Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

The majority of the articles in this book are revised and expanded versions of the papers originally presented at a symposium titled "Xenophobia and Alterophobia in Pre-Modern Ottoman Lands" held at the University of Chicago on October 22–23, 2015. From its inception, this project benefitted from the support of several units and individuals at the University of Chicago and the University of Michigan, who not only found the concept of the symposium intriguing and worthy of support but also helped with the organization of the symposium and the publication of this volume. At the University of Chicago, the editors are grateful to the following units for their financial support: Franke Institute for the Humanities; Center for Middle Eastern Studies; Center for Jewish Studies; Division of the Humanities; Humanities Visiting Committee; Center for the Study of Gender and Sexuality; and Norman Wait Harris Memorial Fund administered at the time by the Center for International Studies. The heavy load of e-mail traffic and various other logistical details were competently administered before, during, and after the symposium by Thomas Maguire and Brittany Ciboski, both of the Center for Middle Eastern Studies. İpek Hüner-Cora and Tunç Şen, then doctoral students at the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, provided the organizers with their on-site help. At the University of Michigan, the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts; the Office of Research; the History Department, and the Near Eastern Studies Department provided financial support necessary for the copyediting and indexing this volume.

We are also thankful to those who assisted in the production of this book. We owe a great debt of gratitude to Alessandra Anzani, acquisitions editor at the Academic Studies Press, for accommodating our manuscript for publication in an exceptionally expeditious manner, and to Kira Nemirovsky, production editor at the Press, who oversaw its production with great care.

Author Bios

Helga Anetshofer (PhD, Vienna University) is Lecturer for Ottoman and Turkish at the University of Chicago. Her publications include her recent article "Folk Etymologies and Stories of Toponyms from Danishmendid Territory in Evliya Çelebi's Seyahatname" (2015) and "The Hero Dons a Talismanic Shirt for Battle: Magic Objects Aiding the Warrior in a Turkish Epic Romance" (forthcoming in 2018).

Faika Çelik (PhD, McGill University) is Assistant Professor of Political Science and International Relations at Manisa Celal Bayar University. Her recent publications are "Civilizing Mission in Late Ottoman Discourse: The Case of Gypsies" (2013) and "Probing the Margins: Gypsies (Roma) in the Sixteenth Century Ottoman Society" (2007).

H. Erdem Çıpa (PhD, Harvard University) is Associate Professor of Ottoman history at the University of Michigan. He is author of *The Making of Selim: Succession, Legitimacy, and Memory in the Early Modern Ottoman World* (2017) and co-editor, with E. Fetvacı, of *Writing History at the Ottoman Court: Editing the Past, Fashioning the Future* (2013).

Jane Hathaway (PhD, Princeton University) is Professor of History at Ohio State University. She is author of *The Arab Lands under Ottoman Rule, 1516–1800* (2008). Her book *The Chief Eunuch of the Ottoman Harem: From African Slave to Power-Broker* will be published in 2018.

N. İpek Hüner-Cora is a doctoral candidate at the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations of the University of Chicago. Her work focuses on the history of Ottoman literature, gender, and sexuality. She published an article titled "Travelling within the Empire: Perceptions

of the East in the Historical Narratives on Cairo by Mustafa Âli and Evliya Çelebi" (2013).

Hakan T. Karateke (PhD, Bamberg University) is Professor of Ottoman and Turkish Culture, Language, and Literature at the University of Chicago. He is author of *Evliya Çelebi's Journey from Bursa to the Dardanelles and Edirne* (2013) and forthcoming article titled "The Rosy History of Jews in the Ottoman Empire: A Critical Approach to Jewish Historiography."

Vjeran Kursar (PhD, University of Zagreb) is Assistant Professor of History and Hungarian, Jewish, and Turkish Studies at the University of Zagreb. His publications include "Being an Ottoman Vlach. On Vlach Identity(ies), Role and Status in Western Parts of the Ottoman Balkans (15th–18th Centuries)" (2013) and "Non-Muslim Communal Divisions and Identities in the Early Modern Ottoman Balkans and the Millet System Theory" (2013).

Emin Lelić (PhD, The University of Chicago) is Assistant Professor of History at Salisbury University. He has recently published "Physiognomy (ʿilm-i firāsat) and Ottoman Statecraft: Discerning Morality and Justice" (2017) and is currently working on "*Firâsa* as an Investigation of Nature and Politics at the Ottoman Court," which will appear in the forthcoming *Routledge Handbook on Science in the Islamicate World*.

Bilha Moor (PhD, Hebrew University of Jerusalem) was the Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow of Islamic Art and Architecture at Northwestern University, Department of Art History from 2014 to 2017. "Shahnama Kings and Heroes in *'Aja'ib al-Makhluqat* Illustrated Manuscripts" (2012) and "Mosque and Church: Arabic Inscriptions at Shivta in the Early Islamic Period" (2013) are among her publications. At present she is writing a book tentatively titled *The World in Muslim Eyes: Illustrated Cosmographies, 1550–1700*.

Konrad Petrovszky (PhD, Humboldt University) is a research associate at the Institute of Modern and Contemporary Historical Research at the Austrian Academy of Science. He is author of *Geschichte schreiben im osmanischen Südosteuropa: eine Kulturgeschichte orthodoxer Historiographie des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts* (2014) and co-edited (with

A. Helmedach, M. Koller, and S. Rohdewald) *Das osmanische Europa: Methoden und Perspektiven der Frühneuzeitforschung zu Südosteuropa* (2014).

Michael D. Sheridan (PhD, Bilkent University) teaches humanities and literature at Bilkent University and TED (Türk Eğitim Derneği) University in Ankara. His recently completed dissertation focuses on rivalries, factions, and power relations among the early seventeenth-century Ottoman elite as viewed through the lens of the period's invective (*hicv*) corpus and in relation with the contemporary advice literature. He has an upcoming publication, with Robert Dankoff and Nuran Tezcan, entitled *Ottoman Explorations of the Nile*.

Baki Tezcan (PhD, Princeton University) is Associate Professor of History at the University of California, Davis. He is author of *The Second Ottoman Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World* (2010). His recent publications include "The Memory of the Mongols in Early Ottoman Historiography" (2013) and "Law in China or Conquest in the Americas: Competing Constructions of Political Space in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire" (2013).

Introduction

Historians know well that post-nationalist societies are not unique in nurturing dislike—or even hatred—of foreigners and members of marginalized subcultures. The perception of certain groups as outsiders, or as alternative groups within a society, is a salient feature of bygone societies as well. In fact, it would be fair to say that dislike of others has been a persistent condition of society throughout history. This volume explores that theme within the premodern Ottoman context.

Recent historical studies on the Ottoman Empire, as well as a contemporary political rhetoric that glorifies the Ottoman enterprise, have taken for granted that subjects of the Ottoman polity flourished under a so-called *Pax Ottomanica*. This widely—but uncritically—accepted view posits that the economic and social stability of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries made the Ottoman lands a relatively safe and secure environment for trade, the flourishing of arts and crafts, peaceful coexistence and settlement, particularly for groups—for example, Jews—for whom the situation in Ottoman lands compared favorably to that in other parts of the world. Whatever the validity of such a supposition, the relative stability of Ottoman lands at that time did not preclude established or even formal antipathies among groups of people within Ottoman society. Some prejudices stretched back to the Middle Ages and earlier; others arose from contemporary social and political tensions. Religious convictions and affiliations were no doubt a factor in the formation of mutual antipathy, but conflicting economic interests played a significant role as well. Thus, historical sources suggest that the social and cultural realities of the premodern Ottoman world were far more complex than is assumed by the proponents of *Pax Ottomanica*—a phenomenon that, plausibly, can be explained and appreciated by historians within its limitations but certainly represents a myth in the way it is understood, especially by

conservative masses, and utilized by populist politicians and neo-Ottomanist demagogues alike.

The critical scholarly evaluation of this myth constituted the principal objective of a symposium at which most of the articles in this volume were first presented. Organized by the editors in October 2015 at the University of Chicago, this symposium aimed to explore two related themes in the context of premodern Ottoman lands: xenophobia (dislike of foreigners) and alterophobia (dislike of "the other," that is, members of alternative groups within the same society). Defining these terms as "irrational or unreasoned" fear of outsiders and foreigners, scholars have noted the socially and religiously stratified structure of Ottoman society. A systematic analysis of antipathies among communities has not yet been attempted, however. Most studies that investigate controversies stemming from antipathy between groups within the Ottoman context have focused on the nineteenth century, exploring enmities that resulted from varied expressions of nationalism as well as religious identities underscored by nationalistic ideals. These findings, while valuable for the present project, have limited relevance to an effort to understand social antipathies in early modern Ottoman society.

Of course, "dislike" takes a multitude of forms and degrees. Whereas systematic state persecution, forced migration, and violence are located at one end of the spectrum, general contempt or distrust in business dealings can be situated at the other. The editors opted to focus on antipathies among groups of people within Ottoman society. As such, this volume features several essays that contribute to the development of a historical approach to classifying forms of social antipathies and contextualizing them in early modern Ottoman society.

We do not mean to suggest that dislike or distrust was the primary defining characteristic of Ottoman society—or of any past society, for that matter. On the contrary, we are well aware that the cosmopolitanist nature of a multiethnic and multireligious empire allowed for the nonconfrontational coexistence of, and various forms of amicable relationships among, diverse communities. We further emphasize that the Ottoman polity represents a particularly fascinating and fruitful field of historical inquiry because, as an empire, it by necessity allowed not only for the existence of a multitude of officially recognized religious, ethnic, and linguistic groups but also for the coexistence of competing claims held by these subject communities. This volume, therefore, explores forms and expressions

of dislike within the early modern Ottoman context, adding nuance to an otherwise uncritically accepted narrative that presumes the uninterrupted peaceful coexistence of various communities under the aegis of a tolerant imperial polity.

Undoubtedly, an interest in reconstructing such sentiments faces significant difficulties. The authors whose works are presented here were asked to reconstruct, to the extent possible, the mind-set of people living in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Ottoman lands. We hoped to explore patterns in expressions of dislike in literature, historiography, and religious texts, particularly in those texts that one would classify as "ego documents," such as memoirs or otherwise personalized accounts. By studying a range of historical narratives, the contributors to the volume were able to develop rare insight into the self-described perceptions of individuals. Perceptions are necessarily difficult to delineate and can be open to multiple interpretations. Moreover, delineating negative perceptions can prove particularly difficult, in part because alterophobic sentiments often were not explicitly presented. Rather, one must carefully read between the lines, sweeping through the adjectives used to describe a group of people and comparing them to expressions used to describe various other groups, in order to reconstruct a perception. Utilizing a range of historical narratives yields opportunities to identify people's perceptions, which can prove exceptionally useful for understanding the intricate workings of past societies. The line of inquiry should not center on perceptions alone; repercussions of antipathy felt between groups compose another important component of analysis. We must be cautious, however, not to conflate feelings of prejudice or dislike with actions, which are likewise not necessarily the result of enduring negative cognition and feelings. Our approach thus considers rhetoric of dislike and actions of hate as two separate analytical categories.

The articles in this volume challenge the received wisdom in the field of Ottoman studies in a variety of ways. Perhaps most importantly, they probe the concept and nature of diversity in premodern Ottoman lands, and focus on a variety of tensions within early modern Ottoman society, by using hitherto unexplored or underutilized historical sources. Some of the essays explore relatively familiar factional divisions; as such, they analyze forms of dislike between groups defined by their denominational belonging or scrutinize expressions of aversion toward traditionally marginalized and alienated groups of people—such as Jews, gypsies, women,

or blacks. Several other contributions focus on forms of antipathy that, one could argue, were peculiar to the Ottoman context. Highlighting the the evolution of Ottoman attitudes toward Circassian Mamluks in Egypt and Istanbul, the dislike between freeborn Muslims and converts, and the one-off stereotyping of people from a central Anatolian town, these essays shed light on the nature and character of coexistence between inhabitants of a vast geography. Two articles in the volume contribute to the previously inadequate dialogue between Ottoman studies and the field of southeast European history by highlighting long-standing tensions among Christian communities in the Balkans. Last, but certainly not least, several essays bring forth original arguments based on fiction, poetry, and the rather well-known autobiographical travel account of the celebrated seventeenth-century explorer Evliyā Çelebī.

Collectively, the essays in this volume highlight that the dislike of others is not conditioned solely by religious affiliation. They also remind us that we should be cognizant of the inaccuracy of identifying large groups of people with overarching categories such as *the* Muslims, *the* Christians, *the* Jews, *the* Druze, and the like. In fact, the attribution of group identities or group perceptions to any of these larger communities over time is of limited analytical value—for such attributions are at least partially due to the historian's lack of the sources necessary to accurately reconstruct the intricate inner workings of these communities.

Therefore, we wish to offer the following research questions as a road map for further scrutiny of Ottoman diversities. We developed these questions in the early stages of our project, to envision potential directions for this edited volume and to serve as guidelines for establishing the specificity of various forms of dislike, either to Ottoman society or to the early modern era:

Can prejudices be traced to sacred religious texts, or to traditions emanating from them? What role can be ascribed to religious conviction and affiliation in the creation of cultures of aversion? Did religious traditions influence one another in creating collective antipathies toward third-party groups? What were the similarities and differences among the respective antipathies held by different religious communities? How can one compare and understand the antipathies felt by members of institutionalized religions toward communities, ideas, or the practices of syncretic religious groups, or by the marginal offshoots of a religion? How did political circumstances and effective state propaganda occasion new antipathies?

How did being a member of the majority or a minority group shape an individual's feelings about other communities? How did it effect his or her ability—and willingness—to express dislike in word or deed? How were sentiments of antipathy directed toward specific ethnic groups, regardless of their religious identities? What were Ottoman elites' common perceptions of foreign others, with whom they may have had little or no contact? How did such perceptions trickle down to the common people? How were negative attitudes toward the poor, homeless, and outcasts of society manifested? How did inhabitants of the imperial center of Istanbul, or of other established urban cultural centers, perceive people immigrating to their cities from the provinces? How can one characterize, generalize, or trace the particularities of antipathies based on gender or on sexual orientation within Ottoman society? Were the antipathies of religious or societal groups toward certain others particular to time periods (for example, the aftermath of a rebellion) or to certain geographies (for example, large cities or borderlands)?

Comparative studies to substantiate the forms and causes of dislike across premodern societies of similar configuration will no doubt open new avenues of research and help rescue historians from feelings of singularity. In offering our preliminary findings to the scholarly world via this volume, we hope that the questions above will also guide researchers as they explore and inquire into similar problems in their respective sources.

Changing Perceptions about Christian-Born Ottomans: Anti-*ḳul* Sentiments in Ottoman Historiography

H. Erdem Çıpa

Writing in the early 1590s, court historiographer Ṭaʿlīḳīzāde Meḥmed (d. 1600) identified the peaceful coexistence of a diverse "collection of religious communities" (*terāküm-i milel*) under Ottoman rule as one of the qualities of the House of ʿOs̱mān that rendered it superior to all Islamic dynasties, past and contemporary.[1] The cohabitation of ethnically and confessionally varied communities in the Ottoman realm is a theme addressed by non-Ottoman early modern authors as well. The bilingual treatise on the state of Ottoman affairs penned in 1672 by Jakab Harsányi Nagy (d. after 1679), an exceptionally versatile Transylvanian man of letters, provides a case in point.[2] A meticulous observer of Ottoman

1 Ṭaʿlīḳīzāde Meḥmed, *Şehnāme-i Hümāyūn*, 7a–b/122: "Ṭoḳuzıncı ḫāṣṣa terāküm-i milel ve telāṭum-ı niḥeldür. Hīç bir salṭanat yoḳdur ki pāy-taḫt-ı pāyende-baḫtda millet-i Tersā ve niḥlet-i Mūsā terāküm eyleyüb ecnās-ı ṣettā ictimāʿ ḳılmaḳ olmamışdur. İllā bu devlet-i ʿālī-ṣān-ı raṣīnü'l-bünyānda vāḳiʿ olmışdur." For a discussion of Ṭaʿlīḳīzāde's list of twenty superior qualities (*ḫāṣṣa*) of the Ottoman dynasty, see Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan*, 30–35. Also see Krstić, "Conversion and Converts to Islam in Ottoman Historiography," 72.

2 Jakab Harsányi composed his *Colloquia Familiaria Turcico Latina* in Ottoman Turkish and Latin. A modern edition of the treatise, including a German translation

realities, Jakab Harsányi attempts to describe "the nature and mores of the Ottomans," but first cautions his readers that the Ottomans formed not a "pure" nation but one composed of the descendants of a great number of peoples, including "Germans, Poles, French, English, Dutch, Hungarians, Muscovites, Czechs, Rus, Cossacks, Serbs, Bulgarians, Albanians, Abkhazians, Georgians, Kurds, Persians, Arabs, Greeks, Armenians, Tatars, Wallachians, Moldavians, Circassians, Croatians, Italians, Jews, Indians, and many others." In a nuanced tone, he further notes that "those who are born Muslim have different customs than those who have converted from Christianity; the educated have their way, the uneducated theirs; people of the frontiers develop different customs than those who are born in the central lands of the empire; everyone learns both good and bad things from Christians and [other] neighbors."[3]

We do not know whether Jakab Harsányi considered the social relations among various ethnic and religious communities living under Ottoman rule—or the relationships between these communities and the Ottoman state—to be fundamentally peaceful. His remarkably non-essentialist attitude, however, suggests that he would probably not be as quick as Ṭaᶜlīḳīzāde Meḥmed to praise early modern Ottomans as the architects of a glorious "Pax Ottomanica." Moreover, judging by Jakab Harsányi's extraordinary breadth of knowledge about Ottoman affairs, it is highly unlikely that he was unaware of expressions of dislike and antipathy employed by Ottoman chroniclers, chancellors, and scribes to describe a great number of subject populations. Among such expressions were the euphonious religio-ethnic slurs referring to the "cursed, dishonorable Hungarians" (*engürüs-i menḥūs*, *engürüs-i bī-nāmūs*), "wicked Kurds" (*ekrād-ı bed-nihād*), "disunited, ignorant, Turks/Turkomans" (*etrāk-ı ḳalīlü'l-ittiḥād*, *etrāk-ı bī-idrāḳ*), and "despicable and scheming Laz" (*mezmūm-u-ġammāz*

of the text, was published by György Hazai in 1973. On Jakab Harsányi's life and career, see Kármán, *A Seventeenth-Century Odyssey in East Central Europe*.

3 See Harsányi Nagy, *Colloquia Familiaria Turcico Latina*, 162–64. For a discussion of the relevant segment of the text, including Jakab Harsányi's portrayal of the "Ottoman character," see Kafadar, "A Rome of One's Own," 14; and Kármán, *A Seventeenth-Century Odyssey in East Central Europe*, 220–21. The translations by Kafadar and Kármán include slight variations. Quoted here is Kafadar's more idiomatic translation (based on the Ottoman Turkish version of the text) rather than Kármán's more literal one (based on the Latin version of the text).

olan Laz),[4] not to mention the Ḳızılbaş, who were commonly depicted as evil-mannered (*bed-maᶜaş*) rabble-rousers (*evbāş*).[5] Last but not least, he surely was aware that Ottoman authors consistently referred to non-Muslims as "evil-doing infidels" (*küffār-ı bed-girdār*).[6]

Jakab Harsányi would also undoubtedly disagree with Ṭaᶜlīḳīzāde's modern—and mostly Turkish—counterparts, who uncritically accept an idealized version of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Ottoman imperial self-image as historical fact.[7] Produced in a politico-religious landscape shaped first by the predominantly secular nationalist ideology of the early Republic,[8] then by the official state doctrine of "Turkish-Islamic Synthesis,"[9] and more recently by the rise of the Sunnī Turkish variant of political Islam and a concomitant sentiment of neo-Ottomanism, this brand of scholarship posits that the (relative) economic and political stability of the early modern Ottoman enterprise rendered Ottoman lands a safe and secure environment for all subjects of a multi-confessional empire, regardless of ethnic or religious background.

Recent studies have moved away from this idealized portrayal of Ottoman realities. A number of works in (primarily) Euro-American scholarship, including the essays that comprise this volume, present nuanced readings of a wide range of historical narratives. In so doing, they identify areas of contention among various communities within Ottoman society

4 For references to the Kurds, the Turks, and the Laz, see, for example, Muṣṭafā ᶜĀlī, *Nuṣḥatü's-selāṭīn*, 1:23, 63 (translation), 139, 158 (transcription); and Celālzāde Muṣṭafā, *Meʾāṯir-i Selīm Ḫānī*, 129.

5 See, for example, Luṭfī Paşa, *Tevārīḫ-i āl-i ᶜOṯmān*, 214; and Celālzāde Muṣṭafā, *Meʾāṯir-i Selīm Ḫānī*, 145.

6 See, for example, Luṭfī Paşa, *Tevārīḫ-i āl-i ᶜOṯmān*, 196.

7 The titles of several recent publications demonstrate that Ṭaᶜlīḳīzāde's idealizing view of Ottoman rule has remained a fundamental component of a particularly durable historiographical current. See, for example, Çiçek, *Pax Ottomana*; and Ortaylı, *Osmanlı Barışı*.

8 For a critique of the "Kemalist view of Ottoman history," which has been characterized by "the imagined descent of an imagined 'Turkish state tradition' from the Orkhon inscriptions to the *ḳānūnnāme* of Meḥmed II," see Imber, "'An Illiberal Descent'".

9 Originally formulated in the 1970s by the right-wing nationalist Intellectuals' Hearths (*Aydınlar Ocakları*), the doctrine of the "Turkish-Islamic Synthesis" became a principal tenet of the Turkish Republic's official ideology after the 1980 coup, aiding the rise of a Sunnī-sectarian variant of political Islam in Turkey. See Eligür, *The Mobilization of Political Islam in Turkey*.

as well as spheres of conflict—and compromise—between individual communities and the Ottoman polity that governed them.[10] The aim of this article is to complement these studies by highlighting the dissonance between groups of people *within* the Ottoman military ruling elite (*ʿaskerī*). Specifically, I intend to focus on the portrayal of the "slave-servants" of the Ottoman sultan—known as *ḳul*s—in Ottoman historiography of the early modern era. Paying particular attention to a number of Ottoman works of advice (*naṣīḥatnāme*), an impressive genre of ethical-political writing that flourished during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, I aim to demonstrate that the majority of freeborn Muslim Ottoman authors directed their frustration and resentment toward the sultan's Christian-born *ḳul*s. Finally, I argue that the expression of *ḳul*-critical sentiments in Ottoman historical writing was not the result of a religio-social conflict between Christian-born and Muslim-born individuals but rather the outcome of rivalry among members of a ruling class who competed for appointments and promotions in the military–administrative hierarchy of the Empire.

SLAVE-SERVANTS IN THE OTTOMAN MILITARY–ADMINISTRATIVE HIERARCHY

Originally an old Turkish word denoting a servant, vassal, or dependent, "*ḳul*" was used in a variety of ways in Ottoman historiography.[11] In some cases, the term specifically denoted a slave, an individual who could be bought and sold.[12] Per Süleymān I's ("the Lawgiver," r. 1520–1566) imperial order of 1531 decreeing that all of his subjects were *ḳul*s, the word could also refer to practically anyone who was not a member of the

10 The best examples in this regard are two book-length studies by Karen Barkey and Tijana Krstić. While the former defines empire as a "negotiated" enterprise and analyzes the social organization as well as the mechanisms of governance of the multiethnic and multireligious polity ruled by the House of ʿOṣmān, the latter provides a sophisticated analysis of interconfessional dynamics within the Ottoman context. See Barkey, *Empire of Difference*; and Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam*.

11 For the various meanings the term acquired over time, see *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* (second edition, henceforth "*EI*^{2}"), s.v. "*Ḳul*" (C. E. Bosworth).

12 The authoritative study on various forms of slavery in the Ottoman world is Toledano, *Slavery and Abolition in the Ottoman Middle East*. On the holding of slaves during the early Ottoman period, also see Erdem, *Slavery in the Ottoman Empire and Its Demise*, 1–17.

dynastic family.[13] Most often, however, "*ḳul*" referred to members of the Ottoman military ruling elite who had been (almost exclusively) recruited through an elaborate system called *devşirme*, through which thousands of Christian-born subjects of the Empire entered the Ottoman military–administrative structure and became the sultan's slave-servants.[14] This practice entailed the forcible removal, in the form of a tribute, of the male children of non-urban, mostly Christian subjects of the Empire from their ethnic, religious, and cultural environments, along with their transfer into the Turkish-Islamic milieu, with the aim of employing them in the service of the palace, army, and imperial bureaucracy. As *devşirme* recruits, these children were, on the one hand, to serve the sultan as slaves and freedmen and, on the other, to eventually form the ruling class of the Ottoman state.

As Ehud R. Toledano notes, "slavery was *both* an important, albeit involuntary, channel of recruitment and socialization into the elite and a major, though forced, means of linking individuals into patronage networks."[15] Indeed, the majority of these recruits became janissaries (*yeŋiçeri*). Originally forming the sultan's household troops and imperial bodyguard, this standing corps of salaried infantrymen evolved to constitute the "indispensable operational core of the Ottoman army" by the early seventeenth century.[16] A great many others served the Ottoman enterprise as statesmen, bureaucrats, and administrators. The critical juncture in this regard was the reign of Meḥmed II ("the Conqueror," r. 1444–1446 and

13 The relevant section of the edict is quoted in Kunt, *The Sultan's Servants*, 35: "Those living in my domains, either officers or subjects, all of them are my servants" (Benüm memālik-i maḥrūsemde vākiᶜ olan eger sipāhīlerdür ve eger reᶜāyādur cümlesi ḳullarumdur). I am grateful to Cornell Fleischer for this reference.

14 In this study, the term will be used in this last, more common sense. Although most *ḳul*s were *devşirme* recruits, their ranks also included captives of war who converted to Islam and became *ḳul*s voluntarily. On this institution, see Ménage, "Sidelights on the *Devshirme* from Idrīs and Saᶜduddīn"; Ménage, "Some Notes on the *Devshirme*"; Palmer, "The Origin of the Janissaries"; Wittek, "*Devshirme* and *Sharīᶜa*"; and Kafadar, "The Ottomans and Europe," 603–606. Prominent sixteenth-century historian and jurist Saᶜdeddīn Efendi (d. 1599) estimates that this system of recruitment produced more than 200,000 converts to Islam over the course of more than two centuries. For this and other estimates, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Devshirme" (Victor L. Ménage). For a discussion of the *devşirme* as a method of conversion to Islam, see Minkov, *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans*, 67–77.

15 Toledano, *Slavery and Abolition in the Ottoman Middle East*, 4. Italics in the original. On the legal status of the *ḳul*, also see Minkov, *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans*, 69n25.

16 See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Yeñi Čeri" (Rhoads Murphey).

1451–1481), who strategically promoted men of *devşirme* background to high offices.[17] In fact, until the late seventeenth century the Ottoman imperial administration was dominated by *ḳul*s.

This was certainly part of Meḥmed II's "imperial project,"[18] which entailed, among other endeavors, the establishment of Constantinople as the new Ottoman capital, the codification of fratricide,[19] and the transformation of privately owned lands (*mülk*), as well as lands that belonged to pious endowments (*vaḳıf*), into military fiefs (*tīmār*).[20] Meḥmed II also created a court culture in which royal patronage of the arts was further extended to "outsiders."[21] An anonymous author used poetry to express his resentment of the sultan's advancement of these "outsider" Jews, Christians, and Persians:

> If you wish to stand in high honor on the Sultan's threshold,
> You must be a Jew, or a Frank, or a Persian;
> You must choose the name Ḳābīlī, Habīlī, Ḥāmidī,
> And behave like a Zorzi; show no knowledge.[22]

---

17 Kafadar notes that between 1450 and the late 1600s, the great majority of Ottoman viziers were products of this system of recruitment. See Kafadar, "The Ottomans and Europe," 605.

18 For the original use of the term, see Yerasimos, *La fondation de Constantinople et de Sainte-Sophie dans les traditions turques*, 249. On Meḥmed II's "imperial project" and its critique as articulated in early Ottoman historiography, see Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 96–97.

19 For a detailed discussion of the "fratricide clause" in Meḥmed II's *ḳānūnnāme* and the most recent argument for its authenticity, see, respectively, Özcan, "Fâtih'in Teşkilât Kanunnâmesi ve Nizam-ı Alem İçin Kardeş Katli Meselesi"; and *Ḳānūnnāme-i āl-i ʿOs̱mān*, xxiii–xxxiv.

20 See Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror and His Time*, 447; and Beldiceanu, "Recherches sur la réforme foncière de Mehmed II." The fifteenth-century historian Ṭursun Beg states that Meḥmed II confiscated more than one thousand villages or estates and converted them to military prebends. See Ṭursun Beg, *Tārīḫ-i ebū'l-feṭḥ* (Tulum edition, 197; İnalcık and Murphey edition, 169a). Earlier in the text, the number of confiscated estates is given as "twenty thousand" (Tulum edition, 22; İnalcık and Murphey edition, 18a).

21 For royal patronage of the arts at Meḥmed II's court, see Rogers, "Mehmed the Conqueror"; and Raby, "A Sultan of Paradox."

22 Translation, with minor modifications, as quoted in Raby, "A Sultan of Paradox," 8. The original poem, which is included in *Risāletü'l-leṭāʾif ve ḥikāyātü'l-Ḥācı Ṣabrī*, is quoted by Süheyl Ünver as "Gel dilerseŋ şāh eşiginde olasın muḥterem / Yā Yahūd ol gel bu mülke yā Frenk ol yā ʿAcem / Adıŋı ḳo Ḳābīlī vü Habīlī vü Ḥāmidī / Żūrzīlikten ġāfil olma maʿrifetten urma dem." See Ünver, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Tarihine Başlangıç*, 248.