

The Rise and Fall of Khoqand: Central Asia in the Global Age, 1709–1876.

Scott C. Levi. *Central Asian History*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2017. xxviii, 258pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Chronology. Glossary. Index.

Illustrations. Photographs. Maps. \$28.95, paper.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.305

Scott Levi's terrific survey of Khoqand's rise and fall accomplishes something far more exciting than what it promises. The introduction primes the reader for a kind of transregional history (in the author's words, "engaging the historiographies of Qing China, the Russian Empire, and the fields of Indian Ocean and world history" [5]), a prospect that worried me. Here, I feared, would be another work ostensibly about Central Asia that is invested mostly in what Central Asia tells us about some other place.

Instead, Levi provides one of the only truly accessible books in recent memory that is fully invested in Central Asia's history for its own sake. We learn about Khoqand's commerce, agriculture, and royal scandals mostly because they reveal something about Khoqand, not St. Petersburg. While the scope of the book is therefore narrower than the introduction would suggest, the potential audience is quite broad. Thanks to its thoroughly engaging coverage and Levi's elegant prose, this is the rare book on early modern Central Asia that I would not hesitate to assign to undergraduates and recommend to colleagues in other fields.

Indeed, Khoqand has never before been brought to life so vividly. The khanate's rulers emerge in full color here, from the tyrannical 'Alim Khan to the lauded conqueror 'Umar Khan to his debauched son/successor Madali Khan, whose most notable "conquest" was his own stepmother. Levi enriches these striking character studies with bold interpretive interventions: 'Alim Khan the tyrant is cast as an effective, dynamic ruler; the beloved 'Umar Khan is revealed as a bit of a tyrant; and, most intriguingly, the Bukharan conquest of Khoqand is alleged to be an effort by Khoqandi elites to liberate themselves from Madali Khan.

Given this book's overall achievements and the absence of comparable works in English, my biggest criticisms feel petty, especially as they concern the book's framing rather than the bulk of its contents. Nevertheless, in the interests of being petty, I'll say that the book's framing made me uneasy. First, the emphasis on "connected histories" (x, xi, 5, 8, 210) seems a bit overstated. There are no fewer than eight references in this book to "integrative structures" (4, 13, 210, 215), "integrative processes" (xi, 223), and "integrative patterns" (44), as well as five references to "globalizing forces" (9) and "globalizing processes" (4, 210, 223). The motive here is to tell the history of Khoqand as one of "integration, not isolation" (4), but these efforts are undermined by an equally strident retreat: "I do not mean to say," the author writes, "that early modern Central Asia was uniformly on a trajectory of increased integration. One can identify many political, social, economic, and intellectual institutions and processes that had earlier linked Central Asia to distant regions and that deteriorated or even collapsed during this period" (4). Whether or not Levi's argument is altogether intelligible or convincing, the most glaring problem is that it is—in stark contrast with the rest of this book—uninspiring. Any scholars with the intellectual firepower to target "integrative structures" should probably save their ammo.

A lesser problem is that this discussion sets up a potential irony—a veritable loose thread for academic beaks. If Levi's argument is that Khoqand's rise owed much to trade with China in the eighteenth century (a key "integrative process"), this could be taken to imply that the Ferghana region was relatively isolated before that trade

developed. Cynics will likely argue, therefore, that Levi's presentation simply shifts the characterization of Ferghana as an isolated region to an earlier period. This potential critique is likewise called to mind by the book's subtitle: if the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were part of the "Global Age," does that make prior centuries part of the "Local Age"?

Finally, I ought to mention the 700-page elephant in the room: Bakhtiyar Babadjanov's *Kokandskoe khanstvo: Vlast', politika, religiia*, published in 2010. This history is the most extensive, in-depth survey of Khoqand ever written, and I was surprised to see it go mostly undiscussed here. By way of contrast, it is worth noting that Levi engages extensively, and profitably, with Laura Newby's excellent book, *The Empire and the Khanate: A Political History of Qing Relations with Qoqand* (2005).

Fortunately, the critiques above concern a mere fraction of the book as a whole. The rest is a treasure, and if Levi can be convinced to write surveys of Khwarazm and Bukhara to stand alongside this one, he will merit a ride on a white felt carpet and a khanate to call his own.

JEFF EDEN
Cornell University

Genocide in the Ottoman Empire: Armenians, Assyrians and Greeks, 1913–1923.

Ed. George N. Shirinian. New York: Berghahn Books, 2017. xi, 433 pp. Notes.

Bibliography. Index. Photographs. \$69.95, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.306

This is a very timely edited volume that will fill a very significant gap in the study of Greek, Assyrian, Armenian, and Turkish history on the one hand, and, on the other, provide an analysis of the collective violence these non-Muslim minorities had been subjected to in the Ottoman Empire and later on.

Two aspects of the book make it highly original: one, the time span covered and two, the framework within which collective violence is analyzed. First, the usual historical focus on World War I, namely 1914–18, misses very significant violent events before and after the Great War. The volume's starting point of 1913 brings into focus the Ottoman violence exercised against the Greek Rum residing in western Anatolia before the War, a violence which was later replicated in the Armenian Genocide. Likewise, the endpoint of 1923 includes the crucial 1919–23 period after the War when the Ottoman Empire was occupied, yet before the official establishment of the Turkish Republic in October 1923. During this time, the Turkish independence struggle leading to the Republic was fought. Two competing governments coexisted in Anatolia during this time: the Ottoman government with Constantinople as its capital, and the burgeoning Turkish government with Ankara as its capital. Since telegraphic communication between the Ottoman capital and Anatolia was interrupted by the Turkish forces early on, there are not many reliable studies relating to the collective violence committed by the Turks against local non-Muslims during the independence struggle. For the first time, then, this volume provides valuable information on the nature and extent of this collective violence by introducing novel primary sources, especially on the 1922 genocide of the Pontus Greeks.

The collective violence analyzed in the volume expands beyond the particular violence committed separately against the Armenians, Assyrians, and the Greek Rum. Instead, it combines all into the "late Ottoman genocides" brought collectively upon the non-Muslim communities of Asia Minor, especially in the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic. For a very long time, probably predicated