sultan's Christian subjects.

Moreover, the assertion on page 109 that “the individuals selected to deliver information and to negotiate diplomatic matters were important members of the Ottoman bureaucracy” is not necessarily true for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially concerning envoys that were sent to Europe. A quick look at the list provided in Maria Pia Pedani's *In nome del Gran Signore: Inviati ottomani a Venezia dalla caduta di Costantinopoli alla guerra di Candia* (Venezia: Deputazione Editrice, 1994, Appendix I) easily proves the point: alongside Jewish power brokers such as Salomon Ashkenazi, a number of medium-level officers such as *sipahi*, *silahdar*, *sipahiođlan*, *kapıcıbaşı*, *kahya*, *çeşnigir*, *bölükbaşı*, *haznedar* and renegade dragomans such as Yunus, Ali and İbrahim visited the Laguna. Compared to aristocratic European ambassadors of high-social standing, these were relatively marginal social figures with limited political relevance in the Ottoman capital; the example he uses, Hamza Çavuş can serve as a proof of the insignificance, rather than the importance, of sixteenth-century Ottoman envoys. Nor were they necessarily more loyal to their masters than European ambassadors were to theirs. Furthermore, it is doubtful whether the Ottomans actually took “a significant amount of time” preparing these envoys for their mission. All these are hastily written sentences that require proper substantiation.

While listing the members of the Ottoman Imperial Council (*Divân-ı Hümayun*) on page 118, Ortega lists only one of the *defterdars*; he moreover mentions a “secretary of the court” and it is not clear whom this title actually refers to. He cannot be *nişancı* who was listed separately; if he is the *reisülküttab*, as I suspect, then this information is incorrect. A marginal figure in the sixteenth century, he was not a member of the Imperial Council.

The author seems to have experienced some difficulties in translating Ottoman offices into English and “secretary of the court” is not the only example. For instance, page 37 mentions a Teodoro Paleologo as a lieutenant pasha in the Ottoman Empire. One could only realize what this person's rank was when going to the original source (Pedani, *In nome*, p. 42): he was apparently a *subaşı*. While I am quite confident that many *subaşı*s went to their bed with dreams of becoming a pasha one day (and there were very few pashas in Teodoro's time), they were medium-level officers in the provinces, unlikely to reach the higher echelons of

Ottoman government. Moreover, why should an Ottoman pasha defect to the Venetians and accept as insignificant a position as a dragoman?

The text contains several misspellings of Ottoman and Turkish words: Şeyhü-islam (p.31), işğında (p. 31, fn. 84), sira (p. 31, fn. 85; bear in mind that this is not the word to use while citing a *mühimme* document), sanjack (p. 31) vakuf (p. 64), Dökakin (p. 81), Ganzafar (p. 103), spahi (p. 112), dostlûgumuz (which should have been translated as “our friendship,” rather than “our friend, ” p. 133), çavus (p. 154). Add to those, numerous other mistakes made in transliteration of Ottoman documents, one example being p. 75, fn. 98. As the book also contains several typos and occasional format problems such as the texts written in italics for no reason (p. 64 or p. 69, fn. 72), some (but not all) of these mistakes could be the result of poor copy editing. Still, it is a mystery how somebody like Dr. Ortega, well-versed in Ottoman paleography, evident from his skill in deciphering hard-to-read documentation from the Ottoman archives, could make such simple mistakes.

Another recurring problem is that the author makes too many references to and comparisons with today’s world. Is it really necessary to constantly caution the reader against not “think[ing] of these situations in a modern context”? (p. 40; also see pp. 61, 84, 127) This insistence upon comparison with the contemporary suggests that his intended audience is as much non-professionals and lay readers as professional historians working on similar subjects. Redundant explanations such as that Klis is in Central Dalmatia (p. 84, fn. 36) further supports this assumption.

The problem with this book is that it lacks a *fil rouge* that strings together all five chapters; it simply needs a general theme or a problematic around which the author could navigate. Each article relies on thick archival documentation and deals with a separate aspect of Ottoman – Venetian relations; yet it seems like the author fails to go in depth in any of these chapters which remain rudimentary. The word “encounter” is too weak a unifying force and chapters are unrelated. The author also tacitly accepted this fact by writing, rather than a comprehensive conclusion, a two-page epilogue that enumerates a number of previously made points without any reference to a common argument.

Finally, the book has very little to add to the historiography and at times sails too close to other people’s works. Ortega does not add much to what Pedani had to say regarding Ottoman envoys in Venice; nor is his emphasis on Ottoman authorities’ anxiety over maintaining social and religious boundaries in any way

substantial or original, especially in light of Natalie Rothman's analyses in *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012). Finally, Ortega's scrutiny of convert women across the Ottoman – Venetian borderland is no match for Eric Dursteler's *Renegade Women: Gender, Identity, and Boundaries in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), which assembled a number of diligently scrutinized case studies based on documentation from a number of archival sources.

Emrah Safa Gürkan

Guy Burak,

The Second Formation of Islamic Law. The Hanafî School in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire,

New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015, xiii+273 pp., ISBN 978-110-7090-27-9.

In his book *The Second Formation of Islamic Law*, Guy Burak convincingly challenges an outmoded but omnipresent narrative of legal decline in Islamicate lands after 1250s. He does so not only by calling into question the grand narratives of Islamic legal history which situate the second half of the nineteenth century as the momentum of major rupture but also by offering a new periodization. He puts forward a strong argument that some of the supposedly nineteenth-century novelties, such as the codification of Islamic law, are extant already in the sixteenth century.

In effect, both the legal historians under the influence of nationalist paradigms and the specialists of classic Islamic jurisprudence religiously reproduce the story of legal break-up between roughly 1250s and 1850s – a story which is by now inadmissible in itself after the “Early Modern” turn. For the first category, if we take only account of the Republican-Turkish case, the Ottoman-Islamic Law was simply an obsolete and insipid emulation of Islamic Law which was graciously abrogated during and after the *Tanzimats*. For the latter, the whole history of