

ԵՐԵՎԱՆԻ ՊԵՏԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՄԱԼՍԱՐԱՆ
ԱՐԵՎԵԼԱԳԻՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՖԱԿՈՒԼՏԵՏ

ԱՐԵՎԵԼԱԳԻՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՀԱՐՑԵՐ

*Նվիրվում է ԵՊՀ արևելագիտության ֆակուլտետի
հիմնադրման 50-ամյակին*

№ 15

ԵՐԵՎԱՆ
ԵՊՀ ՀՐԱՏԱՐԱԿՉՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ
2019

ЕРЕВАНСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ
ФАКУЛЬТЕТ ВОСТОКОВЕДЕНИЯ

ВОПРОСЫ ВОСТОКОВЕДЕНИЯ

*Посвящается 50-летию основания факультета востоковедения
ЕГУ*

№ 15

Ереван
Издательство ЕГУ
2019

YEREVAN STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

*Dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the foundation of the faculty
of Oriental Studies of YSU*

№ 15

YEREVAN
YSU PRESS
2019

**Հրատարակվում է Երևանի պետական համալսարանի
արևելագիտության ֆակուլտետի
գիտական խորհրդի որոշմամբ**

Խմբագրական խորհուրդ՝

Մելքոնյան Ռուբեն բ.գ.թ., պրոֆեսոր (խմբագիր)

Մելիքյան Գուրգեն բ.գ.թ., պրոֆեսոր

Խառատյան Ալբերտ պ.գ.դ., պրոֆեսոր, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ թղթակից-անդամ

Սաֆրաստյան Ռուբեն պ.գ.դ., պրոֆեսոր, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ ակադեմիկոս

Հովհաննիսյան Լավրենտի բ.գ.դ., պրոֆեսոր, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ թղթ.-անդամ

Հովհաննիսյան Դավիթ բ.գ.թ., պրոֆեսոր

Սաֆարյան Ալեքսանդր պ.գ.թ., պրոֆեսոր

Ոսկանյան Վարդան բ.գ.թ., դոցենտ

Քոչարյան Հայկ պ.գ.թ., դոցենտ

Սարգսյան Լևոն պ.գ.դ., պրոֆեսոր

Կարապետյան Ռուբեն պ.գ.դ.

Տեր-Սաթևոսյան Վահրամ պ.գ.դ.

Գրեկյան Երվանդ պ.գ.դ.

Րեպենկովա Մարիա բ.գ.դ., պրոֆեսոր (Ռուսաստան)

Կուզնեցով Վասիլի պ.գ.թ., դոցենտ (Ռուսաստան)

Էքմեքչյան Լեոնա PhD (ԱՄՆ)

Իլյա Յակուբովիչ բ.գ.դ., պրոֆեսոր (Գերմանիա)

Ահմադջան Ղուրոնբեկով բ.գ.դ., պրոֆեսոր (Ուզբեկստան)

CONTENT

Davit Hovhannisyan

THE RESULTS OF WWI AND THE LOGIC OF CURRENT
DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST 8-13

Sarah Irving

EXCAVATING THE SUBALTERN: STUDYING THE LIVES
OF PALESTINIAN PEASANT WOMEN PRE-WWI 14-26

Mariam Elmasyan

IBN AL-MUQAFĀ‘A’S SYSTEM OF ETHICS ON THE BASIS
OF AL-ADĀB AL-SAGHIR AND AL-ADĀB AL-KABIR 27-34

Hayk Kocharyan

ISLAMIC PROTECTION CONTRACTS SYSTEM AND
THE ARMENIANS IN EARLY UMMĀH 35-42

Alice Eloyan

THE STRUCTURAL CLASSIFICATION OF THE KHABARS
OF “ANSĀB AL-ASHRĀB” 43-50

Sona Tonikyan

ON THE PROBLEM OF ORGAN TRANSPLANTATION
IN ISLAM ACCORDING TO YUSUF AL-QARADAWĪ’S
FATWAS 51-56

Shushan Kyureghyan

“THE DEVIL’S DECEPTIONS IN THE RELEVANCE OF
READING THE QURAN ACCORDING TO ‘IBN AL-JAWZĪ’S
“TALBĪS IBLĪS” 57-63

Svante Lundgren

THE ASSYRIAN LOBBYING AT THE PARIS PEACE
CONFERENCE – MYTHS AND REALITY 64-69

Lilit Safrastyan
BETWEEN TWO WORLDS:
THE READING OF THE EXILE EXPERIENCE OF
IRANIAN WRITER GOLI TARAGHI70-80

Noonik Darbinian
IRANIAN POST-MODERNISM: THE SAQQA-KHANEH
ART MOVEMENT 81-89

Gohar Iskandaryan
THE UNITED STATES-IRAN POLICY DYNAMICS
IN 1993-2016.....90-111

Tereza Amryan
THE IDEA OF SECRET MYSTICAL KNOWLEDGE
IN YEZIDI RELIGIOUS HYMNS.....112-121

Nshan Thomas Kesecker
THE HISTORICAL GILGAMESH AND KINGSHIP
IN THIRD-MILLENNIUM MESOPOTAMIA.....122-129

Gevorg Sahakyan
“VICTORY HAS A THOUSAND FATHERS, BUT DEFEAT IS AN
ORPHAN”: WHO IS TO BE BLAMED FOR TURKS’
DISINTEGRATION IN GERMANY?.....130-140

BOOK REVIEW

Alexander Safaryan, Naira Poghosyan
Safrastyan R., Melkonyan R., Ter-Matevosyan V., Dumanyan A.,
Chakryan H., Geghamyan V., Hovhannisyan A., History of the
Republic of Turkey, Yerevan, 2018, 364 p.141-144

ԲՈՎԱՆԴԱԿՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

Դավիթ Հովհաննիսյան

ԱՌԱՋԻՆ ԱՇԽԱՐՀԱՄԱՐՏԻ ՀԵՏԵՎԱՆՔՆԵՐՆ ՈՒ ՄԻՋԻՆ ԱՐԵՎԵԼՔԻ ՆԵՐԿԱ ՉԱՐԳԱՑՈՒՄՆԵՐԻ ՏՐԱՄԱԲԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ.....8-13

Սառա Իրվինգ

ՀԵՏԱՉՈՏԵԼՈՎ «SUBLATERN». ԱՌԱՋԻՆ ՀԱՄԱՇԽԱՐՀԱՅԻՆ ՊԱՏԵՐԱՉՄԻ ՆԱԽՕՐԵԻՆ ՊԱՂԵՍՏԻՆՑԻ ԳՅՈՒՂԱԲՆԱԿ ԿԱՆԱՆՑ ԴՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՈՒՍՈՒՄՆԱՍԻՐՈՒՄԸ.....14-26

Մարիամ Էրնայան

ԱԲԴԱԼԼԱՀ ԻԲՆ ԱԼ-ՄՈՒԿԱՖՖԱՅԻ ԷԹԻԿԱՅԻ ՀԱՄԱԿԱՐԳԻ ՎԵՐԼՈՒԾՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ «ԱԼ-ԱԴԱԲ ԱԼ-ՍԱԴԻՐ» ԵՎ «ԱԼ- ԱԴԱԲ ԱԼ-ՔԱԲԻՐ» ՍՏԵՂԾԱԳՈՐԾՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ ՀԻՄԱՆ ՎՐԱ.....27-34

Հայկ Քոչարյան

ՀՈՎԱՆԱՎՈՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՊԱՅՄԱՆԱԳՐԵՐԻ ԻՍԼԱՄԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՄԱԿԱՐԳԸ ԵՎ ՀԱՅԵՐԸ ՎԱՂ ՈՒՄՄԱՅՈՒՄ.....35-42

Ալիս Էրոյան

«ԱՆՍԱԲ ԱԼ-ԱՇՐԱՖ»-Ի ԽԱԲԱՐՆԵՐԻ ԲՈՎԱՆԴԱԿԱՅԻՆ ՈՒ ԿԱՌՈՒՑՎԱԾՔԱՅԻՆ ԴԱՍԱԿԱՐԳՈՒՄԸ.....43-50

Սոնա Տոնիկյան

ՕՐԳԱՆՆԵՐԻ ՏՐԱՆՍՊԼԱՆՏԱՑԻԱՅԻ ՀԻՄՆԱԽՆԴԻՐՆ ԻՍԼԱՄՈՒՄ ԸՍՏ ՅՈՒՍՈՒՖ ԱԼ-ԿԱՐԱԴԱՈՒԻ ԹԵԹՎԱՆԵՐԻ.....51-56

Շուշան Կյուրեղյան

ՍԱՏԱՆԱՅԻ ԽԱԲԵՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԸ ՂՈՒՐԱՆԻ ԸՆԹԵՐՑՄԱՆ ՀԱՐՑՈՒՄ ԸՍՏ ԻԲՆ ԱԼ-ՉԱՈՒԶԻԻ «ԹԱԼԲԻՍ ԻԲԼԻՍ» ԱՇԽԱՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ.....57-63

Սիվանտե Լունդգրեն

ԱՍՈՐԱԿԱՆ ԼՈՔԲԻՆ ՓԱՐԻՉԻ ՎԵՀԱԺՈՂՈՎՈՒՄ.

ՄԻՖԵՐ ԵՎ ԻՐԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ.....64-69

Լիլյո Սաֆրասայան

ԵՐԿՈՒՄ ԱՇԽԱՐՀՆԵՐԻ ՄԻՉԵՎ

ԸՆԹԵՐՑԵԼՈՎ ՊԱՐՄԻԿ ԳՐՈՂ ԳՈԼԻ ԹԱՐԱՂԻԻ

ՎՏԱՐԱՆԴԻՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՓՈՐՁԱՌՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ.....70-80

Նունիկ Դարբինյան

ԻՐԱՆԱԿԱՆ ՊՈՍՏ-ՍՈՂԵՌՆԻՉՄ՝ ՍԱՂԱԽԱՆԵՀ

ԱՐՎԵՍՏԻ ՇԱՐԺՈՒՄ.....81-89

Գոհար Իսկանդարյան

ՄԻԱՑՅԱԼ ՆԱՀԱՆԳՆԵՐ-ԻԻՀ ՔԱՂԱՔԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ

ԴԻՆԱՄԻԿԱՆ 1993-2016ԹԹ.....90-111

Թերեզա Անդրյան

ԳԱՂՏՆԻ, ԽՈՐՀՐԴԱՊԱՇՏԱԿԱՆ ԳԻՏԵԼԻՔԻ ԳԱՂԱՓԱՐԸ

ԵԶԴԻԱԿԱՆ ԿՐՈՆԱԿԱՆ ՀԻՄՆԵՐՈՒՄ.....112-121

Նշան Զեսեպեր

ՊԱՏՄԱԿԱՆ ԳԻԼԳԱՄԵՇԸ ԵՎ ԱՐՔԱՅԱԿԱՆ

ԻՇԽԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ Ք. Ա. ԵՐՐՈՐԴ ՀԱԶԱՐԱՄՅԱԿԻ

ՄԻՋԱԳԵՏՔՈՒՄ.....122-129

Գևորգ Սահակյան

«ՀԱՂԹԱՆԱԿՆ ՈՒՆԻ ՀԱԶԱՐ ՀԱՅՐ, ԲԱՅՑ ՊԱՐՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ

ՈՐԲ Է». Ո՛Վ Է ՄԵՂԱՎՈՐ ԳԵՐՄԱՆԻԱՅՈՒՄ

ԹՈՒՐՔԵՐԻ ԱՊԱԻՆՏԵԳՐՄԱՆ ՀԱՐՑՈՒՄ.....130-140

ԳՐԱՆՈՍՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

Ալեքսանդր Սաֆարյան, Նաիրա Պողոսյան

Սաֆրասայան Ռ., Մելքոնյան Ռ., Տեր-Սարգսյան Վ.,

Դումանյան Ա., Չաքրյան Հ., Գեղամյան Վ.,

Հովհաննիսյան Ա., Թուրքիայի Հանրապետության

պատմություն, Երևան, 2018, էջ 364.....141-144

Sarah Irving¹

EXCAVATING THE SUBALTERN: STUDYING THE LIVES OF PALESTINIAN PEASANT WOMEN PRE-WWI

Keywords: *Palestine, woman, Ottoman Empire, peasant*

This paper has twin origins. The first was the accidental discovery, whilst researching in an archive in London, that the records of excavations by Euro-American archaeologists in Late Ottoman Palestine contain surprising amounts of information about the people who provided their manual labour, including women. The second was my own wrestling with the ethics and methodologies of writing about the Palestinian subaltern; trying, in some sense, to move from the common reading of Gayatri Spivak's famous essay 'Can the Subaltern Speak?'² as completely foreclosing the possibility of writing effectively about oppressed and marginalised people, to a position of seeing Spivak's message as one of warning, not denial.³ The subaltern can speak, in this formulation, but we must take care to pay attention to what she is saying and not force it into preconceived formats for our own purposes. Bringing together these two strands results in questions which are both ethical (how we write and represent peoples deprived of their own voices, traditionally Othered and constructed by social and intellectual processes outside their control) and methodological (of how we might piece together information from myriad

¹ Dr., Linnaeus University Centre for Concurrences in Colonial & Postcolonial Studies, e-mail: sarahirvingwork@gmail.com; sarah.irving@lnu.se

² The version used was that included in the chapter 'History' in Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1999), 198-310.

³ This reading is suggested by readings of other Spivak writings, such as "Echo," (*New Literary History* 24 (1993), 17-43) and by other theorists of the problem of speaking for and writing about subaltern peoples, such as Linda Alcoff, "The Problem of Speaking for Others," *Cultural Critique* 20 (Winter 1991-92), 21-2. I also wish to thank the organisers and participants of various research seminars at the Linnaeus University Centre for Concurrences in Colonial & Postcolonial Studies for insightful discussions on this topic.

sources, many of them colonial in origin, to build any kind of meaningful understanding of lives in different times and places).

In the case of the Palestinian peasant woman, we encounter a figure who has been depicted by orientalists as the degraded remnant of Biblical civilisation, adding slight interest to a vista of the Holy Land but despised and silenced;⁴ by imperialists and Zionists as a downtrodden figure, justifying forcible intervention by her need to be ‘rescued’ from patriarchal Islamic society;⁵ and by Palestinian iconographers and nationalists as the pure, upstanding and resilient mother of the nation.⁶ Rarely, if ever, does she get to speak in any of these formulations, and her daily life and personal reality are scantily if at all visible. The absence of writings by women from this social context until the second half of the twentieth century, after enormous upheavals including wars and mass displacement in Palestinians ways of life, also means that there is little on which we can draw which comes from such women themselves. If we want to understand anything of their lives, therefore, we need to embark on a delicate, difficult, ethically complex process of reading against grains, between lines, but also looking at what colonial archives tell us in their own terms, and understanding what is or is not included in this.⁷ This can be placed alongside oral history, folklore and other sources deriving from rural Palestine – but these also need care, as they are also often mediated by academic ‘gatekeepers’ and/or come from women a number of decades and several generations later than those of the Ottoman period.⁸ Whilst,

⁴ Eitan Bar-Yosef, *The Holy Land in English Culture 1799–1917: Palestine and the Question of Orientalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 62–119.

⁵ Lila Abu-Lughod, “Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving? Anthropological Reflections on Cultural Relativism and Its Others,” *American Anthropologist* 104.3 (September 2002), 784–85.

⁶ Ted Swedenburg, “The Palestinian Peasant as National Signifier,” *Anthropological Quarterly* 63, 1 (January 1990), 18–19.

⁷ Ricardo Roque and Kim Wagner, “Introduction,” in *Engaging Colonial Knowledge: Reading European Archives in World History*, ed. Roque and Wagner (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 18–21, 28–32.

⁸ There are many valuable examples of such scholarship, such as the work of Rosemary Sayigh, Julie Peteet, Bayan Nuwayhid al-Hout and Falestin Naili. Abbad Yahya’s 2017 article provides an important discussion of the pros and cons of some of these projects and approaches in terms of their choice of subjects, methodologies, and interaction with

therefore, there may be commonalities, we must also be alive to the danger of ignoring the changes and differences in their experiences and outlooks – as replicating the tendency of orientalist writers to present eastern rural populations as static and possessed of an unchanging essence. Adopting these practices, the particular case I present in this article draws on comments by the Scottish archaeologist Duncan Mackenzie. The often hostile, patronising tone of these, and the inequalities and overtones of colonialism and class embedded within them, might seem to make them an unpromising place to start trying to understand some of the subjectivities of a Palestinian peasant woman. But some of the details that Mackenzie’s complaints and insults open up opportunities to consider hitherto ignored aspects of women’s lives.

Women’s labour and the village of Artuf

On August 19, 1911, Mackenzie wrote to Sir Charles Watson, Chair of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, saying that:

On one occasion all our women vanished one fine day as if by magic. The reason was that they were able - or supposed themselves able - to earn 2 bishleks⁹ a day instead of our one by gathering pebbles for the railway. Then again the Jewish distillery of oreganum spirit at Artuf every now and then draws away the women to collect the plant from which the spirit is distilled. Here again they are able to earn two or more bishleks according to the amount they are able to gather.

All this taken together makes the possibilities of labour fluctuate in the most capricious and unforeseen manner.¹⁰

This excerpt is in itself interesting and informative, even if the underlying attitude and language are patronising and hostile (Mackenzie, with the phrase “supposed themselves able,” casts doubt on the women’s knowledge of the labour conditions in the area, and he condemns them as “capricious,” implying that they are not a rational or dependable

hegemonic national narratives (“Oral History and Dual Marginalization: Palestinian Peasant Women and Nakba Narratives,” 97, 106).

⁹ An Ottoman currency unit.

¹⁰ Letter from Mackenzie to Sir Charles Watson, August 19th 1911. Palestine Exploration Fund Archive document PEF/DA/Mack/546.

workforce). It tells us that, contrary to common perceptions, the women of the village of Artuf, in the hills south of Jerusalem, were accustomed to carrying out paid manual labour outside the extended family and the village's land. It also emphasises the shifting nature of this labour: gathering pebbles is work which took place when the Jaffa-Jerusalem railway, opened in 1892, was being constructed or when maintenance was taking place, whilst gathering 'oreganum' – wild thyme, probably that known in Palestine as za'atar – would presumably have been seasonal work.

So, with this kind of information underlying our knowledge of the context of Mackenzie's comments about the women labourers from the village choosing to earn better wages by working for the railway company or by gathering za'atar for the Jewish colony's distillery, how might we gain a sense of moments in the lives of these Palestinian peasant women, unable to write or speak their own stories to us? Firstly, we witness a story of partial displacement from the land which is finalised completely with the Nakba of 1948, when the remaining villagers, the descendants of those at work here, became refugees from the foundation of the State of Israel. But the main force which displaces them to start with is the Ottoman Empire, not Zionist Jews, and indeed Jews are only the third set of owners of the land after the government sold it off to Christian buyers. So we can see an incremental process of dispossession which these women experienced as a result of the 'modernisation' of the Ottoman administration in the nineteenth century, in which Zionism plays only a later role.

We can only speculate about how the women of Artuf viewed the confiscation of the village's land by the Ottoman authorities, but drawing on later and other accounts of similar events we can make some informed guesses: they would first and foremost have been hit economically and in their capacity to feed themselves and their families, which necessitated strategies such as taking outside work. They may have been resentful of the Ottoman government; to see in this a seed of the Arab national awareness and sense of difference and criticism vis-a-vis the Ottomans may be stretching the point, as it is highly unlikely that any of the village women

were able to read the newspapers which started to discuss such issues in the decades after their dispossession,¹¹ but it may be that one or two literate men from the village were aware of these currents and that this fed into the rise of dissatisfaction with Ottoman rule amongst some Palestinians in the pre-WWI period. On an individual level they may also simply have been sad, cut off from sites places where they had grown up and worked and where, by the time Mackenzie arrives, they have reclaimed once and fought a legal battle to retain. Did they worry about their children's prospects for the future if they could not get the land back, and might they have been jealous when the Jewish settlers were given funds by an international organisation to run a school for their own children? Hegemonic narratives in Palestinian national history assume that these women, by 1912, would have understood their displacement as the result of Zionism and colonialism but, as Abbad Yahya's critique of oral history conducted in the context of Palestinian national histories notes, peasant women from Palestinian villages themselves did not always reduce their experiences or those of their female forebears to this standard line.¹²

What this article seeks to do is take the fragment of information about labour relations on a Palestine Exploration Fund excavation taken from Mackenzie's letter, and unpick its various clues, following what we *can* know about the different elements of Artufi life that it mentions. Drawing on sources from the writings of European travellers, from Ottoman and British official records, and from histories of Zionist colonisation in the area, and combining them with what later testimonies of Palestinian women about their lives and memories might suggest to us, it is possible to build up an image which, if not comprising the actual voices of the women involved, permits us to ask informed questions, and perhaps make meaningful speculations, about how they fit into recorded events.

¹¹ A 1931 survey in Palestine put literacy amongst Muslim women at around 3% (25% for Muslim men, 44% for Christian women). In 1947 the figures were 7% for Muslim women, 35% for Muslim men and 65% for Christian women. The women of Artuf were Muslim. Ami Ayalon, *Reading Palestine: Printing and Literacy, 1900-1948* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 2, 16-17

¹² Yahya, "Dual Marginalization," 96, 99-107

Employment on Duncan Mackenzie's excavation seems to have been a widespread, if short-lived, experience for the villagers: if census results from 1922, a decade after Mackenzie's excavations at Artuf, can be taken as roughly representative of the village's population (with 96 "Mohammedan" men and 85 women, 65 Jewish men and 59 women at the nearby settlement of Hartuv included under the Artuf heading¹³), we can see that almost all of the working-age men and women of the Arab village were employed on the dig for at least some time. This was not the work of a few individuals, set apart from their society, but something which would have entered the group memory of the villagers. But the excavations were comparatively brief affairs, returning for perhaps two or three summers, when seen alongside other sources of work mentioned by Mackenzie, such as the "Jewish distillery." This latter was one of the economic initiatives of the small settlement of Hartuv, with which the villagers had maintained amicable, if sporadic, relations for almost three decades before Mackenzie arrived. Mackenzie's angry notes, placed in the context of the previous half-century's developments in the area, open up the story of the fluctuating economic situation of the village and its interactions with the newcomers. From a dismissive comment by an irritated archaeologist, we can unpick some of the influences which shaped the Artufi women's lives and the environment in which they made choices about where to place their labour. Mackenzie saw the changes in his labour supply as "capricious and unforeseen," but when considered in context, they reveal a pattern of comprehensible decision-making on the part of the women themselves.

Although in the late sixteenth century Artuf paid taxes on an apparently abundant range of agricultural produce, including wheat, barley, fruit, goats, beehives and vineyards,¹⁴ by 1852 the American missionary-scholars Edward Robinson and Eli Smith described it as constituting "a

¹³ J.B. Barron, *Report and general abstracts of the Census of 1922* (Jerusalem: Census Office, 1923), n.p.

¹⁴ Wolf Dieter Hütteroth and Kamal Abdulfattah, *Historical geography of Palestine, Transjordan and Southern Syria in the late 16th Century* (Erlangen: Fränkische Geographische Gesellschaft, 1977), 152.

poor hamlet of a few houses.”¹⁵ Although the Survey of Western Palestine identified a spring, “Hūfret ‘Artūf,” in the valley below the hilltop village, from which water was drawn,¹⁶ another travel account noted that it was “peu abondante,” or scarce – perhaps a reason for the poor harvests.¹⁷ As a result of this decline, in the 1860s the village was forced to forfeit a large part of its land to the Ottoman government in lieu of unpaid taxes, leaving it with only some olive groves and a few hundred dunums of arable land protected by waqf status.¹⁸ 5,000 dunums of the confiscated land were bought, in the early 1870s, by the Spanish consul in Jerusalem, who upon his departure from Palestine sold it on to the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews.¹⁹ The loss of the vast bulk of Artuf’s village land explains why the women were, in later years, keen to take up paid labour, whether it was for the railways, the archaeological excavations, or the nearby Jewish community now established on their former lands. The manner of this loss also highlights the fact that standard nationalist narratives -- of villagers displaced by foreign settlements, through the sale of land by absentee landlords such as the rich Beirut Sursuq family to Templer or Zionist groups – are often oversimplifications.²⁰ Indeed, the

¹⁵ Edward Robinson, Eli Smith, *Later Biblical Researches in Palestine and the Adjacent Regions: A Journal of Travels in the Year 1852* (London: John Murray, 1856), 155.

¹⁶ C.R. Conder and Horatio Kitchener, *Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs of the topography, orography, hydrography, and archaeology*, volume III (London: Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, 1883), 22.

¹⁷ Honoré Victor Guérin, *Description géographique, historique et archéologique de la Palestine, accompagnée de cartes détaillées* (Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1868), 15.

¹⁸ Yuval Ben-Bassat, “The challenges facing the First Aliyah Sephardic Ottoman colonists,” *Journal of Israeli History*, 35:1 (2016), 5.

¹⁹ Ruth Kark and Michal Oren-Nordheim, *Jerusalem and its Environs: Quarters, neighbourhoods, villages, 1800-1948* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2002), 303-4.

²⁰ The fate of the village of Aylut, in the Galilee, is another important example of the lengthy and complex process by which many Palestinian peasants were dispossessed of their land. The initial passage of their land from state to private ownership came, like that of the villagers of Artuf, in the wake of the Ottoman Land Law of 1859, when the Sursuqs acquired large tracts of the Marj Ibn Amer as an investment, seeking to ‘modernise’ agriculture there and turning former independent farmers into agricultural labourers, then attempting to sell the land on to German Templer colonists in 1902. Mahmoud Yazbak, “Left Naked on the Beach: the Villagers of Aylut in the Grip of the New Templers,” in *Struggle and Survival in Palestine/Israel*, ed. Mark LeVine and Gershon Shafir (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 34-37.

Jewish colonists of Hartuv mentioned by Mackenzie were only the third set of owners of the land after it was expropriated by the Ottoman government; prior to them came two sets of European Christians, illustrating the fragmented and variable nature of the imperial influences permeating Palestine in the Late Ottoman period.

The London Society, part of a significant trend in the second half of the nineteenth century of enthusiasm from Europe and North America for combining millenarian religious ideas with agricultural settlement,²¹ sought to bring Jews to the Holy Land in order to hasten the Second Coming of Christ. Its opportunity arose in 1882, when pogroms in Eastern Europe brought Jewish refugees from Russia to Palestine; the Society decided to settle some of these on its lands at Artuf, away from the influence of the rabbis in Jerusalem who would support them in their Jewish faith and identity. In late 1883, 24 families moved there under the leadership of a Jewish convert to Christianity, each receiving 150 dunums, a yoke of oxen, a cow, and tools to work the land. Although as a condition of receiving the land they were required to attend church on Sundays, full conversion was not forced upon them, although the existing Jewish community in Palestine condemned them as a “community of inciters” for their collaboration with Christian missionaries. It seems, though, that difficulties which had forced the villagers to forfeit their estates were also too much for the newcomers: the water supply – perhaps still held by the villagers, or perhaps simply drying up – was inadequate, and the land hard to clear and break up.²² The hardships were no doubt compounded by the location, far from other groups of First Aliyah Jewish migrants in Palestine, who preferred the fertile coastal plain, and from the existing communities in Jerusalem.²³ Some of the land was leased back to the village families, and the refugees slowly left;²⁴ by 1886 there were only ten settlement families remaining,

²¹ Ruth Kark, “Millenarism and agricultural settlement in the Holy Land in the 19th century,” *Journal of Historical Geography* 9,1 (1983), 47-50.

²² Kark and Oren-Nordheim, “Jerusalem Environs,” 304.

²³ Ben-Bassat, “First Aliyah,” 4-5.

²⁴ Kark and Oren-Nordheim, “Jerusalem Environs,” 304.

and by 1891 just two. The villagers of Artuf took the opportunity to reclaim the land they still regarded as, in some measure, theirs: they started farming the abandoned land but in 1895 it was sold to a group of Bulgarian Jews wanting to establish a Zionist community in Palestine.²⁵ One wonders how the villagers of Artuf viewed their changing Christian and Jewish neighbours, especially given how strongly both groups seemed to have defined and kept themselves separate from the Muslim Artufis along these religious lines. Extensive documentation suggests that, amongst the popular classes and peasantry, religious practice and communities in Ottoman Palestine often blurred and overlapped, with, for instance, worshippers of more than one faith commonly using the same site.²⁶

The Bulgarian Sephardic Jewish settlers who replaced the refugees in 1896 were a very different group. Members of a proto-Zionist society called Agudat Ahim le-Yishuv Eretz Yisrael (Society of Brethren for the Settlement of Eretz Yisrael, possibly influenced by the Russian Hibbat Zion, or Lovers of Zion²⁷), they aimed to send hundreds of settlers to Artuf, but initially managed only ten families from the cities of Sofia, Tatar Pazarjik, Pleven and Plovdiv. Initially the vanguard families were helped by those back home, but the ownership of the land remained divided between the original fifty families involved in the scheme, causing complications which were only resolved – by buying them out and distributing the land amongst those actually living on it – around the time that the women of Artuf were infuriating Duncan Mackenzie with their allegedly erratic labour habits.²⁸ The purchase was funded by a Zionist philanthropist from Vilna, Yitzhak Leib Goldberg;²⁹ at around the same time, in 1912, the community also received funds from the Jewish

²⁵ Ruth Kark, “The impact of early missionary enterprises on landscape and identity formation in Palestine, 1820–1914,” *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 15:2 (2004), 221.

²⁶ Menachem Klein, *Lives in Common: Arabs and Jews in Jerusalem, Jaffa, and Hebron*, trans. Haim Watzmann (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 36-42; James Grehan, *Twilight of the Saints: Everyday Religion in Ottoman Syria and Palestine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 58-63, 72; Salim Tamari, *Mountain Against the Sea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 72-86.

²⁷ N. M. Gelber, “Jewish Life in Bulgaria,” *Jewish Social Studies* 8, 2 (April 1946), 120.

²⁸ Ben-Bassat, “First Aliyah,” 5.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

Colonisation Association to support its school, which suggests that it was grasping its new-found freedom as an opportunity to develop its resources.³⁰ Mackenzie's complaint to the PEF, of course, also tells us that the settlement was distilling oreganum spirit and employing local Arab women to collect the herbs.

Indeed, a range of other sources highlight the unusual degree of interaction between the villagers of Artuf and the settlers of Hartuv. Although the latter were ideologically motivated, seeing themselves as rightful claimants to the land on religious and ethnic grounds, Yuval Ben-Bassat speculates that a common set of experiences as Ottoman citizens may have offered a bridge between them, and being Sephardic Jews, rather than the Ashkenazis who composed most of the First and Second *Aliyot*, may also have made it easier to build relations.³¹ In addition, the settlers' notion (drawing from *haskalah* Jewish nationalism) of agriculture as a noble and honest pursuit, key to reviving Jewish peoplehood,³² may well have instilled in them some respect for the existing farmers in the Arab village – who, indeed, they brought in to help them work the land, on a crop-sharing arrangement. Did the villagers experience this as a humiliating necessity, working as labourers on land they had once owned, or did they value the opportunity to return to places they knew well and to raise crops which they could themselves consume? Unlike most Second Aliyah settlements, those at Hartuv apparently developed strong social ties with the villagers of Artuf, spoke Arabic, baked bread like their neighbours, and dressed like them (a subject of concern to Ashkenazi Zionists who visited and reported on the colony).³³ As well as the *za'atar* distillation mentioned by Mackenzie, the settlers also exported dried wildflowers – again picked by Arab labourers, probably women – and bought olives and milk from the

³⁰ Anne Ussishkin, "The Jewish Colonisation Association and a Rothschild in Palestine," *Middle Eastern Studies* 9,3 (October, 1973), 356.

³¹ Ben-Bassat, "First Aliyah," 6; Ruth Kark & Joseph B. Glass, "The Jews in Eretz Israel/Palestine: From traditional peripherality to modern centrality," *Israel Affairs* 5:4 (1999), 101.

³² Yael Zerubavel, *Desert in the Promised Land* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2018), 68-70.

³³ Ben-Bassat, "First Aliyah," 9-10.

village to process into cheese, oil and soap for sale further afield. In turn, the settlement also generated an income by hiring its machinery, such as an oil press, to the village,³⁴ so they may have been able to make better use of the olive groves which they hadn't lost in the original land expropriation by the Ottoman government. The Jewish colony's mukhtar, Yitzhak Levi, also apparently gained status amongst the villagers for intervening to prevent the Ottoman authorities from enacting harsh punishments on local people (including execution, earning him the *laqab* of 'he who takes people down from the scaffold'), and as a mediator in confrontations.³⁵

These apparently amicable and mutually beneficial interactions did not, however, prevent an ongoing legal dispute in the Ottoman and then the British Mandate courts, over the land which had been abandoned by the London Jewish Society, farmed for several years in the interim, and then bought by the Bulgarian settlers. The villagers still perceived themselves as having rights over it and at times went beyond their legal action, uprooting mulberry trees planted by the Bulgarians and stealing items from the settlement.³⁶ These disagreements over the fundamental issue of who owned the land taken from the village in the 1870s were never fully resolved and perhaps took on new resonances as tensions over Jewish immigration and Zionists claims to the whole land of Palestine rose during the Mandate period; the uneasy coexistence finally ended during the country-wide riots of 1929, when the colony at Hartuv was attacked and burnt – although whether the perpetrators were from Artuf or elsewhere is unknown.³⁷

Conclusion: finding women in colonial histories

Aspects of the history of Artuf have been told in various ways and from different viewpoints – by travellers, Zionist activists, by historians researching the experiences of Christian and Jewish colonists. The vast majority of the sources these writings draw on are by men and generally

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.9.

³⁷ Michael J. Cohen, "The British Mandate in Palestine: The Strange Case of the 1930 White Paper," *European Journal of Jewish Studies* 10 (2016), 81-2.

talk about them, or speak from an implicitly male standpoint. The women of Artuf are thus doubly silenced, by reason of their status vis-a-vis colonisers and male producers of knowledge. Oral accounts from other villages in the area, such as those examined by Abbad Yahya, also suggest that female narratives of rural life and change may disrupt hegemonic versions of national history, highlighting hierarchies of class and gender which are often evaded. But a brief piece of information from one colonial source, the letters of Duncan Mackenzie, provides a small clue which enables us to parse some of the existing body of information in new ways, questioning it in a manner which exposes how it operates in a gendered way and how it may therefore have affected the women of the village in particular. We might not know these women's names or individual life-stories, but we can at least unpick some of the unspoken assumptions behind the ways in which history is usually written in order to at least understand what differentiated their experiences from their menfolk or from urban Palestinians.

In contrast with many accounts of rural life, in Palestine and elsewhere, this kind of approach allows us to consider peasant women as active subjects. We can see in their choices of labour the diverse coping strategies which the women of Artuf evolved to deal with the loss of most of their arable and pastoral land. Although on one level we might read them as having been forced to make this shift, to interpret the situation only in terms of compulsion is, I believe, to underestimate these women's agency. They apparently feel able – based perhaps on the short supply of available labour in the surrounding area, or on the skills they had built up – to annoy employers such as Mackenzie by choosing to work elsewhere when better pay was offered. They may also have made the decision based on a calculation that Mackenzie's archaeological excavations – though large and lasting several years, and providing daily work during the digging season – were less permanent than both the railway and the Jewish colony, sources therefore of ongoing and more lucrative, if more sporadic, work. Indeed, sporadic work may also have fit their lives more closely, as the village still retained some land and olive trees, and the women presumably also had

domestic roles to fulfil. Gathering za'atar in the hills may well have been a more attractive work option than carrying and sieving earth for Mackenzie, who in other notes complains about the women's gossiping and chatter, suggesting that he might have tried to stop talk and social interaction on the excavation site. Mackenzie saw the women of Artuf as "capricious" in their behaviour as his workers but, as a wider contextualisation of his comments and the women's years of manual labour shows, their decisions were far from lightly taken. Rather, they were embedded in a complex web of relations and in their own weighing-up of gendered, colonial and state influences on their lives, in a period of social, economic and political change.

**ՀԵՏԱԶՈՏԵԼՈՎ «SUBLATERN». ԱՌԱՋԻՆ ՀԱՄԱՇԽԱՐՀԱՅԻՆ
ՊԱՏԵՐԱԶՄԻ ՆԱԽՕՐԵԻՆ ՊԱՂԵՍԻՆՅԻ ԳՅՈՒՂԱԲՆԱԿ
ԿԱՆԱՆՑ ԳՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՈՒՍՈՒՄՆԱՍԻՐՈՒՄԸ**

**Սառա Իրվինգ
(Ամփոփում)**

Հոդվածում ներկայացված է Երուսաղեմից հարավ տեղակայված Արթուֆ գյուղում XX դարասկզբին ապրող պաղեստինցի կանանց կյանքը: Արթուֆ գյուղի վերաբերյալ իրականացված տարատեսակ ուսումնասիրությունները, որոնց հիմքում որպես կանոն ընկած են տղամարդկանց պատմություններն ու տղամարդկանց աշխարհայացքը, գրեթե չեն անդրադառնում կանանց խնդիրներին: Մույն հոդվածում այս հարցը քննության է առնվում շոտլանդացի հնագետ Դունքան Մաքքենգիի՝ իր կատարած պեղումներին մասնակցած պաղեստինցի կանանց մասին նամակ-գրառումների համատեքստում: Թեև Մաքքենգիի նամակները հիմնականում գրված են գաղութատիրական, հաճախ կոպիտ ոճով, սակայն տողատակերում հանդիպող մանրամասնությունները թույլ են տալիս ուսումնասիրել պաղեստինցի կանանց կյանքի և, մասնավորապես, աշխատանքային առօրյայի ցայսօր չլուսաբանված կողմերը: Անդրադարձ է կատարվում նաև կանանց մասին ուսումնասիրությունների իրականացման էթիկական և մեթոդաբանական խնդիրներին: