

OTTOMAN HISTORY

Ottoman History in Early Modern Era, 1300-1750

Course Description

This course aims to introduce the students the administrative and socio-economic history of the Ottoman Empire in the early modern period. It covers key issues and themes from the emergence of the Ottomans till the advent of the modern era. The course was organized around four major themes/units. The first theme, "Continuity and Change in Ottoman History" focuses on the history of the empire and evaluate the history of the empire in three phases. The second theme, "Ottoman State System and Bureaucratic Mechanism", focuses on the royal dynasty, bureaucracy and key institutions of the empire and studies them in three sub sections. The third theme, "Cross-Cultural Relations", deals with the problem of interconfessional relations and evaluates this issue in an chronological manner. The fourth theme, "Socio-Economic Life", focuses on the socio-economic life in urban areas and deals with the issues of urban space, social groups and personal lives of Ottoman subjects.

About the Professor

The instructor, Güçlü Tülüveli, Ph.D., is an assistant professor of Ottoman history currently working in the Department of History, Middle East Technical University. He had received his B.A from METU, M.A from Bosphorus University and his Ph.D. from the Center for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies, University of Birmingham, England. His area of expertise is Ottoman socio-economic and urban history in the early modern era.

Course Contents

Unit I: Continuity and Change in Ottoman History

- Week 1-From Principality to Empire
- Week 2-The Question of "Decline"
- Week 3-Transformation into Modern Era

Unit II: Ottoman State System and Bureaucratic Mechanism

- Week 4-Dynasty
- Week 5-Central Institutions
- Week 6-The Imperial Palace and Royal Household

Unit III: Cross-Cultural Relations

- Week 7-Social Groups in the Classical Age
- Week 8-An Empire of Tolerance?
- Week 9-Impact of Modernization on Social Relations

Unit IV: Socio-Economic Life

- Week 10-Definitions: "Islamic" and "Ottoman" City
- Week 11-City Administration and Economy
- Week 12-Urban Institutions: Waqfs and Guilds
- Week 13-Communal Networks
- Week 14-Social Relations

Required Texts

Karen Barkey, *Empire of Difference, the Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Suraiya Faroqhi (ed.), *Cambridge History of Turkey 1603-1839, Vol. 3*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Kate Fleet (ed.), *Cambridge History of Turkey 1071-1453, Vol. 1*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Daniel Goffman, *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Renata Holod, Salma K. Jayyusi, Attilio Petruccioli and André Raymond (eds.), *The City in the Islamic World*, 2 vols., Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Halil Inalcık, *The Classical Age 1300-1600*, London: Phoenix Press, 2000.

Halil Inalcık and Donald Quataert (eds.), *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300-1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire, 1300-1650: The Structure of Power*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Leslie Peirce, *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Unit I: Continuity and Change in Ottoman History

Week 1-From Principality to Empire

Overview:

The historical origins of the Ottoman dynasty lay in the central Asian steppes. In mid-eleventh century, a confederation of Turkish nomads (referred in the literature as "Turcoman") near Lake Baikal began migrating, conquered Iran and in 1055 captured Baghdad. They established this city as the capital of the Great Seljuk dynasty. The political outlook of this confederation was highly fragmented; leadership was decided by consensus rather than by command. The influx of Turcomans with their animistic (shamanistic) belief system into the Middle East caused major changes in the area. While the nomadic nature of the newcomers clashed with the sedentary culture of the region, they themselves were converted to Islam while retaining some of their former practices.

An important date in this process was the year 1071. In this year, Seljuk sultan defeated the Byzantine emperor at the battle of Manzikert in eastern Anatolia. It was a decisive battle which signalled the decline of the Byzantine power in Asia Minor and the establishment of Seljuk power in the region. In the following decades, a branch of Seljuk dynasty began to control the area. The geography and the climate of the region attracted the semi-nomadic Turcoman groups and they poured into the region. The westward movement of the Turcoman groups suited with the problems facing the Seljuks; what to do with the nomadic tribes who were disrupting the settled agricultural life of their territories.

For the next two centuries, Asia Minor saw the emergence of several Turcoman principalities under Seljuk control. The political background of the region was chaotic. The great Byzantine Empire was in decay, Constantinople was sacked by the Latins in the Fourth Crusade of 1204. The empire was divided into two, forcing the Byzantine government into exile at Nicea (Iznic). Byzantine political power in the Asia Minor rested on a series of border forts and principalities who were feeling the military and demographic pressure emanating from the Turcoman westward migration.

The Ottoman Empire came into being around the turn of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in north-western part of the Asia Minor. The period 1300 to 1450 saw a remarkable growth of the Ottomans from a small principality to an empire with vast territories. The first Ottoman sultans, with their limited resources and manpower, managed to cross the threshold where other Turcoman principalities could not. The reasons for Ottoman success in state-making in her early periods attracted scholarly attention.

Among other factors, it is generally accepted that the frontier location of the principality gave the Ottomans a special role among others. The population pressure caused by the Mongol thrust into the Middle East was counterbalanced by the Ottoman success in holding bridgeheads in some parts of the Balkans. Here, the Ottoman occupation of a town (Tzympe) on the European side of the Dardanelles in 1354 was important. Christians, as well as Muslims, followed the Ottomans not only for spoils but also for gold and glory. The latter sentence needs further explanation since early Ottoman wars were sometimes labelled as "holy wars" in the secondary literature. Historical sources point out the fact that the jump into the Balkans presented material opportunities for social groups, among which were the warrior bands that would later support Ottoman military mechanism. Members of these warrior bands were called *gazis*, warriors of faith fighting against the infidels. The theme of "Holy War" had been challenged by recent scholarship on certain points. The main discussion was focused on three issues; the first is that the frontier Turcoman society was ethnically and religiously inclusive rather than exclusive, the second was there were, in fact, Christian warriors fighting side by side with the Ottomans and the third one is that the Ottomans did not, yet, developed the normative or orthodox form of Islam that the Holy War required.

Other factors that could challenge the "Gazi Thesis" is the presence of heterodox religious groups in early Ottoman society. These people were lured by the opportunities offered by the Ottomans and had a profound effect on later Ottoman state-making process. The

syncretic form of Islam they were following allowed the early Ottoman state for political and ideological elasticity. Another factor was that the Ottoman waged war against not only non-Muslim principalities in the region but also to fellow Muslim principalities also. In fact, Ottomans constantly fight against against Turcoman political systems in Anatolia during the fourteenth till the sixteenth century. In short, early Ottoman leaders were flexible rulers who were ready to adapt to changing conditions and the early Ottoman state was not a religious enterprise in the making but rather a pragmatic one.

From the time of Orhan (1324-62), Ottoman principality began to expand its territories both in the Balkans and the Asia Minor. The fall of Bursa (*Prusa*) in 1326 offered the Ottomans a secure base for further military campaigns. In the Balkans, Edirne (Adrianople) was taken in 1361; it was a city that controlled the hinterland of Constantinople. Murad I (1362-1389), son of Orhan, took Sofia in 1385. This enabled further Ottoman control over Thrace and south-eastern Balkan lands. In 1389, the Ottoman forces under the command of Murad I won a major victory over a coalition of Balkan states at Kosovo-Polje.

Further analysis on expansion strategies in the Balkans offer scholars detailed insight on the Ottoman "methods of conquest". First of all, Ottomans used marriage to consolidate and extend their political power. Orhan married the daughter of John Cantacuzene, pretender to the Byzantine throne, and received the Tzympe strongpoint in the Dardanelles as dowry. The son of Murad I, Prince Bayezit, was married with the daughter of Turcoman ruler of the house of Germiyan and obtained one-half of his lands as dowry. The Ottomans expand their control over neighbouring political entities by way of marriage. Then, when they become more powerful, they establish a loose type of vassalage. The next step would be the total annihilation of the territories of the former ally. Secondly, Ottomans used in their advantage the schism between Catholic and Orthodox churches and its reflection on the Balkan peasantry. The Ottomans quickly lowered the high taxes and dissolved the *corvee* (by which the lord demanded several days of personal service from his serfs) that was implemented by the Latins after the Fourth Crusade of 1204. Thirdly, Ottomans utilised the older feudal class that had been rooted in the Balkans in their advantage. Some of the higher level families were uprooted from their power bases and forcibly sent to other parts of the Ottoman lands. Others were integrated into Ottoman bureaucracy and into military system. The presence of Christian *timar*-holders (*timar* is a prebend acquired through sultanic diploma) in Ottoman army confirm this practice. This practice was further accelerated by the forced migrations (*sürgün*) that the Ottomans liberally used for adjusting the population balance between Muslim and non-Muslims in the area. Fourthly, Ottomans utilised a flexible policy for conquering the various areas in the Balkans. In the cases of Moldavia and Wallachia, the ruling dynasty remained in actual control over many decades. In these areas, the Ottomans imposed direct control only in the eighteenth century. The case of Crimean Khans shows the same trend. They became vassals of the Ottoman dynasty in 1475 and remained so until 1774. And finally, the Ottomans begin to form its bureaucratic and military ranks from the Balkans through a system called *Devşirme* (child levy system). By offering new opportunities for the young people to enter the state mechanism of the conquering power, the Ottomans build loyalties towards the royal dynasty and the sultan himself.

The growth of the Ottoman state came to a halt when Tamerlane began his campaign into the Middle East. Ottoman forces under the command of Bayezit I (1389-1402) was defeated crushingly at the battle of Ankara. The sultan himself was captured at this war. After that, an eleven year of chaos reigned the Ottoman lands where the contenders to the throne fought against each other. The interregnum ended in 1413 with Mehmed I (1413-21). He spends most of his time fighting with his relatives. The restoration of Ottoman power came with the reign of Murad II (1421-51). He put an end to dynastic clashes and reconquered Salonica from the Venetians in 1430. He fought against the Hungarians under John Hunyadi, won the battle of Varna in 1444 which reestablished Ottoman control in the south-eastern Balkans. In the next decades, there were positive steps towards the consolidation of the Ottoman state. In this period, the land-tenure system was standardized, the religious identities were institutionalized and orthodox

Sunni codes were imposed on the Ottoman society. The Janissaries coming from *Devşirme* origins were also acknowledged as the backbone of the Ottoman army.

The "Classical Age" of Ottoman history begins with Mehmed II (1451-1481), called the "Conqueror". The conquest of Constantinople signalled a new phase in Ottoman history where the Ottomans not only inherited the legacy of the Roman Empire but were also elevated into a great Muslim conquering dynasty. The conquest of the city provided the Ottomans with ideological propaganda power to assert themselves as leaders of the Muslim world. The city also provided a secure base for further military advances in the Balkans and Anatolia. Constantinople served for a long time as an entrepot for international trade, linking the Silk Road to Europe. It offered riches coming from the transit trade and filled Ottoman coffers. After the conquest, Mehmed II started a huge rebuilding programme. By 1478, the city's population had doubled from 30.000 to 70.000. A century later, the city became a metropolis of 400.000 inhabitants.

Mehmed continued his advances in Greece and Trabzon between 1459-61, he also annexed southern Crimea from the Genoese and set ties with the Khans of Crimea. His ambitions expanded even to Italy, in 1480 Gedik Ahmed Pasha managed to seize the fortress of Otranto. There was also an attempt to seize the island of Rhodes from the Knights Hospitaller of Rhodes and Malta but its capture would be at the time of the Süleyman the Magnificent.

The apogee of the Empire began with the reign of Selim II (1512-20). In his short eight years of rule, Selim changed the focus of attention from the Balkans to Anatolia and the Middle East. In a series of campaigns, he moved against the Safavids of Iran and the Mamluks of Egypt. In the first phase, the Safavids and their followers in Anatolia was targeted. In 1514 he won a decisive victory over the Safavids in the battle of Çaldıran. Selim used the advanced Ottoman artillery force to disperse the Safavid cavalry. Two years later, he took the city of Diyarbakır in south-east Anatolia and secured the allegiance of local chieftains in the area. Ottomans then turned their focus on the northern Syria and Iraq. The Ottoman and Mamluk armies met at Marj Dabiq in 1516, the war ended with the death of Mamluk sultan. Damascus, an important trade city, was taken the same year and the Ottomans appoint governors to cities like, Aleppo, Tripoli, Jerusalem and to other cities in Syria, Lebanon and Palestine. The final blow to Mamluk power came with the battle of Ridaniyye in 1517 where not only Cairo but also the holy cities of Mecca and Medina were conquered. The conquest of these two latter cities enabled the Ottomans to assert their leading position among other Muslim dynasties. The Ottomans controlled the pilgrimage route to the holy cities. These two cities were also significant entrepôts, leading to Red Sea and also to Indian Ocean. Ottomans reached the transit trade routes of the Indian Ocean and met with a new enemy, the Portuguese.

The transfer of power from Selim to his son Süleyman I (1520-66), who was called as Magnificent, was peaceful because there were no brothers present to dispute the throne. Süleyman's first major victory was the conquest of Belgrade in 1521, a major city which was suitable for further operations in the Balkans. After Belgrade, Süleyman ordered a major expedition against Rhodes which was still in the hands of Knights Hospitaller. Rhodes stood in a strategic point in eastern Mediterranean since it controlled the sea route to Egypt and Arabian Peninsula, a region the Ottomans recently conquered. Egypt was also crucial since it supplied wheat for the capital. The island was taken in 1522 after a five-month siege. These two early conquests not only strengthened Süleyman's reputation as a leader but also secured key positions in the Balkans and in eastern Mediterranean. Belgrade was the conjunction point of Danube and Sava rivers and entry point to Hungary from the south side whereas Rhodes stood in between İstanbul and Egypt.

These victories also introduced the Ottoman Empire with strong opponents. The first one was the Habsburg dynasty under Charles V which formed the vanguard of the Christian world. The other was the Portuguese in the Indian Ocean who were eager to defend their trade monopolies with the Far East.

The Ottoman advance in the Balkans continued with the victory of the Ottomans in the battle of Mohacs in 1526 where the Hungarian army was routed and Hungary became an Ottoman vassal. The crises over the throne of Hungary brought Ottomans face to face to Holy Roman Empire. The ensuing hostilities urge Süleyman to take drastic action and he ordered a campaign against Vienna. The campaign was unsuccessful but paved the way to a long confrontation between the Holy Roman and Ottoman Empires.

The Ottomans were fighting on two fronts. The eastern front was the Indian Ocean and Iran where the Ottomans began to gain ground. In Iran, Tabriz and Baghdad was conquered in 1534 and the border with the Safavids of Iran stabilized for some time. The siege of Diu in India in 1538 shows the extent of Ottoman naval power in the Indian Ocean. The western front was Mediterranean and Balkans where the Ottomans were fighting against Charles V-Holy Roman Emperor and king of Spain. Ottoman navy managed to defeat a combined fleet of Holy League of Pope Paul III, Charles V, Ferdinand of Austria and Venice in the battle of Prevesa in 1538. Ottoman advances in the Aegean Sea continued under the command of Barbarossa. Although Ottoman naval power demonstrate military prowess, it has limits. The siege of Malta in 1565 ended with no success despite the loss of more than 10.000 souls. Malta was regarded as the key to the western Mediterranean and the logistics of the Ottoman military machine could not afford to take it.

The reign of Süleyman is considered in the secondary literature as the apex of Ottoman power. His death is regarded as the end of Ottoman "Classical Age". Although Ottoman Empire continued to exist another 350 years, the Ottoman Empire and culture flourished in his reign. Great figures such as Ebussuud Efendi who codified the Ottoman law and the architect, Mimar Sinan, who established the basis for Ottoman aesthetic and building norms, lived in his reign. His time also presented the culmination of Ottoman cultural life in which Süleyman himself appeared as a poet under the pen name "Muhibbi". Through the networks of patronage, he sponsored great poets like Baki and Hayali. He was compared with Alexander the Great in the verses of the intellectuals.

Süleyman also knew the power of propaganda and marketing. He was presented as the "King of Kings" not only to Ottoman subjects but also to foreign powers. His ceremonial public display in Nish, which was orchestrated by his grand vizier İbrahim Pasha and his Venetian comrade Alvise Gritti, intended to give a certain message to the European media. The manner he competed with the European rulers was reflected in his choice of regalia- a crown and sceptre- which was closely associated with Roman and Catholic imperial traditions. In all, his era stand as a monument in Turkish history.

Readings:

Karen Barkey, "Emergence: Brokerage across Networks," in *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, 28-65.

Cornell Fleischer, "The Lawgiver as Messiah: The Making of the Imperial Image in the Reign of Süleyman", in *Soliman le Magnifique et son temps*, ed. Gilles Veinstein, Paris: Documentation française, 1992, pp. 159-177

Daniel Goffman, "Fabricating the Ottoman State," in *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 27-54

Essay Topics:

- Would you define the first Ottomans as Holy Warriors (*Gazis*)?
- How did the Ottoman state consolidate herself in the Balkans?

Week 2-The Question of "Decline"

Readings:

Daniel Goffman, "Factionalism and Insurrection," in *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 98-127

D. Howard, "Ottoman Historiography and the Literature of 'Decline' of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 1, 1988, pp. 52-77

Cemal Kafadar, "The Question of Ottoman Decline", *Harvard Middle Eastern and Islamic Review*, Vol. 4, Nos. 1-2, 1997-1998, pp. 30-75

Essay Topics:

- Did the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries signify the beginning of decline for the Ottoman Empire?
- How did the Ottoman intelligentsia assess the problem of decline?

Week 3-Transformation into Modern Era

Readings:

Karen Barkey, "An Eventful Eighteenth Century: Empowering the Political", *Empire of Difference, the Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 197-225

Christoph Neumann, "Political and Diplomatic Developments," in *The Cambridge History of Turkey Vol.3*, ed. Suraiya Faroqhi, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 44-62

Donald Quataert, "The Ottoman Empire, 1683-1798" in *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 37-53

Essay Topics:

- What were the basic socio-political developments of the eighteenth century?
- How did the formation of the pasha households affect the socio-political environment in the Ottoman empire?

Unit II: Ottoman State System and Bureaucratic Mechanism

Week 4-Dynasty

Readings:

Colin Imber, "The Dynasty," in *The Ottoman Empire, 1300-1650: The Structure of Power*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002, pp. 87-127

Halil Inalcik, "The Manner of Accession to the Throne" in *The Classical Age 1300-1600*, London: Phoenix Press, 2000, pp. 59-64

Gülru Necipoğlu, "Süleyman the Magnificent and the Representation of Power in the Context of Ottoman-Hapsburg-Papal Rivalry", *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 71, No. 3, 1989, pp. 401-427

Essay Topics:

- How did the Ottomans conducted an "ideological" warfare together with an armed one?
- What was the historical importance of the practice of fratricide?

Week 5-Central Institutions

Readings:

Halil Inalcik, "The Central Administration" in *The Classical Age 1300-1600*, London: Phoenix Press, 2000, pp. 89-103

Halil Inalcik, "The Provincial Administration and the *Timar* System" in *The Classical Age 1300-1600*, London: Phoenix Press, 2000, pp. 104-118

Donald Quataert, "Ottoman Methods of Rule" in *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 90-99

Essay Topics:

- How did Ottoman sultans legitimize themselves in the eyes of the Ottoman subjects?
- What were the basic Ottoman governmental institutions?

Week 6-The Imperial Palace and Royal Household

Readings:

Colin Imber, "Recruitment" in *The Ottoman Empire, 1300-1650: The Structure of Power*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002, pp. 128-142

Halil Inalcik, "The Palace" in *The Classical Age 1300-1600*, London: Phoenix Press, 2000, pp. 76-88

Leslie Peirce, "The Imperial Harem Institution" in *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993, pp.113-149

Essay Topics:

- Why were some social groups exempt from the Recruitment (*Devşirme*)?
- Why was the Harem defined as an "institution"?

Unit III: Cross Cultural Relations

Week 7-Social Groups in the Classical Age

Readings:

Daniel Goffman, "A Seasoned Polity," in *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 59-92

Daniel Goffman, "Ottoman Milletts in the Early Seventeenth Century." *New Perspectives on Turkey*, Vol. 11, 1994, pp.135-158

Halil Inalcik, "The Ottoman Concept of State and the Class System," in *The Classical Age 1300-1600*, London: Phoenix Press, 2000, pp. 65-69

Essay Topics:

- What were the basic social groups in the "Classical Age"?
- How did the Ottoman state categorize and classify Ottoman society?

Week 8-An Empire of Tolerance?

Readings:

Karen Barkey, "Maintaining Empire: An Expression of Tolerance", *Empire of Difference, the Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 109-153

Donald Quataert, "Inter-communal co-operation and conflict" in *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 172-191

Rhoads Murphey, "Forms of Differentiation and Expression of Individuality in Ottoman Society," *Turcica*, Vol. 34, 2002, pp. 135-170

Essay Topics:

- Would you consider Ottoman society as a tolerant one?
- What were the social and political obstacles that could prevent the development of coherent social life in Ottoman cities?

Week 9-Impact of Modernization on Social Relations

Readings:

Karen Barkey, "A Networking Society: Commercialization, Tax-Farming and Social Relations", *Empire of Difference, the Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 226-263

Shirine Hamadeh, "Ottoman Expressions of Early Modernity and the 'Inevitable' Question of Westernization," *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Vol. 63, 2004, pp. 32-51

Rhoads Murphey, "Westernization in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire: How Far and How Fast?", *Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies*, Vol. 23, 1999, pp. 116-139

Essay Topics:

- What kinds of macro economic and political forces contribute to the Ottoman transformation of eighteenth and early nineteenth century?
- Which social groups emerge from Ottoman modernization?

Unit IV: Socio-Economic Life

Week 10-Definitions: "Islamic" and "Ottoman" City

Readings:

Edhem Eldem, Daniel Goffman and Bruce Masters, "Was there an Ottoman City?" in *The Ottoman City between East and West*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 1-16

Andre Raymond, "Islamic City, Arab City: Orientalist Myths and Recent Views," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 1994, pp. 3-18

Gilles Veinstein, "The Ottoman Town (Fifteenth-Eighteenth Centuries)," in *The City in the Islamic World*, 2 vols. eds. Salma Jayyusi, Renata Holod, Attilio Petruccioli and Andre Raymond, Leiden, Brill 2008, pp. 205-217

Essay Topics:

- How did the concept of "Islamic City" evolved over time?
- Was there an "Ottoman City"? If so, what would be its defining characteristics?

Week 11-City Administration and Economy

Readings:

Jean-Luc Arnaud, "Tradition and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century: Modernization of the Cities of the Ottoman Empire (1800-1920)" in *The City in the Islamic World*, 2 vols. eds. Salma Jayyusi, Renata Holod, Attilio Petruccioli and Andre Raymond, Leiden, Brill 2008, pp. 953-975

André Raymond, "The Economy of the Traditional City" in *The City in the Islamic World*, 2 vols. eds. Salma Jayyusi, Renata Holod, Attilio Petruccioli and Andre Raymond, Leiden, Brill 2008, pp. 731-751

André Raymond, "The Spatial Organization of the City", in *The City in the Islamic World*, 2 vols. eds. Salma Jayyusi, Renata Holod, Attilio Petruccioli and Andre Raymond, Leiden, Brill 2008, pp. 47-70

Essay Topics:

- What were the defining characteristics of Islamic and Ottoman cities?
- What were the effects of modernization on Islamic and Ottoman cities?

Week 12-Urban Institutions: Waqfs and Guilds

Readings:

Randi Deguilhem, "The Waqf in the City," in *The City in the Islamic World*, 2 vols. eds. Salma Jayyusi, Renata Holod, Attilio Petruccioli and Andre Raymond, Leiden, Brill 2008, pp. 923-950

Nelly Hanna, "Guilds in Recent Historical Scholarship," in *The City in the Islamic World*, 2 vols. eds. Salma Jayyusi, Renata Holod, Attilio Petruccioli and Andre Raymond, Leiden, Brill 2008, pp. 895-921

Amy Singer, "Devote the Fruits to Pious Purposes", in *Constructing Ottoman Beneficence, An Imperial Soup Kitchen in Jerusalem*, Albany: SUNY Press, 2002, pp. 15-37

Essay Topics:

- Why were the waqfs a crucial element for Ottoman city life?
- What kinds of services did the guilds perform in Ottoman urban life?

Week 13-Communal Networks

Readings:

Najwa Al-Qattan, "Litigants and Neighbors: The Communal Topography of Ottoman Damascus," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 44, No. 3, 2002, pp. 511-533.

Suraiya Faroqhi, "Social Life in Cities", in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300-1914*, eds. Halil İnalcık and Donald Quataert, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994, pp. 576-608

Abraham Marcus, "The Urban Experience: Space, Services and Public Spirit," in *The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity, Aleppo in the Eighteenth Century*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1989, pp. 277-313

Essay Topics:

- In what ways did the Non-Muslims contribute to Ottoman urban life?
- What were the basic social groups that can be observed in Ottoman cities?

Week 14-Social Relations

Readings:

Haim Gerber, "Anthropology and Family History: The Ottoman and Turkish Families", *Journal of Family History*, Vol. 14, 1989, pp. 409-421

Abraham Marcus, "The Urban Experience: Neighbourhood Life and Personal Privacy," in *The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity, Aleppo in the Eighteenth Century*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1989, pp. 314-330

Abdul-Karim Rafeq, "Public Morality in the 18th Century Ottoman Damascus," *Revue des Mondes Musulmans et de la Méditerranée*, Vol. 55, No. 1, 1990, pp. 180-196

Essay Topics:

- How did neighbourhood relations affect the practice of social life in Ottoman cities?
- What were the basic social forces that could define the norms of the Ottoman society?