

HISTORIOGRAPHY OF LAND TENURE AND AGRICULTURE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY OTTOMAN EMPIRE

INTRODUCTION

The Ottoman Empire was an agrarian empire. From the emergence of the Ottoman dynasty in the thirteenth century to the dissolution of the state following World War I, agriculture remained the most important sector of the economy, the major tax base of the state, and the source of livelihood of the majority of its subjects. The scholarly interest in Ottoman agriculture and cultivators, however, has been far from adequate. In comparison with other aspects of the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire, such as bureaucracy, army, foreign relations, intellectual developments, and urbanism, we know less about the agrarian structure of the empire as a whole. On the other hand, there is now quite a sizeable amount of literature on some relevant issues, which has outlined a patchy yet interesting picture about Ottoman agriculture and cultivators.

This paper aims to present the highlights of the literature on land tenure and agriculture in the nineteenth century, summarize the most interesting debates therein, and comment on its strong and weak aspects. First, an overview is presented on the scholarship on the general aspects of agriculture in the late Ottoman times. Second, there is a discussion on how scholars have treated the question of commercialization of agri-

culture and its social and economic consequences. The longest section is devoted to the so-called *çiftlik* debate that has focused on the formation of large landed estates in the empire. The article concludes with an evaluation of the debate on the 1858 Land Code, one of the most contentious issues of research on Ottoman agriculture and land tenure.

OTTOMAN AGRICULTURE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY: AN OVERVIEW

It is generally accepted that Ottoman agriculture is characterized by the scarcity of labor and capital and the abundance of land [Güran 1998:65–69; Keyder 1991; Quataert 2000:128]. While this may be correct, there are two problems with this kind of analysis. First, it is problematic to disregard, as Tevfik Güran seems to do, that labor and capital are social relations and treat them, along with land, as merely factors of production. The factors of production analysis could not account for why similar combinations of land, labor, and capital could give rise to small commodity production in a locality, sharecropping in another, and openly feudal relations of production in yet another.

A second and related problem is to connect an overall picture with local specificities. The general abundance of land in the Ottoman Empire probably did not mean much for landless cultivators who found it impossible to gain control of the arable land in the region in which they lived. The nineteenth century witnessed protracted and intensive struggles between cultivators and members of the upper classes over land in different parts of the empire. The list of only the most significant disturbances is impressive enough. The Niš area witnessed a major rural revolt in 1841, leaving many dead and injured and thousands fleeing to Serbia [Uzun 2002]. In 1849 and 1850, mass uprisings of cultivators against landlords in the Vidin region paved the way for Bulgarian independence [İnalçık 1992]. Bulgarian speaking cultivators rose again in 1856, 1859–60 [Şentürk 1992], and 1876. A peasant revolt in Bosnia in 1875 effectively ended Ottoman rule in the province. In the 1850s, there were large-scale Alawi uprisings in Lebanon [Quataert 1994]. In Lebanon's Kisrawan region, a successful revolt that pitted Maronite peasants against their Maronite Khazin overlords in the years 1858–61 dissolved feudalism [Makdisi 2000]. During the late 1870s, Druze insurrections shook Lebanon; and in Hawran in 1889–90, Druze peasants' success in revolt against their Druze Atrash lords spelled the end of feudal relations of production in the area. In the Canik area in Anatolia, cultivators strug-

gled with local notables over land in a series of disputes that began in the 1840s and continued into the 1880s [Şahin 2007].¹

It is possible, of course, to argue that the upper class attempts to control the cultivators' labor, which stems from the scarcity of labor and not the dearth of land, was the source of such conflicts. Even if it was so, such attempts must have created social obstacles for the cultivators to control the land that they tilled. For example, in the case of Vidin, the main source of conflict was the systematic and state-sanctioned exclusion of Christian cultivators from landowning. It is clear that in such cases, the favorable land/labor ratio would not alleviate the grievances of the cultivators. What is more, there is indication that the physical unavailability of land also played a part in some agrarian conflicts. This was especially true for grazing land, which caused a high number of disputes over such land between, among others, villages, estate owners and villages, and nomadic tribes and sedentary populations [Aytekin 2006:107–116]. Thus, the general proposition that land was abundant in the Ottoman Empire should be seriously qualified in light of these social tensions, many of which revolved around the control of land as much as that of labor.

The attempts to answer such key questions about the rural areas of the empire, however, are seriously undermined by the lack of reliable data. The majority of the available statistical data concerns the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. For example, most of the data used and presented in Tefvik Güran's [1987] and Vedat Eldem's [1994] studies belong to early twentieth century. Likewise, the agricultural censuses of 1909, 1913, and 1914 [DİE 1997a] and the statistical yearbook of the Ottoman Empire in 1897 [DİE 1997b] have been edited and published, and they all include valuable data about agricultural production. There is also relatively more research conducted on the Ottoman state's endeavors to promote development in agriculture [Quataert 1981, 2008; Emiralioğlu 1997].

Thus, the problem of accessing statistical data seems pressing, especially for the earlier periods of the century. On the other hand, the *temetuat defterleri* of the mid-century offers a unique opportunity in that respect. In the years 1840 and 1845, in the midst of attempts to replace the tax-farming based taxation system with a modern one, the Ottoman state conducted a survey on the sources of revenue in all provinces of the empire except the ones populated predominantly by Arab and Kurdish populations [Bulmuş 1995]. The registers recorded and enlisted all sources of revenue of a household, be it rural or urban, and the taxes due on that particular household. Indeed, these registers house a wealth of infor-

mation. They provide precious social as well as demographic data for potential researchers [Kütükoğlu 1995]. It is possible to gather a great deal of information from the registers such as personal and family names, occupations of household heads, immigrants, and the ethnic composition of villages. On the other hand, the greatest value of the registers pertains to economic history. The registers record the amounts of and the income obtained from cultivated and non-cultivated strips, vineyards, mulberry gardens, vegetable gardens, cattle, and beehives as well as the kinds of crops cultivated and income generated through non-agrarian economic activities. The first scholar to make use of the *temettuat defterleri* was Güran [1980]. Since then, a number of scholars have made use of the registers [For example, Öztürk 1996; Yolalcı 1998; Kaya 1998]. Yet, it is hard to say that the promise of the registers have been fulfilled for economic history in general and for that of rural areas in particular. The first problem is the discrepancies in the methodology used in recording the registers. Since the registers were produced by local authorities rather than centrally appointed officials, sometimes different systems of classification and recording can be found in registers belonging even to the same district, which makes the standardization of data collected in the registers quite difficult. A second problem is the sheer number of registers. There are almost 18,000 registers and, in them, an estimated number of one million registered households [Bulmuş 1995]. As a result, the registers have usually been used to write monographic works about individual districts. Unfortunately, most of these are descriptive works that are not comparative in nature and do not take up the methodological challenge raised by the *temettuat defterleri*.²

COMMERCIALIZATION AND LAND TENURE

While the agrarian sector remained the most important source of livelihood for the majority of Ottomans well into the twentieth century, visible changes took place within agriculture; probably the most important among them was commercialization. The commercialization of agriculture in one sense was related to the expansion of domestic and foreign markets for agricultural goods and resulted in more production for the market on the one hand, and the increase in distance between the markets and the production areas, on the other. Another dimension of commercialization was the increasing monetarization of the Ottoman economy. Although the major tax item, the tithe, was still collected in kind, there were many other monetary burdens for the cultivators. Donald

Quataert [2000:130] notes that the cultivators' own demand for consumer goods should also be considered among the factors that accelerated commercialization. Commercialization of agriculture mostly affected the coastal areas and other areas accessible by water. It is no coincidence that studies on commercialization of agriculture have focused on these areas, such as Western Anatolia, Çukurova, and parts of Macedonia and Syria, more than any other region.³

Commercialization had important consequences. It has often been suggested in the relative literature that in order to profit from production for the market as a result of commercialization, peasants increasingly turned to sources of credit, which caused widespread and chronic indebtedness on their part. It is not incorrect to suggest that there was a relationship between the commercialization of agriculture and rural indebtedness, but the relation is more complex and less direct than scholars have thus far granted [Aytekin 2008].

The impact of commercialization and monetarization on land tenure patterns, on the other hand, has been a more controversial issue. A group of scholars have argued that commercialization did not lead to the emergence of large agrarian units in the Ottoman Empire [Keyder 1987, 1991; Kasaba 1991; Tabak 1991]. Çağlar Keyder [1991] forcefully argues that smallholding prevailed throughout the empire's lifetime and large landholding was marginal. He argues that, unlike in many other parts of the globe, large agricultural production units under the control of powerful landlords did not emerge in Ottoman territories even after the empire was effectively peripheralized. Above, I have mentioned that scholars generally accept that land was abundant and discussed some of the problems associated with this proposition. Regarding the related argument about the prevalence of smallholding, one should consider the problem of geographical focus. The arguments put forward about the domination of smallholding, small commodity production, and independent peasant households as opposed to large estates, landless peasants, and agricultural workers seems to be based on Western Anatolia and, to a lesser extent, parts of the Balkans. When the rest of Anatolia, the Arabic-speaking provinces, and all the Balkan provinces are included, the picture will possibly change. Even Güran's own work on the economy of 14 selected vilayets from Anatolia and the Balkans [1998] qualifies some of his points. Moreover, the number and extent of large estates in the European provinces of the empire was at a significant level by the end of the century [Güran 1998:123].

In contrast to the literature on Western and Central Anatolia, that concerning the Balkan provinces has focused largely on the large landed

estates (*çiftlik*). Though not as popular as it used to be, the so-called *çiftlik* debate revolves around some of the key issues concerning land tenure in the late Ottoman period. It is thus appropriate to discuss it at length.

THE ÇİFTLİK DEBATE

The term *çiftlik* has been used in the Ottoman Empire and modern historical literature primarily in two senses. In the first, *çiftlik* was a unit of arable land, supposedly as large as that which could be ploughed by two oxen. Later, another usage evolved. The term came to denote an extensive agrarian estate in contradistinction to the small plot of land a peasant household held. It is in this latter form that the term has been used in the “*çiftlik* debate.”

Gilles Veinstein [1991] defines three positions or arguments on large estates. The first argument is that of the Bulgarian Marxist scholars. It is, however, more apt to call this a debate among Bulgarian scholars, rather than a position or thesis.⁴ The bulk of this debate centers on whether the estates were feudal or capitalist in nature. A related question is the origins and methods of formation of the estates. Some Bulgarian historians put forward the hypothesis that the estates evolved out of *sipahi* (prebendal cavalry) fiefs and to a great extent perpetuated the existing feudal relations [Daskalov 2004:60–70]. Conversely, another group of historians trace the formation of estates not to the prebendal cavalry, but to wealthy urbanites.⁵ Christo Gandev is a prominent supporter of the latter view on the origins of the estates. Based on his work on the court records of Vidin, Gandev concludes that the estates in Northwestern Bulgaria were not feudal enterprises. He makes a distinction between seigniorial villages, which were feudal in nature and the *çiftliks*, which were subject to private property, arguing that the latter were part of a nascent capitalism [Gandev 1960]. Like Gandev, Strashimir Dimitrov distinguishes between feudal and capitalist estates, and claims that the capitalist estates were slowly driving the feudal ones out of business, which itself signaled that the economy was developing towards capitalism [Daskalov 2004:71]. F. G. Milkova [1966] does not distinguish between capitalist and feudal estates. Instead, she views the estates as transitional forms: from state property over land to private property. She nevertheless argues that the Ottoman state, through a series of measures, prevented the emergence of bourgeois landed property. In this sense, she disagrees with Bulgarian scholars, including Gandev, who acknowledge the co-existence of bourgeois and feudal forms of land tenure in the late Ottoman period, but

expound, nonetheless, that the capitalist estates surpassed the feudal ones in terms of quantity and importance.

The points of contention among Bulgarian scholars notwithstanding, it was the intervention of Fernand Braudel and the world-system theorists that made the *çiftlik* phenomenon in the Ottoman Empire a subject of a real debate. Braudel discusses the Ottoman Balkans within the context of “second serfdom” and thus links estate formation in this region to export-oriented agriculture that developed in Eastern Europe as a result of the growing Western European demand for grains [Braudel 1982:265, 595–596; 1984:40, 62, 482]. Immanuel Wallerstein developed Braudel’s line of reasoning, considering the estates in the Ottoman Balkans as export-oriented enterprises, and argued that they were directly linked to the incorporation of the Ottoman Empire into the capitalist world-economy [Wallerstein 1989:154–155, 166–167].⁶

The third position is what Veinstein refers to as the “Ottomanist” argument about *çiftliks*, which I believe would be more appropriately termed the decline/corruption argument.⁷ This position discusses the estates in the context of the disruption and dissolution of the classical Ottoman institutions, most notably the *timar* system. From the early sixteenth century onwards, so the argument goes, the fiefs which had been granted to prebendal cavalry in exchange for military service, and which had been under strict central supervision, were increasingly being transformed into private estates. The widespread corruption in the administration, seen as a common feature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, aggravated and accelerated the process. According to the historians who subscribe to this view, the rise of *ayans* (local and regional magnates) in the eighteenth century and the concomitant weakening of central power carried the usurpation of *miri* (state-owned) land and *çiftlik* formation on this land to new heights [İnalçık 1965:33; Barkan 1986:396–397; Özkaya 1994].

The Braudel/world-system thesis regarding *çiftliks* has come under considerable criticism, most of which was devoted to refuting the key assumptions and claims of this thesis through empirical evidence. The critical works point out that the estates in the Ottoman Empire were hardly related to the growing Western European demand for agricultural goods, most estates were rather small in size, the most common form of labor was sharecropping as opposed to serf labor, the majority of arable land in the empire remained under peasant control, and the estates were in the minority even in those areas where they were considerably present [Veinstein 1991; Adamır 1989; Lampe 1989; McGowan 1981]. It is possible to say that these criticisms by and large discredited the Braudel/

world-system thesis on *çiftlik*s. On the other hand, the Bulgarian Marxist debate was subdued due to the changes in the socio-political structure of Bulgaria. Unlike the other two positions, the major premises of the decline/corruption thesis have become part of the scholarly consensus.

There are a number of problems with the existing consensus on large estates. First, the argument that the estates emerged as a result of the weakening of the state and the corruption of the Ottoman land tenure system reproduces some of the old and tired arguments about the Ottoman Empire, such as the so-called decline paradigm, the idea of Ottoman particularity, and decentralization as a zero-sum game between the state and the provincial magnates.⁸

Second, in the existing consensus, the emergence of estates is seen as a process that occurred at the expense of the Ottoman state. The state in this line of reasoning appears as either unaware of or unable to hinder mechanisms that led to estate formation. The *çiftlik*s were founded on social space that had been filled by the state, so the argument goes, but which later became vacant due to the weakening of state power. Historians who subscribe to this view argue that the Ottoman state strived to curb large estates via various means [e.g., Veinstein 1991:52]. What follows is that whenever large estates came into existence, it reflected a weakness on the part of the state. As I will try to demonstrate below, this argument is based more on prejudices about the nature of the Ottoman state than a careful analysis of available empirical data. Conversely, the persistence of smallholding and petty commodity production, despite the intensive commercialization of agriculture, is similarly explained with reference to the Ottoman state's ability to curb the opposing tendencies [Pamuk 1987:185]. Keyder [1987:10–17] even talks about an alliance between the central state and the independent peasantry against the groups that potentially threaten the domination of smallholding. In fact, the thesis purporting that the Ottoman state strived to limit or reverse estate formation cannot stand the scrutiny of empirical evidence. There were scores of cases in the mid-nineteenth century in which the central state defended the interests of the estate owners against cultivators, effectively legitimizing existing estates, contributed to the birth of avenues for the emergence of new ones, or simply ignored their existence [Aytekin 2006].

Third, an implicit dualism informs many works on the Ottoman *çiftlik*s. It is assumed that the estates in the Ottoman Empire conformed to either of these two models: (i) large, export-oriented, capitalist ones (ii) small, autonomous/autarchic, feudal ones. The dualism prevents us from analyzing different combinations of features of estates that could have existed on Ottoman lands. For example, there were estates (*folwark*) in

Poland during the “second serfdom” which produced for distant markets and were dependent on world prices, although they did not entail hired and paid cultivators [Kochanowicz 1989:101]. It is possible that similarly structured *çiftlik*s and examples of other combinations were found in the Ottoman case, and hasty assumptions close such avenues of investigation.

Fourth, contemporary names and legal categories are important, but they should not be taken too seriously. For example, in Bosnia around the mid-nineteenth century, there were some “independent” peasants living in *sipahi*-controlled villages in which conditions were as bad as or even worse than some of their counterparts in officially recognized private estates. Moreover, defining “*çiftlik*” very narrowly and starting the inquiry from that point, which is what certain Bulgarian historians seem to do with respect to the Vidin estates, only complicates matters. Capitalist and feudal estates, those that used both wage labor and sharecroppers, those owned by people who carried the title of *sipahi*, the imperial estates, and areas on which someone had a *çiftlik* claim without any change in the organization of production—all these represented realities that had a direct impact on the lives and livelihoods of Ottoman cultivators.

Finally the *çiftlik*, at least in the nineteenth century, was an arena for two struggles: one between the rural non-cultivating classes and the cultivators on the amount of surplus to be extracted, and the other between the former and the state over sharing the surplus. As a result, there were numerous attempts at estate formation, some successful and some not, even in regions where it remained marginal. We should also pose the question as to why certain attempts at creating estates failed. In attempting to discover the answer, the possibility of effective cultivator resistance should not be disregarded, as was the case previously. The question of whether the social relations of production involving the cultivators and the estate owners were feudal or capitalist is by no means passé and should be taken seriously. The world-system perspective searched the origins of *çiftlik*s in the Ottoman Empire’s incorporation into the world-economy, while the decline/corruption or “Ottomanist” perspective’s focus was on the process of decentralization and the weakness of the state. It seems, however, that the local balance of power between the cultivators and the actual or would-be landlords is a more promising place to start. This could also be the beginning of not assuming the peasants and other cultivators as passive, as mere pawns in the zero-sum game between the state and the local magnates.

THE LAND CODE OF 1858⁹

The Ottoman Imperial Land Code, promulgated in 1858, has been subject to debate among historians and other social scientists.¹⁰ Scholars have discussed the reasons for its promulgation, its consequences, the goals of the state in enacting the Code, and whether it recognized and allowed private property.

The academic study of the Code started with Ömer Lütfi Barkan's long article published in 1940. Barkan [1940] comprehensively analyses the Code and underlines the evolution of Ottoman land law since the "classical period," the convergence of provisions regarding public and private land, and the silence of the Code with respect to large estates. It is unfortunate that the scholarship on the Code has not significantly advanced since Barkan's early work. Many of the questions Barkan raised have not yet thoroughly been answered.

Despite the positive developments witnessed in the last two decades, an important problem with Ottoman studies has been the over-emphasis on the state as the initiator of change. As a result, many scholars assume that social change in the Ottoman Empire resulted chiefly from the actions of the state. The same problem exists with respect to the study of law in general and of the Land Code of 1858 in particular. Indeed, most studies on the Land Code have treated it as a dynamic in itself, an independent variable that structured the patterns and relations of landholding in the empire.

This tendency has had important consequences for the research on the Code. One consequence is that scholars have generally searched for the goals that the Ottoman state desired to achieve in enacting the Code. For Doreen Warriner [1948], the goal of the Code was to tax every piece of land by preventing the emergence of intermediaries between the state and the smallholders. Gabriel Baer [1966] considers the Code as a defensive move to defend and consolidate the state's rights on land that were being usurped by local forces. In a similar vein, Denise Jorgens [2000:108] argues that the goal of the Code was to establish strong bureaucratic control of the state-held land. Haim Gerber has authored one of most influential works on the social aspects of Ottoman land tenure and agriculture in which he rejects the view that the Ottoman land tenure system based on state ownership was under pressure or threat from social forces. For him, the Code simply regularized and modernized the system of land tenure without substantially altering it [Gerber 1987:72].

The same methodological tendency gives way to a disproportionate representation in the literature of works that, when dealing with the con-

sequences of the Code, choose to discuss whether or not the state acquired its goals. Keyder [1991] argues that due to the power of the contract between the state and the peasants to protect peasant smallholding, the Code failed to change the existing patterns of land tenure. For Albertine Jwaideh [1984:343] the Code was a disappointment because it failed to take into account local law and custom in Iraq. Eugene Rogan [1999:83], on the contrary, regards the application of the Code as a flexible process that enabled the recognition of local differences in land tenure. A question that has been asked quite frequently in the literature concerns the social class that benefited from the promulgation of the Land Code. For Abdul-Kerim Rafeq [1984:390], the main winners in Syrian lands were the large landowners whereas Hanna Batatu [1978:77–78] mentions that the sheiks in Iraq increased their ownership in land as a result of the Code.

The major problem with the over-emphasis on state is that it curtails attempts to account for the sources of state power. The state is taken as a given and the developments regarding land tenure and property in the history of the late Ottoman Empire are explained solely on the basis of the goals and needs of the state. Even sophisticated and theoretically informed studies such as İslamoğlu [2000] fail to avoid this problem. Huricihan İslamoğlu argues that the modern, centralized state constituted private property rights on land, mainly due to inter-state competition and the resulting financial needs of the central state.

In addition to the tendency to exaggerate the significance of the state, a second methodological problem that has precluded advances in the study of the Land Code of 1858 is legal formalism. The historians who adopt legal formalism expound two fundamental assumptions about Ottoman law. First, they assume that legal fictions correspond to social reality. Second, they expect society to operate within the limits prescribed by law. From their perspective, when social relations deviate from what is prescribed in the law, they matter only as an aberration from the norm. With regard to Ottoman land law, legal formalists assume that what was written in the legal texts concerning land tenure must have been what happened “on the ground.” The most evident example of legal formalism in this sense is the exaggerated importance attributed to distinctions stipulated in legal texts, such as between *miri* (state-owned) and *mülk* (private) land, and between the concepts of “possession” and “ownership.” Macit Kenanoğlu’s dissertation [2002] on the Land Code exemplifies the legal formalist tendency in the literature. On the other hand, a number of studies have provided a better departure point and perspective for the inquiry into the Land Code of 1858. Their differences notwith-

standing, these studies do not treat the Code and other acts of the state as the main reason responsible for shaping the structures of land tenure and use [Sluglett and Sluglett 1984; Quataert 1994:860; Belarbi 1983:251; Haj 1997:38].

These alternative studies suggest that the background of the Code is at least as important as its consequences. What follows is that regarding the Code as a consequence rather than a cause might alleviate the problem of over-emphasis on the state. The second major problem detected in the historiography, namely legal formalism, could be more easily avoided through a sensitivity to the difference between legal fictions and the actual social relations they were intended to correspond to and represent, diversifying the primary sources used, and studying the law as a constantly evolving arena of social interaction.

CONCLUSION

This study has touched upon some of the significant issues and problems in the historiography of the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire. It seems that although scholarly work has made important advances towards settling some of the key issues, there are still gaps in the literature as well as misplaced emphases. For example, the widespread argument that smallholding was the dominant form of land tenure in the empire until the end needs to be qualified in accordance with local variations and different systems of land tenure witnessed in various regions of the world. Likewise, historians have justifiably drawn attention to the processes of agrarian commercialization; yet, there is need for more research on the cultivators' responses to commercialization and its consequences such as indebtedness. Although not as popular as it once was, the debate on large estates is still important. It may incite the emergence of certain important questions as well as enrich our perspective on the general problems of doing research on land tenure patterns. The historiography of the Land Code of 1858 is equally important but the scholarship on this particular subject is less developed than some other issues that I have and have not dealt with here. The problem of the scarcity of quantitative and quantifiable data continues in general; on the other hand, a more developed perspective, sensitivity to regional and local differences, and a more imaginative attitude to primary sources might help overcome this problem.

NOTES

- 1 For a preliminary analysis of peasant strategies of resistance in some of these conflicts and revolts, see Aytekin [in print].
- 2 Hayashi and Aydın [2004] might be considered an exception. For a creative way of using *temettuat* registers also see Egawa [2004].
- 3 See Kasaba [1993] and the articles in Keyder and Tabak [1991].
- 4 This can also be witnessed through the comments about them. For example, what Lampe describes as the position of Bulgarian Marxist scholars is distinct from Veinstein's description.
- 5 Demetriades [1981] represents an interesting synthesis in this respect. On the one hand, he underlines the transformation of fiefs into estates as a major method of estate formation. On the other hand, he considers the estates as an early form of the capitalist system.
- 6 Wallerstein and Braudel had slight differences in opinion. Braudel does not quite accept the notion of an Ottoman decline. He, on the other hand, argues that the most developed part of the empire was the Ottoman Balkans, and that this region evolved into an export-based dependent economy. The contradiction is that Braudel does not explain how the Ottoman Empire avoided decline even though its most important regions were incorporated into the world-economy in a subordinate position. Wallerstein, [1989:172ff] more or less, openly endorses the idea of an Ottoman decline.
- 7 For an interesting synthesis of the world-system and decline theses, see Vergopoulos [1977].
- 8 Ariel Salzmann's work [1993, 1995, 2004] on the eighteenth century provides an excellent rebuttal of the conventional notions about decentralization.
- 9 This section is based largely on Aytekin [2005].
- 10 The original (Arabic script) Turkish text of the Code was published in *Düstur* [1291–1299]. English translations can be found in Fisher [1919], Ongley [1892], and Tute [1927]. For a French translation, see Young [1905]. For a Romanized Turkish version, see Akgündüz [1986:683–715].

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

-
- Adanır, Fikret. 1989. Tradition and rural change in Southeastern Europe during Ottoman rule. In *The origins of backwardness in Eastern Europe* (see Chirot 1989), 131–176.

- Akgündüz, Ahmet. 1986. *Mukayeseli İslam ve Osmanlı Hukuku Külliyesi* (Collection of comparative Islamic and Ottoman law). Diyarbakır: Dicle Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi. xxxvi + 1000p.
- Aytekin, E. Attila. 2005. Hukuk, Tarih ve Tarihyazımı: 1858 Arazi Kanunnamesi'ne Yönelik Yaklaşımlar (Law, history, and historiography: Approaches to Ottoman Land Code of 1858). *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 3, no. 5:723–744.
- . 2006. Land, rural classes, and law: Agrarian conflict and state regulation in the Ottoman Empire, 1830s–1860s. PhD diss., Binghamton University, SUNY. 245p.
- . 2008. Cultivators, creditors and the state: Rural indebtedness in the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 35, no. 2:292–313.
- . In print. Neither 'monarchism' nor 'weapons of the weak': Peasant protest in the late Ottoman Empire. In *Proceedings of the CIEPO 18th Symposium, Zagreb, August 2008*.
- Bacqué-Grammont, Jean-Louis, and Paul Dumont, eds. 1983. *Economie et sociétés dans l'Empire ottoman (fin du XVIIIe–début du XXe siècle): Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (1er–5 Juillet 1980)*. Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique. 486p.
- Baer, Gabriel. 1966. The evolution of private landownership in Egypt and the Fertile Crescent. In *The economic history of the Middle East, 1800–1914: A book of readings* (see Issawi 1966), 80–90.
- Barkan, Ömer Lütfi. 1940. Türk Toprak Hukuku Tarihinde Tanzimat ve 1274 (1858) Tarihli Arazi Kanunnamesi (Tanzimat in the history Turkish land law, and the Land Code of 1274 [1858]). In *Tanzimat* (see Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı 1940), 321–421.
- . 1986. Çiftlik. In *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 3, 392–397. Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.
- Batatu, Hanna. 1978. *The old social classes and the revolutionary movements of Iraq: A study of Iraq's old landed and commercial classes and of its Communists, Ba'athists, and Free Officers*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. xxiv + 1283p.
- Belarbi, Louba. 1983. Les mutations dans les structures foncières dans l'Empire ottoman à l'époque du Tanzimat. In *Economie et sociétés dans l'Empire ottoman* (see Bacqué-Grammont and Dumont 1983), 251–159.
- Braudel, Fernand. 1982. *Civilization and capitalism, 15th–18th century*. Vol. 1. New York: Harper & Row.
- . 1984. *Civilization and capitalism, 15th–18th century*. Vol. 3. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bulmuş, Birsan. 1995. *Osmanlı Temettuat Defterleri'nin İstatistik Tablolarının Hazırlama Sempozyumu* (Symposium on the statistical tables of Ottoman temettuat registers). Ankara, Bilkent University, 23 December 1995.
- Chirot, Daniel. 1989. *The origins of backwardness in Eastern Europe: Economics and politics from the Middle Ages until the early twentieth cen-*

- tery. Berkeley: University of California Press. ix + 260p.
- Daskalov, Rumen. 2004. *The making of a nation in the Balkans: Historiography of the Bulgarian revival*. Budapest and New York: Central European University Press. x + 286 p.
- Demetriades, Vassilis. 1981. Problems of landowning and population in the area of Gazi Evrenos Bey's Wakf. *Balkan Studies* 22, no. 1:43–57.
- Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü (DİE). 1997a. *Osmanlı Devleti'nin İlk İstatistik Yıllığı 1897* (The first statistical yearbook of the Ottoman Empire). Ankara: DİE.
- . 1997b. *Osmanlı Dönemi Tarım İstatistikleri 1909, 1913 ve 1914* (Agricultural statistics of Turkey during the Ottoman period). Ankara: DİE.
- Düstur*. 1291–1299. Ser. 1, vol. 1, 165–200. Istanbul: Matbaa-i Amire.
- Egawa, Hikari. 2004. The use of GIS to locate abandoned villages listed in the Temettuat Registers of Balı Kesir District, Anatolia. In *Islamic area studies with geographical information systems* (see Okabe 2004), 122–136.
- Eldem, Vedat. 1994. *Harp ve Mütareke Yıllarında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Ekonomisi* (The economy of the Ottoman Empire during war and armistice years). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Emiralioğlu, Mevhibe Pınar. 1997. Ottoman state intervention in agriculture: Beginning of credit banking within the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire. Master's thesis, Bilkent University. 137p.
- Fisher, Stanley. 1919. *Ottoman land laws containing the Ottoman Land Code and later legislation affecting land with notes and an appendix of Cyprus laws and rules relating to land*. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 150p.
- Gandev, Christo. 1960. L'apparition des rapports capitalistes dans l'économie rurale de la Bulgarie du nord ouest au cour du XVIIIe siècle. *Etudes historiques* 1:207–220.
- Gerber, Haim. 1987. *The social origins of the modern Middle East*. Boulder, Colo.: L. Rienner. 221p.
- Güran, Tevfik. 1980. *Structure économique et sociale d'une région de campagne dans l'Empire ottoman vers le milieu du XIX s.: Etude comparée de neuf villages de la nahiye de Koyuntepe, Sanjak de Filibe*. Sofia: Centre international d'information sur les sources de l'histoire balkanique (CIBAL); développement et tâches, exemple de coopération internationale. 102p.
- . 1987. Osmanlı Tarım Ekonomisi 1840–1910 (Ottoman agrarian economy 1840–1910). In *İÜ İktisat Fakültesi Türk İktisat Tarihi Yıllığı 1987*, 225–303.
- . 1998. *19. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Tarımı Üzerine Araştırmalar* (Studies on 19th-century Ottoman agriculture). Istanbul: Eren. 240p.
- Hayashi, Kayoko, and Mahir Aydın, eds. 2004. *The Ottoman state and societies in change: A study of the nineteenth century temettuat registers*. London: Kegan Paul. 264p.
- Haj, Samira. 1997. *The making of Iraq, 1900–1963: Capital, power, and ideol-*

- ogy. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. viii + 215p.
- Issawi, Charles Philip. 1966. *The economic history of the Middle East, 1800–1914: A book of readings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. xv + 543p.
- İnalçık, Halil. 1965. Ciftlik. In *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. 2, 32–33. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1992. *Tanzimat ve Bulgar Meselesi* (Tanzimat and the Bulgarian question). Istanbul: Eren. xxviii + xi + 161p.
- İnalçık, Halil, and Donald Quataert, eds. 1994. *An economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire, 1300–1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 985p.
- İslamoğlu-İnan, Huri. 1987. *The Ottoman Empire and the world-economy*. Cambridge and Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme. xi + 481p.
- . 2000. Property as a contested domain: A reevaluation of the Ottoman Land Code of 1858. In *New perspectives on property and land in the Middle East* (see Owen 2000), 3–61.
- Jorgens, Denise. 2000. A comparative examination of the provisions of the Ottoman Land Code and Khedive Said's Law of 1858. In *New perspectives on property and land in the Middle East* (see Owen 2000), 93–119.
- Jwaideh, Albertine. 1984. Aspect of land tenure and social change in Lower Iraq during the late Ottoman times. In *Land tenure and social transformation in the Middle East* (see Khalidi 1984), 333–356.
- Kasaba, Reşat. 1991. Migrant labor in Western Anatolia. In *Landholding and commercial agriculture in the Middle East* (see Keyder and Tabak 1991), 113–121.
- . 1993. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Dünya Ekonomisi* (The Ottoman Empire and the world-economy). Istanbul: Belge. 148p.
- Kaya, Alp Yücel. 1998. Dynamics of a regional economy through the temetuat defters: Bayındır (İzmir) in 1845. Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University. 107p.
- Kochanowicz, Jacek. 1989. The Polish economy and the evolution of dependency. In *The origins of backwardness in Eastern Europe* (see Chirot 1989), 92–130.
- Kenanoğlu, Mustafa Macit. 2002. 1858 Arazi Kanunnamesinin Osmanlı Siyasal ve Toplumsal Yapısı Üzerine Etkileri (1858–1876) (The impact of the Land Code of 1858 on Ottoman political and social structure). PhD diss., Ankara Üniversitesi. 303p.
- Keyder, Çağlar. 1987. *State and class in Turkey: A study of capitalist development*. London and New York: Verso. 252p.
- . 1991. Introduction: Large-scale commercial agriculture in the Ottoman Empire? In *Landholding and commercial agriculture in the Middle East* (see Keyder and Tabak 1991), 1–13.
- Keyder, Çağlar, and Faruk Tabak, eds. 1991. *Landholding and commercial agriculture in the Middle East*. Albany: State University of New York

- Press. vi + 260p.
- Khalidi, Tarif, ed. 1984. *Land tenure and social transformation in the Middle East*. Beirut: American University of Beirut. xviii + 531p.
- Kütükoğlu, Mübahat. 1995. Osmanlı Sosyal ve İktisadi Tarihi Kaynaklarından Temettü Defterleri (*Temettüat registers as a source for Ottoman social and economic history*). *Bellekten* 59, no. 225:395–418.
- Lampe, John R. 1989. Imperial borderlands or capitalist periphery? Redefining Balkan backwardness. In *The origins of backwardness in Eastern Europe* (see Chirot 1989), 177–209.
- Makdisi, Ussama Samir. 2000. *The culture of sectarianism: Community, history, and violence in nineteenth-century Ottoman Lebanon*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press. xv + 259p.
- Mcgowan, Bruce. 1981. *Economic life in Ottoman Europe: Taxation, trade and the struggle for land, 1600–1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 226p.
- Milkova, F. G. 1966. Sur la teneur et la caractère de la propriété d'état des terres miriye dans l'Empire ottoman du XVe au XIXe siècles. *Etudes balkaniques* 5:155–175.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. 1940. *Tanzimat*. Vol. 1. Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. 510p.
- Okabe, Atsuyuki. 2004. *Islamic area studies with geographical information systems*. London and New York: Routledge. xxvi + 283p.
- Ongley, F. 1892. *The Ottoman Land Code*. London: W. Clowes and Sons. xii + 396p.
- Owen, Roger, ed. 2000. *New perspectives on property and land in the Middle East*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Center for Middle Eastern Studies.
- Özkaya, Yücel. 1994. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Ayanlık* (Notables in the Ottoman Empire). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu. xv + 354p.
- Öztürk, Said. 1996. *Tanzimat Döneminde Bir Anadolu Şehri, Bilecik: Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapı* (Socio-economic structure of Bilecik: An Anatolian town during the Tanzimat era). Istanbul: Kitabevi. 238p.
- Pamuk, Şevket. 1987. Commodity production for world-markets and relations of production in Ottoman agriculture, 1840–1913. In *The Ottoman Empire and the world-economy* (see İslamoğlu-İnan 1987), 178–202.
- Quataert, Donald. 1981. Agricultural trends and government policy in Ottoman Anatolia. *Journal of the Israel Oriental Society* 15, no. 1:69–84.
- . 1994. The age of reforms, 1812–1914. In *An economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire, 1300–1914* (see İnalçık and Quataert 1994), 759–944.
- . 2000. *The Ottoman Empire, 1700–1922*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. xxii + 205p.
- . 2008. *Anadolu'da Osmanlı Reformu ve Tarım 1876–1908* (Ottoman reform and agriculture in Anatolia 1876–1908). Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları. 365p.
- Rafeq, Abdul-Karim. 1984. Land tenure problems and their social impact in

- Syria around the middle of the nineteenth century. In *Land tenure and social transformation in the Middle East* (see Khalidi 1984), 371–396.
- Rogan, Eugene L. 1999. *Frontiers of state in the late Ottoman Empire: Transjordan, 1850–1921*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. xiv + 274p.
- Salzmann, Ariel C. 1993. An ancien regime revisited: Privatization and political economy in the eighteenth century Ottoman Empire. *Politics and Society* 21, no. 4:393–424.
- . 1995. Measures of empire: Tax farmers and the Ottoman ancien regime, 1695–1807. PhD diss., Columbia University. 625p.
- . 2004. *Tocqueville in the Ottoman Empire: Rival paths to the modern state*. Boston: Brill. xiv + 240p.
- Sluglett, Peter, and Marion-Farouk Sluglett. 1984. The application of the 1858 Land Code in Greater Syria: Some preliminary observations. In *Land tenure and social transformation in the Middle East* (see Khalidi 1984), 409–421.
- Şahin, Canay. 2007. Ondokuzuncu Yüzyıl'da Samsun'da Çiftlik Sahibi Hazineدارzadeler ile Kiracı-Köylüler Arasındaki Arazi ve Vergi İhtilafı Üzerine Bazı Gözlemler ve Sorular (Observations and questions on the land and tax conflict between landlord Hazineدارzades and tenants-peasants in nineteenth century in Samsun). *Kebikeç*, no. 24:75–88.
- Şentürk, M. Hüdayi. 1992. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Bulgar Meselesi, 1850–1875* (The Bulgarian question in the Ottoman Empire, 1850–1875). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu. xv + 401p.
- Tabak, Faruk. 1991. Agrarian fluctuations and modes of labor control in the western arc of the Fertile Crescent c.1700–1850. In *Landholding and commercial agriculture in the Middle East* (see Keyder and Tabak 1991), 135–154.
- Tute, R. C. 1927. *The Ottoman land laws, with a commentary on the Ottoman Land Code of 7th Ramadan 1274*. Jerusalem: Greek Conv. Press. 207p.
- Uzun, Ahmet. 2002. *Tanzimat ve Sosyal Direnişler: Niş İsyanı Üzerine Ayrıntılı Bir İnceleme, 1841* (Tanzimat and social resistance: A detailed examination of the Niş revolt of 1841). Istanbul: Eren. 158p.
- Veinstein, Gilles. 1991. On the Çiftlik debate. In *Landholding and commercial agriculture in the Middle East* (see Keyder and Tabak 1991), 35–53.
- Vergopoulos, Kostas. 1977. *Le capitalisme difforme et la nouvelle question agraire: L'exemple de la Grèce moderne*. Paris: F. Maspero. 306p.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice. 1989. *The modern world system*. Vol. 3, *The second great expansion of the capitalist world economy, 1730–1840s*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Warriner, Doreen. 1948. *Land and poverty in the Middle East*. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs. 148p.
- Yolalıcı, M. Emin. 1998. *XIX. Yüzyılda Canik (Samsun) Sancağı'nın Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yapısı* (The social and economic structure of the Canik [Samsun] District in the 19th century). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

xii + 183p.

Young, George. 1905. *Corps de droit ottoman: Recueil des codes, lois, règlements, ordonnances et actes les plus importants du droit intérieur et d'études sur le droit coutunier de l'Empire ottoman*. London: Clarendon Press. 845p.