

author calls the “Muslim bloc”. Owing to the low level of integration into international markets the central state was able to determine state office as the principal way to power and wealth. Consequently, the urban elites in the interior – merchants, tax farmers, absentee landlords and local bureaucrats – were defined by their close connection to the central state. Economic interests as well as the cultural and educational politics of the late Ottoman state deepened this connection. Political contestation erupted from within the local elite in the form of factional struggle, but there was also popular protest about economic issues, sometimes in the form of bread riots, which could not acquire a class basis as in the port cities.

Ottoman rule was weakest in the frontier zone described in chapter 4. Centralization policies regarding security, infrastructure, administration and education and ideologically sustained by an Ottoman colonial discourse were partly successful in the near frontier (Eastern Anatolia, Northern Iraq). At the far frontier Ottoman power was much too weak and local leaders, who acted as entrepreneurs of violence, extracted protection money and were active in smuggling, remained in power. Political contestation in the frontier zone came in the form of rebellions for local autonomy. Mobilization was most successful when it could rely on religious networks.

The final chapter deals with the modification and dissolution of the three trajectories, coinciding with the post-1908 phase of Ottoman history. The author identifies the Young Turks, who tried to subject all three zones to their centralism with mixed success, as the main actors in this process. All three zones were transformed, especially by the state of constant war from 1912 to 1922, however, some of their features were carried over into the post-Ottoman era of new nation-states.

In summary, the three trajectories model: coast, interior and frontier, succeeds in describing intra-imperial differences in the nineteenth century. It is flexible because it avoids geographical determinism and does not seem overly artificial and because it is developed in close connection with empirical findings from existing historiography. Unfortunately the author consciously limits its application to Anatolia (excluding Eastern Anatolia) and the Ottoman Arab provinces. The interesting case of the Ottoman Balkans where, it can be argued, several trajectories intermingled, remains outside the scope of the book. Perhaps the greatest merit of the proposed model would be if it inspired further comparative research on different regional developments in the late Ottoman Empire, such as the fine examples provided by scholars like Isa Blumi and Yonca Köksal.

Florian Riedler

Zentrum Moderner Orient, Berlin

SIBEL ZANDI-SAYEK:

Ottoman Izmir: The Rise of a Cosmopolitan Port, 1840–1880.

xvii, 273 pp. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012. \$27.50.

ISBN 978 0 8166 6602 7.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X12000730

Sibel Zandi-Sayek’s book takes us into what she sees as the formative period of the busiest port city in the Ottoman Empire, which roughly coincides with the Ottoman *Tanzimat* (1839–76). It focuses on the change of urban space. Space is to be understood here both in a very literal and a more abstract sense. The introduction takes us

on a tour of the most important changes to the built-up space of Izmir during the period: the new infrastructural links running through and from the city that allow people to communicate and move in novel ways; the new sites of pleasure; but also the new places of state power.

The following chapters imbibe these new spaces with meaning. In chapter 1, the author tackles issues of property, taxation, and sovereignty, which in her opinion combined to define a form of citizenship. She concludes that the different ways citizenship was defined and how local residents changed their self-identification indicate “an identity selectively derived from established forms of belonging based on residency and participation in the economic spheres of urban life and from emerging state-sanctioned forms of identity, premised on the equation of citizenship with nationality” (p. 74). In the complex legal context of late imperial Izmir, residents sometimes tended towards the former and sometimes towards the latter.

Chapter 2 addresses the question of order in the streets. A citizenry which in part possessed notable private riches demanded the creation of a public space that reflected this status. This public space should no longer be shaped by the classic urban institutions, such as the *cemaat*, *esnaf*, *vakif* or *mahalle*, but by a new institution banding together the residents as equal and responsible citizens, and which conceived of the urban space as a totality in need of shaping. Sandi-Zayek conceptualizes conflicts between private and public usage not as a conflict between modern and pre-modern, but as “tensions inherent to modern public space” (p. 111). Efforts to shape the public space culminated in the introduction of an elected *belediye* (town council) in 1867.

The heated debates focused on the reordering of the waterfront (chapter 3). While driven by private interests, they were framed as a discussion about the public good. Sandi-Zayek sees here a manifestation of what others have called *conscience citadine* (p. 148).

The final chapter addresses public festivities, beginning with a detailed description of the 1842 Catholic Corpus Christi procession. Religious organizations, expatriate communities, and above all the Ottoman state, achieved through religious holidays, protocol affairs, and national events a temporarily heightened rule over the normally highly diverse public space, co-incidentally producing an impression of unity to others. The number of extravagant festivities demonstrates, according to the author, that allegiances were not stable, but had to be constantly enacted (p. 186).

Sandi-Zayek concludes that “Izmir’s dynamic public sphere . . . emerged at the intersection of the modernizing Ottoman state and the fashioning of new urban identities” (p. 191).

There are two ways of reading this book: one which leads me to laud it without reservation, and another which brings forth a certain uneasiness. I will first explain the latter, then continue with the former. The author styles her book as *avant-garde*, with statements such as, “this book provides an important corrective to studies of Ottoman cities, which have too often been conditioned by assumptions of clear-cut ethnoreligious boundaries and national divides. . . . In particular, I show how people negotiated and maneuvered between institutional boundaries . . .” (p. 7). Such promotional language is best reserved for funding applications rather than manuscripts. However, in the case of nineteenth-century Eastern Mediterranean urban history and that of Izmir in particular, it is simply wrong to say nobody has accomplished a differentiated analysis before. Although less inspired works continue to appear, since 2005 when we have seen the publication of at least three monographs, some edited volumes, and even more articles, we can definitely speak of a turn in “Smyrnoology”

towards a complex reading of this highly diverse society. In the light of these publications, many of Zandi-Sayek's theses do not sound as unique. Her statement in chapter 1 that identities were created through a process of negotiation comes close to Marie-Carmen Smyrnelis's well-known "*jeux d'identités*", where Smyrnelis illustrated how the Smyrniots skilfully manoeuvred between different nationalities and allegiances (*Une société hors de soi: identités et relations sociales à Smyrne aux XVIIIe et XIXe siècles*. Paris, 2005). The ability and limits of citizens claiming to strive for the public good within and without formalized institutions has been a constant theme in numerous articles by Vangelis Kechriotis (e.g. "Protecting the city's interest: the Greek Orthodox and the conflict between municipal and *Vilayet* authorities in İzmir (Smyrna) in the second constitutional period", *Mediterranean Historical Review* 24/2, 2009, 207–21). Likewise, Oliver Schmitt has described the 1842 Corpus Christi celebration (*Levantiner – Lebenswelten und Identitäten einer ethnokonfessionellen Gruppe im osmanischen Reich im "langen 19. Jahrhundert"*, Munich, 2005, 328–37) and Hervé Georgelin has commented on groups carrying their identity into the public space (*La fin de Smyrne. Du cosmopolitisme aux nationalismes*, Paris, 2005, 101–48). It is hard to understand why these authors are not mentioned in the main body of the book. It is possible to conclude that Sandi-Zayek intends to dominate the field of modern Smyrnology, assuming that English-language readers will not know the ample historiography on the subject as it is mostly in French. But let me hope that such a harsh view of the book is unfounded. Smyrnelis is after all mentioned in the acknowledgements and some other authors in the bibliography.

Moreover, that is not to say that this book has nothing new to offer. It follows already published arguments to a point, but either develops them in new directions or charts them on little-known terrain. It focuses on the *Tanzimat*, while most studies have concentrated on earlier or later periods. It takes urban space and the visual dimension seriously, not only in its analysis but also in its evidence, including, in the 200 pages of the main body, 61 photographs and drawings that are not merely illustrations, but tightly intertwined with the text, and 24 maps processed for the purpose of the book. Most importantly, Sandi-Zayek is besides Kechriotis the only researcher who takes the Ottoman state as a major actor in urban politics. Many others tend to see İzmir as a strictly self-made society, whereas she stresses the dialogical nature of identity creation, influenced by local society and the state. It is unfortunate that the book does not bring across the dialogical nature of research into late Ottoman Smyrniot society as well.

Malte Fuhrmann
Orient-Institut Istanbul

M. ŞÜKRÜ HANIOĞLU:

Atatürk: An Intellectual Biography.

xvi, 273 pp. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011. £19.95. ISBN 978 0 691 15109 0.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X12000742

Teachers of Turkish history in particular will be very grateful for this concise and accessible study of one of the most enduring national leaders of the twentieth century. As the title suggests, the emphasis is upon the intellectual milieu within which Atatürk emerged and governed, and less on the actual events associated with his life.