GINGKO LIBRARY ART SERIES

Senior Editor: Melanie Gibson

في ذكرى

مارك لينز

# The Mercantile Effect

*Art and Exchange in the Islamicate World during the 17th and 18th Centuries*

Edited by
Sussan Babaie and Melanie Gibson



# Contents


6 Foreword by Melanie Gibson

9 Introduction by Sussan Babaie — The Mercantile Effect: On Art and Exchange in the Islamicate World

15 SUET MAY LAM — Fantasies of the East: 'Shopping' in Early Modern Eurasia

27 AMY S. LANDAU — The Armenian Artist Minas and Seventeenth-Century Notions of 'Life-Likeness'

39 WILLIAM KYNAN-WILSON — 'Painted by the Turcks themselves': Reading Peter Mundy's Ottoman Costume Album in Context

51 NICOLE KANÇAL-FERRARI — Golden Watches and Precious Textiles: Luxury Goods at the Crimean Khans' Court and the Northern Black Sea Shore

63 NANCY UM — Aromatics, Stimulants, and their Vessels: The Material Culture and Rites of Merchant Interaction in Eighteenth-Century Mocha

75 FEDERICA GIGANTE — Trading Islamic Artworks in Seventeenth-Century Italy: the Case of the Cospi Museum

87 ANNA BALLIAN — From Genoa to Constantinople: The Silk Industry of Chios

102 CHRISTOS MERANTZAS — Ottoman Textiles Within an Ecclesiastical Context: Cultural Osmoses in Mainland Greece

115 FRANCESCO GUSELLA — Behind the Practice of Partnership: Seventeenth-Century Portuguese Devotional Ivories of West India

124 GÜL KALE — Visual and Embodied Memory of an Ottoman Architect: Travelling on Campaign, Pilgrimage and Trade Routes in the Middle East

141 Contributors

# Golden Watches and Precious Textiles: Luxury Goods at the Crimean Khans' Court and the Northern Black Sea Shore

NICOLE KANÇAL-FERRARI

This essay deals with the presence of commodities in the territories of the northern Black Sea shore and the role they played within the broader region.[1] It focuses particularly on the circulation of art objects and luxury articles in the realms of the Crimean Khanate (1441–1783) in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Precious items presented as gifts to the khan and the members of his family were in high demand at the court of Bahçesaray, the capital of the khanate in the Crimean peninsula (a modern panorama of which is offered in Figure 1). Additionally, other noblemen from the influential tribes of the Crimean aristocracy were among those who benefitted from the goods. Tatar princes often asked for specific articles from the French ambassadors in Istanbul, the Ottoman capital, and confronted Europeans at the court in Bahçesaray with concrete demands for articles that were part of the latest trends in Western decor. Until the end of the seventeenth century, precious objects also came to the Crimean court through tributary payments from Poland-Lithuania, Moscow and smaller principalities. Among the goods in high demand were fur, textile, porcelain, personal items like golden watches, and even pendulum clocks.

Much has been written in the last two decades on the practice of gift giving, on the exchange of diplomatic gifts, the circulation of commodities and the traffic of objects in the Islamicate world.[2] This interest has extended to the artistic environment of the Ottoman vassal principalities of *Eflāk* (Wallachia), *Boğdan* (Moldavia) and *Erdel* (Transylvania) in the north-western Black Sea region, which at the same paid tribute to the neighbouring Crimean Khanate.[3] Curiously though, very little has been written about the Crimean Khanate itself.



Figure 1. Panoramic view of the Palace of the Khans in Bahçesaray, sixteenth–eighteenth centuries. Photograph by Osman Oktar.

The Crimean khans, also known under the name of their dynasty, the house of Geray (or Giray in the Ottoman usage), were the dominant power in the region from the fifteenth century onwards. Heirs of the Golden Horde Empire founded by descendants of Genghis Khan (d. 1227), they maintained their privileged status within the socio-political texture of the region until the end of the eighteenth century. Their control of vast territories in the north-western Black Sea region (see Figure 2 for a map) made them important agents in the power politics between the Russian, European and Ottoman Empires.[4]

Given the significance of the khanate in the region, a study of its material culture has the potential to offer important insights. Yet such a study faces certain inherent difficulties. Due to the Russian Empire's invasion and ultimate annexation of the khanate in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, its material heritage was, to a large extent, destroyed.[5] Portable items were carried away or simply disappeared. Some of the most precious objects were likely taken by the Crimean elite when they departed the peninsula for Ottoman territories.[6] Thus, any study of the khanate's material culture has to begin, in the absence of 'real' objects in the former territories of the Crimean




Figure 2. *New Map of the Crimea, the Black Sea and the surrounding Countries*, so called *Ratelband Map*, *circa* 1747 (undated) 19.05 x 30.48 cm. Erven J. Ratelband, *Geographisch Toneel of uitgezochte Kaarten, Totgemak der Officieren, Reisigers en Liefhebbers; Behelsende alle de generale Kaarten, Amsterdam* 1747, plate 30.

khans, by reconstructing that culture from scratch by compiling information from alternative sources.

This essay stands as an initial step towards this broader goal. In what follows, I focus specifically on the gifting of 'luxury' objects and the place of such practices and objects within the socio-cultural structure of the Crimean khanate, and within the broader networks of which they were a part.[7] It is my hope that this essay will contribute to research on the subject by revealing the sorts of objects that were regarded as luxuries, the networks through which they were obtained and the sorts of cultural practices in which they and their delivery were embedded. Though future research may reveal other dimensions to the practice and place of luxury gift giving within the Crimean Khanate, this essay at least provides a foundation upon which to build.

I begin by offering a discussion of the general background to luxury gift giving in the Ottoman Empire and Crimea, with a focus on the material culture in the broader region and the specific sorts of items that were regarded as luxury objects. In the following section, I move on to a discussion of a new class of luxury objects coming from the West. In the final section, I discuss a separate class of luxury goods relating to interior decor and offer a few concluding remarks on the place of the Crimean Khanate within the evolving dynamics between East and West in the early modern period.[8]

## LUXURY ITEMS AND DIPLOMATIC GIFTS

Luxury items can be defined as a specific category of objects that for a significant period of time did not circulate on the 'free' market, but were exclusively chosen for and presented to members of the ruling elite. In the context of the Crimean Khanate, such objects were distinctive to the Crimean ruler, his entourage and, to a certain extent, high functionaries (*kapı kulu*) and the noblemen of important tribes. This created a system of luxury objects that served as status symbols within the territory. A good was perceived to be a luxury because of its being new, precious, limited in availability and/or exotic. The symbolic meaning of the items thus was derived from a specific socio-cultural setting. Objects were often given within a diplomatic context, which gave them a meaning beyond their simple status as luxury goods. Politically motivated presents or rewards were given to the Crimean khans and aristocrats in recognition of their merit—that is, their political role in foreign politics and active participation in the warfare of the Ottoman Empire.[9] The items sent to the khans from Istanbul on the occasion of their inauguration to the Crimean throne are the most important ones in the category of truly exclusive luxury objects. Other luxury items were requested through merchants or directly from the ambassadors of France in Istanbul and/or consuls in Bahçesaray, as objects were also sent from Western rulers to the khan.

Poland-Lithuania, Moscow and the semi-independent principalities of Moldavia, Wallachia and parts of Transylvania[10] sent prestigious merchandise as annual tributary payments to the Crimean court in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In the payment documents, all the members of the princely court, the khan's four wives, his sons and daughters, the functionaries at the court and the important members of the established Crimean tribes were listed to receive such presents as furs, textiles, or money.[11] Every year, immense amounts of furs, fur mantles and fur caps (so-called *kalpak* or *börk*) of diverse qualities were dispatched to the Crimean khan's court as part of Moscow's annual tribute.[12] Other tributary payments made in the form of goods included textiles and birds such as hawks and gyrfalcons.[13] Among the variety of furs, the most prestigious were sable (*samur*), marten (*zerdeva/sansar*), black fox (*siyah tilki*, *rubah*), fox (*tilki*) and squirrel (*sincap*). Sable and fox in particular were both used for the *kalpa*k, the distinctive headgear trimmed with fur worn by the Crimean elite.[14] In Ottoman book illustrations, the Crimean princes are depicted with their characteristic headgears (Figures 3A and B). Precious furs were also in fashion at the Ottoman court, where they were used as trimmings for the robes of honour distributed at receptions to ambassadors and



Figure 3. A: *The future khan Gazi Geray II (fighting against Nāẓır Emīr Khan)*, Āsafī Dal Mehmed Çelebi's *Şecā'atnāme* (Account of the heroic conquest) 1586–1587, Istanbul, Istanbul University Library, TY 6043, 129 r.



B: *Meeting of Crimean Princes (hanzade) and Osman Pasha*, Āsafī Dal Mehmed Çelebi's *Şecā'atnāme* (Account of the heroic conquest) 1586–1587, Istanbul, Istanbul University Library, TY 6043, 209 v.

members of the Ottoman elite. In the Ottoman environment black fox fur was the privilege of the sultan and was rarely given to other high-ranking functionaries.[15] Though the fashion for these fur-trimmed robes originated in a Turco-Mongol-Islamic context, they were adopted and imitated by neighbouring rulers and the aristocratic elite, in whose costume the best quality fur was also a distinctive symbol of princely power or social status.[16] Thus, any discussion on luxury in the Crimean Khanate has to include the situation in the Ottoman Empire and other neighbouring principalities.

In the region as a whole, luxury and status symbols were closely connected to the person to whom they belonged; they were accumulated, worn, displayed and often re-gifted. Luxury items owned by high Ottoman functionaries went back into the royal treasury after the death of their owners. The most distinctive item of the Crimean ruling elite, the *kalpak*, is an example of a luxury object that was adopted and appropriated through cultural borrowing by the ruling classes of the Balkans and that, as a consequence, became a distinctive headdress of the nobility. In the famous *Rålamb Costume Book*, an album containing the depiction of distinctive types and groups of seventeenth-century Ottoman society, the Crimean khan is depicted in a fur-trimmed robe and a *kalpak* (Figure 4). The *kalpak* is all the more important as it was a symbolic headdress which was not part of the Ottoman idiom, and was therefore exclusively Crimean. In other words, it demonstrates the impact that the Crimean—formerly Chinggisid—culture and its code of luxury and (socio-political) power had on neighbouring empires.[17]

The sable *kalpak* was also occasionally included as part of the insignia sent to the newly installed Crimean khan by the Porte—thus expressing both his sovereignty and subordination under Ottoman authority[18]—together with the official inauguration document and the following items: a quiver inlaid or set with pearls, an aigrette (*sorguç*) inlaid or set with precious stones, jewellery, a sable fur, an ordinary robe of honour (*hil'at*), horses with ornamented raiment, inlaid swords and decorated swords




Figure 4. *Khan of the Tatars (Tartare Han)* from the *Rålamb Costume Book*, Istanbul, before 1657. Indian ink with gouache, 10 x 14 cm. Stockholm, National Library, Rål. 8:o nr 10, plate 115.

set with precious stones. Two examples of such swords, originally belonging to members of the Geray dynasty and now housed at the Topkapı Palace, are illustrated in Figures 5 and 6. The following sets of presents offer additional examples: Kaplan Geray I (r. 1707–1708, 1713–1715,1730–1736) was sent a dagger set with precious stones ('bir kabza murassa'hancer') in 1734; Selim Geray II (r. 1743–1748) a watch and a dagger, both encrusted with diamonds, in 1747; and Kırım Geray (r. 1758–1764, 1768–1769) silk fabric (embellished) with gold or silver thread, a sable fur and a sable *kalpak* ('serāsere kaplı semmūr kürk, semmūr kalpak') in 1759.[19]

Sending such precious objects on the occasion of the inauguration of a new khan was part of the Ottoman sultan's confirmation of the khan's position. Like the costumes discussed above, they were part of a shared culture of symbolic luxury gift giving that connected the ruling elites of the different empires in the region.[20] They were a symbolic manifestation of the khan's position in the region's politics, similar to the items sent to Ottoman vassals in the Balkans and later to the *hetman* (commander) of the Cossacks. They expressed political authority visually and were thus key objects represented in portraits of the khan (Figures 3, 4 and 7), members of the aristocracy, and other local rulers like the newly established Cossacks' commander (Figure 8). The French Jesuit P. Claude Duban describes the Crimean khan Devlet Geray II (r. 1699–1702, 1708–1713) in a letter dated 1713 as wearing a sabre, a sable cap and a jewelled aigrette. Some decades later, Nikolaus Ernst Kleemann (1736–1801), a merchant from the Habsburg Empire, gives a similar description of Kırım Geray Khan, adding to these items a golden dagger with a velvet sheath mounted with gold, a golden mace and exquisite equestrian equipment.[21] A small portrait—today in Lancut Castle, Poland—entitled *Khan of the Crimean Tatars* depicts the Crimean ruler with similar apparel. He



Figure 5. Sword of Geray Khan (?),L. 96 cm, Topkapı Palace Museum, TSM Env. No 1/2776. ©Topkapı Palace Museum.

Figure 6. Sword of Sahip Geray Khan, L. 96 cm, Topkapı Palace Museum, sixteenth century (?), TSM Env. No 1/2770. ©Topkapı Palace Museum.

is shown with a robe trimmed with fur, an exquisite belt, a sable cap with two jewelled aigrettes, a precious sword, a dagger and a bow in a richly decorated quiver (Figure 9). Visual portraiture and written accounts thus use the same objects to underscore the khan's authority.

## PRESENTS FROM WESTERN RULERS AND BUREAUCRATS

To understand what the Crimean aristocrats saw as luxury or 'must have' possessions, it is also important to look at items ordered by members of the princely household from those Western individuals they were in contact with: ambassadors, consuls and merchants in Istanbul or Crimea, or even missionaries in Bahçesaray. In the eighteenth century, the Western empires were in constant pursuit of a policy of influence in the Ottoman capital and beyond. This was particularly true in Crimea, where they hoped to win over the khan and, with him, his military and political power, in order to use the khanate for their own interests.[22] To this end they were zealous in satisfying any requests for specific luxury objects made by the Crimean rulers and their entourage. There are also examples of luxury items being given as bribes, such as a watch given to the *mufti* (religious authority) by the consul of France in Crimea, Xaverio Glavani, in order to have a certain affair concluded according to his wishes.[23] It is also interesting to examine the gift ideas that Western individuals came up with on their own rather than in response to a specific request. The missionary Duban, for example, proposed that a terrestrial globe, a mounted lodestone and binoculars should be purchased in France and presented to the khan.[24] Dispersed in diverse sources, we can find information on a number of luxury objects that were requested or known to have been given to members of the Crimean elite.



Figure 7. *Adil Ghiray Gran Camo De Tartari Precopensi, Crimensi, Nogayensi etc*., engraving and etching by Moritz (Mauritz) Lang, Austrian School, *circa* 1649–1700. ©ÖNB/Wien, PORT_00041695_01.




Figure 8. *Giorgio Chimilinschi Generale de Cosacchi,* engraving and etching prepared by Bonacina in Gualdo Priorato, *Historia di Leopoldo Cesare: Contiente le cose piu memorabilia successe in Europa, dal 1656, sino al 1670*, vol. 2, Vienna 1670, plate 137.



Figure 9. *Khan of the Crimean Tatars*, unknown painter, France, eighteenth century, oil on Canvas, 41.8 x 34.2 cm, Collection of the Lubomirski family in Przeworsk, Lancut Castle MŁ, inv. no 400 MŁ. Collection: Museum–Castle in Lancut. Photograph by Marek Kosior.

In correspondence between the French ambassadors and consuls, the following presents are mentioned: in 1725 the ambassador Andrezel (1663–1727) in Istanbul gave Consul Glavani liquor, sweets and 'eau de la Reine d'Hongrie' as presents to give to Mengli Geray II (r. 1724–1730, 1737–1739) on the occasion of his being installed as khan.[25] In 1729, Villeneuve (1675–1745), successor to Andrezel, offered ordinary cloth, exquisite fabric with gold thread, satin fabric and jewellery to Mengli Geray II during his visit to Istanbul, and woollen fabric and cloth from France to Ali Pasha, the vizier accompanying the khan, 'according to the customs in Istanbul'.[26] In 1730, the envoy from Poland arrived in Bahçesaray with a number of presents, including pendulum clocks, a textile with gold thread, marquetry-inlaid boxes, some pieces of crystal and a satin textile for the grand vizier of the khan. Villeneuve also sent other gifts: plain cloth, cloth with gold thread, and satin. For the services he performed for Consul Glavani, the vizier requested a gold repeater watch,[27] a fashionable device invented at the turn of the eighteenth century that was just being launched on the market (Figure 10).[28] The khan asked instead for liquors and a pen. Glavani had previously sent to the khan: ten pieces of Gobelin (textile or tapestry woven at the Gobelin factory in Paris), ten pieces of Lyon fabric with gold thread, ten pieces of satin and ten pieces of 'Gros de Tours'. The khan was very pleased with these presents and sent, as a symbol of his appreciation, two Tatar knives, one for the ambassador and the other for his wife, with tassels '*à la Circassienne*'. In 1732, when the new khan Kaplan Geray I was on the throne, his vizier requested a fur mantle from the French ambassador, while the son of the khan asked for a gold watch to replace a silver model that he had previously received. In 1733, sources state that a 'typical' present, consisting of fabrics, tableware and clocks or watches, was dispatched to Crimea.[29] Special emphasis must be accorded to a list of presents sent by the King of Prussia, Frederick the Great (r. 1740–1786), to the Crimean Khan Kırım Geray. Among these gifts were precious textiles, highly decorated gold watches, boxes set with precious stones and, most importantly, guns and Splendour sabres ('Pracht=Säbel'), a term that indicates these were luxury objects and not for use.[30] As a diplomatic gesture, the items in this list indicate that they were a gift for a ruler on an equal level, rather than to an Ottoman vassal.




Figure 10. Gold repeater watch set with diamonds and gold *chatelaine* (chain), produced for the Ottoman market, Julien Le Roy (1686–1759), France, 1750. Photograph by Carsten Berger. © carsten-antik.

Luxury items such as gem-encrusted weapons sent on the occasion of the inauguration of a new khan were among the most precious items at the Ottoman court. Similarly, presents exchanged during diplomatic encounters such as the well-known visit to Paris by the Ottoman ambassador Yirmisekiz Çelebi Efendi in 1720–21 and by Mehmed Said Efendi in 1741 were very well received by the French king.[31] As members of the Crimean nobility were always present at the Ottoman court in the capital, they were familiar with the luxury items circulating in the Ottoman capital and presented to the court; they thus requested the same items from the European ambassadors for themselves.[32]

## INTERIOR DESIGN AS A STATEMENT OF STATUS

From the beginning of the eighteenth century, the khans showed exceptional receptiveness to all kinds of Western products, and items used for interior decoration were also an important category of luxury goods. Although beyond the scope of this paper, the household wares and decorating materials brought to the court in Bahçesaray merit a detailed investigation of their own.[33] European furniture designs brought by merchants through Istanbul and Poland arrived at the palace in Bahçesaray and certainly influenced its architectural decoration. This formed part of the Ottoman elite's new interest in European artistic forms. No original piece of furniture has survived in the palace of the khans, which makes any discourse on the perception of luxury furniture and its 'real' presence difficult, but the remaining wall decoration in some of the rooms (Figure 11) points to close parallels with contemporary taste in Istanbul. Furthermore, the account of Kırım Geray to the Prussian envoy, the young officer Baron Alexander von der Golz (in Crimea from 1761 to 1762), makes clear that the rulers periodically renewed the palace furniture. The khan, famous for his extravagant nature and the sumptuous festivities held at his court, complained about being in debt after having refurnished the palace with furniture, tapestries and divans acquired from Istanbul.[34] When he received the merchant Kleemann, he immediately ordered large mirrors, lustres and chandeliers for his palace, clearly indicating that he was aware of the new decorating habits in Istanbul, where palaces were being decorated with mirror-covered wall panelling.[35] It seems therefore likely that the palace of the Crimean khans, until the end of the khanate, followed the latest fashion trends perceived as luxurious by the neighbouring ruling houses.

At the same time as an increasing amount of Western luxury goods were entering the Eastern (Ottoman) market; the West had a growing interest in merchandise originating from the East, principally the Ottoman Empire, a new fashion described as *Turquerie*.[36] On a more regional scale, tradesmen (mainly Armenian and Jewish) operating on the trade routes from the East through the northern Black Sea region to the Balkans provided supplies of Eastern merchandise to Europe. This contributed on a different level to the creation of a common hybrid 'luxury' culture in the broader region for a new clientele in the early modern era: the aristocracy and, later, the new rising social classes of the Balkans. This new clientele desired and imitated the luxury symbols of the Eastern (i.e., Crimean



Figure 11. Detail of the interior wall decoration in the Golden (Fruit) Room in the Palace of the Khans, Bahçesaray, second half of the eighteenth century. Photograph by the author.

and Ottoman) courts, as discussed above. At the same time, they attributed to these symbols a political meaning and used them as an expression against the 'invading' Western culture.[37] The traffic of objects and acceptance of the exchange of ideas—from the West to the courts in Istanbul and Bahçesaray, and from the East to the Balkans—played an important role in the creation of a new aesthetic experience in the early modern era. Some items of the newly emerging fashion would later transform into socio-cultural and political symbols, as in the case of Polish Sarmatism. In such cases, Ottoman costumes were often imitated, but rather than the turban with its religious connotations, it was the more neutral *kalpak* of the Crimean Khanate that would become a distinctive symbol of the nobility in the Russian and Balkan principalities.

The Crimean court and its aristocratic elite were active agents in the region's cultural landscape and were eager to possess the same luxury objects as other contemporary courts. The court saw itself as, and wanted to be perceived as, one of the ruling powers in the region. As part of this, the khanate made use of luxury items that would symbolise this status. The current state of research in this area provides enough evidence to confirm this claim on a cultural level. Unlike the situation in Istanbul however, the khanate's unstable regime, and the often swift deposition of rulers and the installation of new ones, as well as the repeated looting of the palace in Bahçesaray, did not permit the khans and their entourage to retain possession of their precious objects. Today, items can be found in museum collections in the former Ottoman capital, in Russia (in Moscow and St Petersburg), in the collections of neighbouring courts and dispersed among private collections. Further investigations will surely furnish more information on the objects as they are documented in the sources and contribute further to our knowledge of the material culture of the Crimean Khanate, and thereby to our knowledge of the broader regional networks and dynamics of which they were a part.

NOTES

1. The material presented here is part of a larger project which focuses on trade, the circulation of goods and diplomatic gifts and their cultural impact in the broader region covering the Golden Horde and Crimean Khanate periods.
2. See particularly: Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello, *The Global Lives of Things, The Material Culture of Connections in the Early Modern World*, London and New York 2016; Suraiya Faroqhi, *A Cultural History of the Ottomans: The Imperial Elite and its Artefacts*, London and New York 2016; Hedda Reindl-Kiel, 'Power and Submission. Gifting at Royal Circumcision Festivals in the Ottoman Empire (16th–18th centuries)',*Turcica* 41, 2009, pp. 37–88; Linda Komaroff, ed. *Gifts of the Sultans. The Art of Giving at the Islamic Courts*, Los Angeles 2011.
3. Nurhan Atasoy and Lale Uluç, *Impressions of Ottoman Culture in Europe: 1453–1699*, Istanbul 2012; Maria Pia Pedani, 'Sultans and Voivodas in the 16th C. Gifts and Insignia', *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 1, 1, 2007, pp. 193–209.
4. Mária Ivanics, 'The Military Cooperation of the Crimean Khanate with the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', in *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Leiden and Boston, 2013, pp. 275–99.
5. Kelly O'Neill, 'Constructing Imperial Identity in the Borderland: Architecture, Islam and the Renovation of the Crimean Landscape', *Ab imperio: teoriia i istoriia natsional'nostel i natsionalizma v postnovetskom prostranstve* 2, 2006.
6. Some items bearing the names of individuals from the Geray dynasty are part of the collections of the Topkapı Palace Museum and the Military Museum in Istanbul. See Hilmi Aydın, *Sultanların silahları: Topkapı Sarayı silah kolleksyonu*, Ankara 2007, pp. 166–73. A few examples are also known in other collections.
7. I say it is an 'initial' step because any effort to reconstruct a non-existent material culture involves identifying and compiling information from a wide range of largely untapped potential sources. There are no doubt many sources I have not had the opportunity to access, and I therefore cannot claim to have said the final word on the subject, or make any bold claims as to the representative quality of the material I present here.
8. In order to shorten the references, only studies directly relevant to the issues examined in this essay are given, with preference given to recent ones containing references to earlier work.

9. Gilles Veinstein, 'Les Tatars de Crimée et la seconde élection de Stanislas Leszczynski', *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique*, 11, 1, 1970, p. 90: The Sultan, wanting Kaplan Geray to go on a campaign against Iran in 1735, offered to give him his *mehter takımı* (military orchestra) and his own tents and 'all the other magnificent things they [the sultans] used when they went to war personally'.

10. Alexandre Bennigsen, Pertev Naili Boratav, Dilek Desaive and Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, *Le Khanat de Crimée dans les Archives du Musée du Palais de Topkapı*, Paris 1978, pp. 189, 244–47.

11. Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, *The Crimean Khanate and Poland-Lithuania: International Diplomacy on the European Periphery (15th–18th century): A Study of Peace Treaties Followed by Annotated Documents*, Leiden and Boston 2011, pp. 498–99, 504–6; Mária Ivanics, 'Entstehung und Quellenwert der Krimtatarischen Tıyış Defters', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 48, 1–2, 1994, pp. 105–12.

12. A number of lists documenting these annual tributes are published in Vladimir Vladimirovich Veliaminov-Zernov, *Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire du khanat de Crimée extraite par ordre de l'Académie impériale des Sciences, des archives centrales du ministère des affaires étrangères, à Moscou*, St Petersburg, 1864.

13. Kirill Kočegarov, 'The Moscow Uprising of 1682. Relations between Russia, the Crimean Khanate, and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth', in *The Crimean Khanate between East and West (15th–18th Century)*, ed. Denise Klein, Wiesbaden 2012, p. 68; for birds given as gifts in the Ottoman context, see Hedda Reindl-Kiel, 'Der Duft der Macht. Osmanen, islamische Tradition, muslimische Mächte und der Westen im Spiegel diplomatischer Geschenke', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Vienna 2005, pp. 216–18.

14. Natalia Krolikowska, 'Sovereignty and Subordination in Crimean-Ottoman Relations (Sixteenth–Eighteenth Centuries)', in *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. Gábor Kármán and Lovro Kunčević, Leiden and Boston 2013, pp. 60–62.

15. Alexandre Bennigsen and Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, 'Les Marchands de la Cour Ottomane et le Commerce des Fourrures Moscovites dans la Seconde Moitié du XVIe Siècle', *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique* 11, 3, 1970, pp. 363–90 ; Filiz Karaca, 'Hil'at', *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 18, 1998, pp. 25–27.

16. Reindl-Kiel, 'Power and Submission', pp. 49–53.

17. Krolikowska, 'Sovereignty and Subordination', p. 60.

18. Sándor Papp, 'Die Inauguration der Krimkhane durch die Hohe Pforte (16.–18. Jahrhundert)', *The Crimean Khanate between East and West (15th–18th Century)*, ed. Denise Klein, Wiesbaden 2012, pp. 75–90; Krolikowska, 'Sovereignty and Subordination', pp. 57–62.

19. This list was compiled from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century documents at the Topkapı Palace Archive. Some documents with lists of gifts are published in Bennigsen, *Le Khanat de Crimée*, see particularly pp. 301–9; and referenced in Gül Irepoğlu, *Osmanlı Saray Mücevheri, mücevher üzerinden tarihi okumak*, Istanbul 2013, pp. 48, 135, 156, 176, 196, 222, 224, 325. For specific examples, see also Kemal Gurulkan, Yusuf İhsan Genç, Uğurhan Demirbaş and Turgay Özekici, *Crimean Khanate in Ottoman Documents*, Istanbul 2013, pp. 140, 191.

20. For a discussion of the political symbolism of these objects, see Alexandr Osipian, 'The Oriental Luxury between Fashion and Politics: Armenian Merchant Network and the Making of Orientalized Sarmatian Culture in the Early Modern Poland-Lithuania', in the forthcoming volume edited by Alina Payne in conjunction with the Harvard University research seminar 'From Riverbed to Seashore: Art on the Move in Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean in the Early Modern Period (1400–1700)'. I am grateful to the author for allowing me to use his unpublished manuscript. See also Adam Jasieński, 'A Savage Magnificence: Ottomanizing Fashion and the Politics of Display in Early Modern East-Central Europe', *Muqarnas* 31, 1, 2014, pp. 173–205; and the more general discussion on the nature of luxury goods and their political dimension in Arjun Appadurai, 'Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value', in *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, ed. Arjun Appadurai, Cambridge 1986, p. 38.

21. Jean-Frédéric Bernard, *Recueil de voyages au nord*, vol.10, Amsterdam 1738, pp. 413–14: 'lettre à Monseigneur le Marquis de Torcy Ministre & Secrétaire d'Etat, Sur le nouvel Etablissement de la Mission des Peres Jésuites dans la Krimée', P. Claude Duban, Bahçesaray, 20 May 1713; Nikolaus Ernst Kleemann, *Nikolaus Ernst Kleemann's Reisen von Wien über Belgrad bis Kilinova, durch die Butschak-Tartarey über Kavschan, Bender, durch die Nogey-Tartarey in die Krimm, dann von Kaffa nach Konstantinopel, nach Smirna und durch den Archipelagum nach Triest und Wien, in den Jahren 1768, 1769 und 1770*, Vienna 1771, p. 48.

22. Pierre Duparc, *Recueil des instructions aux ambassadeurs de France. XXIX Turquie*, Paris, 1969, pp. 222, 358, 387, 391, 398, 404, 422–29; Gilles Veinstein, 'Missionnaires Jésuites et agents Français en Crimée au début du XVIIIe siècle', *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique*, 10, 3–4, 1969, pp. 414–58.

23. Veinstein, 'Les Tatars de Crimée,', p. 35. On the question of the margin between bribery and gift giving in Ottoman society, see Hedda Reindl-Kiel, 'Luxury, Power Strategies and the Question of Corruption: Gifting in the Ottoman Elite', *Şehrāyīn: Illuminating the Ottoman World. Perceptions, Encounters and Boundaries*, ed. Yavuz Köse, Wiesbaden 2012, pp. 107–20.

24. Bernard, *Recueil* 428: 'envoyer de France un Globe Terrestre, une Pierre d'Ayman armée, une ou deux bonnes Lunettes d'approche, & autres choses de cette nature, qui font fort du goût des Princes Tartares'. Optical devices are also among the presents the king of France sent to Istanbul in the eighteenth century; see Fatma Müge Göçek, *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century*, New York 1987, p. 144. The merchant Kleemann also made demonstrations with such devices (*Maschinen*) in front of the khan; see Kleemann, *Reisen*, p. 37.

25. Veinstein, 'Missionnaires Jésuites', p. 453.

26. Veinstein, 'Les Tatars de Crimée', p. 37.

27. Veinstein, 'Les Tatars de Crimée', p. 37.

28. Göçek, *East Encounters West*, pp. 104–6.

29. Veinstein, 'Les Tatars de Crimée', pp. 37, 58.

30. Theodor Mundt, *Krim Girai, ein Bundesgenosse Friedrichs des Grossen*, Berlin 1855, pp. 85–86.

31. Among the items the Ottoman ambassador Mehmed Said Efendi brought to Paris were horses adorned in precious raiment, a bow, a quiver and arrows, a sabre encrusted with precious stones, silk cloth and brocade from Greece and India, very fine muslin and an ermine fur coat. He presented the king with textiles, silver sabres, daggers, Turkish knives, a rock-crystal mace and gold weapons decorated with pearls, precious stones and diamonds. The French king presented Mehmed Said Efendi with a 'damaskin gun of gold', two pairs of gold pistols, carpets, mirrors, furniture, clocks, watches, snuff boxes and jewellery. Among the king's presents to the ambassador for the sultan were a silver chandelier, a basin and pitcher, a mirrors, carpets, furniture, and also a microscope. Lesser functionaries were given clocks and gold watches. The complete lists are given in Göçek, *East Encounters West*, pp. 142–44, and watches are discussed on pp. 105–6; see also Reindl-Kiel, 'Der Duft der Macht', pp. 242–45.

32. On the presentation of gifts at the Ottoman court, see Reindl-Kiel, 'Der Duft der Macht', p. 201.

33. Archival material of items sent to the Crimean court in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is published in Nicole Kançal-Ferrari, *Kırım'dan kalan Miras: Hansaray*, Istanbul 2005, pp. 283–89. For the Ottoman court, see Tülay Artan, 'Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Princesses as Collectors: Chinese and European Porcelains in the Topkapı Palace Museum', *Ars Orientalis (Globalizing Cultures: Art and Mobility in the Eighteenth Century)* 39, 2010, pp. 113–46.

34. Mundt, *Krim Girai*, p. 76.

35. Kleemann, *Reisen*, p. 39: 'Hierauf bestellte er bey mir 150. Spiegeltafeln zu 6. Spannen lang und 3. breit, welche er zu Belegung eines Zimmers haben wollte, nebst ein halbdutzend Haeng=und einem Dutzend Wandleuchtern'.

36. Nebahat Avcıoğlu, *Turquerie and the Politics of Representation, 1728–1876*, Farnham 2011.

37. Osipian, 'The Oriental Luxury between Fashion and Politics'.