

OSMANLI ARAŞTIRMALARI
V

Neşir Heyeti — Editorial Board

HALİL İNALCIK — NEJAT GÖYÜNÇ

HEATH W. LOWRY

THE JOURNAL OF OTTOMAN STUDIES
V

İstanbul - 1986

Axel Havemann, *Rurale Bewegungen im Libanongebirge des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Ein Beitrag zur Problematik sozialer Veränderungen (Klaus Schwarz Verlag : Berlin, 1983).

Havemann's book is concerned with three peasant uprisings that took place in the Mount Lebanon area in 1821, 1840 and 1858; two of them were largely and one of them exclusively limited to Christian (Maronite) villagers. Considerable secondary literature already exists on these uprisings, therefore Havemann states it as his principal aim to analyze the three rebellions in a common context, that is to compare them and make the linkages between them apparent.

To provide the overall framework, the author makes use of Alexander Schölch's thesis that locally in the Lebanon, there existed relationships between peasants and land-owning families that may legitimately be classed as feudal. These pre-existing feudal relationships were fitted into the Ottoman system of state and society (which neither Schölch nor Havemann are willing to class as feudal) by giving the dominant families the status of *mukataaci*. In principle, *mukataaci* meant tax farmer, although the rights of Lebanese *mukataacis* over their peasants were more extensive than those of ordinary *mültezims* in other parts of the Ottoman Empire. In addition, the chapter on social banditry in Eric Hobsbawm's celebrated work on primitive rebels provides further categories for classification¹.

On the other hand, Havemann rejects the Marxist explanation of the Soviet author Smilianskaja, who apparently also views the rebellions as anti-feudal in character. But in Havemann's view, Smilianskaja tends to place too great an emphasis upon social and economic discontents - although the author of *Rurale Bewegungen* would not deny that the latter existed. In fact, he himself strongly emphasizes the mistreatment of peasants by *mukataacis* as one of the major reasons at least for the 1858 rebellion. Smilianskaja's work not being accessible to the present reviewer, the following statements are subject to caution. But it would appear that Havemann differs from Smilianskaja mainly in the greater or lesser emphasis upon the role of the Maronite church in these uprisings, and then of course as far as the general world view is concerned.

Havemann's use of the 'primitive rebel' concept as explicated in Hobsbawm's work may give rise to some reservations: Doubtlessly the revolting peasants were 'rebels' and not 'revolutionaries', and did not possess a developed political ideology. On the other hand in their *vekils* and *divans* an albeit rudimentary political organization is visible, and it remains unclear for exactly what reason the conclusion evokes the mythical -hero image of the Robin Hood type (p. 260). Moreover while Havemann rejects Smilianskaja's high estimates concerning the number of people participating in the revolt, he himself quotes figures of 250.400

1 Eric Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels*, Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries (New York, London, 1965).

and even 800 men participating in individual politico-military actions (p. 250). This is certainly far more than the less than twenty men typically enrolled in the 'social-rebellious' bands studied by Hobsbawm. Possibly the peasants of Kisrawan may have had certain features in common with the 'village anarchists' examined by Hobsbawm in a later chapter of his book, although our lack of information on the Lebanese peasants led by Tānyūs Šāhīn makes any closer comparison impossible. But given the lack of any evidence on independent rebel bands apart from the forces controlled by Tānyūs Šāhīn (compare Hobsbawm's remarks on the thirty-nine bands operating at one time Calabria)² it does not seem appropriate to class Tānyūs Šāhīn as a 'social bandit' of the Robin Hood type.

In the same context, it is not quite clear why Havemann refuses to see 'democratic' tendencies in the Kisrawan rebellion (p. 248). As an argument against this classification, Havemann points out that while Tānyūs Šāhīn consulted with the peasants forming his constituency, the rebel leader was also sure of peasant loyalty toward himself. Moreover, Tānyūs Šāhīn apparently put a certain amount of pressure on his constituents. Common sense tells us that this is likely to have been the case, but it would be difficult to find a democratic leader to whom these statements were inapplicable, particularly in a context of impending civil war.

To better understand what the Lebanese peasant rebels were and what they were not, a comparative approach would have been desirable, which unfortunately is absent from Havemann's study. On the whole, the Ottoman Empire is noted for the relative rarity of large-scale peasant movements as opposed to various types of banditry; and Schölch's theory of a specifically Lebanese variety of feudalism provides a welcome explanation of the apparent anomaly of Mount Lebanon. But one could equally go beyond the confines of the Ottoman Empire and compare the Lebanese rebellions to the by now very wellresearched peasant movements of early modern Europe. Thus the role of the parish as a framework for social organization, militant communalism or localism centered around the concrete interests of an individual village, active participation of priests, as well as occasional support from non-peasants are all features which the Lebanese rebellions shared with at least some of the revolts which shook 16th and 17th century France³.

But most important is another characteristic that the peasant rebellions of Mount Lebanon had in common with the French peasant movements of for instance, the late 16th century: namely the readiness to insert themselves into wars or civil wars which strictly speaking, were of no direct concern to the peasantry. Thus in late 16th century France, we find peasant rebellions siding with Henri IV against the Ligue, and others siding with the Ligue against

2 Hobsbawm, *Rebels*, pp. 18-19, 36.

3 Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, «Révoltes paysannes et histoire sociale», in: *Histoire économique et sociale la France*, ed. Fernand Braudel, Ernest Labrousse (Paris, 1977), vol. I, 1 pp. 819-859.

the royalists. In the same way we find the Lebanese movement of 1840 confronting the Egyptian regime of Muhammad Ali, with all the political commitments which this implied. Even more significantly, Havemann states that the most enduring result of the 1858 rebellion was the increasing 'confessionalization' of Lebanese politics, the dire consequences of which are very much with us today. This is a conclusion of major importance, and one would have liked to see it thoroughly documented; unfortunately this aspect of the problem is mentioned only in passing.

Obviously, these comments from a person who is not a specialist either on the Lebanon or on peasant movements, will be read with reservations comparable to those which Havemann's study has raised in the present reviewer. But is it not a major quality in a book that it challenges the reader to formulate his own conclusions?

Suraiya Faroqhi

Robert OLSON (Arapça çeviri: Abdu'r-rahman b. el-hâc Emin Beg el-Celili), *Hisâru Musil ve'l-Alâkâtü'l-Usmâniyyetu'l-Farsiyye (1718-1743)*, Riyâz 1403-1983.

Amerika'nın Kentucky Üniversitesi Profesörlerinden Robert Olson'un *The Siege of Mosul and Ottoman-Persian Relations 1718-1743* adlı eserine, Musul'un köklü Celili ailesinden Dr. Abdu'r-Rahman b. el-Hâc Emin Beg El-Celili'nin *Hisâru Musil ve'l-Alâkâtü'l-Usmâniyyetu'l-Farsiyye (1718-1743)* adıyla yaptığı Arapça tercümesi (Riyâz, 1403/1983) vasıtasıyla muttali olmuş bulunuyoruz. Eser, bir mukaddime, yedi bölüm ve bir sonuç (hatime) dan meydana gelmiştir. Nâdir Şah'ın Kerkük ve Erbil'i zapt ettikten sonra 1743 yılında da Musul'u muhasarası ve burada uğradığı yenilgi eserin esas konusunu teşkil etmektedir. Fakat gerçekten azimli, gayretli bir araştırmacı ve değerli bir tarihçi olan Robert Olson, Nâdir Şah'ın Musul muhasarasını ve 'Musul'u savunan kahraman Osmanlı Paşa'sı el-Hâc Hüseyin el-Celili'nin üstün gayret ve kahramanlıklarını anlatmaya geçmeden önce 18. asırda Ortadoğunun özellikle Osmanlı Devleti'nin ve İran'ın içinde buldukları, sosyal, kültürel ekonomik, tarihi ve coğrafi şartlar, bu arada Musul'un Osmanlı Devleti ve İran açısından taşıdığı stratejik önemi, İslâm dünyasındaki ilmi ve sınaî gerileme, kültürel ve sosyal bunalmaların doğurduğu çalkantılar, buna karşı Avrupa'nın üstünlüğünü Doğu'ya hissettirmesi gibi konular ele alınmıştır. Yazar bu bölümlerde ilmi ve fikri gücünü, devrin olaylarına derin vukufunu, azim ve gayretini sergilemiştir. Bilhassa Osmanlı Devleti'nin doğudaki olaylarla alâkadar olmasını engelleyen Patrona Halil İsyanı'na geniş (s. 131-203) yer vermekte ve bu konuda çok ihtisaslaşmış olduğu farkedilmektedir. Her bölümün sonunda yer alan dip-notları, yazarın ele aldığı konulara ne kadar hâkim olduğunu gösterdiği gibi bibliyografya bilgisinin de mükemmelliğini