

Hasan Çolak

## The Nature and Limits of Toleration in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire

The way the Ottoman administration has treated its non-Muslim subjects is often regarded as an example of toleration. However, the elements of time and space are often forgotten in using the term toleration for the Ottoman Empire. Hence, we either examine the Ottoman toleration with the standards of the European Enlightenment, or of the modern period. Leaving aside the Eurocentric and current connotations of the term, this article aims at providing an analysis of the nature and limits of the Ottoman toleration towards its non-Muslim subjects during the early modern period.

The grand seignior peaceably rules over subjects of twenty different religions, upward of two hundred thousand Greeks live unmolested within the walls of Constantinople; the Mufti himself nominates the Greek patriarch, and presents him to the emperor; and, at the same time, allows of the residence of a Latin patriarch. The sultan appoints Latin bishops for some of the Greek isles; ... The Othman empire swarms with Jacobines, Nestorians, Monothelites, Cophti, Christians of St. John, Guebres, and Banians; and the Turkish annals do not furnish us with one single instance of a rebellion occasioned by any of these different sects.

Voltaire, 1763.

Voltaire made the above observations on the Ottoman Empire in the fourth chapter of his famous *Traite sur la Tolérance*.<sup>1</sup> Obviously, Voltaire was not an expert on the Ottoman Empire and the above statements present a mixture of factual and rhetorical elements. Nonetheless, if we take them into consideration in both factual and rhetorical spheres, we see that the quotation in question is representative of most of the elements still discussed on the topic of toleration in the Ottoman Empire. It refers to the religious

diversity of people living in the Ottoman Empire, peaceful co-existence of these people without rebelling against the Ottoman administration, and the freedom that the latter offered to them in practicing their religion. Equally, it is also reminiscent of some of the overgeneralizations employed by the modern historians.

Those who have at least some familiarity with the topic of the treatment of non-Muslims by the Ottoman administration, will find it easy to recall a combination of these elements. It is likely that they would also recall examples that would question such an image especially regarding the legal status of non-Muslims *vis-à-vis* the modern standards. Indeed, the Ottoman Empire has been traditionally regarded either as one of the most ideal models worldwide in which various groups with different ethnic, religious, linguistic, and cultural characters coexisted in full harmony,<sup>2</sup> or as one which placed non-Muslims in a second-class position.<sup>3</sup> But how tolerant was the Ottoman administration to non-Muslims? Answering this tricky question requires to clarify the question across time and space, which many experts and non-experts tend to ignore from time to time. If one is talking about toleration in its current sense, comparing the Ottoman example with the existing cases of conflict, mostly in post-Ottoman space, or with modern concepts such as equality, then he or she is committing one of the biggest sins that a historian can, namely anachronism. If one is talking about toleration in its Western-European sense as initially voiced by the Enlightenment philosophers, such as Voltaire, he or she might make two mistakes: 1) Anachronism, because the examples from the Ottoman case precede the Enlightenment, and 2) Eurocentric essentialism, if we are evaluating the validity of the Ottoman case on the basis of its relevance to the European Enlightenment. Without going into these dangerous turfs, and without recourse to the Eurocentric and current standards of the term toleration, this essay will investigate the nature and limits of Ottoman administration's treatment of different groups in its realms and the responses of these groups to some of the policies that the Ottoman administration pursued.

### The nature of Ottoman toleration

Unlike the contemporary Mughal, Mamluk, and Safavid Empires, whose larger and somewhat more mono-chromatic populations were governed by a religious or ethnic minority, unlike the contemporary European states, such as the French, British, Spanish, and Portuguese, with their overseas

empires, which governed more homogenous populations in their metropolis and governed ethnically and religiously different groups in their colonies, and unlike the Russian and Habsburg Empires which ruled over less diverse populations but used more aggressive social policies on these groups, the Ottoman Empire presents an exceptionally interesting, though not a *sui generis*, case in history.<sup>4</sup> Until the incorporation of Syria and Egypt in 1517, the majority of the Ottoman population consisted of non-Muslims. Even when the Muslims began to outscore the non-Muslims in number thereafter, alongside wealthy Muslim groups, non-Muslims continued to fill important functions. While it were mainly Muslim merchants who conducted trade with the Indian subcontinent, Ottoman Christian and Jewish merchants, together with their Muslim compatriots, functioned to replace the Italians in the Eastern Mediterranean and Black Sea trade.<sup>5</sup> Jewish elites were among imperial engineers in the army, private physicians of the Ottoman sultans and of other members of the ruling elite, and they filled important positions in the Imperial Mint.<sup>6</sup> This Ottoman attitude towards Jews presents great contrast with the Iberian cases, where Jews and Muslims were required either to convert to Christianity or leave the Peninsula. The Phanariots, Greek Orthodox aristocratic families, established in the Phanar district of Istanbul, had a considerable influence on bureaucracy, international relations, provincial administration in Moldavia and Wallachia, and finally in the management of the Orthodox Patriarchates.<sup>7</sup> Showing similar organisational traits, Armenian *amira* families took part in financing the Ottoman administration as money-changers.<sup>8</sup> The chief motive in the accommodating policies of the pre-modern Ottoman Empire was to sustain the support of its population. As proven in times of conflict, the means of the pre-modern state was limited in terms of retaining its sources of income. Due mostly to this fact, in the Ottoman state ideology there is a certain emphasis on the contentment of the population, expressed manifestly in the Ottoman circle of justice.<sup>9</sup> Explaining the modes of relations between the Ottoman state and its subject, this model suggests the following set of actors and their roles: The strength of the sultanate is maintained through the army, the army is maintained through the treasury, the treasury is maintained through the tax-payers, and the contentment of the tax-payers is maintained through justice.<sup>10</sup> Overall, success of the state in that period can be measured by its ability to control these diverse groups.

Titulature constitutes a vital field in understanding the inclusive nature of the Ottoman state in terms of establishing its ideology. The titles that the

Ottoman rulers used, show not only the diversity of the Ottoman subjects but also the enthusiasm of the Ottoman polity to incorporate these elements in establishing its own ideology: *bey*, *hân*, and *hâkân* along Turko-Mongolian traditions, *shah* along Persian tradition, *caesar* along Roman-Byzantine tradition, and *sultan*, and *servant of the Islamic Holy Lands* along Islamo-Arabic tradition. In an inscription in Bender, Hungaria, Süleyman — known in Europe as the Magnificent, and in the Ottoman Empire as the Law-Giver — (1520-1566) uses the following expression:

I am God's slave and sultan of this world. By the grace of God I am head of Muhammad's community. God's might and Muhammad's miracles are my companions. I am Süleymân, in whose name the *hutbe* is read in Mecca and Medina. In Baghdad I am the shah, in Byzantine realms the Caesar, and in Egypt the sultan.<sup>11</sup>

The inclusivity of the Ottoman ideology to incorporate different traditions was not only a top-down process. On the contrary, the prominent men of letters, who come from diverse backgrounds, also wrote accounts of the Ottoman sultans along the traditions they had been a part of. A former Byzantine governor and an official historian of Mehmed II, Kritovoulos of Imbros (1410-1470) stated that his primary reason in writing a history of Mehmed was not to offer more information about him than the historians in 'Arabia and Persia' did but to provide an account of his achievements in Greek,<sup>12</sup> which Mehmed apparently appreciated. In a similar vein, a former Byzantine intellectual, George of Trebizond (1395-1486), made frequent use of Orthodox Christian elements in explaining Mehmed's 'divinity'.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, the earliest existing Greek Orthodox synodal register, prepared two decades after the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans in 1453, retains the concept of *basileus*, a Greek term for the universal Christian emperor, and uses it for the Ottoman sultan.<sup>14</sup>

Coexistence of different traditions in the ideology of the Ottoman rulers was also extended to the members of the court. The lives of some of the prominent Ottoman administrators offer vivid examples of the inclusive nature of Ottoman state ideology. An emphatic reverence for the pre-conversion virtues of a converted Ottoman pasha, with particular reference to his masterful knowledge of the Bible, deserves mention here. A hagiographical account of the conversion of a young and learned Christian boy who was to become the celebrated Mahmud Pasha offers an instrumental glance.<sup>15</sup> According to the story, an Ottoman official, entrusted by Sultan

Murad II (1421-1451) with inspecting law and order in Manastir, saw around three or four hundred Christian monks discussing an issue and inquired about it. The monks told him that they gather annually to discuss an issue in the Bible and praise the one who solves the problem. This Ottoman official observed the whole discussion and saw that a young man solved this problem and no one could manage to refute him. When Sultan Murad learned about this incident, he wrote a letter to this man's father inviting his son to his service and after several discussions with the clergymen, 'they made him a Muslim, and named him Mahmud.'<sup>16</sup> Having come under the service of the Sultan, Mahmud started his studies and passed the oral examination before the Ottoman Muslim scholars, to be appointed as the grand vizier the day after.<sup>17</sup> In addition to the decisive role of conversion in climbing up in the Ottoman administrative structure, this episode also constitutes one of the most important cases of positive reception of converts in early Ottoman historiography. Furthermore, in this hagiographic work, written after Mahmud's conversion, his Christian virtues prior to his conversion were elaborately recounted. In other words, not only could the pre-conversion Christian virtues of an eminent Ottoman *pasha* coexist with his Muslim virtues, but it could also be used as an advantage in forming Mahmud's ideology of his own. Putting aside the hagiographic ingredients of this story, it was not rare for the Ottoman administration to incorporate Balkan Christian clergy for profitable reasons such as their literacy in foreign languages, and their familiarity with matters of administration. While the state did not necessarily support mass conversion of non-Muslims into Islam, due mostly to financial reasons, mobility and switching sides through conversion, it is also seen as a smooth process in the Ottoman world.<sup>18</sup> This contrasts with the cases in places such as Mamluk Egypt (1250-1517), where those Christians who were forcefully converted to Islam following instances of mob attacks were referred to converts 'by the sword'<sup>19</sup> or in some cases were not necessarily accepted as proper Muslims.<sup>20</sup>

Taking these points into consideration, positive reception of the Ottoman rule by its non-Muslim subjects is not unexpected. Paul of Aleppo's (1627-1669) travel accounts in the seventeenth century Ottoman Empire presents some of the positive repercussions of the Ottoman rule for the Arab Christians of Syria. Paul was an Orthodox Christian from Ottoman Syria, and the son of patriarch Makarios of Antioch. Writing his account in colloquial Arabic, Paul's account enables one to capture three chief aspects of his identity: an Orthodox Christian, a resident of Syria, and an Ottoman

subject. The most striking aspect of Paul's identity is that despite venerating the Orthodox princes of semi-autonomous provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia, and the Russian tsar, Paul does not allow his Orthodox identity to conflict with his Ottoman identity. He reveres not only the Ottoman sultan himself, but also the dynasty, the whole Ottoman polity, the palace, mosques, tombs, and Turkish language.<sup>21</sup> It is worth mentioning at this point that Paul appears to have gone inside the mosques at a time when the majority of European Christians who visited Istanbul 'dare not peep into' mosques.<sup>22</sup> Paul shows us not only the existence, if not the abundance, of positive approaches to the Ottoman administration among the provincial Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire, but also the possibility of the existence of different identities that formed the basis for some conflicts of the time. While recounting Sultan Murad IV's visit to Aleppo en route to his Baghdad campaign, Paul uses the following expression:

All the Christian communities went out and received him with diverse clothes of precious quality by gathering on the boards of the road; they had with them their father and senior metropolitan, fathers and the other Christians with different trades and crafts, from Khan Tûmân until the square of Midân. That was a famous day which will count in the life of people and will be mentioned for future epochs until the end of the time . . . It was beautiful, like a dream because by his presence abundance has arrived, and everything became fertile.<sup>23</sup>

The Ottoman state did not impose a singular law on every part of the Empire. Ecclesiastical and communal courts coexisted with the *kadi* courts, which preside according to Islamic law. Islamic law itself gave enough room for communal judicial systems. An expert in the history of inter-communal relations in the Ottoman Empire, Evgenia Kermeli, provides a very interesting case where, for a short while, the Orthodox ecclesiastical law was allowed as part of Islamic law's permission for communal law.<sup>24</sup> The *kadi* courts themselves also allowed enough room for interpretation. While the penalty for prostitution was death in Ayntab, the one applied in Crete was expulsion from the town, which often meant a temporary transfer to another town within the same island.<sup>25</sup> Not only Muslims but also non-Muslims frequented *kadi* courts and some recent evidence suggests that one could petition the *kadi* court in different languages than Turkish.<sup>26</sup>

### Limits of Ottoman toleration

In spite of the relative facilitation of the ways of incorporation of diverse groups into the Ottoman state apparatus, coexistence was not always an easy task. Though it was not forbidden for one to live in a neighbourhood inhabited by people from different religions, Ottoman towns were often clustered according to the ethno-religious groups inhabiting them. Problems of this sort posed concerns for the Ottoman administration in times of population growth, when neighbourhoods became more intersected. During the population boom in the sixteenth century, for example, the questions asked to the grand muftis, displayed an increase in matters related to the difficulties of coexistence of people from different religions.<sup>27</sup> These questions indicate not only the presence of mixed neighbourhoods, but also the issues accompanying the coexistence of Muslims and non-Muslims in them. In many cases, the Muslim newcomers asked the grand muftis whether they have the right to expel non-Muslims from their neighbourhoods by getting their houses sold to Muslims. Among the reasons suggested are that the members of the Muslim community did not want non-Muslims among themselves, that the houses of non-Muslims were close to the newly-built mosque in the neighbourhood and they could hear them praying out loud, that a Muslim sold her house to a non-Muslim who turned it into a tavern, and a Muslim bidder wanted to buy the house in order to convert it into a mosque. In another case, the question asked to the grand mufti is whether the Muslim owners of recently-built houses can get the corpses in the nearby Jewish graveyard removed and prevent the Jewish community from burying their dead in that graveyard. Although the main concern of the Ottoman jurists in these documents appear to be social peace at that time and they opposed any effort on the part of the Muslim community to harm the non-Muslim property owners physically or financially, the nature of the issues brought before the grand muftis show that diversity did not automatically lead to harmony, and that coexistence was a painful process.

The inclusive character of the Ottoman political ideology was not unconditionally extended to every group in the Ottoman society, either. Scholars dealing with concepts such as 'otherness' and 'toleration' in the Ottoman context, mostly occupy themselves with the study of Christian and Jewish communities and ignore non-Sunni Muslims. The Shia-oriented *kızılbaş* communities present the most notable case in point. The Ottoman administration's main problems with these Turkoman nomads of Eastern

-Asia Minor are related to the political tension between the Ottomans and the Safavids, who aimed at appealing to the Ottoman Turkomans in Asia Minor with a religious-cum-social agenda.<sup>28</sup> Because these tensions also involved a religious conflict within Islam as well, the mechanisms of the state functioned in creating a certain 'other' and sought to 'Sunnitise' or persecute them. Issued in the political circumstances of the sixteenth century, and probably written in response to the question of the sultan, a jurisprudential opinion by the Ottoman grand mufti Ebussuud Efendi regards the *kızılbaş* both as rebels (*bâğî*) and 'infidels from many perspectives' (*vücûh-ı kesîreden kâfirler*), thus making it licit to launch holy war against them.<sup>29</sup> If we exclude the exceptional case in the far-distant and de facto semi-autonomous province of Lebanon,<sup>30</sup> mixing of the Ottoman Sunni Muslims with the Shiites was almost non-existent, and the Shiites were increasingly expelled from urban places to rural areas and tended not to mix with the rest of the Ottoman communities. While foreigners were welcome as merchants in Ottoman markets, the most notable exception was against Shiites of Iran, especially following the religio-political conflicts with the Safavids of Iran after the sixteenth century. As Shiites were not welcome in the Ottoman markets, it were mainly the Ottoman and Safavid Armenian merchants who took charge of the silk trade between the two empires.<sup>31</sup> The Gypsy community too, formed a distinct and segregated group. As far as their taxation status goes, there was not a significant difference between the taxes paid by Muslim and Christian Gypsies.<sup>32</sup> Ethnic prototypes were not non-existent either. Written in response to the 'cultural corruption' in the eighteenth century Istanbul community, a satirical tract bears testimony to that. In this tract, the anonymous author who was of mediocre literacy condemns those whom he thinks had not adapted to the manners of urban life. Some of the cursing attributes or stereotypes he employed are either ethnicity-aware or based on ethnic terms: the Croats who reveal the fact that their families are in the public bath at the moment, or those who expect the Gypsies to feel ashamed, and the Arabs and the Kurds to have good manners.<sup>33</sup>

A positive view of the Ottoman rule as noted in the writings of Paul of Aleppo was not the widespread phenomenon within the personal writings of all the Orthodox clergymen. Anti-Ottomanism appears to be a strong element in some of their writings. In his confession of the Orthodox Church, the future patriarch of Alexandria, Metrophanes I (1636-1639) describes the Ottoman rule as follows:



## The Nature and Limits of Toleration in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire

They have taken from us all power and authority; they have deprived us of learning and the liberal arts; they have taken away all our wealth and good fortune; they have laid upon us heavy burdens that cannot be borne. Would that they were content with taxation only! But no, they compel us to provide horses and ships and provisions for their army and navy... Their rulers in town and country press us into their service, so that we spend more time on our masters' duties than our own affairs. They take from us anything they fancy, a fine horse, or a good bull or goat or mule. Life under them is worse than death.<sup>34</sup>

Born in Arachova in mainland Greece, Metrophanes spent many years in Oxford and travelled through much of Reformation Europe at a time when the Reformed churches in Europe were interested in church union with the Orthodox against the Catholics. Thus, the views expressed by Metrophanes can be seen in the circumstances of such a political setting but it is clear that his world did not involve the type of mentality seen in the likes of Paul of Aleppo.

### Conclusion

The official ideology of the Ottoman state and the resulting responses of the Ottoman rule by its diverse population originated not only from the multi-cultural world, which the Ottoman state was born in and dominated afterwards, but also from the simple fact that due to its limited means, the pre-modern state had to compromise with the entities under its rule. One of the most distinctive features of state-society relations during the pre-modern Ottoman period was the inclusivity of the state to encompass or accommodate most, if not all, of its subject groups' concerns. Given some of the positive responses on the part of the non-Muslims, the Ottoman Empire can be seen as a successful example in generating an ideology that encompassed somewhat conflicting traditions in a way that both challenged and internalised them. However, ignoring the negative responses to the Ottoman policies, due either to the restricted means of the early-modern state or to the intended policies of the Ottoman administration towards certain groups would mean ignoring the other side of the medal. A more realistic perception of the theme of Ottoman toleration – divorced of the current and Eurocentric standards of the term – depends on doing justice to the diversity of Ottoman policies and of responses to these policies as much as doing justice to the diversity of the people.

## Notes

1. I have used the English translation provided in Mr. de Voltaire, *A Treatise upon toleration* (Glasgow: Printed for Robert Urie, 1765), 34.
2. For two examples, see Ziya Kazıcı, *Uçbeyliği'nden Devlet-i Aliyye'ye Osmanlı* (Istanbul: Kayihan, 2007), and Ahmet Akgündüz, *Pax Ottoman: Osmanlı Devleti'nde Gayrimüslimlerin Yönetimi* (Istanbul: Timaş, 2014).
3. Interestingly, such a view is retained even in the revisionist approaches to the study of non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire. Benjamin Braude & Bernard Lewis, "Introduction," in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, ed. Benjamin Braude & Bernard Lewis (New York; London: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1982), vol. I, 9. A revised and abridged version of this book was single-handedly edited by Benjamin Braude whose newly-written introduction presents a lot more balanced interpretation. Benjamin Braude, "Introduction," in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Abridged Edition with a New Introduction*, ed. Benjamin Braude (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2014), 1-51. A critical analysis of the approaches to the Ottoman rule over the Orthodox populations in the Balkans can be found in Antonina Zhelyazkova, "Islamization in the Balkans as a Historiographical Problem: the Southeast-European Perspective," in *The Ottomans and the Balkans: A Discussion of Historiography*, ed. Fikret Adanır & Suraiya Faroqhi (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 223-266.
4. For a recent comparative analysis of the Ottoman political formation *vis-à-vis* the Habsburg and Romanov cases, see Karen Barkey, *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
5. Halil İnalçık, "The Question of the Closing of the Black Sea under the Ottomans," in *Essays in Ottoman History*, ed. Halil İnalçık (Istanbul: Eren, 1998), 74-111.
6. Mark Epstein, "The Leadership of the Ottoman Jews in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries," *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, ed. B. Braude & B. Lewis (New York; London: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), vol. I, 101-116.
7. Elif Bayraktar Tellan, *The Patriarch and the Sultan: The Struggle for Authority and the Quest for Order in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire* (Bilkent University, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, 2011), 110-119; Hasan Çolak, *The Orthodox Church in the Early Modern Middle East: Relations between the Ottoman central administration and the Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria* (Ankara: Turkish Historical Society, 2015), 137-145.
8. Hagop Levon Barsoumian, *The Armenian Amira Class of Istanbul* (Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1980).
9. Mehmet Öz, "Osmanlı Çözülme Literatüründe İktisat Boyutu," in *Prof. Dr. Özer Ergenç'e Armağan*, ed. Ümit Ekin (Istanbul: Bilgi Kültür Sanat, 2013), 308-317.
10. Linda Darling, *A History of Social Justice and Political Power in the Middle East: The Circle of Justice from Mesopotamia to Globalization* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

## The Nature and Limits of Toleration in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire

11. Halil İnalçık, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age, 1300-1600* (London: Phoenix, 2000), 41.
12. Ari Çokona (ed). *Kritovulos Tarihi, 1451-1467* (Istanbul: Heyamola, 2012), 28-31.
13. George of Trebizond, *Collectanea Trapezuntiana: texts, documents, and bibliographies of George of Trebizond*, ed. John Monfāsani (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies in conjunction with the Renaissance Society of America, 1984), 570-573.
14. Dimitris G. Apostolopoulos, "Du sultan au basileus? Dilemmes politiques du Conquérant," in *Le patriarcat oecuménique de Constantinople au XIVe -XVIe siècles: rupture et continuité, actes du colloque international Rome, 5-6-7 décembre 2005* (Paris: Centre d'études byzantines, néo-helléniques et sud-est européennes, École des hautes études en sciences sociales, 2007), 245-246.
15. For a recent study on Mahmud Pasha see Theoharis Stavrides, *The Sultan of Vezirs: The Life and Times of the Ottoman Grad Vezir Mahmud Pasha Angelovic (1453-1474)* (Leiden: Brill, 2001). It would be almost impossible a century later to see similar stories at least in the same form in Ottoman histories. Tijana Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam, Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford: Stanford University Press 2011), 69.
16. Halil İnalçık & Mevlüt Oğuz (eds.), *Gazavât-ı Sultân Murâd bin Mehemed Hân* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1978), 72-73.
17. Halil İnalçık & Mevlüt Oğuz (eds.), *Gazavât-ı Sultân Murâd bin Mehemed Hân* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1978), 75. With regard to the legendary nature of this story Stavrides says that it functioned 'to underline the supernatural capabilities that he was presented as possessing in that work.' Theoharis Stavrides, *The Sultan of Vezirs: The Life and Times of the Ottoman Grad Vezir Mahmud Pasha Angelovic (1453-1474)* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 107-110.
18. Anton Minkov, *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans: Kısve Bahası Petitions and Ottoman Social Life, 1670-1730* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 94-95.
19. Donald P. Little, "Coptic Conversion to Islam under the Bahri Mamluks, 692-755/1293-1354," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 39/3 (1976), 566, n. 75-76.
20. Moshe Perlmann, "Notes on anti-Christian Propaganda in the Mamluk Empire," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 10/4 (1942), 858.
21. Hasan Çolak, "Worlds apart and Interwoven: Orthodox, Syrian and Ottoman Cultures in Paul of Aleppo's Memoirs," *Studies in Travel Writing* 16/4 (2012), 375-385.
22. Malcolm Jack (ed.), *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu: Turkish Embassy Letters* (London: William Pickering, 1993), 104.
23. Hasan Çolak, "Worlds apart and Interwoven: Orthodox, Syrian and Ottoman Cultures in Paul of Aleppo's Memoirs," *Studies in Travel Writing* 16/4 (2012), 381.
24. Eugenia Kermeli, "Children treated as Commodity in Ottoman Crete," in *The Ottoman Empire: Myths, Realities and 'Black Holes'* ed. Eugenia Kermeli & Oktay Özel (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2006), 269-283.
25. Eugenia Kermeli, "Sin and the sinner: folles femmes in Ottoman Crete," *Eurasian Studies* 1 (2002), 94-96.

26. Alexandar Fotić, “Non-Ottoman Documents in the Kādis’ Courts (Möloviya, Medieval Charters): Examples from the Archive of the Hilandar Monastery (15th–18th C.),” in *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies: State, Province, and the West*, ed. Colin Imber, Keiko Kiyotaki & Rhoads Murphey (London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2005), vol. II, 63-73.
27. For a broader analysis of this matter, see Hasan Çolak, “Transforming the Orthodox landscape of Ottoman Istanbul during the early modern period” in *Layered Landscapes: Early Modern Religious Space Across Faiths and Cultures*, ed. Eric Nelson & Jonathan Wright (London & New York: Routledge, 2017), 119-133.
28. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Marjinal Süfilik: Kalenderîler* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1992), 121-129.
29. Mehmet Ertuğrul Düzdağ (ed.), *Şeyhülislâm Ebussuud Efendi Fetvaları Işığında 16. Asır Türk Hayatı* (Istanbul: Enderun, 1972), 109.
30. Stefan Winter, *The Shiites of Lebanon under Ottoman Rule, 1516–1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
31. Sebouh David Aslanian, *From the Indian Ocean to the Mediterranean: The Global Trade Networks of Armenian Merchants from New Julfa* (Berkeley & Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 2011).
32. Elena Marushiakova and Vesselin Popov, *Gypsies in the Ottoman Empire: A Contribution to the History of the Balkans* (Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2001) 29.
33. Hayati Develi (ed.), *18. Yü. İstanbul’a dair Risale-i Garibe* (Istanbul: Kitabevi, 2010), 29, 45.
34. Colin Davey, *Pioneer for Unity: Metrophanes Kritopoulos (1589-1639) and Relations between the Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Reformed Churches* (London: British Council of Churches, 1987), 3-4.