

Disliking Others

LOATHING, HOSTILITY,
AND DISTRUST
IN PREMODERN
OTTOMAN LANDS

.....

Ottoman and Turkish Studies

Series Editor

HAKAN T. KARATEKE (The University of Chicago)





Disliking Others

LOATHING, HOSTILITY,
AND DISTRUST
IN PREMODERN
OTTOMAN LANDS

.....

Edited by

HAKAN T. KARATEKE

H. ERDEM ÇIPA

HELGA ANETSHOFER

Boston
2018

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data:

The bibliographic data for this title is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-1-618118-80-6 (hardback)

ISBN 978-1-618118-81-3 (electronic)

Book design by Kryon Publishing Services (P) Ltd.

www.kryonpublishing.com

Cover design by Ivan Grave.

On the cover: The “Jewish shaykh” (fragment). Qazwīnī, *‘Ajā’ib al-Makhlūqāt* (Ottoman Turkish), Baghdad, mid-17th century. Jerusalem, The National Library of Israel, Ms. Yah. Ar. 1113, fol. 140a. Courtesy of the National Library of Israel, Jerusalem.

Published by Academic Studies Press in 2018

28 Montfern Avenue

Brighton, MA 02135, USA

press@academicstudiespress.com

www.academicstudiespress.com

Table of Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	vii
<i>Author Bios</i>	viii
<i>Introduction</i>	xi
Changing Perceptions about Christian-Born Ottomans: Anti- <i>ķul</i> Sentiments in Ottoman Historiography <i>H. Erdem Ćıpa</i>	1
Circassian Mamluks in Ottoman Egypt and Istanbul, ca. 1500–1730: The Eastern Alternative <i>Jane Hathaway</i>	22
<i>Dispelling the Darkness of the Halberdier’s Treatise:</i> A Comparative Look at Black Africans in Ottoman Letters in the Early Modern Period <i>Baki Tezcan</i>	43
The Jew, the Orthodox Christian, and the European in Ottoman Eyes, ca. 1550–1700 <i>Bilha Moor</i>	75
An Ottoman Anti-Judaism <i>Hakan T. Karateke</i>	107
Evliyā Ćelebī’s Perception of Jews <i>Hakan T. Karateke</i>	128
Ambiguous Subjects and Uneasy Neighbors: Bosnian Franciscans’ Attitudes toward the Ottoman State, “Turks,” and Vlachs <i>Vjieran Kursar</i>	148

“Those Violating the Good, Old Customs of our Land”: Forms and Functions of Graecophobia in the Danubian Principalities, 16th–18th Centuries <i>Konrad Petrovsky</i>	187
The Many Faces of the “Gypsy” in Early Modern Ottoman Discourse <i>Faika Çelik</i>	215
Gendered Infidels in Fiction: A Case Study on Şābit’s <i>Hikāye-i H’vāce Fesād</i> <i>İpek Hüner-Cora</i>	244
“The Greatest of Tribulations”: Constructions of Femininity in Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Physiognomy <i>Emin Lelić</i>	264
Defining and Defaming the Other in Early Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Invective <i>Michael D. Sheridan</i>	296
“Are You From Çorum?”: Derogatory Attitudes Toward the “Unruly Mob” of the Provinces as Reflected in a Proverbial Saying <i>Helga Anetshofer</i>	321
<i>Index</i>	334

An Ottoman Anti-Judaism

Hakan T. Karateke

This study is part of a larger research project that explores whether anti-Judaic sentiments in premodern Ottoman society may have been more widespread than historians generally presume. I posit that some Ottoman Muslims nurtured a discernible dislike for Jews that was more directed and elevated than the run-of-the-mill contempt felt toward other religious or ethnic groups. Also of interest to me are related questions, such as how and through which traditions these sentiments were propagated as well as whether they were common among or specific to different demographics.

Scholarship generally has assumed that currents from Christian theology and practice may have influenced the perceptions of Sunni Muslims. That line of received wisdom is contradicted, however, by evidence which suggests that at least some of the hostility was rooted in Islamic and Ottoman traditions. Leaving that topic aside for now, this article approaches the issue from another unexplored angle. It investigates the hostile ideas held, and actions committed, toward Jews by Christian converts. I demonstrate below that Ottoman anti-Judaism was a particular phenomenon inasmuch as such sentiments did not spread solely through secondhand influences that occurred on the basis of cross-cultural interactions between Christians and Muslims in that society. Rather, the ideas traveled—along with the people who held them—between cultural spaces; such travel likely was one of the ways in which Christian anti-Judaism made its way into Muslim spheres. This peculiar fluidity of

* Given the complexity of the issue, I plan to expand on the theme of anti-Judaic sentiments that conceivably originated from Islamic Ottoman traditions in a separate study.

boundaries is also what qualifies this strain of anti-Judaism as “Ottoman.” Unlike anti-Semitism, which is generally classified as prejudice and hostility rooted in racial categories, I understand anti-Judaism to respond to cultural and theological differences.

A good part of the enmity in Ottoman society was held by people who were recruited as *devşirme*. These boys were collected primarily as a levy imposed on Ottoman Christian populations in the Balkans, but some were taken captive in wars and raids or were trafficked by slave traders. Coerced into converting to Islam and trained to become the *kapukulu* (or simply *kul*), or “slaves of the Porte” (that is, of the sultan), these individuals not only formed the core of the elite military units—the janissaries and palace cavalry—but also sustained manpower for the expanding Ottoman bureaucracy. Therefore, I chronicle several physical assaults committed by janissaries and palace cavalry in large cities and then examine anti-Judaic comments and schemes attributed to bureaucrats who were converts from Christianity. What is important for my interpretation is the fact that these boys were not converted to Islam or indoctrinated at an age at which they would not have remembered the notions with which they were raised. Considering that the median age of the boys collected as Christian levy was mid- to late teens, there can be no doubt that *devşirme* converts carried some of the convictions and traditions from their childhood and adolescent years.

While I use mostly narrative sources and travelers’ accounts for the abovementioned sections, my sources and methodology differ in the latter part of the article, in which I scrutinize several instances of blood libel. My presupposition about blood libels is clear-cut: this slander was essentially a Christian phenomenon. In its most widespread version, it accused Jews of sacrificing Christian children (usually) at Passover, to obtain blood for unleavened bread. It is well known that this charge was used frequently by Christians in Europe to incite anger against Jews. In this article, I speculate as to whether accusations of blood libel in Ottoman lands could have been advanced by Christian converts. Sources also mention “proper” Christians as accusers, but I am less interested in that phenomenon. I hold that if a Muslim propagated the slander, there are three options: he had recently converted, he hailed from a converted family in which the idea of such libel may have been cultivated, or he learned such slander from and acted alongside Christians. In this section, the sources also lead me to shift my focus from large cities to the provinces.

Admittedly, in both sections my findings are based not on sweeping studies of the sources but on a random collection of incidents, approached with some degree of speculation. Nevertheless, I wish to submit my views to the scholarly community in order to spark a conversation on new ways of evaluating the experiences of Jews in Ottoman lands. My arguments in the larger research project run to some degree counter to the currently accepted narrative and grapple with the received wisdom, which claims:

- 1) that strong anti-Judaic sentiment in the Middle East existed mostly among Christians before the nineteenth century; before the spread of intense Judeophobic sensibilities by Christian nationalist groups during the same period, this sentiment did not exist among Muslims in the Middle East
- 2) if Muslims cultivated (to varying degrees) contempt for Jews prior to the nineteenth century, this aversion must have been due to the influence of Christian theology and practice, learned from Christians living in the Middle East

As must be clear by now, I do not reject these points completely but hope to develop perspectives that identify patterns or currents within anti-Judaic sentiments in Ottoman society.

I was prompted to explore this topic in part by the ways in which the Jewish experience in Ottoman lands is frequently represented. Depending on the type of source consulted, the story of Sephardic migration to the Ottoman Empire is presented as a salvation story of varying degrees of significance: the Ottoman lands may be depicted as a paradise for persecuted Iberian Jews, and the Ottoman government's decision to accept Jews as a generous act of epic proportions. In this telling, the Ottoman lands became a safe haven and a stable home for a sizeable Jewish immigrant community in the early modern period. Here, Sephardic Jews led a peaceful existence and cherished their new home and overlords.

This narrative does bear some truth, particularly if one compares Iberian Jews' experience in Ottoman lands with the concerted state persecution they faced in the Spain of the Catholic Monarchs and in Portugal. The Ottoman state did not systematically persecute Jews—on the contrary, evidence suggests that it protected them as tax-paying subjects. Yet when it comes to anti-Judaic sentiments among different sections of Ottoman society, the realities on the ground may not have been as rosy as described in this widely accepted narrative.

The general tendency of modern scholarship on the status of Jews in Ottoman society may rest on a centuries-old positive feeling cultivated by Ottoman Jews toward the Ottoman government that allowed them to immigrate. Of course, any mass migration creates complications for the migrants and for the recipient societies, inevitably heightening sensitivities between populations. We should leave room for those feelings that may have erupted due to new proximity, but there also appears to be a pattern in which historians may delineate certain deep-rooted sentiments.

JANISSARIES AND PALACE CAVALRY

In a joke presumably dating from Ottoman times, a janissary is sitting in front of his shop when he sees a Jew passing by. Apparently agitated by a piece of information of which he had recently become aware, the janissary walks up to him and strikes him out of the blue. Shocked, the Jew asks, “Did I do something wrong, my agha?” “You people killed Jesus,” the janissary responds. The Jew, still more dumbfounded, replies apologetically: “but that happened 1500 years ago?!” upon which the janissary counters, “Doesn’t matter. I just learned about it.”

It is not a coincidence that the accuser in this joke is a janissary. The accusation of deicide at the hands of the Jewish people was used by Christians during and after the Middle Ages to incite anger and violence against Jews. Because the Islamic tradition does not regard the crucifixion of Jesus as true, the matter was a nonissue for Muslims. It might at first appear illogical that a janissary, who most likely would have been a Christian convert (assuming that the joke is set in the sixteenth century), did not know about such a foundational account of Christianity. Obviously, it would be futile to attempt to put the details of the story to test, but I believe that the joke imparts an important fact, namely, that janissary milieus would have been fertile grounds for anti-Judaic sentiment.

Street violence and lynching, particularly during times of widespread unrest, were not rare in Ottoman Istanbul. Ottoman chronicles are replete with narratives of state grandees being executed at the insistent demand—or the very hands—of unruly military flocks. Examining patterns in these assaults leads us to surmise that Jews were particular victims of prejudice. Indeed, Jewish homes often were among the first targets of the lootings that erupted during periodic power vacuums in Istanbul, and the Jewish quarter continued to be

one of the first destinations in almost every *kul* revolt.¹ A few striking examples make the case for a broader pattern.

During a series of incidents that started in the spring of 1589, commonly known as “the incident of the governor-general,” the cavalry forces (and, according to some sources, the janissaries) attacked and looted Jewish and Christian merchants’ shops.² A newly introduced tax seems to have incited this first phase of unrest.³ However, the disturbance became a full-fledged revolt a few days later, when the military units were paid their salaries in debased silver aspers. When the janissaries learned that a Jewish money-changer was reluctant to redeem the coins because they were not pure silver, they turned to the governor-general, who evidently had made the decision to debase the coins. The governor-general once again pointed his finger at the Jewish money-changer, insinuating that he was trying to trick the soldiers. After some back and forth that agitated the soldiers further, the janissary mob plundered several houses in the Jewish quarter. According to Reinhold Lubenau (d. 1631), an eyewitness to the events, the Jews had already buried their valuables in secret vaults underneath their houses. Enraged that they could not find anything, the soldiers set Jewish houses on fire, forcing the occupants to rescue their hidden precious goods—which, apparently, they did. The rebellion ultimately subsided when governor-general Meḥmed Pasha and the head treasurer Maḥmūd Çelebî were executed.⁴

Despite providing a detailed description of the unrest, Ottoman sources are oddly silent about what went down in the Jewish quarter. Selānikî (d. ca. 1600) and Muṣṭafā °Ālî (d. 1600), the two contemporary historians, focus on the turmoil in the imperial palace grounds but do not mention the unrest effecting other parts of the city. One wonders whether

-
- 1 Kafadar, “When Coins Turned into Drops of Dew and Bankers Became Robbers of Shadows,” 79.
 - 2 The exact dates of the “*beglerbegi* incident” are contested. While Reinhold Lubenau, a pharmacist in the entourage of the Habsburg diplomatic mission and a witness to the events, dates the beginning of the revolts to June 1588, Ottoman sources provide varying dates, several differing by almost a year. İ. H. Danişmend, in his chronology of Ottoman history based on Ottoman sources, also mentions this discrepancy in the dating of the revolt; cf. Danişmend, *İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi*, 3:111. Here, I cautiously use the dates from Selānikî and Ḥasan Begzāde.
 - 3 Lubenau, *Beschreibung der Reisen des Reinhold Lubenau*, part 2, 41.
 - 4 Lubenau, *Beschreibung der Reisen des Reinhold Lubenau*, part 2, 43. Cf. Selānikî Muṣṭafā, *Tārīḫ-i Selānikî*, 1:209–12; and Ḥasan Begzāde Aḥmed Paşa, *Tārīḫ*, 2:346ff.

the attacks in the Jewish quarter were such an ordinary occurrence that they were not worth mentioning. Or, were the events transpiring at the palace so consequential that they usurped all the attention? Granted, this was a riot of unprecedented circumstances. According to °Ālī, it was the first attack on the imperial council by the *kul* and marked a new low in imperial decline.⁵ Furthermore, the head treasurer, Maḥmūd Çelebī, was a dear acquaintance of the historian; devastated by his demise, °Ālī may have concentrated on the circumstances at the imperial palace.

The *beglerbegi* incident may have been the first large, organized *kul* rebellion—and one that resulted in an attack on the imperial palace—but it certainly was neither the first nor the last time the janissaries and the cavalry units would plunder the Jewish neighborhood. For example, a century earlier, during a short period of uncertainty following Mehmed II's (r. 1444–46 and 1451–81) death and prior to Bāyezīd II's (r. 1481–1512) arrival from Manisa in 1481, the janissaries had looted Jewish (and Christian) homes and shops in Istanbul. Upon receiving news of the sultan's death in Maltepe, a township a few hours east of the city, the soldiers in the campaigning army took the trouble to return to Istanbul to do just that. Interestingly, it was not only the regular janissaries who did the pillaging. The “irregulars and brigands” (*levend ve eşkıyā*) in the city disguised themselves in janissary garb and partook in the looting as well.⁶ It appears that the janissary garb provided the necessary disguise for this criminal activity.

The Jewish historian Elijah Capsali, who lived on Crete, in the 1520s reported in some detail about the janissaries' distinct hatred toward Jews and their recurrent plunders of Jewish shops during periods of unrest in the city.⁷ Although Capsali may have had increased sensitivity to incidents concerning Jews, his account is corroborated by non-Jewish authors of the time. In fact, contemporary observers report that whenever a sultan died, Jews would bury their valuables in the ground to protect them from the cavalry, janissaries, and members of the novice corps (*°acemī oğlanlar*) in Istanbul, fearing assaults during those uncertain times. Evidently, Jews in town had to be so vigilant that even *rumors* of a sultan's demise would lead them to take precautionary action.⁸

5 Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, 133.

6 Muṣṭafā °Ālī, *Künhü'l-ahbār*, 818. Cf. Anonymous, *Tevārīḫ-i Āl-i °Osmān* (2013), 116 and Anonymous, *Tevārīḫ-i Āl-i °Osmān* (2006), 114.

7 Capsali, *Seder Eliyahu Zuta*, 110–11.

8 Gerlach, *Stephan Gerlachs deß Aeltern Tage-Buch*, 391.

According to an anonymous Jewish chronicler from Istanbul, the cavalry forces once again targeted Jews during the revolt of 1622, which also took the life of the sultan. The chronicler does not provide specifics on the assaults but notes that Jewish subjects of the sultan were fearful of being massacred at the hands of the cavalry units.⁹ Examples of Ottoman Jewish subjects who became targets of violence by convert military troops extend to the mid-seventeenth century—and apparently beyond Istanbul. For instance, in a highly dramatic incident, Yasef, the mint director in Cairo, was beaten to death by members of the six regiments, and his body was later burned in a major town square. His successor escaped a similar fate only by converting to Islam.¹⁰

And then there is, of course, the extraordinarily gruesome murder of Kira Esperanza Malchi, the female Jewish intermediary between the imperial mother Şafiyye Sultan (d. 1619) and the outside world. Several sources comment on Malchi's corruption: the accusations levied against her include bribery, control of the customs house, and even meddling with governmental posts and appointments through her influence at the palace. Malchi was murdered by the cavalry units of the palace during an uprising in 1600, a decade after the *beglerbegi* incident.

Despite resistance from the sultan, the grand mufti, and others who proposed banning Malchi from Istanbul, the situation became so tense that several policing forces were ordered to look for the *kira*, who had gone into hiding. The commander of gatekeepers (*kapıcılar kethudāsi*) and the chief sergeant-at-arms (*çavuşbaşı*), °Ömer Agha, were dispatched to find the Jewish woman. A member of the Civalellis, one of the prominent aristocratic families of Zadar (Zara), a town on the coastline of the Adriatic Sea, °Ömer must have been captured as a prisoner in the early 1570s, and, after turning Turk, taken into service in the palace. A protégée of the powerful Ğazanfer Agha (d. 1603), himself a Venetian convert, °Ömer quickly rose in the hierarchy of the imperial palace, assumed the position of chief sergeant-at-arms, and became a very influential official.¹¹

9 Anonymous, *Anonim Bir İbranice Kroniğe Göre 1622–1624 Yıllarında Osmanlı Devleti ve İstanbul*, 41.

10 The events leading up to this incident are described in Hathaway, “The Grand Vizier and the False Messiah,” 670. See also Defterdār Şarı Meşmed, *Zübde-i Veķāyi°at*, 611.

11 Dursteler, *Renegade Women*, 43–44; and Pedani, “Safiye’s Household and Venetian Diplomacy,” 20.

For my purposes, it is tempting to follow Eric Dursteler and think that the historian Selānikī Muṣṭafā would assign ʿÖmer Agha a prominent role in the murder of Esperanza Malchi—but he does not.¹² Selānikī does mention that it was ʿÖmer who “suddenly” located the Jewish woman,¹³ but he does not cite him as an agitator or incendiary in the incidents leading up to her murder. He was simply one of the commanding officers of the policing forces who were charged with investigating the issue. In fact, Ğazanfer and ʿÖmer were close to Şafiyye Sultan. Conceivably, ʿÖmer was taking Malchi to grand vizier’s palace, where a solution to the conundrum might have been worked out.

Esperanza Malchi was put on horseback by the palace officers, to be taken to the grand vizier. As the Jewish woman was about to ascend the stairs to the grandee’s house, however, the cavalry soldiers charged and captured her. She was stabbed, and her body was cut into pieces and left in the hippodrome for dogs to devour. A later historian, Muṣṭafā Naʿīmā (d. 1716), claimed shocking details: the cavalry soldiers severed Malchi’s hand, “by which she took bribes,” and cut out her genitals, then nailed them to the doors of officials known to have worked for her.¹⁴ We can identify at least one commanding officer of the cavalry units that took part in the violent episodes: Frenkbeg-oğlu Meḥmed Agha, né Marcantonio Querini. Son of a Venetian nun and possibly of noble descent, Meḥmed Agha apparently became a passionate Muslim after turning Turk; he also rose in the palace cavalry ranks, holding the position of commander of one of the regular cavalry corps during riots.¹⁵ This piece of information is valuable, as it allows us to put a name to one of the rioters. Otherwise, almost all members of the cavalry forces were, of course, converts from Christianity.

Şafiyye Sultan, who was herself Albanian, is quoted as having asked why the Jewish woman’s death was carried out in such an obscene fashion, and whether she could not have been killed with a more common punishment for females, such as being thrown into the sea. The imperial mother’s astonishment seems to highlight the unusual brutality of Malchi’s murder. Based on such evidence, Isabel Lachenauer sought

12 Dursteler, *Renegade Women*, 43.

13 Selānikī Muṣṭafā, *Tārīḫ-i Selānikī*, 2:855.

14 Muṣṭafā Naʿīmā, *Tārīḫ-i Naʿīmā*, 162; see further details in Lachenauer, “‘One Slice of Hir I Did So See Passe by Our House in Galata.’”

15 Pedani, “Safiye’s Household and Venetian Diplomacy,” 22.

explanations for this brutality—which shocked not only contemporary observers but also later Ottoman historians—in her gender and/or her Jewishness.¹⁶ In light of the cavalry soldiers’ mind-set as described in this article, I believe that Malchi’s Jewishness must have been at least an aggravating factor in her particularly cruel murder.

DEVŞİRME BUREAUCRATS

While there seems to have been a pattern of anti-Judaic physical conduct within the *kul* in the military regiments, it would be interesting to explore whether such sentiments were also held by the *devşirme* who rose to higher ranks in the bureaucracy. In other words, did such adverse sentiments only surface within the context of mob riots, or can we find other examples of Christian converts lashing out in one way or another? Although the topic requires more systematic research, a few examples may give us an idea.

A curious coincidence relating to the abovementioned head treasurer Maḥmūd Çelebî, who in all likelihood was also of *devşirme* origin, reminds us of the complexity of historical circumstances and the difficulty of reconstructing personal sentiments. We saw above that Maḥmūd was murdered by angry mobs during the infamous *beglerbegi* incident of 1589. Writing some three decades later, Ḥasan Begzāde Aḥmed Pasha (d. 1636 or 1637) shared in his chronicle a detail about the aforementioned bureaucrat’s character traits. Praising Maḥmūd Çelebî after describing the circumstances of his unfortunate demise, the historian recounts that the treasurer’s piety (*taḳvā*) was so strong that when he received Jewish revenue contractors at his home not only did he take great care not to come physically close to them, he also did not accept the additional gifts and payments conventionally associated with such positions. Apparently, Maḥmūd Çelebî’s disgust for Jews was such that he also had the floors in his residence on which the Jewish contractors stepped thoroughly sponge-cleaned after they left.¹⁷

Then, there are rumors and written evidence about the anti-Judaic sentiments of three powerful grand viziers of the sixteenth century, all

16 Lachenauer, ““One Slice of Hır I Did So See Passe by Our House in Galata.”” Two decades later, Bula Rika, yet another Jewish *kira* of the mother of Muṣṭafā I, was severely beaten and later strangled by the *devşirme* troops, on allegations of sorcery and meddling with politics. See Anonymous, *Anonim Bir İbraniye Kroniğe Göre 1622–1624 Yıllarında Osmanlı Devleti ve İstanbul*, 64.

17 Ḥasan Begzāde Aḥmed Paşa, *Tārīḫ*, 2:351.

of whom were of *devşirme* origin. Possibly of Slavic or Greek origin and born to Orthodox Christian parents in Parga, today in northwestern Greece, İbrāhīm Pasha (d. 1536) became a favorite of Sultan Süleymān (r. 1520–66), serving as grand vizier for thirteen years. He apparently fell out of grace for several reasons, one of which was his alleged support for Prince Muṣṭafā’s cause to the throne. Muṣṭafā would later be executed on his father’s orders (1553). Quite curiously, rumors had circulated before Muṣṭafā’s demise that, if he had become sultan, he would have killed all of the Jews in Ottoman lands.¹⁸ İbrāhīm Pasha would also be remembered by a Jewish historian—Yosef Sambari (d. ca. 1700s), in his *Sefer Divrei Yosef*—as being anti-Jewish.¹⁹ While Sambari’s history, of course, is far from being even near-contemporary to the pasha’s lifetime, the historian clearly was quoting from earlier sources.²⁰ Incidentally, the fact that one of İbrāhīm’s nicknames was Frenk—due to rumors that he was a crypto-Christian—is not without relevance to our topic.²¹

At least one contemporary source reported a similar rumor concerning Rüstem Pasha (d. 1561), another grand vizier of Sultan Süleymān. Stephan Gerlach (d. 1612), a priest who was a member of the Habsburg diplomatic mission, related an anecdote about the pasha advising the sultan to drive all Jews from Ottoman lands.²² While the traveler ties this incident into a lecture given by the sultan about the advantages of a multireligious society, it is important to keep in mind that Rüstem was also a Croatian-born *devşirme*.

These rumors may have been born out of exaggerated anxieties, or based on hearsay and on likely (at least partial) fabrications. Yet the especially insightful reports (*telhīs*) drafted and submitted to the sultan by the five-time grand vizier Koca Sinān Pasha (d. 1596) have reached us in written form. Koca Sinān was a *devşirme* boy taken from a village in Albania. Admittedly, it may be a reach to cherry-pick phrases with which to make pointed suggestions about the convictions and worldview of a man who had converted to Islam some seventy or more years prior. Curiously, though,

18 See, for instance, *Hans Dernschwam’s Tagebuch*, 117: “Wan der Mustaffa, des khaisers son, het sollen kaiser werdn, soll er willens gewesen, alle juden in ganz Turkei vmbzuprenge, das man zw Constantinapol vnd auch Amasia gesagt hot.”

19 Sambari, *Sefer Divrei Yosef*, 118, 259–61.

20 For Sambari’s sources, see Jacobs, *Islamische Geschichte in jüdischen Chroniken*, 122–27.

21 *Hans Dernschwam’s Tagebuch*, 100.

22 Gerlach, *Stephan Gerlachs deß Aeltern Tage-Buch*, 61.

in the midst of his insistent requests for a harsh punishment for a Jewish businessman (see below), and his suspicions about the sincerity of two Ottoman pashas in dealings with the Poles, Sinān Pasha felt it necessary to emphasize that it had been seventy years since he converted to Islam.²³ Though he may have uttered the sentence to make a case about his seniority in the religion and to highlight the youth of other convert pashas, his words remind us that his Christian past was not part of a forgotten life or erased from active memory—but instead may have loomed large in his acquired identity. The striking language he uses about Jews in the reports, along with other evidence quoted in this article, designates the topic as a possible area of inquiry for further research and prompts us to ponder the milieu in which such feelings could be nurtured and could live on.

The reports under investigation here—concerning a certain Portuguese Jewish businessman by the name of David Passi (fl. after 1593)—were composed by Sinān Pasha and submitted to Sultan Murād III (r. 1574–95) in 1591. While Sinān Pasha was clearly a passionate adversary of Passi, and his recommendations to the sultan demonstrate a great desire to have him executed, the sultan repeatedly denied Sinān Pasha’s counsel and spared Passi’s life, only to imprison him eventually. Sinān Pasha’s tone becomes harsher and his accusations more elaborate over the course of a few letters, as the sultan persistently ignores his wish to see Passi executed.

The reports reveal that Sinān Pasha suspected Passi of spying for the Venetians and Spaniards. Indeed, it is widely accepted in modern scholarship that Passi functioned as an agent with shifting loyalties from 1560 to the 1590s.²⁴ Of course, Sinān Pasha did not have concrete evidence with which to convince the sultan. We may hail him as a sharp-eyed statesman with good instincts; however, his reasoning as to why the sultan should execute Passi was only partially based on cogent facts. Sinān Pasha did not speak only of this particular individual but built his argument by deducing character traits from

23 “Yet, I do not have a way out: Whenever I raised certain topics [in the past], I have been accused of being prejudiced. Therefore, in order not to appear as holding a grudge, I do not dare submitting many issues [to you]. Thanks be to God, it has been seventy years that I have been Muslim” (*Ammā neyleyelim, ba‘z-ı umūr ‘arz eyledüğümüzde ğaraźına ğaml olunduğm görüp maźanne-i ğaraź olmayalım deyyü niçe umūr bildürmege cür‘et edemezüz. El-ğandu li’l-lāhi te‘ālā İslām içinde sinnimiz yetmiş aşdı*). See Koca Sinān Paşa, [*Telhışār*], 91.

24 Faroqhi, “Ein Günstling des osmanischen Sultans Murad III”; Arbel, *Trading Nations*, 164–68; Arbel, “Passi, David”; and Özgen, “The Connected World of Intrigues.”

generalizations about Jews, some based on fundamental Islamic texts. He includes several references to “Jews” in the collective.²⁵

“Could a Jew ever be a friend to a Muslim? Aren’t Koranic verses and prophetic sayings evident proof against it?,” reads a section of the reports. The grand vizier not only cited verses from the Koran stating that Jews were not to be trusted but also gave the Turkish translation of certain passages and interpreted them so as to drive home his point. “To take them as allies is to become one of them,” reads the truncated translation of another verse. He continues, using adjectives like “cursed,” “mendacious,” “deceitful,” and “untrustworthy” to describe Passi. Sinān Pasha’s main point is built upon a religious foundation.²⁶

One could say that these are almost extreme examples of expressions of distrust, born out of ad hominem animosity that may not constitute a pattern. To complicate matters, it is worth noting that Sinān Pasha himself employed a Jewish physician.²⁷ But dislike nurtured toward a people can take on subtle and complicated forms. The Catholic monarchs, Ferdinand of Aragon (d. 1516) and Isabella of Castile (d. 1504), who in 1492 issued the Alhambra decree to expel practicing Jews from Spain, are also cited as “having Jews as friends, colleagues and councillors.” The above condemnations were not uttered with any sort of equivocation or hesitation, which might suggest the sense that they would strike a discordant note. They seem to be delivered as well-known and widely accepted facts. But this is also the type of account that complicates an analysis of the anti-Judaism cultivated by the Ottoman elite. How are we to understand Sinān Pasha’s framing his dislike with overtly Koranic references? Should we view such references as evidence of a pragmatic politician who knew how to strike the right chord? Or were some of his sentiments in fact the residue of Christian traditions in the Balkans?

BLOOD LIBELS ADVANCED BY MUSLIMS?

Studies thus far have suggested that prior to the nineteenth century, blood libels in Ottoman lands were exclusively invented by Christians. Yet several Ottoman documents also mention “Muslims” making the

25 Fodor, “An Anti-Semite Grand Vizier?,” 191–206.

26 In referring to David Passi, the pasha uses such adjectives and nouns as *mel’ūn*, *ṣenā’at*, *fesād*, *fāsīd* and *ḥabīs*; cf. Koca Sinān Paşa, [*Telhīşār*], 12–16, 90–91, 181–84.

27 Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 18:145.

accusation of blood libel. Could such slanders have been appropriated by Ottoman Muslims? Were the Muslims mentioned in the documents perhaps converts from Christianity to Islam?

A handful of imperial orders related to this issue are recorded in registers of important affairs (*mühimme*)—chronologically arranged copies of edicts issued by the sultan after deliberations at the imperial council—that are kept in the Ottoman archives. Admittedly, the following few paragraphs do not constitute a sweeping survey of all cases recorded in the registers but represent only samples. Furthermore, *mühimme* entries in general provide limited information and only a superficial context for the causes and the course of events, thus leaving us with many unanswered questions. Nonetheless, a close look at their wording will reveal some patterns.

An illuminating case about an incident in Foça, a fortress town on the Aegean coast, is recorded in one of the earliest *mühimme* registers, dated 1560. Apparently, whenever there was an unsolved homicide in Foça, the town's Jews were accused of the murder and forced to exonerate themselves. The present case was brought, through an intermediary, as a complaint to the imperial council by a Jewish woman who had recently emigrated from "German lands." "It is your skewed custom to mix Muslim or Christian blood to your bread. Therefore you killed these people," was the accusation that the woman reported to the council. It appears to have been an elaborate setup: some people acted as litigants and others as witnesses to substantiate the cases. Curiously, this edict was issued to request that the local judge repeal the order given to the intermediary, who had come to Istanbul to pursue the case. We do not know the verdict of the original edict given to the Jews or why it was retracted.²⁸

The text of an imperial firman with similar content and dated some sixteen years prior was published by Amnon Cohen from the Jerusalem court register. The 1544 firman apparently was dispatched to the governors and judges of the Arab territories (*vilāyet-i ʿArabistān*), but where exactly the incident took place is not indicated in the document. The accusations against the Jews include not only killing people and mixing their blood into bread but also slandering the accusers' religion and cursing at them. The accusers are referred to as "wicked people" (*eşirrā*),

28 3 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri (996–968/1558–1560), 514, case no. 1169.

but no information on their religious background is provided. The litigants and false witnesses apparently acted in tandem to advance their incrimination, which is clearly defined as extracting cash and profits from Jews. The firman strictly orders the local judges not to listen to such cases advanced against Jews.²⁹ Almost an identical accusation was recorded in Aydın in 1595. The accusers are similarly referred to as “wicked people,” without any information on their religious background. Referring to an earlier edict, the local judge is instructed to forgo pursuing such cases.³⁰

The most detailed record on the issue, one that gives us insight into and perspective on blood libels and how they were addressed, was published by Uriel Heyd and is dated 1602.³¹ This order was recorded in a manuscript, but the original entry in a *mühimme* register has not yet been discovered. The edict, sent to the judge of Istanbul, lists some of the earlier sultans who had been petitioned about similar slander. The document suggests that Mehmed II (r. 1444–1446, 1451–1481) issued an edict to the effect that blood libels could not be seen by local judges but were handled exclusively at the imperial council—and only with plaintiffs, defendants, and witnesses present. Süleyman is invoked in the document as having issued an edict in 1553 that essentially dismissed all such accusations (*hılâf-ı vâki*) and strongly enforced that blood libel cases be seen only at the imperial council, by the highest officials of the empire. The document states that every sultan since Mehmed II had ratified earlier decrees, but that the original documents, kept by the petitioners, were destroyed in a fire—and therefore the edict was intended to replace them. For the same reason, historical information on earlier, similar cases is provided in this document.

29 Cohen, “Ritual Murder Accusations against the Jews during the Days of Suleiman the Magnificent,” 75. I have used the text of the firman as transcribed in Cohen’s article. However, I do not share the author’s view that the plaintiff and the false witnesses were clearly Muslim. The argument that he advances—that the word for the alleged victim (*âdam*, “man”) is not specifically Christian, so he must be Muslim—is not convincing. The term is an idiomatic expression for murder (*âdam katl eylediñüz, âdam öldürdüyüz*) and does not refer to a particular person. Therefore, the religious denomination of the accusers is not identifiable in this incident.

30 Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Mühimme Defteri 73, 280, case no. 641; cf. Fodor, “An Anti-Semite Grand Vizier?,” 192n3.

31 Heyd, “Ritual Murder Accusations in 15th and 16th Century Turkey,” 140ff. I was not able to see the original document and thus have used the complete transcription in Heyd’s article. Also see Barnai, “‘Blood Libels’ in the Ottoman Empire of the Fifteenth to Nineteenth Centuries.”

Quoting extensively from Jewish sources and Western travelers' accounts, Heyd provoked a discussion about the 1553 edict, claiming that it must have ratified an earlier firman, which probably was issued after the famous Amasya blood libel incident, commonly dated to the mid- or late 1540s. Supporting Ottoman documents for this particular incident have yet to be unearthed.³² Based on the information in contemporary sources, Heyd advances the assumption that Süleymān's chief physician, Moses Hamon (d. 1567), was instrumental in convincing him to obtain the firman that blood libel cases could only be seen at the imperial council. Heyd also conjectures that there may have been a connection between Süleymān's edict and his willingness to refute his son Prince Muṣṭafā's supposed anti-Jewish sentiments. As mentioned above, rumors were in circulation that if he had become sultan, he would have killed all of the Jews in Ottoman lands. Muṣṭafā's execution took place only a few months before the 1553 edict. These points are important to understanding the background to Süleymān's firman. According to the 1602 document, however, Mehmed II had already issued an edict stating that blood libels were only to be seen at the imperial council. If that information is accurate, Süleymān's firman may not have introduced new judicial directives.

Although these decrees allow us to reason that the imperial center viewed blood libels as nothing but ploys that some racketeers used to extort Jews, and acted to dismiss such cases via the highest legal authority, the insistent recurrence of the issue suggests that public opinion in smaller localities allowed such accusations to be advanced comfortably. We can presume that Jews in these towns were in an underprivileged position and thus could not defend themselves, and that the imperial center felt the highest legal authority was the most effective way to deal with such libels justly.

Still, at least one example complicates the matter further: evidently, in 1592 a certain Mīrzā bin Hüseyn (an Iranian?) from Bursa accused eight Jews of abducting him, tying him to a pillar in their house, and drawing two containers of blood from his calf. The imperial council ruled to exile the eight men on the Island of Rhodes. The particulars of this

32 The Portuguese Marrano poet Samuel Usque provides some details on the incident in his history from the early 1550s: Usque, *Consolaçam às tribulações de Israel*, 210–11.

peculiar case are difficult to determine, but the verdict seems counter to that of the edicts mentioned above. The difference between this case and the ones mentioned above is that the witnesses of the act, as distinctly specified in the document, were also Jews (*birkaç nefer Yahūdi dahī da^cvāların taşdıķ eyledüklerin*), which might explain the decision to exile Jews.³³

As might be expected, it is very difficult to ascertain how these libels disseminated. What we do know is that Meḫmed II's edict, quoted in the 1602 document, explicitly refers to Muslims as the victims (*tā³ife-i Yahūdā vech-i meşrūh üzre müslimān katl edüp*) of the allegations. Although the wording of that firman, from the mid-fifteenth century, cannot be confirmed from the original edict definitively, the first document treated above, about the specific case in Foça, explicitly presents "some people from among the Muslims" (*müslimānlardan ba^czı kimesneler*) as the accusing party. There is no way to determine who these Muslims were. However, it would not be overreaching to suppose that they were recent converts from Christianity to Islam who might have known that Jews were vulnerable to such allegations. Foça (Phokaia), after all, had been a primordial Greek town. If they were freeborn Muslims, did they learn of such libels from their Christian neighbors? Even if they were second-generation converts, it would not be unreasonable to assume that certain strong sentiments might have lived on within their families. While the document is not particularly revealing about the identity of the accusers, other than their being Muslim, blood libel should be considered essentially a Christian phenomenon, and to have spread from there.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

There seems to have been a pattern of outbursts of physical violence against Ottoman Jews, mostly by converts from Christianity. *Devşirme* converts, who probably acquired such hostile ideas as part of their culture growing up in the Balkans, may have naturally continued to nurture them in their new acculturated lives. After all, the soldiers socialized with a group of young men with similar pedigrees, which must have made it easier to

33 Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Mühimme Defteri 69, 297, case no. 584–85; also quoted in Heyd, "Ritual Murder Accusations in 15th and 16th Century Turkey," 138–39.

cultivate their views on Jews in general. Furthermore, the *devşirme* soldiers stationed in cities with mixed populations—such as Istanbul—must have come into contact and conversed in their mother tongues with local Christians. While it is very difficult to ascertain whether there was further circulation of ideas between these groups, anti-Judaism appears to have been an ordinary theme at least within some of these Christian communities.³⁴ Although I have concentrated on cases from the latter half of the sixteenth century, it remains to be seen whether there was a rise in the number of incidents during this time due to particular societal or economic strains.³⁵

I admit that this article contains a good deal of speculation. I would like to reiterate that most of these boys were converted to Islam as teenagers and would have remembered the notions with which they grew up. Of course, an inquiry into the psychological implications of being converted to a new cultural milieu, societal dynamic, and, most importantly, a new confessional mobilization—as well as a hypothesis about the perceptions of these teenagers—is bound to be barren, in the absence of any written personal accounts. As historians, however, I think we are well positioned and authorized to speculate about their mind-set.

I am not suggesting that there was a concerted effort or a conspiracy on the part of Christian converts against Jews, or that all *devşirme* converts categorically hated Jews. However, I believe that regarding these attacks merely as the result of ordinary mobsters looting targets for maximum monetary profit would be an oversimplification. Obviously, there is a great deal of danger in essentializing all converts, assigning to them similar feelings of aversion toward Jews. A janissary mobster may well have assaulted Jews while another convert was defending them and yet another was looting Christian shops alongside Jewish ones. A *devşirme* pasha may have despised Jews generally but also employed skilled Jewish physicians in his service. These are expected complexities of human interactions.

34 For example, in 1627 *Katà Ioudaíων* (Against the Jews)—written by Kyrillos Loukaris, the Patriarch of Constantinople (in office intermittently between 1620 and 1638)—was the first book published at the Greek Orthodox press in Istanbul. The tract was a theological refutation of Judaism, composed in a genre with a long tradition (*Adversus Judaeos*); cf. Pektas, “The First Greek Printing Press in Constantinople (1625–1628),” 110.

35 Fodor sees rising anti-Jewish sentiment as connected to an economic crisis in the latter part of the sixteenth century. Fodor, “An Anti-Semite Grand Vizier?,” 191–206.

Dislike of others is also a complex emotion that is difficult to gauge and substantiate. Depending on several factors, including societal incentives and pressures, the individual's changing approach to life, his or her interests and calculation of benefits, it may take on different forms of expression or may be suppressed altogether. Feelings of aversion may come to be expressed overtly at times of distress and when the opportunity presents itself. I thus am interested in retrieving such instances of personal or group outbursts which may in the end suggest a pattern of motivations.

A related topic that deserves separate study is the obvious aversion and detestation displayed by some of the *devşirme* converts toward all things Christian. The trope that the converts occasionally turned fervent enemies of Christians has been the subject of some studies.³⁶ I believe that modern theories and findings of psychotherapy can guide historians in our efforts to interpret the motivations and ambivalent worlds of *devşirme* converts. Although the field of psychohistory—the study of psychological motivations for historical events, established by Lloyd deMause (b. 1931) in the 1970s—has been treated cautiously by historians, who prefer to work with incontrovertible evidence, the methods of the field would certainly bring new perspectives to our understanding of the possible motivations of *devşirmes*.³⁷

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

- 3 *Numaralı Mühimme Defteri (996–968/1558–1560)*. Edited by Nezih Aykut, et al. Ankara: Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 1993.
- Anonymous. *Anonim Bir İbranice Kroniğe Göre 1622–1624 Yıllarında Osmanlı Devleti ve İstanbul*. Translated by Nuh Arslantaş and Yaron Ben Naeh. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2013.
- Anonymous. *Tevârih-i Âl-i ʿOsmân*. Transliterated by Hüseyin Oğuz as “Arkeoloji Müzesi Kütüphanesi 376 Numarada Kayıtlı Anonim Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman (H.616-929 / M.1219-1519).” MA thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2013.
- Anonymous. *Tevârih-i Âl-i ʿOsmân*. Transliterated by Şamil Can as “XVI. Yüzyıla Ait Anonim bir Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman.” MA thesis, Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, 2006.

36 See the references in Graf's recent *The Sultan's Renegades*.

37 I would like to mention a term paper written by one of my students, from which I drew my initial ideas on the topic: Kirschbaum, “Psychological Implications of the *Devşirme* System.”

- Capsali, Elijah. *Seder Eliyahu Zuta*. Partial translations by Nuh Arslantaş in *Yahudiler ve Türkler: Yahudi Tarihçi Eliyahu Kapsali'nin (1483–1555) Seder Eliyahu Zuta İsimli Kroniği Bağlamında Bir İnceleme*. Istanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2013.
- Defterdâr Şarı Mehmed. *Zübde-i Veķāyi'ât*. Edited by Abdülkadir Özcan as *Zübde-i Veķayât: Tahlil ve Metin (1066-1116/1656-1704)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995.
- Gerlach, Stephan. *Stephan Gerlachs deß Aeltern Tage-Buch . . . an die Ottomannische Pforte zu Constantinopel*. Frankfurt am Main: In Verlegung Johann-David Zunners, 1674.
- Hans Dernschwam's Tagebuch einer Reise nach Konstantinopel und Kleinasien (1553/55)*. Edited by Franz Babinger. Munich, Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1923.
- Hasan Begzâde Aĥmed Paşa. *Tārīĥ*. Vol. 2. Edited by Şevki Nezihî Aykut as *Hasan Beyzâde târīhi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2004.
- Ķoca Sinân Paşa. [*Telĥiřât*]. Edited by Halil Sahillioĥlu as *Koca Sinan Paşa'nın Telhisleri*. Istanbul: İslam Tarih, Sanat ve Kùltür Arařtırma Merkezi, IRCICA, 2004.
- Lubenaus, Reinhold. *Beschreibung der Reisen des Reinhold Lubenaus*. Edited by W. Sahn Kùnigsberg: F. Beyer (Thomas & Oppermann), 1915.
- Muřtafâ 'Āli. *Kùnhü'l-aĥbâr*. Vol. 1, part 2. Edited by Ahmet Uĥur. Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1997.
- Muřtafâ Na'ımâ. *Tārīĥ-i Na'ımâ*. Edited by Mehmet İřirli as *Tārīĥ-i Na'ımâ: Ravzatü'l-Hüseyn fi hulâsati aĥbâri'l-hâfikayn*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007.
- Petz, Bartholomäus. *Petzsche Gesandtschaftsberichten*. K. K. Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv in Wien, Turcica 1587 Fascikel 38. Convolut I u. II.
- Sambari, Yosef. *Sefer Divrei Yosef*. Published as *Mısır'da Türkler, Araplar ve Yahudiler: Yahudi Tarihçi Yosef Sambari'nin (1640–1703) Sefer Divrey Yosef isimli İbrance Kroniği Bağlamında Bir İnceleme*. Partial translations by Nuh Arslantaş. Istanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2015.
- Sanderson, John. *The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant, 1584–1602; with his Autobiography and Selections from his Correspondence*. Edited by Sir William Foster. London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1931.
- Selânikî [Muřtafâ Efendi]. *Tārīĥ-i Selânikî*. Edited by Mehmet İřirli as *Tarih-i Selânikî*. 2 vols. Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakùltesi Basımevi, 1989.
- Sevgen, Nazmi. "'İĥneli Fıçı' Hikâyesinin Sırrı." *Hayat Tarih Mecmuası* 5 (1974): 63–64.
- Silâĥdâr Mehmed Aĥa [Fındıklılı]. *Silâĥdâr Tārīĥi*. Istanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1928.
- Topkapı Palace Museum Archives, E.12321. Edited by Halil Sahillioĥlu as *Topkapı Sarayı Arřivi, H. 951–952 Tarihli ve E–12321 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri*. Istanbul: IRCICA, 2002.
- Usque, Samuel. *Consolaçam às tribulaçones de Israel*. Translated from the Portuguese and edited by Martin A. Cohen as *Samuel Usque's Consolation for the Tribulations of Israel*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1964. Reprint, Skokie, IL: Varda Books, 2002.

Studies

- Arbel, Benjamin. "Passi, David." In *Encyclopedia of Jews in the Islamic World*, edited by Norman A. Stillman, accessed July 5, 2016.
- Arbel, Benjamin. *Trading Nations: Jews and Venetians in the Early Modern Eastern Mediterranean*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Baer, Marc. "Death in the Hippodrome: Sexual Politics and Legal Culture in the Reign of Mehmet IV." *Past and Present* 210, no. 1 (2011): 61–91.
- Baer, Marc. "The Great Fire of 1660 and the Islamization of Christian and Jewish Space in Istanbul." *The International Journal of Middle East Studies* 36 (2004): 159–81.
- Baer, Marc. *Honored by the Glory of Islam: Conversion and Conquest in Ottoman Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Barnai, Jacob. "'Blood Libels' in the Ottoman Empire of the Fifteenth to Nineteenth Centuries." In *Antisemitism through the Ages*, edited by Shmuel Almog, translated by Nathan H. Reisner, 189–94. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1988.
- Baron, Salo Wittmayer. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews: Late Middle Ages and Era of European Expansion, 1200–1650*. Vol. 18: *The Ottoman Empire, Persia, Ethiopia, India and China*. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Benbassa, Esther, and Aron Rodrigue. *Sephardi Jewry: A History of the Judeo-Spanish Community, 14th–20th Centuries*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Bulliet, Richard. *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period: An Essay in Quantitative History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Cohen, Amnon. *Jewish Life under Islam: Jerusalem in the Sixteenth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Cohen, Amnon. "Ritual Murder Accusations against the Jews during the Days of Suleiman the Magnificent." *Journal of Turkish Studies* 10 (1986): 73–78.
- Cohen, Jeremy. "Christian Theology and Anti-Jewish Violence in the Middle Ages: Connections and Disjunctions." In *Religious Violence between Christians and Jews: Medieval Roots, Modern Perceptions*, edited by Anna Sapir Abulafia, 44–60. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Danişmend, İsmail Hâmi. *İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi*. Vol. 3. Istanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1972.
- Dursteler, Eric. *Renegade Women: Gender, Identity, and Boundaries in the Early Modern Mediterranean*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2011.
- Epstein, Mark Alan. *The Ottoman Jewish Communities and Their Role in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*. Freiburg i. Br.: Klaus Schwarz, 1980.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Ein Günstling des osmanischen Sultans Murad III: David Passi." *Der Islam* 47 (1971): 290–97.
- Fleischer, Cornell H. *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âlî (1541–1600)*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Fodor, Pal. "An Anti-Semite Grand Vizier?: The Crisis in Ottoman-Jewish Relations in 1589–91 and Its Consequences." In *In Quest of the Golden Apple: Imperial Ideology*,

- Politics, and Military Administration in the Ottoman Empire*, edited by Pal Fodor, 191–206. Istanbul: ISIS Press, 2000.
- Galante, Avram. *Histoire des Juifs de Turquie*. Istanbul: ISIS, [1986?].
- Graf, Tobias P. *The Sultan's Renegades: Christian-European Converts to Islam and the Making of the Ottoman Elite*. Corby: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Hacker, Joseph. "Ottoman Policy toward the Jews and Jewish Attitudes toward the Ottomans during the Fifteenth Century." In *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, edited by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, 117–26. New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982.
- Hathaway, Jane. "The Grand Vizier and the False Messiah: The Sabbatai Sevi Controversy and the Ottoman Reform in Egypt." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 117, no. 4 (1997): 665–71.
- Heyd, Uriel. "Ritual Murder Accusations in 15th and 16th Century Turkey." *Sefunot: Studies and Sources on the History of the Jewish Communities in the East* 5 (1961): 135–50.
- Jacobs, Martin. *Islamische Geschichte in jüdischen Chroniken: hebräische Historiographie des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Kafadar, Cemal. "When Coins Turned into Drops of Dew and Bankers Became Robbers of Shadows: The Boundaries of Ottoman Economic Imagination at the End of the Sixteenth Century." PhD diss., McGill University, 1986.
- Kirschbaum, Abigail. "Psychological Implications of the *Devşirme* System: A Psychohistorical Approach." Unpublished term paper, The University of Chicago, 2016.
- Lachenauer, Isabel. "'One Slice of Hir I Did So See Passe by Our House in Galata': The Extraordinary Murder of the Kirā Esperanza Malchi." Unpublished term paper, The University of Chicago, 2016.
- Lewis, Bernard. *The Jews of Islam*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Lewis, Bernard. "The New Anti-Semitism." *The New York Review of Books*, April 10, 1986.
- Nirenberg, David. *Anti-Judaism: The Western Tradition*. New York: Norton, 2013.
- Özgen, Elif. "The Connected World of Intrigues: The Disgrace of Murad III's Favourite David Passi in 1591." *Leidschrift* 27, no. 1 (2012): 75–100.
- Pedani, Maria Pia. "Safiye's Household and Venetian Diplomacy." *Turcica* 32 (2000): 9–32.
- Pedani, Maria Pia. "Venetians in Constantinople at the End of the Sixteenth Century." *Arab Studies Notebooks*. Supplement 15: "Venetians in the Levant. Muslims in Venice" (1997): 67–84.
- Pektas, Nil Ozlem. "The First Greek Printing Press in Constantinople (1625–1628)." PhD diss., University of London, 2014.
- Rozen, Minna. "The Ottoman Jews." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol. 3, edited by Suraiya Faroqhi, 256–71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism*. New York: Seabury Press, [1974].
- Shaw, Stanford J. "Christian Anti-Semitism in the Ottoman Empire." *Belleten* 54 (1991): 1073–1149.