CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-03442-6 - Empire and Power in the Reign of Suleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World
Kaya Sahin
Excerpt
More information

Introduction

Revisiting Celalzade Mustafa

On a torrid August day in 2009, I visited Celalzade Mustafa's final resting place in Istanbul's Eyüp district, in a neighborhood called Nişanca. The chancellor (*nişancı*) is buried in the cemetery adjoining the small mosque built for him by Sinan, the chief imperial architect. His brother Salih, a teacher, judge, and religious scholar, is buried nearby, but the sepulchers of poets who received plots from this patron of poetry have disappeared. The mosque, adorned with glazed tiles, has changed significantly since the mid-sixteenth century. It was damaged in a fire in 1729 and was rebuilt following a more devastating fire in 1780.[1] The mansion where Mustafa composed his works, welcomed fellow literati, and provided advice to young and aspiring secretaries is long gone, probably destroyed in the fire of 1780, if not before. The bathhouse and dervish lodge he had commissioned do not survive either. After reaching one of the highest administrative positions of the empire and enjoying the unanimous respect of his fellow administrators and literati, Mustafa now sleeps in a modest working-class neighborhood, away from the bustling avenues, familiar landmarks, and popular locales of imperial and republican Istanbul.

Mustafa (ca. 1490–1567) entered the Ottoman scribal service in 1516, at a time when an embryonic corps of secretaries was about to expand

[1] Tarkan Okçuoğlu, "Nişancı Mustafa Paşa Camii," *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 6, 86–87; Suphi Saatçi, "Observations on Sinan's Mosques and Masjids in Eyüp," in *Eyüp Sultan Symposia I-VIII: Selected Articles* (Istanbul: The Municipality of Eyüp, 2005), 135–36.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-03442-6 - Empire and Power in the Reign of Suleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World
Kaya Sahin
Excerpt
More information

considerably. He was initially taken on as a secretary of the imperial council (*divan katibi*). He became chief secretary (*re'isülküttab*) in 1525 and chancellor in 1534, a position he held until his retirement in 1557 and then briefly in 1566–67. He devoted the last decade of his life to his writing and produced, most notably, two major works on the reigns of Selim (r. 1512–20) and Süleyman (r. 1520–66)[2] and a treatise on politics and morals.[3] Thanks to a stellar bureaucratic career and widely respected, influential works, Mustafa was recognized by his contemporaries as well as by future generations as the ideal Ottoman litterateur who combined service to the dynasty, defense of the empire, and literary prowess under a single mantle.[4] Beyond these lauds, the function of Mustafa's bureaucratic career and literary production is better understood within the global dynamics of the sixteenth century. Mustafa came of age in a time characterized, for the Ottomans as well as the inhabitants of the entire Eurasian continent, by sudden and radical changes in political organization as well as cultural and religious identity. The end result was the creation of new empires that have been characterized by Sanjay Subrahmanyam:

> (1) as states with an extensive geographical spread, embracing more than one cultural domain and ecozone; (2) as states powered by an ideological motor that claimed extensive, at times even universal, forms of dominance, rather than the mere control of a compact domain; (3) as states where

[2] The versions used throughout the book are the following: *Geschichte Sultan Süleymān Ḳānūnīs von 1520 bis 1557, oder, Ṭabaḳāt ül-Memālik ve Derecāt ül-Mesālik / von Celālzāde Muṣṭafā genannt Ḳoca Nişāncı*, ed. Petra Kappert (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1981) (hereafter *Tabakat*); *Tārīḫ-i Sulṭān Selīm*, ms. British Museum Add. 7848 (hereafter *Selim-name*). For *Tabakat*, page numbers followed by the letters a or b refer to the original manuscript, whereas numbers without letters refer to Petra Kappert's critical introduction.

[3] *Mevāhibu'l-ḫallāḳ fi merātibi'l-aḫlāḳ*, ms. SK, Fatih 3521 (hereafter *Mevahib*).

[4] Abdülkadir Karahan, *Fuzûlî'nin Mektupları* (Istanbul: İbrahim Horoz, 1948), 4–7, 31–38; Cornell H. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âli (1541–1600)* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986), 30–31; Âşık Çelebi, *Meşā'irü'ş-şu'arā*, ed. G.M. Meredith-Owens (London: Luzac, 1971), 135a, 228b; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, "Onaltıncı Asır Ortalarında Yaşamış Olan İki Büyük Şahsiyet: Tosyalı Celâl zâde Mustafa ve Salih Çelebiler," *Belleten* 22, no. 87 (1958): 400–04; G.M. Meredith-Owens, "Traces of a Lost Autobiographical Work by a Courtier of Selim II," *BSOAS* 23, no. 3 (1960): 459; Christine Woodhead, "After Celalzade: the Ottoman Nişancı c.1560–1700," in *Studies in Islamic Law: A Festschrift for Colin Imber*, ed. Andreas Christmann and Robert Gleave (Oxford: Oxford University Press and Manchester University Press, 2007), *Journal of Semitic Studies*, supplement 23: 295–96; Ahmed Resmi Efendi, *Ḫalīfetü'r-rü'esā* (Istanbul: n.p., 1853), 4–6.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

Cambridge
Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-03442-6 - Empire and Power in the Reign of Suleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World
Kaya Sahin
Excerpt
More information

> the idea of suzerainty was a crucial component of political articulation, and where the monarch was defined not merely as king, but as "king over kings," with an explicit notion of hierarchy in which various levels of sovereignty, both "from above" and "from below," were involved.[5]

The Ottoman polity was inaugurated by a small group of militarized nomads in northeast Anatolia around 1300, and it subsequently evolved into a frontier principality and a dynastic kingdom. The conquest of Constantinople in 1453 was a turning point in terms of dynastic prestige and political ideology, but it is only in the sixteenth century that we can fully perceive an imperial set of mind and a leap forward in institutionalization. Looking at this period through Mustafa's career shows that, next to a few elements of continuity, new Ottoman administrative practices reflect an impressive level of invention and creativity. This is not the achievement of a particular political and organizational genius but, rather, the outcome of pragmatic measures, adopted under the pressures of a world-historical process of empire building and interimperial rivalry. In the Ottoman case, these pressures are represented by the near-simultaneous expansion of the Safavid (1501–1722) and Habsburg (1526–1918) Empires. Selim's contribution to these developments was the invasion of large territories in the Middle East. Süleyman continued his father's anti-Safavid legacy and adopted an aggressive foreign policy on the European front. Military campaigns required the deployment of increasingly larger financial resources, which in turn necessitated a better management of various revenue sources. Revolts in the Middle East in the first decade of Süleyman's reign exposed the weaknesses of Ottoman control in newly acquired territories and motivated the sultan and his men to develop better methods of management. While searching for the means to prevail over two fronts, field large armies and navies, collect taxes, put down rebellions, ensure the compliance of local elites and communities, and supervise their own ruling elite, the Ottomans contributed to a dialogical process of empire building by constraining their rivals to engage in similar activities. Secretaries were necessary for the creation and deployment of technologies and instruments of control such as land surveys, law codes, and various registers recording expenses, the distribution of land grants (*tımar*), the decisions of the imperial council, and so forth. Mustafa played a

[5] Sanjay Subrahmanyam, "Written on Water: Designs and Dynamics in the Portuguese Estado da Índia," in *Empires: Perspectives from Archaeology and History*, ed. Susan E. Alcock et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 43.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-03442-6 - Empire and Power in the Reign of Suleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World
Kaya Sahin
Excerpt
More information

prominent role in the introduction of new administrative practices and attempted to control and manage both the realm and the members of the Ottoman ruling elite in the name of the sultan.

Imperial rivalries in this period involved a crucial ideological dimension and led to an intense political and cultural competition. The Ottomans competed with the Habsburgs over claims to universal monarchy and with the Shiite Safavids over the definition of true Islam and the leadership of the Muslim community. The Ottoman sultan legitimized his rule by claiming to provide justice, security, and prosperity to his subjects. Documents produced by secretaries in a relatively standardized and sophisticated idiom served the task of creating and propagating particular images of the sultan and particular notions about the Ottoman Empire. Despite the fact that they remained the smallest group within the Ottoman ruling elite, secretaries constituted a very vocal minority whose function was to act as the surrogate of the sultan in bringing order to the realm and in explaining and defending the new empire. In addition to the documents he produced or supervised as chancellor, Mustafa expounded his own ideas about empire and bureaucratic identity in his historical and political writings. He believed that his career as a servant of the dynasty qualified him over other historians who did not know the inner workings of the Ottoman administration. He was also concerned about presenting what he believed to be the correct historical, religious, and cultural position vis-à-vis the Habsburgs, the Safavids, and other enemies and rivals. Although he proudly witnessed the sudden rise to prominence of secretaries in the midst of a newly centralizing early modern dynastic polity, he also worried about their vulnerability vis-à-vis the military class. In his political treatise, he claimed that a well-educated, freeborn service class could manage the empire better than the military men. Mustafa was one of the builders of a new imperial identity according to which the Ottoman realm, ruled by a law-abiding and justice-dispensing dynasty that protected Sunni Islam against enemies from within and without, constituted the epitome of Islamic civilization.

This powerful fiction was subsequently hailed as an Ottoman "classical age," an idealized period that continues to occupy a privileged place in the rhetoric of Turkish political Islam. The Ottoman sixteenth century is widely accepted as a formative stage in the empire's organization and cultural production. Apologetic approaches portray the reigns of Selim and Süleyman as the culmination of a march from tribe to empire. The

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-03442-6 - Empire and Power in the Reign of Suleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World
Kaya Sahin
Excerpt
More information

proponents of the "decline theory" interpret Süleyman's empire as an ideal construction and see the aftermath of his reign as the beginning of an inescapable descent into imperial dissolution.[6] These approaches have the merit of realizing that the first half of the sixteenth century is a critical period; however, they fail to explain its specificity. They refrain from developing more comprehensive models within which the sudden imperial expansion would become more meaningful. There is a "classical age obsession" among Ottoman historians. At the same time, there is a conspicuous absence of works studying the "classical age" with a critical eye.[7]

Studying Mustafa's career and writings allows us to discuss the singularity of early modern empire building and emphasize the parallels and differences between the Ottomans and the other early modern empires. While Mustafa the bureaucrat worked to establish administrative institutions, Mustafa the litterateur, the historian, the political writer created, circulated, and debated universalist political ideas that ranged from claims to universal monarchy over East and West to messianism, from the promotion of Sunni Islam to Mongol/Timurid concepts of ecumenical sovereignty. These activities placed him on the same level with his peers from Henrician England to Mughal India. Despite the considerable differences in political outlook, educational background, and religious belief among individual cases, Mustafa was part of a Eurasian expansion in bureaucratic action, a trend that included his fellow Ottomans Ramazanzade Mehmed (d. 1571) and Feridun Ahmed (d. 1583), the Safavids Qadi Ahmad Qummi (d. after 1606) and Iskandar Munshi (1560/61–1633), and the Mughal Abu'l-fazl ibn Mubarak (1551–1602). On the Western part of Eurasia, this new era was represented by figures such as Thomas Cromwell (1485–1540) and William Cecil (1521–98) in England, Michel de l'Hospital (1507–73) in France, and Mercurino Gattinara (1465–1530), Nicolas Granvelle (1486–1550), and Francisco de los Cobos (1477–1547) in the Habsburg domains.[8] In the sixteenth

[6] For a concise critique of these approaches, see Jane Hathaway, "Problems of Periodization in Ottoman History: The Fifteenth through the Eighteenth Centuries," *TSAB* 20, no. 2 (Fall 1996): 25–31.

[7] Oktay Özel, "Modern Osmanlı Tarihyazımında 'Klâsik Dönem:' Bir Eleştirel Değerlendirme," *TTYY* 4 (Fall 2006): 273–94.

[8] For a few relevant studies, see Stephen Alford, *Burghley: William Cecil at the Court of Elizabeth I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008); Hayward Keniston's somehow old but still very useful *Francisco de los Cobos: Secretary of the Emperor Charles V*

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-03442-6 - Empire and Power in the Reign of Suleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World
Kaya Sahin
Excerpt
More information

century, the number of secretaries and their purview increased throughout Eurasia; the volume and content of administrative records expanded; an imperial grand policy was formulated in the palace and put into practice on the battlefield; the political center began to infiltrate the lives of its subjects through law, architectural projects, politicized ceremonies, and the supervision of religion; quasi-sacral notions of sovereignty were created and circulated as part and parcel of imperial expansion. Mustafa's life and career illustrate the objectives, yearnings, illusions, achievements, and failures of a group of Ottoman administrators and literati who are very similar in outlook to their English, French, Habsburg, Safavid, and Mughal peers. Süleyman's empire is not the outcome of a Near Eastern/Islamic/Turkish historical *Geist* that realized its political and civilizational potential. Rather, it is a creative answer to a global crisis that radically changed the political, cultural, and religious landscape of early modern Eurasia.

Ottoman Empire Building and Early Modern Eurasia

The term *early modern Eurasia* provides a meaningful geographical and cultural space within which the histories of the new empires may be placed. *Eurasia* denotes a zone, from Western Europe to East Asia, which has been connected through various commercial and ecological cycles since the Bronze Age Revolution; this zone was even more thoroughly connected through economic and political/cultural exchanges from the last decades of the fifteenth century onwards.[9] The appellation *early modern* was created by Europeanists seeking a label for the period between the Renaissance on the one hand and the rise of the nation state, industrial capitalism, and European modernity on the other. Jack A. Goldstone's criticisms about the Eurocentric and modernity-centric limitations of the concept are still relevant,[10] and certainly, the histories of non-European

(Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1958); Denis Crouzet, *La sagesse et le malheur: Michel de l'Hospital, Chancelier de* France (Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 1998); John M. Headley, *The Emperor and His Chancellor: A Study of the Imperial Chancellery under Gattinara* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[9] See Jack Goody, *The Eurasian Miracle* (Cambridge and Malden, MA: Polity, 2011).

[10] Jack A. Goldstone, "The Problem of the 'Early Modern' World," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 41, no. 3 (1998): 249–84. For inspiring discussions on the positive and negative aspects of the term *early modern* in the case of Qing China, see Lynn A. Struve, ed., *The Qing Formation in World-Historical Time* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, Harvard University Press, 2004).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-03442-6 - Empire and Power in the Reign of Suleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World
Kaya Sahin
Excerpt
More information

societies cannot be reduced to their progress toward European modernity or their failure to do so. However, it is also true that the early modern era can still be defined as a global moment that included the active participation of various polities that may or may not be geographically situated in Western Europe. By adopting the term *early modern*, my aim is not to subsume the Ottoman experience under the European one, but rather reinsert the Ottomans and, in comparison, other Eurasian polities, cultures, and societies, into a shared time and space that have been taken over and dominated by industrial-capitalist European imperialism and Eurocentrism. Discussing the onset of a global early modernity in the first half of the sixteenth century is a remedy against both Eurocentrism and various defensive, apologetic, proto-nationalist approaches that focus on the particularities (or merits) of non-European and non-Christian societies. In this book, it also serves the purpose of engaging the "global turn" in recent historiography through an analysis of the Ottoman case.[11]

Indeed, there was a period of relatively integrated political and economic developments and relatively dialogical cultural exchanges in Eurasia from the late fifteenth century onward, until the supremacy of Western/European societies was dictated to the rest of the globe through the twin forces of industrial capitalism and new forms of imperialism after the last decades of the eighteenth century.[12] Parallel and near-simultaneous trends, such as "territorial consolidation; firearms-aided intensification of warfare; more expansive, routinized administrative systems; growing commercialization . . . wider popular literacy, along with a novel proliferation of vernacular texts," were observed.[13] These were supported, between 1450 and 1600, by a favorable climate, an improvement

[11] See Jerry H. Bentley, "The Task of World History," in *The Oxford Handbook of World History*, ed. Bentley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 12–13: "The global turn facilitates historians' efforts to deal analytically with a range of large-scale processes such as mass migrations, campaigns of imperial expansion, cross-cultural trade, environmental changes, biological exchanges, transfers of technology, and cultural exchanges, including the spread of ideas, ideals, ideologies, religious faiths, and cultural traditions."

[12] John Darwin, *After Tamerlane: The Global History of Empire since 1405* (London: Allen Lane, 2007), 50–99; Charles H. Parker, *Global Interactions in the Early Modern Age, 1400–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), passim. The break that occurred from the late eighteenth century onward is discussed in C. A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1914: Global Connections and Comparisons* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004).

[13] Victor Lieberman, "Introduction," in *Beyond Binary Histories: Re-Imagining Eurasia to c. 1830*, ed. Lieberman (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 14.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

Cambridge

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-03442-6 - Empire and Power in the Reign of Suleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World
Kaya Sahin
Excerpt
More information

in agricultural production, and an expanding international trade, which allowed the expanding empires to have access to resources needed for administrative consolidation and militarism. In an article that traces the pedigree of the term *early modern*, Jerry H. Bentley identified three global processes that created an early modern ecology: "the creation of global networks of sea-lanes that provided access to all the world's shorelines, global exchanges of biological species that held massive implications for human populations as well as natural environments, and the forging of an early capitalist global economy that shaped patterns of production, distribution, consumption, and social organization around the world." These processes led to "demographic fluctuations, large-scale migrations, intensified exploitation of natural environments, technological diffusions, consolidation of centralized states, imperial expansion, and global cultural exchanges."[14] These cultural exchanges included the reformulation and circulation of ideas on universal/ecumenical sovereignty.[15] Joseph Fletcher, one of the pioneers of global perspectives in history writing, adds to these trends the growth of regional cities, the rise of urban commercial classes, religious revival and reformations, and rural unrest.[16]

The Ottoman polity deserves to be studied within the larger context of early modern Eurasia because it exhibits most of these transformations in the first half of the sixteenth century. Joseph Fletcher's view that the early modern period has a "quickening tempo" is relevant for Ottoman history as well: if for nothing else, the first half of the sixteenth century is worth studying due to the palpably quickening pace of political, military, economic, and religious activity in the Ottoman realm. Next to the attempts at administrative consolidation and cultural competition, the Ottoman realm felt the impact of global ecological and epidemiological dynamics; the Ottoman ruling elite took an active interest in overland and

[14] Jerry H. Bentley, "Early Modern Europe and the Early Modern World," in *Between the Middle Ages and Modernity: Individual and Community in the Early Modern World*, eds. Charles H. Parker and Bentley (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007), 22–23.

[15] Sanjay Subrahmanyam, "Connected Histories: Notes towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia," in Lieberman, *Beyond Binary Histories*, 289–316. For a further illustration of this argument see Subrahmanyam, "Turning the Stones Over: Sixteenth-Century Millenarianism from the Tagus to the Ganges," *The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 45, no. 2 (2003): 129–61.

[16] Joseph Fletcher, "Integrative History: Parallels and Interconnections in the Early Modern Period," in *Studies on Chinese and Islamic Inner Asia*, ed. Beatrice Forbes Manz (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 1995).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

Cambridge

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-03442-6 - Empire and Power in the Reign of Suleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World
Kaya Sahin
Excerpt
More information

overseas travel and communication and engaged in a veritable activity of expansion and exploration.[17]

In recognition of the wider world within which the Ottomans dwelled, Ottoman historians have utilized the term *early modern* to demarcate a historical period (ca. 1450 to ca. 1850) and raise questions about space, legitimacy, knowledge, and religious and cultural identity.[18] Cemal Kafadar was one of the first scholars who discussed affinities and differences between early modern European and Ottoman histories and noted the emergence of new forms of literature, identity, and sociality as the features of a distinct era.[19] More recently, it has been argued that the Ottomans took part in a European or Mediterranean early modernity, especially with regard to the building of military and political institutions and the circulation of universalist politico-religious ideas.[20] Under the impact of Marshall Hodgson's global Islamic history vision or Marxian debates on the particularities of "Asian" societies, the Ottomans have also been studied together with the contemporary Islamic empires of the Safavids and the Mughals (1526–1857).[21] In this book, on the other hand, sixteenth-century Ottoman empire building is presented both as a

[17] Sam White, *The Climate of Rebellion in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Nükhet Varlık, "Disease and Empire: A History of Plague Epidemics in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire (1453–1600)" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2008); Giancarlo Casale, *The Ottoman Age of Exploration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

[18] Metin Kunt and Christine Woodhead, eds., *Süleyman the Magnificent and His Age: The Ottoman Empire in the Early Modern World* (London: Longman, 1995); Virginia Aksan and Daniel Goffman, eds., *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); although it focuses on the 1600–1800 period, Virginia Aksan, "Locating the Ottomans among Early Modern Empires," *JEMH* 3, no. 2 (1999): 103–34.

[19] Cemal Kafadar, "The Ottomans and Europe," in *Handbook of European History, 1400–1600. Late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation*, eds. Thomas A. Brady Jr., Heiko A. Oberman, James D. Tracy, vol. 1, *Structures and Assertions* (Brill: Leiden, 1994), especially 615–25.

[20] Daniel Goffman, *The Ottomans and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Linda T. Darling, "Political Change and Political Discourse in the Early Modern Mediterranean World," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 38, no. 4 (Spring 2008): 505–31; Tijana Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011).

[21] Metin Kunt, "The Later Muslim Empires: Ottomans, Safavids, Mughals," in *Islam: The Religious and Political Life of a World Community*, ed. Marjorie Kell (New York: Praeger, 1984), 113–36; Halil Berktay, "Three Empires and the Societies They Governed: Iran, India and the Ottoman Empire," in *New Approaches to State and Peasant in Ottoman History*, eds. Berktay and Suraiya Faroqhi (London: Frank Cass, 1992), 242–63; M. Athar Ali, "Political Structures of the Islamic Orient in the Sixteenth and

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-03442-6 - Empire and Power in the Reign of Suleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World
Kaya Sahin
Excerpt
More information

subset of the new Eurasian empires and as a hinge that connected (*pace* Sanjay Subrahmanyam and his concept of "connected histories") the eastern and western parts of Eurasia. This process had two facets: the first consisted of practical attempts at establishing territorial and economic control from western Iran to the Hungarian plains, whereas the second involved the production of universal and transcendental political concepts that ranged from Timurid notions of divinely sanctioned sovereignty and European ideas of universal monarchy to a newly imagined Sunni identity.

Discussing empire building and administrative consolidation inescapably creates the risk of overemphasizing intentionality at the expense of contingency, or "efflorescence" at the expense of "crisis."[22] My aim is not to argue that Ottoman empire building was completed in this period or that it reached an "ideal" form. As shown by Rifa'at Abou-El-Haj, Karen Barkey and Baki Tezcan, the post-Süleymanic Ottoman polity continued to manifest a tremendous political and economic dynamism, a pervasive pragmatism, and an important level of social mobility and mobilization.[23] Moreover, a large land-based empire such as the Ottoman subset is a collection of various mechanisms of adaptation that develop several vulnerabilities over time, especially when they fail to transform themselves according to new circumstances.[24] As Sam White has demonstrated, in

Seventeenth Centuries," in *Medieval India 1: Researches in the History of India, 1250–1750*, ed. Irfan Habib (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1992), 129–40; Stephen J. Dale, *The Muslim Empires of the Ottomans, Safavids, and Mughals* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). For a discussion of Dale's work from an Ottoman perspective see Kaya Şahin, Review, *IJTS* 17, nos. 1–2 (2011): 196–99.

[22] I borrow this dichotomy from Jack Goldstone: "While a crisis is a relatively sharp, unexpected downturn in significant demographic and economic indices, often accompanied by political turmoil and cultural conflicts, an efflorescence is a relatively sharp, often unexpected upturn in significant demographic and economic indices, usually accompanied by political expansion, institution-building, cultural synthesis, and consolidation" ("Neither Late Imperial nor Early Modern: Efflorescences and the Qing Formation in World History," in *The Qing Formation*, 252).

[23] Rifa'at Ali Abou-El-Haj, *Formation of the Modern State: The Ottoman Empire, Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries*, second edition (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2005); Karen Barkey, *Bandits and Bureaucrats: The Ottoman Route to State Centralization* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994); Baki Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

[24] See W. G. Runciman, "Empire as a Topic in Comparative Sociology," in *Tributary Empires in Global History*, eds. Peter Fibiger Bang and C.A. Bayly (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 99–107. For the variety of administrative units organized by the Ottoman center as a reflection of local context, see Gábor Ágoston, "A

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org