Veruschka Wagner

University of Bonn, Germany
veruschka.wagner@gmx.de

Mobile Actors, Mobile Slaves: Female Slaves from the Black Sea Region in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul

Abstract

This contribution aims to investigate mobility in the context of Ottoman slavery. Mainly on the basis of seventeenth-century Istanbul court records, the study deals with the question of mobility by focusing on female household slaves in Ottoman Istanbul who originated from the Black Sea region. With a look at the actors who surrounded them, female slaves are analysed at different stages in their lives. These stages were marked by changes related to mobility. The entry as well as the exit from slavery meant a spatial and social mobility for the slave women. But even in the time in between, slave women remained mobile through aspects such as conversion and resale. This paper further shows that Ottoman slavery and the slave trade were part of the Transottoman context: it can be seen that spaces of interaction were created through the connections and exchanges of actors beyond the Ottoman Empire.

Key words: Slavery, mobility, Black Sea region, female household slaves, Ottoman Istanbul, Istanbul court records

1. Introduction

Due to the death of her husband, Üftāde Hātūn bint ʿAbdullah came into the possession of ten slaves, as we learn from an entry in Istanbul court records from 1618. The document informs us that all her slaves were female and of Ukrainian origin. The document clarifying the estate of the deceased lists all slaves individually by name and bundles them together into small groups according to value.[1]

This document shows us two topics relevant to this paper. First, it reflects the region from which most slaves came to the Ottoman Empire in the seventeenth century. Second, it shows that it was mainly female slaves who were employed in Istanbul households.[2] Although most Istanbul court documents illustrate that there were other regions from which slaves came and that there were also male slaves in households,

1 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Galata Mahkemesi 46*, 112 [43a-1], (20 August 1617). The exact date of the entries is not given for all documents. In some cases, even the year can only be derived from the preceding and following entries. In the cases where an exact date is available, I will mention them in the respective footnote.

2 By household I mean here not large military-administrative households, but above all family households constituted by family members and at least one slave (other slaves or servants may have been attached). On military-administrative households, see Hathaway 2013; for family households, see Zilfi 2004.

Diyâr, 2. Jg., 1/2021, S. 83–104, DOI: 10.5771/2625-9842-2021-1-83

this entry gives an impression of the dominant tendency at that time. Most of the entries in Istanbul court records from the seventeenth century involving slaves deal with females from the Black Sea region, mainly of Ukrainian origin.[3] They are the focus of this essay, which deals with mobility in the context of Ottoman slavery.

A large amount of the literature gives us an impression of the importance that the topic of slavery in the Ottoman Empire is currently assuming in research agendas. While the nineteenth century is already well researched,[4] earlier centuries have remained largely unconsidered for a long time, although the number of studies is now increasing. Different questions, regions and sources are being addressed, including increased use of Istanbul court records as a source.[5] This chapter is part of a larger project that draws on these sources and deals with the spatial and social mobility of slaves in Early Modern Istanbul. As the research is still ongoing, we limit our focus here to non-elite female household slaves in seventeenth-century Istanbul who originated from the Black Sea region.[6] The lives of female slaves differed from those of their male counterparts. Aspects such as sexual exploitation, escape attempts, conversion, pregnancy, manumission and marriage were significantly distinct, as we will see below. By focusing on female slaves, this case study explores the link between mobility and Ottoman slavery. Following Van der Linden's division of entry, extraction and exit, which he refers to as 'moments' characterising all forms of coerced labour,[7] we will examine three phases in the lives of female slaves. These are sale into slavery, enslavement and manumission, all of which were characterised by change and mobility. In terms of enslavement, we also look at moments when slaves changed hands. These were mainly resales that took place for various reasons (for example, conversion under certain conditions). Important at all stages were the actors – primarily slave traders and slave owners – who significantly shaped the lives of slaves and had an impact on their mobility. They themselves were also mobile to varying degrees. From this study of mobility, conclusions will be drawn about Ottoman slavery as part of

3 Ukrainian is used as a translation for *rūs* which literally means Ruthenian. Ruthenian is a conventional term for East Slavs in Poland-Lithuania, in opposition to those in Muscovy. In Istanbul court records, a distinction is made between *rūs*, which is usually translated as Ukrainian, and *moskovī*, which is translated as Russian. See Ostapchuk 2001, 51, fn. 84; Ostapchuk 2013, 128; Yaşa 2018, 201, fn. 13.

4 The following are mainly representative of others: Toledano 2014; Ferguson and Toledano 2017.

5 On *kadı sicilleri*, see, for example, Sobers-Khan 2014; on slave agency, see Conermann and Şen 2020; with regard to various normative sources, see Güneş Yağcı and Yaşa 2017. A literature survey on slavery by Suraiya Faroqhi provides us with information on literature about Ottoman slavery up to 2017; Faroqhi 2017.

6 The focus of this study is on female slaves originally from countries neighbouring the Crimea, such as Russia, Poland-Lithuania, Ukraine, Moldavia, Georgia, Mingrelia and Circassia. In the documents at hand, apart from these regions we can also find slaves of Hungarian, French, German, Spanish, Persian, Indian and African origin.

7 Van der Linden labels the stages 'The Three Moments of Coerced Labour'; Van der Linden 2016, esp. 298.

Transottoman mobility dynamics that describe social and (trans)cultural interconnections between Muscovy and/or the Russian Empire, Poland-Lithuania, the Ottoman Empire and Persia.[8] It is argued that the fact that both slaves and actors came from different regions and social groups made the slaving system a hub for Transottoman mobility dynamics. Istanbul society was constituted by diversity as a result of this mobility.

This study will first introduce the Ottoman court records that documented those moments in the lives of slaves that usually implied change and therefore indicate spatial or social mobility. This introduction is followed by a brief overview of the specifics of Ottoman slavery. Then we trace the stages in the lives of female Black Sea slaves to see which actors played a role and to what extent slaves and related actors were entangled with mobility.

2. Ottoman Court Registers

Ottoman court registers (*kadı sicilleri* or *şerʿiyye sicilleri*), which provide us with much information about the empire's social, economic and cultural history, are an essential source for research into slavery.[9] The registers contain a variety of documents recorded by a *kadı* (judge)[10] concerning all kinds of transactions between actors from different social classes, among Muslims and between Muslims and non-Muslims. The records can be of an economic, legal or social nature, documenting agreements or disputes. The Early Modern registers provide an unparalleled record of daily life and unique insights into the institution of slavery.[11] The Istanbul court records of the seventeenth century are accessible online;[12] keyword searches allow us to thematically sift through the data set.[13]

8 For the project website, see www.transottomanica.de.

9 For an overview of the existing *sicil*s in the archives, see Akgündüz 1988. For an introduction to the topic, see Uğur 2010; İnalcık 1943; Ze'evi 1998. For studies drawing on the Istanbul court registers, see Seng 1991; Yi 2004; Sobers-Khan 2014; Wagner 2020; White 2020.

10 While several *kadı*s were responsible for Istanbul and its different districts, in other parts of the empire there were *kadı*s who were solely responsible for larger regions. For more information, see Atar 2001 and Atar 2003.

11 See also Seng 1998, 27.

12 In 2019, in addition to the entries from the Istanbul court registers from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries already digitised by the Centre for Islamic Studies (*İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi*, İSAM) between 2008 and 2012 and made available online in 40 volumes, another 60 volumes of the Istanbul court registers from 1557 to 1911 were digitised and made available online in their original form, as well as texts transcribed into Latin script; http://www.kadisicilleri.org.

13 For the examples used in this contribution, terms individually or in combination such as 'cāriye' and 'memlūke' (both for female slave), 'bint/bt. ʿAbdullah' (daughter of ʿAbdullah), 'esirci' (slave trader), the terms for different regions, 'leh' (Polish-Lithuanian), 'rūs' (Ruthenian = Ukrainian), 'moskovī' (Muscovite), 'gürcü' (Georgian), were used.

The registers contain numerous entries where slaves appear as the subjects of disputes about purchase contracts, estate inventories, purchase prices or credit issues. At the same time, slaves also appear as plaintiffs, agreement partners, defendants and beneficiaries.[14] These records situate the legal status of slaves, not only categorising them as commodities, but also giving them a certain agency. While providing information about the slaves themselves, the documents also shed light on relations and interactions between different actors involved in the institution of slavery. Most of the entries on slavery deal in some way with the relationships between slaves or former slaves and their owners, discussing topics such as manumissions, donations and the establishment of foundations from which (former) slaves could benefit. What can be noted, however, is that in seventeenth-century documents from the Istanbul court records, we most often encounter female slaves from the Black Sea region, which we therefore want to place at the centre of this study.

3. Slavery in the Ottoman Empire

Slavery was an integral part of Ottoman society and continued to exist until the twentieth century.[15] Ottoman slavery covered different areas: military-administrative slavery, harem slavery, domestic slavery and agricultural slavery.[16] It differed in several aspects from slavery in the Americas: its main feature was an 'open system', which drew no clear lines between 'free' and 'unfree' and enabled at least a few slaves to pursue economic and social advancement.[17] Slaves could be found in different arenas and different classes; they came from different regions and were entrusted with different tasks. Just as slaves could serve as high-ranking officials in government, they could also be employed in domestic service or serve as menial labourers in urban centres – as most of them did.[18] Ottoman slavery can be categorised in terms of elite and non-elite slaves,[19] gender, or origin and ethnicity.[20] The multitude of different terms used for slaves illustrates the diversity of the phenomenon.[21] Due to the diversity of Ottoman slavery, which resulted from the variety of functions performed by slaves (among other things), researchers have suggested it is better to speak of a continuum of dependency or 'Ottoman slaveries' rather than a dichotomy between slavery and freedom.[22]

14 This paper will not cover all cases, but only those that are directly related to aspects of mobility.
15 Toledano 1998; Ferguson and Toledano 2017.
16 Toledano 2000, 171.
17 Zilfi 2000, 714.
18 Toledano 2014, 207.
19 For a discussion on the categorisation of elite slaves as slaves, see Toledano 2011b; Faroqhi 2020.
20 Toledano 2011b, 200.
21 Zilfi 2000, 716; İnalcık 1978.
22 Toledano 2000, 173; Ferguson and Toledano 2017, 200.

An important dimension of Ottoman slavery was manumission, for which there were various forms.[23] For slaves, manumission brought with it the possibility of integration into society. Manumitted slaves could stay attached as free servants to the households of their former owners or move to another household.[24] Slaves and former slaves made up a large part of the population, at least in Early Modern Istanbul.[25] Therefore, they played a significant role in the constitution and shaping of society.

3.1. The Procurement of Slaves from the Black Sea Region

The Black Sea region whence the female slaves in question came has long been an area for the trade of all kinds of goods. The military expansion of the Ottomans and the reconfiguration of Black Sea and Eastern Mediterranean spaces from the second half of the fifteenth century onwards led to increased control over the main slave trade routes. These routes had once passed through the Byzantine Empire and were dominated primarily by the Italian maritime republics.[26] At the height of its territorial expansion, wartime capture was the main source of slaves for the Ottoman Empire.[27] Most captives came from South-Eastern Europe, present-day Russia and Ukraine and from the eastern fronts (Iran and the Caucasus). At the same time, raids in regions like the Black Sea also provided the empire with slaves. In addition to areas where the Ottomans dominated the slave trade, non-Ottoman subjects acted as traders and intermediaries in peripheral areas.[28] Apart from the state and its civil servants,[29] numer-

23 Firstly, manumission as a pious act was termed *ʿıtḳ*, namely a declaration of manumission by the owner. The second form was the *mükātebe* or *kitābet*, which was a contract between the slaveholder and the slave stating that they had agreed upon either an amount of money, time, or work a slave had to fulfill in order to gain his or her freedom. These two forms of manumission took place during the lifetime of the owner. The third form was the *tedbīr*, where the contract lay down that the slave was to be manumitted upon the death of their owner. Some owners stipulated in the manumission documents that their slaves were manumitted a certain time (usually forty days) before their death, in order to avoid their slaves becoming part of their property and thus their inheritance. The fourth form was the *ümm-i veled*, the term applied to a female slave who gave birth to an owner's child and was therefore guaranteed her freedom upon the owner's death; Sobers-Khan 2014, 70–78. On this topic, see also Zilfi 2009, 532.

24 Toledano 2011b, 29.

25 It is estimated that slaves and former slaves made up about a fifth of Istanbul's population in the sixteenth century; Zilfi 2009, 531.

26 Özkoray 2017, 104.

27 In the sixteenth century, it was mainly Hungarians, Germans, Italians and Spanish who were captured in the border conflicts with the Habsburgs and in the Mediterranean War; Vatin 2015, 411; Özkoray 2017, 104.

28 Peripheral areas from where slaves were brought to the Ottoman Empire include sub-Saharan Africa (via the Maghreb), East Africa (via Egypt and the Arabian Peninsula) and the Caucasus (supplying the Anatolian Black Sea ports, Mesopotamia, and Egypt); Özkoray 2017, 106.

ous Ottoman merchants throughout the empire made profits from the slave trade.[30] From the sixteenth century onwards, Western traders were also involved in the trade as customers and even intermediaries, often circumventing state-imposed regulations by buying slaves illegally. Some Western traders had residence permits in Ottoman territory and interacted with local slave traders and slaves.[31]

In the sixteenth century, most slaves came from the Balkan region,[32] whereas the slave trade in the Black Sea region reached its peak in the seventeenth century and was fully comparable in size to the transatlantic slave trade.[33] Crimea, where the slave trade made up a significant part of the economy, was the main supplier of slaves to the Ottoman Empire in this period. Once captured by the Tatars from neighbouring countries, men, women, and children were first brought to the Crimea. While some of the captives remained in Tatar hands and were used for domestic and agricultural labour, most were brought to Caffa, the largest port in the region, situated in the Ottoman part of the Crimea.[34] From Caffa, numerous slaves were transported to other smaller and bigger cities in the Ottoman Empire.[35]

Mobility determined the lives of captives on their way into slavery, just as it determined the lives of merchants involved in the trade. The procurement of slaves for markets in the Ottoman Empire was based on networks and actors operating beyond the borders of the sultan's realm. The Ottoman slave trade can therefore be seen as part of mobile dynamics that shaped the Transottoman context.

3.2. The Sale and Purchase of Slaves: Slave Markets, Slave Traders and Other Participants

Alongside the Black Sea ports, captives were purchased and sold in smaller markets and major centres such as Istanbul, Bursa, Edirne, Damascus, Cairo, Nova Zagora and Kazanlik in Bulgaria.[36] Whereas in other cities the slave market was integrated into other markets, Istanbul and Caffa featured separate slave markets.[37] Istanbul and Caffa can thus be seen as two hubs of the slave trade, representing two fixed points within Transottoman mobility dynamics. For the female slaves studied here, Caffa

29 Both the state and individual officers involved in battles seized defeated enemies to sell them on the domestic market; Toledano 2011a, 91.
30 Vatin 2015, 412.
31 Özkoray 2017, 119.
32 Seng 1996, 164.
33 Kołodziejczyk 2006, 152.
34 Kizilov 2007, 10–11.
35 The Treaty of Karlowitz, concluded in 1699 between the Ottoman Empire and the Holy League (consisting of the Habsburg Empire, Poland and Venice), changed the regulations on the Crimean slave trade. It prohibited the Tatars from entering Russian and Polish territories, which considerably reduced the number of slaves sold in Caffa; Özkoray 2017, 112.
36 According to Kołodziejczyk 2006, 152.
37 Fisher 1978, 150.

and Istanbul played significant roles as possible stopovers in their lives. Along the way, slaves changed hands several times until they ended up in the market in Istanbul.

The slave market in Istanbul was the largest in the empire, the place where the newly enslaved were sold and the already enslaved resold. It was thus a space where different strands of mobility converged and diverged again. The Istanbul market mainly satisfied local demand, while those in other locales functioned as points of entry, transit or re-export from Ottoman territory.[38] Aside from the official recognition of slave traders that we will see below, a further regulation introduced in 1640 determined the place of sale.[39] The exclusive sale of slaves in markets under the control of government officers was intended to prevent both the purchase of Muslim slaves and the potential loss of tax revenues.[40] The government established procedures for ensuring equity and equality control, oversaw the operations of the slave merchants' guild and set tax rates on import, export and transit transactions.[41]

The slave traders in Istanbul were organised into a guild, as was the case with most merchants in Ottoman society.[42] This guild included people with different functions in the domestic trade and sale of slaves. Concerning mobility, compared to the traders who brought the slaves to Istanbul, these merchants operated locally. From entries in the registers we can infer various functions and the terms used for them.

In 1666, a record belonging to one Istanbul court states that a certain Ṣāliḥa bint Kenan gave Gülistān bint ʿAbdullah, her female slave of Ukrainian origin, to a certain ʿÖmer bin Hıżır, who belonged to the guild of slave merchants. He was supposed to sell Gülistān for her owner on the slave market, but when his attempt proved unsuccessful, a dispute arose between ʿÖmer and Ṣāliḥa, which was settled by arbitrators. According to the entry documents, ʿÖmer had to pay a certain amount of money to Ṣāliḥa, who, upon receipt, would renounce the slave in question.[43] ʿÖmer is not named as a slave trader (*esirci*) but as member of the slave traders' guild (*esirci tāifesinden*). Presumably, he therefore had a different function than an official trader. Even if not explicitly mentioned, we can assume that ʿÖmer was a broker (*dellāl*) who acted as mediator and without whom slaves could not be sold on the market.[44] But other people also played an important role in the sale of slaves while belonging to the guild. The chief of the slave traders' guild (*kethüdā-yı esirciyān* or *esirciler kethüdāsı*) was supposed to be the most important personage. Another position within the guild was that of the attendant (*emīn*). The attendant of the slave traders was responsible for the

38 Vatin 2015, 412.
39 Refik 1931, 26.
40 Fisher 1978, 159.
41 Fisher 1978, 149.
42 Fisher 1978, 156.
43 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Bâb Mahkemesi 3*, 15 [2b-4], (10 October 1666).
44 Güneş Yağcı 2020, 326.

organisation of the markets and the purchase of slaves.[45] The slave traders were under close government surveillance and had to stand as surety for one another.[46]

A significant source of information about the Istanbul slave traders' guild is found in a report by the seventeenth-century Ottoman traveller Evliyā Çelebī. According to his travel book, the slave market (*esīr pāzārı*) was run by a guild of slave traders, which at the time had about 2,000 members, most of whom were guards, gatekeepers, and apprentices – only a few were actual slave traders licensed by the government.[47] There are indications that the guild of slave traders claimed that unregistered traders were trying to sell slaves, a practice that seems to have occurred quite frequently.[48] Therefore, to better regulate and control the slave trade in Istanbul, certain decisions were taken. The sale of slaves took place only at a market designated for trade, and slave dealers had to be officially registered. A price register for 1640 shows that only thirty-two men and seven women, all Muslims, were officially recognised as slave traders, along with nineteen brokers.[49] According to Zilfi, this same register suggests that one third of these brokers had probably once been slaves themselves[50] – an interesting point concerning the social mobility of slaves that we will discuss below. In later times, the number of recognised slave traders increased. In the mid-eighteenth century, for example, there were about five times as many merchants as there had been after the delicensing operation in 1640.[51] The slave trade, centred in Istanbul, was characterised by traders and other local participants whose numbers varied over time. The regulations of the state and the complaints of traders indicate that more people were involved in the slave trade than was actually intended. The majority of slave traders or members of the slave traders' guild were men, but the names of female slave traders can also be identified in the Istanbul court records in some cases. Take, for example, Şerīfe bint Yūsuf[52] and Ümmühānī bint ʿĀlī,[53] both of whom are mentioned in documents dating back to the second half of the seventeenth century. In another entry that provides evidence of disputes between a merchant and a slave owner regarding payment claims, we come across yet one more female slave trader. The case concerns Māhıruhsār bint

45 Akkaya 2011, 205.
46 Faroqhi 2001, 129; Yi 2004, 43.
47 Fisher 1978, 156.
48 Fisher 1978, 159.
49 Kütükoğlu 1983, 257. The other slave traders, who were denounced for malfeasance and bankruptcy, were removed from the list; Koçu 1971, 5273. The information given by Faroqhi varies slightly. She mentions thirty-three male and eight female merchants; Faroqhi 2001, 129.
50 Zilfi 2010, 144. Presumably the patronymic bin ʿAbdullah, which these men bore, leads them to this statement, since the patronymic 'bin ʿAbdullah' or 'bint ʿAbdullah' shows that someone was very likely a 'first-generation Muslim'. It marks status as a convert to Islam and could therefore also signify a (former) slave; Faroqhi 2000, 10. For more information on the names of slaves, see also Sobers-Khan 2014, 225–227.
51 Faroqhi 2001, 131.
52 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Bâb Mahkemesi 3*, 569 [74a-4], (10 February 1667).
53 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Bâb Mahkemesi 54*, 349 [59a-3], (20 March 1691).

ʿAbdullah, a female slave of Ukrainian origin and a convert to Islam, as can be gathered from her name and a note stating that she belonged to the Muslim community (*müslimetü'l-mille*). The nature of Māhıruhsār bint ʿAbdullah's case was a dispute between her former mistress, Şāhbāz bint ʿAbdullah, and the female slave trader, Esirci Kerīme bint Mūsā, regarding underpayment of the slave's purchase price. According to a court register entry for 1649, Şāhbāz appointed ʿĀyşe bint Muṣṭafa – another participant – as her attorney in order to sell Māhıruhsār, who was valued at five hundred *riyālī gurūş*.[54] ʿĀyşe sold Māhıruhsār for four hundred *riyālī gurūş* – below her market value – to the slave trader Kerīme bint Mūsā. The former mistress claimed the full sum from Kerīme. As recorded in the document, the slave's erstwhile owner and the trader finally agreed on a sum of about four hundred and fifty *riyālī gurūş* that Kerīme paid before the end of the payment period.[55]

Here we are confronted with another female slave trader, although one who buys a slave and does not sell her immediately. The slave owner herself uses an intermediary, namely ʿĀyşe bint Muṣṭafa. The document does not mention whether ʿĀyşe belonged to the slave traders' guild. The sale itself did not take place in the slave market, so we can assume that ʿĀyşe was just another actor involved in the transaction without belonging to the guild. Intermediaries were not involved in all transactions outside the market, but it can be assumed that this was still a common practice. The sale of slaves could therefore take place in the market by official persons belonging to the slave traders' guild or, once purchased as a slave, outside the market. These transactions could involve even more people, male and female alike, than just seller and purchaser. Thus, numerous individuals, official and unofficial, were involved in the Istanbul slave trade.

So far, we have only encountered slave traders who were Muslim. But do the registers also tell us something about non-Muslim traders? In the Istanbul court records, we come across an interesting case that provides information on this topic. A short entry from 1678 deals with the manumission of Bāne bint Havader, a female slave of Ukrainian origin.[56] The document states that Bāne was manumitted by Ṣāra bint Avrāhām. Ṣāra, the entry shows, was a Jewish slave trader (*esirci*). If we rely on the list from 1640, it would appear that there were no non-Muslim slave traders at the time. But, as this entry shows, at least one slave trader was Jewish in the second half of the seventeenth century. It thus seems that some non-Muslims may have entered the slave trade at some point after 1640. So, even though the majority of slave traders in Istanbul in the second half of the seventeenth century were male and Muslim, there were also some women and non-Muslims. This shows that it was not only members of the Muslim community who made their living through the slave trade.

Other official persons involved in the slave business were the slave hunters (*yavacı* or *zābıt-ı āvābık*), who were officially appointed to recapture fugitive slaves. Primarily

54 The term was used in the Ottoman Empire for the Spanish 'piece of eight'; Pamuk 2014, 176.

55 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Rumeli Sadâret Mahkemesi 80*, 51 [13a-2], (27 March 1649).

56 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Hasköy Mahkemesi 10*, 95 [56–4], (23 May 1678).

for male slaves, flight was an attempt to escape from the circumstances of captivity: there are hardly any documented escape attempts for female slaves.[57] There were strict regulations concerning the handling of runaway slaves (*ʿabd-ı ābıḳ* for male slaves and *ʿabd-ı ābıḳa* for female slaves). When a runaway slave was captured, s/he was handed over to the local *kadı*. The person who captured and delivered the slave was paid a certain amount of money. The *kadı* or another responsible person kept the slave in his custody until the latter's owner came forward, whereupon the slave was handed over in exchange for a fee to cover the expenses incurred. If the rightful owner did not come forward after three months, the slave was auctioned off to the highest bidder.[58] The frequency of escape attempts among slaves can be deduced not only from court records documenting failed escape attempts (those that did not fail cannot be traced from these sources), but also from the precise provisions that regulated various aspects of dealing with recaptured slaves.[59] The fact that there were fixed terms for escaped slaves and slave hunters also points to the frequency of this occurrence.[60] Unless we assume that female slaves were more skilful in escaping and were not recaptured, we must assume that female slaves attempted to escape less than male slaves. This may have been for various reasons. Presumably, female slaves were less protected and more vulnerable when on their own, or perhaps they simply attracted more attention and the risk of being recaptured was greater. However, there were options for the manumission of female slaves unavailable to males, as we will see below.

As is now clear, the institution of slavery was a network in which numerous actors were involved. The network was established in the Ottoman realm, but also existed beyond its local structures and borders. The great need for slaves in the seventeenth century was mainly met through slave raids into regions surrounding the Crimea. The slave trade was based on well-established networks and dynamics of mobility that functioned across borders, thus illustrating the significance of the Transottoman context for Ottoman slavery. At the same time, there were immobile spots, like the slave markets where domestic slave traders operated. However, mobility not only played an important role in slavery outside the empire, but also determined slavery within its borders.

3.3. Enslavement: Slave Owners, Conversion and Resale

While slave ownership was concentrated in the wealthier classes, modest families could own slaves as well. Research on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries shows that even if not everyone owned slaves, it was not a rare phenomenon.[61] Slave owners were

57 On fugitive slaves and escape attempts, see Seng 1996.
58 Erdem 1996, 160.
59 For the sum that had to be paid for a runaway slave for the duration of his capture, see Erkek 2017, 73.
60 For more information on the regulations concerning fugitive slaves, see Güneş Yağcı and Ataş 2007; Seng 1996; Erkek 2017.
61 Vatin 2015, 412.

people of diverse professions, some of whom were wealthier than others, both men and women. Slaves were something of a status symbol. The more slaves a person held, the more important this person was.[62] Depending on the wealth of the slave owners, there were different numbers of slaves in one household. The Istanbul court records show that in the seventeenth century there were slave owners – male and female alike – who owned both male and female slaves and not rarely more than one. For their slaves, this meant that they were in a household with others sharing the same lot. This certainly had an impact on their lives. If they originally came from the same region, they may have had a common language and culture. If not, they contributed to the heterogeneity of the household.

It should be mentioned here that, most often, the slaves' region of origin was included in the court registers as a descriptor, although it must be taken into account that this regional label probably denoted the place of capture rather than the site of origin. Furthermore, it is assumed that this assignment provided information on the characteristics and attitudes of slaves.[63] Therefore, these assignments contained information for addressees rather than about the slaves themselves. This could explain why there are few entries on Polish-Lithuanian slaves in the seventeenth century, although they must have existed. They are unlikely to have all ended up in the sultan's harem. Ruthenia (in the Istanbul court records as *rūs*) was commonly used as a regional term for modern Ukrainian and Belarusian territories within Poland-Lithuania.[64] Nevertheless, these labels provide a picture of the regions that played a role in Ottoman slavery at various times and to differing extents. Households with slaves incorporated this diversity and contributed to the constitution of Transottoman society in Istanbul.

The court records address male owners with a great diversity of titles, among them *bey, pāşā, pāşābey, āğā, bābā, reīs*, and *emīr*.[65] These titles provide information about the position the bearer held within society and whether he was of religious, military or administrative rank. This gives us some idea about the possible positions in society slave owners could have. The documents also provide us with information about slave owners' professions. Some were endowment administrators (*mütevellī*), medrese teachers (*müderris*), or men of various military ranks such as sword-bearer (*silāḥdār*), soldier (*sipāhī*), and feudal cavalry captain (*ṣūbāşı*). There were also different craftsmen (*kethüdā*), such as bakers, blacksmiths, tomb caretakers (*türbedār*), tavern keepers (*meyhāneci*), and butchers (*ḳaṣab*). However, most slaveholders did not have a specific

62 See, among others, Fisher 1972, 586.

63 Concerning the labelling of slaves according to origin, see, for example, Sobers-Khan 2014, 109. Evidence of this can also be found in chapters on the treatment of slaves in books on morality by, for example, Kınalızâde 1964.

64 Concerning the number of captives of Polish-Lithuanian origin during the Polish-Ottoman wars in 1620–1621 and 1672–1676, see Kołodziejczyk 2006, 153. On issues concerning this region, see Rohdewald, Frick and Wiederkehr 2007.

65 The examples given here show the wide range of different titles and appellations used in the Ottoman Empire. For a study on the variety of titles used in Ottoman court records, see Güllüdağ and Baş 2019.

title or were not named by profession. The same is true for female slaveholders, for whom hardly any titles (only *hātūn* and *hānım*) were used in the court records: if they were, they were employed only for Muslim owners. Yet, it is remarkable that many female slaveholders bear the patronym bint ʿAbdullah, which may indicate that they themselves had once been slaves. Concerning the slave owners, we can see that slaves were thus employed in households by individuals, both men and women, from different socioeconomic backgrounds.[66]

The slaveholders we have looked at came from different socio-economic backgrounds, but so far they have all been Muslims. The Istanbul court records tell us that non-Muslims were involved in the trade and sale of slaves, but were there any non-Muslim slave owners in Istanbul? Before the seventeenth century, non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire were forbidden to own slaves.[67] However, the payment of a special tax made this possible. Towards the end of the sixteenth century, Jewish communities, at least in the larger cities, apparently paid such a tax in return for the right to own slaves.[68] In 1604, the judge (*kadı*) of Istanbul issued a ruling (*ḥüküm*) saying that the purchase of slaves by unregistered dealers, Kızılbaş,[69] Jews, Christians or 'other unbelievers' was forbidden.[70] Manumission documents from the 1620s, however, show that Jews in Istanbul could own slaves. Mūṣī veled Yāṣef, who was Jewish and lived in the district of Hasköy, for instance, manumitted his female slave of Ukrainian origin, Ḳālya bint Petrū, in 1620. Her manumission was based on a contract that she fulfilled by paying a certain amount of money that she and her owner had previously agreed upon.[71] A 1622 entry shows that the three daughters of a Jew called Kemāl, who lived in the district of Karabaş, manumitted their female slave of Hungarian origin, Ḳatārīna bint Antūn, for pious reasons.[72] Regardless of how they came into possession of slaves, Istanbul court records indicate that non-Muslims did own them in the first quarter of the seventeenth century. If European travel reports are to be believed, it was possible for non-Muslims to use Muslim intermediaries to purchase slaves on the slave market. Louis Deshayes, who visited the Istanbul slave market in 1621, noted that Christians were not permitted to purchase slaves themselves, 'but in this case', he explains, 'they make use of some Turkish compatriot, who buys them as if they were for himself'.[73]

66 For sixteenth-century Üsküdar, Seng draws similar conclusion; Seng 1996, 144.
67 Seng 1996, 145.
68 Ben-Naeh 2006, 322.
69 Kızılbaş (literally 'redhead' – the name is derived from their red headgear) were mostly Shiite Turkmen who supported the Safavid brotherhood from the middle of the fifteenth century onwards. For further reading, see Baltacıoğlu-Brammer 2019; Karakaya-Stump 2019.
70 Refik 1931, 25.
71 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Eyüb Mahkemesi (Havass-ı Refia) 19*, 209 [31b-1].
72 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Hasköy Mahkemesi 3*, 157 [63–1], (14 March 1622).
73 '…mais en ce cas ils se seruent de quelque *Turc* confident, qui les achete, comme si c'estoit pour luy'; Deshayes de Courmenin 1645, 113. My translation.

For the second half of the seventeenth century, there are numerous entries in the Istanbul court records that mention *dhimmī*s – non-Muslims belonging to the protected minorities – as slave owners. A purchase contract from 1662, for instance, shows that a certain Meḥmed bin ʿAbdullah sold his female slave of Ukrainian origin to a *dhimmī* called Dīmū veled Yānī.[74] His religious affiliation is not discussed further, but from his name it can be deduced that he presumably belonged to the Greek Orthodox community. From another court case regarding a jewellery theft in 1663, we learn that there were female slaves in the various *dhimmī* households involved in the incident.[75] However, most of the documents from the second half of the seventeenth century that indicate non-Muslims owned slaves are manumission documents, like that of the *dhimmī* and tavern owner Belūḥūrīn veled Yānī, from whom we learn that he had manumitted his Ukrainian-born female slave Mārūşķa bint Aleksī in 1663.[76] In the same year, the *dhimmī* Ṭūṭūrī veled Mihāl also manumitted his Christian female slave of Polish provenance, Mārīna bint Pāvlī.[77] A Christian woman by the name Melekī bint Bedrūs manumitted in 1663 Mihrībān bint Yuvān, a female slave with a Ukrainian background.[78] In the same year, Pānye bint Ḳaplān, another Christian woman, manumitted her Christian slave Fāṭīnī bint Simūn, a woman of Georgian descent.[79]

Concerning religious backgrounds, the documents provide information that, despite the prohibition of 1604, owners could be non-Muslims in the first quarter of the seventeenth century and increasingly in the second half. Baer emphasises that in this period, there was a heightened awareness of the normative distinction between Muslims and non-Muslims.[80] This corresponds to an entry in the Istanbul court records from 1680 that explicitly states that non-Muslims were not allowed to own Muslim slaves.[81] From this it can be concluded that non-Muslims were allowed to own non-Muslim slaves.[82] So the restriction preventing non-Muslims from buying and owning slaves was relaxed up to 1680.

However, the fact that non-Muslims were not allowed to own Muslim slaves meant that if their slaves converted to Islam, they had to sell them to Muslim owners. This change in ownership meant mobility, both spatial and social. In the court records we find entries showing that non-Muslim female slaves had converted to Islam. A Jewish female slave called Mārūste, for instance, converted to Islam and changed her name to Gülistān. What we learn from the court entry of 1676 is that her owner was Jewish as well.[83] While some entries only document the conversion, others (before and after

74 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. İstanbul Mahkemesi 10*, 362 [45b-3], (29 April 1662).
75 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. İstanbul Mahkemesi 12*, 486 [44a-3], (30 July 1663).
76 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. İstanbul Mahkemesi 12*, 466 [42a-4], (18 July 1663).
77 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. İstanbul Mahkemesi 12*, 265 [23b-1], (11 June 1663).
78 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. İstanbul Mahkemesi 12,* 95 [8b-1], (13 May 1663).
79 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. İstanbul Mahkemesi 12,* 559 [50b-6], (06 August 1663).
80 Baer 2004, 428.
81 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Eyüb Mahkemesi (Havass-ı Refia) 90*, 730 [110b-4].
82 On regulations concerning slavery in Islamic law, see Franz 2017; Oßwald 2017; Brown 2019; Freamon 2019.
83 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Hasköy Mahkemesi 10*, 69 [41–3], (31 July 1676).

the restatement of 1680) state that conversion resulted in the slave having to be sold. One entry for 1675 provides information about the Christian (*nasrāniyye*) female slave Belise, who converted to Islam and changed her name to Gülistān. Thereupon she was sold to a Muslim without even mentioning her former owner's name.[84] In 1686, the female slave of the Jew Isāk veled Mūṣī converted to Islam and took the name Hadice. The records note not only her conversion, but also her owner's resulting obligation to sell her to a Muslim. She was sold to a Muslim named el-Hāc Mūsā bin Meḥmed.[85] Thus, the effect of this ruling was that non-Muslim female slaves could use conversion to change hands. This gave them a certain agency to intervene in the course of their lives, even if only partially and temporarily, since they then became the property of another person once again.[86] For the slaves of non-Muslim households, conversion thus meant that they changed owners.[87] As for mobility, their lives changed through spatial mobility as the slave came to live with a new owner and household. Belonging to a Muslim owner might have changed the slave's social status in terms of her position within the Muslim community.

Conversion was not the only reason for further sales and resales, and thus not the only cause for mobility during enslavement. Some slaves who did not meet the requirements or expectations of their new owners were returned to the sellers, who were either slave traders or previous owners. Reasons for the return of purchased slaves or demands for compensation included illness, injury or pregnancy, as indicated in the court documents. There are numerous entries documenting discussions about the buyers' right to return slaves and demand their money back. In some cases, diseases or blemishes were discovered within a few days, but in others only after years. The claims, however, were not always granted. If no illness or disability was found after an examination of the slave, the request was rejected. In the case of the female slave Dilāver, for example, her new owner complained six months after he bought her that she was suffering from syphilis and that he therefore wanted to return her to her previous owner and get his money back. The document states that Dilāver had been medically examined and that it was concluded she did not suffer from said disease. Consequently, the claims of her owner were not granted.[88]

It can be assumed that female slaves were bought for sexual purposes and after a certain time sold again. Although sexual exploitation was by no means limited to female slaves, it was they who, after their capture, were 'legally subject to the disposition of male captors'.[89] Sexual exploitation was one of the main aspects of the lives of

84 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Hasköy Mahkemesi 10*, 35 [25–1].
85 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Bâb Mahkemesi 46*, 409 [65a-1], (28 June 1686).
86 Baer 2014, 427.
87 For female slaves with Muslim owners, conversion was a way to quicken manumission and to help them integrate into the Muslim community and society; Sobers-Khan 2014, 119.
88 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. İstanbul Mahkemesi 18*, [73b–1], (03 October 1663).
89 Zilfi 2010, 197.

female slaves.[90] Indications of this are also provided by entries dealing with the status of female slaves as *ümm-i veled* ('mother of the child'), that is, they bore a child to their owner.[91]

While the slave trade can be seen as part of Transottoman mobility dynamics, the cultural background that slaves brought with them became part of Istanbul's social fabric. Slavery was an integral part of society, permeating it in all areas and down to the smallest units, namely families. The more often a slave changed owner, the more families and households came into touch with them. Each of these families and households contributed to the constitution of a society characterised by its mobile members. Not only did the slaves often change hands several times between the place of capture and the urban markets, but their arrival in a family or household was rarely a final destination: rather, it was the first of several sales and resales. Thus, the mobile component that these slaves brought to society also affected immobile members, as they were part of a society determined by mobility.

3.4. Manumission and After

Manumission was a significant aspect of Ottoman slavery. It marked the end of enslavement for slaves and was characterised by mobility. The legal and social status of slaves changed through manumission. We come across numerous entries documenting the act of emancipation. There were different forms, based on different conditions at different times (during or after the owner's lifetime).[92] It is assumed that a large number of slaves remained in Istanbul after their manumission and continued to live there as part of society. Manumission thus had an impact on both spatial and social mobility. In a legal sense, release meant a change in status from unfree to free. This had an impact on social status, albeit to varying degrees in each individual case. While some slaves became homeowners or even slave owners, others suffered from poverty. These two extremes illustrate the range of social mobility that slaves could experience after emancipation.

For female slaves, one means of manumission was known as *ümm-i veled* ('mother of the child'), where the owner recognised the child of his female slave as his own. The female slave was then guaranteed her freedom upon the owner's death. This form of manumission was accomplished either by a document drawn up during the owner's lifetime or by witnesses who could confirm that the owner had recognised his slave as *ümm-i veled*.[93] As mothers, their legal and social status changed; according to

90 Toledano 2011b, 29.

91 We will come back to this issue below.

92 See fn. 22.

93 However, there are also cases where female slaves appear as plaintiffs and claim to have been manumitted by their former masters as *ümm-i veled*. See for instance in the case of Gülsüm bint ʿAbdullah who gave birth to three sons from her former master but in order to proof her emancipation, two witnesses had to state that she was freed by this way of manumission; *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. İstanbul Mahkemesi 12* [70b–3].

Wilkins, for a female slave 'one might argue that the key event of cultural and social integration was bearing a child by her master'.[94]

Court records suggest that former slaves were no longer (at least legally) determined as slaves after their manumission, as designations that identified them as former slaves were no longer used. After manumission, the only indication of former slave status was the patronymic bint (= daughter) or bin (= son) ʿAbdullah – for those who converted to Islam. If no further information is given, it is not possible to clearly identify a former slave. There are several entries that show that certain bin or bint ʿAbdullahs, at least some of whom were probably former slaves, also owned slaves themselves. In the case of Gülruh bint ʿAbdullah – presumably a former slave – we can see from an entry for 1618 that after manumitting her female slave Eğlence bint ʿAbdullah, she donated to her a female slave of Russian provenance called Nevrūz bint ʿAbdullah, along with numerous objects and valuables like several blankets, hundreds of cushions, various carpets, gold, jewellery, a silver belt and caftans.[95] Even if Gülruh herself was not a former slave, this entry still shows us that her manumitted slave Eğlence became a slave owner. This meant a full change of status, which seemed to be quite common in seventeenth-century Istanbul.

If we assume that a certain number of slave owners with the patronym bin or bint ʿAbdullah, were once slaves themselves, then it is possible that a significant proportion came from the Black Sea region, especially in the seventeenth century. We also see that their slaves came from various areas, including the Black Sea. The different regional backgrounds of slaves and, to some extent, slave owners played into the lives of households and thus into Istanbul society. Slaves, slavery and the slave trade entailed social as well as spatial mobility.

4. Conclusion

This research has shown that numerous actors were involved in the Ottoman slave trade. The slave trade was part of Transottoman mobility dynamics that involved actors inside and outside the empire. The procurement and import of slaves into the Ottoman realm heavily relied on actors and networks outside its borders. The lives of actors were characterised by mobility, which was an important point of the slaving system. We can assume that numerous people – officially registered and unregistered – were involved in the slave trade and made their living from it. In addition to members of the slave traders' guild, who regulated business in the market, sales also took place in other areas.

The diversity of actors is also reflected in the profile of slave owners. The study shows that slave owners could be women or men in different positions, from different professions and with different religious backgrounds. It can be assumed that some

94 Wilkins 2012, 302. We should not forget that the owner had to recognise the child as his own child for the manumission to be carried out.

95 *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. İstanbul Mahkemesi 3*, [77a–1], (25 August 1618).

slave owners had been slaves themselves. This demonstrates not only the variety of slavery, but also its fluidity, since individual aspects of Ottoman slavery were subject to change.

According to entries in the Istanbul court registers, slaves were brought to the city from various regions and were mainly used in households – the majority of them female slaves from the Black Sea region. Most frequently we come across female slaves labelled as 'rūs', which is translated as 'Ukrainian' but most probably stands for slaves from the broader region of Ruthenia. Female slaves were found in families from different social classes. These households made a serious contribution to social diversity. The lives of female slaves were characterised by mobility, but to different degrees at different stages. While entry into and exit from slavery were probably the most striking moments in the life of a slave, there was nevertheless scope for mobility during enslavement. Conversion among slave women with non-Muslim owners led to a change of ownership that involved spatial and social mobility. Conversion gave the female slaves a certain agency to intervene in the course of their lives and escape from slave owners. For slave women with Muslim owners, conversion could mean integration into the Muslim community and an acceleration of the manumission procedure. An important factor was the resale itself. As a result, slaves changed hands and the household to which they were attached. This brought even more individuals in Istanbul society into contact with slaves whose lives were marked by mobility. As societies characterised by mobility arise where part of the people are mobile, immobile members become part of the same society through socialisation with mobile actors.

Slave women from the Black Sea region were thus spread throughout Istanbul society, and at some point most of them were manumitted. Presumably, the majority remained in Istanbul after their release, officially and legally belonging to free society. It was not uncommon for them to become slave owners themselves. Some even seemed to have been involved in the slave trade, a significant point concerning their social mobility.

The lives of slave women from the Black Sea region were characterised by mobility. Enslavement began with a long journey to Istanbul. The slaves' lives changed through spatial and social mobility as they were torn away from their places of origin and taken elsewhere. As captives and later slaves, their social and legal status changed. They were now unfree. In Early Modern Ottoman Istanbul, their lives continued to be mobile. Slaves were mobile within society, willingly or unwillingly – through conversion, resale, and manumission.

The system of slavery was a fluid one characterised by mobility dynamics. But there were also hubs, such as the markets of Caffa or Istanbul, which were fixed points in the system. Istanbul was the eye of the needle for the slave trade, where different strands of slavery characterised by mobility converged. However, mobility also took place within the Istanbul slave market. Slaves were sold, resold and passed on to new owners, their families and households.

People involved in Ottoman slavery interacted inside and outside the empire and were interconnected through various networks. Through their mobility, actors participating in Ottoman slavery constituted changing and fluid contexts of interaction and

social networks. Just as Ottoman slavery can serve as an example to show how actors and their networks were part of Transottoman mobility dynamics, slaves can demonstrate how mobile individuals shaped the social fabric in Ottoman Istanbul. Mobility was crucial for the Ottoman slave trade and Istanbul society.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Bāb Mahkemesi 3 Numaralı Sicil. (H. 1077/M. 1666–1667). 2011. Edited by Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: İSAM.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Bāb Mahkemesi 46 Numaralı Sicil. (H. 1096–1097/M. 1685–1686). 2011. Edited by Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: İSAM.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Bāb Mahkemesi 54 Numaralı Sicil. (H. 1102/M. 1691). 2011. Edited by Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: İSAM.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Eyüb Mahkemesi (Havāss-ı Refia) 19 Numaralı Sicil. (H. 1028–1030/M. 1619–1620). 2011. Edited by Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: İSAM.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Eyüb Mahkemesi (Havāss-ı Refia) 90 Numaralı Sicil. (H. 1090–1091/M. 1679–1680). 2011. Edited by Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: İSAM.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Galata Mahkemesi 46 Numaralı Sicil. (H. 1024–1029/M. 1615–1620). 2011. Edited by Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: İSAM.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Hasköy Mahkemesi 3 Numaralı Sicil. (H. 1023–1081/M. 1615–1670). 2011. Edited by Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: İSAM.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Hasköy Mahkemesi 10 Numaralı Sicil. (H. 1085–1090/M. 1674–1679). 2011. Edited by Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: İSAM.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. İstanbul Mahkemesi 3 Numaralı Sicil. (H. 1027/M. 1618). 2011. Edited by Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: İSAM.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. İstanbul Mahkemesi 10 Numaralı Sicil. (H. 1072–1073/M. 1661–1663). 2011. Edited by Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: İSAM.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. İstanbul Mahkemesi 12 Numaralı Sicil. (H. 1073–1074/M. 1663–1664). 2011. Edited by Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: İSAM.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. İstanbul Mahkemesi 18 Numaralı Sicil. (H. 1081/M. 1675–1676). 2011. Edited by Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: İSAM.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri. Rumeli Sadāret Mahkemesi 80 Numaralı Sicil. (H. 1057–1059/M. 1647–1649). 2011. Edited by Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: İSAM.

Secondary Sources:

Akgündüz, Ahmet. 1988. *Şer'iye Sicilleri. 1. Mahiyeti, toplu kataloğu ve seçme hükümler*. Istanbul: TDAV Yayınları.

Akkaya, Mustafa. 2011. 'XVII. Yüzyılın İlk Çeyreğinde Üsküdar'da Köle Ticareti, Kölelerin Ticaretle Uğraşması'. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. 14.25. 204–217.

Atar, Fahrettin. 2001. 'Kadı'. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 24. 69–73.

Atar, Fahrettin. 2003. 'Mahkeme'. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 27. 341–344.

Baer, Marc. 2004. 'Islamic Conversion Narratives of Women. Social Change and Gendered Religious Hierarchy in Early Modern Ottoman Istanbul'. *Gender & History*. 16.2. 425–458.

Baltacıoğlu-Brammer, Ayşe. 2019. 'One Word, Many Implications. The Term "Kızılbaş" in the Early Modern Ottoman Context'. In Erginbaş, Vefa (ed.). *Ottoman Sunnism. New Perspectives*. Edinburgh Studies on the Ottoman Empire. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 47–70.

Ben-Naeh, Yaron. 2006. 'Blond, Tall, With Honey-Colored Eyes. Jewish Ownership of Slaves in the Ottoman Empire'. *Jewish History*. 20. 3.4. 315–332.

Brown, Jonathan A.C. 2019. *Slavery and Islam*. London: Oneworld Publications.

Conermann, Stephan and Şen, Gül (eds.). 2020. *Slaves and Slave Agency in the Ottoman Empire*. Ottoman Studies. Göttingen: Bonn University Press at V&R unipress.

Deshayes de Courmenin, Louis. 1645. *Voyage de Levant, Fait Par le Commandement du Roy, en l'année 1621. Par le Sr. D. C.* Troisiesme edition. Paris: A Paris, chez Adrian Taupinart rue St. Jacques a la Sphere.

Erdem, Hakan. 1996. *Slavery in the Ottoman Empire and its Demise. 1800–1909*. New York, London: St. Martin's Press/MacMillan.

Erkek, Mehmet Salih. 2017. 'Eski Yakındoğu'dan Osmanlı'ya Kaçak Köleliğin Tarihyazımı ve Üsküdar'da Kaçak Köleler (1523–1529)'. *Turkish Studies. International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish and Turkic*. 12.19. 61–90.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. 2000. 'From the Slave Market to Arafat. Biographies of Bursa Women in the Late Fifteenth Century'. *The Turkish Studies Association Bulletin*. 24. 3–20.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. 2001. 'Quis Custodiet Custodes? Controlling Slave Identities and Slave Traders in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Istanbul'. In Andor, Eszter and Tóth, István György (eds.). *Frontiers of Faith. Religious Exchange and the Constitution of Religious Identities. 1400–1750.* Budapest: Central European University, European Science Foundation. 121–136.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. 2017. *Slavery in the Ottoman World. A Literature Survey*. Ottoman Spies Memorial Lectures. Volume 4. Berlin: EB-Verlag.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. 2020. 'Slave Agencies Compared. The Ottoman and Mughal Empires'. In Conermann, Stephan and Şen, Gül (eds.). *Slaves and Slave Agency in the Ottoman Empire*. Ottoman Studies. Göttingen: Bonn University Press at V&R unipress. 55–86.

Ferguson, Michael and Toledano, Ehud R. 2017. 'Ottoman Slavery and Abolition in the Nineteenth Century'. In Eltis, David et al. (eds.) *The Cambridge World History of Slavery. Volume 4. AD 1804–AD 2016*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 197–225.

Fisher, Alan W. 1972. 'Muscovy and the Black Sea Slave Trade'. *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*. 6. 575–594.

Fisher, Alan W. 1978. 'The Sale of Slaves in the Ottoman Empire. Markets and State Taxes on Slave Sales. Some Preliminary Considerations'. *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi*. 6. 149–174.

Franz, Kurt. 2017. 'Slavery in Islam. Legal Norms and Social Practice'. In Amitai, Reuven and Cluse, Christoph (eds.). *Slavery and the Slave Trade in the Eastern Mediterranean (12th to 15th Centuries)*. Turnhout: Brepols. 51–141.

Freamon, Bernard K. 2019. *Possessed by the Right Hand. The Problem of Slavery in Islamic Law and Muslim Cultures*. Studies in Global Slavery. Volume 8. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Güllüdağ, Nesrin and Baş, Halit. 2019. '1452 Numaralı İzmir Şeriye Sicilinde Yer Alan Unvan ve Lakaplar Üzerinde Bir İnceleme'. *Anasay*. 7. 73–104.

Güneş Yağcı, Zübeyde and Ataş, Emre. 2007. 'Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kaçak Köleleri. Abd-ı Abık'. In Güneş Yağcı, Zübeyde and Yaşa, Fırat (eds.). *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kölelik. Ticaret, Esaret, Yaşam*. İstanbul: Tezkire. 297–323.

Güneş Yağcı, Zübeyde and Yaşa, Fırat (eds.). 2017. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kölelik. Ticaret, Esaret, Yaşam*. İstanbul: Tezkire.

Güneş Yağcı, Zübeyde. 2020. 'Slave Traders (*Esirciler*) in the Ottoman Istanbul'. In Conermann, Stephan and Şen, Gül (eds.). *Slaves and Slave Agency in the Ottoman Empire*. Ottoman Studies. Göttingen: Bonn University Press at V&R unipress. 321–354.

Hathaway, Jane. 2013. 'Households in the Administration of the Ottoman Empire'. *Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları / Journal of Turkish Studies*. 40. 127–149.

İnalcık, Halil. 1943. 'Osmanlı Tarihi Hakkında Mühim Bir Kaynak'. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* (*A.Ü. DTCFD)*. 1. 89–96.

İnalcık, Halil. 1978. 'Ghulām. Ottoman Period'. In İnalcık, Halil et al. (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Islam. Second Edition*. II. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1090.

Karakaya-Stump, Ayfer. 2019. *The Kizilbash-Alevis in Ottoman Anatolia. Sufism, Politics and Community*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Kınalızāde, Ali Efendi. 1964. *Ahlāḳ-ī Alā'ī*. Hazırlayan Hüseyin Algül. Tercüman 1001 Temel Eser.

Kizilov, Mikhail. 2007. 'Slave Trade in the Early Modern Crimea from the Perspective of Christian, Muslim, and Jewish Sources'. *Journal of Early Modern History*. 11. 1–31.

Koçu, Reşad Ekrem. 1971. 'Esir, Esirciler'. *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*. X. 5269–5278.

Kołodziejczyk, Dariusz. 2006. 'Slave Hunting and Slave Redemption as a Business Enterprise. The Northern Black Sea Region in the Sixteenth to Seventeenth Centuries'. *Oriente Moderno. The Ottomans and Trade*. 25.1. 149–159.

Kütükoğlu, Mübahat. 1983. *Osmanlılarda Narh Müessesesi ve 1640 Tarihli Narh Defteri*. Istanbul: Enderun Kitapevi.

Ostapchuk, Victor. 2001. 'The Human Landscape of the Ottoman Black Sea in the Face of the Cossack Naval Raids'. *Oriente Moderno. The Ottomans and the Sea*. 20.1. 23–95.

Ostapchuk, Victor. 2013. 'Cossack Ukraine In and Out of Ottoman Orbit. 1648–1681'. In Kármán, Gábor and Kunčević, Lovro (eds.). *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Leiden, Boston: Brill. 123–152.

Özcan, Abdülkadir. 2007. 'Pencik'. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 34. 226–228.

Özkoray, Hayri Gökşin. 2017. 'La géographie du commerce des esclaves dans l'Empire ottoman et l'implication des marchands d'Europe occidentale'. *Rives méditerraneénnes*. 53. 103–121.

Oßwald, Rainer. 2017. *Das islamische Sklavenrecht.* Würzburg: Ergon.

Pamuk, Şevket. 2000. *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Refik, Ahmet. 1931. *Hicrī On Birinci Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1000–1100)*. Türk Tarih Encümeni Külliyatı. Volume 20. Istanbul: Devlet Matbaası.

Rohdewald, Stefan; Frick, David and Wiederkehr, Stefan (eds.). 2007. *Litauen und Ruthenien / Lithuania and Ruthenia. Studien zu einer transkulturellen Kommunikationsregion (15.–18. Jahrhundert) / Studies of a Transcultural Communication Zone (15th–18th Centuries)*. Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte. Band 71. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Seng, Yvonne J. 1991. 'The *Şer'iye Sicilleri* of Istanbul Müftülüğü as a Source for the Study of Everyday Life'. *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin*. 15.2. 307–325.

Seng, Yvonne J. 1996. 'Fugitives and Factotums. Slaves in Early Sixteenth-Century Istanbul'. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*. 34. 136–169.

Seng, Yvonne J. 1998. 'A Liminal State. Slavery in Sixteenth-Century Istanbul'. In Marmon, Shaun E. (ed.). *Slavery in the Islamic Middle East*. Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers. 25–42.

Sobers-Khan, Nur. 2014. *Slaves Without Shackles. Forced Labour and Manumission in the Galata Court Registers. 1560–1572*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag.

Toledano, Ehud R. 1998. *Slavery and Abolition in the Ottoman Middle East*. Seattle, London: University of Washington Press.

Toledano, Ehud R. 2000. 'The Concept of Slavery in Ottoman and Other Muslim Societies. Dichotomy or Continuum'. In Toru, Miura and Philips, John Edward (eds.). *Slave Elites in the Middle East and Africa. A Comparative Study*. London, New York: Kegan Paul International. 159–175.

Toledano, Ehud R. 2011a. 'An Empire of Many Households. The Case of Ottoman Enslavement'. In Culbertson, Laura (ed.). *Slaves and Households in the Near East*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 85–97.

Toledano, Ehud R. 2011b. 'Enslavement in the Ottoman Empire in the Early Modern Period'. In Eltis, David et al. (eds.). *The Cambridge World History of Slavery. Volume 3. AD 1420–AD 1804*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 25–46.

Toledano, Ehud R. 2014. 'Shifting Patterns of Ottoman Enslavement in the Early Modern Period'. In Ginio, Eyal and Podeh, Elie (eds.). *The Ottoman Middle East Studies in Honor of Amnon Cohen*. Leiden, Boston: Brill. 204–220.

Uğur, Yunus. 2010. 'Şerʿiyye Sicilleri'. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 39. 8–11.

Van der Linden, Marcel. 2016. 'Dissecting Coerced Labor'. In Van der Linden, Marcel and Rodíguez García, Magaly (eds.). *On Coerced Labor. Work and Compulsion after Chattel Slavery*. Leiden, Boston: Brill. 293–321.

Vatin, Nicolas 2015. 'Esclavage. L'esclavage chez les Ottomans jusqu'au XIXe siècle'. In Georgeon, François; Vatin, Nicolas and Veinstein, Gilles (eds.). *Dictionnaire de l'Empire ottoman*. Paris: Fayard. 411–413.

Wagner, Veruschka. 2020. '"Speaking Property" with the Capacity to Act. Slave Interagency in the 16th- and 17th-Century Court Register'. In Conermann, Stephan and Şen, Gül (eds.). *Slaves and Slave Agency in the Ottoman Empire*. Ottoman Studies. Göttingen: Bonn University Press at V&R unipress. 213–236.

White, Joshua M. 2020. 'Slavery, Manumission, and Freedom Suites in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire'. In Conermann, Stephan and Şen, Gül (eds.). *Slaves and Slave Agency in the Ottoman Empire*. Ottoman Studies. Göttingen: Bonn University Press at V&R unipress. 283–318.

Wilkins, Charles L. 2012. 'Master, Servants and Slaves. Household Formation Among the Urban Notables of Early Ottoman Aleppo'. Woodhead, Christine (ed.). *The Ottoman World*. London: Routledge. 291–306.

Yaşa, Fırat. 2018. 'Desperation, Hopelessness, and Suicide. An Initial Consideration of Self-Murder by Slaves in Seventeenth-Century Crimean Society'. *Turkish Historical Review*. 9.2. 198–211.

Yi, Eunjeong. 2004. *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul. Fluidity and Leverage*. Leiden: Brill.

Ze'evi, Dror. 1998. 'The Use of Ottoman Sharīʿa Court Records as a Source for Middle Eastern Social History. A Reappraisal'. *Islamic Law and Society*. 5. 35–56.

Zilfi, Madeline C. 2000. 'Ottoman Slavery and Female Slaves in the Early Modern Era'. In Çiçek, Kemal et al. (eds.). *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilisation 2. Economy and Society*. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye. 714–718.

Zilfi, Madeline C. 2004. 'Servants, Slaves, and the Domestic Order in the Ottoman Middle East'. *Hawwa*. 2.1. 1–33.

Zilfi, Madeline C. 2009. 'Slavery'. In Ágoston, Gábor and Masters, Bruce Alan (eds.). *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire*. New York: Facts On File. 530–533.
Zilfi, Madeline C. 2010. *Women and Slavery in the Late Ottoman Empire. The Design of Difference*. New York: Cambridge University Press.