Acta Orientalia Hung. 75 (2022) 2, 331–340
DOI: 10.1556/062.2022.00250

AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ

BOOK REVIEW

Felicia Roşu (ed.) 2022. *Slavery in the Black Sea Region, c.900–1900: Forms of Unfreedom at the Intersection between Christianity and Islam.* [Studies in Global Slavery 11.] Leiden, Boston: Brill. xxiii + 448 pp. ISBN: 978-90-04-47071-2

Reviewed by ***Fırat Yaşa****

© 2022 Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

Does tackling a historical continuity through a phenomenon enable us to present a macro perspective through micro instances? To what extent does it allow us to observe the changing silhouettes of the phenomenon in different historical contexts? In other words, is it possible to make a proper snowball from snowflakes that are very different from each other, as Ehud R. Toledano metaphorically indicates in his Preface? The book under review contains the reworked versions of the presentations delivered at the international workshop entitled 'Slavery in the Black Sea Region: Forms of Unfreedom at the Intersection of Islam and Christianity, c. 900–1900', held at Leiden University in 2017. The book comprises 12 articles divided into 5 thematic parts, along with a Preface by Toledano, a prominent scholar of Ottoman slavery and an Introduction by Felicia Roşu, the organizer of the conference and editor of the volume; it includes two excellent maps of the Black Sea region and a number of useful charts and illustrations. In the Introduction, Roşu justifies the inclusion of both the Byzantine and Ottoman periods in the history of enslavement in this region – which altogether covers a millennium – by the usefulness of the timeframe for showing the differences between the periods as well as for potentially revealing 'long-term continuities that would otherwise remain hidden' (p. 4). She also states the reasons for using a regional approach for a synthetic examination of the diverse forms of unfreedom attested in the very different societies around the Black Sea: 'First, it allows us to make a broader inventory of practices and institutions of unfreedom' in the region; '[s]econd, and perhaps more importantly, the regional perspective allows us to notice certain commonalities that transcend political and legal borders' (p. 8). The resulting volume then 'aims to make a first step in the direction of placing the Black Sea on the map of global slavery' (p. 13). In this review I will examine to what extent the stated intention of the book has been achieved.

* Department of History, The Faculty of Arts and Sciences, University of Düzce, Turkey and BCDSS Fellow, University of Bonn, Germany. E-mail: yasafirat@gmail.com.

AKJournals

Authenticated kosagabor9@gmail.com | Downloaded 06/04/22 09:00 AM UTC

Evidently relying on the 'plurality of truth' theory, Toledano reminds us in his Preface that there was no single form of enslavement. He emphasizes the value of a comparative approach to the study of slavery and, more recently, 'efforts to look at slavery as a global phenomenon' (p. viii). Therefore, instead of generating new definitions of slavery as a whole, Toledano advocates formulating concepts of slavery, especially global slavery, that are 'modular and flexible' (p. x). As an example of such a concept he refers to the 'Slaving Zones' model proposed by Jeffrey Fynn-Paul as one that 'offers the most suitable ideas for looking historically at global enslavement' (p. xii). Toledano concludes with presenting 'three focal points' which he regards as likely to achieve prominence in global slavery studies: emancipation as 'a crucial component of understanding global slavery'; microhistory whose role is already growing and whose usefulness he illustrates by quoting Michael Zeuske's observation that 'a fresh microhistorical view changes always, or almost always, global narratives'; and coming directly from the second point, a reevaluation of the agency of the enslaved who are studied as individuals, not as a group (p. xv).

In the Introduction, Roşu remarks on the great diversity of the forms of enslavement found in the Black Sea region, a 'main slaving hub on the frontier between Europe and the rest of the world from the ancient period to the 19th century' (p. 3). She cites the estimate by Dariusz Kołodziejczyk that during the 16th–17th centuries as many as 2 million captives could have been trafficked from the region, which equaled or perhaps even surpassed the numbers of the coeval transatlantic slave trade. (The numbers of East European captives and slaves trafficked to the Khanate and the Ottoman Empire during the early modern period are still far from certain and will continue to challenge and vex historians.[1]) Yet despite its prominence as a source of numerous slaves (Tatars, Circassians, Ruthenians [Ukrainians and Belarusians], Muscovites, Poles, Hungarians, to name just a few), the Black Sea region remains understudied and the forms of enslavement found there are not sufficiently known. Roşu discusses several key concepts formulated in slavery studies in order to demonstrate the challenges posed to the field by the diversity of the region's forms of enslavement. Thus, she posits that none of the Black Sea region's societies could be categorized as a 'slave society' according to Moses Finley's definition and considers the 'social death' concept developed by Orlando Patterson insufficiently flexible for representing the entirety of the region's forms of unfreedom. On the other hand, she commends Toledano's 'continuum model' (p. 4) as preferable to the essentialist binary classification (i.e., slave vs. free) and emphasizes how well Fynn-Paul's 'Slaving Zones' concept applies to the realities of the region's frontier (p. 5). Emphasizing the fluidity of the Black Sea frontier in terms of the diversity of the legal and customary forms of unfreedom attested in the region over a thousand years as well as the interchangeability of the statuses of the free, captured, and enslaved, Roşu remarks that '[f]rom a global perspective, it would be interesting to explore to what extant – and owing to which specific conditions – all frontier zones were also slaving zones', especially during the medieval and early modern eras (p. 8).

The contributions in Part 1 explore the commercial activities of Italian merchants in light of Genoese and Venetian notarial records. In the first chapter Michel Balard, by meticulously utilizing Genoese notarial documentation, explores the main trends of Italian slaving and slave-trad-

[1] Other general estimates include that of Halil İnalcık of 10,000 East Europeans carried off every year to the Crimean Khanate and Ottoman Empire during 1500–1650 (İnalcık 1994: 285) which has informed the one put forward by Kołodziejczyk, as well as that of Yücel Öztürk (2017: 49) who estimates the annual export at 3,000 persons. The accuracy of macro estimates needs treatment separately, suffice it to say that all of them are problematic in one way or another and require detailed analysis of their sources and attendant assumptions.

Authenticated kosagabor9@gmail.com | Downloaded 06/04/22 09:00 AM UTC

ing activities in the Black Sea region from the late 13th century to the second half of the 15th emphasizing the central role of the Genoese merchants and their main port city in the region, Caffa. On the basis of his sources, the author traces the fluctuations of the overall numbers of the slaves being exported to the Mediterranean, first rising prompted in part by the labour shortages in Italian and Spanish cities following the plague of 1348, then falling sharply following the Ottoman conquest of the Dardanelles in 1420 and especially after the conquest of Constantinople in 1453 which gave the Ottomans complete control of the trade. Balard also discusses the slaves' provenance, ethnicity, age, gender, and prices as well as the shifting trade routes and changing specialization of the merchants. He reminds of the importance of taking into account the local situation as well. Thus, among the three types of enslavement in the region, Balard identifies as the main one the sale of children by their families impoverished by endemic upheavals in the region; the remaining two were enslavement of prisoners of frequent wars and piracy/kidnapping. Apart from southern Europe, the Genoese also exported Black Sea slaves to the Mamluk Sultanate of Egypt and Syria. Even after the closure of the Straits by the Ottomans, Black Sea slaves were still delivered to the Mamluks by land routes through eastern Anatolia well into the second half of the 15th century. Balard draws attention to the decrease of the numbers of ethnic Tatar slaves during this period and to the concurrent increase of Circassian slaves and so-called 'Russian' slaves; in a note he states that the term 'Russian' – sic, he gives only the English rather than possible terms in the old Italian documents such as *russo, russa,* and *rubeus* – referred to Slavs in general north of the Black Sea, yet instead of using the more accurate term 'Slavs' he uses the ambiguous English 'Russians' throughout his chapter. The causes of this shift from Tatar to Slavic and Circassian slaves are reinterpreted by Hannah Barker in her chapter discussed below.

On the basis of notarial records composed in Venice and in the Venetian settlement of Tana (Azov) and dating from the period between 1359 and 1452, Sergei Karpov examines the shifts in the composition of slaves exported from Tana. He provides some statistical data on the numbers and ethnic composition of the slaves (among whom Tatars predominated in 1359–1363 to be superseded by 'Russians' in 1407–1452); the slaves' distribution according to age and gender categories; their old and new names; their prices; their employment; and the types of manumission that gave the former slaves full Roman citizenship and thus allowed for their integration into the social milieu of Italian cities. Karpov notes that ethnic labels as used in the sources are essentially generic as they are 'a combination of religious, somatic, and ethnic characteristics' (p. 44) as well as connected to geographic provenance. Having said this and that Tatar slaves are distinguished from Russian slaves, he goes on to clarify what his latter usage means: '"Russian" slaves were identified by Venetian notaries in general terms as slaves of Slavic origin. They were called either Russians or Ruthenians, regardless of whether they originated from the territory of the Moscow principality or from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. That is why, based on the sources I have studied, I do not consider Ruthenians and Russians as different groups' (p. 44). If the Venetian notaries indeed identified them as slaves of Slavic origin, then why not refer to them thus? As to Russians and Ruthenians it would have been useful had the author identified which actual words were used to indicate these two English words. In addition, since 'Ruthenian' is commonly applied to the predecessors of Belarusians and Ukrainians it would have been interesting to see references to its usage, as he claims, for residents of the Moscow principality. Regardless, as stated, the logic of considering Ruthenians and Russians as one group based on purported usage in his sources is weak. There is also an obvious error: the Commonwealth was formed only in 1569,

Authenticated kosagabor9@gmail.com | Downloaded 06/04/22 09:00 AM UTC

for the period of this chapter Poland-Lithuania is more accurate albeit the Union of Krewo that established a loose connection of the two states occurred only in 1385.

The three articles in Part 2 are grouped under the title 'Slavery and Christianity'. The first article, by Daphne Penna, demonstrates the difference between the legal and actual practice with regard to the enslaved in the medieval Byzantine Empire. On the one hand, Byzantine law considered slaves property without legal capacity and denied them the right to purchase and sell property. On the other hand, the author presents evidence that during the 10th–11th centuries slaves engaged in commercial activities. This development stemmed from the laws introduced by Emperor Leo VI (866–912) in order to provide slaves with greater economic opportunity, though, as argued by Penna, the measures were motivated not so much by Christian doctrine as by the contemporary ideal of the fair and merciful ruler. In the next article Sandra Origone examines the relationship between enslavement and religion in western Christendom during the 13th–15th centuries. She discovers that prior to the 15th century Orthodox Christian slaves trafficked from the Black Sea region to Italian cities or those who converted to Catholic Christianity after their enslavement (and whose names are preserved in Italian notarial records and cited by the author), were not usually manumitted by their Catholic owners nor did their conversion necessarily improve their situation. Observing that the papal attitudes towards Christian slaves lacked consistency, Origone concludes that the more favorable attitudes among the Roman Catholics towards baptized white slaves from the 15th century on resulted more from the growing popularity of humanistic ideas in Italy rather than from any direct influence of the Catholic Church. The last article authored by Viorel Achim examines the still underresearched attitudes to slavery and emancipation espoused by the Orthodox Church in the mid-19th century Romanian principalities. In both Moldavia and Wallachia, the majority of slaves were Gypsies, and the Church, especially through its monasteries, was the single largest slave holder. Achim finds that by and large the Church institutions played only a minor role in the pro-abolition movements arising in the principalities by the early 19th century, for the most part supporting the states' policy of general emancipation of slaves as well as the rest of the sweeping program of political, social, and cultural reforms implemented between 1831–1832 and 1858 that pursued the states' modernization. As Roșu sums up in the Introduction, all three chapters of Part 2 attest to 'the largely passive attitude of Christian institutions towards slavery' (p. 10).

Mikhail Kizilov, Andrzej Gliwa, and Maryna Kravets and Victor Ostapchuk contributed to the following part of the book entitled 'Raiders and Captives of the Northern Shore'. Kizilov provides an in-depth examination of the conditions of Polish slaves in Crimea in 1475–1774, though he tends to concentrate mostly on the 17th century. The author bases his research on an impressive number of both Christian and Muslim primary sources, including Sharia court records of the Crimean Khanate, travelogues, missionary accounts, and other. After discussing the terms that were used to define various gender-age categories of slaves in Crimean society such as *çora, dogma, marya, cariye,* and *devke/devuşka,* the author points out that ethnic and geographic markers used in some Muslim sources, first of all in the Sharia court registers, to describe the slaves' origin, are often imprecise. Thus, the terms *Leh*, 'Pole' and *Qıraliyet'ül-asl*, 'Kingdom in origin' whose rough meaning is given by Kizilov as 'Polish' and 'of Polish origin', may indicate not only a Polish Catholic but also an Orthodox Ruthenian, both residents of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (p. 147). Though neither Muslim nor Christian sources give the exact number of Polish slaves in the Crimean Khanate, the author cites the above-mentioned estimate by Kołodziejczyk (about 2 million captives, mostly Slavs, during the 16th and 17th centuries) as well as that

Authenticated kosagabor9@gmail.com | Downloaded 06/04/22 09:00 AM UTC

of Bohdan Baranowski of the loss of about a million of Poland's population during roughly the same period – though Baranowski (1947: 41) in fact refers to the entire Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, not just to the Kingdom of Poland. After pointing out that references in the sources to 'Polish slaves' or 'slaves from Poland' did not necessarily refer to ethnic Poles, but also included Ruthenians and others, Kizilov goes on to estimate that 'about one half of such "Polish" slaves were Poles of Catholic faith' (p. 156). It is impossible to say for sure but considering the geography of Tatar raids that were mostly in Ukraine and even those in the Land of Przemyśl – today Poland proper but then far from ethnically homogenous – such an estimate with no evidence seems high. That is not to say that the topic of Polish captives, be they gentry (these are better documented) or peasants and townsmen is not interesting and important. But while the author shows that he is aware of the problematics of terms that could be either ethnic or political markers, it is hard to distinguish when he is discussing actual Poles as opposed to inhabitants of the Kingdom of Poland or even the entire Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Utilizing some of his primary sources in translation, the author inadvertently falls into an error caused by a translation mistake: relying on a Russian translation of the *Book of Travels* by Evliya Çelebi Kizilov refers to 'young Polish *ghulam*s,' that is male slaves (p. 151), whereas in the original text (also referenced by Kizilov though with the wrong page number) Evliya has *Leh…dilberleri*, 'beautiful Polish girls'; *ghulam*s are mentioned later in the passage without ethnic markers[2]. Trying to determine the extent to which slaves were exposed to violence by their owners, Kizilov, on the basis of his Christian sources, concludes that this was an infrequent phenomenon. Some recent scholarship, however, reveals that slaves were subjected to violence not only by their owners but also by their own milieu (Yaşa 2019: 433–443).

In the next study Gliwa shifts our focus to the strategies, tactics, and quantitative aspects of Crimean Tatar and Nogay raiding for captives in early modern eastern Europe, with the most attention given to the territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In line with his earlier works, the author examines the raiding phenomenon (termed by him 'the Tatar military art of war', p. 194ff) using the terminology of modern warfare. Though on first reading his jargon may seem anachronistic (e.g., 'the Tatar art of war was a highly operationally integrated military system that took advantage of a synergy of several functional elements and cross-boundary methods of military action', p. 225), his approach nonetheless represents a useful direction of scholarly inquiry. Significantly, Gliwa has pioneered the application of the concept of asymmetrical warfare developed in the field of international relations and political science, to Tatar raiding and captive-taking (cf. Gliwa 2016: 196). In the present study the author discusses the main features of this style of warfare including the raiders' avoidance of engagements with regular enemy troops in favor of stealthily attacking civilian populations, most notably in the poorly defended rural areas, in order to maximize the number of captives while 'minimizing unwelcome losses and risks' to the raiders' lives (p. 196). Gliwa has also been one of the few researchers who on the basis of previously overlooked mass quantitative sources of east and east-central European provenance

[2] 'Ve cümle dellâkleri ibrîşim futalar ile sîm-gûn bedenlerin dirâğûş etdirüp bellerinde fütûnî kîseler ve ellerinde sünnetî zînetî(?) hınnâlar urunmuş onar ve on beşer yaşında üstâd-ı Çerkes ve Abaza ve Gürcî ve Rus ve **Leh** ve Maskov **dilberleri** tâvûsî reftâr ile hırâm ederek gelüp âdeme yapışup gûnâ-gûn musanna' şîvekârlık ile herkesin murâd u merâmları üzre hizmet etdiklerinde âdemin sehâ damarları depreşüp cândan azîz şeylerin ol uryân hâlde iken vermek mukarrerdir. Tâ bu mertebe muğlim dellâk-i pâkleri var. Ve her bir **gulâmlar** âlüfte ellerinde mecmerelerle ûd-ı mülebbesler ve buhûr-ı hâverîler ihrâk edüp râyiha-i tayyibeden gasillerin dimâğları mu'attar olur' (Evliya Çelebi 2003: 217–218 – emphasis mine; see also Yaşa 2021: 185).

Authenticated kosagabor9@gmail.com | Downloaded 06/04/22 09:00 AM UTC

quantify the volume of the human booty abducted in certain raids and/or from certain areas – for which such sources are available. In this article the author uses the example of the Land of Przemyśl located in the hinterland of the southeastern steppe frontier of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Though not a frontier region, nevertheless in the 17th century the region was subjected to 16 invasions by Tatars (p. 226). Extant data attests to a minimum 20,026 persons abducted; having added a gauged quantity of captives for the villages lacking documentation, Gliwa estimates that throughout the century the region lost nearly 40,000 residents to the Tatar raids (p. 228). An obvious value of this approach to establishing more accurate figures of captives is that – if done for every locale for which mass quantitative sources are available – it promises to correct the macro estimates formulated so far. Regrettably, Gliwa's chapter, though theoretically impressive and exhaustively researched, is marred by a somewhat inconsistent terminology. For instance, the author uses the terms 'captive' and 'slave' interchangeably. Even though Gliwa professes to concern himself 'only with the fates of Tatar captives before they became slaves in formal and legal terms' and explains the difference between the two statuses of unfreedom (pp. 192–194), he nonetheless refers to the Tatar and Nogay raiding predominately as 'slaving raids' (e.g., pp. 188, 189, 191, also in the chapter's title), 'slaving expeditions' (pp. 189, 192, 221), and 'slave-hunting operations' (e.g., pp. 200–201, 205).

In contrast to the above-mentioned articles in this part of the volume, Kravets and Ostapchuk explore the captive-taking forays of the Ukrainian (called thus to include both Zaporozhian and hinterland/town cossacks who also engaged in raiding) and Don Cossacks to the Muslim side of the frontier. Significantly, the authors establish a new zone of captive taking, one in which Slavs were the raiders. At first partially overlapping the older raiding zone of the Crimean Tatars and Nogays in the Black Sea steppes, by the early 17th century the new raiding zone encompassed all shores of the Black Sea and even further inland in those places where rivers navigable to their long boats allowed cossacks to penetrate, and also simply access on foot by land. The authors estimate that the scale of captives taken in the cossack forays to have been at least an order of magnitude less than that taken by the Crimean Tatars and Nogays, yet still consider that numbers to have been significant. A very important contribution is their efforts to trace the fates of the mostly Muslim Turkic captives among the cossacks as well as in the northern countries of Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy. Overall, the authors consider five different areals where the captives found themselves subject to a variety of forms of unfreedom: the lands of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, those of the Don Cossacks, Muscovy, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and Kingdom of Poland. In the first two some were released for ransom or exchanged, others assimilated into the cossack societies, sent to rulers, administrators, and top commanders as gifts or informants, or sold to the hinterland. In Muscovy, where legal slavery survived to the early 18th century, Turkic captives joined the category of 'slaves (*kholopy*) by captivity' and remained slaves, largely privately owned, unless ransomed or exchanged by relatives; those captured in warfare belonged to the state and could also be exchanged or repatriated following the conclusion of a peace treaty. Kravets and Ostapchuk also argue in favor of Richard Hellie's identification of Muscovite *kholopy* by captivity as slaves. In the remaining two areals the situation of Turkic captives was less clear. In the Kingdom Poland slavery as a legal institution died out in the early 16th century. However although in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania slavery was kept in the lawbooks up until the very end of that state's existence in the late 18th century, slaves as a social group by and large disappeared in the early 17th. In Lithuania, which became the first destination of free Turkic settlers already in the 14th century, the captives were initially settled among their coreligionists on the state or

Authenticated kosagabor9@gmail.com | Downloaded 06/04/22 09:00 AM UTC

private land and used as labor or in armed forces. Towards the end of the 16th century, however, some of the Turkic captives began to be imprisoned; a predicament attested also in Poland and Muscovy. Kravets and Ostapchuk suggest that this change should be considered in the context of the appearance in Europe at about the same time of political and legal ideas advocating amelioration of the treatment of prisoners of war who previously were enslaved or executed but now increasingly kept alive and confined for subsequent ransom, exchange, or repatriation at the end of hostilities. Thus the imprisonment of Turkic captives taken in warfare might represent a new way prisoners of war were treated in the three East European states during the 16th–17th centuries. The authors also address the terminology used in slavery studies emphasizing the need for greater precision in differentiating between captives and slaves. For example, they argue that 'ransom captivity' is preferable to 'ransom slavery', which they consider to be an oxymoron. They urge greater rigor in ascertaining ethnic origins of the unfree and point to errors that uncritical use of modern or ambiguous designations can lead to. They emphasize the importance of making sure historical terminology is well-defined before using it for analytical purposes and point to the pitfalls of facile rendering ethnic or geographic names such as *Rus*, *Russia, Mosqov* with modern names. Kravets and Ostapchuk also argue convincingly that East European forms of unfreedom are best explained not through the slavery–freedom binary model, but as a range of distinct states of unfreedom be it a continuum, a spectrum, or a non-linear matrix.

In Part 4 titled 'The Circassian Question', Hannah Barker offers a convincing reinterpretation of the changing dynamics of the Black Sea slave trade that occurred in the late 14th century. Comparing Mamluk and Italian sources, she discovers in the latter a shift from Tatars to Caucasians and 'Russians' (which like Karpov, she defines with insufficient rigor) mirroring the shift from Kipchak Turks to Circassians attested in the former. The fact that the shift appears in both sets of sources has allowed Barker to trace it to the supply of slave manpower rather than to the demand for it that has for long been emphasized in Mamluk studies. Although the author states that not all the causes of the shift in supply have been identified, she lists several probable ones: 1) the 1360s–1370s civil war in the Golden Horde followed by consolidation in the 1380s, which made fewer Tatars/Kipchak Turks available for enslavement and export to the Mediterranean; 2) more frequent Tatar raids of the 'Russian' (or rather East Slavic) principalities following the Golden Horde civil war; 3) the weakening and fragmentation of the Kingdom of Georgia as a result of the invasions by Timur's army during the 1380s and 1390s, which, together with subsequent wars, revolts, and raids in the Caucasus, facilitated the enslavement and sale of Circassians; and 4) a change in Mamluk merchants' trade routes following by the introduction by the Genoese in 1381 of a tax on Muslim merchants visiting Crimean and Sea of Azov ports; the tax was imposed also on their trade goods and newly purchased Muslim slaves. In order to avoid the tax, Mamluk traders had to relocate their slave-purchasing from the Golden Horde to the Caucasus and Circassian slaves available there whereas Italians began exporting more eastern Slavs as well as Circassians.

Natalia Królikowska-Jedlińska likewise focuses on the Circassians, but during the Ottoman period when they were highly sought after as elite slaves in the Crimean Khanate and Ottoman Empire. Her chapter explores 'the status of Circassians versus the Crimean Khanate and the Ottoman Empire' as pertains to their eligibility for enslavement (p. 380). She bases her study on Muslim primary sources – including Crimean Tatar and Ottoman chronicles, Ottoman Registers of Important Affairs (*Mühimme Defterleri*), and the *Book of Travels* by Evliya Çelebi – combined with the 17th–early 18th century correspondence of Dominican and Jesuit missionaries based mostly in Crimea with their Italian headquarters, held in archival collections of Rome and Vati-

Authenticated kosagabor9@gmail.com | Downloaded 06/04/22 09:00 AM UTC

can and as yet largely unpublished. Using the latter sources to partially fill the gaps in the former has enabled Królikowska-Jedlińska to answer the question posed in the title of her chapter: were Circassians 'slaves of the Crimean khan or Muslim warriors?' (p. 364). She zeroes in on two main aspects: gradual Islamization of the Circassian region and social stratification of its population. On the one hand, the common Circassians of the north-western Caucasus may have adhered to a mixture of pagan, Christian, and Muslim beliefs even in the 18th century. For that reason the Crimean Khanate, which claimed sovereignty over the Circassian tribes, considered most of them infidels (as did the khanate's suzerain, the Ottoman Empire), and thus liable to a tribute in slaves to be sent to both the khans and to the Ottomans, and a legitimate object of punitive raiding conducted by the khans with the help of Ottoman troops and yielding yet more slaves. On the other hand, Islamization of the Circassian elite which began already in the 16th century and continued apace, enabled the Circassian leaders to participate in Ottoman campaigns at least from the second half of the 16th century and be rewarded for their assistance. The author thus provides a more nuanced understanding of the Circassians' ambiguous status in the Crimean-Ottoman world, though she acknowledges the lack of certainly as to the time when Islam began to prevail over the Circassians' previous beliefs and the need for further research of the numbers and fates of Circassians enslaved in the Khanate and the Ottoman Empire.

The final part of the book, 'The Black Sea and Global Slavery', features studies by Colin Heywood and Dariusz Kołodziejczyk which offer tentative comparison of Black Sea slavery with that of the Mediterranean and Atlantic regions. Their contributions are the most wide-ranging in the volume; after the chapters in the previous parts that are concerned largely with micro-scale phenomena, these chapters shift the general focus of the narrative to a macro-scale framework. Heywood bases his contribution on some of the works published by him over the last 20 years. He focuses on Mediterranean piracy during 1670–1720 utilizing three captivity narratives, published or reconstructed from extant documents and correspondence, for his discussion of the vagaries which English and Scottish natives faced as captives or slaves in Tripoli, in Algiers, and on board of a Christian pirate ship flying the colours of Livorno. He relies in part on micro-analysis of these narratives to develop a macro-evaluation of captivity/slavery in the Mediterranean. Although Heywood states that considering some aspects of captive-taking the Mediterranean and the Black Sea were 'two worlds rather than one' (p. 394), he also pinpoints some key parallels, the main one being the variants of 'permeable, fluctuating, unstable, and in part undemarcated, terrestrial and maritime frontier zones' present in both regions that served as raiding zones (p. 390).

In the volume's last chapter, Kołodziejczyk offers some points of comparison between the Black Sea and Atlantic systems of slavery in the early modern period (c. 1500–1800). Although the author repeats his earlier estimate that the number of captives exported from eastern Europe in the 16th–17th centuries (up to 2 million persons) was comparable to the volume of the African slave traffic bound for the Americas during the same period, the differences between Black Sea and Atlantic slavery seem more numerous then the similarities, more so than in the case of captive-taking in the Mediterranean discussed by Heywood. Thus, slaves in the Americas were employed mainly on sugar and cotton plantations, which the author somewhat imprecisely considers 'almost unknown' in the Ottoman Empire (p. 424). For according to Halil İnalcık the use of slaves in agriculture was far from unknown in the Ottoman Empire, especially during the territorial expansion when the conquests supplied numerous and inexpensive slaves thus making their use in agriculture economically feasible (e.g., on newly established large farms). The staying power of Ottoman agricultural slavery, however, was much more limited than that of

Authenticated kosagabor9@gmail.com | Downloaded 06/04/22 09:00 AM UTC

American plantation slavery as over time the Ottoman communities of agricultural slaves gradually diminished in part as a result of marriages with free peasants and ultimately disappeared having dissolved among the latter (İnalcık 1979 / 1985: 30–34). Kołodziejczyk also states that in the Ottoman world white East European slaves (as, for that matter, black African slaves) were not subjected by their owners, who were also white, to the racial stigmatization experienced by Black slaves in the New World. The comparatively quick assimilation of East European slaves in Ottoman Muslim society resulted in a nearly complete disappearance of any visible traces of the once substantial white slave population. One can but agree with Roşu who calls the tentative comparisons of different systems of slavery offered in the volume's last two chapters a useful and 'thought-provoking exercise' shedding 'new light on both regions' and urges a further exploration 'not just by focusing on regional peculiarities in isolation but also from a transregional – if not global – perspective' (p. 13).

The edited volume is a valuable contribution to the growing scholarly literature on Black Sea slavery, or rather unfreedom studies. The chapters included present sophisticated research; they address various aspects of the phenomenon, utilizing a staggering amount of primary sources (Crimean, English, Italian, Ottoman, Polish, Russian, Ukrainian, and others), some hitherto overlooked, some reinterpreted. Taken together, the contributions undoubtedly enhance our understanding of Black Sea slavery and suggest salient points of comparison between it and the Mediterranean and Atlantic slavery ecosystems. The volume might have benefited from having the articles arranged chronologically rather than thematically because under the present arrangement Part 2 that deals with 'Slavery and Christianity' appears somewhat disconnected from the other parts. Despite this and the misinterpretations and terminological irregularities pointed out above, in the opinion of this reviewer the collection is a commendable first attempt in using the Black Sea as an analytical construct for slavery studies on the culturally diverse societies of the region over a long period of time. The scholarship included convincingly places Black Sea slavery in the framework of global slavery.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baranowski, Bohdan 1947. 'Dzieje jasyru na Gródku karaimskim.' *Myśl Karaimska* 2: 40–52.

Evliya Çelebi 2003. *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi: Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Bağdat 308 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkripsiyonu-Dizini* [Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi (Book of Travels): Transcription and Index of the Baghdad Manuscript Numbered 308 in Topkapı Palace Library]. Vol. 7. Ed. Yücel Dağlı, Seyit Ali Kahraman, Robert Dankoff. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Gliwa, Andrzej 2016. 'The Tatar Military Art of War in the Early Modern Period: An Example of Asymmetric Warfare.' *Acta Poloniae Historica* 114: 191–229.

İnalcık, Halil 1979 / 1985. 'Servile Labor in the Ottoman Empire.' In: Abraham Ascher, Tibor Halasi-Kun, and Béla K. Király (eds.) 1979. *The Mutual Effects of the Islamic and Judeo-Christian Worlds: The East European Pattern*. [Studies on Society in Change, no. 3.] Brooklyn, NY: Brooklyn College Press, 25–52. [Repr. in his *Studies in Ottoman Social and Economic History*, VII. (Variorum Collected Studies Series 214.) London: Variorum Reprints, 1985.]

İnalcık, Halil, with Donald Quataert (eds.) 1994. *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*. Vol. 1, *1300–1600*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Authenticated kosagabor9@gmail.com | Downloaded 06/04/22 09:00 AM UTC

Öztürk, Yücel 2017. 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Köle Emeğinin Rolü ve Hacmi [The Role and Dimensions of Slave Labor in the Ottoman Empire].' In: Zübeyde Güneş Yağcı, Fırat Yaşa (eds.) *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kölelik: Ticaret, Esaret, Yaşam* [Slavery in the Ottoman Empire: Trade, Captivity, Daily Life]. Istanbul: Tezkire Yayınları, 31–56.

Yaşa, Fırat 2019. 'Between Life and Death: Slaves and Violence in Crimean Society in the Last Quarter of 17th Century.' *Selçuk University Journal of Studies in Turcology* 47: 433–443.

Yaşa, Fırat 2021. 'Born and Bred in Seventeenth-century Crimea: Child Slavery, Social Reality and Cultural Identity.' In: Gülay Yılmaz and Fruma Zachs (eds.) *Children and Childhood in the Ottoman Empire*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 177–195.

Authenticated kosagabor9@gmail.com | Downloaded 06/04/22 09:00 AM UTC