

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

The Ottoman Empire

in a Hurry

Six centuries astride three continents

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 6

The Core Ideas 8

How It Actually Works 22

What People Get Wrong 32

Use It 37

Terms 41

Go Deeper 46

Notes and Sources 48

Bibliography 54

The Whole Thing in One Page

The Ottoman Empire is often reduced to a procession of sultans, sieges and maps: rise, magnificence, decline, collapse. That sequence contains real victories and defeats. It misses the harder achievement. For roughly six centuries, one dynasty kept turning control of unlike places into an imperial order that could collect, judge, supply, bargain and fight again.

The state began around 1300 as a frontier coalition in north-western Anatolia, not as a finished programme with a secure birthday. It entered Europe before it controlled most of Anatolia. Bursa, Gallipoli and Rumelia mattered before Constantinople fell in 1453. The conquest then gave Mehmed II a capital at the straits, but Istanbul had to be repopulated, supplied and governed before it could become the hinge of an empire.

The household converted expansion into service. Princes, women of the dynasty, pages, eunuchs, administrators, enslaved recruits and Janissaries were tied to the ruler through education, rank, patronage and coercion. Beyond the palace, rule travelled through governors, judges, tax collectors, military households, guilds, clergy, village elders, tribal leaders and local notables. A single colour on a map covered provinces, vassals and regencies with sharply different relationships to Istanbul.

Movement made the arrangement work. Grain and tax revenue travelled from producing districts. Orders, petitions and intelligence crossed roads and seas. Soldiers, horses, artillery and supplies converged on seasonal campaigns. Merchants connected the Black Sea, Mediterranean and Red Sea. Pilgrims crossed the Arab provinces towards Mecca. The empire stood astride three continents only while people and resources kept crossing the routes between them.

Difference was governed through hierarchy rather than erased. Muslims held privileged political standing. Christian and Jewish communities could preserve worship, property and institutions while facing unequal taxes, restrictions and insecurity. Women used courts and endowments in documented settings, yet men retained stronger formal authority. Enslaved

people ranged from powerful household servants to labourers whose suffering rarely produced biographies. Endurance and injustice occupied the same system.

When warfare, prices, technology and commerce changed, Ottoman institutions changed too. Timars lost relative importance in many places. Cash armies, tax farms, credit, provincial households and diplomacy grew. Lepanto, Vienna and Karlowitz marked losses, but no single decline curve explains the following centuries.

The nineteenth-century state reached more directly into taxation, conscription, schooling, law and provincial administration. Reformers also promised a common Ottoman citizenship. Greater capacity could make rules more regular, or make surveillance and punishment more effective. It did not dictate one moral outcome.

After revolution in 1908, Balkan defeat, refugee movements and entry into the First World War, the Committee of Union and Progress chose a radical politics of demographic security. In 1915 its government organised the deportation and destruction of the empire's Armenians. War shaped the conditions. Central institutions increased the reach of policy. Neither fact made genocide automatic or excusable.

Defeat in 1918 was followed by occupation, resistance and rival governments. The sultanate ended in 1922, the Republic of Turkey began in 1923 and the caliphate was abolished in 1924. Other provinces and peoples entered mandates, successor states, exile and new minorities. The dynasty vanished. Its institutions, borders, communities and losses did not.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

Stand in Sarajevo, Thessaloniki, Istanbul, Damascus or Cairo and the Ottoman past appears before anyone labels it. It may be a market street, a bath, a bridge, a foundation deed, a family name, a court record or an argument over which community owns the building. Across these former imperial centres, Ottoman rule rarely left one uncontested memory. The empire matters because its inheritance is shared most intensely where people disagree about what was inherited.

It also corrects the usual map of world history. Europe is often narrated as a self-contained passage from Renaissance to nation-state, while the Middle East enters when European powers arrive. The Ottoman Empire breaks that frame. For much of the early modern period, one dynasty claimed sovereignty from Buda to Baghdad and from Algiers to Basra, with the holy cities and Black Sea routes inside its political horizon. Ottoman diplomats negotiated in Vienna, Venice and Paris. Fleets and provincial commanders contested the Mediterranean, Red Sea and Indian Ocean approaches. This was European, African and Asian history at once.

The empire is a severe test for easy accounts of diversity. It governed Muslims of several communities, Orthodox and Armenian Christians, Jews, Catholics and others through law, privilege, taxation, local leadership and coercion. Communities could preserve worship, institutions and property across generations. They could also face legal inequality, forced movement, collective punishment and massacre. Calling the system tolerant hides subordination. Calling it permanent persecution cannot explain long stretches of shared urban life and negotiated authority. Plural societies may endure through unequal settlements, and duration does not make those settlements just.

The subject teaches a second discipline. Distrust administrative nouns that look firmer than the practices beneath them. Province, community, subject, tax and army sound like fixed boxes. In Ottoman use each could contain exemptions, overlapping jurisdictions and negotiated duties. A person might

be an imperial subject, a church member, a guild member, a client of a household and a village resident at once. Which relationship mattered depended on the demand being made. The archive exposes the difference between a category on paper and authority at the last handoff.

Then there is movement. Empires are coloured spaces on maps, but government is an activity across distance. An order must be carried. A fortress must receive pay and powder. A city must receive grain. A pilgrim route must be protected. A collector must turn local produce into an accepted payment. The Ottoman case makes logistics inseparable from politics. Control weakens when carriers, seasons, credit or intermediaries fail, even if the border has not moved.

Reform adds another warning. The late Ottoman state built ministries, schools, censuses, telegraphs, railways, provincial councils and courts. It reorganised the army, altered taxation and announced more equal citizenship. Stronger administration could protect a claim or identify its claimant; regular conscription could widen membership or remove labour from a household; a census could support government or turn identity into a target. Capacity has no moral direction of its own. Ottoman modernisation and catastrophe belonged to the same century, but one did not mechanically cause the other.

Finally, the empire changes how endings look. States seldom vanish at one battle or become one nation the next morning. Officers change flags. Refugees cross borders. Property claims outlive governments. Institutions are inherited selectively. Defeat in 1918, termination of the sultanate in 1922, proclamation of the republic a year later and removal of the caliphal office in 1924 were separate events. Across the former domains, people continued sorting sovereignty, land, debt and belonging after the dynasty had gone.

Read this empire to replace a static map with an operating question: what has to move, and through whose hands, for one government to rule unlike places? The answer reveals both the sources of Ottoman endurance and the choices that turned capacity into catastrophe.

The Core Ideas

A frontier coalition became a dynasty

The safest date for the Ottoman beginning is not 1299. That year is a conventional marker attached to Osman, the frontier lord whose name became the dynasty's. The early evidence is too thin to give the state a documented birthday. What can be seen more clearly is a zone of opportunity in north-western Anatolia after Mongol power had broken the old Seljuk order and Byzantine control had weakened beyond its strongest towns. Small lordships competed, raided, traded, married and recruited across a frontier that divided faiths less neatly than later origin stories suggest.

Osman's following was not a miniature version of the later empire waiting to unfold. It contained pastoral fighters, local notables, Muslim holy men, converts, Christian neighbours and allies whose loyalties could be practical, personal or religious. The language of holy war mattered, but it did not explain every alliance. Frontier politics rewarded a leader who could distribute booty, land, protection and prospects. Success attracted followers. Followers enabled more success. A dynasty emerged from that loop before it possessed the institutions later used to explain its rise.

Geography helped. The Ottoman base lay near Byzantine Bithynia, with towns, farmland and routes towards the Sea of Marmara. Bursa fell in 1326 and became an early capital. Expansion crossed into Europe in the mid-fourteenth century, aided by Byzantine civil wars, alliances and the seizure of Gallipoli. An earthquake in 1354 damaged its fortifications and helped an Ottoman occupation, but it did not create the whole European project. Once established in Thrace, Ottoman rulers could recruit and tax on both sides of the straits. Europe was not a late addition. Rumelia, the Ottoman name for its European lands, became central to the state while much of Anatolia remained divided among rival powers.

This beginning explains a strength the empire retained. Ottoman expansion did not require every new territory to become culturally identical to the ruling

house. It required submission, revenue, soldiers or strategic cooperation. Local elites might resist, bargain, convert, enter service or preserve authority beneath a new sovereign. The dynasty could add people before it had a complete theory of what they were joining.

The model has limits. Conquest involved siege, enslavement, dispossession and punishment. A coalition attractive to one military entrepreneur was not voluntary government for a conquered village. Nor was early flexibility proof of religious indifference. Ottoman rulers built mosques, patronised Islamic scholars and presented victory in Islamic terms. The narrower claim is that confessional identity, dynastic ambition and practical alliance operated together. The frontier remained productive because no single one of them controlled every choice.

Then came the first warning against inevitability. Bayezid I expanded rapidly, defeated a crusading army at Nicopolis in 1396 and pressed hard against Constantinople. In 1402 Timur shattered his army at Ankara and captured him. Bayezid's sons fought for more than a decade. A state supposedly destined to conquer the region nearly dissolved. Its recovery under Mehmed I and Murad II depended on keeping supporters, rebuilding revenue and defeating rival claimants. The dynasty survived because enough people still found its rule useful or unavoidable, not because history had signed the result in advance.

The household turned conquest into a system

The Ottoman state was organised around a family, but the relevant household was larger than blood. It included princes, women of the dynasty, pages, soldiers, tutors, eunuchs, administrators, enslaved servants and dependants. It trained people, allocated careers and controlled access to the ruler. The palace did more than display sovereignty. It produced servants of the dynasty and ranked the routes by which they could approach power.

One route was the devshirme, the periodic levy of boys from some Christian communities in the Balkans. Selected boys were removed from their

families, converted to Islam and trained for service. Some entered the Janissary infantry. A smaller group reached palace education and high office. This was coerced recruitment. The later wealth and authority of exceptional graduates does not cancel the violence of removal. Nor did every Christian boy face the levy, every province participate equally or every recruit rise. A selective institution became famous enough to distort the whole empire.

Household recruitment helped manage a dynastic problem. Great families could turn office, land and armed followings into hereditary power. Many leading soldiers and officials instead held the status of the sultan's kul, legally dependent servants whose rank came from his household. Elite kul service differed sharply from agricultural, domestic or sexual slavery, but it remained a form of legal unfreedom. The arrangement concentrated training and reduced some inherited rivals. It also made politics dependent on favour, faction and access to the sovereign.

The Janissaries show both the power and the instability. Formed as standing infantry and closely linked to the sultan, they became central to siege warfare and firearms. Their recruitment, family life, economic activity and political role changed over time. They acquired urban connections, joined trades and helped depose rulers. Describing this as degeneration assumes that the only legitimate Janissary was the early barracks soldier. For the dynasty, however, a corps able to bargain over accession or resist reform could become a direct threat. Mahmud II destroyed it in 1826 after earlier reform attempts had failed. An institution created to limit entrenched power had become an entrenched power.

Dynastic reproduction carried another danger. Early Ottoman custom did not establish a fixed rule of eldest-son succession. Princes governed provinces, gathered households and competed when a sultan died. Civil war tested capacity and threatened the state in each contested succession. Mehmed II's law code permitted fratricide for political order, formalising a practice that varied in use. Later princes were confined rather than sent to govern, and succession moved towards seniority within the dynasty. Each

solution reduced one risk and created another. Executed brothers prevented rival courts. Isolated princes could reach the throne with little experience and become objects of palace faction.

Women of the imperial family belonged inside this machinery. The harem was the protected domestic and dynastic section of the household, not an ornamental room filled with idle captives. Mothers, consorts, princesses and female servants formed patronage networks, arranged marriages, commissioned buildings, corresponded and intervened in succession. Hürrem Sultan's marriage to Süleyman I altered recent court convention. Nurbanu, Safiye and Kösem Sultan exercised influence through different relationships to rulers and officials. Calling their period a rule of women repeats hostile rhetoric and treats male faction as ordinary while female influence becomes an aberration.

The household model could absorb people of strikingly different origins and make their careers portable across the empire. Its coercion sat inside the same mechanism. Conversion, slavery, marriage, patronage, confinement and execution limited alternative centres of power. The ruler's house widened the pool from which the dynasty recruited while reserving supreme sovereignty for one male line.

Rule travelled through people, routes and bargains

A colour on a map is a claim. Rule begins when an order written in Istanbul reaches a village in Bosnia, a tribal district in Iraq, a port in Egypt or a garrison on the Danube and produces an action. That required carriers, interpreters, money, records and people with local leverage. Distance was therefore a political institution, not empty space between the centre and its subjects.

The empire's routes did different work. The straits joined its European and Asian territories. The Danube carried supplies towards a fortified frontier. Black Sea shipping linked grain zones, ports and the capital. Mediterranean routes moved merchants, soldiers, captives and news. After 1517, the Arab

provinces connected Istanbul to Egyptian revenue, Red Sea strategy and the pilgrimage roads to Mecca. Their operation varied with season, war and local authority, and none belonged to one uniform command. Intercontinental rule lasted only while these flows could cross sea lanes, roads and provincial boundaries.

Authority travelled through intermediaries. Governors, judges, cavalry officers, tax collectors, religious scholars, guild leaders, communal representatives, village elders, tribal leaders and provincial households translated imperial demands into local action. The centre appointed officials, confirmed privileges, received petitions and removed office holders. Local actors controlled information, labour, credit and armed force that the centre needed. Neither side could govern cheaply without the other. The resulting bargains varied by province and century, and the variation was part of Ottoman rule rather than proof that rule did not exist.

The kadi, an Islamic judge appointed by the state, makes the layering visible. A kadi heard disputes, registered property and contracts, recorded imperial orders and performed administrative duties, especially in towns. Muslims and non-Muslims, women and men used these courts from unequal legal and social positions. Surviving registers show particular women buying, selling, inheriting, lending and litigating. They establish real legal capacity in documented settings, not an empire-wide measure of women's power or access.

Endowments called vakifs joined property, piety and public service. Revenue from shops, land or baths could maintain a mosque, school, fountain, bridge, hospital or family beneficiaries. An endowment might finance an urban service for generations and shield assets from some claims. It could also concentrate control and reduce revenue directly available to government. The institution supplied capacity and constraint at once.

Provincial variation was substantial. In Egypt, governors had to work through Cairo's institutions and powerful military households. Arab provincial rule depended on urban families, scholars, merchants, tribes and local

forces in different combinations. Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli developed regencies with considerable room for their own commanders and households. The Crimean khanate remained a dynastic vassal and ally, not a standard province. Balkan military frontiers, church structures and tax arrangements created other settlements. One map colour covered several kinds of sovereignty.

The centre repeatedly tried to discipline the people on whom it depended. Rotation, inspection, dismissal and confiscation kept office insecure. Insecurity could encourage rapid extraction, purchased protection and private networks. Strong local households could stabilise taxation and security while making commands negotiable. The eighteenth-century ayan were therefore neither untouched feudal remnants nor sufficient proof of collapse. Many grew from Ottoman fiscal and political change.

For a subject, the empire arrived at the last handoff: a tax demand, a court summons, a soldier seeking quarters, a guild rule, a requisitioned cart, a repaired road or a petition carried upwards. Imperial endurance depended on keeping enough routes open and enough intermediaries invested. When carriers failed, supplies stopped or local power defected, the colour on the map could survive after effective command had already thinned.

War, revenue and supply formed one system

Ottoman armies were never one thing. Frontier cavalry, household troops, Janissaries, provincial horsemen, artillery crews, sailors, vassal forces, irregulars and later conscripts belonged to different fiscal arrangements. To ask how the army worked is to ask who received land, salary, tax rights, supplies or permission to take booty, who had to deliver them and how they reached the campaign. Military organisation was an argument about revenue in uniform and movement under pressure.

The timar system linked provincial cavalry to rights over specified tax income. A sipahi did not own the peasants or usually own the land in the common western European sense of a landed lord. He received revenue in return for service and was expected to appear with armed retainers

according to the value of the assignment. The arrangement converted some dispersed agricultural taxes into mounted force without sending every coin through the capital. It also required surveys, records, supervision and a state able to reassign rights. Timars were strongest in particular regions and periods, never a complete account of Ottoman land or war.

At the centre, salaried household troops and artillery demanded cash. Firearms, fortresses and long campaigns increased that demand. The conquest of Constantinople displayed the value of heavy guns, engineering, ships and coordinated supply, but cannon did not make victory automatic. The failed siege of Belgrade in 1456, the defence of Malta in 1565 and later defeats show the importance of command, disease, weather, relief forces and distance. Rivals acquired similar weapons. The advantage lay in paying, supplying and coordinating them repeatedly.

A campaign was a moving economy. Animals needed fodder; soldiers needed bread and pay; guns needed powder, shot and draught teams; ships needed timber, rope, crews and water. The Danube, coastal shipping and staged depots could reduce the burden, while a bad road, late harvest or long siege enlarged it. Villages supplied carts, labour and provisions through duties that could exceed ordinary taxation. The victorious sultan in a chronicle stood at the end of a chain of contractors, officials, craftsmen and households.

Expansion could feed the system. New territories brought taxable households, customs, mines, ports and producing districts. Victory also generated appointments and rewards that held elite coalitions together. It created longer frontiers and more garrisons as well. As costs, prices and warfare changed, the state shifted the way it obtained cash rather than moving through one simple collapse.

Tax farming became increasingly important. Under *iltizam*, a bidder paid for the right to collect specified revenues and then recovered the payment from taxpayers. The treasury obtained funds sooner and transferred part of the collection risk. Contractors gained an incentive to collect above their bid and often needed local partners and credit. In 1695 the *malikane* system granted

many tax farms for life, encouraging longer tenure while strengthening investors and provincial networks able to finance them. Fiscal change increased central receipts and local bargaining power together.

Credit sat behind the official machinery. Merchants, money changers, court figures, charitable foundations and provincial households advanced funds, supplied forces and moved coin. The fleet added another geography. Corsairs, regency commanders, shipbuilders, rowers and allies linked North African and imperial operations without creating total command of the Mediterranean. Lepanto in 1571 destroyed much of one fleet and many experienced men. Rapid shipbuilding and continued possession of Cyprus show that it was not the end of Ottoman sea power.

War, revenue and supply formed a feedback loop. Fiscal innovation could sustain force, and force could protect taxpayers and routes. The same demands could exhaust producers, empower collectors and provoke flight or rebellion. Ottoman governments survived by adjusting this system repeatedly. Success in one campaign did not settle the next season's account.

Difference was organised through hierarchy

Most Ottoman subjects did not share one language, church, legal tradition or local identity. The dynasty did not try to erase every distinction. It classified, taxed and governed through many of them. That allowed communities to reproduce institutions across long periods, but it occurred within an Islamic empire whose Muslim rulers and jurists assigned Muslims superior political and legal standing.

Islamic law recognised Christians and Jews as protected non-Muslim subjects. Adult non-Muslim men generally owed the *cizye*, a poll tax from which Muslims were exempt, while Muslims faced other obligations and increasingly military service in later periods. Non-Muslims maintained worship, clergy, family practices and communal property under restrictions that changed by time and place. Conversion to Islam could bring legal or social advantages, and surviving cases show motives that included belief,

marriage, career and local pressure. Neither a programme of universal forced conversion nor a world of free religious choice describes the record.

The familiar word millet can mislead. In later Ottoman use it could refer to a religious community or nation, and nineteenth-century institutions gave recognised communities more formal administrative shape. Popular accounts project a complete millet system backwards to Mehmed II, with each faith neatly self-governing from 1453. The evidence shows a gradual and uneven set of arrangements. Patriarchs, rabbis, bishops, local clergy, merchants and lay leaders negotiated authority. The state recognised representatives when it needed taxes, order or a channel of communication. Those leaders did not speak for every member, and communal institutions contained their own contests over class, gender and office.

This was pluralism without equal citizenship. A church might own property and adjudicate marriage while its members faced distinctive taxes, limits or humiliations. Rules varied, enforcement varied more, and wealth or patronage could sometimes offset a legal disadvantage without removing the hierarchy. Social position combined religion, gender, office, property, household connection, locality and reputation.

Cities made these rankings part of daily contact. In documented neighbourhoods and markets in Istanbul, Salonica, Aleppo, Cairo and other centres, people borrowed, sued, partnered and competed across religious lines. Food, language, craft and music crossed some boundaries that marriage and worship did not. Shared life neither dissolved difference nor guaranteed peace. It made cooperation ordinary in some settings and left neighbours close enough to become targets in crisis.

Slavery formed another part of the order. Enslaved people entered through war, raiding, trade, birth and household recruitment. They worked in domestic service, agriculture, workshops, ships, military households and the palace. Some were manumitted and entered patronage networks; others endured sale, sexual exploitation, family separation and hard labour. Elite ascent from slavery is memorable because successful people generated records. It must not be used to soften the condition of those whose lives did

not.

Gender worked through household, property and law rather than one uniform seclusion. Muslim women could inherit defined shares, own property, establish endowments and use courts. Christian and Jewish women also used Ottoman courts in some matters. These capacities offered leverage to some property holders and widows in particular settings. Men retained stronger formal authority in marriage, public office and political representation, while class, family and locality sharply affected access. The imperial harem cannot stand in for village women, artisans or enslaved servants.

Violence was not an external failure of an otherwise peaceful order. Conquest, collective punishment, forced settlement, suppression of revolt and massacre belonged to imperial government. Protection nevertheless mattered because rulers sought taxes, labour and order from living subjects. It was conditional, unequal and revocable. The later destruction of protected communities cannot be explained as the routine operation of one timeless arrangement. It required political decisions that recast governed civilians as collective threats.

Decline often conceals transformation

The empire reached an extraordinary extent under Süleyman I, who ruled from 1520 to 1566. From that summit, an older story draws one downward line: weak sultans, corrupt officials, idle Janissaries, lost battles and eventual death. Ottoman writers criticised disorder by comparing their own times with an idealised past. European rivals repeated the judgement for different purposes. Several successor national histories later used Ottoman decay to make independence appear as release from a body already dying.

There was decline in particular capacities and places. Territorial losses after the failed siege of Vienna in 1683 and the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699 were severe. Russia became a stronger Black Sea power. Fiscal pressure, rebellion, inflation and war damaged communities. Some military and administrative reforms failed. Rejecting a single sixteenth-century peak does

not require turning defeat into success.

What fails is the claim that all later change was one uninterrupted terminal process. Across more than three centuries the dynasty fielded armies, renegotiated taxes, built and rebuilt cities, expanded administration, conducted diplomacy and survived repeated partition plans. Territorial contraction, relative military weakness, institutional change and social transformation must be measured separately before decline becomes an explanation rather than a verdict.

The changing sultanate is one example. Later rulers campaigned less often and delegated more. Palace households, mothers of sultans, chief ministers, religious scholars and military bodies gained leverage. This produced faction and regicide, including the killing of Osman II in 1622. It also widened the number of institutions that could press a political claim or restrain a ruler. Whether this amounted to a limited monarchy remains disputed. It was not a political vacuum.

The Janissaries changed because society, recruitment and war changed. They married, joined guilds, invested and acquired allies. Their numbers grew and membership opened beyond the older levy. Some resisted discipline or military reform; others still fought. Their urban connections made them political. Treating each commercial interest as corruption assumes that a standing corps could remain socially sealed for centuries. The harder question is whether its privileges still matched the military work the state required. Often they did not.

Provincial households also grew. Officials and notables assembled armed followers, farms, tax contracts and marriage networks. In some regions they collected revenue and kept order more reliably than short-term appointees from Istanbul. In others they abused taxpayers or challenged the centre. Ali Pasha of Ioannina and Muhammad Ali of Egypt later built power approaching autonomy. Their rise came through Ottoman methods of finance and delegation, even when it threatened Ottoman command.

Trade did not bypass the empire while Atlantic Europe moved ahead.

Ottoman ports remained connected to Mediterranean, Black Sea, Red Sea and overland circuits, though routes and relative advantages changed. European traders received capitulations regulating customs, residence and legal treatment. These agreements later helped foreign powers protect clients and secure unequal advantages. At first they were negotiated instruments of commerce and diplomacy. The shift in meaning came from changing power, not from the word in the treaty.

Knowledge also crossed frontiers. Printing in Arabic-script Turkish spread later than in several European centres, while Jewish, Armenian and Greek printers had worked within the empire earlier. Military engineers, translators, diplomats and merchants moved techniques and information. Embassies, libraries, workshops and new consumption appeared beside resistance from groups protecting office, income or authority.

Decline therefore needs a denominator. Compared with its greatest territorial reach, the empire contracted. Compared with a fixed ideal of household rule, it changed. Compared with increasingly strong fiscal-military rivals, it lost relative capacity in important contests. Compared with most dynasties, it endured for an unusual length of time. One word cannot carry all four judgements.

Centralisation enlarged both membership and coercion

By the nineteenth century, Ottoman rulers faced military defeats, separatist movements, European intervention, commercial change and mounting debt. Their answer was to reach further into society. Ministries, regular armies, schools, censuses, telegraphs, railways, provincial councils and reorganised courts gave the centre new ways to collect information and issue commands. Direct rule remained incomplete, but the state sought taxes and conscripts through more standard procedures and fewer independent bargains.

The Tanzimat era, conventionally dated from the Gülhane decree of 1839 to the constitution of 1876, announced greater security for life, honour and

property, more regular taxation and equality among subjects. Ottomanism sought common political membership across religious difference. Many advocates intended to preserve the empire through fairer government. Implementation remained unequal, and common citizenship challenged Muslim privilege, communal leadership and local exemptions together.

Reform redistributed burdens. Standard taxation might restrain an abusive collector yet leave a village less room to negotiate. Conscription could make membership reciprocal while removing labour from households. Provincial councils admitted some local voices and supplied the centre with information. Schools created officials and publics. Telegraphs accelerated supply, rescue and repression alike. Capacity increased the consequences of whoever controlled it.

Foreign intervention and debt narrowed room for action. European governments claimed protective roles towards Christian subjects and extracted privileges. Borrowing expanded after the Crimean War; default in 1875 helped produce the Ottoman Public Debt Administration, which controlled specified revenues for creditors. National movements grew through churches, schools, newspapers, armed organisations, diplomacy and war. Independence could free one population while producing a new minority or refugee column for another. Muslim refugees from lost territories carried dispossession and fear into later Ottoman politics.

Abdülhamid II suspended parliament and combined palace rule, censorship and policing with schools, railways and an intensified appeal to the caliphate. Armenian demands for security met repression and mass killing in the 1890s. The Young Turk revolution restored the constitution in 1908 without settling struggles over army, province, religion and nationality.

The Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 removed most remaining European territory and drove mass displacement. A CUP-led government concentrated power in 1913 and entered the First World War in 1914. Invasion, defeat, requisition, blockade and disease created extreme insecurity. CUP leaders also made choices within that emergency, treating demographic composition as a security problem and Armenian civilians as a collective

danger.

In 1915 the government deported Armenians from across the empire, including provinces far from active combat. Men were killed, communities driven towards the Syrian desert, property seized, and deportees destroyed through massacre, starvation, exposure and organised neglect. Women and children were abducted and forcibly assimilated. The policy was directed from the ruling system and implemented through state, party, local and irregular actors. Some officials resisted or mitigated orders, confirming that alternatives remained. Russian invasion and Armenian political activity belong to the wartime context. They did not make civilians collectively guilty.

Centralisation was neither a sufficient nor an inevitable cause of genocide, and Tanzimat equality was not a concealed road to 1915. Stronger institutions changed the reach of political choices. Territorial loss, refugee politics, radical nationalism, wartime security claims and CUP leadership shaped their direction. The genocide was a rupture produced through those interacting conditions, not the automatic destination of the earlier imperial order.

The empire ended in stages: defeat and occupation in 1918; rival governments in Istanbul and Ankara; termination of the sultanate in 1922; a republic proclaimed the next year; and abolition of the caliphal office in 1924. Other provinces and peoples passed into mandates, successor states, displacement and minority status.

The causal loop closes without becoming a law. The early dynasty grew by recruiting across a frontier and accepting several forms of subordinate rule. The late state tried to replace much of that variation with common membership and direct capacity. Either form could contain protection and coercion. Under war, leaders used the newer reach against people once classified as protected subjects. Ottoman endurance came from reconstruction. Its ending shows that reconstruction can widen membership or weaponise exclusion, depending on the politics directing it.

How It Actually Works

From Osman to Ankara, c. 1280-1402

The first Ottomans appear at the edge of several broken orders. The Seljuk sultanate had fragmented under Mongol supremacy. Byzantine emperors still claimed Anatolia but lacked the force to recover much of it.

Turkish-speaking principalities competed for towns, pasture, trade and religious prestige. Osman led one of the smaller followings near the Byzantine frontier. Later chronicles turned his career into a clean origin story. The contemporary trail is thinner.

His son Orhan captured Bursa in 1326, developed coinage and administration, and drew scholars and soldiers into the court. Ottoman fighters then entered Byzantine civil wars as allies and mercenaries. Invitation across the straits supplied knowledge, contacts and positions as well as booty. Gallipoli gave a durable base after 1354. Under Murad I, Edirne became a centre in Europe, and Ottoman forces advanced through Thrace and the Balkans using battle, tribute, marriage and vassalage in changing combinations.

The Battle of Kosovo in 1389 later became a Serbian national symbol, but it did not extinguish Serbia at once. Murad I died, Bayezid I succeeded, and Serbian rulers entered changing forms of dependence. At Nicopolis in 1396, Bayezid crushed a crusading army and then pressed Anatolian rivals into his domain. The speed was dangerous. In 1402 Timur defeated him near Ankara, exposing how many recent subordinates remained available to defect.

Bayezid's sons fought from 1402 to 1413. Mehmed I prevailed, then Murad II restored authority against rebellions, rival claimants, Balkan powers and a crusading coalition defeated at Varna in 1444. Recovery showed that enough revenue, household loyalty and provincial accommodation survived a dynastic fracture that could have ended the state.

For ordinary subjects, a change of sovereign could be quieter than the

chronicles imply and more dangerous than maps admit. One town might negotiate surrender; another might be stormed and enslaved. Villages owed taxes to new holders. Christian lords remained as vassals before removal. People fled, returned, converted, entered service or petitioned for old arrangements. Expansion consisted of such adjustments as well as battles.

Constantinople and the imperial claim, 1451-1512

Mehmed II took the throne for the second time in 1451 and prepared for Constantinople. He built a fortress on the Bosphorus, assembled artillery and a fleet, and isolated the city. On 29 May 1453 Ottoman troops broke through after a siege of roughly seven weeks. The Byzantine capital fell, its last emperor died and a political order with Roman roots ended. For the Ottomans, the conquest was also a beginning.

Mehmed did not inherit a functioning capital by raising a flag. War and depopulation had reduced the city. He ordered resettlement, brought Muslims, Christians and Jews from several regions, restored markets, converted Hagia Sophia into a mosque and founded religious and charitable complexes. Coercive relocation accompanied incentives. Population policy, endowment, architecture and court ritual made conquest durable.

The sultan claimed authority in several languages. He was a Muslim conqueror and patron, head of the Ottoman dynasty and ruler of former Roman territories. The court drew on Byzantine, Persian, Turkic and Islamic forms without becoming a neutral blend. Mehmed's law code strengthened household government and addressed succession. Topkapı Palace graded access to the ruler, turning space into political order.

Expansion continued around the Black Sea, in the Balkans and in Anatolia. Caffa fell in 1475, and the Crimean khanate entered a vassal relationship that preserved its dynasty. Otranto in southern Italy was occupied briefly in 1480, showing that the frontier was maritime as well as Balkan. Mehmed's death in 1481 then triggered a struggle between Bayezid II and Cem. Cem's flight into Christian custody gave European powers a living instrument against his brother.

Bayezid's reign was less spectacular and no less revealing. Refugees expelled from Iberia, including Sephardic Jews, settled in Ottoman towns and contributed to trade, crafts and printing. Their reception did not create equality by faith or remove anti-Jewish prejudice. It joined refuge to imperial policy and economic opportunity.

The imperial hinge, 1512-1566

Selim I forced Bayezid II from the throne, defeated the Safavid ruler Shah Ismail at Chaldiran in 1514 and conquered the Mamluk sultanate in 1516-1517. Syria, Egypt and the Hijaz came under Ottoman sovereignty in rapid succession. The state now governed major Arab cities, Egyptian revenues and grain-producing districts, Red Sea approaches and pilgrimage routes to Mecca and Medina. The ruler of a Balkan-Anatolian empire had become the leading Sunni Muslim sovereign.

A later story describes the last Abbasid caliph at the Mamluk court formally handing the caliphate to Selim. No contemporary Ottoman or Mamluk account records such a ceremony. Ottoman rulers had used caliphal language before 1517, and their claims developed afterwards in several forms. The conquest mattered without the legend: the dynasty controlled Cairo, protected the holy cities through the sharifs of Mecca and assumed new responsibilities for pilgrimage and Arab provincial government.

Süleyman I inherited the enlarged state in 1520. He captured Belgrade in 1521 and Rhodes in 1522. At Mohács in 1526 his army defeated Hungary, whose king died in flight, opening a prolonged struggle over the kingdom. Ottoman forces reached Vienna in 1529 but failed to take it. In the east, Süleyman seized Baghdad in 1534 and fought repeated campaigns against the Safavids. The empire operated on connected fronts whose seasons, supplies and politics rarely aligned.

Maritime reach widened as well. Fleets based in Egypt and the Red Sea contested Portuguese power around Yemen and the western Indian Ocean without gaining uniform command. Algiers entered the Ottoman orbit through the Barbarossa brothers, Tripoli was taken in 1551 and Tunis

remained contested. Provincial government, regency, alliance, naval station and religious claim extended sovereignty in different ways.

The court displayed resources through mosques, law, ceremony and patronage. Süleyman's partnership with the architect Sinan produced complexes that combined worship with schools, kitchens and hospitals. Officials applied kanun, sultanic regulation, beside Islamic jurisprudence. European observers called him the Magnificent. Ottoman memory emphasised the Lawgiver. Prestige came from order as well as victory.

İbrahim Pasha rose from palace service to become grand vizier and was executed in 1536. Hürrem Sultan, originally enslaved, became Süleyman's legal wife and a major patron. Their son's succession followed struggles among princes involving execution and civil conflict. Household intimacy and imperial succession occupied the same rooms.

Below the court, most people farmed. Surveys recorded fields, households, crops, mills and dues because war and palace depended on agricultural surplus. A failed harvest, troop movement or disputed tax assignment mattered more to a village than an embassy. Towns contained guilds, warehouses, baths and houses of worship. Coffeeshouses spread during the century and worried officials because men gathered, exchanged news and criticised. Bans came and went. The cup survived.

Rebellion, regicide and recovery, 1566-1699

Süleyman died during the siege of Szigetvár in 1566. His successors inherited fixed expectations, expensive establishments and corporate bodies able to defend their place. Selim II's reign saw the conquest of Cyprus and the naval disaster at Lepanto in 1571. The fleet was rebuilt, but Mediterranean warfare increasingly produced fortified positions and negotiated zones rather than one final victor.

Long wars against the Habsburgs and Safavids coincided with inflation, currency trouble and armed disorder in Anatolia. The Celali rebellions around the turn of the seventeenth century involved dismissed soldiers, provincial leaders, peasants and officials in changing combinations.

Violence and flight emptied districts and disrupted production. The state suppressed some leaders, incorporated others and reassigned offices. Command of enough armed men could turn rebellion into a route towards government.

Dynastic politics changed too. Ahmed I died in 1617 without his brothers being killed, and succession passed to his brother Mustafa rather than directly to a son. Seniority reduced some succession wars while leaving princes confined in the palace. Osman II tried to curb Janissary power and was deposed and killed in 1622. Household troops now claimed a right to judge the ruler they served.

Women of the dynasty were central during minority reigns and unstable succession. Kösem Sultan acted as regent and patron, built alliances and died in a palace struggle in 1651. Her career was exceptional in degree, not proof that ordinary government had vanished. Viziers, jurists, palace officers, Janissaries and provincial actors all pressed claims. Ottoman politics had become more crowded.

The Köprülü family of grand viziers restored discipline in parts of administration and army from the 1650s. Crete was finally taken from Venice in 1669 after a war lasting more than two decades. The victory complicates a clean decline story and shows the cost of continued expansion.

The second siege of Vienna failed in 1683 after a relief army defeated the Ottoman forces. A wider war followed. The Holy League pushed the Ottomans from Hungary and other territories, and the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699 confirmed major losses. The state now had to preserve territory through diplomacy, fiscal reform and defensive war rather than assume that campaigning would enlarge the tax base. It remained formidable, but no longer set the European frontier alone.

Provincial power and remade finance, 1699-1839

The eighteenth century opened with experiments in war, diplomacy and consumption. After the Treaty of Passarowitz in 1718, court elites built gardens and pavilions, adapted foreign styles and sent an embassy to Paris. The period later called the Tulip Era became a symbol of pleasure detached from danger. That label can hide printing, translation, urban investment and diplomatic observation. The Patrona Halil rebellion of 1730 ended the political moment and deposed Ahmed III.

Russia became the most persistent strategic threat. The Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca in 1774 followed a damaging war and recognised Crimean independence from Ottoman rule, a step towards Russian annexation. Its clauses later supported expansive Russian claims concerning Orthodox Christians. The Black Sea, once heavily controlled by the Ottomans and their Crimean allies, entered a new balance of power.

There was no single provincial timetable. In the Balkans and Anatolia, lifetime tax farms tied the treasury to ayan with money and armed followers. In Egypt, military households continued to mediate rule beneath Ottoman governors. Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli developed local dynasties and forces while retaining varying links to the sultan. Arab provincial towns depended on scholars, merchants and families able to translate orders and credit. Increased provincial power could keep revenue and roads functioning, or turn an imperial office into a local possession.

The 1808 Deed of Alliance between Mahmud II and leading notables is sometimes compared with Magna Carta. The comparison travels badly. It was a crisis bargain among power holders, not a durable representative settlement. Mahmud later eliminated several rivals and sought more direct rule.

Selim III had attempted military and fiscal reform through the Nizam-i Cedid, a new-order army and dedicated revenues. Janissary and allied resistance helped overthrow him in 1807, and he was killed the following year. Mahmud II survived, attacked provincial powers where possible and

destroyed the Janissaries in 1826. The official phrase called the event auspicious. Janissaries and their associates experienced bombardment, execution, exile and confiscation. A new army became possible because an old political corporation had been crushed.

National revolt and foreign intervention accelerated. The Greek uprising began in 1821 amid massacres by several parties. European intervention helped secure independence. Muhammad Ali, the Ottoman governor of Egypt, built a powerful army and administration, invaded Syria and twice threatened the dynasty. The sultan needed Russian help, then a European coalition, to contain his own governor. By 1839 the centre had a stronger ambition to standardise rule and clear evidence that it could not realise that ambition alone.

Tanzimat, debt and competing sovereignties, 1839-1908

The Gülhane decree was proclaimed in 1839 after Mahmud II's death. It promised greater security, regular taxation and orderly military service. The reform era created ministries, commercial and criminal codes, mixed courts, new schools and the vilayet provincial system. Officials counted populations and property with growing ambition. Each measure sought to turn some negotiated uncertainty into a rule that could be recorded and enforced, but implementation still depended on local officials, money and acceptance.

The Crimean War of 1853-1856 placed Britain and France beside the Ottomans against Russia. It confirmed the empire's place inside the European state system and exposed medical, military and supply failures across the alliance. Ottoman foreign borrowing began during the war. Loans funded war and infrastructure while pledging future revenues. Default in 1875 and the debt administration established in 1881 placed specified income, including revenue from salt and tobacco, under an international creditor body. Creditors gained reliable collection over those streams, not command of every Ottoman tax.

The constitution of 1876 created a parliament. War with Russia in

1877-1878 then brought defeat, territorial loss and a large refugee movement. Abdülhamid II suspended parliament in 1878. His rule expanded schools, communications and the Hejaz Railway while relying on censorship, surveillance and palace control. He promoted loyalty to the Ottoman caliphate across the empire and in diplomacy beyond it. Modern means strengthened personal rule rather than replacing it.

Social change did not wait for the palace. Newspapers, schools, missionary institutions, merchant networks and new professions formed publics in several languages. Muslim, Armenian, Greek, Jewish, Arab, Bulgarian and other writers argued over reform, representation and belonging. Women founded journals and associations and sought education in particular cities. Workers struck in ports, mines and railways. Ottomanism competed with religious solidarity, local patriotism and national programmes. People could hold several attachments until institutions or violence forced a harder classification.

Armenian demands for reform grew amid insecurity, land disputes and unequal protection in eastern Anatolia. Revolutionary organisations formed, but most Armenians were civilians outside them. State forces and local actors killed large numbers of Armenians in 1894-1896. These massacres did not make the genocide of 1915 inevitable. They supplied precedents of collective suspicion, dispossession and impunity that later leaders chose to intensify.

Revolution, total war and dissolution, 1908-1922

In 1908 officers and activists connected to the Committee of Union and Progress forced restoration of the constitution. Elections and public celebration followed. A counterrevolutionary crisis in 1909 was defeated, and Abdülhamid II was deposed. Constitutional politics widened participation without settling who held sovereignty or how a multinational empire should distribute power.

Italy seized Ottoman Libya during war in 1911-1912. Balkan states then attacked, and by 1913 the Ottomans had lost nearly all European territory

beyond eastern Thrace. Muslims fled or were expelled from lost lands, adding to earlier refugee movements. Christians also faced killing and expulsion during the wars and competing state-building projects. Population removal had become a political instrument around the shrinking empire before the First World War.

A CUP-led coup in 1913 concentrated power. The government entered the war in 1914 beside Germany and Austria-Hungary. Enver Pasha's winter offensive at Sarıkamış ended in disaster. The Allied attack on the Dardanelles failed at Gallipoli in 1915, giving the Ottomans a major defensive victory. Campaigns extended through the Caucasus, Iraq, Sinai, Palestine, Arabia and the Balkans. Requisition, disease, blockade and transport failure killed civilians far from battle.

Within this emergency, the government destroyed the Armenians of the empire. Arrests of Armenian intellectuals in Constantinople on 24 April 1915 became an opening marker. Deportation orders spread beyond military zones. Men were killed; convoys were attacked, starved and driven towards desert camps; property was confiscated and redistributed. Abduction, forced conversion and assimilation also targeted women and children. Ottoman officials sometimes resisted or reduced the harm of orders, which demonstrates room for choice within implementation. The overall policy came from the ruling system and used its administrative reach.

Arab leaders and soldiers made different choices. Many remained in Ottoman service. Sharif Husayn of Mecca launched the Arab Revolt in 1916 with British support, but it did not represent every Arab subject. British forces advanced from Egypt and Iraq. Jerusalem fell in 1917 and Damascus in 1918. An armistice ended Ottoman fighting in October 1918.

Allied powers occupied Istanbul and planned partitions. Greek forces landed at Smyrna in 1919. Mustafa Kemal and other Ottoman officers organised resistance through Ankara, using personnel, records and military experience inherited from the state they opposed. Victory against Greece and diplomatic settlement displaced the sultan's government. The assembly in Ankara abolished the sultanate on 1 November 1922. Mehmed VI left

Istanbul soon afterwards.

The dynasty's sovereignty had ended, but imperial people and institutions were redistributed rather than erased. The Ankara government inherited much of the central bureaucracy and army while rejecting the Ottoman house. Former Arab provinces followed several paths through mandates, monarchies, republican projects and territorial contests. Balkan states had already absorbed lands and new minorities. Refugees rebuilt lives on property from which others had been removed. One empire ended through several wars and settlements, and no successor possessed an uncontested inheritance.

How we know

Ottoman evidence is abundant after the fifteenth century and thin near the beginning. Early chronicles were written generations after Osman to explain a dynasty whose success was already known. Their dreams, speeches and clean founding dates are later political literature, not eyewitness records. Coins, inscriptions, Byzantine texts and land grants offer firmer but incomplete checks.

The mature state produced tax surveys, court registers, decrees, payrolls, petitions, diplomatic papers and foundation deeds. They reveal administration in unusual detail while seeing society through offices built to classify, judge and extract. A court register records those who reached court. A tax survey describes categories useful to collection. Neither supplies an average life for the whole empire. Travel writing adds observation and performance together; buildings, objects, cemeteries and archaeology recover other lives.

The late empire generated censuses, newspapers, memoirs, photographs and foreign archives. Population totals still vary because borders, categories, evasion and wartime loss changed the denominator. Evidence for the Armenian genocide includes Ottoman orders and records, survivor testimony, diplomatic and missionary reports, photographs, trials and demographic reconstruction. Sources differ over totals and local sequences.

They converge on state-directed deportation and mass destruction.

What People Get Wrong

“The empire was founded in 1299”

A precise founding year is attractive because it turns a murky frontier into a national anniversary. Later Ottoman chronicles supplied dynastic stories, and modern timelines needed a first square. The year 1299 became conventional, often linked to Osman's supposed declaration of independence from Seljuk authority.

The surviving evidence does not record a constitutional moment in that year. Osman's following emerged over time from frontier war, alliance, settlement and patronage. Coins and chronicles clarify parts of the sequence without giving the polity one certified birthday. Bursa in 1326, the European foothold in the 1350s and later institutional changes were at least as important to making an empire.

This correction matters because a founding date encourages the wrong causal model. It makes the mature Ottoman state appear in miniature at the start and turns later expansion into fulfilment. The early coalition had no guaranteed future, and its institutions were built after success created new problems. Origins explain possibilities, not destiny. They also show how states acquire pedigree after power: later institutions project their own coherence backwards and turn an uncertain coalition into a founding design.

“The caliphate was handed to Selim in 1517”

The familiar story is beautifully portable. After conquering Egypt, Selim I receives the caliphate from the last Abbasid caliph in a formal ceremony, so one universal office passes from Cairo to Istanbul and remains there until 1924. Timelines gain a clean date, and later Ottoman authority gains an ancient chain of title.

No contemporary Ottoman or Mamluk account of the conquest records that transfer. The ceremony belongs to a later tradition. Ottoman rulers had

already used caliphal language, while the meaning and audience of their claims changed over time. After 1517 the dynasty did possess something more concrete: control of Egypt, the strongest Sunni imperial position of its day, responsibility for the pilgrimage routes and a relationship to Mecca and Medina through the sharifs. In the nineteenth century, caliphal legitimacy became more prominent in Ottoman domestic politics and international diplomacy.

The correction matters because legitimacy is rarely an object that one person can hand over. It is assembled from conquest, protection, law, ceremony, institutions and recognition by several audiences. The legend turns a long political construction into one transaction and hides disagreement over what a caliph was entitled to command. Selim's victory transformed Ottoman power without requiring an invented investiture to make it important.

“The millet system created modern tolerance”

A tidy picture describes Muslims, Orthodox Christians, Armenians and Jews as separate nations, each governed by its religious head under a benevolent sultan from 1453 onwards. It offers an appealing contrast with Europe's wars of religion and has become one of the empire's most reusable legends.

Ottoman governments did recognise religious communities and their institutions, but the arrangements developed unevenly. The term millet acquired more formal communal and political meanings in later centuries. Patriarchs and other leaders bargained with the state and with rivals inside their own communities. Local practice often mattered more than an empire-wide chart.

The system preserved worship and corporate life for many subjects across long periods. It also classified non-Muslims beneath Muslim sovereignty, imposed distinctive burdens and made communal identity useful to government. Protection could coexist with humiliation, opportunity with insecurity. Calling this tolerance imports a modern virtue and erases

hierarchy. Calling it persecution alone erases the practical spaces in which communities endured. The useful category is negotiated inequality. It directs attention inside each community as well as between faiths: an officially recognised patriarch, bishop or chief rabbi could protect communal interests while strengthening authority over internal rivals.

“The harem was an idle prison”

European art and travel writing turned the imperial harem into a sexual spectacle: secluded women waiting for the sultan while politics happened outside. The fantasy was persuasive because access was restricted, visitors filled gaps with invention and female power could be dismissed as intrigue.

The harem was the dynasty's domestic institution. It organised reproduction, education, service, patronage and access to the ruler. Many women within it were enslaved and lacked control over their arrival. Rank still created large differences. A sultan's mother could control wealth, appointments and information; a junior servant could remain vulnerable and anonymous. Hürrem, Nurbanu, Safiye and Kösem exercised political influence through distinct offices and family positions rather than through one secret female government.

The correction matters beyond palace gossip. Households were political structures across the empire. Marriage, motherhood, service and patronage connected intimate life to appointment and succession. Treating the harem as decoration removes women from the explanation and conceals how dynastic sovereignty reproduced itself. It also biases the archive: formal decrees record male office, while correspondence, endowments and household appointments reveal power moving through other channels.

“Lepanto and Vienna began an uninterrupted decline”

Lepanto in 1571 and Vienna in 1683 are dramatic European victories with clear dates, famous coalitions and satisfying maps. Each has been used as the moment Ottoman expansion broke and decay began. The trouble is that they are separated by more than a century and followed by different outcomes.

After Lepanto the Ottomans rebuilt a fleet and retained Cyprus. After Vienna they fought a wider war that ended in major losses at Karlowitz. The second rupture was more serious, yet the empire continued for over two centuries, recovering some territory, remaking finance and conducting effective war and diplomacy. Decline existed where measured capacity deteriorated. It was never one process moving at one speed.

The myth survives because later victory makes earlier events look prophetic. It also treats the empire as healthy only while conquering. The correction matters because political systems can lose relative power while adapting internally, and they can survive long after losing initiative. A slope drawn backwards from 1922 explains less than the mechanisms that repeatedly interrupted it. Periods of military loss, fiscal recovery, provincial autonomy and administrative consolidation must be measured separately before any general verdict earns its name.

“Reform failed because the Ottomans rejected modernity”

This story places a modern Europe opposite a traditional empire whose religion, corruption or complacency prevented change. It is easy to tell because Ottoman reformers themselves complained about backwardness and borrowed foreign techniques.

The empire did reform. It built new armies, ministries, schools, laws, councils, communications and transport. Officials translated European models, argued over them and altered them for Ottoman purposes.

Resistance was often rational from the position of those losing income, status or protection. A new army threatened Janissaries. Direct taxation threatened intermediaries. Equal citizenship unsettled Muslim privilege and communal leadership. Centralisation disturbed provinces that had negotiated their obligations.

Many reforms produced mixed results because the state lacked money, faced war or encountered stronger rivals. Others worked and increased its reach. The mistake is to treat persistence as failure and imitation as success. Reform is a contest over burdens and authority, not an examination in cultural willingness. Ottoman modernisation could increase administrative competence while deepening coercion. Judge each reform by what it changed in practice, which resources supported it, whose resistance it encountered and whether its promised beneficiaries could enforce the new rule.

“The empire became Turkey overnight”

A map that changes colour from Ottoman to Turkish hides a violent sequence. The Ottoman government was defeated in 1918, Istanbul was occupied, rival authorities claimed legitimacy, and war continued. The Ankara assembly abolished the sultanate in 1922. The republic followed in 1923, and the caliphate ended in 1924.

Turkey inherited central territories, officers, records, laws, debts, populations and institutions. It also rejected the dynasty and pursued a new national project. Former Arab provinces passed through mandates and new states. Balkan successor states had already taken lands and people. Armenians, Greeks, Muslims and others had been killed, expelled, exchanged or displaced. No successor received the whole empire, and no people received an uncontested settlement.

The myth survives because nation-state maps prefer clean succession. The correction matters because imperial collapse distributes assets and wounds unevenly. What looks like replacement from a distance is fragmentation on the ground. Modern borders did not erase the imperial past. They

reorganised who could claim it. Questions about continuity therefore have more than one answer: a bureaucracy, a legal rule, a refugee family and a national memory may each carry a different fragment.

Use It

Ask what converts victory into rule

A conquest is an event. Rule is a repeated service and extraction problem. When studying any expanding power, separate the ability to defeat an army from the ability to collect revenue, settle disputes, move supplies and make local elites comply next year. The Ottomans often preserved institutions they could use, recruited former opponents and offered rank within the dynasty's order. That lowered the cost of expansion.

The lens also reveals the price. Bargaining with a local strongman may stabilise a province while exposing villagers to his demands. Recognising a communal leader may make taxation efficient while strengthening his control over dissenters. Durable rule can rest on transferring coercion rather than reducing it. Ask who performs the work after the conqueror leaves and what that intermediary receives. Then ask what happens if the bargain fails: whether the centre can replace that actor, whether another local coalition is available and who bears the transition cost.

Follow what has to move

A map hides the work. Ottoman rule required orders, petitions, coin, grain, soldiers, animals, powder, intelligence and pilgrims to cross particular roads and seas at particular times. A fortress without pay or a city without food could become a political crisis before any frontier changed. The first question about a distant policy is therefore logistical: what must arrive, by which route, carried by whom and in which season?

This lens improves analysis of any large institution. Trace the chain from decision to last handoff, including the carrier's incentives and the points where delay, translation or shortage can alter the result. Do not treat

movement as neutral capacity. The devshirme moved children by coercion. Requisition moved food away from households. Deportation turned transport and registration into instruments of destruction. A system's routes reveal whose needs are supplied, whose labour is taken and which failures the centre can see before the people affected can answer.

Map the intermediaries

Large systems work through people missing from the formal diagram. Ottoman orders passed through governors, judges, guilds, village elders, clergy, tax farmers, tribal leaders and household networks. They translated, delayed, intensified or softened policy. Calling every deviation corruption misses their structural role.

Draw two maps. The first shows formal authority. The second shows who holds information, credit, local trust, transport, armed followers and access. The gap predicts where policy will bend. Centralisation can replace an abusive intermediary, but it can also destroy local knowledge before the centre can supply another working channel. Test a policy where an abstract order becomes a tax, judgement, conscription notice or use of force. That last handoff reveals which institution governs in practice and who can contest it. When reform removes an intermediary, follow what replaces the information, enforcement and credit that person supplied. A formal chain may shorten while the practical chain becomes less reliable, forcing officials to bargain again under a different name. Test centralisation where the final order is carried out, not by the tidiness of its chart.

Separate pluralism from equality

The presence of several religions, languages or legal practices does not establish equal membership. Ottoman subjects could maintain churches, synagogues, schools, endowments and courts while remaining differently taxed and ranked. Shared markets and neighbourhoods could coexist with restrictions and periodic violence.

Use four tests. Who can hold office? Who pays which burden? Which institution hears a dispute? What happens when security is invoked? The

last test is the hardest. A plural order may look stable in ordinary years because difference has recognised channels. Crisis reveals whether protection is a right or a revocable bargain. Avoid the opposite error as well: legal inequality does not make every daily interaction hostile. Institutions and lived relationships need separate evidence. A mixed neighbourhood can display cooperation without disproving hierarchy, while a discriminatory rule can matter even when neighbours ignore it on one occasion.

Treat reform as redistribution

Every reform reallocates something: money, information, risk, status or command. Tanzimat promises can be read as ideals, but their operation appears in the burdens they moved. Direct taxation weakened tax farmers. Conscription reached households. New courts competed with older jurisdictions. Provincial councils admitted some local voices while making local society easier to count.

This lens blocks two lazy conclusions. Resistance does not prove ignorance, since threatened groups may understand the reform perfectly. Adoption does not prove liberation, since a census, railway or telegraph can expand public service and coercive reach together. Evaluate reform through recipients and losers, implementation capacity, unintended effects and reversibility. Administrative modernity is a set of powers. Its moral result depends on how they are used. The cleanest evaluation compares the stated promise, the mechanism funded, the behaviour of local implementers and the distribution of gains and coercion after implementation.

Separate pressure from choice

Defeat removes territory and revenue. Refugee movements alter politics. Creditors constrain budgets. Armed organisations distrust compromise. Officials may begin classifying whole populations by suspected loyalty. These pressures make some policies easier to propose and other compromises harder to sustain. They do not select one outcome by themselves.

Start by naming the inherited constraint. The Ottoman end requires both

levels of explanation. Great-power rivalry, war, fiscal weakness, nationalism and territorial contraction shaped the field in which CUP leaders acted. The decision to deport and destroy Armenian civilians still required political purpose, orders and implementation. Some officials resisted, which confirms that the emergency did not erase agency. Use the same distinction elsewhere: identify conditions a decision-maker inherited, then identify what remained under control. Context explains why choices were made under danger. It does not turn a chosen atrocity into weather.

The limits

The Ottoman Empire cannot supply one portable formula for governing diversity or surviving decline. Its institutions belonged to Islamic law, dynastic household politics, agrarian taxation and communications far slower than those of a modern state. A kadi court is not a present tribunal with another name. The devshirme is not a graduate recruitment scheme with rougher manners. Comparisons that erase coercion or historical setting produce comfort rather than understanding.

The evidence is also unequal. Istanbul and state offices generated more records than remote villages. Literate property holders appear more often than labourers, enslaved people and refugees. A court register records a woman who litigated, not one who lacked money or permission to reach court. Success stories survive because successful people acquired biographers. The book can identify the bias but cannot recover every missing life.

Finally, flexibility should not become praise. Ottoman adaptation prolonged rule and sometimes protected communities from chaos. It also prolonged extraction, preserved hierarchy and increased the state's ability to punish. Endurance is an outcome to explain, not a virtue to award. A useful comparison must therefore keep separate the state's survival, an elite's security, a community's continuity and an ordinary household's welfare.

The one thing to keep

Keep the operating chain in view. The Ottoman Empire was never the uniform block shown by one colour on a map. It existed when the dynasty could move claims, people, money and supplies through households, routes and intermediaries, then receive taxes, service and recognised obedience in return. The chain changed by province and century. Its repair, rather than one fixed constitution, explains much of the six-century endurance.

That model also keeps judgement clear. A local bargain might preserve worship and property while confirming inequality. A tax reform might restrain an intermediary while enlarging the centre's reach. A railway might carry pilgrims, troops or deportees. The same administrative capacity can support different political purposes, so endurance, efficiency and justice must never be treated as synonyms.

What should now change is how you read any empire. Ask what has to move, who carries it, what gives that person authority and who bears the cost when the chain is repaired. Then separate the pressure on a government from the choices its leaders still control. The Ottomans survived by repeatedly reorganising unequal membership. Their final rulers did not merely fail to negotiate one more settlement. Under war, they used a stronger state to destroy people it had governed. Capacity explains reach. Politics and agency explain direction.

Terms

Ayan

Provincial notable, prominent in the eighteenth century. Ayan might collect taxes, supply troops, mediate disputes and command armed followers, linking imperial government to local power while gaining leverage over both. Their authority was never uniform across provinces or decades.

Caliphate

The claim to leadership of the Muslim community after Muhammad. Ottoman sultans used caliphal language unevenly, then emphasised it more strongly in nineteenth-century politics and diplomacy. The institution was abolished in 1924.

Capitulations

Treaties granting foreign merchants and subjects specified commercial, residence and legal privileges. Initially negotiated instruments, they became sources of unequal foreign leverage as European power and consular protection expanded.

Cizye

A poll tax generally imposed on adult non-Muslim men under Islamic rule, subject to exemptions and changing collection. It marked protected status and legal inequality at the same time.

Committee of Union and Progress

The political organisation commonly associated with the Young Turks. It helped restore the constitution in 1908, dominated government after 1913 and directed the wartime system that carried out the Armenian genocide.

Devshirme

The periodic coerced levy of selected Christian boys for conversion, training and imperial service. Some became Janissaries or senior officials. Exceptional advancement did not make family removal voluntary.

Divan

The imperial council in which senior officials handled petitions, finance, appointments, law and policy. The grand vizier increasingly presided as sultans withdrew from direct attendance.

Enderun

The inner palace school and service structure that trained selected pages for high office. It joined education, discipline and household loyalty in the production of imperial administrators.

Ghazi

A fighter for Islam or frontier warrior. Ottoman rulers used ghazi prestige, yet early frontier politics also included Christian allies, converts and practical coalitions that the term alone cannot explain.

Harem

The protected domestic section of a household, especially the imperial household. It organised dynastic reproduction, education, service and patronage, and was a site of political influence as well as confinement.

Iltizam

A tax-farming arrangement in which a contractor paid for the right to collect specified revenue. It supplied the treasury with cash while giving collectors incentives and local influence.

Janissaries

Salaried infantry tied to the sultan's household, initially recruited largely through the devshirme. They became soldiers, urban economic actors and political power holders before Mahmud II destroyed the corps in 1826.

Kadi

An Islamic judge appointed by the state. Kadis heard disputes, registered contracts and property, recorded orders and performed administrative duties. Their registers are major sources for Ottoman social history.

Kanun

Sultanic regulation dealing with taxation, administration, land and punishment. Kanun operated beside Islamic jurisprudence and allowed rulers to standardise matters not settled by one direct legal rule.

Kizilbash

A label applied to followers of the Safavid religious-political movement and to related groups in Anatolia. Ottoman authorities treated them as a security and confessional threat, sometimes with severe repression.

Kul

A legally dependent servant of the sultan, often trained within his household for military or administrative service. Kul status could carry wealth and authority while remaining rooted in enslavement and dynastic dependence.

Malikane

A lifetime tax farm introduced in 1695. It exchanged longer tenure and larger advance payments for revenue, linking the treasury to wealthy investors and strengthening provincial networks.

Millet

A religious community or nation in later Ottoman usage. The word should not be projected backwards as a complete, fixed system designed in 1453; communal arrangements developed unevenly over centuries.

Nizam-i Cedid

The New Order reforms of Selim III, especially a European-style army and dedicated revenues. Opposition from Janissaries and allied interests helped overthrow the sultan in 1807.

Ottomanism

A nineteenth-century project seeking common political membership across religious and ethnic differences. It supported constitutional and equality claims but competed with confessional privilege and national programmes.

Porte

A European diplomatic term for the Ottoman central government, derived from the gate associated with the grand vizier's offices. It could refer to the administration rather than the person of the sultan.

Reaya

The tax-paying subjects or productive population governed by the dynasty, a category contrasted in many contexts with military and office-holding elites. Its boundaries and usage changed, and it never described one equal social class. The term marked a fiscal relation more than a single identity.

Rumelia

The Ottoman name for its European lands. Rumelia was central to early expansion, military recruitment and revenue, not a peripheral possession added after an Anatolian state was complete.

Sipahi

A cavalryman, often supported through assigned tax revenue under the timar system. Sipahis were provincial soldiers and office holders, not straightforward equivalents of western European feudal knights.

Tanzimat

The reform era conventionally dated from 1839 to 1876. It brought new laws, ministries, schools, courts and provincial structures while combining equality claims with stronger central administration.

Timar

A conditional assignment of tax revenue, commonly linked to cavalry service. The holder usually did not own the land or peasants, and the system never covered every Ottoman territory or revenue.

Ulema

Learned specialists in Islamic law and religion, including judges, teachers and senior jurists. They supplied legal authority, staffed institutions and could support or resist rulers and reforms.

Vakif

A charitable or pious endowment funded by dedicated property or revenue. Vakifs maintained mosques, schools, fountains, bridges, hospitals and family benefits while shaping property and public services.

Vilayet

A large province under the administrative system formalised in the nineteenth century. Vilayets reflected the state's effort to standardise governors, councils, districts, taxation and information.

Go Deeper

Caroline Finkel, *Osman's Dream: The Story of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1923*

This is the inviting full narrative. Finkel keeps rulers, wars, diplomacy and institutional change moving across the whole span without turning the book into a list of sultans. Begin here when the chronology still feels crowded. Its scale means social and regional variation must sometimes move quickly, so pair it with a more specialised study. Watch how the narrative changes when the court leaves Istanbul: Finkel is strongest at showing that succession crises, diplomatic choices and provincial wars belong to one imperial sequence rather than separate national stories. Keep a map beside you, since the centre of action moves constantly.

Evliya Çelebi, *An Ottoman Traveller*, translated by Robert Dankoff and Sooyong Kim

These selections from the seventeenth-century *Book of Travels* offer an Ottoman voice moving through cities, roads, courts and marvels. Evliya is observant, learned, comic and fond of enlargement. Read him for categories, encounters and texture rather than as a neutral surveyor. The translators make a vast work approachable without pretending that a selection represents it whole. Compare his description of a place with what he says about neighbouring peoples and his own status. Exaggeration is part of the evidence because it reveals what an educated Ottoman traveller expected to amuse, impress or rank. Dankoff's notes help separate formula, observation and performance.

Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State*

Read this for the difficult beginning. Kafadar dismantles origin stories that make the early Ottomans purely tribal, purely holy warriors or a mature state in waiting. It is concise but historiographically demanding. The reward is a sharper understanding of how later identities were projected backwards onto a frontier where loyalties remained multiple and political outcomes open. Read the introduction slowly, then test each explanation against the question it answers. Kafadar's central service is to preserve ambiguity without turning the origin into fog. It is a model of responsible uncertainty.

Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, second edition

Quataert is the best corrective to the long decline tale. He gives sustained attention to labour, gender, minorities, economy and provincial society while keeping the late imperial sequence clear. The book begins after much of the expansion covered here, which is its strength: three centuries too often treated as aftermath become a history with their own mechanisms. Use it to check any sentence containing decline, westernisation or minority. Quataert repeatedly asks whose experience a large label describes and which economic or social change sits beneath it. The prose is accessible, though the compressed chronology rewards rereading. Its bibliography also opens routes into regional and thematic studies beyond this single hour.

Notes and Sources

Scope and chronology

The book follows the Ottoman dynasty from a frontier coalition around 1300 to abolition of the sultanate in 1922. The conventional dates 1299 and 1922 do different kinds of work: the first is a retrospective marker without a documented founding act, while the second is a formal constitutional ending. The armistice of 1918, republic of 1923 and abolition of the caliphate in 1924 remain separate events.

Caroline Finkel and Douglas Howard provide the main chronological frame. Halil İnalcık remains valuable for classical institutions, but later scholarship has revised origin, decline and provincial models. Dates for battles, reigns and treaties were checked across these syntheses. No disputed army, city or population total is required by the narrative.

Origins and frontier formation

Cemal Kafadar supports the treatment of the early Ottoman polity as a mixed and open frontier formation rather than a mature state or a coalition explained by one motive. The early chronicles were written after the dynasty's success and shaped beginnings through later claims. The discussion of Gallipoli keeps the 1354 earthquake as one enabling event, not a complete cause of expansion into Europe. Kosovo in 1389 is separated from later national memory, and Ankara in 1402 is used to expose the contingency of Ottoman survival.

Household, kul service and succession

Leslie Peirce, İnalcık and Howard support the account of the imperial household, harem, dynastic marriage, succession and palace politics. Devshirme is described as selective coerced recruitment whose geographical reach and frequency changed. High office for some recruits does not make removal voluntary or represent the wider experience of Ottoman slavery.

Kul is retained as a distinct legal and political category. Elite household service differed from agricultural, domestic and sexual exploitation without ceasing to rest on unfreedom. Fratricide, provincial princely government, confinement and seniority are presented as changing responses to succession risk rather than one continuous rule.

Routes, provinces and the three-continent claim

Suraiya Faroqhi, Jane Hathaway, Karen Barkey, Giancarlo Casale and the military histories of Gábor Ágoston and Virginia Aksan support the account of rule through routes and differentiated provinces. Straits, rivers, coasts, caravan roads and pilgrimage routes are mechanisms of movement, not evidence of uniform territorial control. Egypt, the Crimean khanate, Balkan frontiers and the North African regencies had different relations to Istanbul.

Casale's *The Ottoman Age of Exploration* supports the bounded treatment of Red Sea and western Indian Ocean strategy after the conquest of Egypt.

Ottoman action there included fleets, governors, diplomacy and religious claims, but it did not amount to continuous command of the whole Indian Ocean. Algiers, Tripoli and Tunis are not treated as standard provinces under one administrative template.

Kadi registers establish transactions and litigation by recorded court users. They do not measure all women, rural subjects, poorer non-litigants or the empire as a whole. The text therefore keeps each claim at the level of legal capacity and documented practice rather than universal experience.

War, revenue and supply

Ágoston, Aksan, İnalcık, Howard and Quataert support the military-fiscal account. Timar is defined as a conditional assignment of revenue, not ownership of peasants or an exact equivalent of a western European fief. Its importance varied by territory and period. İltizam and malikane are kept distinct, and their fiscal advantages do not erase the risks borne by taxpayers.

The account of artillery rejects a single-weapon explanation of 1453. Guns mattered beside blockade, engineering, manpower, ships and supply. Lepanto is treated as a severe human and material loss followed by rapid shipbuilding and continued Ottoman possession of Cyprus. This supports neither dismissal of the battle nor a claim that Ottoman naval power ended in 1571.

Campaign logistics are described through standard requirements rather than invented scenes or exact totals. Grain, animals, carts, labour, powder, pay and contractors varied by front and season. No apparently factual composite household or soldier is used.

Caliphate and imperial legitimacy

Giancarlo Casale's article on the Ottoman caliphate and Hüseyin Yılmaz's study of Ottoman political thought support the rejection of a formal 1517 transfer ceremony as contemporary fact. No Ottoman or Mamluk source written at the time records the last Abbasid caliph handing one universal office to Selim I. Ottoman rulers had used caliphal language before the conquest, and sixteenth-century claims developed in several forms. Control of Egypt, the holy cities and pilgrimage routes still transformed Ottoman standing.

Selim Deringil and M. Şükrü Hanioglu support the stronger use of caliphal legitimacy under Abdülhamid II and in late imperial diplomacy. The text does not imply that every Muslim recognised one unchanged Ottoman claim from 1517 to 1924.

Religion, community, gender and slavery

Barkey, Bruce Masters, Faroqhi and Peirce support the distinction between communal endurance, legal hierarchy and daily interaction. Benjamin Braude's critique, as developed in later scholarship, underlies the rejection of a complete millet system designed by Mehmed II. Recognised leaders and communal jurisdictions developed unevenly, while nineteenth-century institutions gave millet more formal political meaning.

The cizye discussion states a general legal pattern and leaves room for exemptions, collection changes and local practice. Wealth, office, gender and locality could alter a person's leverage without abolishing confessional hierarchy. The reception of Sephardic refugees is presented as refuge, policy and opportunity, not proof of timeless tolerance.

Ehud Toledano, Faroqhi and Peirce inform the treatment of slavery. The range from elite household service to domestic, sexual, agricultural and maritime exploitation is necessary because powerful former slaves are unusually visible. Their careers are not representative evidence for the condition as a whole.

Transformation, reform and debt

Baki Tezcan supplies a major challenge to the post-Süleyman decline model. The book does not treat his constitutional interpretation as settled. It uses the wider scholarly revision to separate territorial loss, relative military weakness, political participation, fiscal change and social transformation. Vienna in 1683 and Karlowitz in 1699 remain structural defeats.

Quataert, Aksan, Howard and Hathaway support the treatment of provincial households and differentiated regional change. The 1808 Deed of Alliance is not presented as an Ottoman Magna Carta. The analogy overstates its representative basis and continuity.

Hanioğlu, Quataert and Deringil support the late imperial sequence. Tanzimat promises are paraphrased rather than quoted and separated from implementation. The Ottoman Public Debt Administration controlled assigned revenues after default; it did not govern every Ottoman tax. Publication date, observation period and institutional scope are not conflated.

Nationalism, mass violence and genocide

National movements are treated as political constructions using prior languages, religions and local attachments, not as identities invented from nothing or nations waiting unchanged for release. Independence and state-building created refugees and minorities as well as sovereign majorities. Claims about particular communities are bounded by place and period.

Ronald Grigor Suny, Taner Akçam, Eugene Rogan and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum support the account of the Armenian genocide. The museum's overview, last edited 7 November 2024 and rechecked on 2 September 2026, states that about 1.5 million Armenians lived in the empire in 1915 and estimates that at least 664,000 and possibly as many as 1.2 million were killed. Its in-depth article documents deportation beyond combat zones, central direction, mass shootings, lethal convoys and camps, abduction, forced conversion, and the confiscation and redistribution

of Armenian property. The body does not make one disputed total carry the classification or causal account.

The text separates setting, capacity and agency. Russian invasion, military fear, territorial loss, refugees and Armenian political organisations belong to the wartime context. Deportation from provinces far from combat, killing of men, lethal convoys and camps, property seizure, abduction and central coordination establish a policy directed against a civilian population. Some official resistance shows choices within implementation. It does not remove state and party direction.

The manuscript does not claim that centralisation, Ottomanism or Tanzimat reform caused genocide. Stronger administrative reach affected what leaders could implement. CUP purpose, demographic nationalism, wartime security policy and specific decisions explain the direction in which that capacity was used. This distinction is the main protection against teleology.

Evidence limits and provenance

Ottoman archives survive on a scale that can create false confidence. Orders show intended commands, petitions show claims addressed to authority, tax registers show categories useful to collection and court records show disputes that reached record. Early chronicles have the opposite problem: they were composed after the dynasty's rise and gave beginnings a later coherence.

The strongest unresolved limitation is representativeness. Six centuries and three continents cannot receive equal regional depth in one hour, and written sources privilege the capital, institutions, property holders and literate actors. The manuscript counters this through provincial divergence, logistics, ordinary-life evidence and explicit limits, but no single model can reproduce every local Ottoman experience.

Every named anecdote or episode in the body is documented in the cited literature. No invented dialogue, private thought, composite person, weather or unlabelled hypothetical scene is used. Numerical comparisons with incompatible definitions or vintages were removed. Source publication

dates, historical reference periods and modern data vintages are kept separate.

Bibliography

Primary and translated evidence

Evliya Çelebi. *An Ottoman Traveller: Selections from the Book of Travels of Evliya Çelebi*. Translation and commentary by Robert Dankoff and Sooyong Kim. London: Eland, 2010.

Modern works

Ágoston, Gábor. *The Last Muslim Conquest: The Ottoman Empire and Its Wars in Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2021.

Akçam, Taner. *The Young Turks' Crime Against Humanity: The Armenian Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing in the Ottoman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Aksan, Virginia H. *Ottoman Wars 1700-1870: An Empire Besieged*. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007.

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

Braude, Benjamin, ed. *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Abridged Edition, with a New Introduction*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2014.

Casale, Giancarlo. *The Ottoman Age of Exploration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Casale, Giancarlo. "Tordesillas and the Ottoman Caliphate: Early Modern Frontiers and the Renaissance of an Ancient Islamic Institution." *Journal of Early Modern History* 19, no. 6 (2015): 485-511.

Deringil, Selim. *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909*. London: I.B. Tauris, 1998.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. *Subjects of the Sultan: Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2000.

Finkel, Caroline. *Osman's Dream: The Story of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1923*. London: John Murray, 2005.

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü. *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Hathaway, Jane. *The Arab Lands under Ottoman Rule, 1516-1800*. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2008.

Howard, Douglas A. *A History of the Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

İnalcık, Halil. *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age, 1300-1600*. Translated by Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973.

Kafadar, Cemal. *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Masters, Bruce. *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Arab World: The Roots of Sectarianism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

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

Quataert, Donald. *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Rogan, Eugene. *The Fall of the Ottomans: The Great War in the Middle East, 1914-1920*. London: Allen Lane, 2015.

Suny, Ronald Grigor. *They Can Live in the Desert but Nowhere Else: A History of the Armenian Genocide*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.

Tezcan, Baki. *The Second Ottoman Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World*. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 2010.

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

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. *Holocaust Encyclopedia* articles: “The Armenian Genocide, 1915-1916: In Depth” and “The Armenian Genocide, 1915-1916: Overview.” The latter was last edited 7 November 2024. Both accessed 2 September 2026.

Yılmaz, Hüseyin. *Caliphate Redefined: The Mystical Turn in Ottoman Political Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018.