

Zaptıye
230007

16705 LÉVY-AKSU, Noémi. Building professional and political communities: the value of honor in the self-representation of Ottoman police during the Second Constitutional Period. *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, 18 (2014) Online journal with no page numbers or divisions.

30 Nisan 2018

16706 LÉVY-AKSU, Noémi. Institutional cooperation and substitution: the Ottoman police and justice system at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. *Order and compromise: government practices in Turkey from the late Ottoman Empire to the early 21st century*. Ed. Marc Aymes, Benjamin Gourisse, Élise Massicard. Leiden: Brill, 2015, (Social, Economic, and Political Studies of the Middle East and Asia, 113), pp. 146-168.

MADDE YAYIMLANDIKTAN
SONRA GELEN DOKÜMAN

- 34 Membership in the municipal council of Manama for the period 1920–50 has been inferred from electoral lists and the minutes of council meetings for the years 1927–1929 (15/2/1923 and 1218 IOR), 1934–45 (R/15/2/1921 to 1931 IOR), 1946–50 (R/15/2/1932 IOR). ‘Abd al-Razzaq Yusuf al-‘Awadhi, *Thamanun ‘am min ‘amr al-baladiyyah fi-l-Bahrayn*, State of Bahrain, Ministry of Housing, n.d.
- 35 Crystal, *Oil and Politics in the Gulf*, pp. 46–55; N. ‘Abd al-Qadir, *Baladiyyah al-Kuwayt fi khamasin ‘am*, Kuwait: Kuwait Municipality, 1980.
- 36 J. Torpey, *The Invention of the Passport. Surveillance, Citizenship and the State*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 1–3.
- 37 H.M. Al Baharna, *British Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction in the Gulf, 1913–1971*, Slough: Archive Editions, 1998, pp. 1–51; S.A. Al-Ararrayed, *Islamic Law as Administered in British India and in Joint British Courts in the Arabian Gulf, 1857–1947*, Manama, 2001.
- 38 Evidence of these developments is included in files R/15/2/1748 IOR ‘Passports and Visa Regulations, 1930–1933’; R/15/2/1748 IOR ‘Passport and Visa Regulations, 1933–1937’ and R/15/2/1756 ‘Travel facilities for Gulf subjects, 1932–1941’.
- 39 British Resident Bushehr to Foreign Department, Government of India, 17 December 1904, n.421, L/P&S/1081 IOR; Fuccaro, *Histories of City and State in the Persian Gulf*, pp. 157–60.
- 40 ‘Plan Hukumah al-Bahrayn, n.1101/17/1347 and n.50/1351; ‘Bahrain Nationality and Property Law’, 17 February 1937/King’s Regulation n.2 of 1937, September 1937, R/15/2/150 IOR.
- 41 Memo Political Resident Bushehr to Political Resident Baghdad, 7 April 1919; ‘The Kuwait Order in Council, 1920’, R/15/5/293 IOR. ‘Kuwait Order in Council 1935 and Jurisdiction over Foreigners’, R/15/5/294 IOR.
- 42 Tétrault discusses this episode as part of a repertoire of myths of citizenship that underpin modern Kuwait. M.A. Tétrault, *Stories of Democracy: Politics and Society in Contemporary Kuwait*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2000, pp. 43–46; A.N. Longva, ‘Nationalism in Pre-Modern Guise: the Discourse of Badu and Hadhar in Kuwait’, *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 38.2, 2006, p. 174.
- 43 Tétrault, *Stories of Democracy*, pp. 44, 48.
- 44 ‘Plan Hukumah al-Bahrayn, 27 Sha‘ban 1356/1 November 1937, n. 53 of 1356, R/15/2/151 IOR.
- 45 *The Bahrain Government Annual Reports, 1924–1970*, 8 vols (Gerrards Cross: Archive Editions, 1986): ‘The Annual Report for the Year 1365’, vol. III, 56; ‘The Annual Report for the Year 1369’, vol. IV, 7; ‘The Annual Report for the Year 1370’, vol. IV, 39; ‘The Annual Report for the Year 1371’, vol. IV, 38.
- 46 R/15/2/494 IOR, particularly ‘Deportations of Persians from Bahrain, 1938–1944’; Belgrave to Political Agent Bahrain, 17 February 1948, D.O. n. 782, R/15/2/485 IOR.

Edit. Ulrike Freitag and etc: The City in the Ottoman Empire, New York 2011. BU - Near HT384.T9C58 2011

7 Migration and the state

On Ottoman regulations concerning migration since the age of Mahmud II

Christoph Herzog

In the past there has been a tendency to view migration as an expression of social crisis or as a functional failure of economic structures. Although it is clear by now that migration constitutes a regular phenomenon in most socio-economic structures throughout history,¹ there still seems to be some hesitation in including itinerant groups and itinerancy into the overall picture of migration.² However, if we adopt the state’s perspective, as is the intention of this chapter, we realise that itinerant groups and homeless people have been the subject of law-making and administrative repression in Europe at least since early modern times. As most of these itinerant people were poor, many of these measures were carried out in the context of the poor law.³

John Torpey in his study of the invention of the modern passport-system has stressed the importance of controlling migration for the constitution of the ‘state-ness’ of states. For him, control of migration is part of a secular trend aiming at the state’s monopolisation of the legitimate means of movement that parallels its monopolisation of the means of violence.⁴ The ability of the state to actually control or enforce restrictions of movement of its population depends on what Michael Mann has called the ‘infrastructural power’ of the state. Torpey, in contrast to the widely used metaphor of the ability of the state to penetrate societies, prefers to speak of the ability of the state to embrace society. ‘My use of the term “embrace”’, he explains, ‘derives from the German word *umfassen*, which means to “grasp” or “lay hold of” in the sense of “register”’.⁵ Counting, registering, regulation and identifying its populations were indeed the key activities of modern states that led to their ability to embrace society and to invade even small-scale social life. Also, identity is not sufficiently explained by adherence to imagined communities but must be complemented by ‘the ways in which identities are anchored in law and policy’.⁶ Modern states, not least with the help of documents, have created a reality of citizenship that control movement by identifying the individual that is not imagined but much more real because it is backed up by a pervasive apparatus of infrastructural power. Thus, the question of controlling movement is closely linked to the question of identifying the individual. The passport, the identity card and so on, and the obligation in everyday life to produce them to the state’s authorised security forces on demand, were important or even revolutionary⁷ steps on the way to the total electronic control of any

- Mahmud II
- Zaptiye (230007)
P. enecer
(106)

07 MİSAN 2012

✓ **DABISTĀN AL-MADHĀHIB**, "The school of religions", a work in Persian describing the different religions of and in particular the religious situation in Hindustān in the 11th/17th century; it is the most complete account in the Persian language, later than the *Bayān al-adyān* (6th/12th century), which is accurate but concise, and than the *Tabṣīrat al-ʿawāmm* (7th/13th century), written from the Shīʿite point of view. The sources of the *Dabistān* derive partly from the sacred books of the different religious persuasions, partly from verbal information given to the author, and partly from the latter's personal observations. In many chapters he also makes use of the earlier Arabic literature concerning these matters. First of all the religion of the Pārsis is examined extensively; then that of the Hindūs; after some very short chapters concerned with the Tibetans, the Jews and the Christians, the author passes to the study of Islam and its sects; finally there are some chapters on the philosophers (the Peripatetics and the Neoplatonists) and on the Šūfis. For a long time Muḥsin Fānī was thought (mistakenly) to be the author of this work; in some manuscripts he is mentioned solely in his capacity as the author of a *rubāʿī* which is quoted (see trans. by Shea-Troyer, i, 3); it was certainly an enlightened believer in the Pārsī religion who wrote the *Dabistān*, and we must probably accept those manuscripts which, in agreement with Sirādj al-Dīn Muḥammad Arzū (in a passage from his *Tadhkirā*), attribute its composition to Mūbad Shāh or Mullā Mūbad (cf. also Ouseley, *Notices*, 182). It is apparent from the book itself that the author was born in India shortly before 1028/1619, went to Āgra as a youth, spent several years in Kashmīr and at Lahore, visited Persia (Mashhad) and acquired some knowledge of the west and south of India. The *Dabistān* was finished no doubt between 1064 and 1067/1654-57.

Bibliography: *Dabistān al-madhāhib* (Calcutta 1224/1809; other editions from Tehran, Bombay, Lucknow; *The Dabistan or school of manners*, trans. David Shea and Anthony Troyer, Paris 1843, 3 vols. (not always accurate); *JA*, vi, (1845) 406-11; Rieu, *Cat. Persian Mss. of the British Museum*, i, 141 & iii, 1081. (Useful references to other catalogues of manuscripts and to old translations of isolated chapters): Éthé, *Cat. of the Persian Mss. of the India Office Library*, i, no. 1369 (useful references to other catalogues of manuscripts). (J. HOROVITZ-[H. MASSÉ])

✓ **DĀBĪT**, in Turkish *zabit*, an Ottoman term for certain functionaries and officers, later specialized to describe officers in the armed forces. In earlier Ottoman usage *Dābīṭ* seems to indicate a person in charge or in control of a matter or of (? the revenues of) a place (e.g. *Ewḳāf dābīṭi*, *Wilāyet dābīṭi* etc.; examples, some with place-names, in Halit Ongan, *Ankara'nın I Numaralı Şer'iyeye Sicili*, Ankara 1958, index, and L. Fekete, *Die Siyāqat-Schrift*, i, Budapest 1955, 493 ff.; cf. the Persian usage in the sense of collector — Minorsky, *Tadhkirat al-Mulūh*, index). The term seems to have remained in occasional use in this sense until quite a late date (see for example Gibb and Bowen, i, 259, and Dozy, *Suppl.* s.v.). By the 11th/17th century, however, it was already acquiring the technical meaning of army officer. In a *ḡāʿide* inserted under the year 1058/1648-9 Naʿīmā remarks that in the janissary corps the seniors of each *oda* are as *dābīṭs* (*dābīṭ gibidīr*) to the other soldiers (*nefer*), and proceeds to name the ranks of the janissary officers (Naʿīmā, iv, 351). By the 12th/18th century the term was already in common use in this

sense (e.g. Resmi, *Khulāṣat al-ʿItibār*, 5, 'ridjāl we dābīṭān') and documents cited by Djewdet (i, 360; vi, 367 etc.). From the time of the westernizing reforms onwards it becomes the standard Ottoman equivalent of the European term 'officer'. In the Turkish republic it has been replaced by *subay*, but it remains current in the Arab successor states of the Ottoman Empire. (B. LEWIS)

✓ **DABĪT**, assessment of taxable land by measurement, applied under the later Dihli sultanate and the Mughals; land so measured is called *dābīṭi*. See **DARĪBA**, 6.

✓ **DABṬIYYA**, in Turkish *zabtiyye*, a late Ottoman term for the police and gendarmerie. Police duties, formerly under the control of various janissary officers, were placed under the jurisdiction of the Serʿasker ([*q.v.*] see also **BĀB-I SERʿASKERİ**) in 1241/1826, and in 1262/1846 became a separate administration, the *Dabṭiyye Mushiriyyeti* (Luṭfī viii 27-8). At about the same time a council of police (*medjilis-i dābṭiyye*) was established, which was later abolished and replaced by two quasi-judicial bodies, the *diwān-i dābṭiyye* and *medjilis-i tahkik*. After several further changes the *mushiriyyet* became a ministry (*nezāret*) of police in 1286/1870. On 17 July 1909 the name ministry of *Dabṭiyye* was abolished and replaced by a department of public security (*Emniyyet-i ʿUmūmiyye*) under the Ministry of the Interior.

Bibliography: ʿOthmān Nūrī, *Medjelle-i Umūr-i Belediyye*, i, Istanbul 1338/1922, 934 ff. Laws and regulations on police matters will be found in the *Destūr*, (French translations in G. Young, *Corps de Droit Ottoman*, Oxford 1905-6, and G. Aristarchi, *Législation ottomane*, Constantinople 1873-88. See further **KARAKOL**, **SHURṬA**.

(B. LEWIS)

✓ **DĀBOYA** (DĀBÖE), the founder of the Dābūyid dynasty in Gilān [*q.v.*]. The tribe claimed to be of Sāsānid extraction through Dābūya's father, Gīl Gāwbāra. Their residence was the town of Fūman [*q.v.*]. The dynasty clung to Zoroastrianism for a long time, and repeatedly defended the land against the Arabs, until the last ruler, **Khūrshīdh II** (758/60, 141 or 142 A.H.) had to flee before the superior force of the ʿAbbāsids, and put an end to his own life in Daylam (Ṭabarī, iii, 139 f.). One of his daughters, whose name is unknown, became the wife of the Caliph al-Manṣūr.

The names of the members of the dynasty are as follows: Dābōē, 40 to 56/660-1 to 676.—His brother **Khūrshīdh I**, 56 to 90/676 to 709.—His son Farrukhān, 709 to 721-22, 90 to 103 A.H., who took the title *Ispābbadh* [*q.v.*] ("leader of the army"), and warded off an Arab assault in 717.—His son Dādhburzmīhr (Dādhmīhr), 103 to 116/721-22 to 734.—His brother Sārūya (Sārōē), for a few months in 116/721-22.—**Khūrshīdh II**, the son of Dādhburzmīhr, 116 to 141 or 142/721-22 to 758-60 (see above).

A dynasty descended from Dābūya's brother Pādhūspān (title), ruled until 1567 and 1576 respectively (from 1453 in two branches) in Rūyān [*q.v.*] and some neighbouring districts.

Bibliography: Ibn Isfandiyyār, *Taʾriḫ-i Ṭabaristān*, Tehran 1942 (to which I had access only in E. G. Browne, *An abridged translation of the history of Tabaristan . . . by . . . Ibn-i Isfandiyyār . . .*, Leiden and London 1905, index [GMS II]); *Sehir-eddin's [= Zahir al-Din . . . al-Marʿashī's] Geschichte von Tabaristan . . .*, ed. Bernhard Dorn (*Mohammedanische Quellen . . .*, vol. i), St. Petersburg 1850, 319 ff.; idem, in *Mém.*

- 34 Membership in the municipal council of Manama for the period 1920–50 has been inferred from electoral lists and the minutes of council meetings for the years 1927–1929 (15/2/1923 and 1218 IOR), 1934–45 (R/15/2/1921 to 1931 IOR), 1946–50 (R/15/2/1932 IOR). ‘Abd al-Razzaq Yusuf al-‘Awadhi, *Thamanun ‘am min ‘amr al-baladiyyah fi-l-Bahrayn*, State of Bahrain, Ministry of Housing, n.d.
- 35 Crystal, *Oil and Politics in the Gulf*, pp. 46–55; N. ‘Abd al-Qadir, *Baladiyyah al-Kuwayt fi khamsin ‘am*, Kuwait: Kuwait Municipality, 1980.
- 36 J. Torpey, *The Invention of the Passport. Surveillance, Citizenship and the State*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 1–3.
- 37 H.M. Al Baharna, *British Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction in the Gulf, 1913–1971*, Slough: Archive Editions, 1998, pp. 1–51; S.A. Al-Arayered, *Islamic Law as Administered in British India and in Joint British Courts in the Arabian Gulf, 1857–1947*, Manama, 2001.
- 38 Evidence of these developments is included in files R/15/2/1748 IOR ‘Passports and Visa Regulations, 1930–1933’; R/15/2/1748 IOR ‘Passport and Visa Regulations, 1933–1937’ and R/15/2/1756 ‘Travel facilities for Gulf subjects, 1932–1941’.
- 39 British Resident Bushehr to Foreign Department, Government of India, 17 December 1904, n.421, L/P&S/1081 IOR; Fuccaro, *Histories of City and State in the Persian Gulf*, pp. 157–60.
- 40 ‘Plan Hukumah al-Bahrayn, n.1101/17/1347 and n.50/1351; ‘Bahrain Nationality and Property Law’, 17 February 1937/King’s Regulation n.2 of 1937, September 1937, R/15/2/150 IOR.
- 41 Memo Political Resident Bushehr to Political Resident Baghdad, 7 April 1919; ‘The Kuwait Order in Council, 1920’, R/15/5/293 IOR. ‘Kuwait Order in Council 1935 and Jurisdiction over Foreigners’, R/15/5/294 IOR.
- 42 Tétrault discusses this episode as part of a repertoire of myths of citizenship that underpin modern Kuwait. M.A. Tétrault, *Stories of Democracy: Politics and Society in Contemporary Kuwait*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2000, pp. 43–46; A.N. Longva, ‘Nationalism in Pre-Modern Guise: the Discourse of Badu and Hadhar in Kuwait’, *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 38.2, 2006, p. 174.
- 43 Tétrault, *Stories of Democracy*, pp. 44, 48.
- 44 ‘Plan Hukumah al-Bahrayn, 27 Sha‘ban 1356/1 November 1937, n. 53 of 1356, R/15/2/151 IOR.
- 45 *The Bahrain Government Annual Reports, 1924–1970*, 8 vols (Gerrards Cross: Archive Editions, 1986): ‘The Annual Report for the Year 1365’, vol. III, 56; ‘The Annual Report for the Year 1369’, vol. IV, 7; ‘The Annual Report for the Year 1370’, vol. IV, 39; ‘The Annual Report for the Year 1371’, vol. IV, 38.
- 46 R/15/2/494 IOR, particularly ‘Deportations of Persians from Bahrain, 1938–1944’; Belgrave to Political Agent Bahrain, 17 February 1948, D.O. n. 782, R/15/2/485 IOR.

Edit. Ulrike Freitag and etc.: The City in the Ottoman

Empire, New York 2011. BU-Near HT384.T9C58 2011

7. Migration and the state

On Ottoman regulations concerning migration since the age of Mahmud II

Christoph Herzog

In the past there has been a tendency to view migration as an expression of social crisis or as a functional failure of economic structures. Although it is clear by now that migration constitutes a regular phenomenon in most socio-economic structures throughout history,¹ there still seems to be some hesitation in including itinerant groups and itinerancy into the overall picture of migration.² However, if we adopt the state’s perspective, as is the intention of this chapter, we realise that itinerant groups and homeless people have been the subject of law-making and administrative repression in Europe at least since early modern times. As most of these itinerant people were poor, many of these measures were carried out in the context of the poor law.³

John Torpey in his study of the invention of the modern passport-system has stressed the importance of controlling migration for the constitution of the ‘state-ness’ of states. For him, control of migration is part of a secular trend aiming at the state’s monopolisation of the legitimate means of movement that parallels its monopolisation of the means of violence.⁴ The ability of the state to actually control or enforce restrictions of movement of its population depends on what Michael Mann has called the ‘infrastructural power’ of the state. Torpey, in contrast to the widely used metaphor of the ability of the state to penetrate societies, prefers to speak of the ability of the state to embrace society. ‘My use of the term “embrace”’, he explains, ‘derives from the German word *erfassen*, which means to “grasp” or “lay hold of” in the sense of “register”’.⁵ Counting, registering, regulation and identifying its populations were indeed the key activities of modern states that led to their ability to embrace society and to invade even small-scale social life. Also, identity is not sufficiently explained by adherence to imagined communities but must be complemented by ‘the ways in which identities are anchored in law and policy’.⁶ Modern states, not least with the help of documents, have created a reality of citizenship that control movement by identifying the individual that is not imagined but much more real because it is backed up by a pervasive apparatus of infrastructural power. Thus, the question of controlling movement is closely linked to the question of identifying the individual. The passport, the identity card and so on, and the obligation in everyday life to produce them to the state’s authorised security forces on demand, were important or even revolutionary⁷ steps on the way to the total electronic control of any