

Introduction

SELİM KARAHASANOĞLU

Half a century has now passed since the movement for a “history from below” first opened up new paths for research in social history ... In fact, recent scholarship on late Ottoman social history has substantially broadened the scope of research, to a large extent due to the path-breaking work of the late Donald Quataert.¹

Donald Quataert visited Istanbul to give a paper entitled “Ottoman Consumption Studies: A Progress Report” at a conference on “Early Modern Consumption in Comparative Perspective” held on 25-26 September 2009 at İstanbul Bilgi University. On 23 September 2009, he organized a reception for his students from Istanbul and Ankara at Lares Park Hotel in Taksim. At this reception, Quataert’s current and former students were able to meet. One of his senior former students ventured to ask him which of his students he had liked the most! Quataert’s response was: “I have a different story with each of you which I am not gonna tell.” In this book, Quataert’s students - and many of his colleagues who came into contact with him in the US or Turkey - tell the different stories they created or experienced with him.

Memorial volumes are like a person’s home or office. The more people have knocked on the door of the deceased² during his or her life, the more authors will contribute to the memorial

-
- 1 Eleni Gara, Christoph K. Neumann, M. Erdem Kabadayı, “Introduction,” *Popular Protest and Political Participation in the Ottoman Empire: Studies in Honor of Suraiya Faroqhi*, ed. Eleni Gara, M. Erdem Kabadayı, Christoph K. Neumann (Istanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press, 2011), 1, 4.
 - 2 For writings commemorating the life of Quataert see David C. Cuthell, “In Memoriam-Donald Quataert (1941-2011),” *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 16, nos. 1-2 (2011): 279; Deniz Cenk Demir, “Yazılmayanın Tarihçisi,” *Star: Açık Görüş*, April 3, 2011, 4; Suraiya Faroqhi, “In memoriam Donald Quataert (1941-2011),” *Turcica* 43 (2011): 7-10; Nurşen Gürboğa, “Osmanlı İktisadi ve Sosyal Tarihçiliğinde Bir Emekçi: Donald Quataert’in Ardından,” *Toplumsal Tarih* 208 (2011): 80-84; Michael Hanagan, “In Memoriam: Donald Quataert,” *International Labor and Working-Class History* 79 (2011): vi-vii; Selim Karahasanoğlu, “Donald Quataert (1941-2011) ve Mirası,” *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar* 12 (2011): 13-22; Yavuz Selim Karakışla, “Hocamız Prof. Dr. Donald Quataert’in Ardından,” *Atlas Tarih* 7 (2011): 18; Cengiz Kırılı, “In memory of Donald Quataert (1941-2011),” *New Perspectives on Turkey* 44 (2011): 5-10; for a slightly different Turkish version see idem, “Donald Quataert Anısına (1941-2011),” *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, 12 (2011): 7-11; Mustafa Yüce, “Donald Quataert’e Veda,” June 27, 2011. Accessed May 3, 2015 <http://kdzeregelifutbol.blogspot.com.tr/2011/11/donald-quataerte-veda.html>.

after his/her death. This memorial prepared for Donald Quataert is thus in some ways a testimony to the many close friendships he had made throughout his life. Quataert won over a great many colleagues and students with his smiling, affectionate and charitable manner. Through their high-quality contributions to a volume in his honour and memory, they show their continued loyalty to their colleague and teacher.

Deniz Cenk Demir and I began preparations for this book in September 2011; and we made our first call for papers on 1 November 2011, some, three and a half years ago. From that time on, we have worked strenuously to put together this book. The telephone and e-mail traffic between Cenk and me has been unbelievable. When the process of reading and editing had just begun, Cenk moved to Canada and began an intensive graduate program, making things more difficult for me, as suddenly I had to go through a large body of articles on my own. But I have no complaints, as this volume has nonetheless come out today, safe and sound. Doubtless this fortunate outcome is due largely to Fahri Aral, editor-in-chief of İstanbul Bilgi University Press. Indeed, as Quataert's friend, Fahri Bey has supported the publication of this volume at every stage, from the drawing board on. We are also heavily indebted to our copy-editor Kathryn Kranzler. Kathryn has played a key role by correcting all the errors that might have been made by editors who are non-native English speakers. Despite bereavement in her family while editing this book, Kathryn still has swept aside everything that could have been an obstacle to its publication. To her I extend my deepest thanks.

The articles in this book are distributed across topics that Quataert worked on throughout his academic life. An article (Özkan) takes up the topic of his thesis on "Famine in Turkey"³ that he prepared whilst still a master's student⁴ at Harvard University (*Regional Studies*) under the guidance of Stanford J. Shaw, another contribution responds to his final work on Zonguldak mine workers (Şengül and Aytekin). Most, however, have some relationship to the 19th century Ottoman economy, Quataert's particular field of expertise.

Throughout his entire academic career, Quataert almost never wrote on topics outside of 19th century Ottoman history. Even if he once defined his wider period of expertise as being 1700-1922, his textbook on this period (*The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*)⁵ still took the 19th century as its principal focus. The dissertations he oversaw as an advisor almost all remained within the limits of the 19th century. However, some of the students whom Quataert supervised went beyond the boundaries of labour and economic history. For this reason, the present volume contains ar-

3 Donald Quataert, "Famine in Turkey: 1873-1875" (MA Thesis, Harvard University, 1968). Thanks to Fulya Özkan who shared this work with me. This thesis is an inquiry into the famine in Anatolia between 1873-1875 and its effects on village life.

4 I will not give details of Quataert's career/biography here. For an overall picture of his academic life and contribution to Ottoman historiography, see Selim Karahasanoğlu, "Quataert, Donald George," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Zeyl: vol. 2 (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, forthcoming).

For a short piece on his life, academic career and the state of Ottoman historiography as of the mid-1980s in his own words, see Mete Tunçay, "Yaşayan Türkologlar XVI: Donald Quataert'le Söyleşi," *Tarih ve Toplum* 33 (1986): 40-42.

5 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed., 2005.

ticles on many other topics as well. In addition, Quataert also influenced mature scholars working on other periods; and as a result, the articles within this volume have become even more diverse, covering Ottoman history all the way from the foundation of the state to its destruction. Indeed, there are even articles on Turkish Republican history.

Quataert was, in narrow terms, an Ottoman labour historian and in wider terms, an economic historian of the late Ottoman Empire. As the commemorative piece by Heath Lowry published in this volume rightly emphasizes, the sub-field known as “Ottoman labour history” came into being thanks to Quataert’s work. Touraj Atabaki and Gavin D. Brockett thus underlined this fact:

Among historians of the Middle East, Quataert has been largely responsible for establishing Ottoman labour history as a viable field of research. To be sure, various scholars have published studies that examine aspects of working life in the premodern Ottoman Empire, but it is Quataert’s numerous monographs and articles that have focused attention on the experiences of workers at the end of the empire, and on the late Ottoman social history as a whole.⁶

In a piece I published in the wake of Quataert’s passing I used the phrase “the Binghamton School of Ottoman History” for the first time.⁷ Now work produced by the Binghamton School of Ottoman History is being brought together in this volume. Certainly I am not trying to insist on there being such a school. However, I believe that those who read the articles in this volume produced by Quataert’s students will discern that all these writers share some of the same historiographical concerns or use similar methods. All Quataert’s students have in common an insistence on the practice of history from below.⁸ Hence, Onur Yıldırım, in his article in this volume,

6 “Ottoman and Republican Turkish Labor History: An Introduction,” *International Review of Social History* 54 (2009), Supplement, 5.

The following piece, published a short while after Quataert’s death, touches upon his contributions to Ottoman labour history and his efforts at integrating the study of Ottoman labour history into world labour history: M. Erdem Kabadayı and Kate Elizabeth Creasey, “Working in the Ottoman Empire and in Turkey: Ottoman and Turkish Labor History within a Global Perspective,” *International Labor and Working-Class History* 82 (2012): 187, 188, 200.

For a detailed interview on Ottoman labour historiography with Quataert see Can Nacar ve Gülhan Balsoy, “Donald Quataert ile Söyleşi-Osmanlı-Türkiye Emek Tarihi Çalışmaları Üzerine,” *Praksis* 16 (2007).

7 Karahasanoğlu, “Donald Quataert (1941-2011) ve Mirası,” 16.

8 It is clear that Ottoman historiography has for a long time been characterized by the “history from above” approach. This issue has been examined critically and in depth by Halil Berktaş in “‘The Other’ Feudalism: A Critique of 20th Century Turkish Historiography and Particularisation of Ottoman Society” (PhD diss., Birmingham University, 1990); especially see “History from Above,” 291-296. Also see idem, “The Search for the Peasant in Western and Turkish History/Historiography,” in *New Approaches to State and Peasant in Ottoman History*, ed. Halil Berktaş and Suraiya Faroqhi (London: Frank Cass, 1992), 109-184.

Those doing Ottoman/Middle Eastern history from below remain a minority. Stephanie Cronin finds that there was never any question of Middle Eastern historians “from below” dominating the field in the way that British Marxist historians dominated European social history of the 1960s. See Stephanie Cronin, “Introduction,” in *Subalterns and Social Protest: History from Below in the Middle East and North Africa*, ed. idem (London: Routledge, 2008), 4. Cengiz Kırılı is of the opinion that the first serious attempts at history from below by Ottoman historians began only in the early 1990s: “From Economic History to Cultural History in Ottoman Studies,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 46 (2014): 377.

is right to guess that the contributors to this book will provide contributions very different from those of state-centric history, as a result of their encounters with Quataert. Some of those who have contributed to this book have shared sections of the dissertations which they prepared together with Quataert. Others present the first findings of their current-day research. I hope that this book also provides a perspective of the past and present-day situation of modern Ottoman history writing.

Quataert's historical understanding was very far from being limited to state-centric analysis and state documents. He dug deeply into local sources to hear the voices of workers, and was very successful in using these sources. His last book⁹ was completely based upon such material. Once he explained how he came across the sources for his final monograph: "In 1983, I wrote a book that had a chapter on these [Zonguldak] coal mines. In 1996, somebody in this town contacted me and said, by the way, there's this body of Ottoman language materials here that I can't read that you might be interested in."¹⁰ This monograph on Zonguldak mine workers is the unique product of an effort to bring to light those obscured by history. In writing such a work, Quataert turned to local sources in Zonguldak (Karaelmas University and the Zonguldak-centered Education Department of the Turkish Coalmining Ministry) as well as finding first-hand witnesses of mining accidents. Thus he located all the details of those men killed in the mines, down to their "names, marital statuses and occupations."¹¹ Similarly, it is noteworthy that while even first-hand accounts written by Ottoman elite figures (ego-documents) are painfully scarce and have not often been studied, Quataert should have focused on the memoirs of a mine worker¹² (together with Yüksel Duman, one of his earliest students¹³). My reference is to memoirs comprising of a day by day record made by an Ottoman worker named Ethem Çavuş.¹⁴ These memoirs, which are today widely read in new editions,¹⁵ had earlier been published in Ereğli for a limited readership. The translation into English by Quataert and Duman then reached many more people.

Of the 33 authors who have contributed the 32 academic articles that make up this book, 17 were students at Binghamton. Eleven of them wrote their theses under Donald Quataert. Sad-

9 *Miners and the State in the Ottoman Empire: The Zonguldak Coalfield, 1822-1920* (New York: Berghahn, 2006). For a review of the book by Reşat Kasaba see *Review of Middle East Studies* 43, no. 1 (2009): 122-123.

10 Katie Ellis, "Professor emphasizes 'writing history from below,'" *Inside Binghamton University*, November 9, 2010. Accessed May 7, 2015 <http://www.binghamton.edu/inside/index.php/inside/story/539/writing-history-from-below/>. This person was Erol Kahveci, who would be instrumental in the publication of Quataert's Zonguldak book in 2006. See Quataert, *Miners and the State in the Ottoman Empire*, xi.

The aforementioned book from 1983 is: *Social Disintegration and Popular Resistance in the Ottoman Empire: 1881-1908, Reactions to European Economic Penetration* (New York: New York University Press, 1983).

11 Donald Quataert, "Doing Subaltern Studies in Ottoman History," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 40, no. 3 (2008): 380. Quataert here carries out a short analysis, relating his own work to the field labelled Subaltern Studies: 379-381.

12 Donald Quataert and Yüksel Duman (ed.), "A Coal Miner's Life during the Late Ottoman Empire," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 60 (2001): 153-179.

13 Duman, who did not pursue an academic career after his PhD, was sadly unable to contribute to this book despite deeply wishing to.

14 Quataert and Duman, "A Coal Miner's Life During the Late Ottoman Empire," 153.

15 Ahmet Naim, *Yer Altında Kırk Beş Sene: Bir Maden İşçisinin Anıları*, ed. Sina Çıladır (Istanbul: Evrensel Basım Yayın, 2014).

ly, Donald did not live to see four of his students finish their theses; following his death they completed them under other advisors.¹⁶ There are 10 memorial pieces in this book. The first of these, written by Donald Quataert's wife Jean H. Quataert, has already been published immediately following his death, in the news magazine of the American Historical Association, *Perspectives on History*.¹⁷ I thank *Perspectives on History* for their permission to reprint this piece here. Quataert's son Eliot Quataert was unflatteringly polite when I asked him to provide a contribution to this book. In the same way, Immanuel Wallerstein also graciously deigned to provide a piece; and David Cuthell gave us the same form of support. In addition there are the letters read by Nurçin İleri at the 2011 memorial program entitled *Celebrating the Life of Donald Quataert* (Lowry, Farroqi, Kasaba, Owen, Singer). Among these letters is Heath Lowry's long and impressive piece, which depicts the academic environment of UCLA of that time and Quataert's academic training, beginning with their doctoral years¹⁸ together when they became good friends. I would like to thank Nurçin İleri for forwarding these letters to us, and their authors for giving us permission to reprint them here. Rifa'at Ali Abou-El-Haj read his piece published here himself at the memorial ceremony and sent it to me directly, for which I am grateful.

The topics we want to cover in this book include Quataert as a historian, his academic interests and his contribution to Ottoman labour and economic history. Some authors, on their own initiative, have chosen to send us pieces on these topics, in particular, Ariel Salzman and Onur Yıldırım. The style in which our two fellow academics have chosen to structure their pieces is very important: both of them tell of their personal stories with Quataert and starting from there, discuss his academic work.

Ariel Salzman did not write her dissertation under Quataert's supervision, even if her path went through Binghamton University; however, the two scholars became highly interested in one another's work. In consequence, Salzman's name is very familiar to students who studied

16 Following his demise, Quataert's legacy continues to enrich Ottoman studies at Binghamton: Jean Quataert made a donation of 1700 volumes, 1/3 in Turkish and Ottoman and 2/3 in English and other languages, to the Binghamton University (Glenn B. Bartle) Library in July 2011.

Edward J. Shephard, "Professor Donald Quataert Turkish and Ottoman History Collection Acquired," *Library Links*, Fall 2011, p. 4. Accessed 28 October 2014, http://www.binghamton.edu/libraries/about/documents/Fall_2011Library%20Links.pdf

Every book was stamped "From the library of Distinguished Professor Donald Quataert" and doubtless will be much made use of throughout the American university system, thanks to America's excellent Interlibrary Loan system.

17 Jean H. Quataert, "In memoriam: Donald Quataert (1941-2011)," *Perspectives on History*. Accessed 28 October 2014 <http://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/may-2011/in-memoriam-donald-george-quataert>.

18 Quataert considered agriculture in Anatolia in his doctoral dissertation: "Ottoman Reform and Agriculture in Anatolia, 1876-1908" (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1973). This dissertation was published in Turkish: *Anadolu'da Osmanlı Reformu ve Tarım: 1876-1908*, trans. Nilay Özok Gündoğan and Azat Zana Gündoğan (Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2008). Quataert said that his inspiration was the verdict in Bernard Lewis's *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961) that academic work on Ottoman peasants was lacking: "History from Below and the Writing of Ottoman History," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 34, no. 1 (2014): 130.

under Quataert, as they would have heard about her and read her work; in fact, Quataert had all his PhD students read Salzman's doctoral dissertation.¹⁹ Salzman here has written a very important piece, going beyond Quataert's contribution to Ottoman social and economic history and looking at him as a historian, examining his academic stance, his professional and his ethical character from all angles. According to Salzman, Quataert's responsibility towards the past and present show the strength of his professional ethics. Salzman's piece also helps us to understand the formation of the Binghamton School of Ottoman History.

Onur Yıldırım, for his part, was one of Quataert's first students. The article Yıldırım has penned does an excellent job introducing Quataert as a mentor from the perspective of a graduate student. In this piece, Yıldırım probes both his own and Quataert's relationship with history from below. Yıldırım's analysis, important in and of itself, shows how the deficiencies of the literature on subaltern groups in Ottoman history as it was during Quataert's first years at Binghamton, pushed him to study them while still a relatively young academic. Here is his verdict: as the greatest names in the literature, specifically on the topic of guilds, saw all aspects as being under state control, Quataert was inspired to bring the historical narrative of ordinary men to the fore. Both Salzman and Yıldırım consider the relationship between World Systems Theory and Ottoman studies,²⁰ focusing especially Quataert's work.²¹ Quataert was a scholar whose academic life was "integrated" into the course of World Systems Analysis. Despite the fact that Quataert, who produced his first, important work in this framework moved away from it later in his career, it is clear that the dependency school and World Systems Analysis were constitutive of his academic development. Yıldırım's piece is also important for the way it displays Quataert's early years in the discipline.

The first piece in the category "New Vistas in Ottoman Historiography" was written by Barış Ünlü. Ünlü considers a problem that has not been solved though the discussion has continued for over a century, namely the problem of the foundation of the Ottoman state. As someone who has been teaching Early Ottoman History for five years at undergraduate level, I am one of those who have seen at first hand how limited the debate on the foundation of the Ottoman state has always been. So, I have been very pleased to see and read Ünlü's book (a revised version of his dissertation) on this subject,²² a new work that I can set for my students and that is not stifled

19 "Measures of Empire: Tax Farmers and the Ottoman Ancien Regime, 1695-1807" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1995).

20 For the influence of World Systems Analysis on Ottoman studies see M. Asım Karaömerlioğlu, "Bağımlılık Okulu, Dünya Sistemi Teorisi ve Osmanlı/Türkiye Çalışmaları," *Toplum ve Bilim* 91 (2001-2002): 81-99; Ebubekir Ceylan, "Dünya-Sistemi Teorisinin Osmanlı Tarihi Çalışmalarına Yansımaları," *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 1, no. 1 (2003): 81-95; Cem Emrence, "Three Waves of Late Ottoman Historiography," *MESA Bulletin* 41, no. 2 (2007): 141-143. Cengiz Kırılı underlines that the most important impact on Ottoman studies during the 1970s and an important part of the 1980s came from Wallerstein: "From Economic History to Cultural History in Ottoman Studies," 376.

21 For changes over time in his academic career see Selim Karahasanoğlu, "Donald Quataert İle Osmanlı Tarihçiliği," *Toplum-sal Tarih*, 138 (2005): 56-57.

22 Barış Ünlü, *Osmanlı: Bir Dünya-İmparatorluğunun Soykütüğü* (Ankara: Dipnot, 2011). Quataert sat on the committee of the author for his doctoral dissertation.

by the narrowness of the debate. Ünlü does not waste much time on the dichotomies that characterize the existing literature - holy war or not, or Turkish/Islamic versus Greek/Christian; instead he considers the topic from a world-historical perspective. This dissertation came to an unsurprising conclusion, considering it was written in the department of the father of World Systems Analysis, namely Immanuel Wallerstein (SUNY-Binghamton, Sociology). Ünlü does not see the “miracle” of the rise of the Ottoman state as the result of the idea of holy war or the pursuit of booty, of Turkish cunning or Greek experience, of Muslim strength of belief or the conversion of Christians. Rather he views the rise of the Ottomans as a success of the “Greater Near Eastern and Mediterranean imperial platform.” He has adopted a long-term and large-scale perspective; but he never loses focus, not in his book and not in the article contained in the present volume. This fact represents an important success.

The second piece in this section is that of Joyce Hedda Matthews. Matthews considers the topic of estate inventories (*tereke*) as a source often used in Ottoman history, but whose nature has been little considered. Ottoman historiography on this topic has not yet progressed beyond the publication of lists. Differences between *tereke* and *muhallefat* or differences between *askeri kassam*²³ and *muhallefat halifesi* remain unconsidered; those writing on the topic make no distinction between them. Of the 27 sharia courts in Istanbul, we know very little about the two courts that only produced estate inventories (Kismet-i Askeriye Mahkemesi and Mülga Beledi Kassamlığı), which fact indicates the state of the art. What kind of story, really, can a historian hope to build on an estate inventory of, say, a saucepan, a pillow, a pillowcase and a few *kiyye* (approx. 1.3 kg) of rice? And yet, with so many transcriptions of inheritances having been made and analyses so few, Matthews’s analysis of 590 inheritances from Manisa sharia court records between 1600 and 1675 are especially valuable.

My own piece evaluates the wide though largely amateurish literature on the period between 1718 and 1730, named the “Tulip Age” by Ahmed Refik. I have also sought to set in context and understand the changing perceptions of İbrahim Pasha throughout the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries. In my piece I do not recount the findings based on archival documents from my doctoral dissertation. The present piece concerns only the Ottoman and modern historiography of Nevşehirli Damad İbrahim Pasha’s years as Grand Vizier. It has been almost seven years since I defended my doctoral dissertation and during this time I have undertaken research in completely new areas such as ego-documents, but in the present context, it has seemed right to limit my work to what I did together with Quataert.

The final piece in this section belongs to Huricihan İslamoğlu, who is looking for a new answer to an old question. The question is this: why did capitalist development occur in Europe and not in other regions: for example, in China or in Islamic societies? İslamoğlu warns that the economic history of non-European societies cannot be understood through European history and

23 Distributor of *askeri* inheritances.

with reference to European societies' own peculiar development patterns; but she emphasizes the benefits of "shared history". Her most important caution is that the history of non-Western societies needs also be bought into as living history, and that these societies cannot be characterized as dead societies awaiting an awakening by the West. She reveals how efforts to adapt to changing conditions were carried out, by looking at Ottoman law through texts such as the 1858 Land Code and the *Mecelle* (civil code).

The first article in the section called "Economy and Agriculture" is Jane Hathaway's treatment of the donor profile of the chief palace eunuchs. Hathaway has prepared case studies of two chief eunuchs, namely Hacı Mustafa Ağa and Hacı Beşir Ağa, who held office for particularly long periods during the 17th and 18th centuries. Using one source in Wizarat al-Awqaf (Cairo) and another in the Süleymaniye Library (Istanbul), she makes a thorough analysis of the endowment deeds of these two men. Hathaway determines how the chief eunuchs as donors differ from other Ottomans and emphasizes continuity in the foundations of the chief eunuchs.

Meltem Toksöz looks at landholding issues in the case of Çukurova (the Adana plains) in connection with the 1858 Land Code. Looking at this region in particular is important, since from the 1870s onwards it came to have a distinct regional economy based on the mass/commercial farming of cotton. Çukurova as a "success story" has up to now not been properly told. Toksöz emphasizes the emergence of cotton cultivation and large-scale farms. Capitalist change led to a new property regime, which became a particular characteristic of this region at this time.

The final article in this section is Fulya Özkan's piece, which touches on a topic that Quataert worked on in his master's thesis,²⁴ namely famine. As I have pointed out above, it is significant that this article takes up a topic that Quataert was interested in at the very beginning of his academic career. On the other hand, it is also important that Özkan's article looks at transportation and roads in the Ottoman Empire, as throughout his academic life Quataert maintained an interest in transportation and its relationship with labour and economics. His first academic presentation, in July 1977, was exactly on this subject.²⁵ Özkan shows how roads designed by the Ottoman central government as a means to spread welfare and riches produced dire results in times of famine. In other words, well-intentioned initiatives and better transportation opportunities brought about major problems.

According to Özkan, it is true that the roads opened up the way for villagers to sell their crop at market; but in times of famine this situation left them defenceless. In other words, the road represented the creation of a unified national marketplace; it brought riches and welfare to Ottoman rural areas, but on the other hand it lowered the capacity of villagers to provide their own food supplies. The roads enabling the villagers to sell their crops became the routes by which they migrated to other regions in times of famine. Hence, Özkan asks whether the roads were a

²⁴ See footnote 3 above.

²⁵ "The Impact of the Anatolian Railway on the Provisioning of Istanbul, 1890-1914" (paper presented at the *First International Conference on the Social and Economic History of Turkey, 1071-1920*, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey, 1977).

solution to famine or rather a cause of scarcity. She shows how famine cannot be perceived as simply a “natural disaster” and demonstrates how famines as social/economic events can be caused by human agency.

Özkan argues that a greater cause of famine than natural disasters like drought was an unjust distribution of resources. In general, her paper investigates the relationships between roads, famine and villagers’ economic situations through a focus on the Trabzon-Erzurum region, which experienced multiple famines in the second half of the 19th century. Working entirely through archival material she specifically looks at the famine of 1892-1894, which largely affected the Erzurum region. Özkan also mentions the starvation, migration and rebellion that famines brought with them.

In the section I have called “Guilds, Commerce, Credit and Consumption”, Fariba Zarinebaf shares her first results from a new book, which she is currently writing. Her focus is the increase in trade experienced by the Ottoman Empire in the 18th and 19th centuries. She states that this increase in trade gives us the opportunity to test what is known about the role of the state, which has been exaggerated in standard Ottoman historiography. Zarinebaf also discusses how the increase in trade with both the East and West, based in Istanbul and other port cities led to the rise of an Ottoman bourgeoisie. Relatedly the author seeks to answer a series of questions concerning the increase in trade and its effects upon the capacity for investment and production among modest Ottoman merchants. Zarinebaf also questions the meaning of the agreements traditionally labelled as the “capitulations”, which Zarinebaf calls commercial treaties, as she sees them not as weakness in the face of European domination but as a sign of Ottoman economic strength. Basically, Zarinebaf states that agency should be attributed to Ottoman traders more than to the state, explaining how the Ottoman state and its traders resisted Europe as well as French, English and other merchants. Competition between the two sides is her special focus. In conclusion, the Ottomans always protected their powers of financial, legal and bureaucratic control over European traders. Eventually, the story of Muslim Ottoman traders without the capacity to resist or compete with their European counterpart should be considered a myth.

Quataert integrated Ottoman history into the field of consumption studies with his book *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550-1922: An Introduction*.²⁶ Published in the year 2000, this collection was derived from a conference entitled “Consumption in the Ottoman Empire, 1550-1923”, which in turn was part of the broader “Seventh Biennial Conference on the Ottoman Empire and the World Economy” held at Binghamton on 11-12 October 1996. Quataert first showed his interest in this topic at the 22 May 1995 Boğaziçi University conference on the same topic.²⁷ In this context, Amy Kallander has contributed an article on

²⁶ (Albany: SUNY, 2000).

²⁷ At a conference in Binghamton on 30 October 2007, Quataert emphasized his continuing interest in the field by remarking: “if I had not written my last book on Zonguldak, I would have written it on the history of consumption.”

He was very pleased that I had taken Consumption Studies as a minor under the direction of Fa-ti Fan.

Papers from a conference co-ordinated by Suraiya Faroqhi and Anne Gerritsen at İstanbul Bilgi University in 2011 entitled “The Material Culture of Everyday Living: Ottoman Consumption in a Comparative Perspective” will be published under Elif Akçetin’s and Faroqhi’s editorship; and this book (*Living the Good Life in the Qing and Ottoman Empires*) will al-

the topic of food consumption. Kallander is an expert on a still very under-researched field, namely the history of Ottoman consumption: her doctoral dissertation has focused on Ottoman Tunisia between 1770 and 1840, dealing with the numerous expense registers in the Tunisian National Archives in order to reconstruct the domestic economy of the Bardo Palace.²⁸ Scrutinizing Quataert's interest in consumption studies and contribution to this field, she uses account registers from the palace treasury (and also travellers' accounts) to address the topic of food consumption as a societal status symbol and a means of patronage, comparing food consumption within the palace with that of rural elites.

In the Tunis example, Kallander explains how palace consumption was fed by local resources and consequently how it protected and supported the local economy; she also examines the relationship between the palace and traders, artisans and farmers. In doing so, she delves into the social relations of consumption between administrators and the people. Kallander also touches upon the encounter with European tastes and table manners, which began at the turn of the 19th century. She thus considers what the adaptation of European tastes and furniture/decor could mean beyond "Westernization", and suggests using the term "cosmopolitanism" instead. Another important point Kallander makes is that the staples of Tunis food culture cannot be compared to those consumed in other urban centres in the Ottoman Empire, because Tunis was fed only by locally produced staples.

Nalan Turna takes up the institution of the guild warden, which has remained obscure aside from basic references in the literature, examining the issue entirely on the basis of court registers and documents from the Prime Ministry Ottoman archive. She goes beyond the descriptions of the guild warden in the existing literature and introduces us to some of the other functions of the position: in line with Halil İnalçık, Turna argues that some guild wardens were private individuals. Turna questions the thesis that the guild wardens were only appointed by the state and served as the single link between the state and the guilds, emphasizing that the guilds had the power to choose their own wardens. She considers the institution from its first beginnings, displaying particular stories of the functioning of the wardenship at the start of the 19th century. In this work, Turna is highly successful in describing the internal dynamics of guilds and challenging the dominant understanding of the wardenship as a completely state-controlled guild office.

Çağlar Keyder considers the credit network and its meaning before the establishment of the modern banking system. The backbone of Keyder's work is the nature of merchant credit (informal lending), which was informal, flexible, based on trust and not requiring long legal proce-

so be dedicated to Quataert's memory.

28 Amy Aisen Elouafi, "Being Ottoman: Family and the Politics of Modernity in the Province of Tunisia" (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2007). Especially see Chapter 2: pp. 66-111. Compare with her book: Amy Aisen Kallander, *Women, Gender, and the Palace Households in Ottoman Tunisia* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2013).

Donald Quataert first put me in contact with Kallander, when she had freshly finished her doctorate and begun teaching at Syracuse.

dures. He has also discussed the network of economic and social relations that merchant credit created in the pre-modern era. Keyder states that despite changing social opportunities/conditions, merchant credit survived into the 20th century and even, under certain situations, remains today and will continue to exist in the future. In a way, Elena Frangakis-Syrett's piece on the credit sector and first banking activities in the Ottoman state is a continuation of Keyder's. In particular, she looks at the example of İzmir and details the case of the short-lived (1842-1843) Bank of Smyrna.²⁹ Syrett explains the background to the birth of the first Ottoman bank and the opposition to the bank in business circles during its short life. In brief, Syrett's article tells the story of banking in İzmir in the 1840s caught between the central government, the founders of the Bank of Smyrna and a variety of local actors.

One of Quataert's primary fields of interest was Ottoman industry. Beatrice St. Laurent's acquaintance with Quataert arose from this shared concern, and so did the story of how she came to submit an article to this book. St. Laurent presents the story of her research from the time of her doctorate, when she first met Quataert, to the present day. She makes connections between Bursa, on which she wrote her doctoral thesis,³⁰ and Jerusalem, on which she is still working; by means of Kütahya tiles, she has connected the Green Mausoleum of Mehmed I in Bursa to the Dome of the Rock. St. Laurent looks at issues more or less concerned with tile-makers and family connections on the Bursa-Kütahya-Jerusalem axis. She provides an important contribution to our understanding, linking the need to restore Ottoman structures from the 14th and 15th centuries (the Great Mosque, Orhan Mosque, Muradiye Mosque and Green Mosque) that were damaged in the 1855 earthquake, the restoration movement of Ahmed Vefik Pasha-Léon Parvillée beginning in 1863, the 1918 restoration of the Dome of the Rock, and the 1919 migration of many tile-makers to Jerusalem from Kütahya. In short, if you have an interest in the journeys of Kütahya tiles and tile-makers, from the restoration of the 15th century Green Mosque complex in Bursa to the external decoration of today's Dome of the Rock, I can wholeheartedly recommend this art history contribution, a field which is not well represented in this volume.

One of Quataert's strongest interests was doubtless the history of textiles. Hence, Charlotte Ann Jirousek's article on the subject is especially apposite. As neither St. Laurent nor Jirousek are professional historians their contributions may be viewed as an indicator of how Quataert's influence spread beyond the discipline of history. Jirousek's piece looks at how far Quataert's narration of 19th century textile production is still true for Turkey in the 1990s and 2000s. Jirousek's work, which occasioned her field visits to the centres of Anatolian textile production focuses not on the goods produced for the palace or city elites, but on those intended mostly for the personal use of the ordinary people of Anatolia.

²⁹ Syrett also evaluates various other banking activities in İzmir at this time; but she finds that the relevant primary sources are not particularly enlightening.

³⁰ "Ottomanization and Modernization: The Architecture and Urban Development of Bursa and the Genesis of Tradition 1839-1914" (Harvard University, 1989).

After Jirousek had approved the final version of her article, she sadly passed away. In an e-mail on 31 January 2014, she both approved the final changes to her article and asked when the book would be published. Sadly, a very short time after this e-mail conversation she died, unfortunately before the piece was published (12 February). Professor Jirousek, who like some other American Ottoman historians first visited Turkey as a Peace Corps volunteer and later became an expert on our country, will be much missed. May she rest in peace!

The first article in the “Labour and Women’s History” section is by Gülhan Balsoy: it examines the politics of reproduction, abortion, midwifery, midwifery education, the relationship between population policies and reproduction in the late Ottoman Empire. The author presents a reading of official Ottoman population policy on women’s bodies and women’s sexuality. In detail Balsoy takes up the fear of a decrease in the empire’s Muslim population and the meaning of associated bans on abortion (in 1838 and 1858).

In this same section the article by Nurşen Gürboğa examines the processes of retirement among workers at the Şirket-i Hayriye shipping company. The subject, previously addressed only through its legal and institutional dimensions, is here examined in terms of actual retirement applications and the reflection of insurance issues on workers’ daily lives. Using documents from the archives of Turkish Maritime Enterprises, she examines, one by one, the particular situations of various workers. The third article in this section, by H. Tarık Şengül and E. Attila Aytekin, uses archive documents from Zonguldak and Istanbul, as well as oral history, to focus on working class identity in the Zonguldak coalfields and the role of the state in shaping this identity. Workers’ lives and disruption of identity from the late 19th century to the 1980s, via state control and the rise of the private sector, make up the subject of this article. The final piece in this section is by Elif Ekin Akşit, who writes about Girls’ Institutes and the effects these institutions had on the Village Institutes, influential teacher training projects of the 1940s. Akşit has benefited from interviews with graduates of the Girls’ Institutes who have recounted their first hand experiences. She investigates the topics of motherhood, the connection between motherhood and nationalism, the household and the road from the household to the nation. In the most general terms, Akşit explains what type of contribution the Girls’ Institutes made to the creation of a nation and a national consciousness in Turkey. Furthermore, one of Akşit’s contributions is a criticism of the frequently heard thesis that women were marginal in the Village Institutes: here, as in the study of miners’ identities, recourse to oral sources has brought significant benefits.³¹

The first article in the section on “Crime, Violence and Social Control” is by one of Quataert’s later students, namely İrfan Kokdaş. One of Quataert’s greatest hopes was for his students to show interest in places outside of Istanbul, especially to do work on the Balkans. He often complained of the overpowering interest in Istanbul, while expressing his pleasure at the quality of the articles in a special edition of a journal on Ottoman labour history, which some of

31 History from below has also sparked oral history studies: Staughton Lynd, “Oral History from Below,” *Oral History Review* 21, no. 1 (1993), 1.

his own students had contributed to. He insisted that modern Turkey was not the only successor state of the Ottoman Empire, and that to act as though it were, was to wrongly reflect the heritage of the multi-ethnic, multi-national Ottoman Empire.³² We are thus lucky to have Kokdaş's contribution, which Quataert would have highly appreciated. After all, if we exclude Greek scholars, Kokdaş is one of the very few Ottoman historians using Greek primary and secondary sources, which is exactly what Quataert would have wanted. Kokdaş examines the changing networks and relationships in 18th century Salonika on the basis of the Greek and Ottoman sources. Focusing on the military, economic and political power distribution and tensions between the region's strong military household, the Evrenosoğulları, and Evlad-ı Fatihan/Yörük groups, the author underlines how the Evrenosoğulları lost the ability to protect the villagers of the region. This deficiency led to the Evlad-ı Fatihan deepening their ties to the central government. He also investigates the meaning of the rise to prominence of Albanian tax-farmers in the second half of the 18th century, new political actors where the people of the region and the central government were concerned. Finally, Kokdaş concludes that the rising military power of the Albanian mercenaries in Salonika city itself and in the surrounding towns created important tensions with the janissaries.

In the second piece in this section, M. Mert Sunar begins with the three most important revolts of the early 19th century, namely the 1807/Kabakçı Mustafa Incident, the 1808/Alemdar Incident and 1826/the last Janissary uprising, and emphasizing how these movements cannot be considered simple military coups/revolts, and how it is necessary to evaluate them properly in connection with social movements. From the 18th century onwards, the janissaries, though maintaining their military identities, were like ordinary Istanbul residents, largely working as artisans.³³ Accordingly, they were affected by the political and economic situation in the same way as anyone else in the city. One of the things Sunar emphasizes is how janissary participation in Ottoman revolts was rooted more in socio-economic than in military causes; and hence how an easy labelling of the revolts in Istanbul as "janissary riots" is objectionable. Sunar's piece also contains an answer to the question of why the Ottomans never had their own "French Revolution"-style situation!

³² Donald Quataert, "Epilogue," *International Review of Social History* 54 (2009), Supplement, 192-193. For his thoughts on the problematic identification of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey see the following Quataert-Zürcher debate: Donald Quataert, review of *Turkey: A Modern History*, by Erik Jan Zürcher, *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 22, nos. 1-2 (1995): 190-192; Erik Jan Zürcher, "Letter to the Editor," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 23, no. 1 (1996): 113-114. Also see Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire: 1700-1922*, 2.

³³ Sunar here focuses only on the janissary-artisan relationship and the role of the state in this matter: Mehmet Mert Sunar, "Yeniçeri Esâme Defterlerinin Işığında İstanbul'da Yeniçeri-Esnaf İlişkileri," in *Tarih İçinde İstanbul: Bildiriler* (Istanbul: MTT, 2011), 419-426. Actually, the reason for the janissaries having gone into artisanal activities was "official encouragement": Mehmet Mert Sunar, "Ocak-ı Âmire'den Ocak-ı Mülgâ'ya Doğru: Nizâm-ı Cedid Reformaları Karşısında Yeniçeriler," in *Nizâm-ı Kadîm'den Nizâm-ı Cedid'e: III. Selim ve Dönemi*, ed. Seyfi Kenan (Istanbul: İSAM Yayınları, 2010), 502. On the same topic, see Nalan Turna, "Yeniçeri-Esnaf İlişkisi: Bir Analiz," in *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Esnaf ve Ticaret*, ed. Fatmagül Demirel (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2012), 21-42.

There are topics that have traditionally been considered “lightweight” in Ottoman historiography, and consequently not treated very often. Suraiya Faroqhi takes up just such a topic, looking at the history of emotions, more particularly, fear, the need for protection, doubt and hate as well as the relationship between fire and politics.³⁴ The topic of Faroqhi’s paper is the emotional response of Şanizade Mehmed Ataulah, an early 19th century chronicler to fires and fire victims.³⁵ I hope that Faroqhi’s article will motivate colleagues to find more sources reflecting the way in which Ottoman individuals expressed their emotions –ordinary individuals from the period before the Tanzimat being of special interest– and examine these source materials from a similar perspective.

Nurçin İleri’s article in this section considers a dimension of “semi-dark” 19th century Istanbul that is difficult for us to imagine in today’s “fully enlightened” world, namely lighting. İleri’s article discusses the manner in which the state and the people reacted to lighting technology in first days when it was first introduced into Ottoman Istanbul, and the transition of lighting from a personal responsibility to a public/municipal duty. İleri’s article examines in detail the relationship between lighting, public security and economic revitalization; the author follows the topic in multiple dimensions from archival documents, from lighting cuts to lighting taxes. She expounds on the new daily life/nightlife of the people with access to lighting, which was received as an attack on religious, philosophical and moral values by a spectrum of authors, from contemporary intellectuals to the writers of comic magazines.

The final article in this section is Axel Çorlu’s discussion of Ottoman involvement in the first “golden era” of anarchism (1850-1917). I believe that Çorlu’s study, as one of the first on this topic, fills an important conceptual/theoretical gap in terms of integrating the Ottoman case into work on world anarchism and anarchists; I am of the opinion that this conceptual/theoretical broaching of the subject will guide future work. Using documents first accessed for this article - to be more specific, 612 reports from the Ottoman archive - the author decodes the identities and concerns of Ottoman anarchists. In addition to understanding the multiple ethnic and social backgrounds of the people involved, the reader will find the extremely interesting story of an Ottoman anarchist named Sezar Kamilyeri, who changed his name to Hasan bin Abdullah after falling in love with an Arab girl in Zanzibar. Referring to Baha Tevfik, Çorlu’s article ends with the question, “Can we speak of an Ottoman anarchism?”.

Quataert was also much interested in communication and the press; Gül Karagöz-Kızılca did her doctorate on press history under his direction. Although Quataert did not live to see her finish,³⁶ they worked together for long enough to develop the main structure of her work.

³⁴ Faroqhi’s concern with the history of feelings goes thirty years back: Suraiya Faroqhi, “Duyguların da Bir Tarihçesi Vardır: Lucien Febvre’in Yapıtları,” trans. İsen Arıcanlı ve Latife Özkaramete, *Toplum ve Bilim* 28 (1985): 149-163.

³⁵ Şânî-zâde Mehmed ‘Atâ’ullah Efendi, *Şânî-zâde Târîhi [Osmanlı Tarihi (1223-1237/1808-1821)]*, 2 vols., ed. Ziya Yılmaz (Istanbul: Çamlıca Basım Yayın, 2008).

³⁶ “Voicing the Interests of the Public?” Contestation, Negotiation, and the Emergence of Ottoman Language Newspapers during the Financial Crises of the Ottoman Empire (1862-1875) (PhD diss., State University of New York at Binghamton, 2011). The dissertation was completed under the supervision of Rifa’at Ali Abou-El-Haj.

Karagöz-Kızılca advocates a revision of standard Ottoman history-writing, which sees the Ottoman press as merely shedding light on the lives of the Ottoman elites. She has undertaken a detailed reading of a newspaper named *Hadika*, appearing in the 1870s, through the lens of labour history, workers and social history. Looking at its news, advertising, price and form, she comments on the people it seeks to address, its aims and especially its opposition to the Ottoman central government, its international relations and financial plans. The author seeks to understand *Hadika*'s position in the context of the contemporary press; particularly successful is her comparison with *İbret*. Karagöz-Kızılca's reading of *Hadika* shows us how an Ottoman newspaper can be read as more than a "series of events": in particular, how social history can be teased out of it. Karagöz-Kızılca questions the widespread acceptance of the Ottoman newspaper as merely a product of elite circles and consumed only by elites.

Palmira Brummett is well-known for her work on Ottoman press history. She has provided us with a short contribution, by the standards of this book, but a highly valuable one. She examines three Karagöz (shadow puppet) cartoons in terms of labour, trade and the public sphere. Karagöz-Kızılca and Brummett's contributions overlap, both in the sense that they focus on periodicals and as they both emphasize Quataert's theme of "popular resistance."

Quataert never worked on the sixteenth century; he did not focus on the history of Ottoman culture or thought, and he wrote on the secular dimensions of the Ottoman world rather than on *ulema* and sufis. But he was certainly in contact with the experts who studied these fields.

Hence, Baki Tezcan considers the personal, intellectual and philosophical adventures of Muslihiddin Lari, who was born in Iran at the start of the sixteenth century. Lari went from the Safavid to the Mughal Empire and from there to the Ottoman realm in a lifelong search for a patron he never found. Doubtless, his journey through every land brought its own stories, but Tezcan provides a discussion of his Istanbul adventure, and why was a disappointment. In the Istanbul of Süleyman the Magnificent, in the late 1550s, Lari sought the patronage of grand vizier Rüstem Pasha; and he was brought before the Sheikh ul-Islam, Ebussuud Efendi. He did not find what he was looking for with Rüstem, and was silenced by Ebussuud. Tezcan argues that the essential reason why Lari could not cope with Istanbul was the hostile climate of Ottoman thought towards new ideas, at the time when the Ottoman central legal structure was undergoing conservative change. Thus, according to Tezcan's research, Lari's inability to make an impact in Istanbul was not due to a lack of intellectual capacity when confronted with Ebussuud, but resulted from a difference of opinions. Tezcan evaluates Lari not only as a figure who remained outside the circles that dominated the history of Ottoman thought³⁷ but also as an extraordinarily productive scholar. Tezcan especially emphasizes that Lari may be regarded as the first author of a *fundamental* world history book on Ottoman soil, and provides a study of this work, named *Mir'at al-Adwar*, in contrast to its Turkish translation by Hoca Sadeddin Efendi.

37 For answers to what acceptable views were in Lari's environment and which intellectuals went outside the circles, see Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler (15.-17. Yüzyıllar)* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998).

The other article in this section is by Heath W. Lowry, who discusses whether famous sufi Niyazi-ı Mısri had his original dervish lodge in Bursa or in Limni. Lowry defends the view of the dervishes of the Halvetiye sect's Mısriye branch, who see the Limni lodge as their main centre, mainly because Mısri is buried there. Not only dervishes, but the late era sheikhs of the Bursa lodge and even Ottoman state officials expressed the opinion that the Limni lodge was pre-eminent. Lowry supports his view with an inscription on the lodge at Limni, a document from the archives and new photographs from the reign of Abdülhamid II that he has discovered.

The first article in the section "The Ottoman Empire on the Eve of Its Disappearance and the Early Years of the Republic" is by Abdulhamit Kırmızı, and focuses on ordinary Ottoman people and civil and military bureaucrats, who behaved heroically in the events surrounding the Armenians of Adana between 14-17 and 25-27 April 1909. Kırmızı studies the positions of a group of Ottoman bureaucrats such as the headman (*muhtar*), the head of the finance office (*mal müdürü*), the sub-district governor (*kaymakam*), and especially Hacı Mehmed Efendi, Major of Sis (*Sis Binbaşısı*), active within the borders of Kozan *sancak*, who fought to save the lives of Armenians in the wake of the 1908 revolution. One of the most important conclusions Kırmızı makes in his piece, through applying the lifesavers/rescuers paradigm from Holocaust studies to the events concerning Armenians in Adana in 1909, is that whilst most of the Holocaust rescuers were civilians, these Muslim rescuers were civilians plus a wide range of the military and civilian bureaucracy. Kırmızı also emphasizes that both conventional Turkish historiography and Armenian historians have completely neglected the rescuers in the 1909 events.

The second article in this section comes from Reşat Kasaba, who focuses on the war experiences of two individuals who lived in İzmir towards the end of the First World War: the governor of İzmir between 1913 and 1918, Mustafa Rahmi Bey (1864-1947) and a Levantine from Bornova, Hortense Wood (1844-1924). Mustafa Rahmi's attitude in the midst of war coincides with Abdulhamit Kırmızı's examples: Mustafa Rahmi a local administrator, also fought to protect the Levantines' rights at a time when the countries whose passports they carried had declared war on the Ottoman Empire, and they were in desperate need of protection. Kasaba examines the situation of the Levantines³⁸ in wartime through the writings of Wood, and examines her decision to remain in İzmir after the war ended.

The final article in this section, and the book, is by Erik-Jan Zürcher, whose article on the situation of Turkey *vis-à-vis* the 1929 world crisis, concludes that the authoritarian state he perceives as having begun to form from 1925 onwards, at the beginning of the 1930s began to descend into a totalitarian structure aiming to control all dimensions of social life. Zürcher does not see the "totalitarianization" of Turkey in the 1930s as a necessary result of the economic crisis. He believes the Kemalist revolution already contained significant authoritarian leanings. These lean-

38 An extensive compilation on Levantine history, a product of the first Levantine conference in Istanbul (The Levantines: Commerce and Diplomacy), held on November 3 – 5, 2014, is under preparation by Axel B. Çorlu, one of the contributors to the present volume.

ings, he says, combined with the pressures generated by the 1929 world crisis, to push the country onto the road to true totalitarianism. Zürcher says that these totalitarian impulses can be seen in many areas, from pressure on civil society organizations and their ultimate closing to 1933 university reform, and that this course of events set back Turkey's political development by twenty years.

THE TITLE OF THIS BOOK

I did not think very hard about the title of this book. I thought that *History from Below* would be the best choice; the people that Quataert studied throughout his life were never elites or bureaucrats. The website that Quataert established together with John T. Chalcraft, to share documents and pictures that he had collected throughout his academic life carried the title, "History from Below in the Ottoman Empire and the Modern Middle East: An Archive."³⁹ In his later years, he also started a graduate course at Binghamton entitled "History from Below." Even more importantly, three conference talks he gave at the end of his academic life all emphasized this issue:

"History from Below in Ottoman and Middle Eastern Studies: A Call for Volunteers," Keynote address to the "23rd Annual Middle East History and Theory Conference," University of Chicago, May 10, 2008.

"History from Below and the Ottoman World," University of Pennsylvania, Middle East Center and History Department, February 16, 2010.

"History from Below: the Case of the Ottoman Empire," Cornell University, Department of Near Eastern Studies, May 5, 2010.

Following Quataert's death, Jean H. Quataert prepared for publication⁴⁰ "History from Below and the Writing of Ottoman History," his final public conference talk on 5 November 2010 at Binghamton University, which he had also presented at Columbia, Washington and Toronto universities. From information given by Jean Quataert on his three additional conferences, it has become apparent that Quataert emphasized the importance of "History from Below" at no less than seven different American universities, and he had thought hard about how we would be able to apply the relevant methods to Ottoman historiography.

The representatives of the "History from Below" movement have necessarily had to go beyond the sources used by classic historians in order to bring subordinate groups onto the agenda.

³⁹ Accessed May 19, 2015 <http://harvey.binghamton.edu/~ottmiddl/>.

⁴⁰ Donald Quataert, "History from Below and the Writing of Ottoman History," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 34, no. 1 (2014): 129-134.

[Quataert published the version of this talk given in Chicago in May 2008 in Turkish in memory of Sevilay Kaygalak: "Osmanlı Çalışmaları ve Aşağıdan Tarih," trans. E. Attila Aytekin, in *Sevilay Kaygalak'a Armağan: Tarih, Sınıflar ve Kent*, ed. Besime Şen and Ali Ekber Doğan (Ankara: Dipnot, 2010), 20-30.]

The journal *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, in which Quataert's aforementioned article was published, set aside a part of an issue in memory of Quataert; six of his students published articles in it. See 126-219. The introduction to this special section was written by Kent F. Schull who has taken over Quataert's flag for Ottoman studies at Binghamton: "The Impact of Donald Quataert's 'History from Below' on Ottoman and Turkish Studies," 126-128.

These are a variety of sources outside those produced by the state: diaries, memoirs, private narrative, and particularly photographs.⁴¹ Quataert used all of these. His book on Zonguldak emerged entirely from these types of sources, as obvious from his publication of a miner's reminiscences and the photographic site he set up for documenting labour history, as I have mentioned above.

While writing the introduction to this volume I saw that "History from Below" had already been used as the title of a book, which honoured one of the pioneers of this field, namely British historian George Rudé: "*History from Below: Studies in Popular Protest and Popular Ideology in Honour of George Rudé*."⁴² The emphasis on history from below must first have been propounded by Lucien Febvre in 1932: "histoire vue d'en bas et non d'en haut"⁴³ (history seen from below and not from above). Even if there is controversy on the subject, E. P. Thompson seems to have used the term in English for the first time.⁴⁴ In an article, Thompson at an early time,⁴⁵ around 1966, pointed out how studies of labour history needed to change from their traditional form, and how some new labour studies of those days were changing in a positive way. But throughout, he never once used the phrasing "history from below";⁴⁶ or tried to flesh out this conceptualization. Rather, his concern was to evaluate the existing literature in Europe in the field of labour history and explain what "new labour history"⁴⁷ was, emphasizing how it needed to break from traditional ways.

⁴¹ Jim Sharpe, "History from Below," in *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, ed. Peter Burke, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Polity, 2001), 27; David F. Crew, "Alltagsgeschichte: A New Social History 'from Below?'," *Central European History* 22, nos. 3-4 (1989): 396-397; Arthur Lehning, "Sources of Labour History," *The Times Literary Supplement*, September 8, 1966, 809-811.

For a good example of how to use these kinds of sources in "History from Below", and particularly in the history of medicine, see Roy Porter, "The Patient's View: Doing Medical History from Below," *Theory and Society* 14, no. 2 (1985): 175-198.

⁴² Ed. Frederick Krantz (Montreal: Concordia University, 1985). This 22-article festschrift book was three years later published as 14 selected articles as *History from Below: Studies in Popular Protest and Popular Ideology* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988).

⁴³ Lucien Febvre, "Albert Mathiez: un tempérament, une éducation," *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale* 4, no. 18 (1932): 576. Also see Reinhold Kramer, Tom Mitchell, *When the State Trembled: How A. J. Andrews and the Citizens' Committee Broke the Winnipeg General Strike* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 323; Tom Mitchell, "History from Below," *The Times Literary Supplement*, November 24, 2006, 15. For the discussion begun by Tom Mitchell and the answer by Lex Heerma van Voss on the H-Labor listserv see <http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=h-labor&month=0605&week=c&msg=TkgajX7Nh0JkU1hqhM%2bnnA&user=&pw=> Accessed May 1, 2015.

⁴⁴ E. P. Thompson, "History from Below," *The Times Literary Supplement*, April 7, 1966, 279-280. Reprinted in *The Essential E. P. Thompson*, ed. Dorothy Thompson (New York: The New Press, 2001), 481-489.

⁴⁵ As Ottoman labour history still did not form a separate sub-discipline at the start of the 2000s [see Donald Quataert, "Labor History and the Ottoman Empire, c. 1700-1922," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 60 (2001), 95] I call this an early date. According to Quataert, early stirrings on topics that can be considered part of Ottoman labour history should really be considered contributions to Ottoman economic historiography; history from below remained marginal: "Labor History and the Ottoman Empire, c. 1700-1922," 98, 105. What he means here is this: "For a long time, topics such as trade and agriculture have found their place among the topics of Ottoman historiography; however, the people and groups who served in these sectors have not." See Donald Quataert, "Workers and the State during the Late Ottoman Empire," in *The State and the Subaltern: Modernization, Society, and the State in Turkey and Iran*, ed. Touraj Atabaki (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007), 17-18.

⁴⁶ It has been a cause for speculation as to whether it was Geoffrey Barraclough, the editor of the three special sections entitled "New Ways in History" (1966) in *The Times Literary Supplement* who named Thompson's work "History from Below" as Thompson himself never used this exact term: Tom Mitchell, "History from Below," *TLS*, 15.

⁴⁷ After all, he produced the work that enabled the transition from old labour history to new labour history: *The Making of the*

Doubtless, as Vinay Bahl has said, history from below did not emerge in a void, and was not simply fed by an enthusiasm to write about subaltern groups. The “History from Below” movement was brought to life through the efforts of a group of Marxists in the world of the 1960s. E. P. Thompson should undoubtedly be counted as their leader; another was Eric J. Hobsbawm.⁴⁸ In his essay “History from Below” that he contributed to the *Rudé* festschrift, Hobsbawm asked which “ordinary people” should reasonably be made subjects of historiography. While admitting that it was certainly attractive to read the hitherto unknown life stories of ordinary folk, he stressed that our motivations for writing were at least as important as the contents of what we wrote. Whilst conventional historiography was concerned largely with sources “ready for use”, someone looking at history from below would not usually find them ready at hand. In history from below, the sources were created spontaneously, many sources becoming usable for history from below when the right questions were asked of them.

From this perspective, history from below is very gruelling and time-consuming.⁴⁹ Hobsbawm credited the development of the writing of the history of ordinary people into a separate discipline, to the French historiographical tradition, foremost Marc Bloch and George Lefebvre.⁵⁰ Just as Thompson, Hobsbawm did not, with one exception, use the term “history from below”, preferring to use “grassroots history”. It is unclear who brought the term to its present mainstream use, even including the title of an English-language music album.⁵¹ But it is clear that Quataert’s work fell squarely within the research agenda of history from below, and the people he worked on were, in Hobsbawm’s words, “the sort of people whose names are usually unknown to anyone except their family and neighbours,”⁵² and as a result, the title of this book is *History from Below*.

* * *

Quataert was a great lover of nature, and a traveller as well. His brother Michael Quataert sent me an album of photographs showing him from his childhood onwards. Some other photographs were taken during our time together at Binghamton or he shared them with us over the internet after some of his travels. He passed away on 10 February 2011. On 2 April 2011 at Bing-

English Working Class (New York: Pantheon Books, 1963); Marcel van der Linden, “Labour History: The Old, the New and the Global,” *African Studies* 66, nos. 2-3 (2007): 169.

48 See Vinay Bahl, “What Went Wrong with ‘History from Below’,” *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 11, 2003, 140.

49 Eric J. Hobsbawm, “History from Below—Some Reflections,” in *History from Below: Studies in Popular Protest and Popular Ideology*, ed. Frederick Krantz (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988), 13-27.

Hobsbawm gives importance to the power of ordinary people that collectively shape history, [*Uncommon People: Resistance, Rebellion and Jazz* (New York: The New Press, 1998), vii]:

“Their lives [ordinary people] are as interesting as yours and mine, even if nobody has written about them. My point is rather that, collectively, if not as individuals, such men and women are major historical actors. What they do and they think, makes a difference. It can and has changed culture and the shape of history...”

50 Hobsbawm, “History from Below—Some Reflections,” 15.

51 The 2010 Delta Spirit album “History from Below”!

52 Hobsbawm, *Uncommon People*, vii.

hamton University, a memorial entitled *Celebrating the Life of Donald Quataert* was arranged.⁵³ In Turkey too, on 27 May 2011 at Boğaziçi University there was a memorial conference with the participation of Quataert's colleagues and students. [New Perspectives on the Late Ottoman Empire: A Conference in Memory of Donald Quataert (1941-2011)].⁵⁴

Quataert's writings were classics and true gifts to Ottoman historiography. I hope that this book in his honour will also remain a classic in the field and maybe provide some of the source material for a one-day-to-be-written *A People's History of the Ottoman Empire*. I finished the piece I wrote for *Toplumsal Tarih* following the memorial meeting organized at Boğaziçi University like this: "We owe it as a debt to Quataert to publish the papers delivered in this productive memorial conference and make them permanent."⁵⁵ I am very happy to have been able to carry out this duty.

I want to finish my piece with a few sentences by Roger Owen which you can read in this volume:

Best of all, everything he did bore the characteristic Quataert stamp: written with great integrity, written because the study of the working lives of the forgotten people he had chosen to make his subjects really mattered.

* * *

For the cover picture, I took care to choose something that represented Donald Quataert's areas of interest. Clearly the best source were the photographs on Quataert's own publicly-available internet site.⁵⁶ I selected a picture from the Orlando Carlo Calumeno Collection; and Mr. Calumeno said "yes" immediately when I asked him for permission. For this courtesy, I would like to thank him very much. In addition, I thank my dear wife Cihan Osmanağaoğlu-Karahasanoğlu, Süleyman Zağl, Emre Eken and Emrecan Dağlıoğlu for their help and support in preparing this book. I would also like to thank Suraiya Faroqhi for keeping tabs on this work from the beginning. She read a great part of the articles, offering revisions and comments. This was in order to make this book prepared in memory of her friend the best it could possibly be. It is very much appreciated.

REFERENCES

Ahmet Naim. *Yer Altında Kırk Beş Sene: Bir Maden İşçisinin Anıları*. Edited by Sina Çıladır. Istanbul: Evrensel Basım Yayın, 2014.
Atabaki, Touraj, and Gavin D. Brockett. "Ottoman and Republican Turkish Labor History: An Introduction." *In-*

⁵³ This memorial program can still be watched online. Accessed May 3, 2015 <http://www2.binghamton.edu/history/people/faculty/donald.html>.

⁵⁴ Selim Karahasanoğlu, "Donald Quataert Boğaziçi Üniversitesi'nde Anıldı," *Toplumsal Tarih* 211 (2011): 9.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Accessed May 15, 2015 <http://bingweb.binghamton.edu/~coal/>.