

time. On the sensitive matter of *takfīr*, ʿUthaymin rehearses both the Wahhabi position and that of its critics, noting that in early years both claimed to have Ibn Taymiyya on their side. The discussion of *bidʿa* is couched in a concise overview of the concept's handling in the history of Islamic law. ʿUthaymin gives similar treatment to *ijtihād* and *taqlīd* in Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhab's writings.

In sum, this monograph represents a cautious approach to rendering its subject's life and thought. It sifts through inconsistencies in the chronicles about the details of Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhab's early career but does not take up broad questions. For example, ʿUthaymin refrains from offering explanations for the doctrinal rupture that Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhab wrought in 18th-century Arabia. Comparison to other religious-reform movements, a common feature in the literature on Wahhabism, is missing as well. The closest ʿUthaymin comes to a thesis is his suggestion that conditions in Central Arabia were ripe for religious reform and political unification, but the implications of that point are left hanging. A bare-bones presentation of material drawn from the relevant sources does have the virtue of laying out a basic framework for Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhab's career and doctrine. When ʿUthaymin completed his dissertation in 1972, it was an original piece of historical scholarship. Since then, historians have pushed deeper into analysis of the local sources and facets of Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhab's education, travels, writings, and polemics. An updated preface or conclusion would have been a welcome opportunity for the author to reflect on recent scholarship. Nevertheless, the book's brevity and clarity lend it to productive use as an introduction to the sources and the subject.

REŞAT KASABA, *A Moveable Empire: Ottoman Nomads, Migrants and Refugees*, Studies in Modernity and National Identity (Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press, 2009). Pp. 194. \$70.00 cloth, \$30.00 paper.

REVIEWED BY DONALD QUATAERT, Department of History, Binghamton University, State University of New York, Binghamton, N.Y.; e-mail: dquataer@binghamton.edu
doi:10.1017/S0020743810000644

This is a warmly welcomed and successful work on a vital issue in Ottoman and Middle East history—the place of nomads, migrants, and refugees. Both the chronological and geographical scales of the book are vast, including all of Ottoman history and most of the empire. Reşat Kasaba does justice to the former, although, given his own interests, there is more weight to the post-1700 era. In terms of the latter, due attention is given to the Balkan, Anatolian, and Arab provinces, but the African regions are ignored. The book tends to focus on nomads and tribes while migrants and refugees receive far less attention. It should be stressed that the work is a bit of an odd hybrid, a kind of monographic overview. Not since Kemal Karpat's earlier studies have we seen so much attention paid to the worthy subject of population and population movements, and Kasaba's book surely will stimulate further research.

The author presents an intelligent analysis of the Ottoman state's changing policies over the centuries. I liked the nuances of the presentation, demonstrating shifts but not radical breaks in the state's efforts to deal with the vast movements within and across the empire. Throughout, nomads remain an important if ever-changing component in the Ottoman state's calculus of power. In the early years, nomads were an important source of strength as the state sought to weave a symbiosis between them and its emerging institutions. With a flexibility that historians are now seeing as a key factor in Ottoman success, the early state sought to both incorporate and administer many of the mobile groups it encountered in its disparate territories. These administrative tribal units were not bounded but quite loose territorial areas, premised on the understanding that the state needed the nomads to maintain and extend its

own power. It did sometimes move and settle groups, but these were specific, focused, and limited actions. Overall, Kasaba argues, nomads increased in numbers “during the first half of Ottoman rule” (p. 37).

As borders with neighbors began to harden by the end of the 17th century, however, new approaches were needed. Nomadism and mobility became less an asset and more a potential weakness that needed to be contained. Therefore, the state more frequently implemented nomad resettlements, expanded the enrollment of tribal members as border guards, and tried to integrate tribes into special military units. As the author shows, these 17th- and 18th-century programs were but a weak foreshadowing of those to come a century later.

The author illustrates that in the 18th and especially the 19th centuries, an expanding state relied on and used the tribes as part of its increasing power. As he incisively states, nomadism faded, but tribalism remained. Tribes and state grew together in power over the course of the 19th century. Sometimes juggling, sometimes imposing, always negotiating, the state created and maintained a balance of interests that shifted over time. Thus, reliance on provincial forces that saved the empire in the 1820s differed sharply from the use of Hamidiye regiments as a supplemental, if regionally crucial, force in the 1890s. Kasaba’s treatment of tribalism/nomadism and the state is simply excellent.

Although there were major refugee movements in the 18th century, these reached stupendous and at times unmanageable proportions only later. Here perhaps the author might have more explicitly linked the state’s continuing reliance on tribes to its need for aid in dealing with the terrible insecurities brought by the refugee waves. In his closing pages, the author reminds us effectively, if too briefly, of the catastrophic events of the last days of empire, including the slaughter of the Armenians and the brutalities of the population exchange. He seems a bit rushed here, as in his cursory treatment of migratory labor, a subject on which he has written well elsewhere. Overall, however, this book is a truly fine achievement and is highly recommended.

ALI ANOOSHAHR, *The Ghazi Sultans and the Frontiers of Islam: A Comparative Study of the Late Medieval and Early Modern Periods*, Routledge Studies in Middle Eastern History (New York: Routledge, 2009). Pp. 208. \$140 cloth.

REVIEWED BY ANNE F. BROADBRIDGE, Department of History, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Mass.; e-mail: broadbridge@history.umass.edu
doi:10.1017/S0020743810000656

In this ambitious comparative approach to the concept of *ghazā* (roughly, holy war), Ali Anooshahr seeks not to determine what *ghazā* meant and whether particular individuals lived up to the model of a *ghāzi* but rather how Muslim authors and rulers understood, created, and modified *ghāzi* rhetoric. He attempts to answer what role this rhetoric played in rulers’ political self-expression through case studies of three men: Mahmud of Ghazna (d. 1031), the Ottoman Sultan Murad II (d. 1451), and Babur (d. 1530), founder of the Mughal Empire. To accomplish this, Anooshahr focuses on the interrelationships between texts in the creation and transmission of ghazi images, the ways authors and rulers understood and appropriated these images, the images’ employment in propaganda campaigns, and the effect of these campaigns on audiences. Although he connects his literary discussion to historical events, he admits in the introduction that his intent is not to provide a historical narrative. The list of works consulted is impressively long, linguistically diverse, and chronologically and geographically wide ranging: histories, epics, poetry, and advice manuals in Persian, Turkish, and Arabic from the early Abbasid, Ghaznavid, Seljuk, Qarakhanid, Khwarazm-Shah, Ottoman, non-Ottoman