

dynasties (204).” According to Yaycıoğlu, the Deed of Alliance was highly significant for Ottoman constitutional history, its ephemeral fate notwithstanding, as “some of the principles of the Deed would directly continue to shape the political and constitutional culture of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century that laid the groundwork for the Tanzimat edict of 1839 and the later constitutional codifications” (204). One of the central characteristics of this document was that it “not only gave provincial dynasties rights to and security for their statuses and wealth but also made them partners in ruling the empire” (228).

To sum up, Yaycıoğlu’s well-researched and well-written book presents a fascinating argument of how provincial elites were integrated into the state-building processes of the late eighteenth-century reform era in the Ottoman Empire—and how they then rose to defend the new order when a rebellion had overturned the reforming sultan. Yaycıoğlu’s practice to contextualize the developments in the Ottoman Empire within the framework of the Age of Revolutions is a convincing example for how to integrate a “bottom-up perspective” on global processes (L. Hunt) into a study with a non-global scope.

JEFFREY GREY, *The War with the Ottoman Empire: Volume 2: The Centenary History of Australia and the Great War* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2015) Pp. 238 AU\$ 59.85 Cloth

REVIEWED BY STACY D. FAHRENTHOLD, Department of History, California State University Stanislaus, Turlock, CA; email: fahrenthold.s@gmail.com

The War with the Ottoman Empire is the second volume of an Oxford University Press series marking the Great War’s centenary. Its author, Jeffrey Grey, formerly a professor of history at the University of New South Wales Canberra and president of the Society for Military History, provides an authoritative, comprehensive account of Australia’s military engagements with the Ottoman Empire. Working from Australian military archives and an impressive synthesis of British, Australian, and Ottoman military histories, his study takes an operational focus emphasizing the complicated station of Australian commanders and troops in the eastern Mediterranean theater. Ottoman and Turkish historians will appreciate Grey’s framing of the war as an inter-imperial conflict, a shift he embraces in order to establish the Australian military’s unique positionality in relation to British field command but which also asserts the centrality of the Ottoman fronts in a conflict usually narrated from the Western front.

Proceeding chronologically, the book includes the expected examinations of Gallipoli and the Dardanelles campaigns but also advances new comprehensive and archivally sound analyses on the defense of the Sinai, the Palestine stalemate, the conquest of Jerusalem, and the defeat of the Ottomans in Palestine and Syria.

Grey pushes back on the historiography of flashpoints and snapshots that tend to dominate European studies of the Ottoman theater, focusing not merely on major military campaigns but also on the quotidian organizational struggles and tensions as they developed within the Australian, New Zealander, and British leadership. He reveals the Australian encampments as sites of contest among commanders, where provisioning was a struggle and where indiscipline posed a persistent concern. Disaggregating the military and diplomatic chain of command, the author compassionately contextualizes disputes between rival commanders and demonstrates how quarrels over means, goals, and especially provisions impacted Allied plans in the eastern Mediterranean. London's anxiety about the importance of the Ottoman theater in relation to the European Western Front produced intense disagreements between British civilian policymakers and military commanders, as well as between British strategists and their Australian counterparts. Strategic and political infighting "affected resourcing and (the) political direction of the fighting" in the Sinai, Gaza, and the Levantine campaigns in general (129). Grey's unshrinking account of the fraught discussions between Australian and British commanders over Egypt, the Sinai, and especially the Palestine offensive will be of particular interest to Ottomanist historians working on these topics in Turkish archives. Grey's recurring exploration of Allied provisioning lines, the connected struggles of providing food, water, and transport and maintaining morale to overextended troops, invites compelling comparisons with Mehmet Beşikçi's work on the Ottoman Army.

A work on Australia's military engagement with the Ottomans, Grey's book accomplishes quite a lot. But Ottoman and Turkish historians will discover a few missed opportunities, stemming largely from the author's limited engagement with Ottomanist historiography of the war. Grey concludes the volume with a bibliographic essay citing problems of language and translation, of access to Ottoman documents, and a perceived dearth of "serious historical work based on them" (192). Though the author builds from the major English-language studies of the Ottoman military, this is a military history, written through a tradition divorced from the social historical bent that governs recent Ottoman historiography. Grey's discussion of AIF and NZEF troops in Cairo, for instance, briefly tackles prostitution, the importing of liquor, and Australian "antipathy towards the people and the country" which produced riots (31-4), but Grey limits this discussion to the command's campaign against such transgressions. The absence of Egyptian or Ottoman scholarship in this chapter negates the possibilities for a deeper treatment of the occupation's social or cultural impacts. Recalling this book's context as an official history of the Australian military, however, Grey criticizes his Australian contemporaries' fascination with "indiscipline and anti-social behavior" in the camps and argues that such focus "ignores or minimizes the darker side of such behavior" (30). The author is critical of both the sensationalism and the apologetics

that often appear in official military histories, but this book self-consciously limits its scope to the Australian perspective, even where eliding the Ottoman (or Egyptian, or Arab) voice might be warranted. That said, Grey's fresh, well-documented narrative leaves fertile ground for engagement by historians of the Ottoman Empire.

The War with the Ottoman Empire was among final works of Dr. Grey, who passed away in July 2016. The book is sweeping in its narrative and challenging in its presentation of the Australian military not as a unit, but as an entire social universe. Because it sits entirely within the tradition of Australian military history, it will simultaneously challenge and frustrate the Ottoman historian. That said, the book presents an entirely new angle on the empire's war with Great Britain and its allies. It is now up to historians of the Ottoman Empire to pursue this angle; if the goal is to more closely examine the war as an inter-imperial conflict, it is a worthy pursuit.

OKTAY ÖZEL, *The Collapse of Rural Order in Ottoman Anatolia: Amasya 1576-1643* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2016) (The Ottoman Empire and Its Heritage 61), Pp. 282 \$149.00 Cloth

REVIEWED BY CHRISTOPH HERZOG, Department of Turkology, Faculty of Humanities and Cultural Studies, Otto-Friedrich University Bamberg, Germany; email: christoph.herzog@uni-bamberg.de

As it is put succinctly in the introduction, "The entire book is then geared towards a fundamental question: what actually happened between 1576 and 1643 in the district of Amasya?" (p.5). In fact, this is a micro-study in the social, economic and demographic history of the region in question that, at the same time, discusses some of the big questions of Ottoman history, above all the question of the imperial crisis of the late sixteenth and first half the seventeenth centuries.

The book has a somewhat older sibling mainly on the same subject matter (*Türkiye 1643. Goşa'nın Gözleri*, İstanbul: İletişim, 2013) by the same author but with a rather different perspective including noteworthy excursions on the author's biography, on how his doctoral thesis (from which the study under discussion took its origin) came into being and on the historiographical and intellectual climate in Turkey in the past decades. This older book is an important supplement to the present study because it unpretentiously documents the formation process of the author's work, making the two books together a convenient source for a future historiographical case study on the theory and practice of Ottoman studies at the end of the twentieth century. I believe that this type of historians' reflection should neither be dismissed as anecdotic autobiographical flavor nor limited to being source material for future studies of intellectual history. Instead, because it is one answer to the epistemological demand for reflexivity in the production of historical knowledge for which still no generally accepted narrative patterns have been established, the

Copyright of International Journal of Turkish Studies is the property of International Journal of Turkish Studies and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.