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WELCOME

It is with great pleasure that we welcome you to Leiden University for the workshop “Slavery in The Black Sea Region: Forms of Unfreedom at the Intersection between Islam and Christianity, c. 900-1900.”

The papers selected for this workshop span a wide array of topics, from Byzantine economic strategies, to Tatar raiding tactics, to broad comparisons between the Black Sea and the transatlantic slaving zones. The speakers will reflect on slavery in the Black Sea region as an encounter zone between East and West, Christianity and Islam, and their contributions are clustered around six main themes: Late Medieval and Early Modern Trends; Slavery among Christians; The Circassian Question; Raiders, Slaves, and Captives in Crimea; Slaves in the City (Istanbul); and The Black Sea and Global Slavery. The workshop aims to place the Black Sea in the wider debates on global slavery, while raising new questions that will illuminate and possibly modify current theories on medieval, early modern, and modern forms of unfreedom.

The workshop organizers would like to express their gratitude to the speakers and the general audience for their participation in this event.

We would also like to add a special thanks to our sponsors:

- The Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences
- Leiden University Centre for the Study of Islam and Society
- Leiden University Institute for History
- Leiden University Fund

With best wishes,

Felicia Roșu, also on behalf of Leiden Slavery Studies Association
WORKSHOP LOCATIONS*

Leiden University, Cleveringaplaats 1, Lipsius Building, Room 1.48 (LUF Zaal)
Hotel ibis, Stationsplein 240-242
Hotel Golden Tulip, Schipholweg 3
Restaurant Het Prentenkabinet, Kloksteeg 25

*BSS workshop locations on Google Maps [HERE](#).


SPEAKERS

Viorel Achim, Nicolae Iorga Institute of History, Romanian Academy, Bucharest

Michel Balard, Paris-Sorbonne University

Hannah Barker, Rhodes College, Memphis

Andrzej Gliwa, University of Warsaw

Oleksandr Halenko, Institute of History of Ukraine, Kyiv

Serghej Karpov, Lomonosov Moscow State University

Mikhail Kizilov, Centre of Russian Folklore, Moscow

Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, University of Warsaw / Polish Academy of Sciences

Natalia Królikowska-Jedlińska, University of Warsaw

Aleksandr Lavrov, Paris-Sorbonne University

Nida Nebahat Nalçacı, Bilkent University, Ankara

Sandra Origone, University of Genoa

Victor Ostapchuk, University of Toronto

Daphne Penna, Groningen University

Ehud Toledano, Tel Aviv University

Gulay Yılmaz, Akdeniz University, Antalya
**PROGRAM**

**Panel structure:** 10-15 minutes per presentation; general discussion at the end of each panel (30 minutes in 2-speaker panels and 45 minutes in 3-speaker panels).

---

**TUESDAY, 30 MAY – Lipsius Building, Room 1.48**

**9:00 Welcome & coffee**

**9:15 Session 1 – Late Medieval and Early Modern Trends**

**Discussion questions:** What were the main trends (and trend shifts) in slave-taking, slave-trading, and slave-handling in the late medieval and early modern periods? Who were the usual suspects and what can we say about routes, prices, and slave numbers?

- **Michel Balard,** Paris-Sorbonne University: *The Black Sea Slavery, 13th-15th Centuries*
- **Serghej Karpov,** Lomonosov Moscow State University: *Slavery in the Black Sea Region, 14th-15th Centuries*
- **Oleksandr Halenko,** Institute of History of Ukraine, Kyiv: *Slavery Trends in the Ottoman Black Sea in the Light of Fiscal Documents from the 16th Century*

**10:45 Coffee break**

**11:00 Session 2 – Slavery among Christians**

**Discussion questions:** What was the place of slavery in medieval and early modern Christian societies? To what extent did Christianity influence the character of slavery in Byzantine, Orthodox, and Catholic communities?

- **Daphne Penna,** Groningen University: *The Participation of Slaves in Byzantine Economic Activities, 10th–11th Centuries: Some Legal Aspects*
- **Sandra Origone,** University of Genoa: *Christian Slave Traders, Slave Owners and Slaves in the 13th-15th Centuries*
- **Viorel Achim,** Nicolae Iorga Institute of History, Romanian Academy, Bucharest: *The Orthodox Church and the Emancipation of the Gypsy Slaves in the Romanian Principalities, Mid-19th Century*

**12:30 Lunch (catered at the workshop location)**

**13:30 Session 3 – The Circassian Question**

**Discussion questions:** Who were the Circassians? How and why did they become enslaved in large numbers? When and why did they become prized slaves in the Black Sea region and

---

* Updates and other details: [https://www.facebook.com/events/972621669541673/]
beyond? What was the status of the Circassian beys vis-à-vis the Ottoman sultan and the Crimean khan, and what was the religious and social structure of their chieftainships?

- **Hannah Barker**, Rhodes College, Memphis: *The Tatar-Circassian Shift in Comparative Perspective*

**14:30 Coffee break**

14:45 Session 4 – Crimea (1): Raiders

Discussion questions: What was the place of Crimea in the general picture of Black Sea slavery? What did a slave raid consist of? What similarities and differences were there between Tatar and Cossack raids, and what types of slavery were they involved in? To what extent can we see the Tatars and Cossacks as the Black Sea equivalents of the Barbary and Maltese corsairs?

- **Andrzej Gliwa**, University of Warsaw: *How the Captives Were Taken: The Making of Tatar Slave Raids in the Early Modern Period*
- **Victor Ostapchuk and Maryna Kravets**, University of Toronto: *In Search of Slaves Among the Vanished: Cossack Captive-Taking and the Modalities of Unfreedom*

**15:45 Coffee break**

16:00 Session 5 – Crimea (2): Slaves and Captives

Discussion questions: What do the sources say about the number, status, and experiences of Slavic (Polish, Ruthenian, and Muscovite) captives in Crimea? What other captives and slaves were there in Crimea? What legal, social, or other types of differences were there between “slaves” and “captives”?

- **Mikhail Kizilov**, Centre of Russian Folklore, Moscow: *Polish Slaves in the Ottoman and Tatar Crimea (1475-1774): Survey of the Problem with Special Focus on the Seventeenth Century*
- **Aleksandr Lavrov**, Paris-Sorbonne University: *How Many Slaves from Ukraine and Muscovy Were There in the Crimean Khanate in the 17th Century?*

**17:00 Drinks (for all attendants) – Coffee room, Huizinga building (ground floor)**

**18:00 Dinner (for the speakers) – Restaurant Het Prentenkabinet, Kloksteeg 25**

**WEDNESDAY, 31 MAY – Lipsius Building, Room 1.48**

**9:00 Coffee**

**09:15 Session 6 – Slaves in the City: Istanbul**

Discussion questions: What was the place of urban slaves in the overall picture of Ottoman slavery? How big and how diverse was the slave population in big cities like Istanbul, and what were its main economic roles?
• **Gulay Yilmaz**, Akdeniz University, Antalya: *Unfree Labor in the Palace Gardens of the Ottoman Empire, 16th-17th Centuries*

• **Nida Nebahat Nalçacı**, Bilkent University, Ankara: *The Labour of POWs in the City of Istanbul*

10:15 Coffee break

**10:30 Session 7 – The Big Picture: The Black Sea and Global Slavery**

Discussion questions: What is the place of the Black Sea in current debates on global slavery? Is the Black Sea a useful analytical unit and what can it contribute to our understanding of global trends? How comparable is it with other regions such as the Atlantic or the Mediterranean Sea? Is the existent conceptual framework adequate or should it be expanded/adapted to include Black Sea trends and peculiarities?

• **Dariusz Kołodziejczyk**, University of Warsaw / Polish Academy of Sciences: *Slavery and Slave Trade in the Atlantic and the Black Sea: A Comparative View*

• **Ehud Toledano**, Tel Aviv University: *Models of Global Enslavement*

11:30 Coffee break

**11:45 Session 8 – Round table: Conclusions**

Discussion questions: Were there significant shifts or continuities between medieval, early modern, and modern trends as far as slavery in the Black Sea region is concerned? Were there meaningful differences or commonalities between Muslim and Christian societies? What other patterns have become apparent in our discussions and how can we structure the edited volume around them? What directions for further research seem most fruitful at this point?

• **All participants**

13:00 Lunch (catered at the workshop location)

14:00 End of proceedings; departure of participants who have flights in the afternoon/evening

**THURSDAY, 1 JUNE**

Departure of remaining participants

9:00: start of the LSSA conference; for those interested, details may be found here: [http://hum.leiden.edu/history/slavery-and-forced-labour-in-asia/](http://hum.leiden.edu/history/slavery-and-forced-labour-in-asia/)
ABSTRACTS & BIOS

ACHIM, VIOREL – The Orthodox Church and the Emancipation of the Gypsy Slaves in the Romanian Principalities, Mid-19th Century

ABSTRACT. In the 1830s-1850s, when in Wallachia and Moldavia the issue of the emancipation of the Gypsy slaves was on the public agenda and when different categories of slaves were actually freed, the Orthodox Church found itself in a delicate position. On the one hand, the Church was a major slave owner, and on the other hand, it was a partner for the state in its effort, started in 1831, to gradually modernize the Romanian society, modernization which targeted from the very beginning the Gypsy population as well. The Church collaborated in this project with the governments in Bucharest and Iași and some of its prelates (such as the Metropolitan Veniamin Costache in Moldavia and the Metropolitan Neofit in Wallachia) accepted even the idea of abolishing the slavery. At the same time, some of the intellectuals of the Church were among the first to raise their voices against slavery, and some clerics were involved in the abolitionist movement. The two laws for emancipating the slaves belonging to the Metropolitanate, bishoprics, monasteries, churches, and other public institutions, adopted on 31 January 1844 in Moldavia and 11 February 1847 in Wallachia, revealed the divergent interests that existed within the Church. Some churchmen welcomed the law, while some monasteries sought to limit the losses it imposed on them. They asked for financial and other kinds of compensations from the state, and sometimes they managed to obtain them. At the same time, monasteries were concerned to keep on their estates the workforce represented by their former slaves. The present paper sets this complicated array of interests and actions that the Church as institution and its people have held at that time in relation with the slaves and the abolition of slavery.

VIOREL ACHIM is a Senior Researcher at the Nicolae Iorga Institute of History, Romanian Academy, Bucharest. His research fields include the history of the Gypsies (Roma), ethnic minorities in Romania between 1918-1948, population policy in Romania during World War II, and the Holocaust. He is the author or co-author of eight books. He also edited or coedited four collective volumes. In the field of the history of Gypsies (Roma) he published, among others, the book The Roma in Romanian History (Budapest, New York: Central European University Press, 2004). Since 2007, together with his research team at the Nicolae Iorga Institute, he has been studying slavery, abolitionism, and the emancipation of Gypsies in the Romanian principalities between ca. 1830 and ca. 1860. His newest publication in this field is “Gypsies Speak. An Analysis of the Petitions of the Gypsy Slaves in the Romanian Principalities, c. 1835-c. 1855”, in Hristo Kyuchukov, Elena Marushiakova and Vesselin Popov, eds., Roma: Past, Present, Future, München: LINCOM, 2016, pp. 56-67.

BALARD, MICHEL – The Black Sea Slavery, 13th-15th Centuries

ABSTRACT. Slavery was a main characteristic of Mediterranean societies in the later Middle Ages, and during two centuries (1270-1475) its main source was the Black Sea region. The slave trade, inherited by Byzantium from Roman times, grew largely owing to Genoese and Venetian settlements created on the shores of the Black Sea, where Caffa and Tana became the main centers of the trade in humans. The notarial deeds and books of accounts written in these colonies allow a description of who the slaves were: their ethnic origin, their gender distribution, their age, and their price on the local market. To follow the trends of the slave market, one must refer to particular dates illustrated by substantial sources: Lamberto di Sambuceto’s deeds for the end of the thirteenth century, Benedetto Bianco’s deeds for the 1360s, the Genoese books of the Caffa Massaria for the end of the fourteenth and the greater part of the fifteenth century, as well as some fifteenth-century deeds from Tana. The latter sources demonstrate the decline of slavery in the Black Sea by 1475 and the changes that occurred among those who participated in slaving activities. At the end of the fifteenth century, the Black Sea was no longer the main supplier of slaves for the Mediterranean area.

BARKER, HANNAH – *The Tatar-Circassian Shift in Comparative Perspective*

**ABSTRACT.** During the last decades of the fourteenth century, there was a shift in the composition of the slave population exported from the Black Sea into the Mediterranean. The proportion of Tatar slaves decreased while the proportion of Circassian slaves increased. This phenomenon is well known within the field of Mamluk studies, where it is attributed to the desire of the first Circassian sultan, Barqūq, to recruit more Circassian mamluks instead of Turks or Tatars. However, thousands of slave sale contracts recorded by notaries in Genoa and Venice during the same period show that Italian slave markets also experienced a shift away from Tatars and towards Circassians in the late fourteenth century. This was not a coincidence. The demands of slave owners in Mamluk Egypt and Syria were entirely independent from the demands of slave owners in Genoa and Venice, but in the late fourteenth century both groups acquired and shipped slaves through the same set of ports in the Black Sea. Thus I argue that the shift from Tatar to Circassian slaves occurred because of changes in the supply of slaves in the Black Sea rather than demand for slaves in the Mediterranean.

HANNAH BARKER received her Ph.D. from Columbia University in 2014 and is now an Assistant Professor in the History Department at Rhodes College. She studies slavery and the slave trade during the medieval period. Her book manuscript, *That Most Precious Merchandise: The Slave Trade in the Late Medieval Mediterranean*, analyzes the slave trade from the Black Sea to the markets of Cairo, Genoa, and Venice during the thirteenth through fifteenth centuries. Her research interests include medieval ideologies of slavery, the relative importance of state and mercantile interests in shaping the slave trade, and the process of marketing and buying slaves.

GLIWA, ANDRZEJ – *How the Captives Were Taken: The Making of Tatar Slave Raids in the Early Modern Period*

**ABSTRACT.** Research regarding the number of people abducted by the Tatars from the southeast areas of Poland-Lithuania in the early modern period is hindered by the lack of reliable quantitative sources. Even less explored is the question concerning the organization and logistics of Tatar plundering and slaving raids. Studies conducted by the present author, regarding the raids that took place in the seventeenth century, have shown that they fit within the pattern of asymmetric warfare and operated usually in non-military environments, mainly in rural areas. Based on a massive number of primary sources and using cartographic methods and GIS technology, the paper attempts to reconstruct the movements of Tatar troops during slave raids not only at the operational scale, but also at a tactical level, choosing selected Tatar raids conducted on the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the seventeenth century. The aforementioned sources have also enabled a comparative analysis of the efficiency of seventeenth-century Tatar slave raids in regard to the average rate of abducted people from one attacked village. The findings suggest that most military expeditions launched by the Tatars against their northern Slavic neighbors, can be described as asymmetric, large-scale slave hunting operations. General Rupert Smith’s concept of “war amongst the people” may be applied here, even if Smith did not make any references to the early modern Tatar military actions.

ANDRZEJ GLIWA is an Assistant Professor in the Institute of History of the University of Warsaw. Before joining the University of Warsaw, he worked at the National Heritage Board of Poland. His research interests include early modern warfare in the border zone between the Ottoman
Empire/Crimean Khanate and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, economic and social history, and memory studies. His publications focus on the art of war in the Crimean Khanate, war damages in seventeenth-century Poland, Tatar plundering and slave raids, and the experience, collective memory, and cultural trauma of Tatar invasions.

HALENKO, OLEKSANDR – Slavery Trends in the Ottoman Black Sea in the Light of Fiscal Documents from the 16th Century

ABSTRACT. The Ottomans continued the traditions of the slave trade in the Black Sea known since antiquity. The pastoral nomads inhabiting the steppe of Eastern Europe, now under the rule of the Crimean khans, offered slaves to the Ottoman merchants, who replaced the Genoese. The huge Ottoman market nearby invited Tatars to intensify slave raiding, while the population in the area grew with the progress of Ukrainian colonization. However, the Ottomans, unlike other Mediterranean powers, subjugated the nomads to the north. Eager to milk the lucrative slaving business, the Ottomans imposed heavy taxes on the import and transportation of slaves within the empire. The poor Tatars, unable to pay custom duties, usually sold their human catch cheaply to professional slave dealers without entering Ottoman ports, sometimes at occasional markets organized in the middle of the steppe. Thus, numerous and affordable slaves from Eastern Europe soon came to dominate the slave market of the empire. Not surprisingly, slavery became widespread in the northern Black Sea area as well. Slaves are even detectable among the tax-payers registered in the province of Kefe in 1542. These data provide many peculiar details about slavery in the area.

OLEKSANDER HALENKO is a historian and self-trained orientalist and the curator of the Centre for the Study of Civilizations in the Black Sea Area at the Institute of History of Ukraine in Kyiv. He explores various aspects of the pastoral nomad civilization of Eurasia through written sources and art. The history of the slave trade in Eastern Europe from its beginning to the end of the eighteenth century is an old commitment of his, which he aims to ultimately publish in a book under the title The Slave Coast of Europe. This workshop provides excellent opportunity to resume what was interrupted a decade ago.

KARPOV, SERGHEJ – Slavery in the Black Sea Region, 14th-15th Centuries

ABSTRACT. The paper is focused on the shifts in the number and ethnic structure of the slaves bought in the major ports of the Black Sea (mostly Tana/Azov) in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and on the changes in the direction and importance of trade routes. The author attempts to clarify some intractable questions such as the initial origin of the slaves offered for sale on major Black Sea markets, and the physical state, age, sex, and behavior of the slaves. The study is based on data from notarial documents, commercial account books, and official assembly deliberations held in the State Archives of Venice and Genoa. The author undertakes a comparison of prices and individual characteristics of slaves sold on the markets of Venice and Tana, based on underexplored registers and other records of Venetian notaries. Special attention will be given to the widespread (but mostly overlooked) phenomenon of large-scale manumission that took place in the 1430s-1450s, reflected in the notarial records drawn up in Tana. The manners and types of manumissions as well as redemption in the form of manumission are examined with respect to the subsequent destinies of the ex-slaves, their exploitation, hiring or complete liberation as Roman citizens.

SERGHEJ PAVLOVICH KARPOV is Professor of History and President of the Historical Faculty at Lomonosov Moscow State University; he is also Head of the Department of Medieval Studies and Director of the Center of Byzantine and Pontic Studies of the same university. His qualifications and affiliations include: Ph.D. (1974); Dr. habil. (1986); full Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences (2011); corresponding member of the Ligurian Academy of Sciences and Humanities (Genoa, Italy, 1998); corresponding member of the Deputazione di Storia Patria of Venice, Italy (2008). His fields of research are: Late Byzantine history; Venice, Genoa—Trade and Colonization of the Black Sea Region; History of the Empire of Trebizond; and Tana/Azaq in the thirteenth-fifteenth Centuries.
**ABSTRACT.** The slaves undoubtedly were the main article of internal and international trade in Ottoman Crimea and the Crimean Khanate. It is estimated that as many as two million slaves found their way to the Crimean slave market between 1500 and 1700. The Slavs (esp. Russians, Ukrainians, and Poles) always represented the most numerous ethnic group among the peoples that were “the live booty” of the Crimean Tatars. While previous studies focused mostly on Russian and Hungarian slaves in the Crimea, the position of the Polish slaves in the region has not been properly studied so far. My paper is dedicated to the analysis of the position of Polish slaves in the Crimea from the time of the Ottoman conquest of the peninsula in 1475 until the Küçük Kaynarca peace treaty of 1774. The paper is based on the materials found by the author in Polish, Lithuanian, and Russian archives as well as on little-known printed sources. Of special importance for this topic are the letters of Polish slaves from the Crimea and accounts of Dominican and Jesuit missionaries from the seventeenth century.

**MIKHAIL KIZILOV,** DPhil in Modern History, University of Oxford (2007), is a senior research fellow at the Centre of Russian Folklore in Moscow. He has written more than one hundred various publications on Karaite, Crimean, Khazar, and Jewish history—in English, Russian, German, Polish and Hebrew—including *The Karaites of Galicia* (Leiden/Boston, 2009) and *The Sons of Scripture* (Berlin/Warsaw, 2015). He also published several articles on the slave trade in the late medieval and early modern Crimea from the perspective of Christian, Muslim, and Jewish sources.

**KOŁODZIEJCZYK, DARIUSZ** – Slavery and Slave Trade in the Atlantic and the Black Sea: A Comparative View

**ABSTRACT.** The author aims at comparing several aspects related to slavery and slave trade in the Atlantic and the Black Sea regions in the early modern era, namely: 1) chronology and dynamics; 2) variants of slavery; 3) impact on local societies, their economies and environments; 4) impact on the “receiving” societies and their economies; 5) the problem of stigmatization and the position of former slaves in their societies; 6) long-term effects and ways of commemorating in present-day discourse. The paper will be based on the author’s own research related to the Black Sea slave trade and slavery in the Ottoman Empire as well as relevant literature. Special focus will be given to the literature on African slavery developed in communist Poland after 1945. It is symptomatic that Eric Williams’s highly provocative study *Capitalism and Slavery* was translated into Polish in 1953, to uniquely become a book originally published in the US and yet allowed to reach the Polish readers in the Stalin era. Inspired by Williams’ monograph but also by his own pre-war studies on Genovese Caffa, a leading Polish economic historian, Marian Małowist, encouraged a group of his students, most notably Michał Tymowski and Bronisław Nowak, to venture to study African slavery in a broad comparative perspective, informed by the East European experience with slavery and serfdom. This discussion, today largely forgotten, focused on the economic efficiency of slave systems, the impact on local societies, the issues of race, and capital formation. Some of their findings as well as the questions raised over fifty years ago merit to be revisited in the context of the present workshop.

**DARIUSZ KOŁODZIEJCZYK** is Professor of Early Modern History at the University of Warsaw and at the Polish Academy of Sciences. He has published extensively on the Ottoman Empire, the Crimean Khanate, and international relations in eastern Europe. He is currently Vice-President of the Comité International des Études Pré-ottomanes et Ottomanes and an Honorary Member of the Turkish Historical Society. His most important publications include *Ottoman–Polish Diplomatic Relations* (2000), *The Crimean Khanate and Poland-Lithuania: International Diplomacy on the European Periphery* (2011), and (co-edited with Peter Bang) *Universal Empire. A Comparative Approach to Imperial Culture and Representation in Eurasian History* (2012).
ABSTRACT. In the Early Modern Period, the Crimean khans claimed sovereignty over the Circassians, who inhabited north-western Caucasus and a part of the eastern Black Sea coast. Because of that, Circassians were obliged to pay the so-called "shameful" tax in Circassian slaves, who were in great demand on the slave markets in the Crimean Khanate and the Ottoman Empire. In the same period, the Circassian beys were valued warriors in the Ottoman wars against Safavid Persia and the tutors of the Crimean-Tatar princes. Since Circassians left no written sources dating back to the early modern period, research on their history is based among others on Ottoman, Crimean-Tatar, Persian, Russian, and western European sources. Not surprisingly, they offer ambiguous answers to such important questions as: 1) Circassian religiosity; 2) the status of Circassian beys versus the Crimean khan and the Ottoman sultan; 3) the social structure of the Circassian chieftainships; and 4) the relations between these chieftainships. By carefully examining data extracted from a variety of sources (1—Crimean-Tatar, Ottoman, and European narrative sources; 2—missionary correspondence and reports; 3—the orders of the Ottoman sultans; 4—Crimean court registers), the present paper aims to understand what made it possible for some Circassians to be Crimean-Tatar and Ottoman domestic slaves, while others enjoyed the privileged status of being the khan’s vassals and showered with gifts by the Ottoman sultan, who was grateful for their military assistance against the Safavids. In particular, the study focuses on the connection between the Islamization of the Circassians and their status change within the Crimean Khanate and the Ottoman Empire.

includes all slaves: not only those from Muscovy and Ukraine, but also those from Poland and the
northern Caucasus. According to the report of the mission of Vasily Aytemirov, a relative of the khan,
Alish-aga told him during the conference on 21 April 1692 that “there are about one hundred thousand
or more of the Muscovite and Cossack people” in the Crimea. But this number was mentioned in a
particular context, because the Crimean side refused to exchange prisoners by the formula “all against
all” and argued that there are only two or three thousand Tatar prisoners in Muscovy. Given this
particular context, I think that the number mentioned by Alish-Aga is the maximum estimation.

ALEKSANDR LAVROV is Professor of History at the Paris-Sorbonne University. His publications
on the subject of slavery include “Captivity, Slavery and Gender: Muscovite Female Captives in the
Crimean Khanate and in the Ottoman Empire”, in Eurasian Slavery, Ransom and Abolition in World
History, 1200-1860, ed. by Christoph Witzenrath, Farnham, 2015, p. 309-319 and “Les anciens captifs
(polonjaniki), groupe social en Moscovie: statut juridique et réintégration factice,” Cahiers du monde

NALÇACI, NIDA NEBAHAT – The Labor of POWs in the City of Istanbul

ABSTRACT. Slavery was a primeval institution and being a slave was a common position in
Mediterranean societies. The slave trade was a cornerstone of the Mediterranean economy in any
century. Like other countries in the region, the Ottoman Empire kept slaves and Istanbul had harbored
people of slave status since the days of the Byzantine Empire. After the Turks started to rule the city,
the slave population of the city continued its existence. Apart from the slaves used for domestic service,
public service slaves were also a significant part of the social structure of the city. The prisoners of war
who were forcibly brought to the city could only find representation in the narratives of former prisoners
and in brief passages of the travel narratives of foreign visitors to Ottoman Istanbul. Ottoman archives,
on the other hand, hold many documents about those people, including their names, descriptions, and
salaries, and reveal much about prisoner employment practices in the Ottoman empire. The records
reveal not only the presence and employment of prisoners but also the Ottoman diplomatic perspectives
and attitudes regarding European slaves and POWs and the conditions for their freedom.

NIDA NEBAHAT NALÇACI is a Ph.D. student at the Department of History in Bilkent University,
Ankara, Turkey. Her M.A. dissertation focused on “POWs as the Sultan's Subjects in Ottoman Istanbul
and the system of public slavery as forced labor.” Besides the history of slavery in the Ottoman Empire,
her research interests include travelogues on the city of Istanbul and the image of the Ottoman capital in
the world by comparison to other imperial capital cities. Books: Istanbul'un 100 Seyyahı (100 Travelers
of Istanbul), 2011; Sultanın Kulları (Subjects of the Sultan), 2015.

ORIGONE, SANDRA – Christian Slave Traders, Slave Owners, and Slaves in the 13th-15th Centuries

ABSTRACT. The paper will consider unfreedom in the Black Sea from the thirteenth to the fifteenth
century. In particular, this paper will consider the rights of the slaves and ecclesiastical attitudes towards
them. Slaves were in the middle of a network of complicated interests: religious, legal, and economic.
Unfortunately, most of our information comes from the side of the owners. Even so, Genoese sources
can help us to investigate specific aspects of slavery in the Black Sea. How could men and women lose
their freedom? How could they regain it? How did slaves live? What were their main jobs? To what
extent could they have personal activities and possessions? What were their relations with their owners?
Did the slaves’ life change when they followed their owners on voyages overseas? Why and when would
an owner sell his or her slaves? How did the slaves’ life change when their owners died? What were
their relations with other free people? What was the status of their children? Were they considered
human beings or objects? Where was the borderline between their status as human beings—sometimes
even Christians—and commodities?

SANDRA ORIGONE is Professor of Medieval History at the University of Genoa. Her interests
include Byzantine History and Medieval History of the Mediterranean. Her fields of research and
publications mainly concern the relations between Byzantium and the West and Genoese affairs from Corsica to the Black Sea. She also studied subjects such as the Byzantine presence in Italy in the sixth and seventh centuries; diplomatic relations (in particular marriage connections) between Byzantium and western powers; Latin settlements in the Aegean and the Black Sea in the face of Turkish advances in the region; and sea routes, voyages, and navigation in eastern and western Mediterranean.

OSTAPCHUK, VICTOR, and MARYNA KRAVETS – In Search of Slaves Among the Vanished: Cossack Captive-Taking and the Modalities of Unfreedom

ABSTRACT. That Ukrainian and Russian cossacks engaged in captive-taking of Muslims along the Black Sea and its northern frontier has never been a secret in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian sources or folklore. Yet until recently the phenomenon has been mentioned by historians only in passing and even less recognized has been cossack seizure of Christians as captives in hinterlands adjoining the “Wild Field.” Although references to this phenomenon in documents and narrative sources stemming from Muscovy, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and the Ottoman Empire are not uncommon, certainly its magnitude and impact were dwarfed by the captive-taking undertaken by Tatars and Nogays on behalf of the Crimean and the Ottoman market. Where in the spectrum of unfreedom did the captives of cossacks end up? The sources exhibit plenty of cases of captives taken as prisoners of war or abducted for ransom. Capture for personal service, concubinage, or even marriage was not uncommon, whereas captive-taking for purposes of gifting to superiors or tribute was perhaps rarer. Though slaves could be ransomed, the term “ransom slavery” has not been well defined in the literature, since capture for ransom did not necessarily involve enslavement. It is crucial to investigate the historical usage of the Arabo-Turkic term esir'yesir as well the Slavic term jasyr derived from it (and other terms, such as branec', niewolnik, polonjanik). An important question is how common was it for captives procured, kept, or distributed by cossacks to end up in long-term servitude, and whether contemporaries in Polish, Ukrainian, and Muscovite societies were cognizant that this was slavery.
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PENNA, DAPHNE – The Participation of Slaves in Byzantine Economic Activities, 10th–11th Centuries: Some Legal Aspects

ABSTRACT. In Byzantine law—as in Roman law—slaves were used to expand the economic activities of their owners. Slaves had no legal personality, which is why legal constructions were used to allow slaves to take part in business and economic activities. In this paper, I will attempt to highlight some of the legal aspects concerning the participation of slaves in economic activities in Byzantium. The starting point will be the Book of the Eparch, which dates from 911/912.
DAPHNE PENNA studied law at the University of Athens in Greece, where she completed her M.A. in Legal History (2003). She wrote a dissertation (University of Groningen, 2012) on “The Byzantine Imperial Acts to Venice, Pisa, and Genoa, 10th-12th Centuries: A Comparative Legal Study.” She is currently working as a lecturer in the Legal History Department at the University of Groningen. Her interests lie in Roman and Byzantine law and especially in their influence on the European legal tradition.

TOLEDANO, EHUD – Models of Global Enslavement

ABSTRACT. The “comparative turn” in enslavement studies, more visible over the past decade or so than before, has—inadvertently—invited scholars with theoretical inclinations to offer models for explaining the many varieties of human bondage in history. The three latest volumes of the Cambridge World History of Slavery opened up the field for work on the wide range of unfreedom in societies across the globe from antiquity, through medieval times, to the early modern and modern periods. It is not surprising, therefore, that we are also witnessing a pike in new overarching theories that seek unifying models. To be sure, there were earlier waves of competing models, going back to the Nieboer-Domar hypothesis, Alfred Zimmern’s self-manumission, Gilberto Freyre and Frank Tannenbaum on Brazil-US comparative post-emancipation realities, and Moses Finley’s Slave Societies, to name just a few. Later attempts included the social anthropology/sociology-based models of Claude Meillassoux and Alain Testard, followed by the influential sociological model of Orlando Patterson. More recently, the debate about the Atlantic model versus the Indian Ocean one has gained traction, and among the current theories of global enslavement three are noteworthy: Dale Tomich and Michael Zeuske’s Second Slavery, Jeff Fynn-Paul’s Slaving Zones, and Noel Lenski’s Intensification Model. If most models in the past, as the more recent ones by Tomich-Zeuske and Lenski, emphasize quantitative economic elements, Meillassoux, Testard, Patterson, and Fynn-Paul stress “softer” components drawn from anthropology and sociology, such as identity and ideology, or system of meaning, to use Clifford Geertz’s terminology. But, for historians, all past and present models pose a major difficulty, which of course goes well beyond enslavement studies. This paper will survey the discourse on global models of enslavement, examine briefly their relevance to MENA societies, and offer an historian’s perspective on their usefulness for future research.


YILMAZ, GULAY – Unfree Labor in the Palace Gardens of the Ottoman Empire, 16th-17th Centuries

ABSTRACT. The traditional role of the devshirme system was to levy and train Christian subjects of the empire in order to use them in military and administrative positions. A less emphasized role of the devshirme system was that the levied children performed skilled or unskilled labor in state workshops, on the ships carrying goods for the palace, or in fruit and vegetable gardens, vineyards, and orchards. This paper investigates the boys who were forced to labor in the imperial garden (hass bahçe) and the provincial gardens (taşra bahçes), such as those in Büyükdere, Üsküdar, and Edirne. Who were they, where were they levied, how many boys were utilized in which gardens, and what was their salary and working conditions? Luckily, it is possible through archival research to trace the stories of some of the
boys who were forced to labor in the Ottoman capital. The boys worked under specialized masters and were promoted in the echelons of the palace appointment system or remained to work in these gardens. Some simply refused to adjust to the conditions of forced labor and ran away.
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