

worthwhile readjusting the level of inquiry before resorting to some century-old residue in the brain.

On the whole, Berman's book makes for interesting reading. If the limitations are kept in mind, the book allows discerning issues that warrant further research, not least due to the fact that it is well written and presents an extensive overview of the literature. I warmly recommend it.

RAOUF ABBAS AND ASSEM EL-DESSOUKY, *The Large Landowning Class and the Peasantry in Egypt, 1837–1952* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 2011). Translated from the Arabic by Amer Mohsen with Mona Zikri. Edited by Peter Gran. Pp. 296. \$29.95 cloth.

REVIEWED BY PAUL SEDRA, Department of History, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada; e-mail: pdsedra@sfu.ca
doi:10.1017/S0020743813000172

The late Raouf Abbas was among the giants of history as a discipline in 20th-century Egypt. Author of more than a dozen books on modern Egyptian history, mentor to countless students in the discipline, and organizer and motive force behind decades of symposia and conferences—not least in his capacity as president of the Egyptian Society of Historical Studies—Abbas had as great an influence on the development of history writing in Egypt as his renowned forerunners Ahmad 'Izzat 'Abd al-Karim, Ahmad 'Abd al-Rahim Mustafa, and 'Abd al-Rahman al-Raf'i. It is therefore a matter for regret that scholars in the English-speaking world should have so little of his work available to them in translation.

Peter Gran, Amer Mohsen, and Mona Zikri have performed a great service for English-speaking scholars in editing and translating the work under review, coauthored by Abbas and his distinguished colleague from Helwan University, Assem El-Dessouky. Originally entitled *Kibar al-Mullak wa-l-Fallahin fi Misr 1837–1952* and published in Cairo in 1998, the book was in fact a compilation of works penned separately by the authors and published in the 1970s. Both had an enormous influence in reorienting Egyptian historiography away from the political and intellectual history that had dominated the field until that time, and toward social history. To have, at long last, this work available in English is important, then, not simply in enlarging scholars' understanding of the material which forms its subject—social relations in the modern Egyptian countryside, and their bearing on Egyptian politics—but also in exposing the methods and concerns which have structured history writing in contemporary Egypt.

The book was, and remains, pathbreaking, not least given the tremendously rich archival materials upon which it is based. These materials are drawn from Egypt researchers' archival mainstay, the Egyptian National Archives (Dar al-Watha'iq al-Qawmiyya), as well as from the Archives of Egyptian Public Records (Dar al-Mahfuzat al-'Umumiyya) and the archives of the Agrarian Reform Authority (al-Hay'a al-'Ammā li-l-Islah al-Zira'i). The variety of documents scrutinized by the authors is quite literally breathtaking, ranging from land deeds, registrations, and transaction records, to taxation accounts and pension files, to the investigations the Agrarian Reform Authority undertook into particular landowners after the 1952 revolution.

Arguably the central concern of the authors, in theoretical terms, is to debunk the view that social relations in the Egyptian countryside had an essentially feudal character during the period under examination, extending from the Muhammad 'Ali (1769–1849) era through the 1952 revolution. Abbas and El-Dessouky suggest these relations are better understood as a variation on capitalism, insofar as they had a distinctly contractual character. This suggestion is significant in that it represents a departure from the Nasirist analysis of social relations

in the Egyptian countryside, which frequently invoked “feudalism” as a justification for land reform after the revolution.

Chapter 1, entitled “The Development of Capitalist Landownership in Egypt,” is a remarkably detailed and valuable exposition of the mechanisms through which the contractual relationship between peasant and landowner took shape. Despite the existence of feudal practices such as forced labor, the authors demonstrate that various lease and mortgage arrangements were crucially important in structuring the peasant–landowner relationship. They undertake this task very effectively by exploring the specificities of the *gharuqa* contract—a contract dating to Ottoman times that permitted peasants to mortgage or pawn portions of their lands to provide resources for the cultivation of the rest.

Chapters 2 through 4 furnish a highly nuanced portrait of Egyptian landowners as a class between 1837 and 1952. Abbas and El-Dessouky discuss how Muhammad ‘Ali used land grants as a means of both promoting loyalty and expanding cultivation; how improved irrigation techniques drove up the demand for land; and how the expansion of credit through banks and mortgage companies permitted large landowners to dominate land auctions, notably those of the royal estates. Under such circumstances, large landowners consolidated and expanded their holdings through the late 19th and early 20th centuries. However, they were loath to extend their reach far beyond the agricultural sphere, because of the risk to their standing that this might entail. Foreigners were thought to have a structural advantage over Egyptians in the realm of industrial investment, for instance. Specifically, Egyptian landowners were concerned about the legal advantages that foreign investors enjoyed due to the capitulations and mixed courts, and were reluctant to expand their economic activities into the industrial realm for fear that legal challenges from foreigners could cost them dearly.

Chapter 5, “The Relations of Production in the Countryside,” is of particular interest insofar as it explores the contractual relationship between landowner and peasant, initially set forth in Chapter 1, from the perspective of the peasant. Abbas and El-Dessouky demonstrate how small farmers were victimized during the British occupation by the credit arrangements through which large landowners had managed to concentrate so much land under their control: “The landowner would borrow a given sum from a mortgage bank at 9 percent; then he would divide it up, lending out small amounts to the peasants at 25 to 40 percent” (p. 127). Small farmers could rarely approach banks themselves given the need for collateral and the fact that they often lacked the documentation necessary to prove their ownership of land. The precarious existence endured by small holders tended to lead to the fragmentation of land ownership among them, given the notion that ownership spread within a family would reduce the risk of land confiscation by creditors.

Chapters 6 and 7, entitled “The Large Landowners and Politics” and “The Large Landowners and the Social Question,” explore the consequences this landholding regime and class structure had on Egyptian politics. Abbas and El-Dessouky marshal considerable statistics to demonstrate how large landowners dominated the purportedly representative political structures of Egypt’s liberal era. Despite varied party allegiances among the landowners, ideological conflicts were of little importance within the landowning class. Political maneuvering vis-à-vis the British, the Turco-Egyptian aristocracy, the nationalist movement, and the peasantry was determined not by ideology but by the common material interests of the landowners, which led them to embrace a *laissez-faire* approach to economic affairs. Ultimately, what Abbas and El-Dessouky label the “obliviousness” of the landowners to the everyday living conditions of peasants (p. 187), together with the flow of agricultural profits overseas via European commercial banks, would prompt revolution.

Although one is left wanting on the question of whether the 1952 revolution is properly viewed as a turning point in modern Egyptian history, there is no question that the work under review is a veritable *tour de force*, one well worth the attention not only of Egypt specialists

but of all those scholars concerned with the nexus of land and power in the modern world. And particular recognition is due to the editor and translators, for having made a text dense with the difficult terminology of land tenure a pleasure to read.

MARC AYMES, *Un grand progrès—sur le papier: Histoire provinciale des réformes ottomanes à Chypre au XIX^e siècle*. Collection Turcica (Louvain, Belgium: Peeters Publishers, 2010). Pp. 423. €65 paper.

REVIEWED BY GÜNEŞ İŞIKSEL, Department of History, University Paris 1, Paris, France; e-mail: gunesisiksel@yahoo.com
doi:10.1017/S0020743813000184

Marc Aymes's *Un grand progrès—sur le papier* is one of the more recent and stirring additions to a growing body of studies on the transformation of state organization in the Ottoman Empire during the 19th century. This case study on Cyprus explores the variety of relationships established between a Mediterranean insular province and the imperial capital. In the introductory chapter, Aymes revises the conceptualizations and periodizations of what is known as the Tanzimat era in the historiography. This examination incorporates a discussion of the main interpretative schemes in the literature concerning the period, while introducing the subject of the study: Aymes's reinterpretation of the implementation of the reforms in one of the provinces of the Ottoman realm.

The book is divided into six chapters of varying length that correspond to what the author sees as the different layers of the experience of the Tanzimat in Cyprus. Appendices—more than one-third of the volume—consist of maps, meticulous transcriptions of documents, a quasiprosopographic list of governors of the island between 1820 and 1878 as well as a list of the French and British consuls in the same period, a glossary of Ottoman administrative terms, a bibliography, and, last but not least, five separate indexes for terms, persons, places, primary sources, and authors of secondary literature referred to in the text.

The first chapter discusses the meanings and meanderings of a governmental, thus ideological, lexical field invented by the Ottoman central bureaucracy as well as the modalities of its local appropriations in Cyprus. Through a cross-reading of archival sources and published texts, Aymes explores the affinities between the key concepts of the period such as principle and order, as well as between notions such as continuity, custom, and rupture. The chapter might be considered an elaborate essay on the semantics of the Ottoman political and administrative culture in the mid-19th century.

In the second chapter, Aymes scrutinizes the paleographic, diplomatic, and printed by-products of the reforms, and suggests that the Tanzimat movement revolved to a large extent around written forms and their reformulations. The author argues that there was a new set of practices in administrative correspondence that, while increasing the legibility of the texts (such as through clear compartmentalization of the stanza), also introduced the idea of orderliness as a mental representation.

The following three chapters unravel a series of intertwined subjects, among them exceptionalism, agency, and territoriality in the context of an insular province. Subsequently, Chapter 3 describes the modalities of codification and systematization of the mid-19th-century reforms in Cyprus. An initial exploration of the meanings of a half-dozen administrative titles attributed to the governor general of the Cyprus province in the mid-19th century leads Aymes to assert the inconceivability of an overall reform policy within the Ottoman realm. This assertion also enables him to assume that there was not a single uniform policy behind the reforms and that their implementation was patchy.