has led me not only to corroborate these views in full but also to suggest that we can go a step further in the consideration of the *Rasā'il* as a model, and probably even a direct one, to Ibn Masarra. In my view, the *Risālat al-iʿtibār* derives from the *Rasā'il* most of its motifs – as for instance "the Ladder of Ascension", "the upside-down plants", "the Footstool and the Throne" or "the image of the world as a book" – and, what is more, the very first words of the treatise include a typically Ikhwānian formula that suggests that Ibn Masarra might have wished subtly to acknowledge his own debt to the Brethren in that place (G. de Callataÿ, "Philosophy and bāṭinism: Ibn Masarra's *Risālat al-iʿtibār* and the *Rasā'il Ikhwān al-Ṣafā'*", forthcoming in *JSAI*). At the end of Ebstein's magisterial demonstration, one fundamental question remains: through which channels was this particular type of Eastern mystical philosophy transmitted to the western part of Islam, and how can we account for its presence in works of Sunni authors such as Ibn Masarra and Ibn ʿArabī?

Although not claiming to offer any final answer to this discussion, Ebstein puts forward some interesting elements at the beginning and at the end of his book. Among other possible explanations, his preference goes to the suggestion that "in the course of their political–religious struggle against the Fāṭimīs, the Andalusīs became exposed to Ismāʿīlī conceptions and perhaps even to Ismāʿīlī writings" (p. 5). This is certainly a possibility, but it has its limitations. At least in the case of the *Rasā'il Ikhwān al-Ṣafā'*, a work which seems to have been largely ignored by the Fāṭimid *daʿwa*, I would be inclined to regard as much more decisive the journeys accomplished in the Orient by so many Andalusī mystics of the ninth and tenth centuries, including Ibn Masarra and some of his followers, as has begun to be documented in recent decades (M. Marín, "Abū Saʿīd ibn al-Aʿrābī et le développement du soufisme en al-Andalus", *Revue du monde musulman et de la Méditerranée*, 63–4, 1992, pp. 28–38.

Godefroid de Callataÿ
University of Louvain

DOĞAN GÜRPINAR:

Ottoman Imperial Diplomacy: A Political, Social and Cultural History.
(Library of Ottoman Studies.) 288 pp. London and New York:
I.B. Tauris, 2013. £68. ISBN 978 17807 6112 1.
doi:10.1017/S0041977X14000652

Few would disagree that diplomatic history, on the whole, remains a profoundly conservative sub-field of the discipline. However, it has not been entirely unaffected by historiographical developments, with an increasing focus on practice, agency, finance, and other crucial elements aside from metanarratives of Eurocentric geopolitics. Ottoman diplomatic history has largely remained within the confines of the grand narrative, often told by those with no ability to deal with Ottoman sources. This is changing for both the early and late modern periods, however, and Gürpınar's study is a welcome contribution.

Gürpınar uses a range of printed and archival sources to construct his narrative in conjunction with a wide spectrum of scholarly literature, in particular using a number of methodological approaches from international relations and other social sciences. The aims of the study are clearly set out in the introduction, to wit: to examine the "mental structures" of the late Ottoman bureaucracy; to investigate the emergence of a "bureaucratic nationalism" and its links with Turkish

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X14000652 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nationalism; and, ultimately, to show that the "Turkish nation" was created by the elites of the Ottoman foreign ministry through the development of the notion of subservience of the people to the benevolent state (pp. 1–2). This study is therefore an attempt to demonstrate how Turkish national modernity was largely the product of the *mentalité* of the late Ottoman diplomatic corps. This produces a tension in the narrative, on the one hand attempting to shed light on the complex world of late Ottoman diplomatic practice, and on the other writing always with an eye to the methodological goal. Without this tension, Gürpınar's analysis has the potential for a so much more nuanced narrative of late Ottoman diplomatic and intellectual history than some grand teleological march to a generic Turkish modernity.

Gürpınar begins with a study of the idea of a Turkish/Ottoman *ancien régime* as the ideological grandfather of Turkish state-centred nationalism, with the diplomats of the Ottoman state being the pre-eminent representatives of a Turkish *ancien régime* (p. 56) and the ultimate bureaucrats (p. 179). This at once places a national modernity in a specifically European context, in terms of comparisons made and literature used, yet also asserts that there was something idiosyncratic (p. 17) and therefore particular about the Turkish/Ottoman model. Such an assertion is also made at the book's close, claiming that there was little evidence to support the idea that before 1908 the Ottoman Foreign Ministry was modelled on a European example (p. 248). This sort of particularism is perfectly plausible, yet it seems unlikely that the Foreign Ministry as it emerged by the end of the nineteenth century was entirely unaffected by European ideas and institutions, even if this is not explicitly detailed in the sources.

The bulk of the book deals with a number of fascinating case studies of the social background, mentalities, and practices of the diplomatic corps, supported with archival and printed material. These examples ultimately aim to demonstrate the roots of Turkish bureaucracy and state-centred modernity in the late Ottoman context, and provide valuable evidence for the diplomatic sphere in order to build on what has been compiled in other aspects of late Ottoman state and society. Yet there are two elements of this study that might be called into question. The first is the subordination of the narrative to "Turkish modernity" and of that modernity to the category of the state, with no engagement with economic developments and social upheavals, nor with other ideological sources. Indeed, chapter 2 reasserts a Rankean *Primat der Außenpolitik* in intellectual and political formations. The state seems to know all, see all, and do all. Its actors inhabit a closed world, unaffected by other economic or social developments. As such, the "bureaucratic mind" (p. 179) of the Ottoman Foreign Ministry is presented as a homogeneous collective *mentalité*, driven by the idea, expressed in the conclusion, of "the renunciation of the multiple objects of loyalty in the Empire and the monopolisation of one single object of loyalty [in the Republic], the Nation" (p. 266). The story of late Ottoman diplomacy here is one of a march from a uniform Ottoman plurality to a Republican monolith. For Gürpınar, Foreign Ministry officials were governed by one of only two objectives: the nation; or class self-interest. As such, diplomats in this model could *only* act in the interests of their class, until after 1908 when the nation would trump all.

The second issue is one of continuity. Little attention is given to Ottoman diplomacy before the late eighteenth century. According to Gürpınar, the Ottomans "failed to modernise the craft and techniques of diplomacy, such as information gathering and utilisation of gathered information" (p. 63). In other words, the pre-Tanzimat period was something of a dark age, with the Ottoman state unprepared for the challenges of diplomacy, and the bureaucracy dominated by nepotism and personal interest. However, it cannot be said that the early modern Ottomans did

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X14000652 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not possess knowledge of dealing with the European state system. Recent studies of individual Ottoman embassies and knowledge exchange in that period conclusively demonstrate that the Ottomans were not only aware of and even interested in European diplomacy and state structures, but were active participants in a range of diplomatic activities, especially information gathering. It is not fair to argue, therefore, that the rising prominence of foreign affairs should be traced only to the late eighteenth century; the roots go far deeper than that.

Aside from these issues, this study provides a number of valuable insights into late Ottoman diplomacy. One of the most interesting aspects of chapter 3, analysing the social background of Ottoman diplomats, is the analysis of those from the rich and under-studied *salname*s of the Foreign Ministry. One wishes that this had been further developed, as such quantitative and qualitative studies in diplomatic histories are rare, and greatly complement the *longue durée* analysis. Crucially, the study shows quite clearly that positions in the Foreign Ministry very often depended on family connections, and even on inherited position, and subsequent chapters clearly show continuity in this regard. The Foreign Ministry not only helped to shape political discourse, but also managed to maintain a personal interest in the face of changing regimes and upheavals. Gürpınar places the Revolution of 1908 as a moment of change, when the products of the Ottoman education system took over from the older generation of aristocratic elites, creating in their turn a new form of elite that would thrive in the Turkish bureaucratic system. Overall, this study provides a stimulating approach to the study of late Ottoman diplomacy, elite society, and intellectual history.

Michael Talbot
Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne

CLIVE HOLES and RUDOLF DE JONG (eds):
Ingham of Arabia: A Collection of Articles Presented as a Tribute to the Career of Bruce Ingham.
(Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics.) xvi, 241 pp. Leiden: Brill, 2013. €103. ISBN 978 90 04 25617 0.
doi:10.1017/S0041977X14000664

This volume is dedicated to Professor Bruce Ingham, the renowned researcher of Bedouin dialects in the Arabian Peninsula and recently also of the American Indian Lakota language. Following the editors' preface and the list of Ingham's publications (pp. vii–xvi), the volume introduces papers on subjects related to Ingham's Arabic research. Eight of the eleven chapters study various Bedouin Arabic dialects, while the rest discuss grammatical topics (examined also by Ingham). Each paper begins with introductory sections that place each topic in its dialectological framework.

Peter Behnstedt and Manfred Woidich's chapter "About Bedouin tents and other tents, or 'Tent terminology as an example of Semantic shift'" (pp. 1–21) reviews the huge variety of tent terminology in dialects spreading from the Atlantic Ocean to the Indian Ocean and beyond. Many dialects share numerous terms, while other terms are dialect-specific or semantically different. The authors consider tent kinds and functions, e.g. tents for shepherds, military, weddings, urban and Bedouin, and the materials and tools used to put them up. Some terms are compared with their Hebrew, Berber, Greek or Turkish origins.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X14000652 Published online by Cambridge University Press